



2015:3

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Annica Holmberg
Everse M. I Ruhindi

Evaluation of Swedish support to the Diakonia Uganda Programme 2008-2014

Final Report

Evaluation of Swedish support to the Diakonia Uganda Programme 2008-2014

Final Report
January 2015

Annica Holmberg
Everse M. I Ruhindi

Authors: Annica Holmberg and Everse M. I Ruhindi

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2015:3

Commissioned by The Embassy of Sweden in Uganda

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: January 2015

Published by Citat 2015

Art. no. Sida61833en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61833en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms	3
Preface.....	4
Executive Summary	5
1 Introduction.....	8
1.1 Scope of the evaluation	8
1.2 Diakonia Uganda Country Programme.....	9
1.3 Ugandan context	11
1.4 Swedish results strategy.....	14
1.5 Method	15
1.6 Limitations	19
1.7 Evaluation Team.....	19
2 Findings.....	20
2.1 Relevance	20
2.2 Effectiveness	25
2.3 Impact.....	35
2.4 Sustainability	36
2.5 Programme management.....	38
2.6 Support modalities.....	45
3 Conclusions	47
3.1 Relevance	47
3.2 Effectiveness and impact.....	48
3.3 Sustainability	49
3.4 Programme management and Efficiency.....	51
3.5 Lessons learned	52
4 Recommendations.....	53
4.1 Recommendations to Diakonia.....	53
4.2 Recommendations to the Embassy of Sweden	55
Annex 1 - Terms of Reference	56
Annex 2 – Inception Report	61
Annex 3 – Evaluation Matrix	75
Annex 4 – Consulted documents	85
Annex 5 – Consulted Stakeholders	88

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACFODE	Action For Development
ADOL	Action for Development of the Local Communities
AYDL	African Youth Development Link
CCG	Center for Constitutional Governance
CECORE	Centre for Conflict Resolution
COU-PDR	Church of Uganda, Planning Dev't and Rehabilitation
CSBAG	Civil Society Budget Advocacy Group
CBO	Community based organisation
CSO	Civil society organisation
DGF	Democratic Governance Facility
FGM	Female genital mutilation.
FOWODE	Forum for Women in Democracy
GBV	Gender based violence
HRBA	Human Rights-Based Approach
HURIFO	Human Rights Focus
HURINET- U	Human Rights Network Uganda
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
JPC	Arch Diocese of Gulu Justice & Peace Commission
LAZIDEP	Labwor Zonal Development Programme
LGBTI	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex persons
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MSC	Most Significant Change
PWD	Persons with disabilities
PLWHA	People living with HIV and AIDS
SRHR	Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights
SUFO	Summit Foundation
TIP	Teso Initiative For Peace
ToR	Terms ofReference
UJCC	Uganda Joint Christian Council
UWONET	Uganda Women's Network
UWOPA	Uganda Women Parliamentary Association
WEE	Women's economic empowerment
WORUDET	Women and Rural Development Network
ZOA Uganda	(Dutch humanitarian organisation)

Preface

The Embassy of Sweden in Uganda commissioned this final evaluation of the Diakonia Uganda programme “*Making human rights, Gender equality and justice a reality in Karamoja, Acholi, Lango and Teso sub-regions*”. The programme period evaluated is 2008-2014, and is implemented in partnership with Ugandan organisations focusing on human rights, democracy, gender equality, justice and conflict.

The main purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance of a continuation of the programme in relation to the Swedish results strategy 2014-2018 and the current situation in Uganda. The objectives of the evaluation consider the relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency and sustainability of the programme.

Indevelop (www.indevelop.se) undertook the evaluation between November 2014 – January 2015. The independent evaluation team included Annica Holmberg, Team Leader and member of Indevelop’s Core Team of Professional Evaluators, and Everse M. I Ruhindi as National Evaluator.

Ian Christoplos provided Quality Assurance to the methodology and evaluation report, while Jessica Rothman was the Project Manager with overall responsibility for managing implementation of the evaluation process.

The Embassy of Sweden in Uganda and Diakonia Uganda provided comments to the draft report which have been incorporated in the final report.

Executive Summary

The main purpose of this final evaluation of the programme “*Making human rights, Gender equality and justice a reality in Karamoja, Acholi, Lango and Teso sub-regions 2011 – 2014*” is to assess the relevance of a continuation of the programme in relation to the Swedish results strategy 2014-2018 and the current situation in Uganda. The programme, implemented by Diakonia together with Ugandan civil society organisations, focuses on human rights, democracy, gender equality, justice and conflict. The evaluation was commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden in Kampala. It considers the relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency and sustainability of the programme and also assesses the programme and grant management of Diakonia.

The evaluation covers the period of 2008-2014 and has had a participatory approach with a focus on a human rights-based approach (HRBA) and gender equality. The key stakeholders have been involved throughout the evaluation process, giving input during the inception, data collection and the final analysis. The evaluation included a desk study of programme relevant documents as well as Swedish and Ugandan development policies and strategies. Nearly all partner organisations and over 300 respondents were consulted during the data collection that took place during 2.5 weeks in December 2014. The evaluation team, consisting of an international and a national evaluator, visited eight out of the 21 districts in Karamoja, Acholi, Teso and Lango where the programme has been implemented.

Findings were retrieved from the desk review, individual and small group interviews with partner organisations and external stakeholders, and focus group discussions with rights-holders using a simplified version of the method Most Significant Change. Rights-holders and the partner organisations provided information on processes of change that had occurred through the programme interventions and discussions, particularly on relevance, were held with local and national duty-bearers and with a selection of actors in the donor community.

The programme was found to be relevant both to the local and national contexts and to the new Swedish cooperation strategy with Uganda. Diakonia is supporting strategic actors within the civil society and the partners show interesting results particularly at local level for specific rights-holders and duty-bearers. The progressively stronger focus on HRBA and gender equality further enhances the relevance of the programme. A more comprehensive approach to gender inequalities by all partners, including a stronger focus on women’s economic empowerment and men’s and boys’ role in promoting women’s roles, would make the programme even more relevant. The evaluators also concluded that a more aware and consistent approach to different forms of power relations would also strengthen the HRBA.

The programme has been able to deliver several important changes at local level. Some of the most interesting outcomes are related to the empowerment of women and

girls and changed attitudes towards gender equality at community level and among local duty-bearers. Change has started taking shape at individual level, but a critical mass of individuals has yet to be reached, and it is therefore not possible to claim that the programme has so far promoted major societal changes.

The evaluators found that the main challenges to the sustainability of the programme are related to the somewhat scattered initiatives in the districts. This disables a more comprehensive mobilising approach at local level. Rights-holders have built their confidence and abilities to monitor the authorities and make claims when abuse is found, but they are still dependent on further support in order to be able to scale up the process of change to higher levels of decision-making.

To achieve the long-term objectives of the programme, Diakonia and the partner organisations need to secure that the many projects are coordinated and develop in such a way that they have in impact at district level. Good results need to be shared between different districts and it would be good to consider a more comprehensive approach to fewer districts in order to strengthen the future impact of the programme. The challenge of real ownership for maintaining and continuing programming also needs to be taken seriously.

On an overall level the programme management is found to be sound and the size of the country team reasonable. Diakonia has been able to focus more on results-based management during the latter part of the evaluated programme and it was evident that partners now try to focus on processes of change rather than on activity outputs. This area needs to be strengthened and partners, as well as Diakonia's country team, need to develop their skills on how to document and measure the changes they claim to see.

Some of the recommendations to Diakonia are:

- Diakonia and the partner organisations are recommended to develop projects that also target development at district level. Prioritise integrated project approaches that reach the better part of a district, rather than many small interventions in several districts.
- Diakonia is recommended to take the gender commitments a step further, putting a stronger emphasis in each partnership on gender equality.
- Diakonia is recommended to explore the possibilities to include focus on women's economic empowerment or find stronger synergies with other programmes that focus on women's economic empowerment.
- Diakonia and the partner organisations need to lift issues from the grassroots that require the attention of the central government. Civil society actors at national level need to engage in strategic advocacy efforts at national level that focus on the development and human rights in Northern Uganda.
- It is strongly advised that Diakonia follows its commitment on conducting a baseline study as part of the inception of a new programme.
- Diakonia also needs to improve its reporting against outcomes and processes of change beyond individual and group levels and include documented results on the societal outcome level. The use of indicators that trace behaviour changes of duty-

bearers are recommended. Indicators are also needed for all stages of the strategy for change, including the (higher) outcome level.

- Diakonia is recommended to continue to link results based management with HRBA, and to focus on the development of the partner organisations' skills in documenting processes of change related to attitude and behaviour changes of duty-bearers.
- Diakonia and the partner organisations are recommended to further deepen aspects of active and meaningful participation and pro-active non-discrimination.
- Diakonia is recommended to continue to support synergies among the partner organisations. Diakonia is also recommended to invite other development actors and their partners to take part in experience sharing at local and national levels.

The Embassy is recommended to continue to support the Diakonia country programme, but it is important to confirm that the programme design includes:

- relevant and feasible strategies for the advocacy work with described methods on how to link different levels of intervention;
- that the advocacy work at both local and national level is developed from a human rights-based approach, considering in particular the active and meaningful participation of rights-holders;
- a deliberate effort to strengthen both the gender mainstreaming approach and focus on strategic gender issues, such as men's engagement in prevention work against gender based violence, sexual and reproductive health and rights, particularly with focus on young girls and boys.

1 Introduction

1.1 SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation is a summative and formative final evaluation of the Diakonia Uganda programme “*Making human rights, Gender equality and justice a reality in Karamoja, Acholi, Lango and Teso sub-regions 2011 – 2014¹*”, implemented in partnership with Ugandan organisations focusing on human rights, democracy, gender equality, justice and conflict. The main purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance of a continuation of the programme in relation to the Swedish results strategy 2014-2018 and the current situation in Uganda. The objectives of the evaluation consider the relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency and sustainability of the programme. The specific objectives stated in the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation are:

1. Effectiveness of the Swedish Embassy support to the Diakonia Uganda Programme in terms of:
 - a. Achievement of objectives results and impacts;
 - b. Unintended outcomes both positive and negative;
 - c. Potential longer term impacts
2. Relevance of the programme with regards to the current situation in Uganda
3. Relevance of the programme with regards of the Swedish results strategy 2014-2018
4. Sustainability of the positive changes in the target communities, rights holders and partner organisations.
5. Diakonia added value/contribution to the partners’ capacity and results
6. Lessons learned and recommendations that should be considered for a possible subsequent programme
7. The efficiency of programme management looking at how the programme resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have been used to produce results
8. The effectiveness and efficiency of the grants mechanism between Diakonia and the partners
9. Sustainability (enduring results, including increased capacity of partners)

The evaluation report covers the periods of 2008-2011 and 2011-2014, with focus on the second phase of the programme. The evaluation team has covered the full period

¹The Diakonia Uganda Country programme document and the Terms of Reference for the evaluation refer to the original time period which was 2011-2013, the programme was however extended until December 2014 why 2014 is used here.

when looking at programme outcomes and impacts, sustainability issues and lessons learned, but focused only on the second phase for aspects on programme relevance and programme management. Due to the time limitations of the data collection the evaluation team has favoured in-depth discussions with a selection of rights-holder groups and partner organisations over a broad representation in order to address the objectives stated in the ToR and all evaluation questions.

1.2 DIAKONIA UGANDA COUNTRY PROGRAMME

The programme was initiated in 2008 for a three year period, followed by an additional three years and a no cost extension until December 2014. The contribution to the programme budget from the Embassy of Sweden is SEK 45.5 Million. During the second phase the programme has been implemented in 21 districts² in four sub-regions in Northern and North-east Uganda together with an average of 15 partnering civil society organisations (CSOs).

The programme focuses on rights-holders' possibilities to participate and influence democratic processes at local and national levels through three thematic areas, namely human rights, gender and democracy, justice and conflict. The overall programme objective for the second period is *Enhanced fulfilment of human rights, Gender equality and justice in selected districts of Karamoja, Acholi, Lango, and Teso sub-regions by 2013*³.

The partners of Diakonia represent a mix of national and more locally based networks and organisations. The majority of the organisations have partnered with Diakonia since the inception of the programme, three organisations⁴ have been phased out and two organisations entered the programme only in 2014.

Partners and actual financial support TSEK (June 2011 - December 2014)

Thematic area and partner	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	Total
<i>Human Rights overall</i>	3 875	4 575	4 280	12 525
HURINET-U	1 500	1 500	1 500	4 500
HURIFO	600	750	1 000	2 400
Church of Uganda – PDR	500	500	580	1 580
ADOL	400	-	-	400
CoULAZIDEP – Karamoja	400	850	-69	1 181

²Partners work at national level and in the following districts:Agago,Abim, Amudat,Amuru,Amuria, Apac, Bukwo,Dokolo, Gulu,Kaabong,Kaberamaido,Kitgum,Kole,Kotido,Kween, Lamwo, Moroto,Nwoya, Napak,Oyamand Pader.

³According to the programme document, the programme was however extended to December 2014.

⁴ ADOL, LAZIDEP & CECORE

Arch Diocese of GuluJPC	250	500	524	1 274
SUFO	225	475	490	1 190
Gender & Democracy overall	3 600	4 150	7 312	15 062
FOWODE	800	800	800	2 400
UWONET	700	700	700	2 100
ACFODE	700	750	1 200	2 650
ZOA Uganda /AMREACH	350	350	2 004	2 704
AYDL	200	450	1 200	1 850
UJCC	600	600	450	1 650
WORUDET	250	500	608	1 358
UWOPA (new partner 2014)			350	350
Conflict & Justice	1 100	720	1 164	2 984
Teso Initiative for Peace (TIP)	700	750	1 164	2 984
Centre for Conflict Resolution	400	-30	-	370
Other (new partner)				
Civil Society Budget Advocacy Group (CSBAG)			450	450

Diakonia's strategy for change is based on the integration of "rights based [...] norms, principles, standards and goals of international human rights that identify the gaps in fulfilling the rights of citizens, and using the available or new information to mobilise citizens and CSOs for informed action, using a results based approach"⁵. The role of the programme is to awaken Ugandans' to play their civic roles and responsibilities claiming the accountability of duty-bearers. Particularly the accountability work needs strong support and development of capacities in order to establish up- and downwards accountability mechanisms.

The country programme received an additional 300,000 Euros from European Union for the period of 21 months and approximately 1.2 million Euros⁶ from the Dutch Ministry for Foreign Affairs' Fund FLOW (Funding Leadership and Opportunities for Women) which has meant that some partner organisations have been able to expand their project to new districts.

⁵Diakonia Annual Report Uganda Office July 2013 – June 2014.

⁶The full FLOW grant was 2 241 150 Euros divided between Uganda and Kenya with 897 700 for the programme in Kenya, 1 199 467 for Uganda and 243 984 Euros for administration and programme support.

1.3 UGANDAN CONTEXT

Uganda's population is approximately 35.4 million (2014). With a life expectancy at birth of 54.5 years (2011) Uganda has a large young population; 21.3 per cent are under 25 years of age. While child mortality has decreased the maternal mortality remains high, 438 deaths per 100,000 live births (2011)⁷.

Northern Uganda region has lived in a cyclic history of conflict for most of the past 40 years, arising out of national regime instability and local rebel movements⁸. This has largely defined the nature and quality of development and the poverty patterns in the region. For over twenty years a major proportion of the population lived in internally displaced peoples' (IDPs) camps and were heavily dependent on humanitarian aid.

The situation in Northern Uganda has dramatically changed with the majority of the IDPs having returned to, or near to, their original homes due to an improved security situation. Elected governments have re-assumed responsibility for governance and service delivery, previously provided by CSOs. However, the youth, most of whom were born in the camps, are facing challenges in entering into farming and other livelihood activities.

Regarding the Karamoja Sub-region, while this was not heavily affected by rebel movements, being more affected by insecurity related to cattle rustling and the proliferation of arms through the porous borders. This has also caused tremendous suffering, loss of livelihoods and life. The failure of government to address pastoral destitution has entrenched a culture of violent conflicts and cattle raiding in Karamoja. As a result, the Karamoja region is the least developed socially, economically and with extremely poor infrastructure. Infant mortality is 3.9 percent per 10,000 live births compared to the national average of 0.46 percent. Malnutrition is severe at 18.7 percent and illiteracy levels are at 80 percent. Over the past decade the government disarmament programme has managed to get most of the guns out of the community and there is now peace in the region.

Evidently there is still a big disparity between Northern Uganda and Karamoja regions and the rest of the country. Two decades of insecurity has marked the conflict stricken regions. While for example, the national percentage of people living below the poverty line is 19.7⁹ per cent (2012), in Northern Uganda it is 44 percent and 24.5

⁷Uganda Demographic Health Survey (UDHS), 2011

⁸Refugee Law Project/Human Rights Peace Centre, 2009 as cited in the second national development plan.

⁹Although the proportion living below poverty level generally declined, the absolute numbers increased due to the larger population size.

percent in the Eastern region. In addition, Northern Uganda has the highest illiteracy¹⁰ rate at 36 percent, followed by Eastern region with 32 percent, Western region has 29 percent and the Central region 17 percent.

Uganda's economic growth has been characterised by some structural changes, with a steadily declining share of agriculture and increasing shares of industry and services, together with rapid urbanisation. The contribution of services and industrial sectors to GDP averaged 46 per cent and 24 percent, respectively, during the past decade, while the agriculture sector averaged 20 percent¹¹. However, the agriculture sector employs more than 65 per cent of the workforce while the fast growing sectors are not creating many jobs (UBOS, 2013).

Uganda has made good progress in improving primary school enrolment for both boys and girls. However, more than 54 percent drop out of school. The net secondary school enrolment rate is very low (21 per cent) and 20 per cent of these students drop out of school (UBOS, 2013b). Some of the main reasons for high school dropout rates are: high costs of secondary education especially in private schools; early marriages; teenage pregnancy and lack of facilities for girls during their menstrual periods.

The quality of education has and continues to deteriorate partly due to excessive pressure on the limited educational resources (including teachers) as the population of school-age children has increased. Most teachers are also ill-trained and ill-equipped to deliver modern and high-quality education. For instance, a 2013 service delivery indicator (SDI) study showed that only 19 per cent of public school teachers showed mastery of the curriculum they teach and that only 14 per cent of classes in public schools used textbooks.¹² The SDI study also showed that, on average, teachers scored 65 per cent and 58 per cent, respectively, on the mathematics and English tests that were based on the curricula they taught. While the national pupil-teacher ratio is 48:1, in Obalang Sub-county in Northern Uganda, the pupil-teacher ratio is 102:1.

The prevalence of malaria and HIV/AIDS is very high in Uganda, and malaria and respiratory infections are the most common causes of morbidity and the highest contributors to premature death and disability in the country¹³. In 2011, the national HIV prevalence rate was at 7.3 percent among persons aged 15 to 49 years but the rate for Gulu district is 10.3%¹⁴.

The Justice Law and Order Sector (JLOS) is constrained by: institutional barriers to access to JLOS services; low levels of JLOS service delivery and institutional

¹⁰ Inability to read, write and numerate with understanding.

¹¹ Uganda Bureau of Statistics, UBOS 2011; 2013

¹² World Bank, Second National Development Plan, 2013b

¹³ Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, 2010

¹⁴ Source District Speaker in Gulu

productivity; limited coordination between JLOS and other sectors thus affecting JLOS service delivery; poor staff welfare (remuneration and numbers); corruption; limited infrastructure; limited budget to follow-up and investigate cases and slow implementation and fulfilment of international and regional human rights obligations¹⁵.

Regarding gender equality, Uganda moved from 43rd to 29th in the global gender gap ranking between 2008/09 and 2011/12 suggesting some successes in equalising access to services and opportunities between women and men¹⁶, partly through the policy of affirmative action for women's political participation. Uganda is signatory to both global and regional gender equality frameworks, for example the Convention of the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Plan of Action from the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD 1994) and the Maputo Protocol, commitments translated into the national gender policy and the National Development Plan (NDP) 2010/2011-2014/2015. The current NDP identifies gender inequality as one of the main constraints to development, democratic governance and accountability. However the vision, mission and objectives of the plan are gender neutral¹⁷.

Most agricultural land in Northern Uganda is under customary law, which means that women only have access but no control over the land of the clan¹⁸. Only 27% of the registered land is owned by women while 70% of the women are active in the agricultural sector and they control less than 20% of the income from their production. The incidence of sexual and gender based violence is high in Uganda, 56% of women had experienced physical violence by the age of 15 and 28% of women of the age 15-49 sexual violence according to the draft version of the second national development plan. The situation in Northern Uganda is even more severe and according to the Police Annual Incidence Report there is an upward trend in reported cases. The sub-region of Karamoja has the highest SGBV prevalence, mostly defilement and rape cases. There are also a rural-urban dimension of SGBV, where the reporting of sexual violence is almost 10 per cent higher in rural areas.¹⁹

The 2011 CSO Sustainability Index for Sub-Saharan Africa notes that while the NGO sector in Uganda is young, it has been growing fast (official NGO Registry had an estimated 200 registered in 1986, approximately 8,000 in 2009 and 9,500 at end of

¹⁵Second National Development Plan 2015/2016 – 2019/2020, Draft 1, 5th September 2014

¹⁶NDPI Mid-Term Review Results Framework Thematic Report, 2013

¹⁷Gender analysis, Chris Coulter and Ashanut P. Okille, Indevlop/Embassy of Sweden, 2013

¹⁸Promoting Governance and Gender Accountability at Local Governmental Level in Lango Sub-region, Northern Uganda, Gender Self-Assessment, Combined Report for Threese District Apac, Kole and Oyam, ACFODE, 2014

¹⁹Gender analysis, Chris Coulter and Ashanut P. Okille, Indevlop/Embassy of Sweden, 2013

2011)²⁰. The level of liberty enjoyed by any particular NGO depends on the sector in which the NGO operates. On one hand, organisations focusing on small-scale development or service delivery programmes have sufficient freedom to operate and are usually portrayed as role models by the government. On the other hand, organisations that focus on evidence-based research and advocacy, especially on issues of governance failures, mismanagement of public assets, transparency in the oil sector, compensation and reparations for land acquisitions and sales, political and legal reform, and protection of human rights, including the rights of LGBTI²¹ people are at high risk of state interference.

In the last two years government officials at both the national and local levels have deployed an array of tactics to intimidate and obstruct the work of NGOs in certain sectors. The methods used range from breaking into NGO offices, closing meetings, reprimanding NGOs for their work, and demanding retractions or apologies, barring some individuals whom they feel are political competitors from attending meetings organised by NGOs as well as occasional resort to threats, harassment, physical violence and heavy-handed bureaucratic interference to impede renewal of registration. The disabling environment, increased control and restriction towards NGOs has been manifested in increased break-ins in offices of human rights organisations where data and files are stolen²².

As Diakonia states in their new programme proposal, the potential for violent political conflicts increases as the country moves towards the 2016 elections.

1.4 SWEDISH RESULTS STRATEGY

Sweden's strategy for the development cooperation with the Uganda covers the period of 2014-2018 and has the following strategic objectives and expected results:

1. Strengthened democracy and gender equality, increased respect for human rights and freedom from oppression. The objective has three expected results:	• Increased capacity of the civil society to promote the respect for civil and political rights; • Increased capacity of the civil society to promote the citizens' possibilities to influence political processes and claim accountability; • Increased rule of law, with focus on access to justice, particularly for people living in poverty.
2. Improved conditions for poor persons to benefit from and contribute to eco-	• Increased opportunities for women and young persons to productive occupation.

²⁰ USAID. 2011. *The 2011 CSO Sustainability Index for Sub-Saharan Africa*. USAID, p.146.

²¹ Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex persons

²² This actually happened during the data collection to one partner organisation in Gulu.

conomic growth and obtain good education. The expected results of the second objective that is particularly relevant to Diakonia's line of work are:	• Increased access and control over productive resources for women.
3. Improved basic health with two expected results:	• Improved access to quality child- and maternity health care • Sexual and reproductive health and rights are increasingly provided to women, men, girls and boys.
4. Human security and freedom from violence with the expected result	• Increased capacity to prevent gender based violence.

The strategy highlights the value of Sweden as a donor in relation to the promotion of rights that are perceived as controversial, such as freedom of expression, women's empowerment and gender equality, SRHR and access to contraceptives, and LGBTI persons' human rights. Men's and boys' role in gender based violence prevention²³ is highlighted as an added value of Sweden as a donor. The support to change actors within the civil society is seen as relevant and Sweden's support shall also focus on the possibility for rights-holders to claim accountability of the government through the support to the civil society, among others.

1.5 METHOD

1.5.1 Evaluation process

The activities related to the inception period carried out in November included a desk review of programme related documents such as applications and reports, Mid-Term Review, Embassy decision memos/assessments, Embassy of Sweden's development strategy reports for Uganda, Swedish results strategy 2014-2018, Uganda National Development Plan 2010-2015, the Second National Development Plan 2015/16-2019/20, sub-regional development plans, relevant studies on the socio-economic situation of Uganda, among others. A number of programme and partner specific documents were also provided to the evaluation team during the data collection phase. A selection of partner organisations, rights-holder groups and external stakeholders were identified for consultations, interview guides and an evaluation matrix were developed. The dialogue on the inception report with the Embassy of Sweden

²³ Prevention and the role of men and boys is also specifically highlighted in Sida's steering document related to GBV, Sidas verksamhetsinriktning med arbetet att motverka könsrelaterat våld 2013-2015, Promemoria, Sida, 2013-02-07.

and Diakonia helped the evaluators to adjust the agenda for the field visits which led to the inclusion of one more partner organisation during the up-country field visits.

The data collection phase was carried out during 2.5 weeks in December 2014 covering interviews in Kampala, and eight districts in Acholiland, Teso and Karamoja. The consultations allowed the evaluators to verify information given in the annual programme reports, extract additional data on processes of change at individual, group and local societal level and to assess the system and application of Diakonia's programme and project grants management.

Approximately 310 stakeholders were consulted through semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and meetings with larger groups of rights-holders. Discussions with partner organisations and rights-holders focused primarily on results at outcome level and partnership relations with Diakonia.

A slightly simplified version of the Most Significant Change (MSC) method was used. Respondents from partner organisations and rights-holder groups were asked to identify what they considered as important changes to which Diakonia programme has contributed. Respondents within Diakonia were also asked to list what they assessed as the major achievements so far. When the method was used in focus group discussions the group was asked to identify one or two of the examples given as the most representative for the group/period/region, etc.

Two focus group discussions with a mix of partner organisations were held in Kampala. The sessions addressed issues related to results through discussions around what the partners perceive as the most significant changes, the added value of Diakonia and reflections on the programme management, with particular focus on the experience of project management and different funding modalities.

External stakeholder consultations included discussions of relevance of the results, views on the civil society role within the thematic areas of the programme and reflections of the support modality. The phase also included a validation session with the staff of Diakonia and the Embassy of Sweden where the team leader provided these key stakeholders with some preliminary observations.

The stated MSCs and other information given by stakeholders have been analysed in relation to the expected outcomes of the programme, the programme outcomes that the partner organisations highlighted and those that were included in Diakonia's annual reports. The analyses reflect on the ways that actual outcomes may have diverged from those that were initially intended.

The assessment of the effectiveness of the overall programme and grant management is based on a review of steering documents for the programme, an analysis of the set-up of the programme and its procedures based on interviews with Diakonia staff, project coordinators and financial staff from a selection of partner organisations (bilateral interviews and one focus group discussion). Discussions with other donors and the Democratic Governance Facility (DGF) on the programme management and the support modality chosen by the Embassy of Sweden were also held.

1.5.2 Evaluation questions

The evaluation has been guided by the following evaluation questions:

1. To what extent have expected outcomes and impacts been achieved? What are the factors determining these achievements or non-achievements?
2. What are the unintended outcomes both positive and negative from this programme?
3. Are there any positive (or negative) impacts on communities from the intervention? Any potential longer term impacts of the programme?
4. Are the identified and recorded positive changes likely to be sustainable for the communities, rights-holders and civil society organisations involved in the programme?
5. To what extent did Diakonia add value/contribute to the partners' capacity in the relevant areas? What are the results of Diakonia added value to partners?
6. How do the systems and processes adopted by Diakonia relating to grant management have impact on the partner organisations, donor coordination, offering platforms for partner networking, and capacity building for partner organisations etc.?
7. What are the lessons that should be considered for any subsequent programme?
8. Actionable recommendations for Diakonia and partners for ongoing and subsequent programme?
9. Are the achieved results (outcomes and impacts) assessed as relevant with regards to the current situation in Uganda and the Swedish results strategy 2014-2018?
10. How have a human rights based approach (HRBA) and gender equality aspects been applied by Diakonia and the partner organisations in the programme cycle and to what extent has this had an impact on the outcomes?
11. Have the programme inputs like funds, expertise, and time resources, been used in an efficient manner in relation to what has been achieved?

On the request by the Embassy the evaluation team has also looked into issues arising from the fact that Sweden supports work on human rights and democracy by the civil society both through the Diakonia programme and the Democratic Governance Facility (DGF) and that some partner organisations receive funds from the two modalities.

The up-dated Evaluation Matrix developed during the inception phase provides details on how the above questions have been analysed (Annex 3).

1.5.3 Approach and central perspectives

The evaluators have engaged in a close dialogue with the Embassy of Sweden and Diakonia throughout the different phases of the assignment. The evaluation process has been guided by a participatory approach with a particular focus on the dimensions of a human rights-based approach and gender equality perspective, as well as risk and conflict, child rights and HIV/AIDS perspectives. All relevant data identified during the desk study related to achieved objectives, recorded outcomes and impacts were triangulated through stakeholder consultations.

All stakeholders were informed of the purpose and the process of the evaluation. Interview techniques were participatory, translated into local languages when needed

and adapted to the different stakeholders considering their level of literacy and formal education, and other relevant aspects related to power relations within groups and among different types of stakeholders.

The evaluators requested partner organisations to mobilise rights-holders groups that were identified as key target groups in the application for the second phase of the programme, that is, conflict affected women and girls, survivors of different forms of GBV, persons with disabilities (PwD) with focus on women, LGBT persons, youth affected by the conflict, unemployment and lack of education/skills training, political activists and men in their role as change agents. It was possible to meet with all these social groups except with LGBTI persons and PwDs.

Choice of methods for the different stakeholder consultations was partly based on predefined methodological approaches and partly on adaption to the way rights-holder groups had been called by the partner organisations. This meant among other things that fewer focus group discussions could be held than initially planned and that more rights-holders told their stories of change in larger groups. All rights-holder consultations focused on a limited number of specific thematic areas, constructed around discussions on what, according to the respondents, had changed through the interventions of the partner organisations of the programme.

The selection criteria for partner organisations and district/regions were: representation of all three thematic areas; human rights, gender equality and democracy and conflict and justice; reflect the major geographical focus of the programme, that is Acholiland and Karamoja; advocacy work at national level; partner organisations with core funding and with project funding; representing a mix of new partners and partners from the start of the programme; districts where there are many partners; practicability of reach – efficiency in connecting to different districts.

The evaluation consulted 16 partner organisations representing the three thematic areas, longer and shorter cooperation with Diakonia and with work at national and/or local levels:

ACFODE, Action For Development	SUFO, Summit Foundation
AYDL, African Youth Development Link	TIP, Teso Initiative For Peace
COU-Kitgum Diocese, Church of Uganda	UJCC, Uganda Joint Christian Council
FOWODE, Forum for Women in Democracy	UWONET, Uganda Women's Network & FOKAPAWA
HURIFO, Human Rights Focus	UWOPA, Uganda Women Parliamentary Association
HURINET-U, Human Rights Network Uganda	WORUDET, Women and Rural Development Network
JPC – Arch Diocese of Gulu Justice & Peace Commission	ZOA Uganda
LAZIDEP, Labwor Zonal Development Programme	

1.6 LIMITATIONS

The limitations of the assignment were mainly related to the availability of local and national duty-bearers; several interviews could not be realised or were held with respondents that did not hold the most relevant positions as most of the high ranking duty bearers were out of their stations organising for the National Delegates Conference of the ruling party. Furthermore, time constraints limited the possibility to track parts of the programme outcomes and impacts. As stated above, the consultation with LGBTI organisations was despite several efforts not possible to include in the evaluation and only one person with disability targeted by the programme and one staff member from the National Union of Disabled Persons in Uganda were interviewed. The representation of adolescent persons and children was also very limited, except in the ZOA project, where over 23 school pupils were met.

The examples of Most Significant Change provided by rights-holders and partner organisations tended to consist of organisational changes and a shift in the focus of activities, but less so on actual outcomes in changed practices, norms or behaviour among duty-bearers and on a societal level.

The evaluators did not have any possibility to analyse to what extent the additional funding from European Union and the Dutch Ministry for Foreign Affairs contributed to reported changes or increased programme management capacity of Diakonia. One programme officer was initially contracted with the EU funds with special responsibilities for the monitoring and evaluation of the country programme. Diakonia decided to keep the function also after EU funding ended. Capacity development efforts benefitted the whole programme and were not specific to different funds.

The MTR that was carried out as late as in February 2014 and reported in March, has resulted in few programme adjustments so far. Most of Diakonia's response to the recommendations is considered in the proposal for a third programme period. Since the MTR was done recently, and there are some overlaps in focus with this evaluation. The evaluators have opted to rely on some of the MTR findings when consultations have indicated their accuracy.

1.7 EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team consisted of one international team leader, Mrs. Annica Holmberg, and one national expert, Ms. Everse M.I. Ruhindi. The team leader was responsible for the assessment of the programme and grant management, while both evaluators assessed the programme's relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The evaluation team conducted several interviews together during the first week of the data collection (Diakonia staff, partner organisations, rights-holder groups and duty-bearers). The national evaluator met with a larger number of partner organisations, rights-holders and duty-bearers, the team leader conducted the interviews with the donor community.

2 Findings

The chapter looks at relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the programme's results and effectiveness and efficiency of the programme management during the last programme period. Below is an overview of the programme objectives and expected results for the full programme period 2008-2014.

Diakonia Uganda Country Programme

2008-2011		
<i>Programme objective: To change unfair political, economical, social and cultural structures that generates poverty, oppression and violence.</i>		
<i>Expected result: Civil society organisations at different levels have strengthened their capacity and organisation to act for the development of a democratic culture and practice.</i>		
2011-2013 (extended to December 2014)		
<i>Programme objective: Enhanced fulfilment of human rights, gender equality and justice in selected districts of Karamoja, Acholi, Lango, and Teso sub-regions by 2013.</i>		
<i>Promoting fulfilling and protecting human rights</i>	<i>Promotion of Gender Equality and Democracy</i>	<i>Conflict and justice</i>
<i>Objective:</i> State and non-state actors are progressing towards having developed capacities to ensure access to fair and equal justice for poor and marginalised people	<i>Objective:</i> By 2013, the exploitation and oppression of women and girls in selected districts of Karamoja and Acholi land, Lango and Teso sub regions is reducing and they are increasingly enjoying equal rights and entitlements with men and boys in a conducive social-cultural and political – economic environment.	<i>Objective:</i> By 2013 Peace and Development policies, programmes and plans have a stronger focus on protecting and improving the quality of life, dignity and self-esteem of the conflict affected and marginalised people in selected districts in Karamoja, Acholi, Lango and Teso sub-regions
1. Civic groups and partner organisations in the target districts effectively support and represent the poor and marginalised people to claim their rights 2. International and national human rights instruments are domesticated, implemented and are effectively monitored by duty bearers	1. Women and other marginalised groups are increasingly taking action for the realisation of their rights 2. Local civic action groups are proactively engaged and participating in decision making at local levels to ensure that duty bearers are accountable, entrench the culture of constitutionalism and good governance and work towards ensuring the realisation of the rights of poor and marginalised people.	1. Community-led and collaborative peace and security initiatives involving poor and marginalised people are being implemented and the causes and effects of insecurity are reversed. 2. Communities have instituted coping mechanisms that enable them have sustainable livelihoods.

2.1 RELEVANCE

- To what extent did Diakonia add value/contribute to the partners' capacity in the relevant areas? What are the results of Diakonia added value to partners?

- Are the achieved results (outcomes and impacts) assessed as relevant with regards to the current situation in Uganda and the Swedish results strategy 2014-2018

2.1.1 Ugandan context

All consulted stakeholders confirmed the relevance to work in the regions where the programme is being implemented. The impact of the conflict on the social context is still very present, and people are just starting to plan for the future again. Traumatized persons continue to be victims and perpetrators of violence, the young population, marked by growing up in camps, lack job opportunities and possibilities to contribute to the family income, topped with serious alcohol and drug abuse. The absence of quality basic services is still a challenge and people are just starting to get enough knowledge and self-confidence to claim their rights to health services, education for their children and participation in budget decision-making processes.

One of the most strategic and relevant areas identified by external and programme stakeholders was gender equality and women's and girls' rights, including the involvement of men (boys were not mentioned) and focus on women's economic empowerment. The second most common area that was highlighted was the need of creating employment, particularly for the younger population.

As the Mid-Term Review conducted in February 2014 concluded the programme "responds to the strategic priorities of the Government of Uganda's shared aspirations as articulated in the Uganda Vision 2040 and operationalised through the five-year National Development Plan 2010/11-2014/15"²⁴. Issues related to good governance, gender equality, the implementation of human rights commitments and access to justice remain highly relevant. The draft version of the Second National Development Plan (2015/16-2019/20) – NDPII, highlights among other aspects the poverty levels of Northern Uganda; the high unemployment rates particularly among young people; the poor access to maternal health and family planning services (and linked to this the problem with early marriages; high teenage pregnancies and girls school drop-outs); and the low quality of education (enrolment has increased but the education provided does not prepare the students for the demands on the labour market). Diakonia's country programme relates to the implementation goals of the NDPII related to strengthening decentralised service delivery and efficient public service delivery systems; mobilisation and increased participation in the development plans; as well as to the overall efforts to decrease the development gaps between different regions in Uganda.

2.1.2 Coherence with the Swedish strategy

²⁴Mid-Term Review of the Country Programm (2011-2014) implemented with support from the Embassy of Sweden in Uganda, Final Report, March 2014

The programme links to several of the objectives²⁵ of the Swedish cooperation with Uganda. The focus on enabling organised rights-holders to claim accountability from the duty-bearers and to monitor service delivery and compliance with human rights commitments has resulted in positive responses: local organisations have increased their capacity to mobilise and organise rights-holder groups to interact with local duty-bearers; targeted rights-holders are aware of their rights and act upon this knowledge, including sensitising other community members; local duty-bearers are aware that they are being monitored and can be held to account, which in several cases has led to a more open and participatory approach towards the communities and the civil society. The influence over national policy-makers and political processes is however less evident in the reports and was not often highlighted by partners or external stakeholders during the data collection. The different clusters of the Human Rights Network (HURINET) are engaged in relevant advocacy efforts as are the partnering youth and women organisations. The level of influence varies however, the AYDL has been successful in positioning youth issues at policy level while other processes like the Marriage and Divorce Bill, Anti-Pornography Bill, LGBTI rights or enabling environment for the civil society have been characterised with little openness by the duty-bearers to the claims of the civil society.

In Gulu district the engagement with the youth counsellor and other elected leaders Summit Foundation (SUFO) managed to raise the interest in developing a youth action plan. Together with the politicians and youth groups, SUFO has supported the development of the Gulu Youth Strategic Plan for Action and the Acholi Youth Programme for Action, to which other districts are expected to adhere. The plan will be presented to the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development.

Many, but not all partner organisations, have a strong focus on gender equality and address different forms of sexual and gender based violence. Particularly relevant are those projects that engage men in the prevention work and support women's groups and networks to sensitise other women and the larger community. Lack of or low quality maternal health services is a great concern of women activists at grassroots level. The data collection showed that the awareness raising initiatives had resulted in several actions within health centres where the services had been poor. It was not obvious that sexual and reproductive health and rights (SRHR) was a targeted area in the supported projects. Diakonia staff responded that it was actually only ZOA that had an articulated focus on SRHR, and then in particular on female genital mutilation (FGM). The evaluators therefore conclude that it is mainly the rights-holders that have brought SRHR, particularly maternal health and family planning, to the programme rather than the individual projects or the overall programme design.

²⁵See page 14 for list over the objectives and expected results.

Land rights and increased opportunities for women and young persons to productive occupation were raised as relevant issues by many of the partner organisations. Some, such as HURIFO, could also show tangible results in how women's access and to a certain extent control over land had increased in the communities where women human rights groups lobbied for women's rights. The organisations focusing on youth had employment as a priority area and engaged in dialogue with local duty-bearers on the need to provide skills trainings to young women and men. However, the programme does not have economic rights and opportunities in focus.

Women's economic empowerment (WEE) and youth employment (nationally and in particular in the regions where the programme is being implemented), are raised as very important issues by the partners and rights-holders within the programme, as well as by the Government and international development actors, including the Embassy of Sweden. The programme pays little attention to WEE²⁶, and though both SUFO and AYDL stress the importance of preparing young women and men for the labour market, there are no specific targeting strategies. ZOA also earlier promoted economic alternatives to former cutters but not primarily as a specific WEE strategy to our understanding^{27,28}.

2.1.3 Added value

The evaluators asked all partner organisations about their relationship with Diakonia and in what way, if any, Diakonia brings value to their work apart from providing funds. As further explored in the next section and in 2.5, Diakonia's approach towards the partners has resulted in improved reporting and monitoring skills (though M&E continue to be a challenge for many partners²⁹), stronger financial and administrative systems and practices, greater understanding for HRBA, gender mainstreaming and environmental perspective. The focus on developing gender mainstreaming skills has resulted in gender action plans for those partners that did not have a strong

²⁶ ZOA has engaged in some productive activities at a small scale where women and girls in the school had started making bracelets made of beads. A market had been secured and the first shipment was made. Thereafter the activity stalled, yet the buyer still awaits more products. ZOA admitted that this is an area where they have been weak.

²⁷ It should also be noted that several actors working against FGM, like for instance Tostan, claim that it is the demand side (which is normally represented by the elders) rather than the cutters that should be addressed. The economic alternatives to the traditional cutters is a complementary but not key factor in the anti-FGM work.

²⁸ There was support to craft making (beaded bangles) by the survivors and cutters but this stopped after a short period despite the fact that Diakonia had secured a market whose demand is not met.

²⁹ The MTR 2014 raised for example the insufficient collection of data: "Many Partner CSOs have difficulties in collecting data on their thematic areas of work and consequently these important cases go unrecorded and hence unnoticed. Diakonia Country Programme has to work closely with Partner CSOs and other institutions to collect this data and introduce regulations to require Partner CSOs to report them. It is recommended that the Programme works to a greater extent with Partner CSOs especially in the successor programme to achieve this objective. This will improve the capacity of the Partner CSOs to participate and report to the Programme including other external and interested agencies with similar mandates for possibilities of synergies."

focus on gender equality and/or women's rights, but also that partnering women's organisations now also target men in their gender equality strategies. The interest in the institutional development of the partners and the quality of the capacity building initiatives were highlighted as aspects of added value. In the Executive Director of TIP's words: "Diakonia is a unique donor because it is willing to support you to grow."³⁰

The promotion of HRBA and gender equality and its effect on the partner organisations were found by the evaluators to be one of the more salient aspects of added value, both from a national and local contextual and Swedish strategy point of view.

Furthermore, it was stated by both smaller and bigger partner organisations that the cooperation with Diakonia had opened doors to other funding, alliances with civil society organisations in the region and stronger networking between the partners within the programme. ACFODE mentioned³¹ for instance that their visibility had increased and that they now received more recognition for their work. The same organisation pointed out that the exchange with WORUDET in Pader had been very helpful. AYDL highlighted the importance of learning from organisation such as FOWODE and UWONET through the Directors' Forum organised under the programme, and examples of cross learning and fertilisation between the partners were for instance TIP and ZOA, TIP and JPC Gulu, and SUFO was invited to HURIFO for the strategic plan development.

Although the respondents were not quick to highlight the linkage to other programmes or other civil society actors working in the same region or with the same thematic areas, it was established that WORUDET had good working relationships with CSOs in Lamwo and whenever a community dialogue is organised all the five CSOs in the district have to be part of it. This was evidenced when a staff of the National Union of Persons with Disability in Uganda attended the evaluation meeting. Further, The Executive Director of TIP works closely with the Teso Anti-corruption Coalition (TAC) and during the time of the evaluation he had been invited to present a paper during the anti-corruption week.

The evaluation team found that Diakonia as an international CSO seemed to be rather unknown among the consulted external stakeholders (e.g. the Uganda Human Rights Commission), despite its participation in the international and national civil society fora active in Uganda.

The annual report notes how several partner organisations coordinate their work with other parts of the Ugandan civil society and UN bodies (for example on youth policies, human rights, land rights and conflicts and GBV).

³⁰ Interview with Michael Odeke, 11.12.2014

³¹ Interview with Regina Bafaki, Executive Director, 02.12.2014

The programme is held together in as far as empowering the citizens to hold duty bearers accountable is concerned. However, in instances where the issues are beyond the mandate of the districts, then, each partner struggles on its own. There have not been any examples that can be cited where advocacy issues came from the local level and went through to the national level being jointly pushed by the national CSOs. For example, the issue of inadequate staffing at the district, especially in education and health, has not featured strongly as a national advocacy issue, yet the decision to halt recruitment was made at national level by the Ministry of Public Service.

2.2 EFFECTIVENESS

- To what extent have expected outcomes and impacts been achieved? What are the reasons for these achievements or non-achievements?
- What are the unintended outcomes both positive and negative from this programme?
- How has HRBA and gender equality aspects been applied by Diakonia and the partner organisations in the programme cycle and to what extent has this had an impact on the outcomes.

The programme objective as stated in the ToR and the programme document is time-specific to 2013, but the programme was extended to December 2014, which means that by the time of the evaluation it should be possible to see “Enhanced fulfilment of human rights, gender equality and justice in selected districts of Karamoja, Acholi, Lango, and Teso sub-regions”.

The Diakonia annual reports do not report results against the set indicators and seldom trace outcomes or impacts back to the first programme period, or in the case of the last annual report, to the first years of the current phase. This makes it hard to see progress over time. A list of indicators was presented on demand by the embassy as a complement to the last annual report (2013/2014). Though this indicator document shows interesting results, most numbers and examples are not compared to previous situations or achievements. The used indicators are also mostly activity based and do not reflect changes at outcome level. Some of the expected results are also set on a high level, like for instance the expectation that the programme will contribute to *International and National Human Rights Instruments are domesticated, implemented and are effectively monitored by duty bearers*.

The reports focus more on some of the partnerships; most cited is the work of HURINET, followed by the partnering organisations promoting women’s rights³² and the youth organisations. The reports also give the impression of more isolated result

³²Like FOWODE, UWONET, ACFODE, WORUDET and ZOA.

areas and projects with weak linkages among them rather than a joint programme. What holds the different initiatives together are the geographical boundaries, the thematic focus and approaches, and the fact that Diakonia is the partner to all participating organisations in the programme.

There has been advancement of service delivery as a response to rights-holders advocacy work at district and sub-county levels, and in several districts the partner organisations have contributed to the formulation of local by-laws related to for example corporal punishment, education, environmental issues, charcoal selling and alcohol abuse. Women witness about individual empowerment at household level, but also that they have a greater role to play in the community and are respected. Women councillors are occupying spaces and taking on positions that were earlier a male preserve. A small number of men are engaged in gender equality and GBV prevention work³³, and there are examples of traditional conflict mechanisms changing towards increased respect for the roles of women as community members. The Acholi women's group that works together with HURIFO have managed to mediate in many land conflicts. Their free and somewhat different mediation "service" has been effective even though it threatens the position of the chiefs that traditionally have the role to solve land conflicts, and their efforts have gained the support from the Elders Forum in several communities. Since there is no baseline to compare the current situation with, it is however not possible to assess the degree of the "enhancement".

Rights-holders working with WORUDET told how earlier alcohol abuse, gambling and use of violence against their spouses and children had destroyed their families lives. One respondent stated: "I have totally changed since I started to join the training for role model men. I was violent and stopped my wife from seeing other people, even other women. I was seen as an evil man. Today I am met with respect, I am a chairperson and I have even been called by the local council to mediate in cases of gender based violence." A member of Women's Network described how "I used to be angry and fight all the time. I drank and then fought with my husband. I was invited to a training but did not want to go, the other women tricked me to come saying that I needed to be there. When I heard them talk about the problems alcohol causes and about gender based violence it was as if they were talking about me. I started to join the meetings, supported by my husband, and I am now a calm person. WORUDET's social worker helped me to change. Today I am chairperson of the Women's Network and a member of Elders Forum."

³³While there are some men who have realized the importance of good gender relations at household level and have become male role models as in WORUDET (Lamwo District) project, the majority of men have not changed their mindset and even ridicule men who try to change the gender roles as being dominated by their wives. In addition, there are some men who against the tradition have started going to farm with their wives and if they need some pocket money, they ask their wives for some produce to sell (men and women do not normally farm together, and in most traditional households the husband has control over the money). However, there are also men who are still take the family produce and selling it for their own personal use.

Furthermore the stories of change told by the consulted rights-holders mainly referred to individual changes and less of changes at societal level and/or behaviour of duty-bearers at local level. It was expected that individual rights-holder would talk about change from their individual perspective, and that the evaluators would have to put the stories into a wider context. Even when this has been done, the majority of stories represent changes within the private sphere and household economy. The stories of how local duty-bearers had changed or how the society/authorities now respect the rights-holders were less numerous. When putting individual life changes together they constitute a critical mass in the communities, and as such create conditions for more aware, more active, more confident agents for change at local level.

During the meetings with rights-holders, the evaluators came across many stories of change where some persons had changed destructive life styles, according to themselves, thanks to the provided trainings and contact with partner organisations that discussed human rights issues, including the responsibilities among rights-holders to commit, engage and participate. These stories, many times depicted as life changing, were normally said to have occurred under rather short periods of time and after few interventions. Individual perceptions of time might have distorted the descriptions of the length of the processes. It was however difficult to trace processes of change back to the interventions implemented during the first programme period. What also seemed to be a contributing factor for the change was the fact that these persons were listened to with respect, that their problems were put into a social context and depicted as a consequences of conflict traumas and not as bad character.

2.2.1 Achievement of results under Promoting fulfilling and protecting human rights

- Civic groups and partner organisations in the target districts effectively support and represent the poor and marginalised people to claim their rights.
- International and national human rights instruments are domesticated, implemented and are effectively monitored by duty bearers.

Partner organisations in Acholiland and Karamoja showed that they have been successful in supporting local groups to organise themselves, to sensitise other community members and local duty-bearers and to monitor the performance of local governmental bodies. Many stories of significant change told by rights-holders and local staff during the data collection account for processes of awareness raising that have led to action at individual, group and societal levels. Poor performance at health clinics, absence of qualified teachers, cases of severe gender based violence, the consequences of alcohol abuse, and land conflicts, have been addressed by the rights-holders, in social accountability forums, in monitoring activities and in meetings with duty-bearers (primarily at district and sub-county levels) claiming that formal and traditional authorities act accordingly to correct the situations.

The programme promotion of the application of HRBA has definitely deepened the awareness around active and meaningful participation and how rights can be claimed locally. It was however not clear to the evaluators how much the specific issue of the rights-holders influence over the agendas of the partner organisations had been discussed. The democratic culture and structures, as well as the direct representation of

rights-holders as members or groups with influence, vary between the partners. Several of the partners rather work *for* the rights-holders as target groups. This has negative implications on the representativeness and ownership over the results and is not coherent with a more comprehensive application of the rights-based approach. The earlier dominance in Northern Uganda of humanitarian agencies has probably played a role in how rights-holders are seen in the region, though most of the partners have not been involved in humanitarian programmes. Several of the partner organisations have experiences from other regions of the country, which is why the heritage from humanitarian assistance only can be part of the explanation.

The work of AYDL in Abim can illustrate this: As a result of dialogue meetings between youth activists and local duty-bearers a resolution stopped the malpractice of allowing students from other areas to benefit from the quota system of Abim on entry into the University. In Uganda each district has a quota for the number of students that should benefit from government sponsorship at university level for public universities. What used to happen was that students from very good schools would come to register to do their exams from Abim so that they could be counted among the Abim students. Now only students that are borne in Abim and have studied from primary one to senior six can qualify. Another example is community dialogue discussing the issue of jobs. The council made a resolution that all NGOs coming to work in Abim must employ 80% of the staff from within Abim. This resolution has been discussed in the whole Karamoja region and all the seven districts have adopted it.

The promotion of a long-term local organisation among rights-holders was found to be insufficient in several of the interventions. Where the projects work together with existing CBOs or create project specific and/or activity oriented groups, this seems to be done without focusing on the continuation of these groups. For example WORU-DET raised the concern on how they could continue to support the different groups after the programme and COU-PDR Kitgum Diocese suggested that Diakonia should support them with money for bicycle repairs. The bicycles were given by the programme but the group members want the programme to support the repairs. Further group pointed out that they lacked stationery for their work.

The national networks and organisations have a different role to play than local organisations, they either represent their members, like in the case of HURINET, or are expected to channel claims from local level to national policy processes. Strategic evidence based advocacy work was found to be rather absent, a weakness in the programme that both Diakonia and partner organisations acknowledge. A recent workshop on how to improve the strategies was held with the West African organisation SEND. This will may help the partners in the programme to develop their advocacy strategies, and also raise understanding of how to monitor and document these processes.

Diakonia reports on how different human rights organisations and networks monitor and report on different instruments and legislation processes, citing advocacy events and participation in review processes that relate to important political processes, including debates, seminars, training targeting key actors, audits and published reports

and material. They constitute important steps for the dialogue on human rights and create conditions for an improved compliance with human rights instrument. Most of the reported results are at the best on output or intermediary outcome levels, but more often listed activities. The mentioned report on the indicators (2013/2014) also highlights the role of partnering CSOs and their implementing partners in promoting, and sometimes implementing human rights instruments at local level. The evaluators find the accounted actions taken relevant and strategic, but they do not show if attitudes or behaviour of duty-bearers have changed so that it is possible to confirm progress in how human rights commitments of the Government are being fulfilled. One concrete example of changed behaviour was that wild life guards at the Uganda Wild Life Authority no longer use violence against poachers. This was as a result of the awareness raising activities on human rights. It should also be noted that the political environment has not been favourable for further advancement of the rights of women³⁴ and has been extremely hostile against LGBTI persons.

One could claim that the second expected result is beyond the influence of the programme and its actors. Also, when international human rights instruments have been domesticated or the implementation and compliance with national human rights standards has improved, it is very difficult to show in what way the partner organisations and the programme have contributed to these results. Among the reported results at outcome level is the advancement in dialogue on the Police Reform Accountability and Security Sector Reform, the commitment of the National Curriculum Development Centre to integrate aspects of human rights in the lower secondary education social studies learning area and the development of a civic education curriculum and a small increase in the National Health Budget³⁵. The annual reports for the period 2011-2014 also highlight other relevant processes:

- Participation in parliamentary post MDG 2015 discussions; FOWODE was selected to spearhead the process in Uganda on behalf of the women's organisations.
- Partner organisations are part of the anti-corruption campaign "Black Monday" at both local and national levels; although the partners at district level were concerned about the way the Black Monday is evolving. They said that apart from wearing black clothes on Monday, they seem not to see any consistency in the follow up of cases and there is a lack of feedback. This has been worsened by some of the key proponents of the Black Monday who were recently seen in the delegates conference of one of the opposition parties.

³⁴Set-backs related to the Marriage and Divorce bill, the Anti-Pornography Act 2014 and the Anti-Homosexuality Act.

³⁵From 7% to 9% the fiscal year 2012/2013. It should however be noted that this is far beyond the goal 15% in the Abuja Declaration, and that the increase only meant that the Government was slowly reaching the level of 9.6% of 2003/2004.

- FOWODE, UWONET and ACFODE are part of the Women's Democracy Group working to increase the participation of women in decision making. FOWODE is also the current secretariat of the Civil Society Budget Advocacy group (CSBAG), a CSO coalition advocating for a pro-poor and gender responsive national budget.
- HURINET coordinates with CSOs, UN bodies, African Commission on Peoples Human Rights, and Uganda Human Rights Commission on law reform initiatives and monitoring of human rights situation in the country. They interact with key line ministries and authorities on the UPR processes, on access to information, on the status of regional referral hospitals and on human rights issues in protected areas among others.
- AYDL holds an observer status with African Union and the UNECOSOC and has been active in the post MDG 2015.
- SUFO has been able to influence the District Youth Councils in Gulu, Amuru and Nwoya districts, in coordination with UYONET, they have developed a new roadmap for youth participation in the 2016 electoral processes which was adopted by a National Conference held in Mbarara and launched by the Speaker of Parliament of Uganda. They actively participated in Action Aid's Activist Youth Campaigns.
- JPC is a member of the Northern Uganda land platform aiming to see that the Acholi traditional principles and practices are written down and made into law to govern the management of customary land.
- HURIFO is a member of the District Human Rights Promotion and Protection Committee (DHRPPC) in Gulu.

2.2.2 Achievement of results under Promotion of Gender Equality and Democracy

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women and other marginalised groups are increasingly taking action for the realisation of their rights. • Local civic action groups are proactively engaged and participating in decision making at local levels to ensure that duty bearers are accountable, entrench the culture of constitutionalism and good governance and work towards ensuring the realisation of the rights of poor and marginalised people. |
|---|

The programme has clearly supported women which has led to an increased and more active citizenship, including claims of accountability on local duty-bearers and traditional leaders. Many rights-holders talked about how violence against women has decreased; how gender relations within the household had changed and that men and women worked together and made joint decisions on the household economy; how the view on women and their rights had changed; how the value of education had grown and that girls' right to education was now something that communities defended; that women groups were able to solve land conflicts in Acholiland; and women councillors not only were more vocal and self-confident but also treated with more respect and occupy new leadership positions through the ACFODE and FOWODE projects. Also women activists at community levels seek leadership to a greater extent where, for instance, FOWODE operates. Women's and community groups managed to get changes of staff at health centres; get female teachers where there were none; enable teachers to reside at the schools through contributing to constructing houses

(grass thatched huts) for teachers; encourage teachers attend to classes punctually; and call attention to various corruption and human rights abuses through human rights and community budget clubs resulting in concrete budget changes and new allocations. Some illustrative examples are:

- There have been many cases of women returning home from the camps with children fathered by other clans. Traditionally they and their children are not entitled to any land, but through the discussions held together with HURIFO on women's and children's rights the elders have changed their ways and both these women and their children, in many cases divorced women, are accepted and provided with land.
- Activists in Women's Network linked to WORUDET's project in Lamwo expressed their personal journey on how before they did not even talk in front of men but now were called to come and counsel couples and community members. At one of the local health centres the medical worker was often absent and when in duty disrespectful towards the patients. The Women's Network complained about the case and lobbied for almost five months to the local authorities and finally succeeded in getting the health worker transferred. When the new staff came the community was provided with two health workers instead of one. Another case was a midwife at another health centre that also was disrespectful and provided poor service. After threatening her with being reported to the authorities she has changed her ways. The informant said that they would never have had the courage to claim their rights to good service if they had not discussed what human rights mean in practice.
- In Ogole parish, Agago district, the parish chief refused to call community members for consultation on the parish plan. He went ahead and submitted it to the sub-county. When time for the budget conference came, the Speaker read the budget but was disowned by some of the community members (about 15 members) from Ogole parish who pointed out that the plan for their parish was made for the chief. They demanded from the Speaker that the budget be brought back to the parish to allow the community members to prioritise their needs. The Speaker further tasked the community development officer to oversee the process. This was done and the plan was re-submitted.

However, the situation is not so rosy in the ZOA area of operation. While the girls have been running away FGM to Kalas boarding primary school, back home their mothers are experiencing increased domestic violence because the fathers of the girls believe that they connive with their mothers to run away from home. In addition, about 37 girls at the school cannot go home during holidays because of fear of their fathers. The programme has as a response to this intensified the community interfaces and the monitoring of community actions to address the violence against women and has started parent-children meetings between the runaway children and their parents.

Another unexpected but positive result is the trend of boys leaving cattle herding to attend school. It can be said that the increased value of education and the commitment among parents to send their children to school is a general effect of many of the awareness raising initiatives promoted by human rights organisations.

It was less evident that “other marginalised groups” had been supported in a similar way leading to empowerment. The programme document mentions for example that persons with disabilities (PwD), LGBT persons and youth affected by the conflict also should be prioritised. The evaluators were not informed of any initiatives or changes that particularly focused on any of these groups³⁶. The initiatives that target young people mainly concentrate on young adults rather than adolescents. Some partner organisations have included work on HIV prevention which has visualised the presence of HIV positive persons in the communities, but People Living with HIV and Aids (PLWHA) have not been specifically targeted with the exception of LAZIDEP (that has been phased out from the programme). On a general level it can be said, that apart from the clear focus on women and girls, and a general focus on unemployed youth and young elected leaders, communities have been targeted on the basis of the general population living in poverty without considering power dimension within groups and communities.

2.2.3 Achievement of results under Conflict and justice

- Community-led and collaborative peace and security initiatives involving poor and marginalised people are being implemented and the causes and effects of insecurity are reversed.
- Communities have instituted coping mechanisms that enable them have sustainable livelihoods.

The security situation has improved in the districts where the programme is being implemented, including conflicts related to land and violence against women and girls. The consultations with rights-holders, local duty-bearers and partner organisations showed that the programme has enhanced peaceful co-existence between the groups Iteso and the Karamajong. Prior to the programme there was severe enmity between the two tribes with intense conflict over the land in Omokori and Okoboi. The conflicts in the past were so severe that the two tribes could not sit or eat together because the Iteso claimed that their cattle were raided by the Karamojaong and this left the Iteso almost destitute. The only times when these two would meet was when they were fighting for cattle. Currently the conflicts have been managed and the owners of the land are already using it and some people have even settled. Further, the programme has contributed to demystify stereotypes that the two tribes had about

³⁶Diakonia highlights however TIP focuses on youth to promote peace and governance in Napak and Amuria.

each other³⁷. The interactions have improved to the extent that intermarriages have become possible³⁸.

Another progress is the passing of a resolution for peaceful co-existence by the Soroti District Council. This has influenced the other districts of Teso to adopt similar resolutions. As such, there are some Karamojong youth currently residing in Soroti municipality and engaged in productive work of providing motorbike taxi services ('boda-boda riding'). In Amuria district a number of Karamajong have started living in the homes of the Iteso and they are living peacefully.

A notable achievement is that the Karamojong have started entrusting the Iteso with their cattle where the roles, responsibilities and benefits are clearly understood. The Iteso are responsible for taking care of the cattle and they are allowed to access milk and also use the bulls for animal traction. An example is one of the most fierce warriors who used to command one thousand youth warriors (Karacunas) but has split his cattle in three parts and are kept with three Iteso families.

There were practically no examples provided during the data collection on the second expected result. There were however many stories told on how individual rights-holders have engaged in agricultural production as a results of partner organisations' interventions and that they had been able to improve their livelihood, also due to the ability to plan and manage their financial resources better. The annual reports highlight results from livelihood self-help groups, tree planting projects and other initiatives related to agricultural production, as well as some income generating short-term employment for community projects, as part of the TIP, Diocese of Kitgum, AYDL and LAZIDEP projects.

Before AYDL started working in Abim, the youth were not interested in manual or casual labour. They preferred "to sit and talk idle or drink". A case in point is when the Rural Electrification Authority was looking for the people to make pits for the electric poles, the youth refused and workers had to be brought in from Kampala. After AYDL sensitised the youth, they changed their attitude towards work and this time round, they were involved in digging trenches for the water pipes and were able to obtain income.

³⁷The enmity was so grave that when a radio talk show was conducted by the staff of TIP, people kept on calling to express their anger on how they are not ready to forgive the Karamojong. One of the State Ministers even threaten the staff of TIP and cautioned him to stop engaging in that talk since he was not a native of Teso and did not understand the untold suffering that the Karamojong has caused to the Iteso. He had even threatened to chase him from Teso. Of late, the same minister came to Soroti, met with that staff and thanked him for the work TIP has done to facilitate peaceful co-existence.

³⁸ So far over 10 couples have been married and their marriages blessed by the clan elders. This result can be compared to the attitude change in Acholi towards women returning from camps with children fathered by other clans. Both the women (widows, divorcees or single mothers) and their children are now accepted as clan members.

One of the paralegals under Kitgum Diocese was highly appreciative of the Diakonia project. He is one of the beneficiaries of the livelihood component as he was given 29 seedlings of Eucalyptus, 5 grafted orange seedlings, a cow and a bicycle. Out of the 5 oranges seedlings, 1 died and four remained and are doing very well. Currently he owns 3 cows. He also harvests oranges for sale from 3 of the 4 trees because the 4th tree is for home consumption. So far he has harvested twice and got a good revenue. This has motivated him to start a nursery bed for eucalyptus and oranges and these are in high demand. This paralegal is very happy about the programme because it has improved the living standards in his home. His children used to go to boarding school with papyrus mats but are now taking mattresses. They used to carry their belongings in plastic bags, but can now afford suitcases. Apart from this, the level of satisfaction is high because he knows that he is contributing to environmental management.

2.2.4 Changed behaviour among duty-bearers

Related to the first and second thematic areas is the responsiveness of duty-bearers to the collective action of rights-holders; the advocacy work at district and sub-county levels; and the capacity development initiatives of the programme targeting duty-bearers. The changed behaviour in duty-bearers can be seen as intermediary outcomes, constituting conditions for improved service delivery, access to justice and enjoyment of human rights. The consultations with local duty-bearers gave some positive examples that can be attributed, or at least contributed, to the programme:

- The Clan Chief, the local council Chair and the Community Development Officer, during the routine visits in the communities, visits the Model men (WORUDET GBV/gender equality project) to encourage them so that in case some are being ridiculed in their community they can stand firm.
- The lower levels of local government are listened to by the higher levels of the administration when the community members work jointly with the local duty-bearers. One illustrative example is the release of an ambulance meant for the sub-county which the district had refused to send to the sub-county. When the community members started demanding it and backed their local leaders, the district finally paid attention and returned the ambulance.

2.2.5 Developing capacities

As stated earlier the programme results framework does not include specific objectives for the institutional and capacity development of partners³⁹. Diakonia's initial assessment of the partners were not systemised as a baseline against which progress

³⁹ However the new programme proposal 2015-2018 has specific objectives for the capacity development as part of the overall results framework.

could be measured. What is available is the monitoring log and the more ad-hoc assessments that the Diakonia team does for reporting.

This means that there is no systematic way to track the development of the partner organisations or to connect possible improvements in capacities or organisational culture to the support given by Diakonia⁴⁰. The evaluators could therefore not assess potential progress but were told by Diakonia that the quality of reports and the use of interactive and outcome oriented data collection had increased over time. This was also confirmed by the organisations. Some partners also mentioned the importance of the support to the development of their M&E system, and the increased capacity to manage the projects by results as well as improved gender mainstreaming. Some partners, like for example FOWODE, said that they just recently developed a M&E system with the support from Diakonia. Other partners like HURINET, SUFO and HURIFO mentioned the support to the development of their strategic plans.

Several respondents mentioned the risk of partner organisations losing qualified staff shortly after they had attended relevant training. This is a common dilemma for many organisations and concerns the issue of sustainability. But despite that it is a negative outcome, it shows that the trainings given to key staff are perceived as qualified capacity building by other actors.

The annual reports for the period 2011-2013 highlight among other things the increased awareness, interest and actions related to environmental issues, mainly manifested in tree planting activities. It was also confirmed by the consulted partner organisations that the introduction to the Environmental lens had given them tools on how to mainstream environmental aspects into their projects. Some partners also developed or up-dated their HIV and Aids policies (in 2011 and 2012⁴¹) as well as distributed information and conducted capacity building events around HIV and AIDS⁴².

2.3 IMPACT

- Are there any positive (or negative) impacts on communities from the intervention? Any potential longer term impacts of the programme?

⁴⁰ Some partners informed that they are provided with similar workshops by different donors/partners.

⁴¹ Given the national HIV prevalence and the importance that Diakonia has given HIV mainstreaming, it is somewhat surprising that HIV and AIDS policies were not in place before or during the first programme period.

⁴² For example AYDL in cooperation with Unfpa, COU-PDR which has had as result that HIV positive persons have become open about their status, ZOA in the Functional Adult Literacy interventions; TIP counselling/sensitizing couples on HIV which has opened up discussion on HIV, changed negative attitudes towards PLWHA and motivated people to test themselves.

The possibility to assess results at impact level has been limited. The rights-holders mainly provided examples of recent processes of change, which mostly represented outputs, outcomes or intermediary outcomes. The expected result for the first programme period was that “Civil society organisations at different levels have strengthened their capacity and organisation to act for the development of a democratic culture and practice” leading to a change of “unfair political, economic, social and cultural structures that generates poverty, oppression and violence”.

Depending on where the measurement of impact starts, one could claim that the increased ability among rights-holder to monitor local government’s performance and to claim accountability when service delivery is absent or of low quality has resulted in changes at impact level. The efforts made by the partner organisation have improved the dialogue with local and traditional leaders as well as strengthening capacities by councillors to respond to their responsibilities. Local duty-bearers have in fact delivered better health services and more qualified teachers at local schools for example. Other examples are the reduced level of conflicts (Karamoja); new conflict mechanisms driven by women’s group in use for land conflicts (Acholiland); the increase of reporting GBV (due to awareness raising) and the authorities responsiveness to these crimes; the changed perspectives on women’s rights through the strategy to use male role models; the stories of attitude changes towards family planning; and the support to girls’ education all indicate that gender inequalities are slowly changing. It is also possible to say that local duty-bearers’ attention and responsiveness to community monitoring activities have increased, knowing that the rights-holders are backed both with donor funds and advocacy skills that can draw the attention to mismanagement of funds and non-compliance with local plans.

The one serious negative impact found during the data collection, one that the Diakonia annual reports also highlight, is the intensified domestic violence on women by their husbands because they think and believe that the girls’ mothers are the ones who advise them to avoid FGM. Several examples of women separating from their husbands were cited during the Focus Group Discussion with the parents of the girls in Kalas boarding primary school. As noted above actions are being taken by the partner organisation to minimise these negative unintended effects of the anti FGM actions.

2.4 SUSTAINABILITY

- Are the identified and recorded positive changes likely to be sustainable for the communities, rights-holders and civil society organisations involved in the programme?

The programme is implemented by the partner organisations mainly working together with local community groups. Some of the projects are based on already existing groups and/or actors, building on their earlier experience, while others have mobilised rights-holders to form groups and CBOs. The programme has slowly developed to have a more locally driven programmatic approach, including the provision of technical support from the Diakonia Gulu office and ZOAs office in Amudat, and the direct partnership with WORUDET, that previously was an implementing partner to

UWONET. There is no overall or consistent programme strategy for organisational development of local groups and CBOs (like for instance supporting informal groups to be registered, local funding strategies, alliance building strategies, or similar). AYDL has for example enabled many young persons to form groups. Currently there are 67 youth groups⁴³. But the objectives for formation revolve around accessing government programmes. Once they have accessed the funds and used them for their short-term purpose, they disband the group and form another one.

Despite the great focus on awareness raising on rights and the role of citizens to monitor the performance of the duty-bearers, the long-term strategies for collective and organised action at grass-root level are not very visible in partners' and rights-holders' descriptions of their work.⁴⁴ There were many instances where the members of the groups indicated that they are not yet strong enough to be on their own and needed further support from the partnering CSOs. The focus on institutional development of the partner organisations, on the other hand, is strategic from a sustainability perspective. Increased capacity to implement and report on rights-based development initiatives is and will continue to be a strong asset for the partners in their relations both to national and international development actors. On the other hand, most partner organisations lack effective mechanisms to retain their staff and manage staff turn-over. There is no deliberate and systematic approach to ensure that whoever benefits from capacity development enhancement, shares the knowledge with the other staff upon returning to the organisation.

A strategic approach to long-term partnerships is crucial for organisations in changing funding landscapes, particularly when there is a shift from humanitarian agencies towards development actors. In situations where staff feel insecure about future funding institutional development that leads to good human resource policies is needed. It is also important to provide support to donor and alliance mapping to open up for new partnerships.

⁴³ There are also Youth Forums that holds radio talk shows on youth issues.

⁴⁴ Diakonia notes that there are long-term strategies but that they are not spread out in all programme areas. Some partners have made attempts to organise citizens for collective action. For example, the FOWODE Village Governance Clubs; TIP also strengthens empowerment of youth and women groups for sustainable engagement on peace and governance issues. Other partner organisation like UWONET, WORUDET, ACFODE have encouraged formation of advocacy groups. The issue is however if these actions are really long-term strategies. For example the Village Governance Clubs of FOWODE in Amuria seem to have been heavily relying on a former staff member. The clubs would identify issues and the staff member would push the issues or facilitate and coordinate the organisation of the dialogue meetings. When he left, the work stopped. A case in point is Amare Primary School where the Village Club found out that the quantities of cement used for construction were (1:6) less than the recommended (1:4). The construction had reached the ringbeam level. The club was not able to follow-up because they kept waiting for the CSO staff. The Club further pointed out that since June 2014, they had not done any project related work and had not even made effort to meet the new sub-county chief who had been on the station for over ten months to talk about the work they do.

Diakonia informs that they have started to invite several representatives from the same organisation to workshops to mitigate the harm from loss of key staff. This is a good strategy, but needs to be coupled with good human resource policies and strategies for institutional learning. Respondents in several consultations mentioned that information and knowledge had been lost when earlier programme officers had left the organisations for another job. It was also raised that the Diakonia team sometimes has functioned as an institutional memory when partner organisation have suffered from high staff turnover. Having the international CSO partner as back-up is really not a sustainable approach and the increased focus in the programme on risk management is therefore positive.

The partners continue to be highly dependent on external funding for both operations, project and core staff and institutional costs. Some have succeeded in attracting different donors which increases the financial security and the possibility to implement the strategy plans, but it does of course not decrease the overall dependency on project funds. There is no quick fix to this donor dependency dilemma and particularly human rights defenders will most probably continue to be fully dependent on external donors as Diakonia.

Some of the outcomes are highly dependent on an enabling environment and the respect for human rights, allowing rights-holders to take active part in the development of their local communities. The programme builds on attitude and behaviour changes among rights-holders and duty-bearers. To be sustainable these changes need to be coupled with support to these actors to maintain their commitment to change but also that more actors are willing to change.

2.5 PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

- How do the systems and processes adopted by Diakonia relating to grant management have impact on the partner organisations, donor coordination, offering platforms for partner networking, and capacity building for partner organisations etc.?
- Have the programme inputs like funds, expertise, and time resources, been used in an efficient manner in relation to what has been achieved?

Diakonia Uganda team is back-stopped by Diakonia's regional office in Nairobi and by Diakonia thematic staff in Sweden. The programme management is guided by Diakonia's PME handbook, a comprehensive set of instructions that provides support to all Diakonia programme and financial staff. The handbook has been further developed over the last years, it is supposed to be up-dated regularly and is based on experiences from development cooperation through civil society in different social and

cultural contexts. The procedures and programme steering document are based on the handbook and other Diakonia generic materials, but are also adapted to the local and programme specific context. The templates for reporting have for instance been changed during the programme implementation on the demand of the partner organisation since they were found to be too repetitive and complex.⁴⁵

The programme designs for both implementing periods lack a baseline study. This is a major weakness and surprising that the back-stopping from the Nairobi and Stockholm offices has not supported the country team in developing any baseline since the start of the programme in 2008. The results framework of the programme does not include any specific expected results on the development of capacities of the partner organisations and only some annual reports highlight actions taken to increase capacities in different areas. During the data collection the evaluators learnt however that the country team had organised a large number of thematic and methodological workshops⁴⁶ since the beginning of the programme. Most of them were conducted by the Diakonia team and others by external facilitators⁴⁷. These initiatives have been followed-up with individual monitoring and refresher seminars. The information on institutional progress of the partners related to this support given in the reports mainly refers to policy development and improved mainstreaming of gender and environment.

A comprehensive guideline on the standpoints of Diakonia on partnership and different stages of partnering with civil society organisations has been developed by the country office during the second half of 2014⁴⁸. The development of such guidelines was a strong recommendation already made in the first Mid-Term Review (2010)⁴⁹. The document provides hands on instructions on how to initiate, develop, implement and end cooperation with CSOs, and includes 15 annexes of templates and rather detailed instructions for different partnership related activities. The manual aims to support Diakonia to engage in an even more participatory and inclusive approach when

⁴⁵ Information provided both by partners and Diakonai staff. One partner stated that the report formats were not as a “straight jacket”.

⁴⁶ Covering gender mainstreaming, results based management and other M&E themes, advocacy, human rights-based approach, the Environmental Lens, Do No Harm, to mention some of the topics.

⁴⁷ The workshops also function as another meeting point for programmatic discussions but also depend to a high degree on in-house competences. No examples were given of co-ordinated workshops together with likeminded international or national CSOs.

⁴⁸ A Manual for Partnership Development and Management, Draft, Diakonia Uganda, September 2014

⁴⁹ Recommendation 2: “Diakonia needs to hasten the process of developing partnership policy guidelines which should clarify partnership roles, exâectations but above all, principle that promote complementarity of purpose, added value, commitment to mutual respect for values, beliefs and learning; clarity of roles, responsibilities, and decision making; transparency and accountability, commitment and flexibility.”, Mid-Term Review 2008-2010 Diakonia Country Programme, M. Mugisha, B. Kandymunda, June 2010:

identifying and developing different partnerships. The manual is coherent with both good donorship and partnership.

Diakonia has not yet implemented its own recommendation to promote the praxis of Quality Assurance Mechanism⁵⁰ (QuAM) certification within the programme. Diakonia believed that QuAM certification is one way of promoting the accountability of Diakonia and partners to various stakeholders. This was noted in the plans for partner's capacity and institutional development where it is stated that Diakonia and partners would be assessed in order to be accredited by the Quality Assurance Certification Mechanism. This has still not been realised despite the commitment of the QuAM secretariat to work with Diakonia as pointed out by the QuAM Coordinator. Of all the partners of Diakonia, it is only HURINET that has a Standard Certificate that was awarded in November 2011.

Another recent innovation (2014) are the more structured assessments of capacity development needs of individual partners. This process has been delayed, the MTR 2010 raised the need to develop a "comprehensive capacity building strategy for the partners – rooted in the assessed organisational capacity needs", that the partners needed to be part of the development of these plans and that they should be based on individual needs⁵¹. These assessments have been conducted by the partner organisations with support from Diakonia. The Evaluation Team was provided with 8 examples of the assessments aiming at support in 2015 and onwards⁵². These are intended to help the Diakonia team and the partners to focus on the most urgent and strategic needs and ensure that the future support to capacity development will be more partner than Diakonia driven. During the evaluated period capacity development events, mostly workshops for all or most partners, have been initiated by Diakonia based on findings from monitoring and reports.

Partnership audits have been performed where partners are requested to give feedback to Diakonia on their partnership principles and performance. Diakonia says that the technical support for capacity development have received very good ratings⁵³.

Respondents among the partner organisations expressed appreciation of Diakonia as a partner, claiming that the organisation is different from most other partners/donors because of Diakonia's interests in the institutional development of their partners (meaning that focus is not only at project level). The consulted partners stressed that both Diakonia and themselves had developed a relation with a great deal of flexibility

⁵⁰QuAM is a civil society initiative that promotes transparency and accountability of the Ugandan civil society through a peer review (self regulatory) mechanism. Once an organisation has accepted the review and been certified it will be submitted to regular reviews by the national or local QuAM secretariats.

⁵¹Ibid, Recommendation 4 and 12..

⁵²There is now a Capacity Development framework for the period 2015-2019.

⁵³The evaluators did not have access to the partners' audit.

and that Diakonia was perceived more as a mentor than a funding partner. Both national and locally based partner organisations informed that Diakonia's team supports them with programme and project development, with comments on draft versions of proposals (and as well with activity plans⁵⁴) and reports. This support does not interfere with the ownership of the documents according to the respondents⁵⁵.

Several of the partners highlighted the Partner Learning Forum and the Executive Directors Forum as particularly valuable for experience sharing and development of the programme and its different components. Others mentioned how they found it very positive that Diakonia staff accompany them to the field.

According to Diakonia staff at the country office the increase in staff since the inception of the programme has allowed the team to provide more support to the partner organisations. From one financial and one programme officer there are now two for each area, which allows closer follow-up of reports, participation in partners' activities and focus on a more tailor-made technical support. Diakonia has also recently decided to monitor the progress of the partners' projects on a quarterly basis compared with earlier two times per year. The intensity of the dialogue with partner organisations, including the number of monitoring visits, differ however between partners due to their individual needs of support. This means, according to Diakonia staff, that some of what they see as the more institutionally developed organisations will most probably continue to receive two monitoring visits per year. The increase in monitoring visits might be a positive step for most partners, but it is relevant to raise here that some partners claimed that the response to their narrative reports come very late and that this has implications for the adjustment of the implementation of activities and the choice of methods/strategies.

Another aspect that several partner respondents raised as less positive was that invitations to workshops and similar events came late and that it was sometimes difficult to attend due to already scheduled agendas⁵⁶. It was also said that Diakonia sometimes visits "a bit too often" and that it would be good to have a more differentiated approach to the members of the partner groups since the needs of support varies. An approach towards even more tailor-made support was desired by some. Diakonia said on the other hand that they often were called by the partners, particularly for support on financial and administrative management.

The programme has been reviewed twice, the most recent Mid-Term Review was carried out as late as last February and reported in March 2014. Diakonia's manage-

⁵⁴ The programme officer at the Gulu office explained that he supports some of the partners to develop their activity plans and indicators for the output level.

⁵⁵ Focus group discussion with Church of Uganda, UWONET, AYDL and FOWODE, 01.12.2014.

⁵⁶ Interviews with duty-bearers showed that this negative pattern is being repeated by the partner organisations, inviting duty-bearers to events on short notice,

ment response was produced only in August and most of the recommendations are planned to be addressed in a new programme phase. As noted above, recommendations made in the MTR 2010⁵⁷ have only recently been addressed and will not have any real implications for the ongoing programme phase. This means that the main purpose of a MTR, that is to assess the need to revise an ongoing programme, has not played its part. Diakonia has not shown great capacity to promptly manage the programme based on results and findings from the MTRs. Nevertheless, it should be said that most recommendations have resulted in action, however delayed,

2.5.1 Grant management

The grant management process can briefly be described as follows:

Partners are invited, there is no call for proposals; organisational, financial and administrative structures are assessed when the partnership starts but also up-dated regularly;

For the second programme period partner organisations developed their proposals within the overall programme structure, aligning the project with one or several programme specific objectives⁵⁸. The proposals are assessed by Diakonia programme and financial staff. Partner agreements during the first period were on one year basis. Since the partnerships were new this is comprehensible, but it created a certain degree of uncertainty. The second programme period has been based on longer agreements, normally contracts equivalent to the full programme period are signed.

Partners report twice a year (narrative and financial); The financial reports include the cash books, audit reports are important source of information but the Diakonia financial and administrative officers also use their own risk management and compare with the content in the auditors' statements.

Project monitoring, including financial and administrative follow-up, is conducted twice a year or more often when needed; a monitoring log and check list for financial procedures and systems are used. The check list includes aspects on: steering documents and system for financial and administrative planning, human resource policies, book keeping, audits, relation to other donors and how financial support and monitoring is provided by donors, possible evaluations on the financial system, self-assessment of the human capacity and support in the organisation. The check list does not include questions on the capacity/possibility to disaggregate data by sex/gender budgeting however.

Both programme and financial and administrative officers conduct on the job trainings when needed (findings from assessments of reports or by request from the partner organisation) at the same time as the regular monitoring visit is carried out. Partners are requested to adhere to the anti-corruption policy and Diakonia states that they have an "eye on budg-

⁵⁷The purpose of a MTR is to inform the ongoing programme, The two MTR that have been conducted have rather resulted in changes to be implemented in a new programme phase. For example therecommendations made in June 2010 to hasten the development of partnership policy guidelines and to develop a comprehensive capacity building strategy were followed up in action only in 2014. The draft version of a partnership document was ready in September 2014 and the capacity development assessment that were carried out during 2014 will be implemented in a next phase.

⁵⁸This was not entirely the process for the first programme period and the MTR 2010 raised the need to strengthen the linkage between project and programme levels and the participation of partners and rights-holders in the different stages of the project and programme cycles.

et discipline”.

Diakonia organises several meetings per year with all or a selection of the partners. There are for example Partner Learning Forums, thematic workshops and monitoring and reporting seminars.

Capacity development needs have been identified by mainly Diakonia during the evaluated period, including project cycle and results based management, and often follow the focus and strategic areas of Diakonia. Partners have also raised capacity development needs during for example the monitoring visits and learning forums.

Budget revisions are possible. Partners have received additional funds from the programme budget on their requests to Diakonia. This is however not systematically done, but rather more of an ad hoc procedure in response to those partners that are proactive. There is also a budget line for advocacy activities, but not all partners know about the possibility according to the discussions with partners and the Diakonia team. One finding is thus that Diakonia needs to be more transparent in how and when there is a possibility for the partners to apply for additional funds to the already approved project budgets.

The partner organisations said that they were well informed of the programme’s overall objectives and that their project proposals therefore were aligned with one or several of the themes and objectives already at the development stage. They had also been invited to discuss the new programme proposal (handed in to the Embassy of Sweden last July). The grant management was described as supportive and constructive by the consulted partners who also said that the system and formats used by Diakonia worked well with those organisations that had more developed M&E systems. Others stated that they only recently had developed M&E at a more systematic level and that this had been done with the support of Diakonia. In those cases Diakonia’s templates have been used.

The grant mechanism has not been directly shared with other donors or funders. The NGO Forum and the Country Directors ‘Forum open up for some sharing of experience, but according to Diakonia it is only recent that this has been done on the programmatic level (which is what Diakonia hopes for). Several partners said that the partnership with Diakonia and their “passing” of Diakonia’s system and audit controls had functioned as a quality stamp for other donors and that they had succeeded in attracting new funds⁵⁹, including grants from the DGF.

Diakonia Uganda aspires to work directly with locally based organisations when possible rather than provide support only through umbrella or network organisations. This is partly justified by issues of effectiveness and efficiency. There was also an example of one programme internal graduation process. WORUDET was first a sub-grantee to UWONET, but is now, after an organisational assessment was conducted, a

⁵⁹ ACFODE, FOWODE, AYDL among others.

direct partner with Diakonia. Other local partners to the current partner organisations are also under consideration according to Diakonia. The partnership with ZOA Uganda is coupled with expectations that they will strengthen their local organisation in Amudat and their implementing partner.

Currently only HURINET-U receives core funding among the partner organisations. The fact that Diakonia after a period opted to follow Sida's⁶⁰ earlier example of supporting HURINET's strategy plan rather than give project support, has also enabled core support from DGF. The issue of core support was raised by several other partners and there is an ongoing discussion with some of them on the possibility to be considered for core or programme⁶¹ support in the next phase. Diakonia states that apart from having a strategic plan, the partner must also show willingness to share information of funding and that the organisations is transparent on the dialogue with other donors.

Disbursements of project funds have suffered from delays both from Diakonia and from partner organisations towards implementing partners, and the programme has had difficulties in absorbing funds. This is why the programme was extended to the end of 2014.

The following is a discussion on programme management and review of Diakonia's partnership and programme management in relation to the Istanbul principles:

Istanbul Principles	Diakonia guidelines/praxis
1. Respect and promote human rights and social justice	Diakonia's main focus, promotes HRBA programming and good donor/partnership.
2. Embody gender equality and equity while promoting women and girls' rights	Strong focus on gender in Diakonia's work, promotes gender equality and gender mainstreaming as bearing principles, manifested in policies, guidelines and partner dialogue.
3. Focus on people's empowerment, democratic ownership and participation	Principle coherent with HRBA. Some partners claimed that they are however more invited than actively contributing to programme design. Rights-holders have no influence over the agenda setting of many partners, active and meaningful participation also in organisational decision making still a challenge.
4. Promote environmental sustainability	Environmental lens is a mainstreaming tool developed by Diakonia for organisations that do not focus on environment and climate change. The programme is making efforts at strengthening resilience programming.
5. Practice transparency and accountability	Diakonia promotes transparency and the practice of use of whistle blower mechanisms. A partner audit on Diakonia was

⁶⁰ HURINET did earlier receive funds directly from the embassy. When Diakonia's country programme started in 2008 the support to HURINET was transferred to Diakonia.

⁶¹ This support modality is a new feature in the PME handbook and has not yet been tried in the programme.

	conducted during the programme period. The annual reports to the Embassy are not shared with the partners (according to information by the partner organisations). Practice on possibility to apply for additional funds, including advocacy funds can be more transparent.
6. Pursue equitable partnership and solidarity	Diakonia's partnership guidelines coherent with the principle. Partners are however more invited than actively contributing to programme design. The variation in the definition of some budget lines such as per-diem and safari day allowance causes some discomfort among some partners ⁶² .
7. Create and share knowledge and commit to mutual learning	The programme has increased experience sharing among partners, Diakonia invites partners from other programmes as facilitators.
8. Commit to realising sustainable change	The programme targets structural injustices and focuses, at least in principle, on advocacy work to promote long-lasting changes.

2.6 SUPPORT MODALITIES

The Evaluation Team also discussed with external stakeholders and partner organisations the fact that Sweden is supporting the civil society in Uganda through different support modalities. In focus for the discussion was the issue of the Democratic Governance Facility, the Independent (IDF) and the Diakonia country programme, but as can be seen in the below table, partner organisations are also receiving funds indirectly from other Sida funds, like EU funds and the CSO appropriation.

CSOs receiving parallel financing through the different Sida support modalities:

CSO	FUNDED BY			
ACFODE	Diakonia	DGF	We Effect	EU-DGAP via Konrad Adeneaur Stiftung
CCG	Diakonia	DGF		
COU-PDR-DIOCESE OF SEBEI	Diakonia	DGF	SvenskaKyrkan	
FOWODE	Diakonia	DGF		EU-DGAP via Diakonia
HURIFO	Diakonia	DGF	Forum Syd	
HURINET	Diakonia	DGF		
JPC	Diakonia	DGF		
SUFO	Diakonia	DGF		
UWONET	Diakonia	DGF		EU-DGAP
UWOPA	Diakonia	DGF	Plan Sverige	
TIP	Diakonia			EU –DGAP viaTrocaire

⁶² While Diakonia for the local context has a high per diem following Swedish authority standards aimed at foreign visitors with no local knowledge.

Most respondents thought that there was no real dilemma for Sweden in using parallel funding mechanisms as long as the mechanisms were used to fund different organisations and/or areas of work. Though the Diakonia Country Programme is not an open programme, it still opens up for the Embassy to support a broader spectrum of the civil society than only going through DGF. The issue of centralising civil society funds to one mechanism was perceived as being counteractive to the goals of a pluralistic civil society. Another positive aspect that was raised was the fact that Diakonia is a faith-based organisation and as such has greater possibilities to influence Christian actors on some of Sweden's standpoints on gender equality, SRHR and LGBTI rights.

Respondents from DGF and EU asked whether the Embassy has the human resources to follow-up different funding mechanisms and also raised the issue on double transaction costs. However, they saw the value of the Embassy to have more flexibility and the possibility to brand Sweden and Swedish priorities even more. From the DGF point of view, it is particularly support to rights in relation to gender equality and SRHR, as well as livelihood aspects, that complement the DGF support.

Another point raised by the consulted donors was the absorption capacity of the Ugandan civil society, particularly given that several donors are channelling more funds to non-state actors.

3 Conclusions

3.1 RELEVANCE

The programme is found to be relevant both to the Ugandan context and the Swedish results strategy given its geographical and thematic focus. Diakonia is supporting several strategic and relevant actors within civil society and the partners have been able to show interesting results particularly at local level for specific rights-holders and duty-bearers. The local aspects of the programme are both a strength and a weakness. While the programme is able to demonstrate some real changes, to a great extent due to the interaction between rights-holders and duty-bearers on concrete problems related to local service delivery and to conflicts mainly between individuals, the outreach of the supported projects is limited.

The strong focus on the human rights-based approach and gender equality enhances the relevance of the programme. Partner organisations demonstrate a broader understanding of gender mainstreaming (particularly towards the end of the second phase) and a different perspective on what active participation is about. This is a step in the right direction. A more comprehensive approach to gender inequalities by all partners, including a stronger focus on men's and boys' role in promoting women's roles, would make the programme even more relevant and also single the programme out from other civil society support that still lack a real focus on gender equality and women's rights.

The programme has not had a focus on women's economic empowerment (WEE), an area that is important to the new Swedish results strategy for Uganda. Diakonia does not necessarily have a comparative advantage in supporting the partners to address WEE. But the programme could seek synergies with other development actors working in those areas and also discuss how to build alliances around advocacy work for governmental agricultural programmes targeting Northern Uganda.

The focus on real influence of the rights-holders on the agenda setting within the programme could be stronger, as well as the capacity to analyse and address power relations within and between rights-holders living in poverty and marginalisation. A more aware approach to, for example, age dimensions and disabilities would be a good way to start. A stronger focus on internal democratic practices and discussions on how mandate and legitimacy are obtained are equally important for the relevance, but also for the programme's effectiveness in relation to the support to a vivid, democratic and representative civil society.

3.2 EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT

The Diakonia Uganda country programme has been able to deliver several relevant and important changes at local level. The findings confirm the conclusions in the last MTR which states that the Diakonia Strategy for Change is sound and relevant and that the programme has been able to promote both mid- and long-term results, but that so far the programme has had an over-emphasis on results at output level. The good results and practices need to be shared among partners and with other development actors, as well as be used to connect changes at local levels to broader policy processes. The programme has slowly started to focus on more local partnerships. This is a positive development, and also opens up for the possibility to link the projects within the programme to other local initiatives. It is however important to maintain a strong connection to civil society actors that have the capacity to lobby for structural change and access to policy-makers at national level.

Change has started taking shape at individual level, but a critical mass of individuals has yet to be reached, and it is therefore not possible to claim that the programme is promoting major changes at societal level. The results so far generally stay at individual level and the communities that are reached are not sufficiently interlinked with each other to create a greater impact. This makes the programme to certain degree less effective.

Some of the most interesting and relevant outcomes are related to the empowerment of women and girls and changed attitudes towards gender equality at community level and among local duty-bearers. Some of the external stakeholders raised the issue of low capacity (or lack of commitment) to integrate gender into other civil society support mechanisms. Diakonia's partnering women's organisations state that much more could be done to promote a real gender mainstreaming in the programme. Strengthening even more the focus on women's and girls' rights, including the involvement of men and boys in the promotion of gender equality would be an interesting programme development and would also be aligned with Swedish priorities. The issue of Women's Economic Empowerment is equally important, wherein work at a strategic level that addresses women's access and control over resources that will enable them to not only leave extreme poverty but improve their life substantially, is key.

The support to partners' institutional development and thematic capacities has led to improvement in how project management and approaches are being implemented. The delay in developing individual capacity assessment plans, based on needs identified by the partner organisations, shows however that Diakonia has not been able to fully abandon a supply driven approach to capacity building during the second phase of the programme. The recommendation to base capacity development on the partner organisations' own plans was raised in the MTR 2010. The support has mainly been provided through workshops on topics identified by and aligned with the priority areas and approaches of Diakonia. It is positive that Diakonia in 2014 has been able to initiate the process of individual capacity development plans, but from an effectiveness perspective, this comes very late in the programme considering that this was an issue raised already in the MTR 2010.

Several of the partner organisations work *for* different rights-holder groups rather than being constituted by the rights-holders themselves. The mobilisation and organisational strategies at community level are not focusing enough on local ownership and building strong CBOs. The projects and the activities are in most cases driven by the partner organisations and the evaluators conclude that sufficient ownership to maintain the project activities has not been developed. Awareness raising and different forms of capacity development is provided, and this has in many cases resulted in real changes at individual level. But to have a greater impact of the work, long-term strategies for the accountability work at grass-root level is needed as well as stronger linkages between this work and broader policy processes.

It is also important to analyse the current geographical coverage. The number of districts included in the programme does not really reflect a « district » approach. The proposals of partners highlight that they work in districts, while in fact, they are either at sub-county level or parish level. This gives the impression that the entire district is taken care of when in reality, it is just a few parishes within a respective district. The evaluators found that the programme is actually more sub-county than district based and that limits the impact of the programme. Furthermore, the inability to share the plans of the partners with the district in some instances causes overconcentration of partners in certain sub-counties or even parishes. This means that the impacts only reach a limited number of rights-holders and that the results are to be found in small pockets and it cannot be greatly felt at societal level.

The objectives as they are defined for both the first and the second programme periods cannot be achieved without a strong advocacy effort targeting national as well as local political processes. Progress for citizens' engagement and improved service delivery registered at local level without approval or support from national policy level will have little long-term impact. The programme has experienced limitations in how the advocacy has been strategised by the partners and the linkages between the local and national processes have not been strong enough. Addressing this should be a major issue for the dialogue between the Embassy of Sweden and Diakonia when considering a possible next programme phase.⁶³

3.3 SUSTAINABILITY

The evaluators find that the main challenges to the sustainability of the programme are related to the somewhat scattered initiatives in the districts. This disables a more comprehensive mobilising approach (building a critical mass vertically and horizon-

⁶³Diakonia states in their new programme proposal for the period 2015-2018 that "Local anti-corruption advocacy has dominated civic grassroots action while advocacy efforts towards law reform at national level have been slow but progressive- though with complicated processes and sometimes few gains are made."

tally) at local level. It also makes it difficult to build a strong foundation from which local examples of the government's lack of compliance to its human rights commitments can be used in evidence based advocacy work at both district and national levels. The examples of social change are mostly very local (and even individual) and while rights-holders definitely have built their confidence and abilities to monitor the authorities and claim when abuse is found, they are still dependent on further support in order to be able to scale up the process of change to higher levels of decision-making. In other words, the rights-holders are confident to demand for services when there is an organisation to lean on. The programme is also found to work a little bit too much in isolation, and could aim to build more on/seek synergies with other local grass-root organisations and initiatives, particularly in the area of economic empowerment.

The strategy to continue to develop the organisations' capacities and internal structures and base the support more on self-assessments is relevant for sustainability. Tailor-made technical support by Diakonia staff and external resources, particularly in how to deepen HRBA and develop the advocacy strategies, will further strengthen the partners to attract funds and to remain relevant actors to both rights-holders and duty-bearers. Strategic plans that include human resource development plans both at an institutional and individual staff level are equally important.

Targeting local women politicians is relevant for fostering sustainability, but experience from many similar initiatives that it is as important to focus on how to maintain women in politics by encouraging their empowerment. Support systems are needed; this includes alliance building with male politicians and civil society as well as economic and social enabling factors. By developing the support to build even more networks will strengthen the sustainability. The UWOPA project, where women members of parliament mentor new women political leaders, that was initiated in the current programme phase and is foreseen to be part of a third period, suggests an example of how to build sustainable results in the area of women's political participation⁶⁴.

Finally, the discussions on different forms of graduation (change of support modality, level of support to capacity development to different partners, e.g. more support to strategic coordination and less technical support to more developed partners, phasing out strategies for partners with alternative funds and similar) and a more customised approach to the different partners were found to be insufficient. Such a process could benefit from a sustainable development of the targeted sectors of civil society.

⁶⁴The new programme proposal includes UWOPA and their project.

3.4 PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT AND EFFICIENCY

On an overall level the programme management is found to be sound and the size of the country team reasonable. There were delays in disbursement of funds during the first phase, which remained a challenge during the second phase. Late response to narrative and financial reports also continued as well as late programming of joint events organised by Diakonia. This raises questions about time management and if the country team is engaged at too many levels in the partnership relations, not allowing them to focus enough on the results based monitoring and strategic development of the programme.

The programme had additional funds during the second programme phase and was able to expand to more districts. The additional human resources, particularly in M&E, have enabled Diakonia to focus more on results-based management in the dialogue with partners, and it was evident that partners now try to focus on processes of change rather than on activity outputs. This area still needs to be strengthened and partners, as well as Diakonia's country team, need to develop their skills on how to document and measure the changes they claim to see. The increased use of stories of change needs to be combined with a more systematic record and reflective analysis on what these changes imply on a societal level to avoid that they remain on an anecdotal level.

Several partners noted that the flexibility that Diakonia shows as a funding partner was positive. This is aligned with good donorship and the Istanbul Principles, but when the results based management is weak, when there is no baseline and no practice to use outcome indicators in the reporting, there is also a risk that the flexible approach leads to the wrong priorities and that changes are not based on reflective thinking and lessons learned.

Given the demand for more tailor-made support and Diakonia's ambition to increase the number of monitoring visits, the plan to expand the number of partners from 15 to 20 or more for the coming period, is not advisable. At least not if Diakonia does not make a clearer differentiation between different forms of partnerships and how different partners are supported technically within the programme. The one size fits all is neither efficient nor effective. The discussion that Diakonia has with some of the partner organisations on other support modalities (core funding and programme funding) needs to include discussion on Diakonia's role in capacity development of those partners.

Related to this is also the need to base future support to capacity development on needs assessment and to make use of more external resources where Diakonia either does not have the competencies or the time. The country team needs to prioritise the strategic discussions on programme development and results management to a greater extent, which implies leaving less time to plan and conduct workshops. There seems to be a slight tendency in Diakonia to rely on its own technical resources and analysis, and allowing the partner organisations to take greater responsibilities for the planning and implementation of their capacity development could increase both the participa-

tion and ownership in the discussion on what is required by human rights-based actors.

3.5 LESSONS LEARNED

The Partner Learning Forum and the promotion of experience sharing between partners is a positive development, something that was lacking during the first years of the programme. The development towards more synergies between partners is a good practice that many partners highlighted as an added value of the programme. Taking this a step further by institutionalising coordination with similar/likeminded programmes and organisations would be recommendable.

The dialogue with partner organisations and Diakonia have demonstrated other lessons learned throughout the two programme periods:

- Diakonia and the partner organisations have seen the need to develop a more customised and tailor-made support to the institutional and capacity development.
- There is a need to continue to link results based management with HRBA, and to develop skills in documenting processes of change related to attitude and behaviour changes of duty-bearers.
- Evidence based advocacy, as well as developing strategic advocacy plans that relate to relevant political processes at different levels have been insufficient.
- It is important to be consistent in the demands for gender mainstreamed development strategies and to work through different approaches to gain acceptance of the need for gender mainstreaming
- It is essential to be more proactive when it comes to non-discrimination and be consistent with the choice of which marginalised groups to prioritise. The programme fell short in its ambition to support the LGBTI community and even to promote disability rights within the supported initiatives.
- Furthermore, Diakonia acknowledges that their age analysis, particularly when it comes to a youth perspective, has been weak and that further discussions on how to address age related power differentials and relations are needed.
- In Uganda, projects targeting Members of Parliament should start with the new incoming Parliament. This is when attention of the parliamentarians to the success of project or programme can be caught.

4 Recommendations

4.1 RECOMMENDATIONS TO DIAKONIA

On programme approaches:

1. The programme development would benefit from a critical analysis on how the work at district level is being carried out and how the very many local initiatives can be better interconnected. **Diakonia and the partner organisations are recommended to develop projects that also target development at district level to ensure a greater impact. Priority should be given to more integrated project approaches that reach the better part of a district than many small interventions in several districts.** The latter will continue to be difficult to scale up or even use as convincing evidence in advocacy work at national level.
2. The evaluators welcome that Diakonia states that gender mainstreaming will be scaled up in the next programme phase. In line with this strategic decision, **Diakonia is recommended to take the gender commitments a step further putting a stronger emphasis in each partnership on gender equality. Achievements at local ground need to be visible in advocacy at regional and national level.**
3. Given that women's entry in political leadership is not only hindered by cultural practices and tendencies but also their economic disempowerment, the area of economic empowerment of women needs to be taken into consideration. **Diakonia is recommended to explore the possibilities to include focus on WEE or find stronger synergies with other programmes that focus on WEE.**
4. **Diakonia and the partner organisations need to lift issues from the grassroots that require the attention of the central government.** Civil society actors at national level need to engage in strategic advocacy efforts at national level that focus on the development and human rights situation in Northern Uganda. The evaluators have noted that the new programme proposal enhances advocacy work in particular for economic, social and cultural rights, and that the plan is to support partners to engage on macro-economic policies with the Government.
5. The discussion that Diakonia has initiated with some of the partner organisations on other support modalities (core funding and programme funding) is welcomed. It is also **recommended that these discussions include aspects of Diakonia's role in capacity development of those partners.**

On programme management and partnership:

6. It is strongly advised that **Diakonia follows its commitment in the new programme proposal and as expressed in the interviews on conducting a baseline study as part of the inception of a new programme period and that the baseline is systematically up-dated and followed-up on a regular basis.** The baseline should consider both qualitative and quantitative data for the indicators in the results framework.
7. Diakonia needs to improve its reporting against outcomes and processes of change beyond individual and group levels and include documented results on the societal outcome level. **The use of indicators that trace behaviour changes of duty-bearers are recommended.** Indicators are also needed for all stages of the strategy for change, including the (higher) outcome level.
8. **Diakonia is recommended to continue to link results based management with HRBA, and to focus on the development of the partner organisations' skills in documenting processes of change related to attitude and behaviour changes of duty-bearers.**
9. A continuous strong focus on HRBA is key to the programme's relevance and effectiveness. **Diakonia and the partner organisations are recommended to further deepen aspects of active and meaningful participation and pro-active non-discrimination.** One way to do this is to consider age/power dimensions and start to stratify the youth group due to their very different life situations.
10. The ownership of the partner project proposal is highly relevant. **Diakonia should, however, secure that strategic gaps in approach and methodology are mitigated once a proposal has been approved.** This should be done by supporting partners with technical assistance in the final project design, including the development of relevant indicators at outcome level, and the mainstreaming of relevant perspectives, including HRBA and gender.
11. **Diakonia's results-based management should be strengthened,** and as part of this future Mid-Term Reviews need to be planned at an earlier stage so that lessons learned can be integrated in the on-going programme and not only be used for future programme periods.
12. **Diakonia is recommended to develop a mechanism for weaning off partners depending on their capacity levels.** This should always be communicated so that the partners take the capacity development of Diakonia seriously and recognise that these are time bound inputs. Weaning would also enable Diakonia to reach a larger number of CSOs and in the long run, which would generate a critical mass of capacitated CSOs with a clear gender equality commitment and human rights-based approach that can stand-up strongly against the injustices in society.
13. A strategic approach to long-term partnerships is crucial for organisations in changing funding landscapes. **Diakonia is recommended to continue its sup-**

port to the development of human resource policies and also support the partners with donor and alliance mapping.

14. **Diakonia should take the issue of QuAM seriously and demand that all the partners be accredited.** In addition, it gives other donors the assurance and confidence to work with such organisations.
15. **Diakonia is recommended to continue to support synergies among the partner organisations and see that exchange visits are organised between the national level partners and the district based partners.**
16. **Diakonia is also recommended to invite other development actors and their partners to take part in experience sharing at local and national levels.**
17. Given the demand for more tailor-made support, Diakonia's ambition to increase the number of monitoring visits, the plan to expand the number of partners from 15 to 20 or more for the coming period, is not advisable unless the **expansion is accompanied by a clearer differentiation between the support to different types of partners.**

4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EMBASSY OF SWEDEN

1. **The Embassy is recommended to continue to support the Diakonia country programme but before any decision is made it is important to ensure that the programme design includes:**
 - relevant and feasible strategies for the advocacy work with described methods on how to link different levels of intervention;
 - that the advocacy work at both local and national level is developed from a human rights-based approach, considering in particular the active and meaningful participation of rights-holders;
 - a deliberate effort to strengthen both the gender mainstreaming approach and focus on strategic gender issues such as men's engagement in prevention work against gender based violence, sexual and reproductive health and rights, particularly with focus on young girls and boys.
2. **The Embassy of Sweden is furthermore recommended to support the QuAM secretariat and to promote the services of the mechanisms among other donors.**

Annex 1 - Terms of Reference

2014-10-02

Terms of Reference

Evaluation of Swedish Embassy support to Diakonia Uganda Programme 2008 – 2013

Background

Diakonia is an international development organization that works together with local partner organizations for sustainable change for the most vulnerable people in the world.

The Swedish Embassy in Uganda is supporting the Diakonia Uganda programme “***Making human rights, Gender equality and justice a reality in Karamoja, Acholi, Lango and Teso sub-regions 2011 – 2013***” with fourteen partner organizations in Uganda. It is a continuation of Swedish Embassy support to the Diakonia Uganda programme 2008-2011 with some modifications.

The programme objective is “Enhanced fulfilment of human rights, Gender equality and justice in selected districts of Karamoja, Acholi, Lango, and Teso sub-regions by 2013” with three strategic (thematic) objectives:

A. Promoting fulfilling and protecting human rights

Objective: State and non-state actors are progressing towards having developed capacities to ensure access to fair and equal justice for poor and marginalized people. Result areas:

3. Civic groups and partner organisations in the target districts effectively support and represent the poor and marginalized people to claim their rights
4. International and national human rights instruments are domesticated, implemented and are effectively monitored by duty bearers

B. Promotion of Gender Equality and Democracy

Objective: By 2013, the exploitation and oppression of women and girls in selected districts of Karamoja and Acholiland, Lango and Teso sub regions is reducing and they are increasingly enjoying equal rights and entitlements with men and boys in a conducive social-cultural and political – economic environment. Result areas:

1. Women and other marginalized groups are increasingly taking action for the realization of their rights
2. Local civic action groups are proactively engaged and participating in decision making at local levels to ensure that duty bearers are accountable, entrench the culture

of constitutionalism and good governance and work towards ensuring the realization of the rights of poor and marginalized people.

C. Conflict and justice

Objective: By 2013 Peace and Development policies, programmes and plans have a stronger focus on protecting and improving the quality of life, dignity and self-esteem of the conflict affected and marginalized people in selected districts in Karamoja, Acholi, Lango and Teso subregions. Result areas:

3. Community-led and collaborative peace and security initiatives involving poor and marginalized people are being implemented and the causes and effects of insecurity are reversed.
4. Communities have instituted coping mechanisms that enable them have sustainable livelihoods.

The programme has been supported by the Swedish Embassy with the aim to contribute to the country strategy for Uganda 2009 – 2013 and specifically the objective “Improved democratic governance with greater respect for and enjoyment of human rights and the rule of law”.

Partners

Cooperating partners include:

1. Uganda Human Rights Network (HURINET-U)
2. Human Rights Focus - HURIFO
3. African Youth Development Link - AYDL
4. ZOA Uganda/Amudat Inter-religious Development Initiative/ Pokot Zonal Development Programme
5. Uganda Women's Network -UWONET
6. Summit Foundation - SUFO
7. Women and Rural Development (WORUDET)
8. Forum for Women in Democracy - FOWODE
9. Action for Development (ACFODE)
10. Justice and Peace Commission of Gulu Arch Diocese (JPC-GULU)
11. Church of Uganda Planning, Development and relief department (COU-PDR)
12. Teso Initiative for Peace (TIP)
13. Uganda Joint Christian council (UJCC)
14. Karamoja diocese Development services/Labwor Zonal development programme (LAZIDEP)

The Swedish Government has adopted a new results strategy for Uganda with four result areas:

1. *Strengthened democracy and gender equality, greater respect for human rights and freedom from oppression*
 - Greater capacity of civil society to improve respect for civil and political rights
 - Greater capacity of civil society to promote the conditions for citizens to influence political processes and demand accountability
 - Enhanced rule of law, with a focus on access to justice for people who live in poverty
2. *Better opportunities for people living in poverty to contribute to and benefit from economic growth and obtain a good education*

- Strengthened competitiveness among producers and suppliers of goods and services
- Increased productive employment opportunities for women and young people
- Increased access to and control of productive resources for women
- Better access to social safety nets for vulnerable children.
- 3. *Improved basic health*
 - Improved access to high quality child and maternal care
 - Improved access to sexual and reproductive health and rights for women and men, girls and boys.
- 4. *Safeguarding human security and freedom from violence*
 - Enhanced capacity to prevent gender-based violence.

The Swedish Embassy is currently engaged in operationalization of the strategy. The outcome of the evaluation of the Diakonia Uganda program will provide important information to determine whether a continued support for Diakonia Uganda is justified for an upcoming portfolio to contribute to the fulfillment of the result areas above.

Objectives of Evaluation

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess:

With regard to programme results:

10. Effectiveness of the Swedish Embassy support to the Diakonia Uganda Programme in terms of:
 - a. Achievement of objectives results and impacts;
 - b. Unintended outcomes both positive and negative;
 - c. Potential longer term impacts
11. Relevance of the program with regards to the current situation in Uganda.
12. Relevance of the program with regards of the Swedish results strategy 2014-2018
13. Sustainability of the positive changes in the target communities, right holders and partner organizations.
14. Diakonia added value/contribution to the partners' capacity and results.
15. Lessons Learned and recommendations that should be considered for a possible subsequent program.

With regard to programme management:

1. The efficiency of programme management looking at how the programme resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time etc) have been used to produce results
2. The effectiveness and efficiency of the grants mechanism between Diakonia and the partners
3. Sustainability (enduring results, including increased capacity of partners).

Suggested evaluation Questions

12. Are we achieving what we want to achieve? What are the reasons for these achievements or non-achievements?
13. What are the unintended outcomes both positive and negative from this program?

14. Are there any positive (or negative) impacts on communities from the intervention?
Any potential longer term impacts of the program?
15. Will there be sustainability of the positive changes in communities, right holders and civil society organizations?
16. To what extent did Diakonia add value/contribute to the partners' capacity in the relevant areas? What are the results of Diakonia added value to partners?
17. How do the systems and processes adopted by Diakonia relating to grant management have impact on the partner organizations, donor coordination, offering platforms for partner networking, and capacity building for partner organizations etc.
18. What are the lessons that should be considered for any subsequent program?
19. Actionable recommendations for Diakonia and partners for ongoing and subsequent program?

The consultant may suggest additional questions.

Methodology

The consultant will combine qualitative and quantitative data collection methods and produce a narrative report using the following schedule:

1. A desk review of available documentation.
2. A preparation meeting with program staff.
3. Consultation with staff members.
4. Consultation with partners/rights holders.
 - a. Individual consultation with partners to address review objectives.
 - b. Reflection with individual partners on case studies (successes and failures).
 - c. Interviews with rights holders beneficiaries
 - d. Joint meeting with partners to make meaning of data, confirm/verify results and brainstorm possible implications/changes desired.
5. Data analysis and draft reporting.
6. Discuss with Diakonia management for findings and comment.
7. A final report prepared after comments have been received.

Time frame

The evaluation will be undertaken over 30 days consisting of design and preparation, desk review, consultation with partners, staff and rights holders beneficiaries, analysis and reporting. The consultant should suggest how time is best divided between the different items

Budget

The budget for this assignment should be set according to the agreed amounts in the framework agreement. It should not exceed 400 000 SEK.

Duration

October - December 2014

Output

- It is expected that an inception report (English) describing how the evaluation will be carried out (methodology) and an evaluation schedule be submitted two weeks after the start of the assignment.

- It is expected that a draft report (English) be submitted by the 28st November 2014 to allow for any clarification of data or interpretations of this data, and conclusions drawn.
- A final report that addresses the terms of reference shall be submitted by 12th December 2014.
- The final report should not exceed 30 pages and is expected to include the following chapters:
 1. Executive summary
 2. Table of Contents
 3. Background
 4. Objectives of the evaluation
 5. Evaluation methodology
 6. Findings:
 - a) Effectiveness of Swedish Embassy Support Diakonia Uganda Programme 2008-2013
 - b) Relevance of the program
 - c) Sustainability of the positive changes in the target communities
 7. Diakonia added value contribution to the partners' capacity and results
 8. Lessons and recommendations
 9. Appendices:
 - a) Terms of Reference for the evaluation team
 - b) Evaluation tools
 - c) List of places visited
 - d) List of documents reviewed
 - e) List of people interviewed etc.

Support

The consultants will be supported by Embassy staff and Diakonia staff where possible.

Qualifications of Consultants

The Evaluation Team shall consist of a team leader and team members. The team leader will lead and be overall responsible for the evaluation process. The team members are expected to take shared responsibility for data collection and analysis.

There needs to be a suitable mix of skills amongst team members, including Monitoring & Evaluation, Democracy & Human Rights, Results based management, conflict sensitivity sensibility, gender equality, data collection and report writing.

For interviews with beneficiaries there is need for knowledge of local languages. This can be done through interpretation.

Annex 2 – Inception Report

1. Executive Summary

The assignment is a summative and formative final evaluation of the Diakonia Uganda programme “*Making human rights, Gender equality and justice a reality in Karamoja, Acholi, Lango and Teso sub-regions 2011 – 2013*”, implemented together with Ugandan partner organisations at national and sub-regional levels. The assignment also includes the first phase of the programme 2008-2011

The inception report provides details on the different phases of the evaluation process and how the responsibilities will be divided within the evaluation team. The attached Evaluation Matrix describes how the OECD/DAC criteria and the evaluation questions will be addressed during the evaluation process. The evaluators suggest some slight alteration of the evaluation questions raised in the Terms of Reference (ToR) and three new questions:

- Are the achieved results (outcomes and impacts) assessed as relevant with regards to the current situation in Uganda and the Swedish results strategy 2014-2018?
- How have HRBA and gender equality aspects been applied by Diakonia and the partner organisations in the programme cycle and to what extent has this had an impact on the outcomes?
- Have the programme inputs like funds, expertise, and time resources, been used in an efficient manner in relation to what has been achieved?

The timeframe for the assignment does not allow a full coverage of all partners (19 in total) or sub-regions and the 21 districts where the programme has been implemented. The evaluators see the need to favour in-depth discussion over a broad representation in order to address the objectives stated in the ToR and all evaluation questions. This implies a limited number of consultations and field trips and also some limitations regarding the opportunities to verify findings in different districts. A selection of five (5) districts (including Kampala for national level activities and approximately twelve (12) partnering CSOs is therefore suggested.

2. Assessment of Scope of the Evaluation

2.1 THE ASSIGNMENT

The assignment is a summative and formative final evaluation of the Diakonia Uganda programme “*Making human rights, Gender equality and justice a reality in Kar-amoja, Acholi, Lango and Teso sub-regions 2011 – 2013*”, implemented together with 15⁶⁵ Ugandan partner organisations.

The main purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance of a continuation of the programme in relation to the Swedish results strategy 2014-2018 and the current situation in Uganda. The objectives of the evaluation, as stated in the Terms of Reference (ToR), are to assess programme results as well as Diakonia’s programme management. With regard to programme results the ToR states that the evaluation shall assess the OECD-DAC criteria effectiveness (including impact), relevance and sustainability:

1. Effectiveness of the Swedish Embassy support to the Diakonia Uganda Programme in terms of:
 - a. Achievement of objectives results and impacts;
 - b. Unintended outcomes both positive and negative;
 - c. Potential longer term impacts
2. Relevance of the programme with regards to the current situation in Uganda
3. Relevance of the programme with regards of the Swedish results strategy 2014-2018
4. Sustainability of the positive changes in the target communities, rights holders and partner organizations⁶⁶
5. Diakonia added value/contribution to the partners’ capacity and results
6. Lessons Learned and recommendations that should be considered for a possible subsequent programme.

Furthermore the evaluation shall assess the efficiency, effectiveness and the sustainability with regard to programme management:

4. The efficiency of programme management looking at how the programme resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have been used to produce results

⁶⁵14 partners according to ToR and 15 partners according to the programme proposal 2011-2013 and latest annual report (June 2013-July 2014) from Diakonia to Embassy of Sweden. The partner list provided by Diakonia during the inception however shows that the total number of partners during the period 2008-2014 is 19. Diakonia ended the agreement with some of the partner organisations from the first period, and UWOPA and CSBAG only became partners in 2014.

⁶⁶There is an overlap of the two bullets on sustainability, this has been discussed with the Embassy prior to the inception, and the main focus on the issue of sustainability is of programme management and the sustainability of the support to the capacity development of partner organisations.

5. The effectiveness and efficiency of the grants mechanism between Diakonia and the partners
6. Sustainability (enduring results, including increased capacity of partners)⁶⁷.

2.2 COMMENTS ON THE SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation will cover the two contract periods of 2008-2011 and 2011-2013, with a stronger focus on the second phase of the programme. The evaluation team will cover the full period when looking at programme outcomes and impacts, sustainability issues and lessons learned, but will only focus on the second phase for aspects on programme relevance and programme management. The assessment of the relevance will refer to the Swedish results strategy and the current situation of Uganda, but also the application of a Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) and gender perspective.

The Embassy of Sweden expects that the evaluation includes an impact assessment. As stated in the implementation proposal we foresee that some impact assessment will be possible but that scope for results at impact level from the second phase of the programme will be limited. The issue is further discussed in the next chapter and in the attached Evaluation Matrix.

During 2011-2013 the programme has been implemented in 21 districts⁶⁸ in four sub-regions together with 15 civil society organisations (CSOs). The timeframe for the assignment does not allow a full coverage of all partners or sub-regions and districts where the programme has been implemented, which is why a proposal for the selection of districts and partnering CSOs is presented in next chapter.

Given the timeframe of the data collection, the Evaluation Team will further need to prioritise in order to give sufficient time to the two areas of the evaluation; the assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the programme implementation, and the effectiveness and efficiency of the programme management in general and the grant mechanisms in particular. There needs to be a balance between time for consultations with rights-holders, partner organisations and Diakonia programme staff and external stakeholders. The evaluators see the need to favour in-depth discussion over a broad representation in order to address the objectives stated in the ToR and all evaluation questions. This implies a limited number of consultations and field trips and also some limitations regarding the opportunities to verify findings in different districts.

⁶⁷ See footnote 2.

⁶⁸ Partners work at national level and in the following districts Agago, Abim, Amudat, Amuru, Amuria, Apac, Bukwo, Dokolo, Gulu, Kaabong, Kaberamaido, Kitgum, Kole, Kotido, Kween, Lamwo, Moroto, Nwoya, Napak, Oyam and Pader.

3. Relevance and Evaluability of Evaluation Questions

3.1 EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

1. Are we achieving what we want to achieve? What are the reasons for these achievements or non-achievements?

Comment: In coherence with the objectives of the ToR we propose that the evaluation question (EQ) 1 to be rephrased as follows:

EQ1: To what extent have expected outcomes and impacts been achieved? What are the factors determining these achievements or non-achievements?

2. What are the unintended outcomes both positive and negative from this programme?
3. Are there any positive (or negative) impacts on communities from the intervention? Any potential longer term impacts of the programme?

No comments to EQ 2 and 3.

4. Will there be sustainability of the positive changes in communities, right holders and civil society organizations?

Comment: The EQ 4 is speculative. The evaluators will develop a set of indicators for each target group in the question, that is the communities that are included in the evaluation, the rights-holders that are consulted directly or indirectly, and the partnering CSOs. The Embassy of Sweden and Diakonia need to confirm that the suggested indicators sufficiently measure the plausibility and probability of sustainability for each group. We likewise propose a slight reformulation of the evaluation question 4.

EQ4: Are the identified and recorded positive changes likely to be sustainable for the communities, rights-holders and civil society organisations involved in the programme?

5. To what extent did Diakonia add value/contribute to the partners' capacity in the relevant areas? What are the results of Diakonia added value to partners?

No comments to EQ 5.

6. How do the systems and processes adopted by Diakonia relating to grant management have impact on the partner organizations, donor coordination, offering platforms for partner networking, and capacity building for partner organizations etc.?

Comment: We understand the EQ6 to be a question of effectiveness and efficiency related to the programme management of Diakonia (as one of the objectives of the evaluation). The grant management mainly influences the partner organisations, and only in an indirect manner other actors. Likewise the systems and approaches for capacity building efforts mainly relate to the partners. The question also includes the impact of the applied grant management on donor coordination and platforms for partner networking. We regard the impact on donor coordination, which we mainly understand as a question on harmonisation among different grant mechanisms, and facilitating network opportunities as issues primarily related

to effectiveness. We do not suggest any reformulation of the EQ6 but confirm that the question contains several sub-questions that all relate to the *effectiveness* of the grant management but only some to the *efficiency* of the same.

7. What are the lessons that should be considered for any subsequent programme?
8. Actionable recommendations for Diakonia and partners for ongoing and subsequent programme?

No comments to EQ 7 and 8.

3.2 ADDITIONAL EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The issues of relevance of the programme and efficiency of the overall programme management are included in the objectives of the Terms of Reference but not in the EQs. We also see the importance of highlighting the application of the dimensions of human rights-based approach as well as gender equality in the assessment of the programme's results and relevance. Diakonia stresses that the programme is based on HRBA and rights-based programming. Likewise gender equality and the challenging of discriminatory norms and practices against women, LGBTI persons and persons with disabilities, as well as other marginalised but not specified groups, are emphasised by Diakonia. We therefore suggest the following additional evaluation questions:

9. Are the achieved results (outcomes and impacts) assessed as relevant with regards to the current situation in Uganda and the Swedish results strategy 2014-2018?
10. How have HRBA and gender equality aspects been applied by Diakonia and the partner organisations in the programme cycle and to what extent has this had an impact on the outcomes?
11. Have the programme inputs like funds, expertise, and time resources, been used in an efficient manner in relation to what has been achieved?

4. Proposed Approach and Methodology

4.1 THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation process will be divided into the following phases: 1) inception and desk study, 2) field work (data collection and verification of information in reports), 3) data analysis and reporting.

The evaluation will apply a participatory approach based on a close dialogue with the Embassy of Sweden and Diakonia throughout the different phases of the assignment. The inception period has served for the establishment of initial discussions on additional sources of information, on suitable timeframes and detailed plans for the field trip as well as on proposed methods for the data collection.

Methods for data collections will be transparent, clearly explained to all interviewees and as inclusive as possible. Choice of methods will be based on the different realities

of individuals and groups to be consulted as well as the different local contexts. The Evaluation Team will make an effort to give continuous feed-back to Diakonia and EoS on the progress of the evaluation and will also conduct a special feedback session with the aim to discuss some of the preliminary findings, sort out issues that need to be clarified and possibly ask for additional information.

4.1.1 Description of the evaluation process

Inception

- ✓ Initial contacts with the Embassy of Sweden and Diakonia Uganda; documentation provided by the Embassy and Diakonia to the evaluation team including contact information for all the partner organisations in the programme; list of external stakeholders (including contact data) and identification of stakeholders to be interviewed;
- ✓ Desk review of relevant documents connected to the Diakonia Uganda programme, such as annual and final reports to the EoS, mid-term assessment, Embassy decision memos/assessments and strategic reports, Sweden's former country strategy and current result strategy, and other relevant documentation identified by the Embassy and the Evaluation Team;
- ✓ Desk review of relevant studies and report covering the socio-economic and political current situation of Uganda, particularly in regard to the regions where the programme is being implemented. The evaluators are also trying to get access to the draft of the next national development plan of Uganda.
- ✓ Development of further evaluation questions, indicators for the evaluation criteria and questions and an evaluation matrix describing how the different evaluation questions and cross-cutting perspectives will be addressed;
- ✓ Method development for the different parts of the evaluation and different stakeholder groups to be consulted, including generic interview guides;
- ✓ Development of criteria for selection of geographical coverage and partner organisations to be consulted (covering all three strategic programme objectives). Identification of prioritised areas for in-depth consultations and a preliminary programme proposal;
- ✓ Dialogue on the inception report.

Data collection

- ✓ Prior to the start of this phase, confirmation of the programme from EoS and Diakonia for interviews in Kampala and field trip, including logistical planning;
- ✓ Interviews with rights-holders, partner organisations and external stakeholders such as local and national governmental representatives, international CSOs and a selection of donors, focus group discussion with a selection of partners with offices in Kampala and with different rights-holder groups;
- ✓ In relation to relevance and different aspects of donor coordination we see it as important to interview other donors (agencies and ICSOs) on the context around aid conditionality in Uganda;
- ✓ Half day session with Diakonia programme staff on the grant mechanism;

- ✓ Identification and discussion of reported outcomes and impacts, and verification with rights-holders of a selection of these outcomes/impacts;
- ✓ Brief feed-back session with EoS and Diakonia with the team leader.

Analysis and report

- ✓ Evaluation Team consolidate preliminary findings and conclusion once all consultations are done;
- ✓ Desk study refresher;
- ✓ Draft report produced and sent to EoS and Diakonia for comments;
- ✓ EoS and Diakonia provides comments on draft report;
- ✓ Edit of the draft version and the production of the final report;
- ✓ Dialogue on the final report.

4.1.2 Principles and methods for the data collection

All relevant data identified during the desk study related to achieved objectives, recorded outcomes and impacts, and to any of the central perspective (see below) to the evaluation, will be verified and triangulated through stakeholder interviews and focus groups discussions. Steering documents and procedures for the grant mechanism will be studied and discussed at Diakonia's Kampala Office.

All stakeholders will have information on the purpose and the process of the evaluation, and will be informed that we will only quote interviewees with their explicit approval (otherwise informants will be anonymous). Interview techniques will be participatory and adapted to the different stakeholders considering their level of literacy and formal education, disabilities and other relevant aspects related to power relations (like gender, position, origin, class, civil status) within groups and among different types of stakeholders.

4.1.3 Central perspectives for the evaluation

HRBA, gender equality perspective, risk and conflict perspective, child rights and HIV/AIDS -perspectives will be considered in all stages of the evaluation and be taken into consideration in relation both to organisational processes and how outcomes have materialised.

4.1.4 Division of responsibilities within the Evaluation Team

The members of the Evaluation Team will work closely together throughout the full evaluation process. The Team Leader has the overall responsibility for the method development, data collection, the analysis and the writing of the report, but the process will be highly interactive within the team taking into account the different areas of expertise of the evaluators.

The evaluators will participate in some interviews together. Due to time limits the team need to split in two for some stakeholder interviews and field visits. The Team Leader will focus on both parts of the evaluation, while the national expert will focus on the first part, that is evaluation objectives 1-6 excluding programme management. She will also conduct two field trips and attend meetings in Kampala while the Team

Leader will visit only one sub-region and Kampala. The Team Leader will be responsible for the direct dialogue with EoS and Diakonia throughout the evaluation.

4.2 INCEPTION

4.2.1 Desk review

The desk review was carried out in November and included programme related documents such as applications and reports, Mid-Term Review, Embassy decision memos/assessments, EoS development strategy reports for Uganda, Swedish results strategy 2014-2018, Uganda National Development Plan 2010-2015, sub-regional development plans, relevant studies on the socio-economic situation of Uganda, etc. We highlight some observations from the reading of Diakonia's programme reports, the Mid Term Review report and the new results strategy of Sweden for the cooperation with Uganda.

Diakonia's programme reports:

A first overview of the reports from 2011 to the most recent report (2013/2014) account for a number of interesting outcomes within the different thematic areas. The Mid Term Review and assessment memos from the Embassy of Sweden confirm this. The reports highlight in the narrative which partners have contributed to the different outcomes but there are no overviews of the progress of all partner organisations. The evaluators have yet not been provided with the attachments to the reports; therefore the analysis of the reporting of the results frameworks is still pending.

There are no baselines for the programme which will somewhat limit the scope of the assessment of achieved results. Some baselines have however been conducted by partner organisations. Diakonia will be asked to provide the Evaluation Team with these studies during the data collection.

The results framework does not include any specific expected results on the development of capacities of the partner organisations. Some but not all annual reports highlight actions taken to increase capacities in different areas. The evaluation team will ask for more information on capacity development plans and achieved results at the beginning of the data collection.

From the annual reports and the Mid-Term Review we have learnt that the programme has been extended to December 2014. The desk review informed the team that Diakonia received additional funds for the programme from EU and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands. The ToR does not mention the extension or the other donors. The evaluators need to get more information on this from the Embassy of Sweden prior to the data collection.

The findings in the Mid Term Review of the programme (carried out in February 2014) will be important source of information and the evaluators will carefully follow up the conclusions and the recommendations in the review. Diakonia will also be asked to provide the team with its management response.

Sweden's results strategy:⁶⁹

The first strategic objective of the Swedish results strategy 2014-2018 is strengthened democracy and gender equality, increased respect for human rights and freedom from oppression. The objective has three expected results:

- Increased capacity of the civil society to promote the respect for civil and political rights;
- Increased capacity of the civil society to promote the citizens' possibilities to influence political processes and claim accountability;
- Increased rule of law, with focus on access to justice, particularly for people living in poverty.

The above results are assessed all relevant to Diakonia's programme. The second strategic objective of the strategy, *Improved conditions for poor persons to benefit from and contribute to economic growth and obtain good education*, also includes an expected result that is particularly relevant to Diakonia's line of work; namely increased access and control over productive resources for women. The other two strategic objectives of the Swedish strategy; improved basic health and human security and freedom from violence are also relevant to the programme with the results aiming to improve SRHR and decrease GBV.

4.2.2 Selection criteria for partner organisations to be consulted and district/regions:

Given the timeframe of the evaluation it will not be possible to consult all 15 partner organisations of the programme. We suggest that approximately two thirds of the partners should be consulted. The selection of partners and districts is suggested to be based on the following criteria:

- representation of all three thematic areas; human rights, gender equality and democracy and conflict and justice;
- reflect the major geographical focus of the programme, that is Acholiland and Karamoja;
- advocacy work at national level;
- partner organisations with core funding;
- partner organisations with project funding;
- representing a mix of new partners and partners from the start of the programme;
- districts where there are many partners;
- practicability of reach – efficiency in connecting to districts.

4.2.3 Selection of partner organisations to be consulted in the evaluation:

⁶⁹ Only available in Swedish.

National Level		Period
HURINET-U ,Human Rights Network Uganda	Human Rights and Access to Justice	2008-June 2014
UWONET, Uganda Women's Network	Gender and Democracy	2009-June 2014
UWOPA, Uganda Women Parliamentary Association	Gender and Democracy	July 2014 – Dec 2014
ACFODE, Action For Development	Gender and Democracy	2008 – Dec 2014

Karamoja		Period
TIP, Teso Initiative For Peace	Conflict, Peace building and Livelihoods.	2009-Dec 2014
LAZIDEP, Labwor Zonal Development Programme	Conflict, Peace building	2008 – Nov 2013
AYDL, African Youth Development Link	Gender and Democracy	2010 – Dec 2014
ADOL, Action for Development of the Local Communities	Human Rights	2008 –June 2012

Acholiland		Period
COU-Kitgum Diocese, Church of Uganda	Gender and Democracy, Conflict, Peace building	2008-Dec 2014
UWONET/ FOKAPAWA, Uganda Women's Network	Gender and Democracy	2009.June 2014
JPC – Arch Diocese of Gulu Justice & Peace Commission	Human Rights and Access to Justice	2011–Dec 2014
UJJC, Uganda Joint Christian Council	Gender and Democracy	2010 – Dec 2014
SUFO, Summit Foundation	Gender and Democracy	July 2011 –Dec 2014
FOWODE	Gender and Democracy	2009–June 2014

4.2.4 Suggested external stakeholders to be consulted⁷⁰

Duty-bearers:

⁷⁰ Preliminary list, input from the Embassy and Diakonia is needed before deciding on the final list.

- Justice Law and Order Sector (JLOS) Secretariat
- Uganda Human Rights Commission (UHRC)
- QUAM Secretariat

Civil Society Actors:

- Coalition of Civil Pastoralists Society Organisations (COPACSO)
- Sexual Minorities Uganda/Freedom and Roam Uganda

Donors and ICSOs:

- Democratic Governance Facility
- European Union Delegation
- Democratic Governance and Accountability Programme (DGAP)
- Embassy of the Netherlands
- SNV

4.2.5 Suggested approach for the different stakeholder consultations

Semi-structured interviews will be held with staff at the Embassy, Diakonia and a selection of partner organisation, as well as external stakeholders such as local and national governmental representatives, international CSOs and a selection of donors. Both evaluators will as far as possible attend the meetings with EoS and Diakonia. Meetings with external stakeholders will in general be held by one evaluator.

The individual meetings with partner organisations will focus on programme outcomes and impacts, including results related to capacity development efforts, and the sustainability of achieved results. Some interviews will be held with both evaluators.

With the purpose to be able to consult a broader spectra of partners, one focal group discussion with a mix of partner organisations is planned to be organised in Kampala. This session will address issues related to results through discussions around what the partners perceive as the most significant changes (MSC) and reflections on the programme management, with particular focus on the experience of project management and different funding modalities.

Consultation with rights-holders will focus on the groups that were identified in the application for the second phase of the programme, that is, conflict affected women and girls, as well as survivors of different forms of GBV (including FGM), persons with disabilities (PwD) with focus on women, LGBT persons, youth affected by the conflict, unemployment and lack of education/skills training, political activists and men in their role as change agents. Different methodologies will be used for these interviews, but all will focus on a limited number of specific thematic areas and will be constructed around discussions on what has changed, according to the respondents, through the interventions of the partner organisation(s) of the programme. Individual interviews will be brief (aprox. 45 minutes) while focus group discussions will be 1-2 hours.

A slightly simplified version of the MSC method will be used. Respondents from partner organisations and rights-holder groups will be asked to identify what they consider as important changes to which Diakonia programming has contributed. Respondents within Diakonia will be asked to list what they assess as the major achievements so far. When the method is used in focus group discussions (possibly in workshop/s) the group will be asked to identify one or two of the examples given as the

most representative for the group/period/region, etc. The stated MSCs will be analysed in relation to the overall programme outcomes that the partner organisations perceive have been achieved so far and will be compared with Diakonia perspectives and those reported in the Diakonia programme reports. The expected outcomes of the programme are included in the evaluation matrix in annex 1 below. Analyses will highlight and reflect on the ways that actual outcomes may have diverged from those that were initially intended.

The assessment of the effectiveness of the overall programme and grant management will be carried out through 1) a review of steering documents for the programme and 2) an analysis of the set-up of the programme and its procedures based on interviews with Diakonia staff, project coordinators (or similar) and financial staff from a selection of partner organisations (bilateral interviews and one focus group discussion) and other donors that Diakonia coordinates with and/or that also support the Diakonia partner organisations.

Generic interview guides are found in annex 2.

4.2.6 The Strategy for Change⁷¹ (SfC) of Diakonia

Diakonia states in their latest annual programme report that the strategy for change is based on the integration of “rights based [...] norms, principles, standards and goals of international human rights that identify the gaps in fulfilling the rights of citizens, and using the available or new information to mobilize citizens and CSOs for informed action, using a results based approach”. The role of the programme is to awaken Ugandans’ to play their civic role and responsibilities claiming the accountability of duty-bearers. Particularly the accountability work needs strong support and development of capacities in order to obtain up- and downwards accountability mechanisms.

4.3 COLLECTION OF DATA

The data collection will take place during the first three weeks of December. The consultations with different stakeholders will differ in scope and depth, some partners and rights-holder groups will participate in focus group discussions and/or evaluation workshops with the evaluators while others will be consulted through individual meetings.

A mix of methods (suggestions described above) will be used in the data collection to address the evaluation’s objectives:

- The desk review of data (carried out during the inception period) which can be retrieved from programme relevant documents is mentioned above;
- Semi-structured interviews will be used for most stakeholder consultations (individual meetings with Diakonia staff, individual meetings with a selection

⁷¹Diakonia does not use the term Theory of Change (ToC) but Strategy for Change

of partner organisations at their head office, EoS staff, other donors and duty-bearers, etc.);

- Focus group discussions with rights-holders at district and community level and a selection of partner organisations based in Kampala;
- Feed-back session in Kampala with Diakonia and the Embassy of Sweden.

4.3.1 Preliminary programme⁷²

Monday 1 st of Dec.	• Diakonia start-up meeting and interviews with Diakonia management and staff. • Joint meeting with Kampala based partners whose up-country projects will be visited (UWONET, UJCC, FOWODE & COU-PDR)	
Tuesday 2 nd	<i>Interviews with</i> • HURINET • ACFODE • JLOS • QUAM Secretariat • UWOPA	
Wednesday 3 rd	<i>Interviews with</i> • UHRC • COPCSO • DGF • EU Delegation	• Half day session with Diakonia on grant management
Thursday 4 th	• Evaluation team leaves for Up- country field visit • Meeting with Diakonia sub-office in Gulu • Local duty-bearers in Gulu District	
Friday 5 th	• Meetings with SUFO • Focus group meeting with SUFO beneficiaries	
Saturday 6 th	Travel to Abim District. • Meeting with TIP, • Focal group meetings and individual interviews with rights-holders	
Sunday 7 th	No programme, Annica returns to Kampala	
Monday 8 th	Cont. field visit 1 (Everse) • Meeting with LAZDEP (Abim), • Meeting with duty-bearers in Abim • Focus group discussion	Annica interview external stakeholders; • Sexual minorities in Uganda and freedom; Roam Uganda; SNV; • Meeting with a selection of partners on grant-management (and pending issues)
Tuesday 9 th	Cont. field visit 1 (Everse) meets ADOL and beneficiar-	Annica meets with • Former Staff of DGAP currently with

⁷² The proposal has not been checked with the stakeholders, all meetings need to be confirmed.

	ies	IDF • Pending meetings Kampala • Joint-feed back session with EoS and Diakonia (Annica) Annica travel late night
Wednesday 10 th	Everse travels to Agago Field visit 2 meetings • COU-Kitgum Archdiocese and beneficiaries • JPC and beneficiaries	
Thursday 11 th	• Meets UWONET and beneficiaries in Agago • UJCC and beneficiaries in Agago	
Friday 12 th	• Travel to Amuria and meet with FOWODE beneficiaries • If time allows meet the district duty bearers in Amuria	

4.4 ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

Data collected during the desk review and field work will constitute the basis for the overall analysis. The evaluation matrix will help the evaluators to synthesise findings. A draft report will be submitted to the EoS and Diakonia for comments, after which the report will be finalised.

Milestones and deliverables:

- Start of the inception work: 3rd of November
- Submission of the draft Inception Report: 18th of November
- Feedback/approval of Inception Report: 24th of November
- Submission of the final inception Report and approval: 28th of November
- Submission of the Draft Report: 22nd of December
- Written feedback/comments on the Draft Report: 13th of January

Submission of the Final Report: 22nd of January

Annex 3 – Evaluation Matrix

The results achievement will be assessed against the following programme specific objectives and expected results:

Objectives	Expected results	
State and non-state actors are progressing towards having developed capacities to ensure access to fair and equal justice for poor and marginalized people	Civic groups and partner organisations in the target districts effectively support and represent the poor and marginalized people to claim their rights	International and national human rights instruments are domesticated, implemented and are effectively monitored by duty bearers
By 2013, the exploitation and oppression of women and girls in selected districts of Karamoja and Acholiland, Lango and Teso sub regions is reducing and they are increasingly enjoying equal rights and entitlements with men and boys in a conducive social- cultural and political – economic environment.	Women and other marginalized groups are increasingly taking action for the realization of their rights	Local civic action groups are proactively engaged and participating in decision making at local levels to ensure that duty bearers are accountable, entrench the culture of constitutionalism and good governance and work towards ensuring the realization of the rights of poor and marginalized people.
By 2013 Peace and Development policies, programmes and plans have a stronger focus on protecting and improving the quality of life, dignity and self-esteem of the conflict affected and marginalized people in selected districts in Karamoja, Acholi, Lango and Teso sub-regions	Community-led and collaborative peace and security initiatives involving poor and marginalized people are being implemented and the causes and effects of insecurity are reversed.	Communities have instituted coping mechanisms that enable them have sustainable livelihoods.

ANNEX 3 – EVALUATION MATRIX

Questions raised in ToRs	Indicators to be used in Evaluation	Methods	Sources	Availability and Reliability of Data /comments
Relevance				
To what extent did Diakonia add value/contribute to the partners' capacity in the relevant areas? What are the results of Diakonia added value to partners?	- Account of progress of thematic capacities in the areas of human rights, gender equity, democracy, conflict and justice - Account of increased skills and capacity in integrating gender and HRBA, project cycle management and results based management - Degree of broaden and/or deepened networking and alliance building	- Desk review - Focus group discussions (FGD) and interviews with partner organisations - Partner organisations will be asked to do a simple written self-assessment - External stakeholder interviews - Review of sample of partner reports	Diakonia reports Respondents statements Available organisational assessment of partners' institutional development (Diakonia) Partner reports Reports from existing networks and their agendas	Available and fairly reliable. Dependence of Diakonia as sole partner organisation might influence the responses from some partners. Lack of baseline will somewhat limit the possibility to assess the degree of the impact of the provided organisational development support.
Comments after the data collection	- The efforts to build and develop the capacities of the partner organisations have been many and most of the central areas for CD have been repeated in order to develop deeper understanding among the partners, the Workshops and other forms of capacity support is normally followed-up by Diakonia staff at individual level when monitoring visits are carried out. The narrative reporting has improved by various trainings on M&E, including RBM and data collection techniques; promotion of gender mainstreaming has led to gender equality action plans, improved quality in reporting and analysing the different situation and conditions for women and men. - Gender equality is highlighted as central issue in the partnerships, but the way the partner organisation address gender inequalities varies greatly. Not surprisingly the women's organisation focus on strategic issues that deprive women their rights, and have been able to also engage men in their promotion of gender equality. - The level of understanding of HRBA is assessed to be high, most of the partner organisations manifested the need to practice what you preach and focus both on internal and external matters in relation to accountability, transparency, participation and non-discrimination. The HRBA practice showed to be weakest in relation to the principle of non-discrimination, a more comprehensive power analysis within rights-holders group would benefit the programme's relevance. - The earlier annual reports have scarce information on the capacity development of the partner organisation and the reported activities are not related to any organisational assessment/baseline over areas that need to be developed. The last report has more substantial information on the matter. - Mainly the women's and youth organisations among the consulted partner organisations said that partnership with Diakonia had opened doors to other development partners, but also to seek synergies with civil society actors they had not worked with before. The learning forums held within the scope of the programme and other opportunities for experience sharing were also mentioned as contributing to stronger alliances. There were specific cases of new project funds, through Diakonia's intermediary role in relation to EU funds, the Dutch FLOW, We Effects regional gender programme (ACFODE) and the access to DGF (for example SUFO). The partners did only mention Diakonia Africa partner organisations from other regions that had played the role as facilitators (like SEND West Africa and Gender Links, support technically and financially facilitated through the Diakonia Africa regional programme African Economic Justice) not mention Diakonia's networks like the ACT alliance or other CSO allies.			
Are the achieved results (outcomes and impacts) assessed as relevant with regards to the current situation in Uganda and the Swedish results	- Level of fulfilment of programme objectives - Success stories (reported by Diakonia, partners and rights-holder) in the areas of human rights, gender equality, democracy,	- Identified outcomes and impact will be assessed in relation to the strategic areas and expected results of the Swedish results strategy for Uganda - External stakeholder interviews	Diakonia reports Respondents examples of MSC Sweden's results strategy Studies and reports on the current socio-economic situation	Most sources are assessed to be available and reliable, analysis dependent on the possibility to get access to the most recent development

ANNEX 3 – EVALUATION MATRIX

strategy 2014-2018	- peace and justice ▪ Degree of coherence between Diakonia's programme areas with Sweden's result strategy ▪ Degree of coherence between Diakonia's thematic and geographical focus and targeted rights-holders with findings from desk review of relevant studies and development strategies	• Desk review of relevant studies and reports and Ugandan development strategies	Current national development strategy, including regional strategies and the draft version of the new national development strategy. Respondents statements	strategies.
Comments after the data collection	▪ The lack of a programme baseline makes it difficult to assess the fulfilment of the thematic programme objectives as they are defined; the following can be said: ○ <i>State and non-state actors are progressing towards having developed capacities to ensure access to fair and equal justice for poor and marginalized people.</i> Partner organisations and rights-holder groups have strengthened their capacities in monitoring policy compliance and promoting human rights, but not to such a degree that it could be said they now are able to ensure fair and equal justice; the programme's influence over state actors is limited to isolated cases of local duty-bearers and a number of women councillors in several districts. ○ <i>By 2013, the exploitation and oppression of women and girls in selected districts of Karamoja and Acholi land, Lango and Teso sub regions is reducing and they are increasingly enjoying equal rights and entitlements with men and boys in a conducive social-cultural and political – economic environment.</i> The number of reported changes support the conclusion that the human rights abuses against women have reduced during the programme period, but it is rather in specific communities than on a general district level such change can be claimed to have occurred in most cases. Many consulted women rights-holders stated that their situation had improved and that they and their daughters were now treated with more respect. It is not possible to assess the level of improvement or the contribution of the programme to this changed situation since the objective is not related to any specific data on women's human rights in those locations. ○ <i>By 2013 Peace and Development policies, programmes and plans have a stronger focus on protecting and improving the quality of life, dignity and self-esteem of the conflict affected and marginalized people in selected districts in Karamoja, Acholi, Lango and Teso sub-regions.</i> The evaluation found little support that policies, programmes and plans had improved, it was however possible to see that local conflict management mechanisms had improved the self-esteem and the security of marginalised and conflict affected people. ▪ The programme is not particularly visible to other donors why because few examples of achievements could be provided in those interviews. ▪ Reported results in the annual reports were verified by rights-holders and local duty-bearers, mainly in regard to changes at community and individual level but also a number of the reported results at district level; few examples were verified at national level. ▪ The data collection gave at hand many examples of changes at individual and group level, the majority of the MSC stories referred to changes that had taken place the last 2-3 years, sometimes only the last year. Very few cases of change could be traced back to the first programme period, at least as part of interventions within the country programme. The behaviour changes that were raised by the partner organisations, duty-bearers and/or the rights-holders related to changed attitudes among traditional and local leaders', and by some men in the communities, towards women resulting in increased respect for women's rights (to voice an opinion, to be part of decision-making processes, to live without violence); stopped abuse of alcohol both among women and men and decreased incidence of gender based violence; awareness about and manifested support to girls' right to education; young people becoming organised and interested in paid work, family farming and engaging in community work; and local responses by duty-bearers to community monitoring and advocacy. ▪ The contribution of interventions by other actors (or same partner but with other funding) are not highlighted in Diakonia's reports, why it was difficult to discuss the level of joint efforts by the civil society (or by other development actors) with Diakonia and the partner organisations. ▪ The targeted regions and rights were found to be relevant, rates of poverty, illiteracy, lack of land access for women and other human right abuses against women are higher in the targeted regions than in the rest of the country. The post-conflict situation is still causing many social problems and people are poorly organised to defend their rights as citizens and community members.			

ANNEX 3 – EVALUATION MATRIX

	▪ Reported and verified result in general aligned with Sweden’s priorities in regard to the thematic areas that the programme covers, particularly in relation to strategic areas 1 and 4, and to lesser extent to the strategic areas 2 and 3. ▪ Reported and verified result aligned with the current NDP, including the relevance of the geographical focus.			
Impact				
Are there any positive (or negative) impacts on communities from the intervention? Any potential longer term impacts of the programme?	▪ Number and type of statements from consulted rights-holders on the contribution to substantial changes ▪ Number and type of statements from consulted local duty-bearers and other key actors on the contribution to substantial changes	• Interviews and focus group discussions • Use of MSC (referring to the two programme periods) • Desk review	Respondents statements Diakonia reports EoS comments and assessments in strategy reports and memos	The evaluation will only be able to consult a limited number of rights-holders, partners and external stakeholders why part of the impact assessment will be dependent on findings from the visited districts and general perception by other actors. The level of impact reporting in Diakonia reports will influence the assessment. MSC is an open ended method that may challenge our views of what are appropriate and intended outcomes.
Comments after the data collection	▪ Except from some cases of impact at individual or group level, the examples given during the consultation were foremost on an outcome level, and even then mostly on a local community level which makes it difficult to talk about social changes at impact level. For example, mobilisation and advocacy work in Acholi by SUFO has resulted in strategy plans for the young population and in some cases to access to local funds for youth activities, but the result of these achievement on young people’s lives are yet to be materialised. The work of AYDL has resulted in more students from the marginalised region of Karamoja join the government universities on affirmative quota system that is government sponsored which used to benefit students that had not necessarily studied from the region. ▪ Negative unexpected impact or rather outcome: Increased violence against mothers to daughters that have escaped FGM. ▪ Positive unexpected impact or rather outcome: Another unexpected but positive result is the trend of boys leaving cattle herding to attend school. It can be said that the increased value of education and the commitment among parents to send their children to school is a general effect of many of the awareness raising initiatives promoted by human rights organisations.			
What are the lessons that should be considered for any subsequent programme?	▪ Account of best practices highlighted by partners and Diakonia ▪ Account of innovative approaches apt for the local context ▪ Account of reflections on the necessity of different methods and/or approaches	• Interviews and focus group discussions with key stakeholders, partners and rights-holders	Partner statements Diakonia reports	
Comments after the data collection	▪ Many lessons learned relate to the partnership relation and programme management; other to the application of a more comprehensive understanding of gender perspective leading to a greater focus on the involvement of men in gender equality work. ▪ The gender awareness processes practiced internally in the partner organisation WORUDET prepare staff for a more effective work with the communities.			

	▪ The programme has started to discuss economic empowerment as a recipe for realisation of other human rights that is the linkage between economic opportunities and civil political rights and other socio-cultural rights. ▪ Most common was the reflection of the need of involving men and to embrace a more comprehensive gender equality approach. Several partners also raised the issue of the need to improve their advocacy strategies.			
Effectiveness				
To what extent have expected outcomes and impacts been achieved? What are the reasons for these achievements or non-achievements?	▪ Diakonia’s report on the programme’s indicators: ✓ <i>The increase of the number of marginalised people reporting cases of right abuse and violations and getting redress and support;</i> ✓ <i>Increase in the number of citizen groups monitoring and advocating for effective service delivery, policy implementation and practice</i> ✓ <i>Percentage of community members reporting improved services</i> ✓ <i>Number and quality of implementation of human rights instruments monitored, documented and reported on</i> ✓ <i>Number of laws, policies and regulations reviewed, reformed and adopted in favour of poor and marginalised people</i> ✓ <i>Action taken against discriminatory laws, policies and practices</i> ✓ <i>Number and type of documented GBV cases tried and actions taken against perpetrators</i> ✓ <i>Number of women and girls using knowledge and skills to protect themselves against GBV</i> ✓ <i>Number of civic groups engaged in planning and monitoring policy and government programmes</i> ✓ <i>Number of groups engaging with and monitoring corruption issues</i> ✓ <i>Reduced restriction on NGO operations</i> ✓ <i>Number of community led initiative geared</i>	• Desk review of Diakonia reports • Desk review of recent studies relating to the sub-regions • Interviews and focus group discussions • Use of MSC (referring to the two programme periods)	Respondents statements Diakonia reports Studies and reports on the current situation of the sub-regions where the programmes is being implemented EoS comments and assessments in strategy reports and memos	As above on impact. The level of outcome reporting in Diakonia reports will influence the assessment.

ANNEX 3 – EVALUATION MATRIX

	<i>towards conflict transformation</i> ✓ <i>Number of initiatives for youth integration and empowerment (economic and other-wise)</i> ✓ <i>Number of women and youth participating in conflict and justice initiatives</i> ✓ <i>Number of innovative and alternative livelihood approaches implemented by community groups</i> ✓ <i>Numer of disaster risk reduction and management initiatives undertaken by communities and the local government</i> • MSC statements that support the expected outcomes • Account of factors behind results achievement			
Comments after the data collection	▪ See comments above on relevance and impact. ▪ The evaluators compiled a working document with all reported results in the annual reports for the second programme period. This document was used as reference both for the team's preparations of the interviews and when analysing all the collected data. ▪ The annual reports do not report against the indicators. Only the last annual report 2013/2014 relates the results to the indicators in a special annex handed in on demand by the Embassy. Increase can only be compared to earlier years and not at a programme level due to lack of a baseline study. Given numbers are generally not contextualised why it is impossible to assess if the number of actions, number of reached rights-holders, etc. is a good enough, excellent or poor result. Some comments to the indicators are: ▪ Both duty-bearers and rights-holder informed that the number of reported cases of GBV had increased, the majority of the respondents were of the view that the actual violence had not increased but the awareness that GBV is a crime and the willingness to report. Local duty-bearers claimed that the improved response (cases taken to court) also had an impact on people's trust in the system and supported the trend to report cases. ▪ Most projects implemented by the partner organisations involves mobilisation of rights-holder to monitor the performance of local duty-bearers and many examples of local actions were given in the interviews. The evaluators assess that level of citizens' engagement in monitoring and advocating for improved services has increased in the target communities but it was not possible to assess the number of groups compared with the situation prior to the programme. ▪ Several examples were given on improved health services and the quality of education, including the number of qualified teacher, but percentage of community members reporting on improved services was not possible to assess. ▪ The partners active on national level have monitored and participated in processes related to debates on specific rights, shadow reports, regional and international meetings related to human rights instruments; the reports do not inform on the progress of implementation of human rights instruments. There is no overall account for number of laws, policies or regulations, in favour of poor and marginalised people; changes in by-laws at local level are highlighted but not presented (aggregated) in such a way that is possible to assess the overall impact of these local changes.			

ANNEX 3 – EVALUATION MATRIX

	- It has not been possible to assess the total number of groups for different civil actions (which is used in many of the indicators) or if the number of recorded actions is on an expected level (or on a higher or lower level) - On a general note it can be said that many of the MSC statements do relate to the pre-defined indicators, with a different monitoring/reporting system and a more structured documentation it might have been possible to compare the MSC stories with the data in Diakonia's M&E system. - Factors that were said to have contributed to the achievement of changes at individual and local level were the presence of the CSO and the continuous support to local groups working with awareness raising, methods focusing on personal responsibilities and commitments; the relationship with local duty-bearers also as partners (including allies at very local level in relation to higher levels) and the fact that they are invited to trainings and seminars organised by CSOs; endurance in actions of pressure on local duty-bearers.			
What are the unintended outcomes both positive and negative from this programme?	- MSC statements that indicate unexpected outcomes - Results in Diakonia reporting on unexpected outcomes	As above	As above	
Comments after the data collection	See above.			
How has HRBA and gender equality aspects been applied by Diakonia and the partner organisations in the programme cycle and to what extent has this had an impact on the outcomes. Also relevance	- MSC reflecting the practice or non-practice of HRBA and/or gender equality approach - Kind of gender aspects being addressed by partners in interviews - HRBA aspects being addressed by partners in interviews - Existence of plans and follow-up of the four key principles of HRBA (accountability, transparency, participation and non-discrimination) in the three thematic areas within Diakonia's and partner M&E systems" - Existence of plans and follow-up of gender equality dimensions in the three thematic areas within Diakonia's and partner M&E systems - Reported results that reflect the practice of HRBA at partner level (organisational and implementation) - Reported results that reflect the practice of gender mainstreaming and/or gender focus at partner level (organisational and implementation)	- Desk review of Diakonia reports - Interviews and FGD with partners, rights-holders and duty-bearers - Use of MSC (referring to the two programme periods) - Observations during interviews and FGD	Respondents statements Diakonia reports Observations during FGD and interviews	MSC might not at all reflect HRBA and gender, the evaluator might need to ask direct questions about HRBA practice and outcomes related to changes in gender equality. Observations during FGD and interviews with partner organisations on how they address and discuss (or do not mention) gender equality and HRBA dimensions will be used by the evaluators in their overall assessment.

ANNEX 3 – EVALUATION MATRIX

	Reported results that reflect HRBA and/or gender equality claims and the increased practice of HRBA and/or gender equality policies by duty-bearers			
Comments after the data collection	- The MSCs gave many examples of the understanding of the relation between rights-holder and duty-bearers and the necessity to claim rights and also monitor that gained rights are being respected and implemented; the partner organisations showed that the understanding of what meaningful and active participation had changed over time and that they were much more aware of women’s right to have a voice and the need to promote methods to increase the influence of women. - Transparency was discussed but mostly in relation to access to official information and to a lesser degree on the transparency mechanisms internally, including Diakonia’s own system for sharing information on programme specific processes. With some of the human rights or- ganisations the risks of being too transparent were discussed. - None of the interviewed organisations manifested that they actively seek to counteract different forms of discrimination or that they discuss power relations within and between different groups of members and/or rights-holders, the practice of non-discrimination is still being dealt with on a principle and more passive level. The organisations mainly mention gender inequality and to certain extent the lack of in- fluence of young people. Other groups like persons with disabilities, persons with HIV, or the LGBTI community were seldom mentioned if the evaluators did not raise specific questions related to their rights. - The focus on gender equality involves a broad range of issues, from women’s self-organisation to political leadership, GBV, access and control over land, right to education, relation to traditional leadership and customary systems, SRHR, etc. - The majority of the consulted organisations have advanced in their strategic gender equality planning, including developing gender policies and gender action plans. The evaluators were not able to directly assess if project plans or reporting had improved from a gender perspec- tive during the programme period but according to the self-assessment of the organisations they felt that they had made significant progress particularly after the last capacity development intervention led by the South African partner Gender Links. - The M&E structure does not include expected results or indicators that specifically relate to on the four principles of HRBA, the basic knowledge and the awareness of the importance of HRBA was however assessed to be on a rather high level both at Diakonia and the in- terviewed partner organisations.			
(Cost) Efficiency				
How do the systems and processes adopted by Diakonia relating to grant management have impact on the partner organizations, donor coordi- nation, offering platforms for partner networking, and capacity building for partner organizations etc.	- Level of flexibility of the grant system (agreement periods, opportunities to hand in proposal, adjustments for on-going pro- jects, etc.) - Existence and level of core funding - Existence of ad hoc/short term funds for advocacy initiatives - Level of compliance with the grant system (both Diakonia staff and partners) - Level of harmonisation with and/or influ- ence over other relevant grant mechanisms	- Review of the grant management guide- lines and their application - Interviews with Diakonia programme staff (half day session) - Interviews with a selection of partner organisations on the grant management - Interviews with donors with insight on Diakonia’s programme management	Guidelines and instructions Templates used Sample of applications, assessment and decision memos, etc. Diakonia reports Donor and partner statements on the pro- gramme management and grant system	

ANNEX 3 – EVALUATION MATRIX

Comments after the data collection	- Grants period are in general the same as the programme period, for new partners the practice of a first shorter agreement is applied. There are no call for proposal, Diakonia identifies the partner organisations, programme objectives are shared with the partner and the partners are expected to be well aware of the programme's overall and specific objectives and link their own objectives to those. Partner organisations say that they get good support by Diakonia to develop their proposal, and even draft versions of reports. The evaluators found however that approved projects did not always consider the most central perspectives and approaches, like for example in the case of one of the most recent projects, the one implemented by UWOPA that lacks plans for how to follow-up and monitor the mentoring support. This somewhat contradict the statements of support to develop proposals so that they are coherent with the programme. - There are additional funds available for capacity development and advocacy efforts but procedures on how and when to apply for these funds are not known by all and therefore not very transparent. It is equally possible to adjust the project budget (when and if there are funds available) on the proposal of the partner organisations, but this is only done with what Diakonia label as the pro-active partners. This mechanism is not known by all partners according to the Diakonia team. - Diakonia uses templates for proposals and reporting, these have been discussed with the partner group and adjustments have been made on the request by partners. Diakonia also supports those partners that so require with the development of M&E system and strategy planning. - Only one partner receives core funding. - There is no coordination regarding templates, project or report periods report with other civil society supports why the grant mechanism is not harmonised with other funds. In the case of core funding donor coordination takes place and the partner produce one report to all donors.. - Experiences from the programme and grant management have been shared with other funding CSOs and the DGF			
Have the programme inputs like funds, expertise, and time resources, been used in an efficient manner in relation to what has been achieved?	- Relations between partner agreements and programme staff - Type of capacity development initiatives and degree of satisfaction - Response to partner reports and support planned and implemented due to findings in the reports - Number of field monitoring visits - Number and type of partner dialogue meetings - Application of RBM	- Interviews with Diakonia programme staff - Interviews with a selection of partner organisations - Desk review	Diakonia narrative and financial reports	
Comments after the data collection	2 programme officers and 2 financial/administrative officers for 15 partners (including earlier EU funds and FLOW) - All central perspectives to Diakonia have been promoted through workshops throughout the implementation of the programme, including mainstreaming of gender and environmental issues and advocacy strategies, - Partner organisations have reviewed Diakonia as a partner/donor and the satisfaction with the capacity development efforts is high. This was confirmed during the data collection, but remarks were made that they need to be more tailor made and more organisational specific which implies less of bigger workshops for all and more interventions targeting a smaller group or individual partner organisations. - Partner reports receive written comments and are followed-up during monitoring visits. Some of the consulted partners claimed that the comments sometimes come very late. 2 monitoring field visits per organisation as standard, plus additional visits on demand or in coordination with partner organisations' events			

	RBM has been promoted through several trainings and is progressively being implemented. There is a need to continue to develop data collection and documentation skills, as well as focus on indicators (process and progress indicators) at outcome level.			
Sustainability				
Are the identified and recorded positive changes likely to be sustainable for the communities, rights-holders and civil society organisations involved in the programme?	- Diakonia’s indicators above that are relevant for the issue of sustainability will be used - Duration of formed community groups and local initiatives from the first phase - Account of extended coalitions and alliances with national and international actors - Existence of initiatives by duty-bearers in response to rights-holders/CSO claims as a result of the programme implementation	- External stakeholder interviews - Interviews and FGD with rights-holder and partners - Desk review	Reports from rights-holder and partners on changes from the first period Duty-bearer statements or reference to local commitments in reports and studies	
Comments after the data collection	- Rights-holder groups that already existed when the programme started have been supported to grow. - Few cases identified during the data collection of strategies for maintaining new grass-root organisation, there was little focus on more long-term mobilisation strategies and/or using already existing CBOs as examples. - Groups tend to be organised more around activities than processes. - The interaction with local duty-bearers happens on several levels, including capacity development which creates a good foundation for more long-term relationships and functions as an introduction to new leaders to the roles of the civil society.			

Annex 4 – Consulted documents

Programme specific

- Uganda Programme Proposal Application to Sida 2008-2010, Diakonia
- Supplements to Diakonia's Uganda Programme Proposal 2008-2010, 2007-12-07
- Uganda Country Context Analysis Report 2010, Basil Kandyomunda Maude Mugisha, Diakonia, July 2010
- Uganda Country Programme 2008-2010, Mid-Term Review Report, Diakonia, Reviewers Maude Mugisha and Basil Kandyomunda, June 2010
- Uganda Country Programme, Final Programme Report 2008- June 2011, Diakonia
- Uganda Country Programme Proposal 2011-2013
- Mid-Term Review of the country programme 2011-2014 implemented by support from the Embassy of Sweden in Uganda, Final Report, prepared by Diakonia Country Office, Uganda, Consulting Team: Pascal Odoch, PhD and Ms. Agnes Kabajuni, March 2014
- MTR Follow-up Plan for Diakonia, Review of the Uganda country program II Supported by the Sida/Embassy of Sweden in Uganda
- Country Programme, Final programme report 2008-2011, Diakonia
- Uganda Country Programme, Addendum to the final report (JAN – DECEMBER 2011), Diakonia
- Diakonia Annual Report Uganda Office, July 2011 – June 2012
- Diakonia Annual Report Uganda Office, July 2012 – June 2013, including Annex I: Partner achievements during the reporting period (JULY 2012 – JUNE 2013)
- Diakonia Annual Report Uganda Office , Annual report July 2013 – June 2014, including financial report
- Annual programme indicator matrix reporting, July-June 2014
- Decision on Assessment and Preparation of Contribution to Diakonia Country Programme, Embassy of Sweden, Uganda, 2011-05-09
- Statement of Narrative and Financial report, Diakonia Civil Society II, Embassy of Sweden, Kampala, 2012-12-06
- Diakonia Programme Operational Areas (June 2008 – Dec 2014)
- Monitoring and Evaluation Framework Uganda Country Programme, updated version October 10, 2013
- Draft Manual for Partnership Development and Management, 23 September 2014, Diakonia Uganda, including 15 annexes.
- Checklist for Financial and Administrative Capacity Assessment, Partner Capacity Assessment Tool (Finance, Accounting and Administration) Diakonia

Capacity building

- Assessment Tool COU-PDR; AYDL; Acfode, TIP. WORUDET, HURIFO, HURINET-U, SUFO (2014)
- Summary of the organisational capacity building assessments of partners organisations, including COU-PDR, AYDL, TIP AND ACFODE
- Capacity building plan HURIFO 2015, SUFO 2015, WORUDET
- Diakonia Uganda Partner Institutional Development Plan – Final January 2013 – Dec 2014
- General capacity areas for JPC 2014
- Partner Capacity Assessment Report 2014
- Outcome and Impact-Oriented Planning and Monitoring, Results Based Management, Traing Workshop for Diakonia Uganda Partners 20-24-October 2008
- Rights-based and gender equality, Diakonia Partners’ Training Report. 29 November – 4 December 2009
- Outcome and Impact-Oriented Planning and Monitoring, Results Based Management, Traing Workshop for Diakonia Uganda Partners 24-28 May 2010
- Environment Lens Training For Diakonia Partners 2012, Training Workshop Report, 2425 April 2012, Diakonia
- Partners Monitoring & Evaluation Meeting Report, Strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation of Diakonia’s Work with Partners, 30 July – 3 August 2012, Diakonia
- Partners Learning Forum, Strengthening Organisational Effectiveness through critical Reflection and Learning, 26-28 November 2012, Diakonia
- Partner Do No Harm Training Workshop 4-5 February 2013, Diakonia
- Rights Based Approach Training for LAZIDEP, 26-28 February, 2013, Abim, District, Training Report, Diakonia
- Partners’ Peer Review Workshop, 9-11 July 2013, Diakonia
- Diakonia and Partner Gender Audit Report 23-27 September 2013, Facilitated by Gender links for equality and justice
- Diakonia Gender Mainstreaming Workshop Report, 21-25 October 2013, prepared by Gender links for equality and justice
- Partners Advocacy Participatory Monitoring & EvalautionWorskhop Report, June 2014, (SEND Ghana), Diakonia

Sample of information material from partner organisations

- Tee-Ibu, Bold and Empowered Citizenry Transforming Governance and Gender Accountability in Lango Sub region, Acfode Booklet, no date(Project period described 2011-2013)
- Youth Vision 2026, “Youth Voices for a Transformed Uganda”, African Youth Development Link
- A Study Report ON the Analysis of the Implementation of the African Youth Charter in Uganda, Promoting Youth Participation in Development, AYDL 2014
- Corporal Punishment, The Examiner Biannual Publication for Human Rights Focus (HURIFO), Issue 1 2014

Diakonia other reports and documents

- Diakonia Civsam report; B. 3 Africa 2008 – 2010
- Diakonia Civsam Africa Narrative report, 2011
- Africa regional progress report 2013, AFRICA REGION: Regional summary progress report 2013

Swedish strategy and other

- Samarbetsstrategi för utvecklingssamarbetet med Uganda mars 2009 – december 2013, Regeringskansliet, 2009-03-19
- Strategirapport för Uganda 2010, Promemoria, Sida, 2010-11-17
- Strategirapport för Uganda september 2010 – augusti 2011, Promemoria, Sida, 2011-10-20
- Strategirapport för Uganda september 2011 – september 2012, Sida
- Strategirapport för Uganda Del 1: Rapportering av strategigenomförande och resultat, september 2012 – september 2014, Sida
- Resultatstrategi för Sveriges utvecklingssamarbete med Uganda 2014-2018, Regeringskansliet, 2014-07-24
- Sweden's development cooperation with Uganda 2011, Brief summary of current and planned contributions, 2011-04-19
- Gender analysis, Chris Coulter, Ashanut P. Okille/Indevelop, Embassy of Sweden Uganda, 2013-10-16
- Conflict Analyses for the Great Lakes Regions: DRC, Rwanda and Uganda Sida Helpdesk on Human Security, Bradford University, Saferworld and Sthlm Policy Group, Draft Report, Submitted: 27 August 2013
- Prevention and the role of men and boys is also specifically highlighted in Sida's steering document related to GBV, Sidas verksamhetsinriktning med arbetet att motverka könsrelaterat våld 2013-2015, Promemoria, Sida, 2013-02-07

Uganda policies, strategies and other references

- National Development Plan 2010/2011-2014/2015, Republic of Uganda
- Second National Development Plan 2015/16-2019/20, Republic of Uganda, Draft 1, 5th September 2014

Other

- Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2013, Uganda Demographic and Health Survey
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2011, Uganda Demographic and Health Survey
- The 2011 CSO Sustainability Index for Sub-Saharan Africa. USAID
- World Bank, 2013b, Second National Development Plan

Annex 5 – Consulted Stakeholders

Partner organisations

Regina Bafaki, Executive Director	Action for Development, ACFODE
Ahmed Hadji	African Youth Development Link, AYDL
Secondina Apio, Project Assistant	AYDL-Abim
John Otuko, Senior Accountant	Church of Uganda, Planning Dev't and Rehabilitation, COU-PDR
	Diocese of Kitgum (DOK)
Francis K. Otto, Psychosocial Counsellor for Kalaka	DOK
Makarios Ongom, Paralegal – Labwa	DOK
Irene Auma, Psychosocial Counsellor for Labwa	DOK
David Olango, CBPSP – Kulaka	DOK
Geoffrey Onen-can, CBPSP – Kulaka	DOK
Jimmy Odong, CBPSP-Labwa	DOK
Catherine Atimango, Psychosocial Counsellor for Labwa	DOK
Otto Aldo Lutwara, Psychosocial Counsellor for Ligiligi	DOK
Johnson Otim, Psychosocial Counsellor for Kulaka	DOK
Geoffrey Nyeko, Psychosocial Counsellor for Lalal	DOK
Julius Omony, Project Officer	DOK
Yasinto Okidi Okot, Ag. Executive Director	DOK
Dixon Odur, Documentation Officer	DOK
	DOK
Stella Kelik	DOK
Patricia Munaabi Babiha, Executive Director	Forum for Women in Democracy, FOWODE
Ndifuna Mohammed, Chief Executive Officer	Human Rights Network-Uganda HURINET-U
Steven Odong, Programme's Manager	HURINET-U
Goretti Okello Odoki, Dep. Executive Director	Human Rights Focus (HURIFO), Gulu District
James Okello Owov, Finance & Administrative Manager	HURIFO, Gulu District
Justin Awang, Resource Centre Assistant	HURIFO, Gulu District
Cynthia Ayaa Komakec, Research & Advocacy	HURIFO, Gulu District
Elizabeth Lomunu Peace, Human Rights Protection Officer	HURIFO, Gulu District
Job Collins Okello, Chief Executive Officer	Summit Foundation, SUFO, Gulu District
Amnon Bwoch, Former Programme Manager	Labwor Zonal Development Programme, LAZIDEP
	LAZIDEP
Lillian Violet Acheng, Former Staff	SUFO, Gulu District
Paska Lanyero Otto, Chief Development Representative	SUFO, Gulu District
Jouan Atim Oduka, Local Accountability Programme Officer	SUFO, Gulu District
Christophe Okello, Deepening democracy Programme Officer	SUFO, Gulu District
Charles Okello, Monitoring & Evaluation	SUFO, Gulu District
Ronald Ngobi, Finance & Admin. Assistance	SUFO, Gulu District
Emma Olara Ivans, Deepening democracy Programme Assistant	SUFO, Gulu District
Martine Akullu, Finance & Admin, Officer	SUFO, Gulu District
Ronald Ogwang, Local Accountability, Programme Assistant	SUFO, Gulu District
Michael Odeke, Executive Director	Teso Initiative For Peace, TIP
Stephen Makumbi, Programme Coordinator	TIP
Philip Osodo, Programme Officer	TIP
Muhammad Ayub, Communications Officer	TIP
Rev. Can. Erinayo Oryema, District Coordinator Agago	Uganda Joint Christian Council, UJCC
Mary Filder Nyeko, Facilitator	UJCC
Rita Aciro Laker, Executive Director	Uganda Women's Network, UWONET
Julian Naluwooza, Social Worker	UWONET
James Olweny, B.O.G Programmes	FOKAPAWA (partner to UWONET)
David Oryem, Programme Officer	FOKAPAWA

Alex Ogwal, Project Officer	UWOPA
Aldo Olwoch, Programme Officer	Women and Rural Development Network (WORUDET), Lamwo District
Brenda Akot, Social worker	WORUDET, Lamwo District
Jimmy Lawa, Social worker	WORUDET, Lamwo District
Simon Olanya, Social worker	WORUDET, Lamwo District
Martin Etolu, Programme Manager	ZOA
Ijala Simon Peter, Senior Project Officer	ZOA
Justin Tabu, Project Manager Civic Education	ZOA
Merabu Alosikin, Project Officer-Diakonia & Acting Gender Focal Person	ZOA
Carol Cheputo, FAL Trainer	ZOA
Samuel Maraka, Project Officer	POZIDEP

Rights-holder representatives and traditional leaders

1. Northern Youth Alive Multi-purpose UgandaGulu/Summit Foundation

Richard Opique,	Thomas Omony
Bukenya Okeny .	Kenneth Ouma
Charles Opio	Liam Otim
Mercy Akello	Racifael Latien
Nancy Bridget Ataa	Jennifer Aber
Propser Amony	Patrick Onigu

2. Kal Youth Group/Summit Foundation

Kevin Ajoka Aromo	Lilly Grace Aceng
Florence Alur	Stella Aciro
Richard Achellam Boliface	Beatrice Abur
Winnie Akello Oola	Kevin Lakara-Ser
Joseph Ochan	Prossy Amltee
Alfred Ocitti	Kenedy Ochola

3. Oru Ki Acholi, Women's group/HURIFO

Teddy Okot, Chairperson Elders Forum, Lokum	Devince Ocan, Ex. Member Elders Forum, Lokum
Martin Nyeko, Chief, Head of Rwodi Kweri	Betty Arach, member
Santa Aciro, member	John Okidi, member
Alex Omeda, member	James Orama, member
Josephine Amito, Chairperson	Finens Ija Okech, member
Evalin Atoo, member	Leyotina Lapido, member
Santa Abuke, member	Paska Adule, member
Balbina Acayo, member	Mangure Achol, member
Nora Langoya, member	Colin Awo, member
Paska Achola, member	Kandida Laluka, member
Santa Achola, member	Tereza Acan, member
Beatrice Achola, member	Bironica Arach, Vice persons
Florence Acayo, member	Leorina Akollo, member
Florence Lakot, member	Ida Adoko, member
Magdalena Ayoo, member	Vikey Anek, member
Grace Atim, member	Valent B. Nyeko, member

4. Mixed FGD rights-holders/WORUDET

Wilfred Ujelo, Male role model, Padibe West	Wilson Omapa, Counsellor as Couple, Lokung
Sabina Achao, Women's network, Lokung	Grace Akello, Task Force, Padibe West
Simon Oringa, Couple, counsellor, Lokung	Betty Abalo, Couple, counsellor, Lokung
Julius Peter Olung, Chairperson and Task Force,	Florence L. Auma, Chairperson and Women's

Padibe East

network, Padibe East

Nyero Augustine Ceaser CSO Focal Person
NUDIPU

Local NGO working together with WORU-
DET, participated in mixed FGD with local
dut-bearers

5. Funcational Adult Literacy students, Naremit Village Centre Class A, Amudat/ ZOA

Lokwono Mary
NokonoIsaya
Chepnyono Selma
KajereLonah
Chepotapolile Rose
Mailil Musa

Niak
Chepchorok Christine
Siwamwai Michael
Samuel
Ema

6. A group of 23 Pupils of Kalas (20 Girls and 3 boys)/ ZOA

7. Lapino United to Work (LUW)- Rights holders under UWONET

Aciro Alice, Member
Okidi Gaudine Leyes, Field Officer
Obwona Robert Falton, Member
Aryemo Anna , Member
Olwoch
Ouma Paul, Project Officer

Lokot Hellen Adok, Office Assistant
Okidi A. Acellam, Member
Alonyo Jennifer, Programme Coordinator
Okello James John, Member
Odong Francis, Field Officer
Okello John, Chair- Board of Directors

8. Adeta Young Stars Youth Group/ Rights holders under TIP

Okiror Patrick Chairperson
Auro Sarah Member
Abulo Stella Treasurer
Eidn Samuel Member
Anebi Peter Mobiliser
Etori Filbert Member
Odeke John Former Chairperson and Advisor
Opio Francis Member
Apio Jessica Member
Aduto Agnes Member

ApolotMagdaline Member
Aleju Joseph Member
Angiro Michael Member
Otyanite James Vice- Chairperson
Amou Michael Member
Otim Moses Secretary
Akiteng Mary Member
Eyaru John Member
Omulei John Bosco Member
OngoleIsreal Member

9. Obalang Sub-county Village Budget Club- Rights holders under FOWODE

Ayoko Joyce Mary, Chairperson
Aboyo Janet,
Akello Mary Kevin Chairperson Agesi/ Oba
Apolot Paul,
Osege Richard
Olemy John
Okello Moses
Opio Joseph

Okello Paul
AgimoCristin
Adito Joyce
Ayaro Jenifer
EkomuJullius
Eriau Max
Ebulu Robert
R

10. Kalas Girls' Primary School Parents and Head Teacher

LomerengAnnah
CheponyoriaEvalyne
Lonwino Paulina
Arele Veronica
Opuwa Anna
Chepokitipa Maria
Chepokatekok Susan

Cheposetem Mary
Chenuket Celina
Chemengea Liliana
NakoloPricelia
Kocherelin Mary
CheptaiAnnet
Sister Magdalene Nantongo Head Teacher

11. FGD for rights-holder under AYDL

Amony Alice, Patong Town Council
 Adong Agnes Florence, Otalabar Village,
 Awori Prossy, DFCU Bank, Abim

Okot James Menyamoi, Patong Town Council
 Abura Jimmy, Abim Town Council
 Akello Susan, Abim

12. FGD (several groups) for rights-holders from different groups under LAZIDEP

Oguwan G. S.P, Oretta village
 Alwoch Agnes, Wilela
 Tolit Dickson, Wilela
 Ogowang Florence, Kiru
 Edisa Ogowang, Kiru
 Abodo Sarah, Akwangagwel
 Otim Akasa Kakas, Owamuge

Ogolla Job, Kiru CDA
 Abonyo Anjilina, Wilela
 Loumo Denis, Wilela
 Akech Dorcus, Kiru
 Ongom Christine, Kiru
 Awuli Rose Scovia, Wilela

13. FGD for rights holders under JPC

Owiner Joel, Parish Justice Peace Centre
 (PFPC), Kotomor
 Okwii Dickens, PJPC Kotomor
 Odong Moses, PJPC Kotomor
 Angom Dorine, PJPC Omiya Pacwa
 Odora Mathew, PJPC Omiya Pacwa
 Oryema David, PJPC Omiya Pacwa
 Onyinga John Apio, Kotomor

Kimons Joseph Atuka, Kotomor
 Otim Jasper, PJPC Kotomor
 Onini Lamek, PJPC Kotomor
 Ayoo Christine, PJPC Parabongo
 Abalo Lojina, PJPC Omiya Pacwa
 Ocen Bosco, Kotomor
 Opio Bonifess, community member, Kotomor

Diakonia

Annabel Ogowang Okot, Country Manager
 Eric Abima, Grants & Compliance Officer
 Mikidat Kibirige, Finance & Admin. Officer
 Dinah Joy Okono, Programme Officer & Gender
 Focal Person & M&E Officer
 Andrew Thomas Bagoole, Programme Officer
 Patrick Oringa, Programme Officer, Gulu
 Luz Baastrup, former Deputy Regional Director

Diakonia Uganda
 Diakonia Uganda
 Diakonia Uganda
 Diakonia Uganda
 Diakonia Uganda
 Diakonia Uganda
 Diakonia Uganda, Field Office in Gulu
 Diakonia Regional Office, Nairobi

Duty-bearers

Margaret Ajok, Technical Advisor, Transitional
 Justice
 David Opwonwa, Deputy Chief Administrative
 Officer.
 Patrick Jimmy Okema, Public Relations
 Douglass Peter Okello, Speaker
 Opira Walter, Community Development Officer
 Olebe Richard Burton, Councillor
 Ojara Sisto Ben, Chairperson 111
 Omony Geoffrey, Gombolola Internal Security
 Officer
 Rwot Omal Alfred, RWOT
 Odech Lawrence, Officer in Charge
 Oyet Richard, Community Development Officer
 Arach Hellen, LC Chairperson
 Abalo Agnes, Councillor
 Ojok Edward, Parish Chief
 Atumo Josephine Aleu, Female District Councillor
 Akol Ketti, Female District Councillor
 Anyilat Mary, Female District Councillor
 Asimo Jane, Female District Councillor

The Justice Law and Order Sector, Ministry of
 Justice
 Gulu District
 Police. Gulu District/ Acholi Sub-region
 Gulu District
 Padibe West
 Padibe East
 Padibe East
 Omiya Pacwa
 Padibe Town Council
 Padibe West
 Lokung
 Lokung
 Lokung Town Council
 Kotomor
 Amuria District
 Amuria District
 Amuria District
 Amuria District

Obwona David Komakech, Chairperson LC111	
Oling Jacob, Chairperson LC111	Kotomor Sub-County
Ochaya Geoffrey Amot, Sub-county Chief	Kotomor
Okot Fred Yoromoi, Parish Chief	Kotomor
Chelain Dorcus, Female LC V Councillor Representing PWDs	Amudat
Hon. Akello Susan Jenny, Female Deputy Mayor	Abim Town Council
Akidiny Salome, Female Sub- County Chief	Patong
Hon. Okech Basil Obwon, LCV Councillor	Morulem
Okello Churchhill, Speaker	Patong Town Council (PTC)
Okello David Obina, Chairperson LC111	PTC
Opio Raymong Asega, LC 111 Chairperson	Lapino S/ County
Olwit Nelson, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer	Abim District
<u>Donors and international CSOs</u>	
Majbrit Holm Jakobsen, Counsellor, Politics & Governance	Danida, Royal Danish Embassy
Chemisto Satya Ali, Advisor, WASH	SNV, Netherlands Development
Christian Raitz Von Frentz	EU Delegation
Sophie Racine, Component Manager, Rights, Justice and Peace	Democratic Governance Facility, DGF



Evaluation of Swedish support to the Diakonia Uganda Programme 2008-2014

This final evaluation commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden assesses the relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency and sustainability of a human rights, gender equality and justice programme implemented by Diakonia and Ugandan civil society organisations in Karamoja, Acholi, Lango and Teso. Based on consultations with over 300 stakeholders, the evaluators found the programme to be relevant to the Swedish development strategy for Uganda and the national and local contexts. The programme has delivered important changes at local level but to become more effective and to achieve the long-term objectives, Diakonia and the partners need to secure a better coordination between the many projects.

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

