

# EVALUATION DEPARTMENT

Report 12 / 2020  
Country Evaluation Brief



UGANDA

## Evaluation Portrait

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Evaluations published in 2019 .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Evaluation of the Uganda Country Programme 2016-2018 .....	1
1.2	Evaluation of Water, Sanitation and Environment Programmes in Uganda (1990-2017) .....	2
1.3	Endline Assessment for Multi-Sectoral Assistance to South Sudanese Refugees and Ugandan Host Communities in Bidibidi, Palorinya and Rhino Camp .....	3
1.4	Central Project Evaluation Promotion of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Programme Uganda .....	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Evaluations published in 2018 .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	From Donors to Partners? Evaluation of Norwegian Support to Strengthen Civil Society in Developing Countries through Norwegian Civil Society Organisations .....	5
2.2	Corporate Evaluation of UNFPA support to the prevention, response to and elimination of gender-based violence and harmful practices (2012-2017) .....	6
<b>3</b>	<b>Evaluations published in 2017 .....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Country Assistance Evaluation of the Republic of Uganda .....	7
3.2	Final Evaluation of the Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) - Uganda: Agricultural Adaptation to Climate Change project .....	8
3.3	Impact evaluation report for the multi-sectoral livelihood and environmental interventions for the refugees in Kyangwali .....	9
<b>4</b>	<b>Evaluations published in 2016 .....</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1	Evaluation of Danida Support to Value Chain Development - Uganda Country Study. ....	10
4.2	External Evaluation of Youth Development and Northern Uganda Youth Entrepreneurship Programme .....	11
4.3	Evaluation of the Uganda Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment (SAGE) Programme. Endline programme operations performance .....	12
4.4	Evaluation: USAID/Uganda strengthening decentralization for sustainability (SDS) program .....	13
4.5	The effectiveness and efficiency of implementing the chronic care model for HIV care in Uganda .....	14
4.6	Evaluation of the DFID Funded "Enhancing Resilience in Karamoja Programme (ERKP)" .....	15
4.7	An Assessment of Uganda's Progressive Approach to Refugee Management .....	16
4.8	Evaluation of UNHCR's Response to the L3 South Sudan Refugee Crisis in Uganda and Ethiopia .....	17
4.9	Completion and Learning Review (CLR) Fiscal Year 2011 - Fiscal Year 2015 .....	18
<b>5</b>	<b>Evaluations published in 2015 .....</b>	<b>19</b>
5.1	Joint Evaluation of Budget Support to Uganda .....	19
5.2	Final Impact Assessment of the Results-Based Financing Programme for Northern Uganda .....	20
5.3	Evaluation. Review of the Uganda Country Strategy 2010-2015 .....	21
5.4	Evaluation of Irish Aid's Uganda Country Strategy Programme 2010-2014 .....	22
<b>6</b>	<b>Evaluations published in 2014 .....</b>	<b>23</b>
6.1	Country Portfolio Evaluation Uganda: An evaluation of WFP's Portfolio (2009-2013).. ....	23
6.2	A terminal evaluation of UNDP-Uganda Country Program Action Plan (CPAP) .....	24
<b>7</b>	<b>Evaluations published in 2013 .....</b>	<b>25</b>
7.1	Report of the evaluation of the USAID/Uganda Stop Malaria Project (SMP) .....	25
7.2	Evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society .....	26

## Uganda – Evaluation Portrait

### 1 Evaluations published in 2019

#### 1.1 Evaluation of the Uganda Country Programme 2016-2018

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Evaluation of the Uganda Country Programme 2016-2018</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2019
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Silva Ferretti, Joaquín de la Concha González
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country Programme
<b>Project period</b>	2016-2018
<b>Keywords</b>	Human rights
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The objectives of the evaluation were to assess the relevance of OHCHR's work in Uganda during the period 2016-2018. The intervention targeted a variety of stakeholders, in particular national authorities and policy-making actors. Thus, the work included the monitoring of human rights issues with a view to advising the authorities and other relevant actors on the formulation and implementation of policies, programmes and measures to promote and protect human rights; the provision of technical cooperation to national authorities, the Uganda Human Rights Commission and civil society organisations to strengthen respect for human rights; and the promotion of human rights to the general public and dissemination of information on international human rights and humanitarian law standards. Information for the evaluation was gathered through various sources: 78 people were interviewed, and two questionnaires were administered, including both qualitative and quantitative questions.</p> <p>Main findings of the evaluation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OHCHR contributed to stronger foundations for human rights in Uganda by incorporating a Human Rights Based Approach and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in national plans and strategies. It further contributed to organisational systems by conducting the sustainability of human rights work by national actors.</li> <li>• The continued presence of international organisations in post-conflict situations can make a difference for local actors, e.g. by supporting coordination mechanisms. The strong and mutually valued collaboration at field level with the Uganda Human Rights Commission as well as the effective targeting and interactions with civil society umbrella organisations and OHCHR's success in setting platforms for discussion and action at the local level were highlighted by the evaluation.</li> <li>• The programme was relevant for all actors involved and engaged positively with a large array of different stakeholders (government, national institutions, civil society actors), thereby ensuring that changes in norms eventually trickle down to citizens.</li> <li>• While capacity building for Human Rights Defenders led to concrete attitude shifts, the evaluation team identified a need for alternatives to conventional training formats to foster learning, experience sharing and networking.</li> <li>• The evolving role of OHCHR in Uganda was not always clearly conveyed to or understood by local and international actors. This created friction with stakeholders and has considerably affected its actions.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender

<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/AboutUs/Evaluation/UgandaCountryProgrammeEvaluation2016-2018.pdf">https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/AboutUs/Evaluation/UgandaCountryProgrammeEvaluation2016-2018.pdf</a>
---------------------------	---

## 1.2 Evaluation of Water, Sanitation and Environment Programmes in Uganda (1990-2017)

<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>Evaluation of Water, Sanitation and Environment Programmes in Uganda (1990-2017)</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2019
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Nordic Consulting Group (NCG), Orbicon A/S, Hydroconseil
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Evaluation Department of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Danida)
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Sector
<b>Project period</b>	1990-2017
<b>Keywords</b>	Water, sanitation, environment, rural water supply, water resource management, climate change
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The overall objective of the evaluation was to document results and achievements of the Danish support to water, sanitation and environment in Uganda between 1990 and 2017. An analysis of the value added from Danida's support to the sub-sectors was also carried out with a view to extracting lessons learned. The evaluated programme targeted a variety of stakeholders, among them the rural population, civil society organisations, the private sector and the government. The evaluation used a combination of document reviews, key informant interviews, fieldwork in Uganda, and quantitative data analysis of national household surveys, annual sector performance reports, and the Uganda water supply atlas database.</p> <p>The relevance of the Danish support to the water and environment sector in Uganda was deemed high by the evaluation with respect to the priorities and needs in the Ugandan development context. Particularly, the findings show that the support of Danida contributed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increasing the delivery of safe water to Uganda's rural population with coverage increasing from 20% in 1990 to 70% in 2017, despite the high population growth rates of the period;</li> <li>• providing capacity building and institutional strengthening through a variety of approaches such as on-the-job training;</li> <li>• introduction of international good practices that became the basis for commendable sector policies and strategies;</li> <li>• mainstreaming cross-cutting issues in the water and environment sector including gender, equity and good governance.</li> </ul> <p>The evaluation showed that while Danida's support was significant in some subsectors, in others, such as sanitation, the strategy did not deliver satisfactory results. Moreover, while interventions contributed to raise awareness, the mainstreaming of climate change had not happened yet. Challenges regarding project implementation and long-term sustainable interventions were also mentioned in the evaluation. In order to achieve the SDG targets (in particular SDG 6, ensuring access to water and sanitation for all and SDG 13, regarding climate action) the evaluation suggested that further Danish private sector and research interventions should be explored as well as new financing partnership models.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, civil society organisations, capacity development, sustainability
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://www.danida-publikationer.dk/publikationer/publikationsdetaljer.aspx?PId=f07979a4-cd65-4db3-969e-7cb525363e04">http://www.danida-publikationer.dk/publikationer/publikationsdetaljer.aspx?PId=f07979a4-cd65-4db3-969e-7cb525363e04</a>

### 1.3 Endline Assessment for Multi-Sectoral Assistance to South Sudanese Refugees and Ugandan Host Communities in Bidibidi, Palorinya and Rhino Camp

<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>Endline Assessment for Multi-Sectoral Assistance to South Sudanese Refugees and Ugandan Host Communities in Bidibidi, Palorinya and Rhino Camp</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2019
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Governance System International (GSI)
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Mercy Corps
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Project
<b>Project period</b>	2018-2019
<b>Keywords</b>	Refugees, migration, child protection, water and sanitation, livelihoods, market development
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The assessed project delivered life-saving and protection assistance to vulnerable South Sudanese refugees and host communities in Bidibidi (Yumbe), Palorinya (Moyo) and Rhino Camp (Arua) settlements through general protection, including child protection; water and sanitation infrastructure and hygiene promotion; livelihoods and cash-based interventions; market development, financial services and enhanced coordination. The project aimed at increasing resilience of South Sudanese refugees and host communities while promoting peaceful coexistence between and among the two target groups. A combination of qualitative and quantitative data as well as primary and secondary data was collected for the project evaluation. Primary data was collected through surveys, focus group, and key informants' interviews.</p> <p>The evaluation highlighted the following results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considerable increase in the access to protective education of conflict-affected children (75% male, 51% female) compared to the baseline value (54% male, 48% female). Improvement in the reported feeling of safety and dignity (from 51% at baseline to 73% after intervention). Increase in the participation in recreational project activities (75% of the children interviewed) as well as other services, such as legal or medical (205% of the target). The number of women who gained knowledge of their rights increased from 2% in baseline to 40% end line.</li> <li>• The project contributed to a significant increase in the access to adequate WASH services (from 43% at baseline to 74% end line). The number of people having access to sufficient and safe water for domestic use also increased reaching 103% of the target. Number of people with access to dignified safe, clean and functional excretal disposal facilities improved considerably.</li> <li>• In terms of livelihood and market functions, refugees and host communities increased income through agriculture and income generating activities (99% of the target farmers have improved access to agricultural inputs via vouchers; 42% of the target households are engaged in income generating activities).</li> </ul> <p>Major challenges were not mentioned in the evaluation besides limitation in the access to data, long term sustainability of the interventions and the short-term nature of the project. In terms of lessons learned, the evaluation mentioned the need to include the targeted community in the design of the programme in order to meet their needs and requirements and to create ownership. The creation of synergies among different organisations was also seen as a facilitator of achieving the targets.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender

<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.careevaluations.org/evaluation/endline-assessment-for-multi-sectoral-assistance-to-south-sudanese-refugees-and-ugandan-host-communities-in-bidibidi-palorinya-and-rhino-camp/">https://www.careevaluations.org/evaluation/endline-assessment-for-multi-sectoral-assistance-to-south-sudanese-refugees-and-ugandan-host-communities-in-bidibidi-palorinya-and-rhino-camp/</a>
---------------------------	---

## 1.4 Central Project Evaluation Promotion of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Programme Uganda

<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>Central Project Evaluation Promotion of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Programme Uganda</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2019
<b>Author/Agency</b>	ICON Institute
<b>Commissioned by</b>	GIZ
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Programme
<b>Project period</b>	2017-2019
<b>Keywords</b>	Energy efficiency, renewable energy
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The project objective and intended outcome was to improve the access to renewable and clean energies as well as to improve the framework conditions for the sustainable supply of energy to enterprises and households in Uganda. The target group was initially defined as “Commercial, industrial and private energy consumers in cities and rural regions who do not have access to electricity” although this definition was narrowed down by the evaluation team, who referred to staff of national-level and district-level government in charge of energy policies; providers and users of renewable energy technologies and energy efficiency services; and experts and executives in the field of renewable energy and energy efficiency. The indirect target group were commercial, industrial and private energy consumers who do not yet have reliable access to electricity.</p> <p>The main findings of the evaluation were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With respect to the OECD-DAC criteria, the project was rated ‘rather successful’ (an average of 78.4 out of 100 points) in terms of relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency and sustainability.</li> <li>• The focus on private sector-led growth was in line with the strategy of the Government of Uganda (GoU). The supported associations that operate in various renewable energy and energy efficiency areas were relevant in filling the gaps in targeting and the provision of energy services.</li> <li>• The support for the energy-policy revision proved effective and would mark a significant outcome if adopted by the government.</li> <li>• The energy efficiency intended output was fully achieved through the certification of more than 20 energy auditors, energy audits in more than 15 companies, and energy management awards to enterprises/companies utilising energy-efficient measures.</li> <li>• Within the output of market structures, associations in energy efficiency, solar energy, hydro etc. were formed and supported (although with limited operation capacity).</li> <li>• The project supported the 17 pilot districts in introducing energy planning and budgeting, accountability and awareness (although impacts in energy efficiency remain limited and further impact depends on policy changes).</li> </ul> <p>The evaluation recommended to consolidate partner relationships, concentrate resources on key sector challenges, improve the flow of information, connect local activities to national opportunities, and promote a stronger impact orientation.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, HIV/AIDS, disability inclusion
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://mia.giz.de/esearcha/browse.tt.html">https://mia.giz.de/esearcha/browse.tt.html</a>

## 2 Evaluations published in 2018

### 2.1 From Donors to Partners? Evaluation of Norwegian Support to Strengthen Civil Society in Developing Countries through Norwegian Civil Society Organisations

<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>From Donors to Partners? Evaluation of Norwegian Support to Strengthen Civil Society in Developing Countries through Norwegian Civil Society Organisations</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2018
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI), Nordic Consulting Group (NCG) and Ternström Consulting
<b>Commissioned by</b>	The Evaluation Department in Norad
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Thematic
<b>Project period</b>	2006-2015
<b>Keywords</b>	Civil society
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The objective of the evaluation was to assess and document effects of Norwegian aid through Norwegian civil society organisations and their local partners, targeting the local civil society. After selecting five of the largest Norwegian CSOs for the study, the team selected Ugandan partners and projects for the five organisations. The team used a mix of methods to support triangulation and validity in the data collection: literature survey, semi-structured interviews with Norwegian CSOs and local partners, a survey among Norwegian CSOs (40 organisations), focus groups discussion and key informant interviews (in total 481 interviews).</p> <p>The main evaluation findings were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnership approaches were applied depending on whether partners were means to implement objectives (instrumental) or recognised as ends themselves (intrinsic). Another distinction had to do with power sharing and the direction to which capacity building and accountability goes. A conclusion regarding which type of partnership was more effective and efficient could not be reached.</li> <li>• Partnerships based on common values and informal dialogue seemed to have a larger focus on building the partner organisation, while the more professionalised partnerships tended to be more instrumental and results focused. Although the approaches were not dualistic, the increasingly demanding planning and reporting requirements showed that there was a trend towards formalisation.</li> <li>• All five organisations contributed to strengthening civil society in Uganda by gathering people together for a common purpose and being strengthened as a collective.</li> <li>• There were clear deficiencies in almost all partnerships in terms of how they are contributed to building a vibrant, national civil society capable of affecting and altering outcomes on politically sensitive topics due to weak conceptual clarity.</li> <li>• The 'results agenda' arguably contributed to the shift in focus from civil society as advocacy organisations and change actors at the national level to civil society as service providers working with local organisations.</li> </ul> <p>In terms of challenges, all partnerships had critical sustainability issues, particularly when regarding funding due to the lack of the state service delivery capacity.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	N/A

<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://norad.no/en/toolspublications/publications/2018/from-donors-to-partners-evaluation-of-norwegian-support-to-strengthen-civil-society-in-developing-countries-through-norwegian-organisations/">https://norad.no/en/toolspublications/publications/2018/from-donors-to-partners-evaluation-of-norwegian-support-to-strengthen-civil-society-in-developing-countries-through-norwegian-organisations/</a>
---------------------------	---

## 2.2 Corporate Evaluation of UNFPA support to the prevention, response to and elimination of gender-based violence and harmful practices (2012-2017)

<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>Corporate Evaluation of UNFPA support to the prevention, response to and elimination of gender-based violence and harmful practices (2012-2017)</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2018
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Itad and Impact Ready
<b>Commissioned by</b>	UNFPA
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Thematic
<b>Project period</b>	2012-2017
<b>Keywords</b>	Sexual and Gender Based Violence
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The purpose of the evaluation was to assess UNFPA's support to the prevention of, response to, and elimination of gender-based violence (GBV) and harmful practices, across the Humanitarian-Development-Peace nexus, targeting a wide range of stakeholders in North and North Eastern Uganda. The evaluation used a mixed-methods design including 4 in-country case studies, 2 regional case studies, a global e-survey and desk review, qualitative comparative analysis, contribution analysis, and realist synthesis to generate and triangulate evidence.</p> <p>The main findings of the Uganda case study were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNFPA's work situated GBV within the broader agendas of peace-making, humanitarian response and conflict recovery, giving Uganda global visibility. The political will and national ownership of work on GBV and harmful practices was manifested in the substantial progress on normative frameworks. UNFPA interventions were aligned with the current NDP and with sector-specific plans. The interventions directly contributed to normative and operational guidance on gender, violence, and humanitarian response at the regional and global levels, providing a unique opportunity to leverage Uganda's experience with the work of OHCHR and the recent consensus on the need for a more comprehensive and sustained approach to refugee response.</li> <li>• Diverse and longstanding partnerships with a wide range of civil society actors and key government actors exist and relationships were maintained with both the women's rights community, and stakeholders who are not in full agreement with some of UNFPA's core objectives. UNFPA successfully mobilised political support for new normative frameworks and policies and support from key stakeholders in implementation, but failed to mobilise sufficient financial resources to sustain this investment. Advocacy was diversely approached at the national and at grassroots level (through capacity building and awareness raising), while the development of coordination mechanisms and collaborative work at district level was not effective and sustainable.</li> <li>• Services for survivors were substantially strengthened and dedicated integrated service models such as shelters, and helplines were established and contributed significantly to the response to GBV and harmful practices. Through facilitating application of the law and reinforcing social sanctions, accountability was also strengthened.</li> <li>• UNFPA's technical capacity to prevent and respond to GBV and harmful practices was limited by insufficient supply of commodities, the need for additional training or guidance, and serious human resource shortages. With the new influx of resources for addressing GBV, a mapping of what remained in place and what is needed is necessary.</li> </ul>



	In addition, the high rates of turnover presented a challenge to sustainability.
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	N/A
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/corporate-evaluation-unfpa-support-prevention-response-and-elimination-gender-based">https://www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/corporate-evaluation-unfpa-support-prevention-response-and-elimination-gender-based</a>

### 3 Evaluations published in 2017

#### 3.1 Country Assistance Evaluation of the Republic of Uganda

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Country Assistance Evaluation of the Republic of Uganda</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2017
<b>Author/Agency</b>	KPMG AZSA LLC
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2010-2017
<b>Keywords</b>	Country programme
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The objective of the evaluation was to improve Japan's assistance to the development of Uganda by evaluating Japan's assistance policies and deducing lessons and recommendations as well as disseminating the evaluation results to government officials (the main target groups of the Japanese assistance) and other development partners (DPs).</p> <p>The evaluation was conducted from both development and diplomatic viewpoints. The report showed that Japan's assistance policies were consistent with the National Development Plan (NDP) of Uganda and hence relevant. In terms of effectiveness, Japan's assistance to Uganda made more remarkable contribution in quality than in quantity. While Japan assisted in the priority areas of "Infrastructure Improvement to Achieve Economic Growth", in areas such as "Income Elevation in Rural Areas", it faced difficulties on the Ugandan side, such as lack of data. In terms of "Improvement of Living Conditions (Health and Water Supply)", improvement in health sector indicators were observed.</p> <p>In terms of diplomatic viewpoints, the evaluation highlighted the role of Japan in enhancing the administrative capacity of the local governments in the communities hosting refugees in Northern Uganda and how this benefitted the local residents and contributed to the stabilisation of the area. The evaluation also highlighted the improvement in the visibility of Japan's assistance to Uganda as reflected in the increase in the number of articles about Japan in local media in the preceding few years. From an economic perspective, business activities of Japanese private companies in Uganda were increasing gradually and Japanese small and medium-sized enterprises were establishing and expanding their business and developing new business in Uganda.</p> <p>The report recommended strengthening strategic approaches in the implementation of assistance projects, strengthening measures to develop ownership and self-help effort of Ugandan counterparts; the formulation of exit strategies for long-term assistance projects; strengthening Japan's ODA implementing structure in Uganda and developing and actively using human resources knowledgeable about Japan. From a diplomatic viewpoint, the team recommended strengthening measures aiming at expanding interaction between Uganda and Japan at multiple levels and the establishment of venues for Ugandans and Japanese in the public and private sector to interact in both Uganda and Japan.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/oda/evaluation/FY2017/pdfs/uganda.pdf">https://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/oda/evaluation/FY2017/pdfs/uganda.pdf</a>

### 3.2 Final Evaluation of the Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) - Uganda: Agricultural Adaptation to Climate Change project

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Final Evaluation of the Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) – Uganda: Agricultural Adaptation to Climate Change project</b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2017
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Carsten Schwensen, Rose Azuba, Frank Muhereza, Veridiana Mansour Mendes
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO-UN) Office of Evaluation
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Project
<b>Project period</b>	2012-2017
<b>Keywords</b>	Climate change
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The evaluation focused mainly on the outcome level, as progress against activities and outputs was already presented in the Mid-Term Review (March 2016). The intended outcomes of the project were: i) improved knowledge and capacities for climate change adaptation; ii) better access of livestock and crops to water through water for production; iii) increased resilience of agricultural production systems in the cattle corridor. The project directly targeted communities, farmers and the GoU. Quantitative data (i.e. surveys) and qualitative information (i.e. desk review, focus group discussions, semi-structured interviews, household visits and field observations) were used for the evaluation. The team met approximately 350 persons across the six districts from the cattle corridor and from Kampala and visited over 15 intervention sites.</p> <p>Main findings included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in the level of awareness and engagement in climate change mitigation as well as the development and implementation of a key institutional framework to sustain climate change processes at international and national level.</li> <li>• Contribution to an important move toward resilience of agricultural production systems.</li> <li>• A total of 15 new valley tanks were constructed and five existing tanks rehabilitated through the project enhancing access to water.</li> <li>• Positive gender results which were not initially addressed were reflected in a more equitably distribution of tasks.</li> <li>• Focus group discussions (FGDs) within beneficiary communities indicated that enrolment of children into school had increased and the nutrition status among children improved due to an increased income among many beneficiary farmers.</li> <li>• Beneficiaries at community level were trained on climate change adaptation and other related issued.</li> </ul> <p>The evaluation recommended continuing the GCCA project through a second phase in order to consolidate results and include additional districts. The second phase should progress from raising awareness on climate change impacts to improving agriculture sector capacities to respond to climate change challenges. Moreover, support should be provided for the full operationalisation of the water infrastructure in order to ensure availability of an adequate amount of water to both crops and livestock in the cattle corridor districts throughout the dry season. Other recommendations highlighted the need to have a more effective coordination platform among partners.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, youth
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://www.fao.org/3/a-bd692e.pdf">http://www.fao.org/3/a-bd692e.pdf</a>

### 3.3 Impact evaluation report for the multi-sectoral livelihood and environmental interventions for the refugees in Kyangwali

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Impact evaluation report for the multi-sectoral livelihood and environmental interventions for the refugees in Kyangwali</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2017
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Brian Katungi, Nelson Wakka-Musukwe
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Action Africa Help (AAH) & UNHCR
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Programme
<b>Project period</b>	2011-2016
<b>Keywords</b>	Refugees
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The evaluation aimed at assessing the progress, performance and achievements made in the implementation of the Livelihood and Environment Multi Sectoral Assistance programs in Kyangwali Refugee Settlement. The evaluation focused on the two target groups: the refugee population in the settlement (men, women, and youth) engaged in various livelihood and environment activities and the host communities.</p> <p>The study was participatory, descriptive and cross-sectional utilising qualitative approaches. Qualitative data was collected through in-depth interviews with refugees at household levels, dialogue sessions with various groups at community levels, a sample of key informant and in-depth interviews with partners and camp management, and a review of relevant literature on implementation of activities by refugees (progress reports, multi-year strategy 2016-2020).</p> <p>The main findings included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substantial efforts were invested in refugees to increase agriculture production through extension services and direct farm input provision, post-harvest handling and village savings. However, there were strong bottlenecks that needed multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder response. Farmers showed needs to diversify from agriculture to off-farm businesses at some stages.</li> <li>• A growing momentum of interventions by partners in environment management and energy saving technologies was recorded. However, energy sources in Kyangwali remained mainly firewood, charcoal and reported agricultural wastes. Massive use of wood and charcoal deteriorated the existing natural resource base in the settlement. The production of briquettes was on small scale.</li> </ul> <p>Based on the observations, the evaluation team recommended the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partners need to tackle holistically the whole value chain rather than only different stages; and partners should share plans, targets, areas of operation, duration of funding etc.</li> <li>• Joint planning of all partners needs to be encouraged and promoted.</li> <li>• Enhance modernisation of agriculture, increase access to market-led skills development, support business and microfinance enterprises aimed at meaningful engagement of the youth, and strengthen non-farm income generating activities.</li> <li>• Enhance measures such as the value chain approach, financial literacy and business skills, and environmental management. Responsiveness to climate change, chronic malnutrition, reproductive health, HIV/AIDS and gender are recommended in all livelihood programming.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender. HIV/AIDS, climate
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/66063.pdf">https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/66063.pdf</a>

## 4 Evaluations published in 2016

### 4.1 Evaluation of Danida Support to Value Chain Development - Uganda Country Study

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Evaluation of Danida Support to Value Chain Development - Uganda Country Study</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2016
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Orbicon A/S and the Centre for Development Innovation (CDI), Wageningen UR
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Evaluation Department of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Thematic
<b>Project period</b>	2010-2013
<b>Keywords</b>	Value chain development (VCD), agriculture
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The purpose of the evaluation was to contribute to improving the design and implementation of Danida's bilateral programme under inclusive green growth and employment by documenting results and experience and providing recommendations for future support to VCD. The evaluation focussed on 11 countries, including Uganda. In Uganda, Danida provided support to the Agribusiness Initiative Trust (aBi Trust), which targeted farmer organisations and small-medium enterprises (SME), and farmers. The methodology of the Uganda country case included the "5Capitals" (tool for assessing the poverty impact of VCD), field work including document reviews, key stakeholder interviews, and FGDs.</p> <p>The report concluded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• aBi Trust provided a strong platform and concept for continued support to agribusiness development through its combined financial and technical assistance supporting mechanisms and multi-donor set-up.</li> <li>• Even though aBi was managed to support more than 200,000 farmers from 2010 to 2013, this was still less than 20% of the annual increase in the rural population in the country.</li> <li>• The performance targets (outputs) of Phase I were largely achieved. Short-term increases in production levels, employment and income within the targeted value chains were significant and food security was improved. Commercialisation and linkages to markets were introduced at small scale.</li> <li>• There were strong indications of negative impact on agricultural production from climate changes (rain patterns and intensity) and from a declining natural resource base (soil quality, forest, water). This underlined the urgency for developing of systemic "green growth" solutions to the agricultural value chains.</li> <li>• The support provided through aBi Trust, and the complementary support from aBi Finance, contributed to an improved access to finance for small farmers and SME's.</li> <li>• There was little indication that aBi's continuation of support to farmer groups and cooperatives would become sustainable. The GoU system for extension services did support VCD. The services were rarely available to the farmers, came too late, were mainly technical with little value chain focus, and often farmers were requested to pay a service fee.</li> <li>• aBi Trust contributed positively to improving gender relations. More women participated more equally in decision-making at household and farmer group level, women's workload was reduced as men were taking a more active part in production work at the farms.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender

<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/evaluation_value_chain_development_uganda/html/helepubl.html">http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/evaluation_value_chain_development_uganda/html/helepubl.html</a>
---------------------------	---

## 4.2 External Evaluation of Youth Development and Northern Uganda Youth Entrepreneurship Programme

<b>Evaluation</b>	<i>External Evaluation of Youth Development and Northern Uganda Youth Entrepreneurship Programme</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2016
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Montrose
<b>Commissioned by</b>	DFID
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Programme
<b>Project period</b>	2013-2016
<b>Keywords</b>	Youth skills building, youth development, entrepreneurship
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The independent final evaluation assessed two programmes in Northern Uganda: Youth Development Programme (YDP) managed by VSO, and the Northern Uganda Youth Entrepreneurship Programme (NUYEP) implemented by Enterprise Uganda (EUG) and Youth Business International (YBI). YDP targeted youth with upskilling programs to increase their ability to qualify for employment opportunities and to reduce the high reliance on subsistence agriculture in Northern Uganda. NUYEP focused on building capacity of entrepreneurs; targeting anyone interested, but self-selecting for those 'high-flyers' willing to invest their time and money to improve their skills. The evaluation focused on assessing strengths, weaknesses, results, costs, benefits, and Value for Money (VfM). The methodology included a 'mixed methods' approach including both quantitative and qualitative data collection. Respondent groups included beneficiaries of both programmes and a control group. The methodology furthermore included desk-based review of project material and VfM assessment. The School to Work Transition Survey (SWTS) was used as the counterfactual against which to assess the impact of both the YDP and NUYEP programmes. The main findings of the evaluation included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFID invested £10.5 million on the NUYEP and YDP projects. Assuming a three-year programme and no changes such as job loss or failure of businesses, the cost-benefit analysis suggested a return of 0.9 for YDP and 3.1 for NUYEP. With an investment in YDP of around £8 million and an investment in NUYEP of around £2.5 million, this would result in a return on investment of £14.95 million plus social returns (not measured in monetary terms).</li> <li>• Both YDP and NUYEP implemented their programmes successfully, achieving positive results against each output and outcome.</li> <li>• 97% of YDP beneficiaries had some income from non-agricultural sources compared to 47% of non-beneficiaries. Diversification of skills was important to ensure there was less saturation of the agriculture market thus increasing prices and, as a result, earnings.</li> <li>• The impact of the youth-to-youth peer activities is a social return in the form of young beneficiaries, who were amongst the poorest and most marginalised, and who were now serving as role models.</li> <li>• People with disability earned a higher monthly income than those without. Statistical analysis demonstrated that the difference in income was not a result of education, gender, course taken or sector of employment. It could have been a result of individual's characteristics, e.g. determination to succeed.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-youth-development-and-northern-uganda-youth-entrepreneurship-programme">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-youth-development-and-northern-uganda-youth-entrepreneurship-programme</a>

### 4.3 Evaluation of the Uganda Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment (SAGE) Programme. Endline programme operations performance

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Evaluation of the Uganda Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment (SAGE) Programme. Endline programme operations performance</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2016
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Oxford Policy Management
<b>Commissioned by</b>	DFID
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Programme
<b>Project period</b>	2011-2015
<b>Keywords</b>	Cash transfer, chronic poverty
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The SAGE pilot was a key element of the GoU's Expanding Social Protection Programme (ESPP). SAGE aimed to help to tackle chronic poverty and address the impact of poverty on social cohesion and the ability of chronically poor people to access key services. The SAGE pilot tested a range of implementation modalities for an efficient, cost-effective and scalable social cash transfer and generated evidence for national policy-making. The SAGE pilot targeted around 600,000 people in about 95,000 households covering approximately 15% of households in 14 pilot districts. The evaluation focused on effectiveness (e.g. in relation to the cash transfer system); furthermore, it examined SAGE operations in relation to awareness and case management processes, and the implications for policy. The evaluation used a mixed methods approach, combining qualitative research with a quasi-experimental quantitative survey design (treatment and control household groups) implemented in 399 clusters across 48 sub-counties in eight programme districts. Qualitative fieldwork included FGDs and key stakeholder interviews. The main evaluation findings were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SAGE programme was functioning effectively. Where there were challenges it had made some improvements since the midline survey.</li> <li>• It was understood by programme implementers that there was supposed to be a reassessment every two or three years, implying that beneficiary households should receive their transfers for the entire time until this reassessment. There was thus little incentive for beneficiaries and programme implementers to either exit or enter households to the programme.</li> <li>• Importantly, a minority of beneficiaries became de facto excluded from the programme due to problems with their payment cards that they had been unable to rectify.</li> <li>• As the SAGE programme graduates from the pilot phase and scales up nationally there would be a need for an ongoing system of eligibility assessment. One of the challenges was the cost to local government structures for implementing such a system.</li> <li>• The SAGE programme continued to rely on local government officials for major parts of its operations (village chairpersons (LC1s) in particular). The report notes that given the varying levels of capacity and competence of LC1s, SAGE will need to continue to provide support to LC1s and the other local government officials.</li> <li>• The direct cost of collecting the transfer for beneficiaries was very modest. Yet, the indirect cost in the form of the time spent collecting the transfer was found to be quite high. On average it took five hours to access the money, including travel to the pay point and waiting time while there (but not including the return journey).</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	N/A
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-uganda-social-assistance-grants-for-empowerment-sage">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-uganda-social-assistance-grants-for-empowerment-sage</a>

#### 4.4 Evaluation: USAID/Uganda strengthening decentralization for sustainability (SDS) program

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Evaluation: USAID/Uganda strengthening decentralization for sustainability (SDS) program</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2016
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Dexis Consulting Group
<b>Commissioned by</b>	USAID
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Programme
<b>Project period</b>	2010-2016
<b>Keywords</b>	Decentralisation, coordination among partners, capacity building, social sector services
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The SDS programme aimed to improve the results and sustainability of decentralised social service delivery. The SDS targets community members in 12 districts. USAID/Uganda commissioned an end-line evaluation of the programme in order to understand its contribution to decentralised systems and service delivery, as well as to assess the relevance of the SDS model and provide practical recommendations in order to strengthen decentralisation and good governance in Uganda. The end-line evaluation covered all 12 SDS districts and two non-SDS districts; it employed mostly qualitative methods of data collection with in-depth interviews and group interviews, as well as document review.</p> <p>The main findings of the evaluation were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SDS support to the districts led to some improvements in the functionality of the Local Government (LG) systems, particularly in coordination, financial management, M&amp;E, and MIS. Yet, according to the report, these achievements may not be sustained, mainly due to frequent changes in the district civic and technical leadership. The fact that the central government and other donors did not apply similarly stringent accountability standards was another disincentive to sustaining the gains.</li> <li>• The performance based SDS grants provided vital additional funding for LGs and generated some results across all the departments supported. Yet, the low to sub-optimal rate of absorption of human resources for health (HRH) and lack of funding to fill the gap left by SDS remain key challenges that threaten to undermine the progress made.</li> <li>• The SDS programme design and objectives were broad enough to accommodate modifications, and the leadership and management of SDS ably managed the rolling-out of the numerous modifications. The modifications, e.g. the District Operational Plan (DOP), enhanced the performance of the districts in key areas of service delivery as well as strengthened the roles and responsibilities of political and technical personnel. Yet, the modifications were often perceived as a result of USAID policies, which raised the question of ownership.</li> <li>• The SDS Model was relevant in so far as it contributed additional resources and capacities and to the extent that it attempted to inculcate a culture of strict performance management and accountability. Yet, harmonisation of principles and priorities between Granting and TA mechanisms is needed.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	N/A
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/GetDoc.axd?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&amp;rlD=MjE2NjQ3&amp;pID=NTYw&amp;attachmnt=True&amp;uSesDM=False&amp;rlDx=MjU2ODA5&amp;rCFU">https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/GetDoc.axd?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDBmY2Uy&amp;rlD=MjE2NjQ3&amp;pID=NTYw&amp;attachmnt=True&amp;uSesDM=False&amp;rlDx=MjU2ODA5&amp;rCFU</a>

#### 4.5 The effectiveness and efficiency of implementing the chronic care model for HIV care in Uganda

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>The effectiveness and efficiency of implementing the chronic care model for HIV care in Uganda</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2016
<b>Author/Agency</b>	University Research Corp. (URC)
<b>Commissioned by</b>	United States Agency for International development (USAID)
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Thematic
<b>Project period</b>	2013-2014
<b>Keywords</b>	HIV care, health
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The chronic care model (CCM), is an integrated, population-based approach to providing health care for persons with chronic diseases that involves patient self-management support, delivery system design and decision-support for clinicians and patients to ensure evidence-based guidelines are integrated into practice. The CCM was used in Uganda for providing care for patients with HIV on antiretroviral therapy with technical assistance from the Applying Science to Strengthen and Improve Systems (ASSIST) project. The CCM targeted both patients and clinicians. The evaluation focused on determining the effectiveness and efficiency of CCM implementation. The methodology included controlled pre/post-intervention study in two districts, collecting data on CD4 (cluster of differentiation 4) and patient adherence from a random sample of clients receiving HIV services. A difference-in-differences analysis was used; furthermore, qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews. The evaluation findings were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The odds of an increase in CD4 in the intervention group was 3.2 times higher than in the control group (<math>p=0.022</math>). About 9% of clients had clinician-reported adherence to ART the same or better at end line compared to baseline in the intervention group (<math>p&lt;0.001</math>). A greater proportion of the patients in the intervention group reported being more responsible for their health and feeling better. There was a total of 7,016 patients enrolled for ART care in the participating clinics for \$1.67 per patient served in the clinics. The incremental cost-effectiveness ratios of the intervention compared to business-as-usual was \$ 8.88 per additional ART patient with an improved CD4 and \$ 2.07 per additional ART patient with the same or better adherence to ART.</li> <li>• Qualitatively, provider knowledge had increased in intervention sites compared to control sites and there was a perception of increased efficiency and organisation, which led to positive impressions of the services provided among workers at those sites. Overall, providers experienced improvements delivering care and clients experienced improvement in the care they received.</li> <li>• The findings suggest that for a modest expenditure, it is possible to improve process and outcome indicators of the quality of care by implementing the CCM. Qualitative improvements in the intervention sites were observed in areas beyond the focus of the activity, such as task-shifting of triage responsibilities to expert patients and managing inventory to prevent stock-outs.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	N/A
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.usaidassist.org/resources/effectiveness-and-efficiency-implementing-chronic-care-model-hiv-care-uganda">https://www.usaidassist.org/resources/effectiveness-and-efficiency-implementing-chronic-care-model-hiv-care-uganda</a>



#### 4.6 Evaluation of the DFID Funded “Enhancing Resilience in Karamoja Programme (ERKP)”

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Evaluation of the DFID Funded “Enhancing Resilience in Karamoja Programme (ERKP)”</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2016
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Acacia Consultants Ltd.
<b>Commissioned by</b>	WFP
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Programme
<b>Project period</b>	2013-2016
<b>Keywords</b>	Resilience, Karamoja, food and nutrition security, agriculture, market support
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The decentralised evaluation was commissioned by the WFP Uganda Country Office and covers the DFID supported 'Enhancing Resilience in Karamoja Programme' (EKPR) in Uganda. The overall programme objective was to improve the resilience of households and communities in Karamoja. The target group consisted of food insecure households with labour capacity. The evaluation assessed the following activities: a) seasonal employment opportunities for the targeted moderately food insecure households with labour capacity; b) rehabilitated land for productive use; c) enhanced livelihood opportunities, reduced disaster risk, enhanced ability of communities to adapt to climate change and d) improved local capacity for the implementation of pro-poor public works programmes to contribute to disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.</p> <p>Both quantitative and qualitative data gathering tools were used to collect primary and secondary data. Standard multi-module structured questionnaires were administered to 903 households (477 beneficiaries and 426 non-beneficiaries). The household data were disaggregated by gender to the extent possible. Focus group discussions (14) were held with men, women and youth (separately) and 86 key informant interviews were conducted.</p> <p>The main findings included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The programme responded to the SDGs (particularly 1, ending poverty; 2, ending hunger; and 17, strengthening the means of implementation and revitalise the global partnership for sustainable development) and was aligned with the priorities and policies of the GoU and Ministry of Karamoja Affairs. All activities were geared towards supporting Uganda's National Development Plan (NDP).</li> <li>• Gender equality issues were addressed, and gender was mainstreamed through a livelihoods-based approach recognising gender differences in roles, access to and control of assets. Women were empowered by being involved in the decision-making process at community level.</li> <li>• Land was successfully rehabilitated for productive use through various methods enhancing resilience to drought by storing water and reducing erosion. Livelihood opportunities were enhanced through provision of water for crop production, effectively improving incomes and lowering food security reducing risks associated with disasters.</li> <li>• While the programme recognised the central role played by the Government for sustainability of interventions and adequately involved them, the short nature of the project and lack of resources by sub-county organs limited their ability to maintain the completed and handed over projects.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender

Link to evaluation	<a href="https://www.wfp.org/publications/enhancing-resilience-karamoja-programme-decentralized-evaluation">https://www.wfp.org/publications/enhancing-resilience-karamoja-programme-decentralized-evaluation</a>
--------------------	---

#### 4.7 An Assessment of Uganda's Progressive Approach to Refugee Management

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>An Assessment of Uganda's Progressive Approach to Refugee Management</i></b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2016
<b>Author/Agency</b>	World Bank
<b>Commissioned by</b>	World Bank/UNHCR
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Thematic
<b>Project period</b>	Not clearly stated
<b>Keywords</b>	Refugees, migration
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The study's primary focus was the socioeconomic impact of Uganda's refugee law on the refugees themselves. The overall objective of analysing the evolving refugee policy and practices in Uganda was to: (1) better understand how well the policy framework has contributed to the refugees' well-being and self-reliance; (2) identify key areas of policy and practice that can be better implemented to enhance social and economic benefits for refugee and host communities; and (3) identify lessons learned from Uganda's experience to inform the design and implementation of the Settlement Transformative Agenda and the Refugee and Host Population Empowerment (ReHoPE) strategy as well as the policy dialogue in other refugee hosting countries. The project targeted refugees and the host community in order to strengthen their self-reliance and resilience.</p> <p>The study included a legal and policy analysis and a socioeconomic impact assessment, the former complementing the latter. The impact of legal and policy frameworks on the refugee situation in Uganda were analysed, as were the social and economic impacts and the contribution of the current policy framework to these outcomes for the refugees. The study employed qualitative and quantitative research methods and covered refugees in rural and urban sites in Uganda.</p> <p>The results showed that Uganda's policy and legal framework was comprehensive in its scope and progressive in content which provides refugees with significant rights. However, limitations in the freedom of movement or freedom of association left the refugees susceptible to exploitation. The inability of refugees to acquire Ugandan citizenship regardless of how long they remain in the country was also seen as a limitation in the policy framework. Regarding the social impact, the settlement approach adopted by Uganda was perceived as positive as it fostered interaction between the refugee and the host community and enabled refugees to access basic services, receive physical protection, and to be provided land to cultivate for self-sustenance. From the economic impact perspective, labour market opportunities and/or access to capital varied according to the refugees' nationality, whether they were located in urban or rural areas, education and gender. Refugees were mainly engaged in occupations that provide little income, social protection, or job security. Moreover, the coordinated —and where possible integrated— delivery of basic education, health, water, and other community services had provided host communities with numerous benefits. There were still some challenges, which included the delivery of education beyond the primary level as well as tackling gender-based discrimination.</p> <p>The report emphasised the idea that a few modifications to policy implementation can help refugees particularly in the area of freedom of movement and can enable refugees to benefit from social and economic opportunities without being exploited or engaging in risky behaviours. Close cooperation with local stakeholders was also seen as imperative.</p>

<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/259711469593058429/pdf/107235-WP-PUBLIC.pdf">http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/259711469593058429/pdf/107235-WP-PUBLIC.pdf</a>

#### 4.8 Evaluation of UNHCR's Response to the L3 South Sudan Refugee Crisis in Uganda and Ethiopia

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Evaluation of UNHCR's Response to the L3 South Sudan Refugee Crisis in Uganda and Ethiopia</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2016
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Guido Ambroso, Gita Swamy Meier-Ewert, Julian Parker, Leah Richardson
<b>Commissioned by</b>	UNHCR
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Thematic
<b>Project period</b>	2014-2016
<b>Keywords</b>	Refugees, migration
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The evaluation assessed the UNHCR Regional (Refugee) Response Plan (RRP) after the South Sudanese conflict which triggered the influx of over 600,000 refugees to neighbouring countries, particularly Uganda and Ethiopia. The RRP for South Sudan elaborated in 2014 incorporated the financial requirements of UNHCR, other UN agencies, international Organisations and NGOs and targeted the needs of refugees. The evaluation covered the following areas: protection, health, nutrition, WASH, site-planning, shelter and education. The methodology employed a mixed-method approach consisting of both qualitative and quantitative methods including document review, interviews, focus groups and surveys.</p> <p>The findings of the evaluation suggested that while views on the value of the RRP as a fundraising tool were mixed, many stakeholders interviewed felt that it was a useful tool for top-level coordination and setting out the comprehensive financial requirements of the response. The main challenges came from the difficulty to standardise the response across countries, partly due to differing host country policies towards refugees. Moreover, it did not contain a recognisable results framework, instead it was setting out a list of planned activities. In the case of Uganda, the results showed that the managerial and the sectorial response were effective and appropriate in meeting the needs of refugees in a timely manner, despite the absence of recent contingency planning and minimal ad hoc preparedness for the emergency. However, the large investment in services was challenged in terms of longer-term sustainability and maintenance.</p> <p>The evaluation team recommended strengthening certain areas such as case management for child protection and Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV), the prevention and treatment of malaria; improving and developing an appropriate water safety strategy and strengthening the education sector by developing an action plan. More general recommendations included the need to develop an integrated community-based protection and community mobilisation strategy across sectors; to strengthen and systematise accountability to affected populations; to harmonise policies and procedures for identification, referral and follow-up on persons with specific needs across partners, and to emphasise documentation as a protection priority.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Education, gender, health
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.unhcr.org/research/evalreports/56b1d8df9/evaluation-unhcrs-response-l3-south-sudan-refugee-crisis-uganda-ethiopia.html">https://www.unhcr.org/research/evalreports/56b1d8df9/evaluation-unhcrs-response-l3-south-sudan-refugee-crisis-uganda-ethiopia.html</a>

#### 4.9 Completion and Learning Review (CLR) Fiscal Year 2011 - Fiscal Year 2015

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Completion and Learning Review Fiscal Year 2011 – Fiscal Year 2015</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2016
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Independent Evaluation Group IEG (World Bank Group)
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Independent Evaluation Group IEG (World Bank Group)
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2011-2015
<b>Keywords</b>	Infrastructure, sustainable economic growth
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The objective of the Completion and Learning Review was to assess the four strategic areas of the Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) for the fiscal years 2011-2015, which were: 1) promoting inclusive and sustainable economic growth; 2) enhancing public infrastructure; 3) strengthening human capital; and a cross-cutting fourth objective, 4) improving good governance and value for money.</p> <p>The results of the review show that while CAS implementation fostered deeper regional integration, there was an overly optimistic view of the country's capacity to implement projects and its ability to reach the CAS objectives. Moreover, the review noted that the indicators chosen to assess progress towards CAS objectives in the results framework were not always appropriate. The findings of the review were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus Area 1 (promote shared and sustainable growth) was rated moderately satisfactory, reflecting success in improving regional integration, and addressing constraints to doing business, but mixed results in increasing productivity and commercialisation of agriculture and no progress in increased transparency and sustainability of natural resource management.</li> <li>• Focus Area 2 (enhancing public infrastructure) was rated unsatisfactory, reflecting progress in WBG support to Uganda's electricity sector, improved quality of roads in Northern Uganda, and rural households' access to quality water and sanitation, but mixed results in improved management and delivery of urban services.</li> <li>• Focus Area 3 (strengthening human capital development) was rated unsatisfactory, reflecting a marked retrogression in literary proficiency in Primary 6 and an inability to verify a decline in the contraceptive prevalence rate. Against these developments, there was an increase in average gross enrolment in lower secondary education and the number of health care deliveries in government and other health care facilities surpassed targets.</li> <li>• Focus Area 4 (improve good governance and value for money) was rated moderately unsatisfactory. There was improvement in transparency and efficiency of public financial management and public procurement as well as strengthened public sector management accountability at national and local levels.</li> </ul> <p>Besides the lessons drawn by the Completion and Learning Review (more specific indicators; realism in project design and adequate time for project preparation; a strong emphasis on portfolio management, and World Bank Group leadership in development partner coordination and dialogue with the government), IEG highlighted the need to take into account all the available evidence to redesign the programme if so warranted by that assessment, and to integrate other programs into the CAS results framework.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Good governance and Value for Money (VfM)
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/sites/default/files/Data/reports/uganda_clr_2016_0.pdf">http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/sites/default/files/Data/reports/uganda_clr_2016_0.pdf</a>

## 5 Evaluations published in 2015

### 5.1 Joint Evaluation of Budget Support to Uganda

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Joint Evaluation of Budget Support to Uganda</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2015
<b>Author/Agency</b>	IEG and Particip GmbH
<b>Commissioned by</b>	DG DEVCO Evaluation Unit, World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), Government of Uganda, Ireland, UK
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2004-2013
<b>Keywords</b>	Budget support (BS), education, Water and Sanitation (WASH), gender
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The main objective of the evaluation was to assess to what extent the General Budget Support (GBS) and Sector Budget Support (SBS) contributed to the expected results by providing means to the GoU (thereby targeting the GoU) to implement its national/sector strategies, and to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of its policies, strategies, and spending actions. The evaluation also analysed how GBS and SBS contributed (or not) to improved transparency within government systems and stronger accountability. The evaluation applied an adapted version of the OECD-DAC approach for BS evaluation; data collection methods included: documentary review; semi-structured interviews, on-line stakeholder survey, field survey, FGDs, and site visits/observations.</p> <p>The evaluation found that the relevance of BS objectives in support of the government's poverty reduction strategy was high. The shift to GBS helped elevate the level and coordination of the policy dialogue and broadened the consultation process. However, by moving away from the explicit protection of sector funds for basic services, the actual convergence between GoU's and DPs in terms of policy and expenditure priorities may have been overestimated. This may have affected the relevance of BS design, which continued to focus mainly on education, health, and WASH. Despite the reduction of volumes over time, BS funds ensured significant resources to finance development expenditure and, apart from the very last years, partly 'covered' the development expenditure in the three focal sectors.</p> <p>The report further found that significant increase in basic access to education at both primary and secondary level, including achieving gender equality at primary level, was a result of GoU education policy. The main role of BS was in funding sector strategies, which resulted in significant improvements in access to education. GoU's strategy of decentralised and deconcentrated WASH implementation resulted in increased access and functionality of rural and small towns' water supply. BS contributed through funds, policy dialogue, and capacity building, which enhanced sector policy design and implementation.</p> <p>However, according to the evaluation, the stagnation in key performance indicators against trends in funding suggested that sector funding was insufficient to reach sector targets, notwithstanding improvements in efficiency and maintenance. With regard to health, access to most medical services improved due to important public investments; yet, improvements were unevenly distributed with an urban-rural gap. Although health related gender outcomes, such as access to maternal health care, improved during the period, improvements slowed down (e.g., HIV infection rates). There was a high risk that even mixed basic outcomes in education and relatively poor outcomes in health and better outcomes in WASH would not be sustained because of future underfunding due to low revenue mobilisation. This was compounded by very limited implementation capacity at the local level.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender

<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://ec.europa.eu/international-partnerships/joint-strategic-evaluation-budget-support-uganda-2004-2013_en">https://ec.europa.eu/international-partnerships/joint-strategic-evaluation-budget-support-uganda-2004-2013_en</a>
---------------------------	---

## 5.2 Final Impact Assessment of the Results-Based Financing Programme for Northern Uganda

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b><i>Final Impact Assessment of the Results-Based Financing Programme for Northern Uganda</i></b>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2015
<b>Author/Agency</b>	LSTM Consulting
<b>Commissioned by</b>	DFID
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Programme
<b>Project period</b>	2012-2015
<b>Keywords</b>	Health, access to health care, financial programme, Northern Uganda
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>This was a final report of an impact evaluation of a results-based financing (RBF) programme, where financing was based on achieving pre-agreed quantitative targets of service provision. RBF aimed at improving the health of very disadvantaged post-conflict communities in the Acholi sub-region of northern Uganda (the target group). The programme supported 21 private-not-for-profit (PNFP) health facilities in Acholi. To compare the effect of RBF to a more traditional financing mechanism, the project also supported 10 facilities receiving input-based financing (IBF) in Lango sub-region. Quality of care was measured by observing service provision using a rapid health facility assessment tool to determine compliance with national protocols, assessing use of services as recorded in the routine Health Management Information System (HMIS), and by measuring outcomes of health care provision and affordability using a community Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) survey and the Results Health Facility Assessment (R-HFA). Data were collected at three time points using a non-equivalent control group design.</p> <p>The main evaluation findings were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to health service increased in the RBF sub-region (mainly in small health centres), furthermore the availability of staff generally increased, however, not in the small health centres.</li> <li>• The quality of infrastructure, medical supplies, medicines, and management processes improved substantially in the RBF-financed sub-region, yet, the quality of clinical care was poor in both sub-regions, especially in Acholi.</li> <li>• National protocols for diagnosis of the sick child were not used, caretakers were not counselled on how to administer the medicines prescribed for their child, and even fewer caretakers knew how to use the medication.</li> <li>• Affordability of health services, patient costs on average decreased in both sub-regions, but more so in Acholi.</li> <li>• With respect to the disease burden, both sub-regions exhibited decreases in the proportion of households with health complaints, but the decrease was significantly greater in Lango sub-region.</li> <li>• There were several indications of increased demand for RBF by the World Bank and by district health officers.</li> <li>• Capacity was built in Acholi to manage health facilities using the RBF payment scheme, and capacity was also built at the district level for using the M&amp;E approaches applied in this evaluation.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	N/A
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-results-based-financing-programme-for-northern-uganda">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-results-based-financing-programme-for-northern-uganda</a>

### 5.3 Evaluation. Review of the Uganda Country Strategy 2010-2015

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Evaluation. Review of the Uganda Country Strategy 2010-2015</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2015
<b>Author/Agency</b>	JIMAT Development Consultants
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Austrian Development Cooperation (ADA)
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2010-2015
<b>Keywords</b>	Water and sanitation (WASH), rights, justice and peace
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The support of ADA 2010-2015 focused on two areas: Water and Sanitation in the Water and Environment Sector; and Rights, Justice and Peace in the Justice, Law and Order Sector. The programme targeted Northern Uganda. The purpose of the review was to assess the relevance of the Country Strategy, likely impact and the effectiveness of its strategic focus, its efficiency and the sustainability of its implementation, and to provide recommendations to feed into the design of the next Country Strategy. The review included briefing and consultation visits to Austria and country visit to Uganda (interviews with GoU officials, DPs, and CSOs). The main findings of the review were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Relevance:</b> The review found the ADA support was aligned with the relevant Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and with Uganda's priorities articulated in the National Development Plan (NDP) I. The geographical focus on Northern Uganda was appropriate from poverty, human rights and conflict prevention lenses, but could be broadened to include regions such as West Nile, Central and Eastern Regions. The findings confirmed that Austria's aid modalities (e.g. Sector Budget Support, Basket Funds, Technical Assistance Facility, and Project Financing) were complementary and should be continued. Areas of comparative advantage included: strong institutional knowledge of the two sectors; technological and institutional innovations in the WASH sector; and strong partnership with the GoU earning a reputation of "trusted partner/donor".</li> <li>• <b>Efficiency:</b> The implementation efficiency of the Country Strategy in both sectors was high, with the Country Office using its technical capacity and reputation to convince the GoU to allocate additional resources to the focal sectors.</li> <li>• <b>Effectiveness and impact:</b> Good results were achieved in the two targeted sectors, linked to e.g. strong donor coordination, long period of consistent capacity building, and enabling and growing macro-economic and governance environment.</li> <li>• <b>Sustainability:</b> Sustainability of water supply was almost guaranteed within the lifespan of the infrastructure as operation and maintenance mechanisms put in place were well-functioning. Sustainability beyond the lifespan of schemes was doubtful as there was no provision for reinvestment costs in the determination of user fees, nor did the government policy encourage this. Mainstreaming of a human-rights-based approach and awareness promotion for Management for Development Results led to a sustainable positive change in service culture in the administration and delivery of justice. However, the sustainability was challenged by donor attrition, which was likely to lead to a reversal in gains such as enhanced access to justice for the poor and marginalised, case backlog reduction, prison de-congestion, de-concentration of service points, and promoting human rights observance in key police/judiciary/ prison service institutions and in the public in general.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, environment, good governance, disability, HIV/AIDS

<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/derec/austria/Review-Evaluation-Uganda-2010-2015.pdf">http://www.oecd.org/derec/austria/Review-Evaluation-Uganda-2010-2015.pdf</a>
---------------------------	---

#### 5.4 Evaluation of Irish Aid's Uganda Country Strategy Programme 2010-2014

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Evaluation of Irish Aid's Uganda Country Strategy Programme 2010–2014</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2015
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Mokoro Ltd
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Irish Aid
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2010-2014
<b>Keywords</b>	Poverty, social service provision, governance, economic opportunities
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The purpose of the evaluation was to provide an independent, evidenced-based assessment of the performance of the Country Strategy Programme (CSP) 2010-2014, and to identify lessons learned as an input into the design of the next CSP and to inform programming more broadly. The goal of the CSP was to reduce chronic poverty and vulnerability in Uganda in line with the Ugandan National Development Plan (NDP) with a focus on social service provision, governance, and promoting economic opportunities. The CSP sought to combine support to and learning from strong engagement in Karamoja with national-level assistance (thereby targeting both Karamoja and other geographical areas in Uganda). Following the October 2012 fraud in the Office of the Prime Minister, Irish Aid suspended funding to GoU. A complete review of Ireland's way of operating in Uganda was conducted, and an Interim Programme was put in place for 2013 and subsequently extended for 2014 and 2015. The methodology of the evaluation included the combination of a Theory of Change approach and Contribution Analysis. In terms of data collection, the evaluation combined a review of relevant literature with data collection in Uganda (field work). The main findings were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CSP design reflected the priorities of beneficiaries, the GoU and Irish Aid. The CSP design also reflected a streamlined and focused approach, with clearer linkages between financial investment and policy dialogue, and greater focus on chronic poverty and vulnerability. However, the CSP design did not make sufficiently hard choices about responding to the changing political environment, nor were interventions across the CSP effectively prioritised, resulting in an over-ambitious programme.</li> <li>• The OPM fraud and the subsequent changes resulted in a CSP that effectively consisted of two very different phases; these changes, inevitably, impacted on the effectiveness and likely sustainability of some programme in the second phase.</li> <li>• Irish Aid contributed to important progress in reducing poverty and promoting asset creation, expanding access to social services (including in terms of justice) and generating greater awareness around gender and gender-based violence.</li> <li>• Irish Aid's single most important contribution was probably its sustained commitment to providing educational opportunities for girls and boys in Karamoja building on previous engagements.</li> <li>• In the new area of the CSP, economic opportunities, the results were disappointing, with the exception of the area of social protection.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	HIV&AIDS, Governance, Gender, and Environment
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://www.irishaid.ie/media/irishaid/allwebsitemedia/30whatwedo/IA_UgandaCSP_FinalReport_Final_05-05-2015.pdf">https://www.irishaid.ie/media/irishaid/allwebsitemedia/30whatwedo/IA_UgandaCSP_FinalReport_Final_05-05-2015.pdf</a>



## 6 Evaluations published in 2014

### 6.1 Country Portfolio Evaluation Uganda: An evaluation of WFP's Portfolio (2009-2013)

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Country Portfolio Evaluation Uganda: An evaluation of WFP's Portfolio (2009-2013)</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2014
<b>Author/Agency</b>	The KonTerra Group
<b>Commissioned by</b>	World Food Office (WFP) Office of Evaluation
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country portfolio
<b>Project period</b>	2009-2013
<b>Keywords</b>	Emergencies, food assistance, gender, nutrition, school feeding, market
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>This evaluation covered WFP's portfolio in Uganda 2009-2013 under the 2009–2014 country strategy. The country strategy targeted refugees, food and nutrition insecure, school children in Karamoja, and farmers nationwide (for local food purchase) through the following types of interventions: 1) emergency humanitarian action (EHA): general food distributions (GFDs) to various beneficiary groups and support to the treatment of acute malnutrition; 2) food and nutrition security (FNS): support to education, asset creation and prevention of malnutrition; and 3) agriculture and market support (AMS): agriculture and market development, including local purchases. The methodology of the evaluation included in-depth desk review, country visits for primary data gathering, semi-structured and structured interviews with WFP staff and other stakeholders (UN agencies, NGOs, partners, donors, Implementing Organisations (IOs), GoU), and site visits.</p> <p>The main evaluation findings included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WFP's country strategy set an appropriate strategic direction in the shift from food aid to food assistance. The country portfolio was closely aligned with Uganda's evolving priorities and policies, and responded to needs of vulnerable communities. Despite budget cuts, WFP achieved extensive coverage in the most vulnerable geographical areas and of refugees.</li> <li>• The strategy's objectives were aspirational and were inadequately translated into implementation and delivery of results. WFP's monitoring and reporting remained input/output-based, and outcome-level progress was inadequately tracked. Technical and field staff capacity did not match the country office's strong strategic and analytical capacity.</li> <li>• Recurrent pipeline breaks jeopardised effectiveness and efficiency of all activities, undermining the adequacy and predictability of GFD transfers in particular. This was caused by weaknesses in WFP's secondary transport and logistics arrangements.</li> <li>• WFP's support to the GoU in implementing comprehensive nutrition interventions to address undernutrition were partially effective. School feeding appeared to have a positive effect on enrolment and attendance rates in Karamoja. There was evidence that AMS activities had effects on policies and markets, showing a potential for scaling-up. The quality and sustainability of assets created under Food-for-Assets (FFA) had not received adequate attention; the short-term relief approach undermined medium/long term effectiveness. Hand-over strategies for safety net activities were limited and uncertain in all areas. The Government demonstrated strong ownership of the grain quality standards initiative and the development of market infrastructure.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WFP's interventions ensured women's inclusion, but made insufficient effort to assess the potential impacts on gender roles and dynamics within households and communities, or on protection.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, protection
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/reports/wfp269109.pdf">https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/reports/wfp269109.pdf</a>

## 6.2 A terminal evaluation of UNDP-Uganda Country Program Action Plan (CPAP)

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>A terminal evaluation of UNDP-Uganda Country Program Action Plan (CPAP)</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2014
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Delta Partnership Ltd
<b>Commissioned by</b>	UNDP
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Country
<b>Project period</b>	2010-2015
<b>Keywords</b>	Growth and poverty reduction, governance, policy development, crisis prevention, early recovery and peace building, disaster risk reduction, environment and energy, economic growth, and poverty reduction.
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>The overall purpose of the CPAP was to promote livelihoods and employment, promote democratic governance and improve access to high quality social services. It was implemented with GoU and/or civil society organisations as implementing partners. The 35 projects associated with the CPAP were implemented through two thematic areas: 1) Accountable Democratic Governance and 2) Growth and Poverty Reduction. The programme targeted the GoU and the conflict-affected areas of the North. The methodology of the evaluation included review of documentation, meta-analysis of all related evaluations, interviews with UNDP and a number of key stakeholders, partners, projects' personnel and other stakeholders; as well as case studies (sample of 8 projects). The main evaluation findings were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the CPAP objectives were likely to be achieved within the scope of the project as the majority of projects were successfully implemented or were likely to be successfully completed over the course of the upcoming year. However, the evaluation also found the CPAP to be thinly spread, lacking cross linkages internally within the UNDP and externally with other relevant development programmes.</li> <li>Compared to what was originally envisioned, UNDP invested less of their own resources; it was however able to mobilize resources beyond what had been anticipated. Despite a slow start, UNDP was able to gain momentum in steadily increasing its delivery rate, thereby demonstrating efficiency in implementation.</li> <li>The short lifespan of most projects did not guarantee effectiveness of results. Project coverage was low, with poor visibility and the good effects felt by beneficiaries are not at scale.</li> <li>Monitoring, evaluation and learning improved over time and were informing programming processes. The use of annual and bi-annual review meetings formed a good foundation.</li> <li>Sustainability was inbuilt through building capacity across the projects and policy reviews, and supporting government, e.g. in the development of the Uganda strategic investment framework (USIF) and Tourism Policies. Programme monitoring reports, Result Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs), project evaluation reports and evaluation surveys by UNDP and Non-UNDP actors suggested that there was a high degree of project sustainability and ownership. However, some projects required more time to be fully sustainable as they started late.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The last year of the Country Program Document (CPD) should enable the Country Office (CO) to fully implement its country programme and achieve the results as well as compensate for the almost two-year delay between the approval of the CPD (September 2009) and the full operationalisation of the country programme (late 2011/early 2012).</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender, energy and environment, HIV/AIDS
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7237">https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/7237</a>

## 7 Evaluations published in 2013

### 7.1 Report of the evaluation of the USAID/Uganda Stop Malaria Project (SMP)

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Report of the evaluation of the USAID/Uganda Stop Malaria Project (SMP)</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2013
<b>Author/Agency</b>	Robert Pond, Fred Matovu, Festu Kibuuka
<b>Commissioned by</b>	United State Agency for International Development (USAID)
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Project
<b>Project period</b>	2009-2013
<b>Keywords</b>	Malaria, health
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>SMP was established to increase coverage and use of key interventions for prevention and treatment of malaria in Uganda. The project was managed by a partnership of organisations (the United States President's Malaria Initiative and USAID). The project was designed to provide support to the National Malaria Control Programme (NMCP). The project targeted health staff and the population of half of the districts of the country. After year 2 of the project, the original geographic focus of the project was reduced by about one third due to the extra burden of working in newly created districts. The evaluation made use of the following methods: review of project documentation, interview of key informants, visits to a sample of districts and health facilities, secondary analysis of multiple datasets from household surveys, a health facility survey and routine health data of the Ministry of Health (MoH).</p> <p>Main conclusions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SMP improved access to long-lasting insecticide treated nets (LLINs) among pregnant women in the project districts, but improving and sustaining the achieved gains would depend on future supply of antenatal (ANC) LLINs.</li> <li>SMP achieved limited progress with IPT2 (reported number of women given their second doses of intermittent presumptive treatment of malaria in pregnancy).</li> <li>Accuracy of malaria microscopy and testing ratio significantly improved in SMP-supported districts, but majority of malaria diagnosis were still not lab confirmed. Adequate supply of appropriate drugs for pre-referral treatment of severe malaria was seen as vital for improving severe malaria case management.</li> <li>The development of the Malaria control policy, the NMCP strategic plan and M&amp;E plan and the malaria programme review were key milestones in providing a strategic approach to malaria control in Uganda.</li> <li>NMCP understaffing impacted on NMCP participation in SMP supported activities.</li> <li>SMP training improved data reporting, timeliness and accuracy. However, SMP planning was not well integrated with district planning and tended to by-pass the constraints of district capacity.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrated supportive supervision (ISS) built the capacity of individual district staff for malaria supervision and "mentoring". ISS depended on SMP for vehicles/SDA and therefore not sustainable by districts.</li> <li>• The project was effectively managed and the SMP partners worked well together based on complementary roles and respect for each other.</li> </ul>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	N/A
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/GetDoc.axd?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDYyYy&amp;rlD=MTgyMTQ3&amp;pID=NTYw&amp;attachm nt=True&amp;uSesDM=False&amp;rlDx=MjU2MDQx&amp;rCFU">https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/GetDoc.axd?ctID=ODVhZjk4NWQtM2YyMi00YjRmLTkxNjktZTcxMjM2NDYyYy&amp;rlD=MTgyMTQ3&amp;pID=NTYw&amp;attachm nt=True&amp;uSesDM=False&amp;rlDx=MjU2MDQx&amp;rCFU</a>

## 7.2 Evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society

<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Evaluation of Danish Support to Civil Society</i>
<b>Published (year)</b>	2013
<b>Author/Agency</b>	INTRAC, Tana, Indevelop
<b>Commissioned by</b>	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	Thematic
<b>Project period</b>	2008-2013
<b>Keywords</b>	Civil society, good governance, human rights
<b>Abstract</b>	<p>Danida commissioned the evaluation to review how well the Civil Society Strategy (developed in 2000 and updated in 2008) was operationalised from 2008 and onwards and how it might be more effectively implemented, monitored and evaluated in the future. The evaluation focused on Nepal and Uganda (country studies) and Somalia and Tanzania ("at distance review"). Danida targeted civil society organisations in Uganda. The support to civil society in Uganda was provided through: 1) Headquarter managed support, mainly through Danish NGOs, i.e. through framework organisations of which five out of six have programmes in Uganda, through programme and project support and through a fund for smaller organisations administered by an umbrella organisation, Civil Society in Development's mission and strategy (CISU); 2) Embassy managed programmes; mainly through thematic/sector programmes and – to a much smaller extent – the local grant authority. Three out of the four Danish supported thematic/sector programmes in Uganda, i.e. HIV/AIDS, good governance and water and sanitation, included support to civil society organisations.</p> <p>The methodology of the evaluation included comprehensive desk research, a pre-visit to Uganda, a two weeks field study in Uganda, including numerous individual interviews and focus group meetings, as well as a survey of Ugandan civil society organisations (CSO) partners supported by Denmark.</p> <p>The evaluation found that Danish support to civil society in developing countries, including Uganda, was highly regarded by Southern partners as both relevant and effective. There was evidence it had contributed to strengthening civil society and supporting open, vibrant debate in the priority countries, including Uganda. In particular, Danish support to capacity development, advocacy and networking continued to be seen as important pathways to achieve a stronger, more independent, diverse civil society. Danida's Civil Society Strategy was found to have performed an important role in formalising the role of civil society in Denmark's development cooperation, however, the evaluation deemed that the strategy had not been systematically operationalised, monitored and reported on across Danida's cooperation modalities.</p>
<b>Cross-cutting issues</b>	Gender
<b>Link to evaluation</b>	<a href="http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/11207/">http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/11207/</a>

## Commissioned by

The Evaluation Department in Norad

## Carried out by

Particip GmbH

## Written by

Pernille Sørensen

## Supported by

Jörn Dosch (Team Leader)

Isabell Breunig (Project Manager)

This report is the product of the authors, and responsibility for the accuracy of data included in this report rests with the authors alone. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions presented in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the Evaluation Department.

Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

[www.norad.no](http://www.norad.no)

[post-eval@norad.no](mailto:post-eval@norad.no)

Cover photo Walter Astrada / AFP / NTB

*Ugandan women work a plot of land in the hills surrounding the Rwenzori mountains near Bundibugyo in western Uganda on May 22, 2009. In 1906, Mount Speke, one of the highest peaks on the range was covered with 217 hectares of ice, according to the Climate Change Unit at Uganda's ministry of water and environment. In 2006, only 18.5 hectares remained. For the people of Bundibugyo who rely on agriculture to survive, temperature increases have changed their lives dramatically.*

ISBN 978-82-8369-062-0

November 2020