

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
1.1	About the Evaluation	1
1.2	About the Inception Report.....	1
2.	Work done to-date.....	2
3.	Confirmation of Conceptual Approach and Methodology	3
3.1	Specific objectives of the Evaluation.....	3
3.2	General understanding of the scope of the assignment and the envisaged outputs.....	4
3.3	The Evaluation Framework.....	5
3.3.1	Conceptual Frameworks	5
3.3.2	Evaluation Matrix	6
3.4	Sources of Evidence.....	8
3.4.1	Review of Aid Delivery Instruments	8
3.4.2	Review of Aid Effectiveness Mechanisms	8
3.4.3	Performance Assessment Frameworks	9
3.4.4	Review of country level dialogue, relationships and decision making..	9
3.4.5	Review of approaches to Strengthen Country Systems	9
3.5	Evaluation Tools	10
3.5.1	Literature Review and On-Line Sources.....	10
3.5.2	Key Informant Interviews	10
3.5.3	Focus Group Discussions.....	10
3.5.4	Stakeholder Consultation Workshop	11
3.6	Approach to Selection of Information Sources.....	11
3.7	Proposed Analytical Approach	12
4.	Steps to Completion of the Assignment.....	12
5.	Study Limitations.....	13
6.	Annexes.....	15
6.1	Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration in Uganda	16
6.2	Annex 2: Updated Workplan	22
6.3	Annex 3: Documents for Review.....	23
6.4	Annex 4: Evaluation Framework	24
6.5	Annex 5: Draft Table of Contents for Main Report.....	32
6.6	Annex 6: List of People Met.....	35
6.7	Annex 7: OECD Paris Declaration Country Level Evaluation Summary Worksheet	36

Acronyms

A	Alignment
AfDB	African Development Bank
AIM	Aid Information Map
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CP	Country Partner
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
DoL	Division of Labour Exercise
DP	Development Partner
EC	European Commission
FDT	Financial Data Tool
EU	European Union
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
GBS	General Budget Support
GoU	Government of Uganda
H	Harmonisation
HLF	High level forum
IDA	International Development Association
IMF	International Monetary Fund
JLOS	Justice, Law and Order sector
LDPG	Local Development Partner Group
MA	Mutual Accountability
MDR	Managing for Development Results
M & E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MFPEd	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTEF	Medium-Term Expenditure Framework
NC	National Consultant
NGO	Non governmental organisation
O	Ownership
ODA	Official Development Assistance
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OPM	Office of the Prime Minister
PAC	Public Accounts Committee
PD	Paris Declaration
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PR	Peer Review
PRBS	Poverty Reduction Budget Support
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
PRSC	Poverty Reduction Support Credit
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Programme
SEATINI	Southern and Eastern African Trade Information and Negotiations Institute
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SWAps	Sector-Wide Approaches

SWG	Sector Working Group
TL	Team Leader
TTM	Transtheoretical model of behaviour change
UJAS	Uganda Joint Assistance Strategy
UK	United Kingdom
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank

1. Introduction

1.1 About the Evaluation

The Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration in Uganda is part of a global study proposed by the DAC Development Evaluation Network to contribute to the process of continuous learning and the strengthening of outcomes of the Paris Declaration. The Paris Declaration itself was endorsed on the 2nd March 2005 by over one hundred Heads of Governments and Head of Agencies and institutions managing and receiving development aid. It is an international agreement to which several countries including Uganda, committed themselves to harmonisation, alignment and management of aid for results, based on an agreed set of *monitorable* actions and indicators.

The **overall purpose** of the evaluation is to assess the performance of the implementation of the Paris Declaration at its mid-point to the 2010 targets. The mid-term evaluation is also expected to feed into an impact evaluation scheduled for 2009/10. The **specific purpose** is to assess what constitutes better practices for partner and development partner behaviour in regard to implementation of the Paris Declaration. As a mid-term evaluation, it will focus on assessing the performance to-date (inputs to outputs) and evidence of progress and direction made towards the intended outcomes. It is also aimed at seeking out early lessons from the implementation process of the Paris Declaration in order to deliver practical lessons and help take stock of implementation performance at the 3rd High-Level Forum (HLF) on Aid Effectiveness to be held in Accra, Ghana in September 2008.

The global evaluation of the Paris Declaration covers both the development partner agencies and the partner countries, of which Uganda is a part. Hence the evaluation in Uganda is being carried as part of other on-going Country Level Evaluations. Furthermore, according to the Terms of Reference for the study (Annex 1), the Uganda Country Level Evaluation not only seeks to complement the on-going monitoring of the implementation of the Paris Declaration, undertaken through the Joint Venture on Monitoring, but will feed into the on-going PEAP Evaluation process that is going to inform the development of the new planning framework for Uganda in 2008/09.

1.2 About the Inception Report

This Inception report has been prepared in fulfillment of Section 6 (a) of the Terms of Reference for the Country Level Evaluation in Uganda¹, which require the evaluation team to produce an Inception Report that sets out the following:

- *“A contextualized evaluation approach and framework based on the outlined evaluation questions of the study ToRs;*
- *A methodology for selection of respondents (sector and geographical focus), including identification of relevant information sources;*
- *Data collection methods and draft tools (interview guide, questionnaire, etc”;*

¹ For detailed ToRs, see Annex 1 of this report.

- *Processes for institutional learning during the evaluation; and*
- *A detailed (updated) workplan”.*

The report has six sections including this introductory part. The second is a record of the work done to-date, covering the first three weeks of the assignment. The third section discusses the conceptual framework and methodology developed based on the specific objectives of the study. The section reaffirms and further develops the conceptual approach offered in Jimat’s Technical Proposal for the assignment. General understanding of the assignment has been strengthened with the briefing by the Evaluation Committee, three weeks of consultations with stakeholders, and the review of some of the documents provided. With the new information acquired, the Evaluation Team has fully developed the Evaluation Framework for the assignment guided by the outline proposed by Jimat in Section 5 of the Technical Proposal. It also includes the approach to selection of information sources and the analytical approach to be adopted.

The fourth section discusses the next steps to completion of the assignment, including an updated workplan. This is followed by a highlight of the study limitations and issues relating to the reorganization of the work in Section 5.

Finally, the report contains a number of annexes, listed here as follows: (1) the Terms of Reference for the study; (2) updated workplan (Gantt chart containing an updated activity schedule); (3) list of documents for review; (4) the proposed evaluation framework; (5) a draft Table of Contents for the main report; (6) list of people interviewed to-date (i.e., first three weeks of assignment); and (7) the OECD Summary Worksheet, which is **an addendum to the ToRs**. The Inception report has been kept brief as much work has already gone into preparing a preliminary findings report (Synopsis) for input into the global evaluation.

2. Work done to-date

The PD Evaluation in Uganda commenced on 18 February 2008 with a start-up preparatory meeting between the National Consultant and the Evaluation Committee overseeing the Country Level Evaluation (see Annex 2 for updated workplan). In the first week, the NC prioritized the identification of information sources, such as key persons to interview (Annex 6) and the main documents to review (Annex 3). In addition, the NC set up some of the appointments for key meetings with stakeholders to be interviewed, mainly in central government and in the development partner community.

During the first week, the Team Leader also reviewed some of the key documents that were provided, including the Terms of Reference, the 2005 Paris Declaration, the 2006 Survey on the Monitoring of the Paris Declaration in Uganda, the 2007 Interim Report on the Uganda Development Partner Division of Labour Exercise and the 2006 Uganda Aid Information Map.

The second week commenced with travel to Uganda by the Team Leader on 24th February. The Team met the Evaluation Committee on Monday, the 25th of February

2008 for a full briefing on the assignment. During the briefing, the evaluation team was apprised of the objectives and scope of the evaluation as well as the conceptual framework underpinning the assessment. Section 3 of this report builds on this framework. The Evaluation Committee also provided the study team with initial suggestions on key stakeholders to be consulted, only as a starting point. After this briefing, the evaluators met the Austrian Development Cooperation².

Given the urgency to prepare a preliminary findings report by 1 March to feed into the global evaluation, much of the work during the second week focused on targeted interviews of key informants and prioritized reading of literature in order to inform the production of the first deliverable – the Synopsis Report. A list of people met and interviewed to-date is presented at Annex 6. Having collected sufficient information for the first report, the consultants spent much of the period, 28 February – 4th March, writing the first report. The report was submitted a separate volume.

During the remainder of the third week³ the consultants continued with the setting up additional appointments for the main data collection phase, drafting the evaluation framework, and the interview checklists, reviewing literature and preparing this Inception Report. Hence, this document constitutes the output of the 3rd week of the assignment.

3. Confirmation of Conceptual Approach and Methodology

The conceptual approach and methodology is based on the specific objectives of this mid-term evaluation. It is important therefore to list them first (in section 3.1 below) then proceed to elaboration of the study approach.

3.1 Specific objectives of the Evaluation

According to the ToRs, the **specific objectives** of the evaluation are to:

- Assess how effectively the principles have been translated into specific actions in Uganda;
- Determine whether and how effectively the PD has built upon pre-existing partnership principles and agreements in Uganda;
- Determine how effective the implementation of the PD has been in Uganda against its own objectives and targets, as a basis to assess what (if anything) needs to change and for the purpose of international comparison;
- Determine whether the current pattern of implementation is likely to result in the intended outcomes, in part measured by the indicators and associated targets;
- Determine the extent and causes of positive behavioural changes implied by the implementation of the PD, both amongst development partners (donors), the government and other actors;
- Provide the evidence base for the final impact evaluation of 2009/10;
- Review the monitoring framework and determine its utility and continued relevance;

² This PD Evaluation for Uganda has been funded by the Austrian Development Agency.

³ After a busy weekend writing the Synopsis, consultants took a short break on Wednesday 5th March.

- Deepen the understanding of the lessons emerging from the Paris Declaration's baseline survey conducted in 2006; and
- Facilitate national and global learning on aid effectiveness.

It is important to note here that the ToRs for the Uganda Country Level Evaluation were **specifically customised** to the unique situation obtaining in this country, where implementation of the Paris Declaration built on a **pre-existing partnership framework** between the government and development partners, dating back to 2001. This is in the context of the Uganda *PEAP Volume III Partnership Principles (2001)*⁴ which were developed as part of the second iteration of the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP)⁵. The PEAP is Uganda's national development framework and medium-term planning tool and serves as the country's Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRSP), guiding the formulation of Government policy and the implementation of programs through sector wide approaches and a decentralized system of governance.

3.2 General understanding of the scope of the assignment and the envisaged outputs

Scope of the Evaluation

The Paris Declaration is intended *to increase the impact of aid...in reducing poverty and inequality, increasing growth, building capacity and accelerating the achievement of the MDGs*⁶. The PD aims ultimately to strengthen aid delivery and stresses the importance of the five principles (Ownership, Alignment, Harmonisation, Management for Development Results and Mutual Accountability) as key to improving the use of aid. In addition to these principles, **12 indicators for monitoring progress** development partners and governments also agreed to in the implementation of the PD. Monitoring of the Paris Declaration is conducted both within its structures and by an independent cross-country process. Already, a Survey on the Monitoring of the Paris Declaration in Uganda was conducted in 2006, as part of a global exercise by OECD, and **established the baselines and targets against the 12 PD indicators**. Progress on the PD indicators will not in itself guarantee increased aid effectiveness in bringing sustainable benefits; this should be coupled with meeting the broader PD commitments, hence the evaluation focuses not only on the 12 indicators but the commitment of the DPs and partner countries to the **broader commitments of the PD**.

The partnership commitments of the Declaration provide major entry points for strengthening broad based ownership, guiding policy dialogue, shaping the contents of development cooperation programmes and bringing about the institutional and

⁴ The *PEAP Volume III Partnership Principles* seek to link donor support with the PEAP. Over the years other frameworks for cooperation around the Paris Declaration principles and the Government PEAP process have evolved. These have included instruments like the Poverty Reduction Support Credit and the Uganda Joint Assistance Strategy. All these frameworks have influenced the localization of the Paris Declaration.

⁵ The first PEAP was produced in 1997. This has since been revised in 2000 and 2004. In 2008 a new initiative has been launched to review PEAP 2004 and come up with a new National Development Plan. The process may take 1-2 years.

⁶ PD Paragraph 2

budgetary changes that are required to improve poverty outcomes and empower poor and excluded groups. More **systematic evidence is required** on whether the Government of Uganda is doing the right thing (relevance) and at output level doing things right (effectiveness; efficiency) in the new evolving approaches to aid delivery and partnerships. Evidence gathering will be addressed through the conduct of an in-depth country study. Dissemination of this evidence, and the lessons and recommendations that derive from it, is at the core of the assignment. Dissemination will be addressed through development and implementation of a partnership and influencing strategy, which will be defined within the evolving framework of interventions prompted by the international aid effectiveness agenda.

Given that the Paris Declaration is at its mid-stage, the evaluation **focuses on inputs, the implementation process and the level of outputs**. The study will lead to an agreed agenda for action *to strengthen the focus of the Paris Declaration on in Uganda*”, and *assess better practices that can be enforced*”.

Envisaged outputs

More specifically, in terms of outputs, the study seeks to achieve the following three outputs:

- Feasible, flexible and affordable workplan, methodology, and **partnership influencing plan developed** and agreed with PEAP Evaluation Subcommittee.
- PD stakeholders provided with: a) **evidence** on how, and to what extent, the goal and purpose of PD have been met, how PD indicators have been achieved are analyzed, captured and monitored in evolving new approaches to aid delivery and partnerships; and b) **practical lessons and recommendations** for the improved promotion and integration of PD implementation, monitoring and evaluation.
- Consensus is reached among PD stakeholders participating in the study on **shared key messages**.

3.3 The Evaluation Framework

3.3.1 Conceptual Frameworks

The main focus of our evidence gathering will be on the **behaviour changes** within government and among development partners that have occurred (or are supposed to occur) and are expected to underpin subsequent improvements in aid effectiveness and the delivery of outcomes and impacts for Uganda. To break down the issues to be analyzed and hypotheses to be tested, into a series of questions to be asked when collecting information, we have followed the specific questions in the ToRs and the Summary Sheet (**Evaluation Matrix**) provided by OECD to guide country case studies during the First Phase Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration (Annex 7).

The OECD Summary Sheet

The Summary Sheet (presented in Annex 7) provides a matrix that diagrammatically illustrates a two-dimensional aspect of the analysis to be carried out as part of this

evaluation. On the Y-axis (rows) are the key questions and on the X-axis (columns) are the 5 PD principles. The key questions are grouped under five broad themes, namely:

- Assessment of the PD declaration in terms of its clarity, relevance and coherence (Sections A-C of the Evaluation Framework, Annex 4);
- Assessment of changes in Development Partner behaviour (Section D of Evaluation Framework);
- Assessment of changes in Country Partner behaviour (Section E of the Evaluation Framework);
- Results achieved (Section F); and
- Lessons Learnt and Conclusions (Section G).

These groupings have formed the basis for the layout of the Evaluation Framework, the outline and content of the Interview Guides (whose questions have been drawn from column 2 of the Evaluation Framework), and the proposed outline for the Draft Table of Contents for the Main Evaluation Report (Annex 5).

A **third dimension** is added, that is, the donor-government dichotomy. For example, an **evaluation question** such as the clarity of the PD (*dimension 1*) shall focus on each of the **five PD principles (O, A, H, MDR and MA)**, each of the PD commitments under each principle and each of the indicators associated with that PD principle (*dimension 2*). In addition, it will cover clarity **among donors, within government and among CSOs** (*dimension 3*). The three dimensions comprising the evaluation themes/questions, the PD principles, and the sector (government, development partner or non-state actor) shape the content of the Evaluation Framework and by deduction that of the questionnaires and, eventually, the Evaluation Report.

3.3.2 Evaluation Matrix

Overview of the evaluation matrix

The objective of the Evaluation Framework (Annex 4) is to present in a logical manner the main issues to be investigated (column 1), link these to specific questions that need to be asked to different stakeholders in search for answers (column 2), then link the questions to indicators or evidence that would be expected to corroborate the answers given, and information/data sources that should be interrogated (column 3 and 4, respectively). It should be emphasized that column 3 on evidence is optional and has been included here to enhance probity.

Main evaluation issues and questions

The main issues to be studied by this evaluation can be grouped into four clusters as follows:

Cluster 1: Questions relating to the appropriateness of the Paris Declaration document in reinforcing the aid effectiveness agenda

Cluster 2: Changes in Partner Country behaviour and results achieved

Cluster 3: Changes in Development Partner behaviour and results achieved

Cluster 4: Lessons of experience so far, conclusions and recommendations

Cluster 1: Appropriateness of the Paris Declaration document

Under this cluster of issues, a number of specific questions will be asked, comprising:

- The clarity, relevance and coherence of the Paris Declaration (principles, commitments - including roles and responsibilities of various players - and indicators)
- The value added by the PD vis-à-vis pre-existing arrangements such as the PEAP III Partnership Principles
- Adequacy of the PD in addressing critical aid effectiveness issues in Uganda
- Impact of new developments in global aid architecture on Uganda's aid policies (global funds, private funds, new emerging donors)
- Additional PD indicators necessary to monitor in Uganda
- Utility of the Paris survey in promoting aid effectiveness

Cluster 2: Changes in Partner Country behaviour and results achieved

Under this cluster of issues, the main questions to be addressed consist of the following:

- Level of commitment to the PD by country partner
- Extent to which PD indicators and commitments have been mainstreamed into government frameworks for aid management
- Adequacy of fora to influence behaviour change within government and outside the government sector
- Adequacy of capacity to implement PD commitments
- Incentives put in place to motivate staff to implement the PD commitments
- Results achieved by Country Partner vis-à-vis the relevant PD indicators (including change in dialogue with DPs and in accountability for use of development resources)

Cluster 3: Changes in Development Partner behaviour and results achieved

Similarly, under this cluster of issues, the main questions to be answered are:

- Level of commitment to the PD by development partners
- Extent to which PD indicators and commitments have been mainstreamed into DP frameworks for aid management
- Adequacy of fora to influence behaviour change among DPs and in the government sector
- Adequacy of capacity to implement PD commitments
- Incentives put in place to motivate staff to implement the PD commitments
- Results achieved by Development Partner vis-à-vis in relation to the relevant PD indicators on Ownership, Alignment, Harmonization, MDR and MA.

Cluster 4: Lessons, conclusions and recommendations

Under this cluster of issues, the main questions are to do with:

- Conclusions on appropriateness of PD, changes in CP and DP behaviour and results achieved
- Lessons that can be drawn in terms of what worked (best practices) and what did not

- Recommendations to (i) improve appropriateness of the PD, (ii) promote and maintain behaviour change among the CP and DPs, and (iii) enhance results.

3.4 Sources of Evidence

As proposed in the Jimat Technical proposal, we set out a more detailed explanation of evidence sources under the headings of:

(i) General budget support; (ii) Sector wide approaches; (iii) Joint assistance strategies; (iv) PRS processes; (v) Performance assessment frameworks; (vi) Dialogue forums; (vii) Accountability tools; (viii) Country monitoring systems; and (ix) Capacity building mechanisms. Each one of these is tackled in more detail in the following sub-sections.

3.4.1 Review of Aid Delivery Instruments

A number of aid delivery instruments have been produced already which can be used as a starting point. A more systematic review will be conducted during the next steps of the country study. This will provide a comprehensive analysis of how the 3 focus areas (assessment of the PD; change in DP behaviour and change in country partner behaviour) have been addressed across different instruments and sectors:

- *General Budget Support:* For analysis of issues related to the budget support the evaluation team shall review the following documents:
 - MoU between Government of Uganda and the GBS agencies
 - Fact sheets on poverty reduction budget support
 - DFID/SIDA evaluation of the PRBS in Uganda
 - Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support (1994-2004) covering the following countries: Uganda, Burkina Faso, Malawi, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Rwanda, and Vietnam.
- *Sector-wide approaches:* On SWAps, the team will get an overview of the issues by reviewing the following documents/instruments:
 - Sector policy and strategy documents (Education, Agriculture and JLOS)
 - MoU signed between the Government and DPs supporting SWAps in case study sectors selected for this country evaluation: Education, Agriculture the Justice, Law and Order
 - Recent evaluations of the SWAps or basket funded programmes in these sectors
 - Joint sector reviews
 - Diagnostic studies

3.4.2 Review of Aid Effectiveness Mechanisms

- *Uganda Joint Assistance Strategy (UJAS):* both the UJAS and related documents capturing the process and outputs of the Uganda Development Partner Division of Labour exercise will be reviewed.
- On *PRS documents*, the following are enlisted for detailed review:
 - PEAP III Partnership Principles (2001)
 - MoUs for Poverty Reduction Support Credit (PRSC) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc signed between the World Bank and the Government of Uganda

- Joint annual reviews of the PRSC
- Joint Assessment Framework for GBS

3.4.3 Performance Assessment Frameworks

The evaluation team will target its review of literature at the following:

- Reports on the joint annual PEAP review exercises (APIR report),
- Joint annual sector reviews
- Annual performance reports of the DPs working in Uganda (such as the 2006 Annual Performance Report of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs).
- World Bank and OECD reports on performance of Uganda in the areas of aid effectiveness, macroeconomic management, administrative governance, business environment, etc.

3.4.4 Review of country level dialogue, relationships and decision making

The study will provide evidence on how country level dialogue, relationships and decision making have influenced achievement of PD Commitments within Uganda.

- *Dialogue:* To review dialogue processes, the study will search for any documentation on donor-to-donor, government-government and donor-to-government consultations that may have taken place in the context of the **PEAP, the PRSC, the GBS, or SWAp**. Hence **proceedings/minutes of the Local Development Partner Group (LDPG), and SWAp committees and subcommittees will be solicited from relevant officials**. Dialogue taking place in the context of the new **National Development Plan will also be analyzed**.

- *PRS Process:* Information on the PRS process will be gathered and reviewed. Of interest shall be **previous IMF/WB evaluations of PRSPs**. In the context of Uganda, it shall be important to review the reports on the **Joint Annual Reviews of the Poverty Reduction Support Credit**, an instrument used by the World Bank to support Uganda's own version of a PRSP, the PEAP.

3.4.5 Review of approaches to Strengthen Country Systems

The study provides an opportunity to review existing approaches to strengthen country systems for better mainstreaming of PD Commitments. The study will identify good practices that should be disseminated through the influencing strategy.

- *Accountability tools:* The Paris Declaration identifies means for measuring public financial management, accounting and auditing systems, procurement systems, results frameworks, transparency and capacity. The evaluation shall examine adequacy of government financial management, accounting and auditing system by reviewing the **audit reports of the Auditor General's Office, the Public Accounts Committee (PAC) reports** and related documents.
- *Procurement systems:* literature on the **procurement system currently in place** in government and recent **reform initiatives** will be reviewed, together with the following two reports:

- **Evaluation of the Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Act**
- **National Public Procurement Integrity Survey of 2006**
- *Country monitoring system:* A review of the progress made by the government in putting in place functional country M&E systems and commitment by DPs to use these systems will be carried out. This will explore the link between the **PEAP review and reporting arrangements (including the Results and Policy Matrix and the annual PEAP implementation review mechanism, APIR), annual reviews of the Poverty Reduction Support Credit, the joint reviews of the UNDAF Outcome Results Framework and UJAS Results Based M&E Framework.** The study shall examine the roles and capacities for delivery of the **National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and sector-based management information systems** (e.g., in education, JLOS and Agriculture).
- *Capacity building:* The study will search for information on capacity building strategies as enunciated in the PEAP (under human development pillar) or other documents that articulate capacity building plans of government. At the minimum the consultants will gather and review literature on current or previous **projects that are supporting capacity building efforts at sector level** (JLOS, Education, Agriculture) or within central government (e.g., Ministry of Finance, or Ministry of Local Government, etc).

3.5 Evaluation Tools

3.5.1 Literature Review and On-Line Sources

A comprehensive and in-depth literature survey is being undertaken on a continuous basis, from both print and on-line sources. On-line sources are important for accessing information on previous or parallel initiatives such as other country level evaluations, the 2008 Survey on the Monitoring of the Paris Declaration, the on-going First Phase Evaluation of Implementation of the Paris Declaration at the Asian Development Bank as well as at the United Nations and by donor countries (Netherlands, Denmark, DFID, Germany, France and the United Nations). The **OECD website** will also be visited in search of latest discussions and debates on the topic. Finally, important documents will also be downloaded from **several websites hosted by the different sectors of the Government of Uganda**. Some of the information on national policies, strategies and reviews done to-date will be accessed from this source.

3.5.2 Key Informant Interviews

Semi-structured interviews will be conducted targeting a number of key informants in Uganda using interview guides drawn directly from detailed questions in the Evaluation Framework (Annex 4). These will be drawn from government, civil society, the private sector and the donor community.

3.5.3 Focus Group Discussions

Where possible, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) will be conducted to gather views of CSOs and sector ministries. Two interview guides, one for CSOs and another for government will be used.

3.5.4 Stakeholder Consultation Workshop

A stakeholder dissemination workshop is proposed to share the findings after the draft report has been produced. The meeting will validate the findings and highlight any factual errors/omissions. Stakeholders will be given **two weeks to read the Draft Report** so that they can meaningfully participate and provide inputs that will enrich the **Final Report**. The workshop will bring together a **wide spectrum of stakeholders** comprising development partners, government officials and civil society groups.

It is anticipated that **all the stakeholders consulted during the data collection exercise will be invited**. In addition, other stakeholders who may not have had the time to meet the evaluators will also be invited to enable the Evaluation Team to consult them and triangulate study findings more broadly. A workshop programme will be shared with participants closer to the workshop date.

The Workshop will be hosted by OPM at a convenient location in Kampala and 30+ participants from a cross-section of these stakeholders will be expected to attend. After the Workshop, the Team Leader may stay up to another 3 days in-country, if necessary, to carryout any follow-up consultations that may be required towards finalisation of the report.

3.6 Approach to Selection of Information Sources

The evaluators propose to carryout detailed analysis within two sectors: **Education and JLOS**, and contrast this with the experience in a third sector, **agriculture**. However, due to time constraints, the analysis in the third will not be as detailed as the first two. This approach is consistent with that adopted for the South Africa Country Level PD Evaluation which focused on **health** and the **environment** sectors.

The three sectors chosen for the Uganda study will provide a cross-sectional view of what is happening or has happened in sectors with a varied mix of donors and financing modalities. The sectors are chosen for case studies rather than as a representative sample of sectors in Uganda.

In line with this thinking (of sampling 3 sectors), donors working in these sectors and the relevant arms of government executing programmes in these sectors shall be automatically selected for key informant interviews. However, not all donors working in the three sectors will be interviewed but only a sample. For the donor sector the sampling strategy will seek to have good representation of small bilateral donors (e.g., **Belgian Development Cooperation**), medium to large bilaterals (e.g., **Netherlands, Denmark, UK-DFID and USAID**), and multilateral donors (**EU, World Bank and AfDB**). It will also include a fair representation of like-minded donors (e.g., UJAS partners) and the independent ones (those outside UJAS, e.g., **USAID, Japan, China**, etc). The **United Nations** will also be included as this grouping has undertaken to make progress in achieving similar principles to the PD as part of the **UN reform agenda**. Given the tight timetable and likelihood of unavailability of some key informants within the donor group, the sampling frame will remain wide to ensure that as many as those available are included for interviews.

A small sample of **non-state sectors**, mainly **umbrella bodies of NGOs** and the private sector, will be included to solicit views and perceptions of civil society in the

broader sense in terms of the PD itself and the associated behaviour changes which they see in government or the development partner group. The sample shall include lobbyists (e.g., the **Debt Network and SEATINI**), the **NGO Forum**, and the **Private Sector Foundation**, among others.

3.7 Proposed Analytical Approach

This evaluation is of a qualitative nature and **generic approaches to qualitative data analysis** will be adopted. The evaluation team envisages the selective application of concepts from behaviour change models such as the **Transtheoretical model of behaviour change (TTM)** to gain deeper insight into factors supporting and constraining change. **The TTM can be adopted, for example, as a conceptual framework for determining the stages at which DP and government agencies lie in terms of progress made along the behaviour change path** in relation to the five PD principles and the commitments they made under each principle. In principle, with the TTM it should be possible to rate each agency or stakeholder (donor, or government), based on progress made so far although the challenge for such a rating system would be the absence of benchmarks in the M&E framework for the Paris Declaration.

The generic approach to qualitative data analysis being proposed here will provide ways of discerning, examining, comparing and contrasting, and interpreting meaningful patterns or themes. The analysis will be organised in three steps: (i) data reduction; (b) data display and (c) conclusion drawing and verification.

Throughout the course of qualitative analysis, the following questions shall continuously be asked by the Evaluators:

- What **patterns and common themes** emerge in responses dealing with specific items? How do these patterns (or lack thereof) help to illuminate the broader study question(s)?
- Are there any deviations from these patterns? If yes, are there any factors that might explain these **atypical responses**?
- What interesting trends/stories emerge from the responses? How can these stories help to illuminate the broader study question(s)?
- Do any of these patterns or findings suggest that additional data may need to be collected? Do any of the study questions need to be revised?
- Do the patterns that emerge corroborate the **findings of any corresponding qualitative analyses** that have been conducted before? If not, what might explain these discrepancies in the context of the Uganda country evaluation?

Finally, it should be restated here that the planned stakeholder dissemination workshop where the Draft Report will be presented may further contribute to the synthesis and triangulation of findings.

4. Steps to Completion of the Assignment

There are five main steps remaining to completion of the assignment (see Annex 2 for updated Workplan). The first is **completion of data collection**. Due to the request by the Evaluation Committee for the Evaluators to produce an additional output, the Synopsis of Preliminary Findings and Emerging Issues in the first two weeks of the

assignment, the data collection phase has been extended by a further 3 days to 21st March. As stated earlier in section 3.5.4, additional interviews may be held with stakeholders to follow-up issues raised during the Stakeholder Dissemination Workshop. Hence, the Team Leader may stay up to another 3 days in-country, if necessary for collection of additional information after the Workshop.

One of the remaining steps is **completion of literature review**. This process is ongoing and shall extend throughout the study as more documents are collected. Special time (one week) has been provided during the **synthesis and report preparation stage** of the study for a structured search and review of documents.

The third step shall involve the **elaboration of the Draft Report** (using a prior approved Table of Contents for the main report). Factoring in additional time for literature review (one week) and 2 more weeks needed to draft the report, the Draft Report itself will be delivered 3 weeks after completion of fieldwork. An indicative table of contents for this report is attached at Annex 5.

The fourth step shall be the presentation of the Draft Report at the proposed **Stakeholder Dissemination Workshop** to share and validate the findings together with the conclusions and recommendations. It is proposed that OPM hosts this meeting 2 weeks after receipt of the Draft Report in order to give stakeholders ample time to read the report and contribute meaningfully to discussions at the Workshop. The final step will be to **incorporate comments** from the Evaluation Committee as well as from the Stakeholder Dissemination Workshop and produce a **Final Report**. The consultants will need two weeks from the date of receipt of written comments to incorporate them into the final report.

5. Study Limitations

Some of the study limitations, already been highlighted in the Synopsis Report, are restated hereunder, as follows:

- There are no benchmarks set for the PD monitoring exercise against which to base the qualitative judgement of performance either by donors or by the government. A system of rating progress such as the one used by the World Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment could have been introduced by OECD for monitoring the PD. This work is necessary in future in order to improve and standardise the evaluation of progress in the implementation of the PD.
- The PD principles lack proper definitions and are rather repetitive, the same commitments being duplicated, for example, there is significant overlap between commitments for ownership, alignment and harmonisation themes. This impairs judgement on what actually qualifies under each of the themes (ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for results and mutual accountability), or introduces redundancy in the analysis and reporting of progress, when covering them by theme.
- Under some of the pillars, where several commitments were made by DPs and the partner countries, only one indicator was proposed which does not fully capture the intention of the commitments under the principle.

- Due to addition of an extra deliverable upfront by way of the Synopsis Report, the study workplan had to be reworked with the work on the inception report being postponed by at least one week to make way for the first deliverable. In addition, the envisaged inception workshop (as done in South Africa) to bring together government and donors at the start of the assignment was not possible. In addition, the change has also had a knock-on effect of extending the data collection phase by 3 days to ensure that the originally planned 2 weeks of data collection is still ensured. This also means the second workshop planned before the end of the data collection exercise to share preliminary findings and conclusions and to solicit additional inputs from a wide cross-section of stakeholders will not be possible. Only one stakeholder meeting will be held after the Draft Report has already been produced, and this will serve both the purposes of sharing and validating/triangulating the findings.

6. Annexes

6.1 Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of the Paris Declaration in Uganda



Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration *TOR for Uganda Country Level Evaluation*

1. Background and rationale

On the 2nd March 2005, over one hundred Heads of Ministers and Head of Agencies and institutions managing and receiving development aid endorsed the Paris Declaration. The Paris Declaration is an international agreement to which countries committed themselves to continue to increase efforts in harmonisation, alignment and managing aid for results based on an agreed set of *monitorable* actions and indicators. As part of the process of continuing to learn and strengthen the outcomes of the Paris Declaration, the DAC Development Evaluation Network has proposed an evaluation of the Paris Declaration in both the development partner agencies and the partner countries.

2. The Uganda Partner Country Evaluation

In Uganda the Paris Declaration builds on the Government of Uganda *PEAP Volume III Partnership Principles* that were developed as part of the Poverty Eradication Action. Since 1997, Uganda has pursued the poverty eradication agenda through the implementation of the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP).

The PEAP is Uganda's national development framework and medium-term planning tool. It is also the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRSP), guiding the formulation of Government policy and the implementation of programs through sector wide approaches and a decentralized system of governance. The *PEAP Volume III Partnership Principles* therefore identifies the development objectives for Government and its development partners. It effectively links donor support with the PEAP. Over the years other frameworks for cooperation around the Paris Declaration principles and the Government PEAP process have evolved. These have included instruments like the Poverty Reduction Support Credit and the Uganda Joint Assistance Strategy. All these frameworks have influenced the localization of the Paris Declaration.

3. The Evaluation Process

It is within this context that the evaluation of the Paris Declaration will be conducted in Uganda. This will be a mid-term evaluation, to be followed by an impact evaluation scheduled for 2009/10⁷. As a mid-term evaluation, it will focus on assessing the performance to date (inputs to outputs) and evidence of progress and direction made towards the intended outcomes. It will also emphasis seeking out early lessons from the implementation process of the Paris Declaration in order to deliver practical lessons and help take stock of implementation performance at the 3rd High-Level Forum (HLF) on Aid Effectiveness to be held in Ghana.

The evaluation will complement and feed into the monitoring of the implementation of the Paris Declaration, undertaken through the Joint Venture on Monitoring. In Uganda, this phase of the evaluation will feed into the ongoing PEAP Evaluation process that is going to inform the development of the new planning framework for Uganda in 2008.

The proposed Evaluation has received strong support from the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF) and the DAC Evaluation Network. An international Reference Group, comprising partner country members of the WP-EFF, members of the DAC Evaluation Network, and representatives of civil society, has been established to commission and oversee the evaluation.

4. Purpose and Objectives

- a) The **overall purpose** of the evaluation is to assess the performance of the implementation of the Paris Declaration at its mid-point to the 2010 targets.
- b) The **specific purpose** of the evaluation is to assess what constitutes better practices for partner and development partner behaviour in regard to implementation of the Paris Declaration.⁸

The **specific objectives** of the evaluation are:

- To assess how effectively the principles have been translated into specific actions in Uganda
- To determine whether and now effectively the PD has built upon pre-existing partnership principles and agreements in Uganda
- To determine how effective the implementation of the PD has been in Uganda against its own objectives and targets, as a basis to assess what (if anything) needs to change and for the purpose of international comparison
- To determine whether the current pattern of implementation is likely to result in the intended outcomes, in part measured by the indicators and associated targets
- To determine the extent and causes of positive behavioural changes implied by the implementation of the PD, both amongst development partners (donors), the government and other actors.

⁷ The final evaluation will run from the HLF in Ghana in 2008 up to the 4th HLF in 2010. This second phase will focus on whether the intended long-term effects of the Paris Declaration are being achieved.

⁸ Starting from the premise that implementation of the Paris Declaration principles will lead to more effective aid, emphasis will be on *learning* by asking the twin questions: are we doing the right things and, at the output level, are we doing things right?

- To provide the evidence base for the final impact evaluation of 2009/10.
- To review the monitoring framework and determine its utility and continued relevance.
- To deepen the understanding of the lessons emerging from the Paris Declaration's baseline survey conducted in 2006
- To facilitate national and global learning on aid effectiveness

5. Scope and Focus of the Evaluation

Since the endorsement of Paris Declaration (PD) in March 2005, at least 60 countries have taken steps to implement the PD. Uganda took part in the 2006 Survey on Monitoring the PD. This evaluation will build on the findings of the Paris Survey, taking account of the commitment of Government and development partners in Uganda to the partnership principles. It will focus on three areas:

- The relationship and value of the PD in Uganda with pre-existing partnership agreements
- The change of development partner behaviour in terms of alignment of their policies, systems and procedures to implement the PD and partnership principle commitments; and
- The change of Government of Uganda behaviour, with ownership as the key entry-point

The evaluation is expected to address the following issues and questions:

1. The Paris Declaration and Pre-Existing Partnership Arrangements

- a. What is the relationship between the PD principles and practices in Uganda and the PEAP Partnership Principles? To what extent is the PD commitments and indicators reflected in the 'home-grown' PEAP Partnership Principles of 2003 and vice versa?
- b. To what extent has the PD indicators and commitments been mainstreamed into donor frameworks and into Government of Uganda's approach towards receiving aid?
- c. What were/are perceived as the critical aid effectiveness issues in country as articulated in the PEAP Partnership Principles and the UJAS? Are these addressed by the PD principles? Are all elements perceived critical to aid effectiveness in the country currently addressed?
- d. How the results generated from the Paris Survey will be used to help improve aid effectiveness
- e. Has new developments in the global aid architecture (emergence of global funds, private funds, new emerging donors etc.) necessitated a revision of Uganda's aid policies?
- f. In addition to the 12 quantifiable PD indicators, what PD commitments would be useful to measure in Uganda?
- g. Any problems experienced in completing the questionnaire (including clarity of definitions, relevance of indicators and coherence)

2. Development Partner Behaviour

A review of whether development partners are changing their behaviour to meet the PD and partnership principle commitments, covering both processes and results, namely:

Processes:

- a. Whether DPs are meeting the broader PD commitments (not just the indicators) and the partnership principles and how they are doing this.
- b. Capture good practice and why progress has (or hasn't) been made.
- c. How have development partners come together to discuss the needed changes in development partner practices?
- d. Are the current development partner fora and mechanisms adequate to address the PD commitments and targets, the commitments of the Partnership Principles as well as the commitments of the UJAS and the UNDAF?
- e. How have development partners engaged with the Government of Uganda to drive these changes?
- f. Do the development partners work coherently to support the PEAP, UJAS and PEAP Partnership Principles?
- g. To what extent have development partners sequenced their efforts to, a priori; align with government processes rather than seeking to harmonize first?
- h. Support and draw from Uganda's efforts to manage for development results?

Results:

What has been the effect of any behaviour change in terms of alignment and harmonization?

- i. Alignment of aid flows on national priorities through, inter alia, division of labour exercise
- j. Use of country systems for PFM and procurement
- k. Use of parallel implementation structures
- l. Predictability and untying of aid
- m. Harmonizing capacity efforts
- n. Harmonization and alignment of missions and analyses

3. Partner Country Behaviour and Results

A review of whether the Government of Uganda is meeting its commitments in the PD and partnership principle commitments, covering:

Processes

- a. Whether the Government is meeting the broader PD commitments (not just the indicators) and the partnership principles and how they are doing this.
- b. Capture good practice and why progress has (or hasn't) been made.
- c. How has the Government articulated its desire for all development partners to join one joint assistance strategy?
- d. How has Government of Uganda come together to discuss the needed changes in steering development partner practices?
- e. Are the current Government of Uganda fora and mechanisms adequate to address the PD commitments and targets?
- f. How has Government of Uganda engaged with the development partners to drive these changes?
- g. To what extent has Government of Uganda used different approaches to sensitize different development partners (UN family, multilaterals, bilaterals,

- new emerging donors etc) about Government aid priorities, as laid down the Partnership Principles?
- h. Do sector ministries have *capacities* and political will to communicate and adhere to the PEAP Partnership Principles and aid policies?

Results

- i. What outputs have been achieved in Government of Uganda's dialogue with development partners on the 12 PD indicators?
- j. To what extent has the PD resulted in any changes in accountabilities in the use of development resources?
- k. What commitments have government made to further the implementation of PD?

6. Structure of Work

Overall Coordination

The PD Evaluation will be managed under the secretariat of the National Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy. Specifically the PEAP Evaluation Sub-committee which has been formed as a tripartite sub-committee of the PEAP secretariat with members from of the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, the National Planning Authority and the Office of the Prime Minister will oversee the day to day management of the PD Evaluation. The National Coordinator for the Evaluation will be the Coordinator of NIMES and will be deputized by the Coordinator for the PEAP Revision Secretariat. Relevant stakeholders will be co-opted in the sub-committee.

The evaluation should be conducted in three phases:

- a. Inception Phase: The contracted evaluation team will develop an inception report (30 pages maximum) including:
- A contextualised evaluation approach and framework based on the outlined evaluation questions of the present ToR;
 - A sampling frame (sector- and geographical focus) including the identification of relevant information sources;
 - Data collection methods and draft instruments (interview guide, questionnaires, etc.);
 - Processes for institutional learning during the evaluation; and
 - A detailed work plan.

The PEAP Evaluation Sub-committee will review and comment on the draft Inception report.

b. Data collection and report drafting Phase

- The evaluation questions listed above are intended to be posed to development partner and partner country stakeholders alike, with a focus on *perceptions of changed behaviour*.

The drafting of the report will be facilitated; adhering to the country level evaluation report outline attached in Annex 1. The country level evaluation report should be of maximum 50 pages including the executive summary.

c. Consultation and Finalization Phase

Led by the National Coordinator of the Paris Declaration in the Office of the Prime Minister, the Evaluation findings would be discussed in Uganda between relevant Government of Uganda officials and development partners (represented by the Local Development Partners Group in Uganda). They will then be shared with the joint Government/LDGP Harmonization Committee. The evaluation report will serve as an input into the PEAP Evaluation.

7. Composition of Teams

The evaluation team should comprise the following key skills: Advanced knowledge and experience of aid effectiveness and development policies including that of the Paris Declaration. Experience with policy dialogue on aid effectiveness and development effectiveness issues in Uganda is an advantage. Advanced knowledge and experience of programme approaches (General Budget Support and Sector Wide Approaches). Knowledge and experience on Ugandan policy processes. Knowledge of and training in evaluation methodology including process and participatory evaluation.

Team members should reflect a gender balance and comprise national and international consultants.

9. Timing and Conduct of Work

The timetable for the evaluation is as follows:

Sept 2007	Develop and discuss specific ToR
Oct-Dec 2007	Contract evaluators
Jan 2008	Inception Workshop
Jan – February 2008	Conduct evaluation
March 2008	Draft country level evaluation report
April 2008	Finalize Uganda report for publication

6.3 Annex 3: Documents for Review⁹

1. Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005)
2. The Paris Declaration: Towards Enhanced Aid Effectiveness? (January 2007)
3. Uganda Joint Assistance Strategy, The World Bank (2006)
4. 2006 Survey on the Monitoring of the Paris Declaration in Uganda
5. Uganda Development Partners Division of Labour Exercise, Interim Report (2007)
6. Annual Review of Development Effectiveness, The World Bank (2006)
7. Justice Law and Order Sector, Annual Justice Baseline Survey (2003)
8. Partnership Principles Between Government of Uganda and its Development Partners, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (2003)
9. Poverty Eradication Action Plan (2004/5-2007/8), Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (2004)
10. Poverty Eradication Action Plan, Volume 3: Building Partnerships to Implement the PEAP, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (2001)
11. Evaluation of Danish Assistance to Uganda 1987-2005 (2006)
12. The Republic of Uganda, Country Financial Accountability Assessment, The World Bank (2004)
13. The Republic of Uganda, Country Fiduciary Assessment 2004, The World Bank (2004)
14. 2006 Aid Information Map for Uganda
15. Africa Peer Review Mechanism Report on Uganda
16. Annual PEAP Implementation Review Report

⁹ List to be continuously updated as interviews continue and other documents are identified.

6.4 Annex 4: Evaluation Framework

Issues	Detailed Questions	Evidence	Data collection method/sources
<p>A. Clarity of Paris Declaration Principles, Commitments and Indicators</p>	<p>Extent of awareness of the 5 PD principles and commitments under each principle at individual and organizational level</p> <p>Clarity on the meaning of the terminology: 5 PD principles: (O, A, H, MDR and MA)</p> <p>How knowledge about the PD is acquired in general</p> <p>Clarity of roles and responsibilities of different parties as envisaged under the commitments (DP, Govt and CSOs) vis-à-vis O, A, H, MDR and MA</p>	<p>Existence of functional structure for discussing PD among DPs and within Govt</p> <p>Similarities or contradictions in interpretation among DPs, within Govt, and between Govt and DPs</p> <p>Evidence of appropriate or inappropriate use of PD (by DPs or by Govt or CSOs)</p>	<p>Qualitative checklist DPs Qualitative checklist Govt Qualitative checklist CSOs</p> <p>2006 PD monitoring survey 2008 PD monitoring survey</p>
	<p>Extent of awareness of the 12 PD indicators at individual and organizational level</p> <p>Clarity of the meaning of the indicators</p>	<p>-Absence of ambiguity in performance measurement</p> <p>-Evidence of locally (donor/govt) adjusted definitions</p> <p>-Existence of measurement problems (e.g., 2006/8 surveys)</p> <p>-Evidence of protracted discussions on meaning of indicators (e.g., #4. CB and #6. PIUs)</p>	

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration in Uganda

Issues	Detailed Questions	Evidence	Data collection method/sources
B. Relevance of PD principles, Commitments and Indicators	Appropriateness of PD principles, commitments in addressing critical aid effectiveness issues in Uganda	Evidence of critical aid effectiveness issues not covered by the 5 PD principles or by commitments	Qualitative checklist DPs Qualitative checklist Govt Qualitative checklist CSOs <u>Literature review:</u> -previous reviews of aid effectiveness in Uganda -APIRs -UJAS -DP Country Strategy papers -PEAP Partnership Principles -Joint sector review reports -PD document
	Appropriateness of PD indicators vis-à-vis both PD commitments and critical aid effectiveness issues	PD commitments not captured by the 12 indicators Critical aid effectiveness issues in Uganda not captured by PD indicators Evidence that 12 PD indicators have been mainstreamed into DP, Govt and CSO aid monitoring frameworks	
	How Govt and DPs plan to use results generated from the 2006 and 2008 PD monitoring Paris Surveys	Evidence of use of 2006 PD baseline survey by DPs and Govt or by CSOs	Qualitative checklist DPs Qualitative checklist Govt Qualitative checklist CSOs
	Appropriateness of PD commitments vis-à-vis new developments in global aid architecture	Revision in CP aid policies in response to new developments in global aid architecture??	Qualitative checklist DPs Qualitative checklist Govt Review of Uganda aid policies

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration in Uganda

Issues	Detailed Questions	Evidence	Data collection method/sources
C. Coherence of the PD principles, commitments and indicators	Extent to which there are logical inter-linkages between commitments and indicators within each of the 5 PD principles (O, A, H, MDR, MA)	Contradictions between commitments and indicators Contradictions between indicators (e.g., CB and PIUs)	Qualitative checklist DPs Qualitative checklist Govt Qualitative checklist CSOs
	Consistency of PD principles with DP aid policies	Similarities or contradictions between PD and DP aid policies	<u>Literature review</u> - PD document
	Consistency of PD principles with country partner aid policy	Similarities or contradictions between PD and national aid policies: PEAP and Debt Policy	- Corporate strategy and policies of DPs - PEAP Partnership Principles
	Plausibility of theoretical linkages between PD principles and aid effectiveness	Realism of suggestions and assumptions	- National policy and strategy documents (e.g., PEAP; Debt Strategy; etc)

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration in Uganda

Issues	Detailed Questions	Evidence	Data collection method/sources
D. Change in Development Partner Behaviour			
D1. Commitment, capacity and incentives <u>D1.1 Commitment</u>	Does corporate policy commit HQ and CO staff to the 5 PD principles (broader sense not just the 12 indicators) (O; A: H; MDR and MA)	Written evidence of change in corporate policy – post 2005 to support PD	DP corporate policy documents
	Consistency of significance of PD at HQ and CO	Evidence of internal HQ-CO information exchanges on PD Evidence of joint strategic planning between HQ/CO to share vision & working models DP targets for achievement of DP indicators Cases of conflict on PD principles between HQ and CO	Qualitative checklist DPs Review of DP strategy documents
	Consistency of significance of PD among donors	Existence of functional for a for joint planning and peer reviewing achievement of PD, PP, UJAS, UNDAF commitments and targets For a for peer influence of practices	Qualitative checklist DPs Review of DP strategy documents
	Coherence of approaches to meet PD commitments among donors	Examples of common or complementary approaches by donors to support PD, PEAP Partnership Principles and UJAS Evidence of conflicting approaches among DPs Evidence of implementation of UJAS in	Qualitative checklist DPs <u>Literature review:</u> - UJAS - Sector Wide Approaches (Educ, JLOS, Agric) - GBS MoU - PRSC MoU

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration in Uganda

Issues	Detailed Questions	Evidence	Data collection method/sources
		practice	
	Are DPs meeting the broader commitments	Evidence of real attempts to meet the other commitments Examples of best practices among DPs Examples of factors supporting results	Qualitative checklist DPs, Govt and CSOs
	Sectors or themes where CO addresses PD commitments more than others	Examples of what Country Office has done in each sector Examples of challenges in other sectors	Qualitative checklist DPs, Govt
	Adequacy of for a and mechanisms to address PD commitments and targets	Existence of issues not discussable in present fora	Qualitative checklist DPs
<u>D1.2 Capacity</u>	Adequacy of staff capacity to comply with the 5 PD principles in Uganda (O; A; H; MDR and MA)	Evidence of tasks that cannot be performed due to lack of skills and/or personnel	Qualitative checklist DPs, Govt and CSOs
<u>D1.3 Incentives</u>	Incentives in COs that motivate staff to implement commitments under the 5 PD principles (O; A; H; MDR and MA)	-Evidence of incentives -Evidence of staff motivation -Measures to prevent slippage into previous mode of operation	Qualitative checklist DPs

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration in Uganda

Issues	Detailed Questions	Evidence	Data collection method/sources
E. Change in Country Partner Behaviour			
E1. Commitment, capacity and incentives	CP understanding of ownership at different level?	Examples of practical application of ownership principle	Interview of key informants in Govt
<u>E1.1 Commitment</u>			
	Key claimants of ownership (different policies)?		Interview of key informants in Govt
	National development and aid policy objectives wielding political power in terms of high government commitment		Interview of key informants in Govt and CSOs
	How well aligned with PD commitments	Examples of conflicts if any, and how they are resolved?	Interview of key informants in Govt Lit review of PD
	Sectors or themes where CP ownership of policy/strategies is less?		Interview of key informants at sector level (govt, DP, CSOs)
	Change in inclusiveness of civil society, marginalized groups, etc following PD	Evidence of more active participation and input	Interview of key informants in Govt and in CSOs at central and sector levels
<u>E1.2 Capacity</u>	Adequacy of staff capacity to community and adhere to the 5 PD principles in Uganda (O; A; H; MDR and MA)	Evidence of tasks that cannot be performed due to lack of skills and/or personnel Skills gaps at central and sectoral levels	Interview of key informants in Govt and DPs at central and sector levels
	Has change in partner ownership changed nature of Govt-DP relations?	Examples of changes or conflicts, if any	
	Are emerging donors such as China less attuned to country needs?	Evidence of projects outside MTEF, etc?	

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration in Uganda

E1.3 Incentives	Incentives in Govt that motivate staff to implement commitments under the 5 PD principles (O; A; H; MDR and MA)	Evidence of incentives Evidence of staff motivation Measures to prevent slippage into previous mode of operation	Interview of key informants in Govt at central and sector levels
------------------------	---	--	--

Issues	Detailed Questions	Evidence	Data collection method/sources
F. Emerging Results in relation to the 5 PD Principles, commitments and indicators			
F1. Ownership	Extent of a priori alignment with government processes	Evidence of DP support for govt role and capacity to lead policy formulation and aid coordination at all levels Evidence of withdrawal of DP leadership in policy setting and aid coordination	Qualitative checklist DPs/Govt Lit review
	Changes in priority setting among DPs and within Government, including cross-cutting priority issues	Evidence of re-allocation of financial and human resources	Qualitative checklist DPs/Govt
F2. Alignment	Extent of alignment of aid flows on national priorities	-Increase in share of DP support reported on national budgets -Reduction in PIUs? -More timely and predictable disbursement of aid -Untying of aid	Qualitative checklist DPs/Govt Lit review
F3. Harmonization	Progress achieved towards harmonization of approaches among DPs	- Provision by Govt of clear view on DP comparative advantage - Increase in use of programme based approaches - Use of country systems for PFM and	Qualitative checklist DPs/Govt Lit review

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration in Uganda

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> proc - Harmonization of CB efforts - Harmonization and alignment of missions and analyses - Harmonized approach to EIA and cross-cutting issues 	
F4. Managing for Development Results	Support for and drawing from Uganda efforts to MDR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Link strategies and annual and multi-annual budget process -Cost-effective results-oriented reporting for national/sectoral strategies -Evidence of DP efforts to strengthen country capacities and demand for results -Harmonized DP M&E requirements -DP programming linked to results and aligned with country PAF 	<p>Qualitative checklist DPs/Govt</p> <p>Lit review</p>
F5. Mutual Accountability	Change in results culture within Govt and among DPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Systematic and broad engagement of DPs in review of national strategy/policy -Additional commitments by Govt to further PD -Change in accountability for results within Govt -Timely and transparent DP info on aid flows -Joint assessment (DP + Gov) of mutual progress on PD 	<p>Qualitative checklist DPs/Govt</p> <p>Lit review</p>
G. Lessons Learned and Recommendations	Main lessons learned?		Qualitative checklist DPs/Govt
	Recommendations		

6.5 Annex 5: Draft Table of Contents for Main Report

1. Background and Rationale [MC]

- Background to the PD, Objectives, Principles, Indicators and Targets
- Objectives of the Evaluation
- Expected Outputs and Planned Use of the Results

2. Evaluation Approach and Limitations [MC]

- Contextual approach and evaluation framework
- Sampling approach
- Data collection methods and instruments
- Processes for institutional learning
- Workplan

3. Evaluation of the Relationship between the Paris Declaration and Pre-Existing Arrangements [MC]

- Clarity, Relevance and Coherence of the PD
- Value-added by PD (areas of convergence and divergence)
- Effectiveness of the PD principles in addressing critical Aid Effectiveness Issues in Uganda
- Impact of New Developments in Global Aid Architecture on Uganda's Aid Policies
 - global funds, private funds, new emerging donors
- Additional PD Commitments Important to Measure in Uganda

4. Changes in Country Partner Behaviour and Results

- Level of commitment to the PD by country partner
- Extent to which PD indicators and commitments have been mainstreamed into government frameworks for aid management
- Adequacy of fora to influence behaviour change within government and outside the government sector
- Adequacy of capacity to implement PD commitments
- Incentives put in place to motivate staff to implement the PD commitments
- Results achieved by Country Partner vis-à-vis the relevant PD indicators (including change in dialogue with DPs and in accountability for use of development resources)

Ownership

- *Leadership and broad-based consultation in developing and implementing national development strategies*
- *Translate national strategies into prioritized results oriented operational programmes (**PD Indicator 1**)*
- *Leadership in aid coordination at all levels*

Alignment

- GOU dialogue with DP on the 12 PD indicators
- PD-driven reforms in Govt to increase transparency and accountability in resource use

Harmonization

- Provide clear views on donors' comparative advantage and how to achieve donor complementarity at country or sector level
- Procurement reforms
- Incentives for staff to work towards A, H and Results
- Harmonized approach to EIA and cross-cutting issues

Managing for Results

- Strengthen link between strategies and annual and multi-annual budget processes
- Establish results-oriented reporting for national/sectoral strategies based on cost-efficient data collection (**PD Indicator II**)

Mutual accountability

- Systematic engagement of broad range of DP when formulating and assessing progress in implementing national development strategies
- Specific additional commitments by Government to further implementation of PD
- Participatory approach to strengthen capacities and demand for RBM

5. Changes in Development Partner Behaviour and Results

- Level of commitment to the PD by development partners
- Extent to which PD indicators and commitments have been mainstreamed into DP frameworks for aid management
- Adequacy of fora to influence behaviour change among DPs and in the government sector
- Adequacy of capacity to implement PD commitments
- Incentives put in place to motivate staff to implement the PD commitments
- Results achieved by Development Partner vis-à-vis in relation to the relevant PD indicators on Ownership, Alignment, Harmonization, MDR and MA.

Ownership

- Respect for partner country leadership and strengthen capacity to exercise it

Alignment

- Increase share of DP support reported on national budgets (**PD Indicator 3**)
- Link aid to single framework of conditions and indicators from national strategy
- Reduce parallel structures for management of aid-financed projects (**PD Indicator 6**)
- Timely and predictable disbursement of aid (**PD Indicator 7**)
- Untying aid (**PD Indicator 8**)
- A priori sequencing of DP efforts to align rather than harmonize first

Harmonization

- Increased use of programme-based aid modalities and common arrangements for reporting activities and aid flows to Govt (**PD Indicator 9**)
- Staff incentives to work towards harmonization
- Use of country systems for PFM and procurement where good practice exists or needed reforms are in place (**PD Indicator 5**)
- Harmonization of capacity building efforts
- Harmonized diagnostic reviews, field missions and analysis (**PD Indicator 10**)
- Division of labour among DPs, delegation of lead role

Managing for Results

- Support for and use of country frameworks and systems to manage for development results

Mutual accountability

- Timely, transparent and comprehensive reporting to Govt on activities and aid flows
- Joint assessment of mutual progress in implementing agreed commitments on aid effectiveness (**PD Indicator 12**)

6. Conclusions, Lessons and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

- 6.1.1 Conclusions on the relationship and added value of the PD in Uganda vis-à-vis Pre-Existing Partnership Agreements
- 6.1.2 Conclusions on Change in Development Partner Behaviour
- 6.1.3 Conclusions on Change of Government of Uganda behaviour
- 6.1.4 Conclusions on Results Achieved
 - Aid effectiveness
 - Development effectiveness

6.2 Lessons Learned from Implementing the Paris Declaration in Uganda

6.3 Recommendations

- 6.3.1 Improving clarity, relevance and coherence of PD
- 6.3.2 Strengthening effectiveness of PD in addressing critical issues
- 6.3.3 Reinforcing and maintaining behaviour change within Government
- 6.3.4 Reinforcing and maintaining behaviour change among development partners
- 6.3.5 Improving results
- 6.3.6 Improving the monitoring of PD

7. Annexes

- 7.1 Terms of Reference
- 7.2 List of people met (including workshop participants)
- 7.3 Evaluation Framework
- 7.4 Interview Guides
- 7.5 Documents Reviewed

6.6 Annex 6: List of People Met

No.	Person(s)	Contact	Ministry/ Organisation
1.	Mr. Richard Ssewakiryanga	4236205/4707250; 0772-408365;	Office of the Prime Minister
2.	Mr Peter Sentongo	414-341139	Office of the Prime Minister
3.	Mr. David Smith	077 4827338	MFPED
4.	Mr. Walter Ehmeir	031 2235104	Austrian Regional Bureau
5.	Ms. Christine A. Jantscher	031 2235104	Austrian Regional Bureau
6.	Mr. Robert Burtscher	031 2235104	Austrian Regional Bureau
7.	Mr. Fred Tusiime	041-4707183	MFPED, ALD
8.	Mr. Kenneth Mugambe	077 2408061	MFPED
9.	Mr. Tom Venn	041 4701000	EU Delegation
10.	Mr. Richard Edwards	041 4331000	DFID
11.	Ms Evelyn Edroma	077 2670067 075 3670067	JLOS
12.	Dr Kihangire	Research Department	Bank of Uganda
13.	Mr Theophane Nikyema	041 4233440	UNDP
14.	Dr. Alex Aboagye	041 4233440	UNDP
15.	Dr. J. G. Mbabazi	041 4233651	MOES
16.	Ms. Harriet Nannyonjo	0312221416/7 0414230094	The World Bank
17.	Ms. Maris Wanyera	4707217	MFPED
18.	Mr. Fredrick Matyama	4707229	MFPED
19.	Mr. Gabriel Hatega	077 2200561	PSFU
20.	Mr. Gideon Badagawa	077 2601646	PSFU
21.	Mr. Andrew Luze	077 2602874	UMA
22.	Ms. Deborah Grieser	4306001	USAID
23.	Ms. Nancy Eslick	4306001	USAID
24.	Ms Jane Nalunga	4540856	SEATINI
25.	Ambassador Nathan Irumba	4540856	SEATINI

6.7 Annex 7: OECD Paris Declaration Country Level Evaluation Summary Worksheet

	Ownership	Alignment	Harmonisation	Results-based Management	Mutual Accountability
Assessment of the Paris Declaration					
Clarity	What is the perceived clarity of the PD commitments and indicators? If further clarification work has been needed, which agreements have been reached by the partners (country government and development partners) and are the agreements satisfactory?				
Relevance	What is the perceived relevance of the PD commitments and indicators? What are perceived as the critical aid effectiveness issues in country? Are these addressed by the PD principles? Are all elements perceived critical to aid effectiveness in the country currently addressed?				
Coherence	What is the perceived coherence of the PD? Are any of the commitments and indicators and/or derived implications experienced as contradictory?				
Assessment of development partner behaviour					
Commitment	Are development partner field staff aware of the PD commitments? Are they committed to implementing the PD? How has this been demonstrated in development partner practices? Do development partner field staff across sectors and themes address PD commitments evenly? Are development partner HQ and				

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration in Uganda

	Ownership	Alignment	Harmonisation	Results-based Management	Mutual Accountability
	field offices aligned with respect to PD significance and implementation?				
Capacity	Do the development partners work coherently to support nationally led development frameworks such as the national plan, PRS or UNDAF?				
	Do development partner field staff (including project/programme staff) hold sufficient capacities to implement the PD?				
Incentives	Do development partner incentive systems motivate field staff to fulfil PD commitments? Have incentive systems changed to reflect PD commitments?				
Assessment of partner country behaviour					
Commitment	What do partners understand as 'ownership'?				
	Who are the key claimants to ownership?				
	Which national development and aid policy objectives hold real political power in terms of high government commitment?				
	How well do these align with PD commitments? How are internal alignment conflicts resolved?				
	Has the implementation of the PD principles had an impact on the level of ownership inclusiveness in regard to civil society, marginalised groups, and other national bodies?				
Capacity	Do partner stakeholders have capacities to communicate and adhere to partner national development and aid policies?				
	? Has the nature of partner				

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration in Uganda

	Ownership	Alignment	Harmonisation	Results-based Management	Mutual Accountability
Incentives	ownership given rise to change in development partner-partner country relations? If conflictual, how was the conflict resolved? Are emerging donors such as China more or less attuned to partner country needs? Do the partner country's incentive systems motivate staff to fulfil national development and aid policy commitments?				
Process Results	Emerging Results What are the emerging intended and unintended effects of the aid effectiveness initiatives? Is there evidence of changes? Has the roll-out of the aid effectiveness agenda had effects on development co-operation priority-setting, including cross-cutting priority issues?				
Outputs	What are the transaction costs/cost-benefits of implementing the PD commitments of the five axes? And, in what directions have the transaction costs/cost-benefits moved since implementation of the PD commitments?				
	Conclusion Conclusions Drawn Recommendations				