# ROM report

| | |
|---|---|
| Type of ROM review | Projects and Programmes |
| Project title | Integrating Legal Empowerment and Social Accountability for improved local government performance and governance in the districts of Koboko, and Maracha (LESA Action) |
| Project reference | C-412823 |
| Delegation in charge | Uganda |
| Status | Draft |
| Report date | 30/11/2021 |

## Project - Key Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Domain (instrument) | European Development Fund |
| DAC Sector | Democratic participation and civil society |
| Zone Benefitting from the Action | Uganda |
| Action Location | Northern Uganda: West Nile Region in the districts of Koboko and Maracha. Koboko sub counties will include: Lobule sub county: North Division and Kuluba sub county Maracha sub counties will include: Oluffe sub-county, Tara sub-county: Oleba sub-county |
| Type of Project/Programme | Geographic |
| Geographic Implementation | Single-country |
| Entity in Charge | DIRECTORATE A - Africa |
| OM in Charge | LHOSTE CELINE |
| Contracting Party | CENTER FOR HEALTH HUMAN RIGHTS ANDDEVELOPMENT (CEHURD) LIMITED BY GUARANTEE |

## Project - Financial data on 05/11/2021

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total budget | 222,223 € | | |
| EU contribution | 200,000 € | | |
| Paid Amount | 91,303 € | Date of last payment | 26/02/2020 |

## Project - Dates

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Contractor Signature Date | 10/01/2020 | | |
| Activities | Start Date | 01/01/2020 | End Date | 30/06/2022 |
| Final Date for Implementation (FDI) | 31/12/2023 | | |

## ROM review - Key information

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Reason for ROM review | Yes | | |
| ROM expert(s) name(s) | STONES Elizabeth | | |
| Field phase | Start Date | 08/11/2021 | End Date | 18/11/2021 |

# Executive Summary

Key-findings (summary)

The intervention supports accountability and service delivery and is closely aligned with the priority needs and rights of target groups including local government (LG), civil society organizations (CSOs), Community Health Advocates (CHAs) and citizens. The intervention is well designed to both benefit from and enhance the institutional and human capacities of the district and LG structures and the target groups in Northern Uganda (NU).

Development Initiative for Northern Uganda (DINU) is a complex programme with several components, many stakeholders and a variety of implementation methods. The Legal Empowerment and Social Accountability (LESA) Action project is funded by a grant compliant with EU procedures, under indirect management of the EU with the Government of Uganda (GoU), within the wider framework of the DINU programme, which is coordinated and supervised by the OPM, and both these structures and the implementing partner (IP) Center for Health, Human Rights and Development (CEHURD) are appropriate to implement and oversee the project. Stakeholders and target groups in demonstrate high levels of awareness of, and commitment to, the objectives of the intervention which are well aligned with GoU priorities.

The intervention benefits from alignment with the other DINU interventions through the Working Groups (WGs) as well as synergies and complementarities with other interventions implemented by CEHURD and partner Partners in Community Transformation (PICOT).

The intervention is well designed to integrate best practices and lessons learned from past projects and to leverage past capacity building of target groups. The vertical logic is consistent with expected impacts and outcomes of the LESA Action project and overarching DINU programme but principles of subsidiarity are not coherent for the Specific Objective (SO) formulation. The horizontal logic is generally not well operationalized in the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) at the SO and Intermediary Outcomes (IO) sub-levels, although is reasonable at Output level. Monitoring data are collected and analysed regularly for activities, outputs and outcomes, but outcomes are not systematically monitored against the LFM due to poor indicator and target formulation.

Tasks and responsibilities are clearly defined to support efficient implementation of activities and oversight is adequate. Project inputs are sufficient for strengthening the capacity, gender-responsive good governance and the rule of law at the level of LG authorities, and empowering communities to participate in improved local service delivery and strengthening downward accountability of LGs by empowering citizens, CSO, media, NSAs and CHAs in their interaction with LG. The intervention adapted to COVID-19 reasonably efficiently but delayed activities resulted in underspending, with 40% of the budget absorbed to date, although this is proportional with the implementation of activities. Budget for the Endline Evaluation is inadequate.

The quality of project outputs is reasonably, sensitization strategies are strong and activities are well regarded by stakeholders. Outcomes and outputs are being achieved effectively with emerging evidence of positive outcomes for enhanced dialogue and service delivery between rights holders and duty bearers. These outcomes do not align with LFM indicators and targets, but are nevertheless impressive. The intervention is well designed to enhance accessibility of vulnerable groups.

Sustainability mechanisms are strong, leveraging and strengthening existing LG structures and building capacities of embedded target groups. Outcomes are embedded in sustainable structures and mechanisms, ensuring long-term access to benefits. The project enhances community resilience by strengthening accountability mechanisms and amplifying citizens' voices to improve service delivery.

The intervention contributes meaningfully to gender equality, supporting gender-responsive budgeting and enhancing women's political participation and voice, and supports the working principles of the rights-based approach (RBA). The project broadly supports environmental protection and climate change mitigation and enhances duty bearers' sensitivity to, and awareness of, potential conflict risks and takes measures to minimize the risk of harm from COVID-19.

Project visibility is reasonable but in some cases the names, aims and timelines of "DINU" and "LESA Action" are used interchangeably, which may result in misunderstandings.

Conclusions and recommendations (summary)

C1. LESA Action is well-designed and relevant to needs and capacities of target groups, but there are no activities or outputs associated with private sector.
R1: It is advisable to re-categorise the private sector as indirect beneficiaries.

C2: There are considerable complementarities and synergies with other DINU Lot 2 projects.
R2: It is advisable to support further collaboration and learning through face-to-face platforms and potentially exchange visits to cross-pollinate knowledge.

C3: LFM outcome level indicators and targets would benefit from updating to align with the real outcomes, internal monitoring recommendations are not aligned with a management response, and risks are not monitored systematically at all levels.
R3: It is advisable to update the LFM to enhance alignment with DINU and update SO and IO indicators and targets.
R4: Support to the Design of Logframes (SDL) is recommended.
R5: Action points emerging from internal monitoring would benefit from management responses.
R6: It is important to routinely monitor risks at all levels.

C4: Activity implementation has been significantly delayed by COVID-19 and national and local elections, resulting in underspending of the budget. The budget for the Endline Evaluation is inadequate.
R7: CEHURD may require a no cost extension to facilitate implementation of remaining activities.
R8: It may be necessary to reallocate budget from under-utilized budget lines to facilitate a robust external Endline.

C5: There has been little interaction between the implementing partners CEHURD and PICOT and the EUD since the initial inception phase.
R9: It would be beneficial to facilitate further engagement between CEHURD and OM/EUD to provide some technical capacity building around grant management etc. and help build their capacity and professional network.

C6: Visibility of the project is reasonable and stakeholders recognise the support provided by OPM and EU but there is confusion between 'DINU' and 'LESA Action', and even some project outputs appear to be affiliated more broadly as DINU rather than specifically as LESA Action.
R10: It is strongly recommended to ensure that the project is consistently referred to, both internally and on all outputs, publications, and communications, as LESA Action rather than DINU, clarifying its place within the DINU programme framework.

## Project Synopsis

### Description of the context with a focus on the problematic to be addressed by the action

Uganda is striving to become a middle income country by 2020, and overall indicators show significant progress during the last two decades. Reduction in the absolute number of poor people is marginal due to population growth and hides substantial spatial variation (with Northern Uganda still lacking behind) and rising inequality. Northern Uganda (NU) has suffered from the combined effects of conflicts, extreme weather conditions and insecurity, it lags behind the rest of the country in terms of most human development indicators (notably poverty and the number of undernourished children has increased), with women being disproportionately affected. While the potential of the agriculture sector in terms of poverty reduction is important, this is still largely untapped. Poverty indicators are among the worst on the continent, at 43.7% (twice the national average). Conflict drivers, such as land rights, youth unemployment and access to land and water are still threatening the consolidation of the post-conflict recovery.

The general shortcomings of accountability and service delivery in Uganda's decentralised governance system are exacerbated in NU by a long history of conflict that broke down the systems for citizen-State engagement. The Government and development partners have continued to undertake various efforts to accelerate development and good governance in NU, but limited citizen participation undermines the demand side for accountability, and governance-oriented Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in NU are limited due to ongoing conflicts. While civil society is usually expected to play an oversight role of accountability and good governance, in NU, civil society actors are adjusting from providing humanitarian assistance to focusing on governance-related matters.

Good governance and performance at the local governance structure are hindered by limited community participation and monitoring. Low community participation in the districts of Koboko and Maracha is majorly attributed to factors like: limited understanding of the on-going political processes; limited accountability to community and limited interactions between the community and decision makers; limited forums; limited platforms for engagement; limited leadership skills. Furthermore, women and young people have become more susceptible to political manipulation including violence, due to low civic awareness, lack of platforms to engage with leaders on service delivery mandate and high unemployment levels. These challenges have undermined citizen's meaningful and objective participation in governance in the districts of Koboko and Maracha leading to low quality representation, poor service delivery, and decreasing participation in local governance processes.

Citizens of Uganda have the right to participate in the affairs of government, and to influence government policies; and such participation deepens democracy, promotes good governance and fulfils the global agenda of inclusive growth. The rural-poor, compared to their urban counterparts, face additional structural constraints impending their ability to mobilize around and influence policy processes. Uganda's West Nile region ranked the second poorest region in the country with 43% of the population living in poverty, continues to lag behind on many development fronts as attributed to its struggle to recover from its history of protracted armed conflict.

Local governments also face constraints in delivering services for self-settled refugees and host communities in Northern Uganda, as a result of pressure on social amenities, compromised standards in the delivery of quality education, constrained healthcare service delivery, congestion at water points, increased food prices and services. These issues affect service delivery across Northern Uganda.

## Description of the intervention logic

The LESA Action project is a component of the broader DINU programme and contributes to the EU-funded DINU Specific Result 3, Action 3.3.1 which aims to increase downward accountability mechanisms through strengthening the role of CSOs, media and other local actors (media, private sector) in local governance and promotion of accountable and responsive service delivery. The LESA LFM (Logical Framework Matrix) has been revised since the initial version presented in the Description of Action (DoA), and the revised version is presented here as this is in use by the project.

The Overall Objective (OO) of LESA Action is "To consolidate stability in Northern Uganda, eradicate poverty and under nutrition and strengthen the foundations for sustainable and inclusive socio-economic development". There is one indicator at OO level, "Level of citizen participation and accountability in the local government processes" with no target specified.

The Specific Objectives (SOs) are twofold. SO1 is "Strengthened capacity, gender-responsive good governance and the rule of law at the level of LG authorities and empower communities to participate in improved local service delivery". There are two indicators for SO1: 1) "A gender responsive governance in planning, budgeting, implementing and monitoring of local government processes; target "Equal representation of both women and men governance for local government processes". For indicator 2) "Level of citizen participation and accountability in the local government processes" the target is "Participation of community members".

SO2 is "Downward accountability of LGs to its constituents is strengthened by empowering citizens, CSO, media, NSAs, private sectors in their interaction with LG". There are two indicators for SO2: 1) "% of citizen's satisfaction with delivery of public services, accountability and governance (disaggregated by sex)" with target "At least 55% citizen satisfaction level with delivery of public services, accountability and governance" (M: 25%, F: 30%). For indicator 2) "Level of stakeholder participation in planning, budgeting and monitoring LG programs" the target is: "At least 4 CBOs, 100 citizens engaged in the district budgeting and planning processes".

The project LFM also describes three intermediate outcomes (IOs) which are not clearly associated or subordinated to the SOs:

IO1: "Enhanced communities' capacities to hold duty bearers accountable for improved service delivery" with indicator Platforms established to hold duty bearers accountable" and target "Platforms including community score cards, health assemblies, and community dialogues attended by both community members and duty bearers"

IO2: "To enhance the capacities of duty bearers on their roles and responsibilities in governance for improved service delivery" with indicator Number of community plans that advance into implementation phase" and target "6 action plans implemented by duty bearers from 6 sub counties".

IO3 "Improved capacity of Civil Society Organizations (CSO)/Community Based Organizations (CBO) to monitor and assess government's compliance with its obligations to fulfil economic, social and cultural rights" with indicator,"Active involvement of CSOs to monitor and assess government's compliance with its obligations to fulfil economic, social and cultural rights" and target "CSOs/CBOs that make submissions on economic, social and cultural rights in different platforms at local government levels".

Ten outputs are detailed under IO1. 1.1 60 key stakeholders engaged in 2 district Inception meetings, 1.2 Project baseline conducted to establish project initial values against which progress will be measured, 1.3: 60 Community-link advocates(30 per district) identified from the existing community structures in 6 sub counties, 1.4: Capacity assessment on capacities of community-link advocates on governance and accountability conducted for 60 community link advocates, 1.5: 60 community link advocates trained/strengthened on accountability and monitoring mechanisms to reach out to their constituents. A capacity development plan developed, 1.6: 12 neighbourhood assemblies conducted through community link advocates reaching 1,800 participants (150 per sub county per neighbourhood assembly ), 1.7: 600 people in communities (media, private sector, community representatives) sensitized on the budgeting process, 1.8: 8 community dialogues to identify social, economic and governance issues that limit citizen's participation in governance conducted. 2000 community members reached through the community dialogues. 1.9: 12 Radio outreaches conducted to amplify community voices and concerns on social accountability, governance and service delivery. 100,000 people reached through the radio outreaches to amplify their voices and concerns on social accountability, governance and service delivery. 1.10: Priority Issues fronted by the community link advocates to be included in the budget. 2 district budgeting processes/conferences attended by community link advocates.

Three outputs are detailed under IO2. 2.1: 2 orientation sessions conducted for 30 duty bearers on their roles and responsibilities in promoting good governance, performance and accountability. 2.2: 2 district health assemblies conducted 200 People attend district health assembly in each district (400 people for 2 districts). 2.3: 4 community public awareness campaigns conducted to encourage citizens' participation in governance and accountability issues to promote service delivery.

Eight outputs are detailed under IO3. 3.1: CBOs/CSOs trained on trained on using community score cards and interpret the results for monitoring and improving service delivery in the districts of Koboko and Maracha. 3.2: List of CBOs assessed on governance and accountability to establish the active CSOs on ground interested in good governance and accountability with ability to deliver on the same Capacity assessment tool, 3.3:60 CBOs/CSOs representatives supported to develop tools and support them to monitor service delivery. 3.4: 60CBOs/CSOs trained on collaboration with local governments to undertake local governments' performance assessments 3.5: At least 4 governance issues arising from community, dialogues, community health assemblies and annual barazas handled/litigated, 3.6: Quarterly and bi-annual monitoring visits conducted, 3.7: LESA methodology document, 3.8: Communication and visibility materials produced.

Detailed activities are listed by output, including organising community dialogues, trainings, conducting sensitizations and radio outreach.

A total of 46 assumptions are also part of the LFM (3 at SO level, 3 at IO level, 19 at Output level and 22 at Activity level). Those assumptions are reasonably aligned with the overall risk analysis delivered in the Description of the Action and are still valid at current time, in generic terms at least.

## Description of the target group(s) and final beneficiaries

The target groups at political and administrative level are local government in the districts of Koboko and Maracha, particularly district leaders; the Resident District Commissioners; Chief Administrative Officers; Local council leaders; District coordination committees; religious and cultural leaders; justice and law enforcement, opinion leaders; youth and women leaders. At the community level, target groups include; CHAs (initially termed Community Link Advocates), CBOs, youth groups, media, women groups, private sector actors and community representatives in the districts of Koboko and Maracha.

Specifically, the project aims to directly support 4,520 beneficiaries including 60 community link advocates, 1,800 community members, 600 people from communities including media, private sector, and community representatives, and 2000 community members. Through local radio geographical coverage, the project also aims to reach 100,000 final beneficiaries across the two districts, including men women and youth.

Final Beneficiaries are the community members of the target districts of Koboko and Maracha. It may be considered that the private sector and communities in neigbouring districts may be indirect beneficiaries of the initiative.

CEHURD and implementing partner PICOT deliver the project in the West Nile Region in the districts of Koboko and Maracha. Koboko sub counties include Lobule sub-county: North Division and Kuluba sub county. Maracha sub counties include Oluffe sub-county, Tara sub-county: Oleba sub-county.

## Findings

### 1. Relevance

The intervention supports accountability and service delivery and is closely aligned with the priority needs and rights of target groups including Local Government (LG), duty bearers, Community Health Advocates (CHAs), Civil society Organizations (CSOs), citizens affected by rights violations and the general public. The Government of Uganda (GoU) emphasizes strengthening accountability and gender-responsive governance at all levels and is committed to enhancing service delivery. The proposed action is designed to build linkages to existing efforts and services of GoU and strengthen the performance of LGs and the engagement of communities and target groups to promote good governance, accountability and gender-responsive good governance in NU.

The intervention is recognized as a priority for all interviewed stakeholders, who described its relevance to the serious and widespread challenges facing Northern Uganda (NU). Stakeholders highlighted the poor awareness of rights and duties among rights holders and bearers, poor accountability mechanisms with low attendance and low confidence among communities to hold duty bearers to account and political representatives with limited understanding of their mandates.

Good governance and performance at the local governance structure are hindered by limited community participation and monitoring in the districts of Koboko and Maracha leading to low quality representation, poor service delivery, and limited participation in local governance processes. GoU emphasizes strengthening accountability at all levels. Article 38 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (as amended) guarantees citizens the right to participate in the affairs of government, and to influence government policies; and Uganda's National Development Plans (NDP) II and III emphasize that such participation deepens democracy, promotes good governance and fulfils the global agenda of inclusive growth.

Strengthening the role of CSOs and Community Based Organisations (CBOs), CHAs and other actors in accountable and responsive service delivery enhances downward accountability mechanisms, and strengthens oversight and collaboration. At present, these target groups lack adequate capacity (knowledge, tools of engagement and facilitation) to hold LGs accountable, including knowledge of legal frameworks and statutory Government processes.

For LG representatives and duty bearers such as planning officers and police, the intervention is well designed to support them to understand and execute their mandate by building their understanding of the legal framework within which they operate, and wider good governance and accountability frameworks. For CHAs, training provided on the Human Rights Based Approach (RBA), the budgeting process, governance, roles and responsibilities of LG leaders and accountability process is highly relevant to support them to hold duty bearers accountable for service delivery.

For CSOs and CBOs, the project addresses clearly identified knowledge and capacity gaps including monitoring local governance, accountability, and the budgeting process using the "Outcomes, Policy Efforts, Resources, Assessment" (OPERA) framework, building their capacities to monitor and track LG compliance in fulfilling economic, social and cultural obligations.

For the general public, the intervention is relevant in empowering communities and building their confidence and ownership of service delivery through community and district assemblies and supporting participation in barazas as platforms for communities to hold LG accountable and access information and services, and to feedback outcomes and updates; responding to real needs. Previously, barazas were characterised as "silent places" for the community.

Support is delivered through multiple channels including face-to-face trainings, radio outreach and talkshows, community events such as barazas, and reference materials addressing relevant issues through accessible and participatory formats. The expected results of the intervention are appropriate to the needs of target groups who lack adequate capacity (knowledge, tools of engagement and facilitation) to hold LGs accountable, including knowledge of legal frameworks and statutory Government processes.

The intervention design was highly participatory and planned activities and results emerged through research and dialogues with target groups. This is complemented by close collaboration with partner PICOT. The intervention strategy identifies and responses to the intersecting weaknesses of target groups, and is well designed to meet the identified needs and rights, enhancing service provision through empowering LG, demand side through empowering local community voice and awareness, and monitoring and accountability mechanisms through the planned capacity building of CSOs and CBOs. Target groups are well-chosen and have the required experience, technical capabilities and human resources to benefit from the intervention, with the exception of the private sector who are identified in the project design as a target group but in reality would be better classified as indirect beneficiaries.

The project is implemented by CEHURD with support from partner PICOT. Both organisations have extensive relevant regional experience and technical expertise, and are well regarded with strong reputations among the key target groups. CEHURD and PICOT have worked together for the past five years, and both organisations collaborated on the design and planning of the intervention and contribute strong organisational, administrative and technical support. CEHURD has not previously managed EU funded projects but nevertheless have reasonable capacity to manage and report on the intervention, which is augmented by strong support from their Senior Management Team (SMT) and from the DINU OPM-PMU team. Partner PICOT is based in Koboko District and also operating in Maracha district, and was selected to work with CEHURD on the LESA Action project in recognition of their extensive relevant regional experience and technical expertise as well as part experience with EU funded projects.

The project is funded by a grant compliant with EU procedures, under indirect management of the EU with the Government of Uganda (GoU), within the wider framework of the DINU programme which is coordinated and supervised by the Office of the Prime Minister's Programme Management Unit (OPM-PMU). The OPM has the mandate to lead and coordinate activities in NU at political and technical levels. The OPM-PMU is responsive to coordinating the DINU interventions to enhance coherence between programmes from design to implementation phase. The OPM works in partnership with line ministries, local governments, implementing partners and other stakeholders at central as well as district and sub-county levels.

The target groups have reasonable resources and capacities to use the products of the intervention, and efforts are made to ensure that sensitizations, trainings and other outputs are delivered and produced in accessible formats, at convenient times of day and in accessible locations, through participatory processes and in local languages, and are made widely available for relevant stakeholders. The representatives of target groups and beneficiaries (including LG representatives and duty bearers, civil society, media, and community members) are highly committed to the success of the intervention which has significant and far-reaching implications for their ability to deliver, demand and monitor service delivery to meet real needs. Support for the intervention is high, with positive uptake of activities in the field, and LGs request additional support and expansion of LESA Action project activities into neighbouring districts, including Yumbe and Terego District Local Governments.

The intervention is designed to work with and through existing LG and community level structures as far as possible, to embed the enhanced knowledge and strengthened capacities in enduring structures and provide enduring benefits.

## 2. Coordination, complementarity and EU added value

The intervention benefits from alignment and communication with other DINU interventions through the Working Groups (WGs) and with other funded projects in the target districts implemented by the IPs and other agencies. There is scope to further enhance and embed these synergies, particularly to strengthen sharing of lessons learned and best practices, networks, and outputs under DINU.

The LESA Action project is one component of the wider GoU DINU programme supported by EU with the objective to consolidate stability in NU, eradicate poverty and under-nutrition, and strengthen the foundations for sustainable and inclusive socio-economic development. DINU is a complex multi-sectoral programme led by Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), implemented in 33 districts across five sub regions of Acholi, Lango, Karamoja, Teso and West Nile. The LESA Action project contributes toward Specific Result 3, Action 3.3.1 under the DINU: "Increase downward accountability mechanisms through strengthening the role of CSOs, media and other local actors (media, private sector) in local governance and promotion of accountable and responsive service delivery".

The action is designed in complementarity with other components of the DINU programme and produces potentially reusable outputs for other Lot 2 DINU projects (e.g. the Handbook) and broadly strengthens supply of, and demand for, accountable service delivery to complement other DINU initiatives. LESA Action also raises the profile of DINU at the grassroots level, engaging directly with local communities as well as other target groups and stakeholders across Koboko and Maracha districts.

There are several mechanisms to enhance alignment. The District Coordination Meetings (DCMs) implemented by DINU offer a platform to build and enhance collaboration between DINU IPs, all of whom are invited to participate. The SPACE team make use of the DINU WhatsApp group to invite the other IPs under the governance section to events in the target districts (e.g. Barazas) to prevent duplication and support synergies. The allocation of districts to the DINU IPs (assigned during a roundtable in October/November 2019) is aligned across the DINU programme to ensure coherence, impact and sustainability and avoid duplication. Participation in the governance, communication and visibility (C&V) and M&E groups also supports synergies and inter-linkages between the DINU interventions to avoid duplication of efforts and ensure alignment of activities and data.

The project also benefits from other interventions implemented by the lead IP and partner, including an ongoing EU-funded action "Enhancing Access To Skills Development And Reducing Unemployment Among Youth Strengthening The Capacity Of Local Civil Society Organizations In West Nile" (EARN) project led by PICOT and, "Comprehensive refugee response CRRF: Inclusive Urban Development and mobility in the municipality of Koboko" led by Koboko Municipal Council with partner PICOT.  Some LESA Action CHAs are also working as Community Based Trainers for the NU Resilience Initiative with support from Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA), further building their capacity to support the outcomes of both projects.

These aligned projects contribute to LESA Action by strengthening the capacity of target groups and building relationships with municipal authorities. The aligned interventions have also built the capacity of implementing partners CEHURD and PICOT, enhanced their networking and relationships with leaders and key stakeholders, and contributed to high levels of visibility and credibility in the target districts.

The intervention reflects an added value of EU cooperation both from the structures, support mechanisms and wider objectives of the overarching DINU programme, and also from the high level of credibility associated with the sound management procedures adopted by the EU. Furthermore, thanks to the political dialogue with LG, the EU combines priorities of external aid policies (shared with European Member Countries) with national-level strategies and initiatives of the Government of Uganda on a sectoral basis.

## 3. Intervention logic, Monitoring & Learning

LESA Action effectively builds on the lessons, outputs and outcomes of previous and ongoing interventions which target similar stakeholders and related outcomes in enhancing accountability and service delivery, particularly in the health sector.

LESA Action is informed by several past CEHURD and PICOT projects including "Determined, Resilient, Empowered, AIDS-free, Mentored and Safe Initiative" (DREAMS) which piloted the LESA framework at national, district and local levels and supported CHAs in target communities, and the joint research study with Warwick University "Integrating Legal Empowerment and Social Accountability (LESA) for Sexual Reproductive Health and HIV services for Young People in Selected Slum Areas in Uganda". The Community Health Advocacy Model was piloted by CEHURD for health interventions, assessing and supporting to promote community participation in governance.

Lessons and good practices from past EU-funded PICOT projects also inform the design of LESA Action, including, "Promoting Youth Social Economic Empowerment through Civil Society and Local Authorities Project" (YSEECS) and "Empowering Local Communities to Prevent Violence against Women and Children in West Nile". The past projects informed and contributed to the networks and trust-based relationships underpinning LESA Action.

The LFM provides a clear vertical logic broadly consistent with expected outcomes of the LESA Action project and overarching DINU programme, but the principle of subsidiarity is not coherent. Although the layers of vertical logic are targeted on results, DINU Result 3.3 is identical to SO2 which does not facilitate appropriate nesting of SO1 under this broader objective (which should guide the entirety of the intervention). In reality, SO1 is subsidiary to SO2/DINU Result 3.3. In line with DINU objectives, the action aims at strengthening downward accountability by empowering communities in their interaction with LGs.

The original LFM details the entire logic chain, but the revised version (in use, not formally approved) is missing the OO (replaced by DINU Objective 3 and Result 3.3) and activity levels.

Appropriate outputs (e.g. trainings, neighbourhood assemblies, sensitisations, community dialogues, radio outreach, district budgeting conferences, barazas, community public awareness campaigns) contribute to the intended intermediary outcomes (IOs) labelled 'sub outcomes'. IO1: "Enhanced communities' capacities to hold duty bearers accountable for improved service delivery", IO2: "To enhance the capacities of duty bearers on their roles and responsibilities in governance for improved service delivery" and IO3: "Improved capacity of CSO/ CBO to monitor and assess government's compliance with its obligations to fulfil economic, social and cultural rights". These IOs contribute to SO1 "Strengthened capacity, gender-responsive good governance and the rule of law at the level of LG authorities and empower communities to participate in improved local service delivery" and SO2: "Downward accountability of LGs to its constituents is strengthened by empowering citizens, CSO, media, NSAs, private sectors in their interaction with LG". These two SOs ultimately support the OO: "To consolidate stability in Northern Uganda, eradicate poverty and under nutrition and strengthen the foundations for sustainable and inclusive socio-economic development".

The expected results at output level are broadly adequate and proportional to the size, scope and duration of the intervention although level they are not sufficiently specific. Several outputs nested under IO3 do not relate to that result statement (improved capacity of civil society) e.g. Output 3.6 monitoring visits, 3.8 social media communications, 3.9 endline evaluation.

The horizontal logic is generally not well operationalized in the LFM at the IO and SO levels, although it is reasonable at Output level. In the original LFM at OO level, the indicator is "Level of citizen participation and accountability in the local government processes", which is also indicator SO1.2.

No baseline or targets are indicated, and SoVs are missing at OO level. In the revised LFM the OO level is missing and SO level indicators have been revised. Indicator SO1.1 is: "A gender responsive governance in planning, budgeting, implementing and monitoring of local government processes" and SO1.2 is "Level of citizen participation and accountability in the local government processes". SO1.1 target (equal representation of women in LG) is unrealistic for the scope and scale of the project, and SO1.2 target is non-specific (participation of community members). Indicator SO2.1 relates to citizen satisfaction with public service delivery and is not well formulated, with meaningless quantitative targets which aggregate rather than average gender-disaggregated satisfaction levels (55% satisfaction: 25% male and 30% female). Indicator SO2.2 (level of stakeholder participation in planning) is accompanied by an inappropriate target (4 CBOs and 100 citizens engage in district budgeting and planning processes) relative to the size of the target groups (e.g. 60 CBOs) and the timeline of the project (CBOs are engaged only in the final months). SoVs at SO and IO levels are given as the Endline Evaluation.

For IO1, the indicator is "Platforms established to hold duty bearers accountable", but these platforms pre-exist the project. LESA Action aims to enhance or re-energise, rather than establish, accountability platforms. The target is unclear and includes various project outputs (e.g. score cards, dialogues).

For IO2, indicator, "number of community plans that advance into implementation phase" (target 6) is neither feasible nor measurable in the timeframe of the project (many actions presented by the community are already planned and in progress, some do not align with the criteria of LGs, etc.). A better indicator would be the number of issues raised at community dialogues, barazas and budget conferences which are subsequently addressed by leaders, or even the number of people affected by these actions. Data on these outcomes are already collected by the project team.

For IO3, indicator, "active involvement of CSOs to monitor and assess government's compliance with its obligations to fulfil economic, social and cultural rights" is problematic as these outcomes are likely to occur after the project implementation period, and the target is non-specific (CSO submissions in different platforms). An improved indicator would relate to the strengthened capacity of civil society in governance issue, or in monitoring service delivery.

Output level indicators and targets are reasonable and are monitored consistently including capturing gender-disaggregated data on the number of stakeholders engaged, assessed trained, and participating in activities, the number of outputs (e.g. community dialogues, barazas) delivered, etc. Output 3.5 relates to governance issues handled/litigated and would be better included as a project outcome. The target for Output 3.7 is currently "one LESA documentation" but could be better formulated in relation to the dissemination strategy for this significant project output.

Gender specific indicators are included in the LFM targets for SO 2 but are not well formulated, and sex-disaggregated data are routinely monitored and reported at output level for all relevant indicators, providing data about participants at all activities, events and trainings.

Enhanced outcome indicators could monitor improved downward accountability mechanisms to promote accountable service delivery, understanding of and adherence to legal frameworks, enhanced capacities of CSOs and other target groups, increased representation of minorities in public accountability platforms, enhanced quality and openness of exchanges between duty bearers and rights holders, active engagement of citizens in existing governance accountability platforms, etc. These wider outcomes are broadly being achieved according to the testimony of stakeholders and beneficiaries interviewed throughout this ROM and supported by the internal project monitoring processes, although they are not measured by current indicators. Overall, the project is supporting target groups to enhance downward accountability and responsive service delivery.

Assumptions focus on communities and target groups participating in project activities and subsequently in planning, budget processes and monitoring at district and community levels. Risks are not formulated in the LFM and CEHURD has identified only two outcome-level risks (COVID-19 pandemic reducing attendance, and insecurity around the 2021 General elections), compiled in the risk register. Activity monitoring templates capture risks identified during activities, which are followed up by the implementing team and QA department, e.g. the distribution of neutral coloured T-shirts to avoid assumptions of political affiliation and partisanship. Output level risks are not routinely monitored.

Internal monitoring systems are reasonable at activity and output level, and outcomes are monitored but not in alignment with LFM outcome indicators and targets. CEHURD have strong internal M&E templates but lacks a management response system to systematically

## 3. Intervention logic, Monitoring & Learning

record actions taken in response to stakeholder and participant recommendations and emerging challenges. Data are collected by PICOT and CEHURD M&E Officers during project activities using the Activity Reporting templates and used to inform the Quarterly Reports and track progress against LFM indicators. The quarterly reporting template provided by the DINU programme requires reporting on activities, while the annual report focuses on progress against planned results. Output data are extracted from these report templates and used to populate the project LFM. CEHURD also captures extensive outcome data but due to the quality of outcome indicators and targets, these are not always reported systematically.

CEHURD planned quarterly field monitoring visits but only one has been completed in March 2021 due to COVID-19 restrictions and delays. Key issues were captured in an activity report and discussed in the quarterly project review meeting. The project team and SMT responded to these issues e.g. increasing activities at the grassroots and parish level, but only two recommendations/action points are noted in the conclusion of the report (supporting CHAs to plan their activities, need for future projects on SGBV - sexual and gender based violence - and teenage pregnancy). There is no associated management response indicating where further actions are needed for LESA Action, or allocating responsibilities and timelines for these.

Project reporting is reasonable. The inception report was submitted to National Authorizing Officer (NAO) on time in April 2020 and was contractually compliant; reviewed by OPM-PMU and Technical Working Group (TWG) and approved in July 2020. Quarterly reports are submitted on time and meet the required standard. The Baseline Report was completed in September 2020 and the first Annual Report was submitted to NAO in March 2021, reviewed by OPM-PMU and TWG, key findings and recommendations presented to the PSC in April 2021 and rated "satisfactory with comments" in May 2021.

DINU provided extensive detailed comments on the report and requested the CEHURD team to provide additional information, and ensure follow-up on specific technical, operational, and financial issues in the next quarterly report (July 2021). The feedback also requested a revised payment request. The CEHURD team provided the additional requested information in a detailed response to all the identified issues in September 2021 and integrated these lessons into the quarterly report along with resubmitting a revised payment request to the NAO. An Endline evaluation is planned for 2022.

## 4. Efficiency

Activities are being implemented with reasonable efficiency and the project has adapted appropriately to the challenges of the COVID-19 restrictions and national lockdowns, although inevitably many activities are significantly delayed as a result. Tasks and responsibilities are clearly defined and support efficient implementation of planned activities across DINU Lot 2 projects, including CEHURD-managed LESA Action project. Those are well defined in the Financing Agreement (FA) and have not changed.

The CEHURD Kampala office hosts the Project Coordinator, M&E Officer, Finance Officer and Communications Officer. The team are supported by the CEHURD administrative and technical support teams and SMT. CEHURD co-finances the project and contributes 10% of the budget. CEHURD and PICOT closely monitor project spending and progress and all reporting has been timely, with the Inception Report submitted 15/04/20 and Quarterly and Annual reporting thereafter.

LESA Action is overseen by the governance and reporting structure of DINU, including the Programme Steering Committee (PSC), Technical Negotiation Committee (TNC), District coordination by District Focal Point Persons (FPP), and monitoring by the OPM-PMU staff. FPPs are nominated by the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) and support CEHURD (and other IPs) to efficiently coordinate with district government structures. FPPs facilitate District Coordination Meetings (DCMs) chaired by Resident District Commissioners (RDCs) in all 37 DINU districts, supporting IPs to present their successes and challenges to the district leaders and gather on DINU implementation together with the OPM-PMU, supporting more efficient implementation of the DINU projects including LESA Action.

The next DCM is planned for end-2021. The OPM-PMU facilitates quarterly Working Group (WG) meetings including the Governance, M&E and Communication and Visibility (C&V) groups. The DINU TWG review project outputs (e.g. the Annual Report submitted March 2021) and present key findings and recommendations to the DINU PSC (last in April 2021). The PSC provides an effective oversight mechanism, e.g. providing detailed and timely written comments on the Annual Report in April 2021. DINU projects are encouraged to share activity planning and publications to capitalize on emerging synergies, avoid duplication and enhance efficiency. These mechanisms are reported to be implemented efficiently and in accordance with the contractual terms, providing guidance and feedback on project deliverables and on request.

CEHURD proposed technical modifications to the grant contract on 15/09/20, to which OPM-PMU formally responded on 10/05/21 at which date these modifications came into effect. OPM-PMU accepted technical modifications including reducing radio talk show listeners from 100,000 to 60,000, renaming the Community-Link Advocates (CLAs) as CHAs and removing Yumbe as a target intervention area (included in the DoA in error). LFM discussions are ongoing since 2020 with the intention of harmonizing all DINU LFMs. CEHURD has been advised not to make formal LFM adjustments until this process is complete.

Donor coordination appears to be limited, resulting in part from the shift from a sector approach to a programme-based budgeting approach which coincided with the launch of the NU NDP III in 2020 and undermined the sector coordination WGs. A World Bank portal accessible to Chairs and Co-Chairs of development partner groups across Uganda facilitates access to information about the objectives of development partner group members, meetings, and interactions with GoU, but viewing rights are not granted to other stakeholders nor between the participating groups (e.g. governance, health, etc.).
Communication between EUD and CEHURD is limited, with reports submitted to DINU OPM-PMU and approved by NAO. OPM-PMU are the main point of contact who provide support to the project and also maintain good working relationships with EUD. EUD provide guidance on compliance, technical support and feedback and participate in the PSC and TWG. OPM-PMU shares reports with EUD, and the Operational Manager (OM) is updated on progress. The LESA Action team have not met the OM. Procedures are reasonably clear and facilitate the implementation of the intervention, with a sub-grant contract agreement with PICOT signed in June 2020 detailing the roles and responsibilities of both parties. There is a cordial relationship between CEHURD and PICOT who meet their obligations according to the contract terms.

Project inputs are generally adequate for strengthening the capacity, gender-responsive good governance and the rule of law at the level of LG authorities and empowering communities to participate in improved local service delivery and strengthening downward accountability of LGs by empowering citizens, CSO, media, NSAs and CHAs in their interaction with LG. Resources are used efficiently and the budget is proportional to the scope and scale of the intervention. The total budget is 222,223.00 EUR, with 90% (200,000 EUR) provided by EU and 10% (22,223.00 EUR) provided by CEHURD.

The budget includes lines for human resources car hire and fuel, local office supplies and printing costs, costs associated with the baseline study, visibility materials including banners and T-shirts, radio airtime and mobilisation costs. The budget remains sufficient to carry out all planned activities and is assessed by the ROM Expert as internally consistent and well balanced, with no excessive indirect or non-operational costs. The exception is the budget for the Endline Evaluation, which is inadequate (1799EURO) and will not realistically facilitate an external evaluation to assess project outcomes, particularly given the scale of the outcome indicators.

In practical terms the intervention had encountered many delays in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and associated lockdowns and the political campaigns and elections, particularly affecting gatherings like barazas and trainings. The project is 23 months through the 30 months implementation timeframe and has implemented around half of the planned activities.

Under the first outcome (IO1), activities have been delayed compared to the original planned schedule. District Inception Meetings were held in Koboko and Maracha (output 1.1), the Baseline was published in September 2020 (1.2). 60 CHAs were mapped across both districts (1.3) in Q2 2020 and their capacities assessed (1.4) in Q3 2020, followed by capacity building trainings (1.5) facilitated in Q3 2020 (planned for Q1) and refreshers in September 2021. Six community dialogues/neighborhood assemblies (NAs) are planned to be conducted by trained CHAs (1.6) in Q4 2021 (planned for Q1), Community sensitization meetings have not yet been conducted on the budgeting process (1.7) and are planned for Q4 instead of Q1 as initially intended. Four (of planned 8 by 2022) community dialogues (1.8) were conducted in Q4 2020 and four have been delayed from Q2 to Q4 2021. Six (of planned 12 by 2022) radio outreaches (1.9) were conducted in Q3 and Q4 2020 and aired on Radio Pacis, with the remaining six delayed until 2022 due to the backlog of activities planned for implementation in Q3 and Q4 and radio talkshows also delayed from Q1 2021 until 2022. 70% of the trained CHAs (41 of 60, no target) were supported to attend district budget conferences in Maracha and Koboko districts (1.10) in Q3 2020.

Under the second outcome (IO2), activities have also been delayed. The planned orientation sessions have been conducted for 26 (target 30) duty bearers (2.1) in Q3 2020 (delayed from Q1) and two (of two planned by 2020) district baraza has been conducted in each district a year later than planned: Koboko on 31/08/21 and Maracha on 15/09/21 (2.2). The two district barazas planned for 2021 are now anticipated in 2022. Four planned community public awareness campaigns were conducted in 2021 (planned for 2020) and the 2021 campaigns (which include a video documentary) are now scheduled for 2022 (2.3).

Under the third outcome (IO3), CEHURD have launched for the call for proposals in August 2021 and applications are being processed to select the consultant to undertake these tasks. These activities were planned for Y2 and are now resuming, including CSO training on community scorecards (3.1) which was delayed and is currently pending (target 1 in Y1 and 1 in Y2), CBO assessments (3.2), and capacity building (3.3) and training (3.4) are also pending (target 1 in Y2). Two governance issues have been addressed (3.5) in 2021 (target 2 in Y1, 2 in Y2). Field monitoring visits (3.6) have been affected by COVID-19 and only one has been conducted to date (target quarterly). The LESA document (3.7) is planned for 2022 (target: published by end of project) and project achievements have been published on Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube meeting the target of three platforms (3.8).

Budget utilization is lower than expected due the delayed activities as a result of the pandemic restrictions, with 40% of the budget absorbed as of 30/09/21. Due to the delays, it is likely that the project may need to request a no-cost extension to complete all activities within the remaining implementation timeframe. The total budget is 222,223.00 EUR, with 90% (200,000 EUR) provided by EU and 10% (22,223.00 EUR) provided by CEHURD. The budget includes lines for human resources car hire and fuel, local office supplies and printing costs, costs associated with the baseline study, visibility materials including banners and T-shirts, radio airtime and mobilisation costs. The budget remains sufficient to carry out all planned activities and is assessed by the ROM Expert as internally consistent and well balanced, with no excessive indirect or non-operational costs.

## 5. Effectiveness

Outputs are being well achieved and the project is broadly on track to meet targets where activities have been implemented, with strategies in place to ensure that delayed activities achieve the planned outcomes.

Under IO 1, district inception meetings (1.1) supported strong stakeholder participation exceeding target 60 key stakeholders (76 participated). The baseline (1.2) is of reasonable quality and generated insights and recommendations informed project design and planning, e.g. knowledge gaps on duty bearer mandates, women's underrepresentation in accountability processes, irregular implementation of district barazas, limited engagement of CSOs and citizens in budgeting processes. 60 CHAs (50% female) have been identified (1.3) and demonstrate high levels of ownership, commitment and dedication. The capacity assessment (1.4) for CHAs was reasonable, identifying capacity and knowledge gaps around governance and accountability. CHA capacity building trainings (1.5) were reported to be strong and tailored to real needs, supplemented by a refresher focusing on RBA, advocacy, accountability, LG structures and legal frameworks. The trainings included participatory components, visual images, role-play, storytelling, forum theatre, breakaway sessions and sharing of successes and good practices. Outputs at community level including the NAs (1.6), sensitisations (1.7) and community dialogues (1.8) are reported to be well facilitated and of a high standard, identifying key issues and supporting community engagement in governance processes. Attendance numbers are higher than anticipated, e.g. 952 of target 900 attended the NA, 1244 of target 600 attended the budget sensitisations (mobilised by Forum Theatre strategies).  Radio outreaches (1.9) met their (revised) target audiences (60,000) and included high quality content moderated by well-selected hosts and attended by appropriate LG stakeholders including Sub-county Chiefs, CDOs, Health Facility leaders and police leaders. Radio outreaches benefit from strong community buy-in, e.g. one was followed up by 30 phone calls, 45 text messages, and around 15 informal visits from leaders or community members expressing appreciation. Radio Pacis are well regarded with high audience numbers, including in neighbouring Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and South Sudan, with a strong reputation for raising community issues through their Community Voice programme. Radio outreaches covered relevant topics including the LESA approach, budgeting processes, planning schedules, infrastructure, maternal health, medicine shortages, water and sanitation, roads and bridges, waste management, policing and security, etc.  CHAs attending the District Budget Conferences in Maracha and Koboko districts (1.10) report meaningful participation was achieved.

Under IO2, duty bearer orientations (2.1) report that orientations were useful and relevant to needs, recommending them for other LG colleagues. The District baraza (2.2) was well attended (271 of target 200) with relevant LG stakeholders actively engaging, responding to questions and concerns raised, and following up on community concerns including medical supplies and shortages, community policing concerns and coverage, poor road conditions, Emyooga, Operation Wealth Creation (OWC) and the senior citizen's grant. Public awareness campaigns were adequate.

Under IO3, planned outputs with CBOs (3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4) have been delayed and quality cannot be assessed, but selection processes are strong (e.g. District NGO Forum, WGs, and West Nile Humanitarian Platform). Governance issues (3.5) are well selected to reflect serious community concerns (healthcare neglect and child molestation). These are supported to a high standard by the in-house CEHURD lawyer, but are mislabelled as outputs and in reality are project outcomes. The field monitoring visit (3.6) was well implemented and the report is of reasonable quality, but the recommendations do not encompass the content of the report and action was not taken on key issues (e.g. the ID card issue raised by CHAs). The LESA document (3.7) is incomplete so cannot be assessed during this ROM, but "Handbook on Governance and Accountability" contains errors (missing headings, numbering starts at 3, acronyms are missing). Social media reporting on Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube (3.8) is adequate.

The achievement of outputs is effectively contributing to project results at outcome level.

IO1: "Enhanced communities' capacities to hold duty bearers accountable for improved service delivery" is measured by indicator IO1.1 "Platforms established to hold duty bearers accountable". However, the target platforms including barazas, health assemblies, and community dialogues pre-existed the project and the baseline already noted, "District leaders identified monthly planning meetings with partner, district technical planning committee meetings for CSOs and Barazas while the community was not aware of any platforms".  While the indicator is unachievable, the project has enhanced the quality and relevance of existing platforms and encouraged awareness and attendance by community members and duty bearers, supported by the project outputs including radio broadcasts, community dialogues and CHA actions.

IO2: "To enhance the capacities of duty bearers on their roles and responsibilities in governance for improved service delivery" is measured by indicator, IO2.1 "Number of community plans that advance into implementation phase", with the target of six action plans implemented by duty bearers from six sub-counties and a baseline value of two in Maracha. This indicator does not reflect project outcomes and is not aligned with the project design and timeframe, and could be better assessed through identifying issues raised at community dialogues and budget conferences which are subsequently addressed by leaders. LESA Action is achieving strong outcomes, e.g. the MoH upgraded Tara Health Centre from Level II to Level III to improve supplies of essential medicines, committed to strengthening police operations to address security gaps, allocated more money for road maintenance, investigated complaints about allocation of resources under government programs and special grants (e.g. i.e Emyooga, OWC and senior citizens' grants), the Local Council (LC) III Chairperson immediately committed to allocate office space for the Community Development Officer (CDO) in Oluffe Sub County and pledged support to participate in the Joint quarterly monitoring exercises, service delivery violations were identified in the Education and Health Sectors and catalysed legal and disciplinary actions.

IO3: "Improved capacity of CSOs/ CBOs to monitor and assess government's compliance with its obligations to fulfil economic, social and cultural rights" is measured by indicator, IO3.1"active involvement of CSOs to monitor and assess government's compliance with its obligations to fulfil economic, social and cultural rights". The baseline identified limited CSO involvement in governance-related work. The target "CSOs/CBOs that make submissions on economic, social and cultural rights in different platforms at local government levels" is unclear. It is too early to assess these outcomes as most activities under IO3 are still pending and target CSOs have not yet been identified or assessed, but it seems likely that planned outcomes will include enhanced capacity of civil society to monitor service delivery and government accountability.

The IOs are broadly aligned with and contributing to SO1: "Strengthened capacity, gender-responsive good governance and the rule of law at the level of LG authorities and empower communities to participate in improved local service delivery", as measured by the indicator, SO1.1 "a gender responsive governance in planning, budgeting, implementing and monitoring of local government processes" and SO1.2 "Level of citizen participation and accountability in the local government processes". However, the target for SO1.1 is unlikely to be achieved as it beyond the scope, and not aligned with the timeline, of the project: "Equal representation of both women and men governance for local government processes". The target for SO1.2 is unclear ("Participation of community members").

The IOs are broadly aligned with, and contributing to, SO2: "Downward accountability of LGs to its constituents is strengthened by empowering citizens, CSO, media, NSAs, private sectors in their interaction with LG" as measured by the indicator, SO2.1 "% of citizen's satisfaction with delivery of public services, accountability and governance (disaggregated by sex)" and SO2.2 "Level of stakeholder participation in planning, budgeting and monitoring LG programs". However, there is no plan in place to assess these outcomes except through the Endline Evaluation, which has not yet been conducted. Despite this, the project is contributing to positive wider outcomes as platforms facilitate discussions and enhance accountability across a wide range of issues.

This project supports participation and amplifies the voice of vulnerable groups through targeted strategies at all levels. In community level activities the project team encourage and promote the participation of marginalised groups such as women, youth, elderly and persons with disabilities, actively targeting them in mobilisation efforts. Meetings are scheduled intentionally to align with community work schedules (e.g. generally held in the afternoons, from midday onwards). Radio programmes are an effective strategy to increase the diffusion of knowledge about LG action plans, budgets, the implementation status of ongoing projects, etc. across all sectors. Radio talkshows and dialogues are hosted in local languages. Radio also enhances participation where vulnerable groups lack access to public spaces, although inevitably radio ownership and access is not universal. During the trainings, women, youth and persons with disabilities (PWDs) are encouraged to engage actively, and are supported to participate in activities and gain in confidence and capacity. Selected venues are accessible by ramps but support participation of PWDs. Women are supported to bring caretakers for their children and nurse babies on demand.

## 5. Effectiveness

During the next phase of activities, the LESA Action team plan to extend engagements to the parish level to support LG leaders to engage with communities in rural villages who are unable to attend activities in urban centres.

The intervention supports relevant GoU policies and supports district LGs to communicate more effectively with their rights holders through a range of approaches. It also contributes to enhancing awareness of and transparent dialogue around a variety of GoU initiatives, including (but not limited to) Social Assistance Grant for the Elderly (SAGE) scheme providing support for over-80s, Operation Wealth Creation (OWC) seeking to catalyse national socio-economic transformation, the Presidential Initiative on Wealth and Job Creation (Emyooga), the Youth Livelihoods Program (YLP) a GoU Rolling Programme targeting the unemployed and poor youth in the country, Uganda Women Empowerment Program (UWEP), and support provided under the Third Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF III).

The intervention has produced unanticipated positive outcomes and no unforeseen negative effects were identified. For example, the activities implemented by the project team have raised awareness of the COVID-19 virus and methods to reduce transmission risks among the target communities. It is also reported to have supported wider community trust in legal processes following the actions taken to address the high profile rights violation cases.

## 6. Sustainability

Sustainability-oriented mechanisms are reasonable, leveraging existing LG structures and civil society networks and building the capacities and professional networks of target groups.

LESA Action supports deepening the accountability and service delivery of LGs in Maracha and Koboko, and leverages existing platforms of engagements e.g. barazas established by the GoU to enhance citizen participation in local governance processes. Supporting existing structures to strengthen the institutional and organisational frameworks for participatory governance and address information gaps effectively embeds sustainability. These gains also increase the potential for actions and by-laws further strengthening accountability measures in the District LGs.

Engaging LGs from the outset has secured ownership and contributed to the sustainability of outcomes, further supported by the strong reputations of CEHURD and PICOT in the target districts. Signing MoUs with all target districts solidified these cooperative working relationships and the engagement of key LG stakeholders at the political and administrative level embeds sustainability effectively, particularly district leaders such as the RDCs; CAOs; LC leaders; district coordination committees; justice and law enforcement. District leaders report that they were encouraged to align the project with LG development plans, planning cycles and government initiatives. The engagement of district leadership in the decision making embeds sustainability and secures LG support at all levels and supports the likelihood that they take forward the outputs, lessons and best practices.

Strengthening performance and accountability is the core desire of both central and local Government. LCs welcomed and fully appreciated the intervention into their districts, which is likely to result in long-lasting gains for all participating beneficiaries and target groups. The enhanced capacities of duty bearers on their roles and responsibilities in governance for improved service delivery (under IO2) are likely to continue to support greater accountability and engagement in barazas and other platforms supporting community awareness of, and engagement in, decision making processes.

Building professional working relationships with district LG officials and duty bearers across the target districts has also contributed to securing sustainable gains for CEHURD and PICOT professionally and institutionally. Partnering with PICOT also embeds the sustainability of project outcomes as this organisation will continue to work in the targeted districts, with the same stakeholders and on a range of aligned interventions which have embedded learning from LESA Action. This continues to support their ongoing efforts to increase accountability and service delivery in Northern Uganda.

For other TGs, sustainability mechanisms are reasonably well developed. CEHURD has worked with and through the CHAs since 2013 and many of them have previous and ongoing relationships with PICOT projects. The CHAs are individuals and groups of grassroots-based advocates that CEHURD identifies, trains and supports to work within their communities as volunteers to promote access to rights, particularly health, and are well respected within their communities.

Target media stakeholders plan to continue to broadcast community radio shows which support accountability, and invite both communities and duty bearers to participate.

Target CBOs and CSOs have not yet been supported, but it is anticipated that they will continue to strengthen civil society and their networks, building a community of practice well equipped to monitor service deliver and accountability and to work with relevant stakeholders to embed sustainability of outcomes. The improved capacity of target CSOs and CBOs to monitor and assess government's compliance with its obligations to fulfil economic, social and cultural rights (under IO3) is likely to enhance the capacity of civil society to enhance accountability and service delivery across the target districts and potentially across Northern Uganda, depending on the CSOs selected to participate in activities under IO3.

For the target communities, CEHURD uses the LESA approach to build their capacities to demand and access justice, hold duty bearers accountable to improved service delivery but also empower duty bearers (local government officials) to carry out their roles and responsibilities more competently hence improving both their performance, accountability, and service delivery. The enhanced communities' capacities to hold duty bearers accountable for improved service delivery (under IO1) is likely to continue to enhance community level monitoring of service delivery and wider awareness of rights and structures supporting accountability and good governance.

Citizens also directly benefit through their enhanced knowledge of LG responsibilities and plans, and enhanced capacities to raise their voices and demand services. Supported by stronger CSOs and CBOs and capacitated duty bearers, final beneficiaries are likely to benefit from embedded gains which continue to support improved governance, enhanced accountability and gender inclusion over time.

Furthermore over the longer-term, the improved downward accountability and increased capacity among civil society to scrutinize processes should enhance the effective use of GoU development funds, potentially shaping the business landscape in NU and increasing domestic revenue which could support further accountability building processes.

Further to these specific sustainability actions and mechanisms, CEHURD and PICOT are implementing a range of other projects in the target districts and are likely to continue to include project target groups and key stakeholder in future actions.

The design of the intervention did not intend for the private sector to take over at the end of the intervention although they are likely to indirectly benefit from the improved access to services, strengthened civil society and enhanced accountability of LG. Private sector was included as a target group in the initial design, but this appears to have been an error in the DoA. All trainings were provided free of charge and participants were reimbursed for associated costs. Venues were selected to include disability access (e.g. ramps). Women were supported to bring childcare support.

The project enhances community resilience by strengthening accountability mechanisms and amplifying citizens' voices to improve service delivery, addressing the root causes of fragility across a range of sectors from healthcare and education to infrastructure.

## 7. Cross-cutting issues

The intervention contributes meaningfully to gender equality, supporting gender responsive governance and budgeting and enhancing women's political participation and voice. The intervention design is aligned with the EU Gender Action Plan 2016-2020, and gender equality is a significant objectives of the DINU overall and of the LESA Action project specifically.

The 2020 Baseline study highlighted the imbalance between men and women in leadership positions and output level indicators capture gender-disaggregated data relating to the number of stakeholders engaged, assessed, trained, and participating in activities. Gender-disaggregated data are routinely monitored and reported for all relevant indicators at output level. Gender specific indicators are included in the LFM targets for SO2 but are not well formulated.

The project took action for International Women's Day 2021, releasing an article published across social media platforms on the 2021 International Women's Day theme, "Women in Leadership: achieving an equal future in a Covid-19 world' and the support of the intervention for raising awareness of the representation of women in government in Uganda, and of the actions taken by the project to support women to secure their rights.

Gender equality is well embedded in the intervention design, including addressing knowledge gaps of duty bearers and rights holders on gender issues, supporting engagement of women in dialogues and activities with LG representatives, supporting women to raise their voices through community discussion forums and radio broadcasts, and facilitating radio talk shows focusing on topics targeting women's rights and concerns. Women are targeted and supported at all levels, encouraged to participate and also supported with childcare provision during trainings.

The project supports positive outcomes amplifying women's voice at community level and improve women's participation in governance structures, often in proactive and practical ways. For example, during a community dialogues in Tara Sub County in Maracha District in November 2020, it emerged that the CDO did not have an office to execute her duties, negatively affecting service delivery, her ability to fulfil her mandate and her participation in leadership as she sought to take an active role in governance. As a result of the LESA Action project, the LCIII Chairperson committed to offer the CDO office space at the sub-county, empowering her to meet with her constituency and strengthening accountability and service delivery.

The project recognizes that the Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights violations in hospitals and schools hinder access to education, healthcare and other services, and their legal resolution supports women to understand and demand their rights more widely. The project also takes direct action on gender-based rights violations, addressing one case of denial of access to maternal health services in Ede Odravu village, Oleba Sub-County and supporting a child sexual abuse victim in Anyakani village in Oluffe Sub-County to access justice. The child sex abuse case was taken to court at the Chief Magistrates Court of Koboko in April and June 2021 and is currently awaiting trial at the High Court.

The intervention also supports the working principles of RBA and enhances awareness of and access to rights and services for marginalised and disadvantaged groups, in addition to raising awareness of RBA more widely by training LGs, CHAs, CSOs and CBOs on this topic. The LESA Action methodology is grounded in RBA, focusing on the needs of the target groups (as respectively rights-holders or duty-bearers) at all times and supporting target groups to have meaningful voice in shaping activities and contributing to decision-making. Obstacles for socially marginalised groups are identified and the project team take efforts to support their inclusion.

The project builds capacities and raises awareness, both for representatives of institutions delivering accountability and inclusiveness and citizens and CSOs demanding them. Accordingly, the action takes a holistic approach and targets both state actors and non-state actors. The intervention seeks to enhance awareness of and access to rights across target communities, enhancing duty bearers' capacity to understand community needs and communicate effectively, enhancing transparency and accountability. Simultaneously, it support rights holders' capacities to raise their voices demand services and articulate their needs and hold duty bearers accountable through community forums. Through supporting CSOs and CBOs, and community radio broadcasting, the intervention also supports accountability checks and balances to monitor and raise awareness of service delivery and obstacles to rights for all groups in the target communities.

The action takes into consideration the inclusion of minority groups, particularly refugees from neighbouring South Sudan and Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) who are supported to participate in community engagement activities. The project also collects disaggregated data on participant numbers to capture refugee and host community participation, aligned with PICOT's broader organisational strategic objectives and indicators.

Modalities have also been developed to engage and support persons with disabilities and those living in remote communities, for example using radio talk shows to overcome physical barriers and accessibility issues and extend the coverage, as well as to raise disability issues and empower persons with disabilities (PWDs) to share their challenges and raise their voices. For example, views were gathered from PWDs in Oluffe Sub County, Maracha District in April 2021 during a radio community outreach.

The timing of activities such as community dialogues is planned around availability considerations to support women's participation in particular, for example recognizing that women struggle to attend due to domestic tasks and responsibilities in the mornings, and scheduling afternoon sessions accordingly. Stakeholders interviewed during this ROM also report that venues selected for activities and training delivery were equipped with accessible ramps, and support was provided for mothers with young babies to bring a childcare assistant to the trainings. Meanwhile, LCs are supported to mainstream disability rights into their decision-making and budgeting process.

CHAs and community members interviewed during this ROM report that this project is unique in their communities in supporting community members who do not speak English to engage in international development initiatives, supporting everyone to raise their voice. Trainings and activities are delivered in local languages, written materials (e.g. the handbook) and other outputs are also planned to be translated into local to enhance accessibility, recognizing language barriers.

The design of the community radio outreach supported rural populations to participate in the dialogues even where they lack access to communications technologies to call in to the radio broadcasts in real time. Despite this, access to the project activities is inevitably constrained by barriers (poor road access, remote communities, limited mobile coverage, etc.) which are likely to have disproportionately affected the poorest and most vulnerable. In the next implementation period the project team intends to mitigate these limitations as far as possible by visiting these remote rural communities to encourage and facilitate their participation in the project, increase their access to information around service delivery and ensure that their voices are heard.

Environment and climate change are significant objectives of the DINU programme and the LESA Action project indirectly contributes to environmental sustainability through supporting communities to hold LG representatives to account on issues of natural resource management, capacitating community members to engage directly with duty bearers through community dialogues, empowering CSOs to understand legal obligations of LG and hold them to account, and through supporting LCs to communicate with, and be held accountable by their communities' roles and ensure appropriate natural resource management practices are implemented in their constituencies. Within project activities, working through regionally based staff reduces travel and related environmental impacts, and the project has no unforeseen environmental impacts.

The intervention supports duty bearers to understand, be sensitive to and mitigate potential harms associated with public resource management and service delivery, enhancing transparency and accountability with the potential to reduce resource-based conflicts. The design is sensitive to conflicts and acknowledges the inequalities and power imbalances at the heart of structural inequalities, seeking to support LG stakeholders to address these through equitable service delivery. This is designed to help to enhance connections that improve scrutiny mechanisms at local levels, thus contributing to maintaining peace and stability in the region.

Minimising the risk of harm associated with the spread of COVID-19, the intervention has limited gatherings to twenty participants (plus staff and trainers) and requires participants to use facemasks provided by the project, hand sanitizer and frequent hand washing, and encourages participant to remain two meters apart. The radio broadcasts, trainings and community dialogues are also leveraged as

| 7. Cross-cutting issues |
| --- |
| platforms to raise awareness and promote best practices to prevent the transmission of the virus. |

| 8. Communication and visibility |
| --- |

Visibility of the project implementing partners, OPM-PMU and EUD are reasonable, with logos used consistently and all interviewed stakeholders aware of the sources of support and affiliation of the project, but in some cases "DINU" and "LESA Action" are used interchangeably, which could result in misunderstandings.

The banners and other signage used at events (e.g. district barazas) are of high quality and clearly support the visibility of the action. Throughout this remote ROM fieldwork, all interviewed stakeholders recognise the support provided by OPM and by EU and expressed gratitude for the project activities and emerging outcomes.

The C&V strategy, is well resourced and appropriate for the scale of the project (11,176.10 EURO), with 49% absorbed for the visibility materials until September 2021. Visibility materials include project branded publications, website, and t-shirts branded for the project. The C&V strategy was shared with the NAO in May 2020.

Social media engagement is adequate and is also supported with an output indicator (3.8) in the LFM with the target of engaging on three platforms; Facebook, Twitter (hashtags #DINUganda and #LESA), and YouTube. Social media engagement is monitored internally. As an example, CEHURD's Facebook post about the District Baraza in Maracha reached 1,300 individual users and received 272 engagements (interactions) on Facebook, and reached 1,167 impressions (views) and received 109 engagements (interactions) on Twitter.

High quality photographs of engagements and high profile stakeholders are disseminated regularly, building the profile and the credibility of the project and the implementing organizations CEHURD and PICOT. Visibility on CEHURD and PICOT websites are reasonable, and project outputs and outcomes are hosted (including the Baseline report and Handbook).

CHAs are provided with branded T-shirts which increases project visibility, but more formal means of identification would enhance their credibility, particularly when engaging with newly elected political representatives and stakeholders outside of their communities.

However, donor visibility could be improved on some project reports and publications as logos are not always accompanied by the names of the supporting organisations (e.g. EU and OPM) and the DINU affiliation is not consistently included in the header, although they are always acknowledged in the accompanying text.

It is also noted that the project is referred to internally as 'DINU' rather than 'LESA Action', and even some project outputs appear to be affiliated more broadly as DINU rather than specifically as LESA Action. For example, the CHA Assessment Report is titled as a DINU output rather than LESA Action output, and the Maracha and Koboko District Baraza Issue Paper combines the DINU programme profile with the LESA Action timeline and implementation districts. This introduces a risk of misunderstandings by stakeholders.

| Conclusions | |
|---|---|
| N° | Conclusion |
| C1 | The LESA Action project is well-designed and relevant to the needs and capacities of the target groups, although the planned inclusion of the private sector as a target group in the initial design has not been integrated into the planned activities and outputs. |
| C2 | The project is aligned with DINU Lot 2 interventions and there are considerable complementarities and synergies with other past and ongoing projects in the target districts, including some implemented by the IPs. |
| C3 | The project builds and integrates past experience and good practices into the design and implementation of LESA Action. However, the LFM in use is not formally approved and outcome level indicators and targets would benefit from updating to align with the real outcomes of this project, which are significant in practice. Recommendations emerging from internal monitoring processes are not aligned with a management response, and risks are not monitored systematically at all levels. |
| C4 | The initial timetable for activity implementation has been significantly affected by the pandemic lockdowns and restrictions and by political campaigns and national and local government, resulting in underspending of the budget and delayed implementation of activities. The allocated budget for the Endline Evaluation was also inadequate. |
| C5 | Although the procedures are clearly defined and LESA Action is efficiently overseen by the governance and reporting structure of DINU, there has been little interaction between the implementing partners CEHURD and PICOT and the EUD since the initial inception phase. |
| C6 | Visibility of the project implementing partners, OPM-PMU and EUD are reasonable and stakeholders recognise the support provided by OPM and EU. However, there is confusion as the project is referred to internally as 'DINU' rather than 'LESA Action', and even some project outputs appear to be affiliated more broadly as DINU rather than specifically as LESA Action. This introduces a risk of misunderstandings and reputational harm. |

| Recommendations | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| # | Linked to | Recommendation | To whom | Priority | Importance |
| R1 | 1 | It is advisable to remove the private sector as a target group, as they would be more accurately categorised as indirect beneficiaries of the intervention. | CEHURD | Medium term | Medium |
| R2 | 2 | It is advisable to build on the synergies between DINU IPs to support further collaboration and learning, and promote the sharing of best practices and lessons learned and the wider dissemination of project successes and outputs.  The DINU supported WG meetings facilitated through Zoom could be supplemented with face-to-face platforms attended by implementing partners and co-applicants could enhance and embed synergies between these projects and add value to all, particularly to strengthen sharing of lessons learned and best practices, networks and reusable project outputs. Exchange visits could also be considered to strengthen intersectional learning and cross-pollinate knowledge gains across the IPs. | OPM-PMU | Medium term | High |
| R3 | 3 | It is late in the implementation timeframe to update the LESA Action LFM, but nevertheless it is advisable to review and update the LFM to ensure overall alignment with DINU, and update SO and IO indicators and targets. It is important include the Activities and OO in the revised version. | CEHURD | Short term | High |
| R4 | 3 | Support to the Design of Logframes (SDL), a free-of-charge service offered by the EU via Particip, is recommended. This can be obtained upon formal request by the OM by contacting Particip with a formal request (rom-devco-af@particip.com), with Unit DEVCO 04 in copy (EUROPEAID-04-ROM@ec.europa.eu). | EUD | Short term | Medium |
| R5 | 3 | It is advisable to ensure that activity report recommendations respond closely to stakeholder priorities, and all action points would benefit from a written management response detailing the responsibilities and timelines for further actions, where appropriate. | CEHURD | Short term | High |
| R6 | 3 | It is important to routinely monitor risks at all levels, and action should be taken to enhance risk monitoring at outcome level in particular. | CEHURD | Short term | High |
| R7 | 4 | In light of the delays and adaptations associated with the COVID-19 pandemic and associated lockdowns, it is recommended: that CEHURD considers the option for requesting a no cost extension to facilitate the implementation of remaining planned activities. | CEHURD | Short term | High |

| R8 | 4 | It is advisable to carefully plan the Endline Evaluation to respond to updated outcome indicators, and to reallocate budget from underutilised budget lines to increase the allocation for a robust and objective Endline from an external consultant. | CEHURD | Medium term | High |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| R9 | 5 | It would be beneficial to facilitate a meeting between CEHURD, PICOT and OM/EUD to provide some technical capacity building around grant management etc. and help build their capacity and professional network. | EUD | Medium term | Medium |
| R10 | 6 | It is strongly recommended to ensure that the project is consistently referred to, both internally and on all outputs, publications, and communications, as LESA Action rather than DINU to avoid any risk of confusion or reputational harm. The DINU affiliation and alignment should still be showcased, but it is important to clarify the distinction between the LESA Action project and the wider DINU programme. | CEHURD | Short term | High |

## Scoring overview

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Relevance** | 1.1 🟢 | 1.2 🟢 | 1.3 🟢 | 1.4 🟢 | |
| **Coordination, complementarity and EU added value** | 2.1 🟢 | 2.2 🟢 | | | |
| **Intervention logic, Monitoring & Learning** | 3.1 🟢 | 3.2 🟠 | 3.3 🟠 | 3.4 🟠 | 3.5 |
| **Efficiency** | 4.1 🟢 | 4.2 🟢 | 4.3 🟠 | 4.4 🟠 | |
| **Effectiveness** | 5.1 🟢 | 5.2 🟢 | 5.3 🟢 | 5.4 🟢 | 5.5 🟢 |
| **Sustainability** | 6.1 🟢 | 6.2 🟢 | 6.3 🟢 | 6.4 🟢 | |
| **Cross-cutting issues** | 7.1 🟢 | 7.2 🟢 | 7.3 🟢 | 7.4 🟢 | 7.5 🟢 |
| **Communication and visibility** | 8.1 🟠 | | | | |