The Republic of Uganda

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

PROGRAMME DOCUMENT
Uganda

Programme Title: Institutional Effectiveness
Programme Number: 00092241
Implementing Partner: Office of the Prime Minister
Start Date: January 2016 **End Date:** December 2020 **PAC Meeting date:** 1 March 2016

Brief Description

The Institutional Effectiveness Programme is one of the three components of *Inclusive and Effective Governance Pillar* of the UNDP Country Programme 2016-2020. The programme will follow a transformational development approach to address three inter-related bottlenecks hindering institutional effectiveness, transparency and accountability in Uganda's public sector, well analysed in UNDAF 2016-2020. The bottlenecks include: *i) gaps in policy, legal and regulatory frameworks, and operational mechanisms to foster effectiveness in public sector management; ii) weak institutional capacities to implement policies for accountable institutional effectiveness and corruption control in an inclusive manner, and iii) weak public demand for transparency, accountability and efficacy in the management of public affairs.*

UNDP will provide upstream support (technical, technological, operational and financial) targeting relevant MDAs and key non-state institutions to ensure that i) by 2017, gaps in public sector policies, legal and regulatory frameworks and operational mechanisms that impede effectiveness in public sector management are eliminated, including provisions for a high-level oversight and learning function to guide decision-making processes; ii) by 2018, the policies are effectively implemented; iii) As a result, public demand for accountability and transparency in public affairs is increasing and effective by 2020, and contribute to the building of a culture of zero tolerance to corruption in Uganda; and iv) by 2020, MoFPED has improved quality and effectiveness of development cooperation and country programme implementation. The programme is built upon the premise that an effective **high level development research and evaluation function** that reports directly to the Cabinet and the Parliament coupled with progress in **social engagement and demand for transparency and accountability** will act as **game changers** in the transformative process**.**

The programme aims to ultimately improve overall government's effectiveness, particularly in critical areas such as human capital development (including service delivery effectiveness), which is a prerequisite to realising an inclusive and sustainable growth in Uganda.

Contributing Outcome (UNDAF/CPD):

Institutional Development, Transparency and Accountability: By the end of 2020, targeted public institutions and public-private partnerships are fully functional at all levels, inclusive, resourced, performance-oriented, innovative and evidence-seeking supported by a strategic evaluation function; and with Uganda's population enforcing a culture of mutual accountability, transparency and integrity.

Indicative Outputs:

1. By 2017, selected MDAs with enhanced technical capacities to strengthen public sector policies and develop legal and regulatory frameworks and operational mechanisms to foster effectiveness in public sector management.
2. By 2018, selected MDAs and CSOs with enhanced technical capacities and tools to promote institutional effectiveness and efficiency at central and decentralized levels and a culture of transparency, accountability and zero tolerance to corruption.
3. By 2020, selected MDAs and LGs with adequate technical, operational and financial capacities to engage relevant CSOs, media, private sector and academic institutions to raise the consciousness of the public to articulate their needs, defend their rights and demand for accountability and transparency in public affairs.
4. By 2020, MoFPED with enhanced technical capacities to effectively coordinate development cooperation and country programme implementation.

Total Resources Required:	USD 12,070,000	
Total Resources Allocated:	**UNDP TRAC:**	8,000,000
	Donor:	
	UNDP Seoul Policy Centre	50,000
	Government:	
	In-Kind:	
Unfunded:	USD 4,020,000	

J216

Agreed by (signatures)

Government	UNDP	Implementing Partner
HON. MATIA KASAIJA Minister of Finance Planning and Economic Development	**ALMAZ GEBRU** Country Director	**CHRISTINE GUWATUDDE KINTU** Permanent Secretary Office of the Prime Minister
Date:	Date:	Date:

Responsible Parties:

Ministry of Local Government

Ministry of Public Service

National Planning Authority

Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Kampala Capital City Authority

Anti-corruption Coalition of Uganda

Directorate of Ethics and Integrity

Table of Contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS 4
I. Development Challenge 6
II. Strategy 7
Programme Alignment 7
Programme Intervention Logic and Exit Strategy 7
III. Results and Partnerships 10
Expected Results 10
Resources Required to Achieve the Expected Results 13
Partnerships 14
Risks and Assumptions 14
Stakeholder Engagement 15
South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSC/TrC) 15
Knowledge 15
Sustainability and Scaling Up 16
IV. Project Management 17
Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness 17
Project Management 17
V. Results Framework 18
VI. Monitoring And Evaluation 30
Monitoring Plan 30
Evaluation Plan 31
VII. Multi-Year Work Plan 32
VIII. Governance and Management Arrangements 42
IX. Legal Context 44
X. Annexes 46
Annex 1: Programme Quality Assurance Report 46
Annex 2: Social and Environmental Screening 50
Annex 3: Risk Management and Risk Analysis 57
Annex 4: Capacity Assessment (HACT Micro Assessment) 59
Annex 5: Programme Board Terms of Reference; Key Management Positions 59
Annex 6: Terms of Reference: Programme Manager 60
Annex 7: Terms of Reference: Programme Officer 63
Annex 8: Terms of Reference: Finance Associate 66
Annex 9: Communication Plan 69

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACCORD	Agency for Co-operation and Research in Development
ACCU	Anti-corruption Coalition of Uganda
AG	Auditor General
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CAOs	Chief Administrative Officers
CGEQ	Commitment to Gender and Equity
CPD	Country Program Document
CSBAG	Civil Society Budget Advisory Group
CSCU	Civil Service College of Uganda
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
DEI	Directorate of Ethics and Integrity
DENIVA	Development Network of Indigenous Voluntary Associations
DPUs	District Planning Units
FBOs	Faith-Based Organisations
FOWODE	Forum for Women in Democracy
GoU	Government of Uganda
IGG	Inspector General of Government
IE	Institutional Effectiveness
IP	Implementing Partner
KCCA	Kampala Capital City Authority
KRA	Key Result Area
LED	Local Economic Development
LGAs	Local Government Associations
LGs	Local Governments
LGDPG	Local Government Development planning Guidelines
M/F	Male/Female
MDAs	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
MIS	Management Information System
MoFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MoFPED	Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development
MoGLSD	Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development
MoLG	Ministry of Local Government
MPS	Ministry of Public Service
NDP	National Development Plan
NPA	National Planning Authority
NRM	Natural Resources Management
OPM	Office of the Prime Minister
PFMA	Public Finance Management Act
PPDA	Public Procurement and Disposal Act
PPP	Public Private Partnership
PPR	Project Progress Reports
PSOs	Private Sector Organisations
QPR	Quarterly Progress Reports
QUAM	Quality Assurance Mechanism
R&D	Research and Development
R/U	Rural / Urban
R4D	Research for Development
RP	Responsible Party
RRF	Results and Resources Framework
SBAA	Standard Basic Assistance Agreement
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SIEP	Strengthening Institutional Effectiveness Programme

UAAU	Urban Authorities Association of Uganda
ULGA	Uganda Local Government Association
UN	United Nations
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNNGOF	Uganda National NGO Forum
USD	United States Dollars
WGIs	Worldwide Governance Indicators

I. DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGE

Good governance and institutional robustness has been acknowledged in the national Vision 2040 as a pre-requisite for Uganda's sustainable development as it enhances transparency, accountability, effectiveness and efficiency in the management of public affairs and delivery of services to citizens. Uganda has made some progress in this area through enacting and implementing a number of policy and legal instruments as well as adopting administrative reforms that are aimed at streamlining public finance management (PFM) arrangements; enhancing the role of oversight functions; consolidating national planning processes; and strengthening performance management in the public sector.[1] However, the reforms have not translated into expected institutional performance. Uganda is rated among the lowest performers in institutional effectiveness-related aggregate Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGIs). In the areas of 'Government Effectiveness' and 'Voice and Accountability', the Country's rating has remained low since 1996 (below 35 on a scale of 0 to 100).

The country's WGI rating on *Control of Corruption* has declined from 30/100 in 1996 to 10/100 in 2014. It is estimated that annually 250 to 300 million US dollars of public resources is lost through corruption in Uganda.[2] The ability of national accountability institutions to exercise effective control of corruption is handicapped by multiple factors including gaps in policies and regulatory frameworks enforcing transparency and accountability in the management of national resources and public affairs; ineffective and inefficient policy implementation; and weak public engagement in the demand for transparency and accountability in the management of public affairs.[3]

Consequently, there is the need for Government of Uganda to address institutional weaknesses in order to improve on the effectiveness of its Public Investment Plan (PIP). The three outstanding issues hampering institutional effectiveness in Uganda include *i) gaps in policy, legal & regulatory frameworks and operational mechanisms to foster effectiveness in public sector management; ii) weak institutional capacities to implement existing and new policies for accountable institutional effectiveness and corruption control,* and *iii) weak public demand for transparency, accountability and efficacy in the management of public affairs.*

The gaps in policies and related legal & regulatory frameworks have limited the capacity of public sector institutions to adequately implement programmes and achieve intended results, especially in the areas of corruption control and the building of a culture of transparency and accountability in the society. The weak public demand for transparency and accountability perpetuates corruption and institutional ineffectiveness at all levels of government. The accountability function in the public sector in Uganda is largely supply-driven, relying mainly on the capacity and resilience of the public sector accountability institutions to enforce control and oversight role in the use of public resources. The citizenry is not yet fully empowered to demand better performance from duty bearers.

Institutional ineffectiveness is particularly evident at the decentralized level, linked to the following factors: limited linkages between local and national development planning frameworks; uncoordinated lines of accountability; limited participation of public institutions and citizens, particularly women and youths in public sector governance and decision-making machinery processes.

[1] Accountability Sector Strategic Investment Plan 2014 -2019
[2] UNDP Country Programme 2016 - 2020
[3] National Development Plan 2015/16– 2019/20

II. STRATEGY

Programme Alignment

The Institutional Effectiveness (IE) programme addresses key components of good governance which are defined in the Uganda **Vision 2040** and reiterated in the National Development Plan (**NDP II**) as prerequisites for achieving the required growth rates and therefore social transformation in Uganda**.** These include: citizen participation in governance, control of corruption, Government effectiveness, regulatory quality and effective knowledge management**.** In these regards, IE is a flagship programme within **UNDAF 2016-2020** Governance pillar that helps establish solid bridges between national efforts to promote good governance and those to build a strong social capital towards sustainable and inclusive economic development. The programme is aligned to **UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017**, notably to Section V on Transforming Institutional Effectiveness. While building a slid foundation of the realisation of all **Sustainable Development Goals** (SDGs), the programme contributes directly to the achievement of SDG 16 on Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions.

Programme Intervention Logic and Exit Strategy

The *Institutional Effectiveness* (IE) Programme is one of the three components of the *Inclusive and Effective Governance* pillar of the UNDP Country Programme (CP) 2016-2020. Its ultimate goal is to improve government's performance in critical areas such as human capital development, which is a pre-requisite to realizing an inclusive and sustainable economic growth in Uganda.

The programme will focus on: strengthening performance of key normative public institutions (Cabinet, Parliament, OPM); promoting Public-Private-Partnerships (PPPs); driving innovation in the areas of knowledge generation and management (including the use of new technology), strategic planning and programme implementation oversight; as well as fostering public demand for accountability, transparency and integrity. The programme will also strengthen systems for Public Sector Management (PSM) including enhancing evidence based planning, progress tracking and reporting. It will also support the government in stimulating and leading efforts in strategic research, in-depth problem analysis and programme evaluation towards a culture of evidence-based decision-making and innovation in problem solving.

UNDP will exit at the point where relevant MDAs, selected LGs, CSOs, media, private sector and academic institutions, etc., have acquired adequate capacities to engage constructively, and where the consciousness of the public to articulate their needs, defend their rights and demand for accountability and transparency in public affairs have been strengthened. Upon the realisation of these results, UNDP will then focus on consolidating the acquired capacities at the MDA and CSO levels respectively to ensure the development of a culture of transparency, accountability and zero tolerance to corruption supported by a strong and responsive policy, legal and institutional framework. It is only after ensuring that the generated capacities are guaranteed by strong and responsive policy, legal and institutional framework that UNDP will gradually exit from its downstream end towards the upstream policy support. Table 1 below summarizes the intervention logic underpinning the Institutional Effectiveness Programme (*Figure 1).*

IE: Intervention Logic and UNDP Exit Steps - *Causality and Exit Strategy Logics*

Development bottlenecks	Exit Order	UNDP CPD Outputs
Issue # 1 Major Gaps in **policy, legal & Regulatory Frameworks** and operational mechanisms to foster effectiveness in public sector management	3	By 2017, relevant MDAs & RP with enhanced technical **capacities to strengthen public sector policies and develop legal and regulatory frameworks and operational mechanisms** to foster effectiveness in public sector management.
Issue # 2 Weak institutional capacities to implement existing and new policies for accountable institutional effectiveness and corruption control	2	By 2018, relevant MDAs & RP with enhanced technical **capacities and tools to** effectively **coordinate** development cooperation and Country Programme Implementation and **promote institutional effectiveness and efficiency** at central and decentralized levels and **a culture of transparency, accountability and zero tolerance to corruption**
Issue # 3: Weak public demand for transparency, accountability and efficacy in the management of public affairs.	1	**By 2020**, relevant MDAs, RP and selected LGs with adequate technical, operational and financial **capacities to engage relevant** CSOs, media, private sector and academic institutions to raise the consciousness of the public to articulate their needs, defend their rights and **demand for accountability and transparency in** public affairs.

Figure 1 IE Intervention Model

Overall, the IE intervention model takes a programme approach with the ultimate intention of generating concerted results from interlinked programmes' activities. A programme approach has already been adopted by the UNDAF 2016-2020 as an overarching strategy for UNDP support during this CP cycle. The programme is built upon the premise that an effective high level development research and evaluation function that reports directly to the Cabinet and the Parliament coupled with progress in social engagement and demand for transparency and accountability will act as game hangers in the transformative process.

Programme Theory of Change

In the context of Uganda, progress in the area of institutional development is tributary to progress in Rule of Law and Constitutional Democracy. Building upon this, the specific programme **Theory of Change** for the IE programme, guided by the UNDG National capacity Development Framework (*Figure 2*), is based on the understanding that, at the current junction of Uganda development, effective implementation of policies that targets gaps in the smooth functioning of the national decision-making machinery (central and local governments), supported by independent, well resourced and empowered oversight functions, including in the areas of development research and evaluation (*Game Changer*), would lead to rapid emergence of models of **effective Local Governance** to drive a people-centred local and national development and knowledge generation through enhancement of overall capacities of national institutions to: (a) achieve and sustained development results; (b) institutionalize international best practices in the management of public

affairs; (c) **adapt,** innovate and generate home-grown solutions to emerging development challenges facing Uganda; and, thereby (d) reduce the country's vulnerability to aid dependency syndrome.

Such a transformation process would be effective and sustainable only if all key assumptions agreed upon are true, namely those regarding the responsibilities of the government during the implementation of the **Inclusive Governance programme** (especially the item related to institutional stability) and those related to development assistance approach by UNDP and its




Figure 2 National Capacity Development Framework (UNDG)

(international) partners [*insert Annex Ref*].

III. RESULTS AND PARTNERSHIPS

Expected Results

CPD outcome 1.3

By the end of 2020, targeted public institutions and Public-Private Partnerships are fully functional at all levels, inclusive, resourced, performance-oriented, innovative and evidence-seeking supported by a strategic evaluation function; and with Uganda's population enforcing a culture of mutual accountability, transparency and integrity.

The programme will deliver four inter-related outputs that will inform the above outcome as follows:

Output 1: Selected Ministries, Department and Agencies /sectors effectively coordinate and implement targeted public sector reforms by 2020

The following four key result areas will be realised under this output:

Key Result Area (KRA) 1: Relevant MDAs and LGs with strengthened capacity to formulate appraise and review policies and regulations for effective and gender-responsive public sector management.

Interventions:

1. Provide financial and technical support to relevant MDAs to conduct a study on the challenges in the policy, legal and operational frameworks and assess institutional capacity needs for improving effectiveness and gender responsiveness in public sector management
2. Provide financial and technical support for implementing interventions identified by the study on the key challenges in the policy, legal and operational frameworks in order to provide institutional capacity to sustainably address the challenges
3. Support the benchmarking and mainstreaming of best practices from within the region and internationally on various effectiveness-related reforms including policy formulation and implementation, women participation in public sector decision making, etc.
4. Support relevant MDAs to review the "Pay and Reward Policy" for public service to match the market trends and operationalize the salary review
5. Provide financial and technical support to strengthen the capacity of relevant MDAs to carry out inspections in Public Service
6. Support the designing and implementation of training programmes of public service on gender responsive policy formulation, appraisal, implementation, analysis, monitoring and evaluation

KRA 2: Strong and institutionalized development policy, research and evaluation function in the public sector

Interventions:

1. Provide financial and technical support to the research and evaluation function

2. Provide financial and technical support to the establishment of a mechanism for knowledge generation and exchange on key policies and programmes through high level dialogues and diagnostic studies

KRA 3: Relevant institutions with enhanced capacity to plan implement and monitor public policies and programmes

Interventions:

1. Support the introduction of the Transformational Development Approach (TDA) in MDAs and LGs planning frameworks for gender and environmental responsive planning
2. Provide financial and technical support to Ministry of Public Service to strengthen the human resources planning function at national and local government levels (i.e. to develop comprehensive Human Resource Development Plan; Content policy, Human Resources Development indicators; tailored training in Human Resources planning)
3. Support the scale up of Prime Minister's Management Information System (PMIS) for implementing and reporting on government programmes
4. Support the digitalisation of protocol services
5. Support the domestication, monitoring, evaluation, reporting and mobilization of resources for SDGs
6. Support mid-term review of NDP2 and NDP3 formulation processes

KRA 4: A strong and effective collaboration between MDAs, CSOs, and private sector in fostering public policy effectiveness and a culture of transparency, accountability and zero tolerance to corruption

Interventions:

1. Support capacity development of relevant anti-corruption institutions through rigorous skills training, acquisition of modern tools and equipment and transport logistics
2. Support the strengthening of the ombudsman's function of the Inspectorate of Government (IG)
3. Support capacity enhancement for LG councils to deliver effective legislation and oversight services including establishment of effective collaboration with civic groups in the rendering of oversight services in LGs
4. Provide financial support to relevant MDAs to strengthen the inter-agency forum to coordinate anticorruption efforts by public accountability institutions and CSOs
5. Support selected CSOs to advocate and promote transparency, accountability and zero tolerance to corruption including facilitating dialogue between state and non-state actors in the implementation of transparency and accountability policies and regulations
6. Support selected LGs to undertake local economic development (LED) and business assessment; develop LED strategic plans; and adopt PPP approaches as a means of enhancing private sector collaboration and women's empowerment in service delivery
7. Support the piloting of the clean construction open data system in selected infrastructure investments in LGs and KCCA

Output 2: By the end of 2020 targeted accountability institutions (MDAs, CSOs and media) uphold and reinforce standards of accountability, transparency and integrity

The following two key result areas will be realised under this output:

KRA 5: An enabling environment for the CSOs and the media to effectively engage the public to demand for transparency and accountability

Interventions:

1. Support accountability institutions and other MDAs to harmonise and institutionalise existing social accountability platforms through partnerships with LGs, CSOs, and the media
2. Support the customization and implementation of the local government's Good Governance and Anticorruption frameworks in selected LGs
3. Provide financial and operational support to relevant CSOs to implement and sustain the CSO-led Quality Assurance Mechanism in Uganda
4. Support the review and updating of service delivery standards for the housing and roads sub-sectors that addresses gender and environment issues to guide quality control and accountability in service delivery
5. Support the Inspectorate of Government to implement and roll-out an online declaration process and conduct timely verification of declarations in order to strengthen the implementation of Leadership code and to ensure compliance in MDAs and LGs
6. Provide financial and technical support to public sector accountability institutions and selected CSOs to Strengthen their capacity to detect, prevent and redress corruption; and to operationalise a high-level platform for engagement between CSOs and government on good governance

KRA 6: Increased vigilance of the citizenry including women and youths in demanding and enforcing accountability and good governance of public sector institutions

Interventions:

1. Support the Simplification, localisation and popularization of accountability laws and their implementation arrangements (*including the anti-corruption Act, Access to information Act and the Whistle-blower Protection Act, and the Down-ward social accountability framework, etc.*)
2. Support relevant MDAs and CSOs to develop and popularise the national values system for Uganda and operationalise the Anti-corruption Public Private Partnership framework
3. Support selected CSOs to enhance Citizens' participation in accountability process through undertaking social accountability advocacy campaigns; establishing platforms for community level debate and engagement on ethics and integrity[4]; and implementing the community monitoring group model in selected LGs
4. Support the implementation of the LG Charter on Accountability and Ethical Code of Conduct in LGs

[4] This activity will put specific emphasis on women (FOWODE) as a way of providing women to articulate their interests and concerns and pave the way for increased women participation in decision making processes in their communities

5. Provide financial and technical support to relevant MDAs to undertake gender responsive studies that inform public sector decision making
6. Provide financial and technical support to a high-level discussion with senior management at MoGLSD on the principles and road map for institutional capacity development

Output 3: Improved and effectiveness of development cooperation, and country programme implementation

The following two key result areas will be realised under this output:

KRA 7: Current knowledge and best practices on development assistance coordination attained

Interventions:

1. Support the enhancement of technical competencies / skills among staff at ALD and UNDP for effective programme implementation, quality assurance and results reporting
2. Provide financial and technical support to enhance capacities of implementing partners and UNDP staff through regular orientation, training, office retooling and learning events attendance
3. Support the functional monitoring and evaluation mechanism for aid coordination and management.
4. Build capacity of ALD to coordinate development assistance including participation in national and international fora
5. Support the MoFPED in resource mobilization (domestic private and external)

KRA 8: Country office programme oversight and management successfully undertaken in line with UNDP's policies and procedures

Interventions:

1. Undertake functional monitoring and evaluation mechanism for country programme implementation
2. Undertake HACT macro/micro assessment processes
3. Conduct projects monitoring and audit
4. Organize annual portfolio review on UNDP/UN agencies
5. Operationalize the country programme evaluation plan
6. Enhance support to CPD implementation within UNDP for effective programme management

Output 4: Programme management

This output will focus on effective Programme management including general management services, monitoring and evaluation, communication, staffing etc.

Resources Required to Achieve the Expected Results

The programme is estimated to cost USD 12,070,000. This will cater for financial, technical and operational support to IP and RPs staff, programme purchases and partnerships that are required to deliver the outputs. This will also include UNDP staff time from the country, region or HQ level as estimated in the Results and Resources Framework / Budget.

Partnerships

The programme strategy recognises the need to establish effective synergies and collaboration amongst different development actors in order to create a strong momentum for strengthening the effectiveness of public sector institutions in Uganda and for addressing corruption. The programme strategy, therefore, provides for inclusiveness and partnership building to tap into the resources and the comparative advantages of both state and non-state actors in programme implementation. The programme will also benefit from the collaborative arrangements within the UN context of delivering as one where specific partnership and collaboration will be pursued with the relevant UN Agencies in Uganda delivering on respective UNDAF outcome and outputs. Collaborative networks will also be pursued with development partners working in this area such as DFID's Strengthening Uganda's Anti-Corruption and Accountability Regime (SUGAR) Programme which mainly focus on developing the capacity of parliament and selected accountability institutions in Uganda to tackle corruption in the public sector.

Risks and Assumptions

Table 2: Risks and Mitigations

Possible Risks	Mitigation
A. Inadequate number of staff in participating MDAs and CSOs to timely implement the programme activities	• Establish strategic collaborations between programme partners to augment their capacities • UNDP in collaboration with the partners recruit additional staff to support programme implementation
B. Political activities interrupting programme implementation especially in year 1	• Effective mobilisation of all key programme stakeholders, including beneficiaries, to remain politically neutral
C. Stringent legal and administrative procedures such as the requirements of POMA are likely to limit the participation of the CSOs	• Effective mobilisation of top-level political and administrative support coupled with an effective publicity and communication strategies about all programme activities
D. Delayed disbursement of funds to IP and RPs	• Enforce timely accountability and reporting practices to facilitate prompt release of funds by UNDP • Timely release of funds between the partners to be made a quality assurance parameter for the project

Assumptions

- Government of Uganda guarantees strong political will and commitment towards enhanced and sustained good governance
- UNDP will provide quality up-stream capacity development support for strengthened national capacities fully in line with national priorities
- IP and RPs are committed to implementation of the programme in line with UNDP guidelines

Stakeholder Engagement

The programme will have a nationwide dimension as prioritized in the CPD 2016-2020, preference will be given to districts in the Northern and Eastern regions of the country.[5] The primary beneficiaries are the citizens of Uganda who will enjoy the increased effectiveness and efficiency in public service delivery as a result of enhanced accountability and transparency in public sector management. The citizenry will particularly benefit from raised consciousness and awareness that will allow them to better articulate their needs, defend their rights and demand for accountability and transparency in public affairs. Specifically, women and youths will benefit through their increased participation in decision making at different government levels. Selected MDAs and CSOs, as IP and RPs will also benefit from the interventions particularly with regards to internal institutional capacity performance and credibility.

Stakeholder engagement strategy

Stakeholders	Interest	Engagement Strategy
MoFPED	Executing Partner	• Portfolio review meeting
Selected MDAs	Responsible Parties	• Quarterly/annual programme review meetings • Capacity building programmes
Selected CSOs	Citizen Voice	• As RPs to implement some interventions
Academia	Knowledge generation	• Conduct high policy dialogue • Participate in analytical studies and evaluations
Citizenry	Effective service delivery	• Participate in accountability fora
Development Partners	Synergy & coherence in development support	• Partnership on some interventions
Donors	Value for Money	• Updates on programme results
Other UN agencies	Contribution to the result area	Integrated work plan
Media	Propagate citizen voice	• Communicate programme results • Platform to amplify citizens' engagement in demand for accountability

South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSC/TrC)

Benchmarking and study visits to model countries with effective institutions in delivering services will be explored. In particular, the countries will include but not limited to the following: Botswana, Mauritius, South Africa, Rwanda, Brazil, India, South Korea, some Scandinavian countries (where appropriate).

Knowledge

The programme will support the establishment of a mechanism for knowledge generation and exchange on key policies and programmes through high level dialogues and diagnostic studies. It will also support the development of computerized monitoring system for implementation and reporting on the government. See annex 6 for a detailed communication plan.

[5] These two regions have the highest statistics of the poor and insecure non-poor categories of people in Uganda. For example, the Uganda Poverty status report, 2014, found that 43.7% and 37.1% of the population in the Northern region were categorised as Poor and Insecure non-poor respectively. The figures for the Eastern region were 24.5% and 54.3% for the poor and insecure non-poor categories respectively.

Sustainability and Scaling Up

A National Implementation Modality (NIM) will be adopted to build national capacity and ownership. Programme interventions will be integrated in MDA/LG development plans and budgets to ensure sustainability. In addition, UNDP will follow a stepwise approach exit approach that is, initially from down-stream support to upstream support (evidence based policy making by 2020).

The scaling up effects for the IE Programme include policy and legislative reforms and capacity-building of institutions, where these changes would lead to a reasonably high probability of yielding a large-scale of benefits for all citizens of Uganda.

While scaling up coverage will be pursued through support to the design of technological development models in the areas of institutional effectiveness in order to strengthen the public institutions. It will also include upscale innovations in harmonizing information management systems among key normative institutions especially OPM, MoFPED and NPA. In addition, accountability forums will be harmonized and this would in turn increase the participation citizenry demand for accountability.

Communication Strategy

The IE programme will adopt a Communication for Development (C4D) approach, which consists of using a two-way and horizontal communication approach to enhance sustainable democratic development in the areas of institutional development, government's effectiveness and corruption control.

Technical, technological, operational and catalytic funding support will be provided to targeted Local Governments, the Media and relevant CSO/CBOs to develop communication strategies and tools that are tailored to targeted communities' beliefs and values, as well as the social and cultural norms that shape the lives of their people, with the ultimate goal to: (i) amplify the voices of the people, particularly women, youth and other traditionally marginalized groups; (ii) facilitate their meaningful participation in policy debates; (iii) foster social changes that facilitate the entrenchment of the '*Zero Tolerance to Corruption*' concept into national value systems; and (iv) promote changes at different levels of the society including in terms of listening, building trust, sharing knowledge and skills, debating, learning and influencing national policies.

For achieving the above objectives, responsible MDAs and partners will be supported technically, technologically, operationally and financially in their efforts to promote and strengthen people-centered communication channels – e.g. public hearings; public debates; public deliberations and stakeholder consultations; participatory radio and television programmes; community-based theatre and storytelling; social media; and web forums – that address issues of transparency, accountability and performance in national institutions.

IV. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness

Lessons learnt from the previous evaluations such as the CPAP (2010-2015), reveal that a large UNDP portfolio with miniature of projects (about 35) and 10 outcomes areas in Country Programme was a challenge in implementing and documenting results. UNDP has thus moved away from micro-support modalities to issue-based and focused programmes with a large scope. This will deliver maximum results with available resources. The IE programme design is based on a portfolio approach in order to improve the cost effectiveness through leveraging activities and partnership with other projects in the governance portfolio.

To further maximise the result, the programme recognised the need to effectively partner with the private sector as well as civil society to complement government processes and fast track resource delivery. This was supported by the evidence from the CPAP (2010-2015) evaluation, which pointed out the slow implementation of planned interventions by government institutions, leading to low resource delivery.

Using the theory of change analysis, the optimal pathway to achieve the intended results is the step wise approach of addressing the three bottlenecks hampering institutional effectiveness. This is due to the interconnectedness and self-reinforcing nature of the bottlenecks. Thus, addressing gaps in the regulatory framework will enhance the implementation of policies, which will in turn stimulate civic engagement in demand for accountability and transparency from duty bearers.

Project Management

The programme will be operationalised within the selected MDAs and CSOs. The OPM will be the implementing partner responsible for the entire programme implementation as the executive. Due to the complexity of the intervention, the programme will involve shared support from MoLG, MPS, MoFA, MoFPED, NPA, DEI, IG, ACCU, KCCA which will be the responsible parties purposely selected for their technical / operational mandate. Programme interventions will also be undertaken within the following MDAs and CSOs: MoWT, MoLHUD, MoGLSD, OAG, UNNGOF, DENIVA, ULGA, UBOS, FOWODE, CSCU. The programme will be reviewed quarterly/annually as well as audited annually to inform decision making processes. Generally, the Programme will have a national coverage, however, particular focus will be on Northern and Eastern Uganda.

V. RESULTS FRAMEWORK[6]

Intended Outcome as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resource Framework: *CPD outcome 1.3: Institutional Development, Transparency and Accountability:* By the end of 2020, targeted public institutions and Public-Private Partnerships are fully functional at all levels, inclusive, resourced, performance-oriented, innovative and evidence-seeking supported by a strategic evaluation function; and with Uganda's population enforcing a culture of mutual accountability, transparency and integrity.
Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets: **Indicator 1:** Status of corruption perception index Baseline: 26 (2013); Target: 35; S: Corruption perception index report **Indicator 2:** Percentage of women/men who think Government is fighting corruption very well Baseline : 4 (M/F:4:4; R/U:4:1)(2012); Target: 10 (M/F:10:10; R/U:10:10); S: Afro-barometer/UBOS surveys **Indicator 3:** Percentage of local governments and other implementing agencies meeting standard performance measures of service delivery Base line: 84(2013); Target: 95; S: Local government report
Applicable Key Result Area (from 2013-17 Strategic Plan): Outcome 2: Citizens' expectation for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance.
Partnership Strategy: Establishment of effective synergies and collaboration amongst different actors in the SIEP to tap into their resources and comparative advantages in order to create the necessary momentum for strengthening the effectiveness of targeted public sector institutions and addressing corruption is a required condition for programme's success. The Programme will also exploit the collaborative arrangements within the UN context of delivering as one where specific partnership and collaboration will be pursued with the UN Agencies in Uganda delivering on related UNDAF outcome and outputs. Collaborative synergies will also be pursued with other development partners working in this areas such as the DFID's SUGAR Programme and Korea's E-Governance system.
Alignment : **NDP II: Objective 4:** Strengthening Mechanisms for quality, effective and efficient service delivery **SDG 16:** Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels **UNDP Strategic Plan**: Strategy 2: Inclusive and effective democratic governance *(Governance strengthening and innovation)*
Project title and ID (ATLAS Award ID): Strengthening Institutional Effectiveness (00092241)

[6] UNDP publishes its project information (indicators, baselines, targets and results) to meet the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standards. Make sure that indicators are S.M.A.R.T. (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound), provide accurate baselines and targets underpinned by reliable evidence and data, and avoid acronyms so that external audience clearly understand the results of the project.

INTENDED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TARGETS FOR (YEARS)	INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	INPUTS
Output 1: Selected Ministries, Department and Agencies /sectors effectively coordinate and implement targeted public sector reforms by 2020 **<u>Indicators; Baseline and Targets</u>** 1.3.1.1: No. of MDAs and LGs developing and implementing strategic development plans and frameworks and complying with NDPII Priorities. B: 1(2013); T: 5; S: Sector review reports; F: Annual 1.3.1.2: No. of new PPPs providing innovative solutions for development : (IRRF 7.6.1); B: 0 (2014); T: 3; S: Sector review reports; F: Annual 1.3.1.3: Existence of strategic functional management information system informing policy direction: B: No (2013); T: Yes; S: Sector review reports; F: Annual **Targets** Indicator 1.3.1.1: 2016: 2 2017: 3	**<u>Targets (2017)</u>** By 2017, selected MDAs and LGs with s enhanced technical capacities to strengthen public sector policies and develop legal and regulatory frameworks and operational mechanisms to foster effectiveness in public sector management. **By Year 2 (2017)** *- 2 Study reports/ diagnostics on challenges and capacity needs for improving effectiveness in public sector management in place <u>(2016-1; 2017-2)</u>;* *-27 MDAs and LGs benefiting from the training and benchmarking activities on various effectiveness-related reform <u>(2016-10, 2017-20 and 2018-27)</u>;* *-Training module on policy formulation, appraisal, implementation, analysis in place at the CSCU;* *-A functional research and evaluation unit at NPA in place <u>(2016-No, 2017-2020- Fully in place)</u>;*	**Activity Result 1: Relevant MDAs and LGs with strengthened capacity to formulate appraise and review policies and regulations for effective and gender-responsive public sector management.** **Action 1:** Provide financial and technical support to relevant MDAs to conduct a study to identify challenges in the policy, legal and operational frameworks and assess institutional capacity needs for improving effectiveness and gender responsive in public sector management **Action 2:** Provide financial and technical support for implementing interventions identified by the study on key challenges in the policy, legal and operational frameworks in order to provide institutional capacity to sustainably address the challenges **Action 3:** Support benchmarking and mainstreaming of best practices from within the region and internationally on various effectiveness-related reforms including policy formulation and implementation, women participation in public sector decision making, etc. **Action 4:** Provide financial and technical support to review the "Pay and Reward Policy" for public service to match the market trends and operationalize the salary review **Action 5:** Provide financial and technical support strengthen the capacity of relevant MDAs to carry out inspection in the Public Service **Action 6:** Support the designing and implementation training of programmes of public service on gender responsive policy formulation, appraisal, implementation, analysis, monitoring and evaluation;	OPM, MPS, Cabinet Secretariat MPS, OPM, Cabinet Secretariat OPM, MoGLSD, NPA, Cabinet Secretariat, MPS,UNDP MPS MPS MPS (CSCU)	UNDP to provide financialtechnical and operational support (USD) 1,550,000

INTENDED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TARGETS FOR (YEARS)	INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	INPUTS
2018: 4 2019: 5 Indicator 1.3.1.2: 2016: 1 2017: 2 2018: 3 2019: 4 Indicator 1.3.1.3: 2016: No 2017: Yes 2018: Yes 2019: Yes 2020: Yes		**Activity Result 2: Strong and institutionalized development policy, research and evaluation function in the public sector.** **Action 1:** Support the establishment of a research and evaluation function at relevant MDAs **Action 2:** Support the establishment of a mechanism for knowledge generation and exchange on key policies and programmes through high level dialogues and diagnostic studies	NPA, OPM, MoFPED, UBOS, UNDP UNDP, NPA, MoFPED, OPM, MoLG	
	<u>Targets (2018)</u> By 2018, selected MDAs and LGs with enhanced technical capacities and tools to promote institutional effectiveness and efficiency at central and decentralized levels and a culture of transparency, accountability and zero tolerance to corruption ***Target By Year 3 (2018)*** *-80% of staff in ministerial planning units and DPUs trained in Transformational development Approach (2016-30%, 2017-50%, 2018-80%;* *-50 LGs with strategic development plans aligned to the NDP 2 <u>(2016-35, 2017-45 and 2018-50)</u>;* *-5-year Human Resources Development plan for Uganda developed and operationalised* *-80% of LGs with 5-year development plans aligning with the SDPs and NDP following*	**Activity Result 3: Relevant institutions with enhanced capacity to plan, implement and monitor public policies and programmes** **Action 1:** Support the introduction of the Transformational Development Approach (TDA) in MDAs and LGs planning frameworks for gender and environmental responsive planning **Action 2:** Provide financial and technical support to MPS to strengthen the human resources planning function at national and local government levels. *(Develop comprehensive HRD plan; Content policy, HRD indicators; tailored training in HR planning)* **Action 3:** Provide financial and technical support to scale up the Prime Minister's Management Information System (PMIS) for implementing and reporting on government programmes. **Action 4**: Support the digitalisation of protocol services **Action 5**: Support the resource mobilisation, domestication, monitoring, evaluation and reporting for/of SDGs. **Action 6**: Support mid-term review of NDP2 and NDP3 formulation processes. **Activity Result 4: A strong and effective collaboration between MDAs, CSOs, and private sector in fostering public policy**	NPA, MoFPED MPS OPM, MoFPED, NPA, MoLG MoFA UBOS, OPM, MoFPED, NPA, MoFA NPA	UNDP to provide Financial, technical and operational support (USD) 2,990,000

INTENDED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TARGETS FOR (YEARS)	INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	INPUTS
	LGDP guidelines (2016-20%, 2017-50%, 2018-80%); *-Midterm review of the NDP2 conducted* *-4 public sector accountability institutions and 4 CSOs supported with staff training, equipment and transport logistics (to be done 2016, 2017 and 2018);* *-14 PPPs launched and operationalized by LGs (2016-2; 2017-8, 2018-14);* *-14 LGs (selected from all regions of the country) successful conducted local economic assessment and developed & operationalised LED strategic plans (to be done annually);* *-14 CSOs equipped with knowledge, skill and equipment for promoting transparency and accountability policies and regulations through dialogue*	**effectiveness and a culture of transparency, accountability and zero tolerance to corruption** **Action 1:** Provide financial and technical support to strengthen the capacity of relevant anti-corruption institutions through rigorous skills training, acquisition of modern tools and equipment and transport logistics **Action 2:** Provide financial and technical support strengthen the ombudsman's function of the Inspectorate of Government (IG) **Action 3:** Support capacity enhancement for LG councils to deliver effective legislation and oversight services including establishment of effective collaboration with civic groups in the rendering of oversight services in LGs. **Action 4:** Provide financial support to relevant MDAs to strengthen the inter-agency forum to coordinate anticorruption efforts by public accountability institutions and CSOs **Action 5:** Support selected CSOs to advocate and promote transparency, accountability and zero tolerance to corruption including facilitating dialogue between state and non-state actors in the implementation of transparency and accountability policies and regulations **Action 6:** Support selected LGs to undertake local economic and business assessment; develop LED strategic plans; and adopt PPP approaches as a means of enhancing private sector collaboration and women's empowerment in service delivery **Action 7**: Support the piloting of the clean construction open data system in selected infrastructure investments in LGs and KCCA	IG, DEI, OAG, ACCU IG MoLG DEI ACCU, FOWODE, UNNGOF MoLG, Selected LGs and PSOs MoLG, Selected LGs, KCCA, ACCU	
Output 2: By the end of 2020 targeted accountability institutions (MDAs, CSOs and	**Targets (2020)** By 2020, selected MDAs and CSOs with adequate technical,	**Activity Result 5: An enabling environment for the CSOs and the media to effectively engage the public to demand for transparency and accountability**		UNDP to provide Financial,

INTENDED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TARGETS FOR (YEARS)	INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	INPUTS
media) uphold and reinforce standards of accountability, transparency and integrity **<u>Indicators; Baseline and Targets</u>** 1.3.2.1: Existence of service delivery standards for key extractives and infrastructure (housing and roads) sectors: B: 0 (2014); T: Yes; S: Sector reports; F: Annual 1.3.2.2: No. of CSOs that are QUAM certified and participate in ensuring compliance with national standards; B: 76 (2013); T: 150; S: QUAM report by DENIVA; F:Annual 1.3.2.3: % of targeted MDAs effectively monitoring (complying with) implementation of the 'Leadership Code'; B: 0 (2013); T: 75: S: Sector reports; F:Annual 1.3.2.4: No. of accountability institutions with functional mechanisms for detection, prevention and redress of corruption ;B: 0 (2013); T: 3; S: Government performance report; F:Annual **Targets** Indicator 1.3.2.1: 2016: No	operational and financial capacities to engage relevant CSOs, media, private sector and academic institutions to raise the consciousness of the public to articulate their needs, defend their rights and demand for accountability and transparency in public affairs. **Target By Year 5 (2020)** *-Targeted social accountability platforms harmonized and institutionalised <u>(to be done annually)</u>;* *-Service delivery standards for the housing and roads sectors developed <u>(to be done in 2016 and 2017)</u>;* *-Accountability laws simplified and localised by CSOs per year;* *-National values system for Uganda developed and popularised and the Anti-corruption Public Private Partnership framework operationalised* *-Citizens' participation in accountability process, platforms for community level debate and engagement implemented <u>(to be done annually)</u>;* *-75% of MDAs effectively complying with the leadership code (online declaration of assets system and mechanisms for verification of declarations established)*	**Action 1:** Support accountability institutions and other MDAs to harmonise and institutionalise existing social accountability platforms through partnerships with LGs, CSOs, and the media. **Action 2:** Support the customization and implementation of the local government's Good Governance and Anticorruption frameworks in selected LGs **Action 3:** Provide financial and operational support to relevant CSOs to implement and sustain the CSO-led Quality Assurance Mechanism in Uganda **Action 4:** Provide financial and technical support to review and update service delivery standards for the housing and roads sub-sectors that addresses gender and environment issues to guide quality control and accountability in service delivery. **Action 5:** Support the Inspectorate of Government to implement and roll-out an online declaration process and conduct timely verification of declarations in order to strengthen the implementation of Leadership code and to ensure compliance in MDAs and LGs **Action 6:** Provide financial and technical support to public sector accountability institutions and selected CSOs to Strengthen their capacity to detect, prevent and redress corruption; and to operationalise a high-level platform for engagement between CSOs and government on good governance **Activity Result 6: Increased vigilance of the citizenry including women and youths in demanding and enforcing accountability and good governance of public sector institutions** **Action 1:** Support the simplification, localisation and popularization of accountability laws and their implementation arrangements (*including the anti-corruption Act, Access to information Act and the Whistle-blower Protection Act, and the Down-ward social accountability framework, etc*)	OPM, DEI, MoLG, Selected CSOs MoLG, Selected CSOs DENIVA,UNNGOF MoW/Ministry of Housing IG DEI, IG,OAG, ACCU	technical and operational support (USD) 2,423,800

INTENDED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TARGETS FOR (YEARS)	INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	INPUTS
2017: No 2018: Yes 2019: Yes 2020: Yes Indicator 1.3.2.2: 2016: 80 2017: 100 2018: 120 2019: 135 2020: 150 Indicator 1.3.2.3: 2016: 10 2017: 25 2018: 50 2019: 60 2020: 75 Indicator 1.3.2.4: 2016: 0 2017: 1 2018: 2 2019: 3 2020: 4	*-75% of accountability institutions with functional mechanisms for detection prevention and redress of corruption* *-High-level platform for engagement between CSO and government on good governance operationalised;* *-LG Charter on Accountability and Ethical Code of Conduct in LGs in place;* *-Study to identify foundational bottlenecks to women participation in public sector decision making conducted and follow-up interventions implemented*	**Action 2:** Support relevant MDAs and CSOs to develop and popularise the national values system for Uganda and operationalise the Anti-corruption Public Private Partnership framework. **Action 3:** Support selected CSOs to enhance Citizens' participation in accountability process through undertaking social accountability advocacy campaigns; establishing platforms for community level debate and engagement on ethics and integrity[7]; and implementing the community monitoring group model in selected LGs **Action 4:** Support the implementation of the LG Charter on Accountability and Ethical Code of Conduct in LGs **Action 5:** Support gender responsive studies that inform public sector decision making **Action 6:** Provide financial and technical support to design a road map for institutional capacity development at MoGLSD.	DEI, ACCU, UNGOF, MoLG DEI, ACCU, & UNNGOF DEI, Selected LGs, FOWODE, ACCU, OPM, IG ULGA MoGLSD MoGLSD	
Output 3: Improved and Effectiveness of development Cooperation, and Country Program Implementation **<u>Indicators; Baseline and Targets</u>**	**Targets (2016)** *- 50% of ALD staff equipped with knowledge and skills in DA coordination and management* *-50% UNDP staff equipped with skills in Country program management and oversight* *-100% new implementing partners trained in UNDP HACT processes*	**Activity Result 7: Current knowledge and best practices on Development Assistance coordination attained** **Action 1:** Provide support to enhance the technical competencies/skills among staff at ALD and UNDP for effective programme implementation, quality assurance and results reporting **Action 2:** Provide support to enhance capacities of implementing partners and UNDP staff through regular orientation, training, office retooling and learning events attendance	MoFPED, UNDP UNDP	*UNDP to provide financial, technical and operation support (USD)* 2,360,000

[7] This activity will put specific emphasis on women (FOWODE) as a way of providing women to articulate their interests and concerns and pave the way for increased women participation in decision making processes in their communities

INTENDED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TARGETS FOR (YEARS)	INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	INPUTS
Baseline: A new Country program document 2016-2020 is in place, but: - No staff have been trained/oriented in new Country program management and oversight - 10% of target IPs micro-assessed - No HACT micro-assessment plan/Assurance plan in place for the new programme - No report on financing for SDGs - No UNDP annual portfolio review report on the new programme - No Country programme evaluation plan for 2016-2020 - Zero evaluations completed in the new programme - Zero projects audited in the new programme -85% programme delivery as of 2015 **Indicators**: - % of staff (government/UNDP) equipped with knowledge and skills in Development Assistance coordination and management & skills in Country program management and oversight - % of target IPs micro-assessed - Existence of HACT micro-assessment plan/Assurance plan -Existence of report on financing for SDGs	*-100% of target IPs micro-assessed* *-Existence of HACT micro-assessment plan/Assurance plan* *-Existence of report on financing for SDGs* *-UNDP annual portfolio review report in place* *- Existence of a Country programme evaluation plan* *-Number of evaluations completed* *-Number of projects audited* *- Effective CPD Implementation, management and reporting* **Targets (2017)** *-75% of ALD staff equipped with knowledge and skills in -DA coordination and management* *-75% UNDP staff equipped with skills in Country program management and oversight* *-100% of target IPs micro-assessed* *-Existence of HACT micro-assessment plan/Assurance plan* *-Existence of report on financing for SDGs* *- UNDP annual portfolio review report in place* *-Existence of a Country programme evaluation plan* *-2 evaluations completed* *-6 projects audited* *-Effective CPD Implementation, management and reporting*	**Action 3:** Support the functional monitoring and evaluation mechanism for aid coordination and management **Action 4:** Provide support to build capacity of ALD to coordinate Development Assistance, including participation in national and international fora **Action 5:** Support the MoFPED in resource mobilization (domestic, private and external sources) **Activity Result 8: Country office programme oversight and management successfully undertaken in line with UNDP's policies and procedures** **Action 1:** Undertake functional monitoring and evaluation mechanism for Country Program implementation **Action 2:** Undertake HACT macro/micro assessment processes **Action 3:** Conduct projects monitoring and audit **Action 4:** Organize annual portfolio review on UNDP/UN agencies **Action 5**:Operationalise the Country programme evaluation plan **Action 6:** Enhance support to CPD implementation within UNDP for effective programme management	MoFPED MoFPED MoFPED UNDP UNDP UNDP MoFPED UNDP UNDP	

INTENDED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TARGETS FOR (YEARS)	INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	INPUTS
- Existence of UNDP annual portfolio review report - Existence of a Country programme evaluation plan - Number of evaluations completed - Number of projects audited -% of Programme delivery Targets: **Note:** Refer to 2nd column for annualised targets. Life of project output targets are: *-100% of DARC staff equipped with knowledge and skills in ODA coordination and management* *-100% UNDP staff equipped with skills in Country programme management and oversight* *-100% of target IPs micro-assessed* *-Existence of updated HACT micro-assessment plan/Assurance plan* *-Existence of updated report on financing for SDGs* *-UNDP annual portfolio review report in place* *-Existence of an updated Country programme evaluation plan* *-6 terminal evaluations completed* *-6 projects audited* *-Effective CPD Implementation, management and reporting.*	**Targets (2018)** *-90% of ALD staff equipped with knowledge and skills in -DA coordination and management* *-90% UNDP staff equipped with skills in Country program management and oversight* *-100% of target IPs micro-assessed* *-Existence of updated HACT micro-assessment plan/Assurance plan* *-Existence of updated report on financing for SDGs* *-UNDP annual portfolio review report in place* *-Existence of an updated Country programme evaluation plan* *-6 mid-term evaluations completed* *-6 projects audited* *-Effective CPD Implementation, management and reporting* **Targets (2019)** *-95% of ALD staff equipped with knowledge and skills in DA coordination and management* *-95% UNDP staff equipped with skills in Country program management and oversight* *-100% of target IPs micro-assessed*			

INTENDED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TARGETS FOR (YEARS)	INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	INPUTS
	-Existence of updated HACT micro-assessment plan/Assurance plan *-Existence of updated report on financing for SDGs* *-UNDP annual portfolio review report in place* *-Existence of an updated Country programme evaluation plan* *-3 evaluations completed* *-6 projects audited* *-Effective CPD Implementation, management and reporting.* **Targets (2020**) *-100% of ALD staff equipped with knowledge and skills in DA coordination and management* *-100% UNDP staff equipped with skills in Country programme management and oversight* *-100% of target IPs micro-assessed* *-Existence of updated HACT micro-assessment plan/Assurance plan* *-Existence of updated report on financing for SDGs* *-UNDP annual portfolio review report in place* *-Existence of an updated Country programme evaluation plan* *-6 terminal evaluations completed* *-6 projects audited*			

INTENDED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT TARGETS FOR (YEARS)	INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	INPUTS
	-Effective CPD Implementation, management and reporting.			
Support to Country Office Programme Implementation		Evaluation (Project Mid-term & final) evaluation		*75,000*
		Communication (1%)		*651,081*
Administrative/Management Support Costs		General Management Services (8%)		*893,704*
		Direct Project Costs		*730,833*
Grand Total				**12,065,008**

Intended Outcome as stated in the UNDAF/Country [or Global/Regional] Programme Results and Resource Framework:

CPD outcome 1.3: Institutional Development, Transparency and Accountability: By the end of 2020, targeted public institutions and Public-Private Partnerships are fully functional at all levels, inclusive, resourced, performance-oriented, innovative and evidence-seeking supported by a strategic evaluation function; and with Uganda's population enforcing a culture of mutual accountability, transparency and integrity.

Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme [or Global/Regional] Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets:

Indicator 1: Status of corruption perception index
Baseline: 26 (2013); Target: 35; S: Corruption perception index report

Indicator 2: Percentage of women/men who think Government is fighting corruption very well
Baseline : 4 (M/F:4:4; R/U:4:1)(2012); Target: 10 (M/F:10:10; R/U:10:10); S: Afro-barometer/UBOS surveys

Indicator 3: Percentage of local governments and other implementing agencies meeting standard performance measures of service delivery
Base line: 84(2013); Target: 95; S: Local government report

Applicable Output(s) from the UNDP Strategic Plan: Outcome 2: Citizens' expectation for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance.

Project title and Atlas Project Number: Strengthening Institutional Effectiveness (00092241)

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT INDICATORS[8]	DATA SOURCE	BASELINE		TARGETS (by frequency of data collection)						DATA COLLECTION METHODS & RISKS
			Value	Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	FINAL	
Output 1 **Selected Ministries, Department and Agencies /sectors effectively coordinate and implement targeted public sector reforms by 2020**	**1.3.1.1** No. of MDAs and LGs developing and implementing strategic development plans and frameworks and complying with NDPII Priorities.	Sector review reports	1	2013	2	3	4	5	5	5	Document review
	1.2.1.2 No. of new PPPs providing innovative solutions for development : (IRRF 7.6.1)	Sector review reports	0	2014	1	2	3	4	4	4	Document review
	1.3.1.3 Existence of strategic functional management information system informing policy direction	Sector review reports	No	2013	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Document review
Output 2 **By the end of 2020 targeted accountability institutions (MDAs, CSOs and media) uphold and reinforce standards of accountability, transparency and integrity**	**1.3.2.1** : Existence of service delivery standards for key extractives and infrastructure (housing and roads) sectors	Sector reports	0	2014	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Document review
	1.3.2.2 No. of CSOs that are QUAM certified and participate in ensuring compliance with national standards;	QUAM report by DENIVA	76	2013	80	100	120	135	150	150	Document review
	1.3.2.3 % of targeted MDAs effectively monitoring (complying with) implementation of the 'Leadership Code'	Sector reports	0	2013	10	25	50	60	75	75	Document review
	1.3.2.4 No. of accountability institutions with functional mechanisms for detection, prevention and redress of corruption	Government performance reports	0	2013	0	1	2	3	4	4	Document review

[88] It is recommended that projects use output indicators from the Strategic Plan IRRF, as relevant, in addition to project-specific results indicators. Indicators should be disaggregated by sex or for other targeted groups where relevant.

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT INDICATORS[8]	DATA SOURCE	BASELINE		TARGETS (by frequency of data collection)						DATA COLLECTION METHODS & RISKS
			Value	Year	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	FINAL	
Output 3 **Improved quality and effectiveness of development cooperation, and country Programme implementation**	% of ALD staff equipped with skills in development assistance and CP management[9]	PMDs, Knowledge management reports	0	2015	50%	75%	90%	95%	100%	100%	Document review
	% of target IPs micro-assessed	Micro-Assessment reports	10%	2015	50%	75%	90%	95%	100%	100%	Document review
	Existence of HACT micro-assessment plan/Assurance plan	HACT micro assessment-plan	No	2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Document review
	Existence of report on financing for SDGs	Reports on SDG financing	No	2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Document review
	Existence of UNDP annual portfolio review report	Portfolio review reports	No	2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Document review
	Existence of a CP evaluation plan	CP Evaluation Plan	No	2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Document review
	Number of evaluations completed	Evaluation reports	0	2015	0	0	1	0	2	2	Document review
	Number of projects audited	Project audit reports	0	2015	1	2	3	4	5	5	Document review
	% of Programme delivery	Project review reports	85%	2015	25%	35%	50%	75%	100%	100%	Document review
Note: No data collection risks envisaged											

[9] % of ALD staff (government/UNDP) equipped with knowledge and skills in development assistance and Country Programme management and oversight

VI. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

In accordance with UNDP's programming policies and procedures, the project will be monitored through the following monitoring and evaluation plans:

Monitoring Plan

Monitoring Activity	Purpose	Frequency	Expected Action	Partners (if joint)	Cost (USD)
Track results progress	Progress data against the results indicators in the RRF will be collected and analysed to assess the progress of the project in achieving the agreed outputs.	Quarterly, or in the frequency required for each indicator	Slower than expected progress will be addressed by project management	All partners as listed in the RRF above	54,315
Monitor and Manage Risk	Identify specific risks that may threaten achievement of intended results. Identify and monitor risk management actions using a risk log. This includes monitoring measures and plans that may have been required as per UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards. Audits will be conducted in accordance with UNDP's audit policy to manage financial risk.	Annually/Quarterly	Risks are identified by project management and actions are taken to manage risk. The risk log is actively maintained to keep track of identified risks and actions taken	All partners as listed in the RRF above	144,840
Learn	Knowledge, good practices and lessons will be captured regularly, as well as actively sourced from other projects and partners and integrated back into the project.	At least annually	Relevant lessons are captured by the project team and used to inform management decisions	All partners as listed in the RRF above	72,420
Annual Project Quality Assurance	The quality of the project will be assessed against UNDP's quality standards to identify project strengths and weaknesses and to inform management decision making to improve the project.	Annually/quarterly	Areas of strength and weakness will be reviewed by project management and used to inform decisions to improve project performance	All partners as listed in the RRF above	36,210
Review and Make Course Corrections	Internal review of data and evidence from all monitoring actions to inform decision making.	Annually/quarterly	Performance data, risks, lessons and quality will be discussed by the project board and used to make course corrections	All partners as listed in the RRF above	18,105
Project Report	A progress report will be presented to the Project Board and key stakeholders, consisting of progress data showing the results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level, the annual project quality rating summary, an updated risk long with mitigation measures, and any evaluation or review reports prepared over the period.	Annually, and at the end of the project (final report)		All partners as listed in the RRF above	18,105
Project Review (Project Board)	The project's governance mechanism (i.e., project board) will hold regular project reviews to assess the performance of the project and review the Multi-Year Work Plan to ensure realistic budgeting over the life of the project. In the project's final year, the Project Board shall hold an end-of project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up and to socialize project results and lessons learned with relevant audiences.	Specify frequency (i.e., at least annually)	Any quality concerns or slower than expected progress will be discussed by the project board and management actions agreed to address the issues identified	All partners as listed in the RRF above	18,105

Evaluation Plan[10]

Evaluation Title	Partners (if joint)	Related Strategic Plan Output	UNDAF/CPD Outcome	Planned Completion Date	Key Evaluation Stakeholders	Cost and Source of Funding
Mid-Term Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness Programme		Citizen expectations for voice, development, rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance.	By the end of 2020, targeted public institutions and Public-Private Partnerships are fully functional at all levels, inclusive, resourced, performance-oriented, innovative and evidence-seeking supported by a strategic evaluation function; and with Uganda's population enforcing a culture of mutual accountability, transparency and integrity.	By Dec 2018	UNDP (Uganda CO, RSC, HQ) IP & RPs Citizenry of Uganda	USD 30,000 UNDP
Terminal Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness Programme		Citizen expectations for voice, development, rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance.	By the end of 2020, targeted public institutions and Public-Private Partnerships are fully functional at all levels, inclusive, resourced, performance-oriented, innovative and evidence-seeking supported by a strategic evaluation function; and with Uganda's population enforcing a culture of mutual accountability, transparency and integrity.	By Dec 2020	UNDP (Uganda CO, RSC, HQ) IP & RPs Citizenry of Uganda	USD 30,000 UNDP
Mid-term Evaluation of gender mainstreaming in the UNDP programme		Citizen expectations for voice, development, rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance.	By the end of 2020, targeted public institutions and Public-Private Partnerships are fully functional at all levels, inclusive, resourced, performance-oriented, innovative and evidence-seeking supported by a strategic evaluation function; and with Uganda's population enforcing a culture of mutual accountability, transparency and integrity.	By Dec 2018	UNDP (Uganda CO, RSC, HQ) IP & RPs Citizenry of Uganda	USD 10,000

[10] Optional, if needed

VII. MULTI-YEAR WORK PLAN [11][12]

All anticipated programmatic and operational costs to support the project, including development effectiveness and implementation support arrangements, need to be identified, estimated and fully costed in the project budget under the relevant output(s). This includes activities that directly support the project, such as communication, human resources, procurement, finance, audit, policy advisory, quality assurance, reporting, management, etc. All services which are directly related to the project need to be disclosed transparently in the project document.

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES	Planned Budget by Year					RESPONSIBLE PARTY	PLANNED BUDGET		
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5		Funding Source	Budget Description	Amount
Output 1 Selected Ministries, Department and Agencies /sectors effectively coordinate and implement targeted public sector reforms by 2020	Activity 1.1: Provide financial and technical support to relevant MDAs to conduct a study on the challenges in the policy, legal and operational frameworks and assess institutional capacity needs for improving effectiveness and gender responsive in public sector management	50,000	-	-	-	-	OPM, MPS, Cabinet Secretariat	UNDP	Local consultancy	50,000
	Activity 1.2: Provide financial and technical support for implementing interventions identified by the study on key challenges in the policy, legal and operational frameworks in order to provide institutional capacity to sustainably address the challenges	-	75,000	75,000	-	-	MPS, OPM, Cabinet Secretariat	UNDP	Budgetary support for implementing interventions identified	150,000
	Activity 1.3: Support the benchmarking and mainstreaming of best practices from within the region and internationally on various effectiveness-related reforms including policy formulation and implementation, women participation in public sector decision making, etc.	50,000	50,000	50,000	-	-	OPM, MoGLSD, NPA, Cabinet Secretariat, MPS, UNDP	UNDP	Regional study tours; stakeholders' conferences to dialogue strategies for mainstreaming best practices; UNDP/ international facilitation	150,000

[11] Cost definitions and classifications for Programme and development effectiveness costs to be charged to the project are defined in the Executive Board decision DP/2010/32

[12] Changes to a project budget affecting the scope (outputs), completion date, or total estimated project costs require a formal budget revision that must be signed by the project board. In other cases, the UNDP Programme manager alone may sign the revision provided the other signatories have no objection. This procedure may be applied for example when the purpose of the revision is only to re-phase activities among years.

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES	Planned Budget by Year					RESPONSIBLE PARTY	PLANNED BUDGET		
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5		Funding Source	Budget Description	Amount
	Activity 1.4: Support relevant MDAS to review of the "Pay and Reward Policy" for public service to match the market trends and operationalize the salary review	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	MPS	UNDP	Consultancies, workshops, and communications	200,000
	Activity 1.5: Provide financial and technical support to strengthen the capacity to carry out inspection in the Public Service	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	MPS	UNDP	Consultancies, printing, communication and training	200,000
	Activity 1.6: Support the designing and implementation of training programmes of public service on gender responsive policy formulation, appraisal, implementation, analysis, monitoring and evaluation	100,000	100,000	-	-	-	MPS (CSCU)	UNDP	International consultancies; Module development and piloting; annual training sessions (3 No)	200,000
	Activity 2.1**:** Provide financial and technical support to the research and evaluation function	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	NPA, OPM, MoFPED, UBOS, UNDP	UNDP	Consultancy to support Research and Strategic Evaluation; 2 policy research missions; policy dialogue to debate results; production of resultant policy management briefs.	300,000
	Activity 2.2**:** Provide financial and technical support to establishment of a mechanism for knowledge generation and exchange on key policies and Programmes through high level dialogues and diagnostic studies	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	UNDP, NPA , MFPED, OPM, MoLG	UNDP	High-level dialogue on policy effectiveness; annual Decentralisation policy dialogue (MoLG / UMI)	300,000
	Activity 3.1**:** Support the introduction of the Transformational Development Approach (TDA) in MDAs and LGs planning frameworks for gender and environmental responsive planning	40,000	70,000	40,000	40,000	-	NPA, MoFPED	UNDP	External facilitation; Establishment of TOT; consultancy to review planning guidelines to integrate TDA principles; TDA Training workshops at MDAs and LGs	190,000

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES	Planned Budget by Year					RESPONSIBLE PARTY	PLANNED BUDGET		
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5		Funding Source	Budget Description	Amount
	Activity 3.2**:** Provide financial and technical support to Ministry of Public Service to strengthen the human resources planning function at national and local government levels. *(i.e., to develop comprehensive Human Resource Development plan; Content policy, Human Resource Development indicators; tailored training in Human Resource planning)*	-	40,000	30,000	30,000	-	MPS	UNDP	External Training/ facilitation of Ministerial Planning units, sector planning conferences; documentation cost	100,000
	Activity 3.3**:** Support to scale up the Prime Minister's Management Information System (PMIS) for implementing and reporting on government programmes	-	100,000	100,000	100,000	-	OPM, MoFPED, NPA, MoLG	UNDP	Purchase of equipment, training and installation of equipment and software	300,000
	Activity 3.4**:** Support the digitalisation of protocol services	10,000	65,000	75,000	-	-	MoFA	UNDP	Consultancies, meetings Training, learning	150,000
	Activity 3.5**:** Support the resource mobilisation, domestication, monitoring, evaluation, reporting and mobilisation for/of resources for SDGs.	-	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	UBOS, OPM, MoFPED, NPA, MoFA	UNDP	Production of annual NDR	200,000
	Activity 3.4**:** Support mid-term review of NDP2 and NDP3 formulation processes	-	-	100,000	100,000	200,000	NPA	UNDP	Consultancies, meetings.	400,000
	Activity 4.1**:** Support capacity development of relevant anti-corruption institutions through rigorous skills training, acquisition of modern tools and equipment and transport logistics	-	100,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	IG, DEI, OAG, ACCU	UNDP	Staff Training; equipment and logistics	250,000
	Activity 4.2**:** Support the strengthening of the ombudsman's function of the Inspectorate of Government (IG)	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	IG	UNDP	Capacity needs assessment, starter activities based on identified capacity needs	200,000

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES	Planned Budget by Year					RESPONSIBLE PARTY	PLANNED BUDGET		
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5		Funding Source	Budget Description	Amount
	Activity 4.3**:** Support capacity enhancement for LG councils to deliver effective legislation and oversight services including establishment of effective collaboration with civic groups in the rendering of oversight services in LGs	-	80,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	MoLG	UNDP	Training; support supervision and mentoring (20 LG)	200,000
	Activity 4.4**:** Provide financial support to relevant MDAs to strengthen the inter-agency forum to coordinate anticorruption efforts by public accountability institutions and CSOs	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	DEI	UNDP	Quarterly dialogue meetings	200,000
	Activity 4.5: Support selected CSOs to advocate and promote transparency, accountability and zero tolerance to corruption including facilitating dialogue between state and non-state actors in the implementation of transparency and accountability policies and regulations	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	ACCU, FOWODE & UNNGOF	UNDP	Anti-corruption advocacy Campaigns; and Engagement Meetings with MDAs (ACCU) Trainings of Women political leaders on legal and policy framework for transparency and accountability (FOWODE) CSO-district dialogue to build consensus on district budget priorities (UNNGOF)	200,000
	Activity 4.6**:** Support selected LGs to undertake local economic and business assessment; develop LED strategic plans; and adopt PPP approaches as a means of enhancing private sector collaboration and women empowerment in service delivery	-	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	MoLG, selected LGs and PSOs	UNDP	Local economic and business assessments in 14 LGs; development of LED strategic plans in 14 LGs; PPP design and implementation in 14 LGs	200,000
	Activity 4.7: Support the piloting of the clean construction open data system in selected infrastructure investments in LGs and KCCA	-	80,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	Selected LGs, KCCA, ACCU	UNDP	Pilot activities in 8 LGs and KCCA	200,000

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES	Planned Budget by Year					RESPONSIBLE PARTY	PLANNED BUDGET		
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5		Funding Source	Budget Description	Amount
	Monitoring									120,700
	Sub-Total for Output 1	**478,000**	**1,325,000**	**1,190,000**	**740,000**	**577,125**				**4,430,825**
Output 2 **By the end of 2020 targeted accountability institutions (MDAs, CSOs and media) uphold and reinforce standards of accountability, transparency and integrity**	Activity 5.1: Support accountability institutions and other MDAs to harmonise and institutionalise existing social accountability platforms through partnerships with LGs, CSOs, and the media.	-	100,000	50,000	50,000	-	OPM, DEI , MoLG and selected CSOs	UNDP	Dialogue meetings; joint accountability platforms	200,000
	Activity 5.2: Support the customization and implementation of the local government's Good Governance and Anticorruption frameworks in selected LGs	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	MoLG and Selected CSOs	UNDP	Local consultancy; Documents; sensitisation forums	200,000
	Activity 5.3: Provide financial and operational support to relevant CSOs to implement and sustain the CSO-led Quality Assurance Mechanism in Uganda	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	DENIVA and UNNGOF	UNDP	QUAM Campaign and Advocacy; NGO Capacity enhancement; Certification of NGOs; M&E; Institutional Strengthening; and operational support (UNNGOF–; DENIVA-QUAM-)	200,000
	Activity 5.4: Support the review and updating of service delivery standards for the housing and roads sub-sectors that addresses gender and environment issues to guide quality control and accountability in service delivery	-	40,000	40,000	-	-	MoW, Ministry of Housing	UNDP	International consultancy; working task teams; approval and documentation costs	80,000

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES	Planned Budget by Year					RESPONSIBLE PARTY	PLANNED BUDGET		
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5		Funding Source	Budget Description	Amount
	Activity 5.5: Support the Inspectorate of Government to implement and roll-out an online declaration process and conduct timely verification of declarations in order to strengthen the implementation of Leadership code and to ensure compliance in MDAs and LGs	-	100,000	100,000	50,000	-	IG	UNDP	Training and sensitization of agencies; conduct expert valuations exercises , operational support to regional IG offices to enforce compliance, Training of focal persons in MDAs; equipment and logistical support ,	250,000
	Activity 5.6: Provide financial and technical support to public sector accountability institutions and selected CSOs to Strengthen their capacity to detect, prevent and redress corruption; and to operationalise a high-level platform for engagement between CSOs and government on good governance	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	DEI, IG, AG, ACCU	UNDP	Complaint report system ; high-profile investigations ,prosecutions and asset recovery; inter-agency collaborations; follow-up on oversight decisions/ recommendations, roll-out the project monitoring and inspection model to the infrastructure sector (IG); & Quarterly MDA-CSO good-governance symposia	250,000
	Activity 6.1: Support the simplification, localisation and popularization of accountability laws and their implementation arrangements (*including the anti-corruption Act, Access to information Act and the Whistle-blower Protection Act, and the Down-ward social accountability framework, etc*)		47,500	47,500	47,500	47,500	DEI, ACCU, UNGOF, MoLG	UNDP	Production of popular versions of relevant accountability laws and frameworks; print and electronic media campaigns to elicit citizen awareness and engagement	190,000

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES	Planned Budget by Year					RESPONSIBLE PARTY	PLANNED BUDGET		
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5		Funding Source	Budget Description	Amount
	Activity 6.2: Support relevant MDAs and CSOs to develop and popularise the national values system for Uganda and operationalise the Anti-corruption Public Private Partnership framework.	-	100,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	DEI ACCU, UNNGOF	UNDP	Development and documentation of national value system (DEI & UNNGOF); Advocacy campaign to popularise and disseminate the national value system as a tool for enhancing accountability (ACCU); (*For Anti-corruption Public Private Partnership framework*) - Sensitisation campaigns; Guidelines development; advocacy and piloting (20MDAs and 40 LGs)	250,000

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES	Planned Budget by Year					RESPONSIBLE PARTY	PLANNED BUDGET		
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5		Funding Source	Budget Description	Amount
	Activity 6.3: Support selected CSOs to enhance Citizens' participation in accountability process through undertaking social accountability advocacy campaigns; strengthening platforms for community level debate and engagement on ethics and integrity[13]; and implementing the community monitoring group model in selected LGs	50,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	50,000	DEI, Selected LGs, FOWODE, UNNGOF, ACCU	UNDP	Trainings of women political leaders on Anti-corruption laws and policies; accountability advocacy meeting at national level (FOWODE) Five regional anti-corruption symposium & one National Annual Anti-Corruption Convention (UNNGOF) Social accountability dialogues at the national and local level; and community-based anti-corruption campaigns (ACCU); Community education and sensitization, Training of community monitoring groups; community reporting systems; (- 5 districts -one from each region)- IG, DEI, ACCU	400,000
	Activity 6.4: Support the implementation of the LG Charter on Accountability and Ethical Code of Conduct in LGs	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	ULGA	UNDP	Guidelines development; advocacy and mobilisation; annual progress assessment; operational support to ULGA (30 LGs)	250,000


[13] This activity will put specific emphasis on women (FOWODE) as a way of providing women to articulate their interests and concerns and pave the way for increased women participation in decision making processes in their communities

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES	Planned Budget by Year					RESPONSIBLE PARTY	PLANNED BUDGET		
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5		Funding Source	Budget Description	Amount
	Activity 6.5: Provide financial and technical support to relevant MDAs to undertake gender responsive studies that inform public sector decision making	20,000	40,000	40,000	-	-	MoGLSD	UNDP	Consultancy fee; development of action plan	100,000
	Activity 6.6: Provide financial and technical support to a high-level discussion with senior management at MoGLSD on the principles and road map for institutional capacity development	-	23,800	15,000	15,000	-	MoGLSD	UNDP	Workshop; dialogue meetings; facilitation	53,800
	Monitoring									120,700
	Sub-Total for Output 2	**245,650**	**1,099,865**	**810,625**	**550,625**	**327,500**				**3,154,965**
Output 3 Enhanced Capacity Development for Aid Effectiveness and Country Program Implementation	Activity 7.1: Support the enhancement of technical competencies/skills among staff at ALD and UNDP for effective Programme implementation, quality assurance and results reporting	20,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	40,000	MoFPED, UNDP	UNDP	Staff Training; equipment and logistics	195,000
	Activity 7.2: Provide financial and technical support to enhance capacities of implementing partners and UNDP staff through regular orientation, training, office retooling and learning events attendance	15,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	40,000	UNDP	UNDP	Staff Training; equipment and logistics	190,000
	Activity 7.3: Support the functional monitoring and evaluation mechanism for aid coordination and management	15,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	40,000	MoFPED	UNDP	Staff Training; equipment and logistics; field travel costs	190,000
	Activity 7.4: Build capacity of ALD to coordinate Aid, including participation in national and international fora	40,000	50,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	MoFPED UNDP	UNDP	Training and travel costs	210,000

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES	Planned Budget by Year					RESPONSIBLE PARTY	PLANNED BUDGET		
		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5		Funding Source	Budget Description	Amount
	Activity 7.5: Support the MoFPED in domestic resource mobilization (domestic borrowing)	15,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	50,000	MoFPED	UNDP	Training, mobilization and sensitization, meetings costs	230,000
	Activity 8.1: Undertake functional monitoring and evaluation mechanism for Country Program implementation	15,000	85,000	55,000	65,000	50,000	UNDP	UNDP	Travel, reporting costs	270,000
	Activity 8.2: Undertake HACT macro/micro assessment processes	30,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	UNDP	UNDP	Travel, Reporting costs	190,000
	Activity 8.3: Conduct projects monitoring and audit	15,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	40,000	UNDP	UNDP	Audit fees, travels costs	190,000
	Activity 8.4: Organise annual portfolio review on UNDP/UN agencies	-	50,000	50,000	50,000	40,000	MoFPED	UNDP	Meeting and reporting costs	190,000
	Activity 8.5: Implement the Country Programme evaluation plan	-	50,000	50,000	50,000	40,000	UNDP	UNDP	Budgetary cost for implementation	190,000
	Activity 8.6: Enhance support to CPD implementation within UNDP for effective Programme management	40,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	50,000	UNDP	UNDP	Meeting, field monitoring costs	330,000
	Monitoring									120,700
	Sub-Total for Output 3	**205,000**	**590,000**	**550,000**	**560,000**	**470,000**				**2,495,700**
Total Implementation Budget		**928,650**	**3,014,865**	**2,550,625**	**1,850,625**	**1,374,625**				**9,719,390**
	Evaluation			35,000		35,000				70,000
	Communication (1%)	175,538	83,705	102,589	134,924	154,324				651,081
Total Support to Country Office Programme Implementation		**1,104,188**	**3,098,570**	**2,688,214**	**1,985,549**	**1,563,949**				**10,440,471**
	Management Support Services (8%)	94,519	265,238	230,111	169,963	133,874	UNDP	UNDP	GMS	893,704
	Direct Project Costs	77,293	216,900	188,175	138,988	109,476	UNDP	UNDP	DPC	730,833
Total Administrative/Management Support Costs		171,812	482,138	418,286	308,951	243,351				1,624,537
TOTAL		**1,276,000**	**3,580,708**	**3,106,500**	**2,294,500**	**1,807,300**	**12,065,608**			

VIII. GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The IE programme management arrangements are summarised in the organisational structure described below:



The IE Programme management arrangements are summarised in the organisational structure illustrated above and described below:

Programme Board

A multi-stakeholder IE Programme Board comprising of the executive IP (Chair of the Board), the senior supplier as UNDP and the senior beneficiaries represented by the Responsible Parties (RPs) will be formed. The Board will be the highest policy organ of the programme management structure responsible for overseeing the implementation of programme activities. The IE Board's main functions will include provision of policy, strategic and functional direction and guidance to the Programme (including making all the necessary policy-level decisions and approvals); as well as being responsible for overall coordination among all national stakeholders, with respect to programme matters.

The Programme Board will be comprised of all accounting officers of the IP, RPs and UNDP. The Board will be responsible for strategic management decisions of the Programme including review and approval of annual work plans prepared by Programme managers. In addition, the Project Board will play a critical role in UNDP commissioned project evaluations by quality assuring the evaluation process and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning. Based on the approved annual work plan (AWP), the Programme Board may review and approve project quarterly plans when required and authorize any major deviation from these agreed quarterly plans.

Implementing Partner (IP)

The Office of Prime Minister (OPM) will be the implementing partner of the IE Programme. This is due to its constitutional mandate as the leader of government business and as a chair of public sector management. OPM, therefore, has convening powers. The implementing partner is responsible and accountable for managing the programme, including achieving outputs as well as monitoring and evaluation for the effective use of UNDP resources.

Responsible Parties (RPs)

Several responsible parties will take part in the implementation of programme activities working under the IP. The following will be the programme's RPs: Ministry of Public Service (MPS), Ministry of Local Government (MoLG), National Planning Authority (NPA), Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MoFPED), Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA), Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA), Directorate of Ethics and Integrity (DEI), Inspectorate of Government (IG), and Anti-corruption Coalition Uganda (ACCU). The responsible parties will directly collaborate with the implementing partner with regards to planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and reporting of the respective activities for which they will be responsible. However, financial management by the RP (including financial requisition, disbursement, reporting and accounting) arrangements will be handled directly by the UNDP.

Programme Board

The Programme Board will be comprised of all accounting officers of the IP, RPs and UNDP. The Board will be responsible for strategic management decisions of the Programme including review and approval of annual work plans prepared by Programme Managers. In addition, the Programme Board will play a critical role in UNDP commissioned programme evaluations by quality assuring the evaluation process and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning. Based on the approved annual work plan (AWP), the Programme Board may review and approve programme quarterly plans when required and authorizes any major deviation from these agreed quarterly plans.

The Board is the authority that signs off the completion of each annual plan as well as authorising the start of the next annual plan. It ensures that required resources are committed and arbitrates on any conflicts within the programme or negotiates a solution to any problems between the programmes and external bodies. In addition, it approves the appointment and responsibilities of the programme manager and any delegation of its programme assurance responsibilities.

Board decisions will be made in accordance with UNDP standards that will ensure management for development results, best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. For further information of the components of the Programme Board, please refer to Annex 5.

Programme Assurance

Programme assurance will be the responsibility of each Programme Board Member; however the role will be delegated to UNDP Inclusive and effective Governance Portfolio. The programme assurance role will support the programme Board

by carrying out objective and independent programme oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures that appropriate programme management milestones are managed and completed. Programme assurance will be conducted independent of the programme managers.

A technical team will be constituted to provide technical assistance when needed and requested for. In addition, the UNDP programme and support team will provide periodic monitoring and evaluation of the programme implementation, to ensure that IE is on track and secondly to ensure that the programme is contributing to the CPD outputs and UNDAF outcomes. To this effect, UNDP will recruit on a service contract three Programme Officers in order to carter for the three broad IE components namely public service effectiveness, transformational development policy making and transparency, accountability and anti-corruption - and two Programme/Finance Associates who will support the programme

To ensure effective use of programme resources, there will be scheduled audit by the Office of the Auditor General once a year in accordance with annual audit plan for the programme developed by UNDP in consultation with the MoFPED, and Auditor General. Separate audit exercises for IP and the respective RPs will be undertaken. In accordance with the provisions of the signed CPD, special programme audits by external auditors may be called by UNDP. Implementing partners have audit obligations to: prepare in a timely manner all books of accounts and other financial records to facilitate scheduled and special audits; receive and review the audit reports issued by the auditors; provide timely statement of the acceptance or rejection of any audit recommendations to the UNDP; undertake timely actions to address the accepted audit recommendations; and report on the actions taken to implement accepted recommendations to the UNDP.

The Programme Manager (GoU)

The Implementing Partner OPM will identify one Programmer Manager under the National Implementing Modality (NIM), who will report to the Permanent Secretary OPM and work in close collaboration with UNCT? Team Leader Governance. The Programme Manager will oversee the day to day implementation of the IE activities under the respective components of the programme and will assign the programme work and related activities to the Responsible Parties as necessary and in accordance with the legal framework of UNDP and the GoU. On an annual basis, the Programme Manager in consultation with the Team leader, the IP and RPs will prepare and submit one annual work plan to UNDP which will be the basis for annual financial allocations. The Programme Manager will be assisted by two United Nations Volunteers (UNVs) who will be recruited as Programme Associates by UNV Uganda on behalf of UNDP.

IX. LEGAL CONTEXT

Select the relevant one from each drop down below for the relevant standard legal text:

1. Legal Context:

☒ Country has signed the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA)

2. Implementing Partner:

☒ Government Entity (NIM)

Option a. Where the country has signed the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA)

This programme document shall be the instrument referred to as such in Article 1 of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between the Government of (Uganda) and UNDP, signed on April 1st, 1977.

Consistent with the Article III of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement, the responsibility for the safety and security of the executing agency and its personnel and property, and of UNDP's property in the executing agency's custody, rests with the executing agency.

The executing agency shall:

a) put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;

b) Assume all risks and liabilities related to the executing agency's security, and the full implementation of the security plan.

UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of this agreement.

The executing agency agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1267/1267ListEng.htm. This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under this Project Document

X. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Programme Quality Assurance Report

OUTPUT 1: Selected Ministries, Department and Agencies /sectors effectively coordinate and implement targeted public sector reforms by 2020		
Activity Result 1 (Atlas Activity ID)	**Activity Result 1:** By 2017, selected MDAs with enhanced technical capacities to strengthen public sector policies and develop legal and regulatory frameworks and operational mechanisms to foster effectiveness in public sector management.	Start Date: April 2016 End Date: December 2020
Purpose	To enhance the capacity of public sector institutions to make and implement effective policies to strengthen institutional effectiveness in the public sector	
Description	The following activities will be completed under this activity results: 1. **Strengthen capacity of relevant MDAs and LGs to formulate appraise and review policies and regulations for effective public sector management.** 2. **Institutionalize development policy, research and evaluation function in the public sector.**	

Quality Criteria *How/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?*	**Quality Method** *Means of verification. What method will be used to determine if quality criteria has been met?*	**Date of Assessment** *When will the assessment of quality be performed?*
1.3.1.1: No. of MDAs developing and implementing strategic development plans and frameworks and complying with NDPII Priorities. B: 1(2013); T: 5; S: Sector review reports; F: Annual	Quarterly/Annual Reviews	At the end of every quarter/year
1.3.1.2: No. of new PPPs providing innovative solutions for development : (IRRF 7.6.1); B: 0 (2014); T: 3; S: Sector review reports; F: Annual	Review of periodic performance reports for respective activities	At the end of every quarter/year
1.3.1.3: Existence of strategic functional management information system informing policy direction: B: No (2013); T: Yes; S: Sector review reports; F: Annual	Review of report of benchmarking activities	At the end of every quarter/year
	Review of annual reports by the CSCU	At the end of every quarter/year

OUTPUT 1: Selected Ministries, Department and Agencies /sectors effectively coordinate and implement targeted public sector reforms by 2020		
Activity Result 2 (Atlas Activity ID)	**Activity Result 2:** By 2018, selected MDAs and LGs with enhanced technical capacities and tools to promote institutional effectiveness and efficiency at central and decentralized levels and a culture of transparency, accountability and zero tolerance to corruption	Start Date: April 2016 End Date: December 2020:
Purpose	To enhance technical capacities and tools of selected MDAs and LGs to promote institutional effectiveness and efficiency at central and decentralized levels and a culture of transparency, accountability and zero tolerance to corruption	

Description	The following activities will be completed under this activity results: 1. **Support Relevant institutions to plan, implement and monitor public policies and programmes** 2. **Ensure a strong and effective collaboration between MDAs, CSOs, and private sector in fostering public policy effectiveness and a culture of transparency, accountability and zero tolerance to corruption**	
Quality Criteria How/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?	**Quality Method** Means of verification. What method will be used to determine if quality criteria has been met?	**Date of Assessment** When will the assessment of quality be performed?
1.3.1.1: No. of MDAs developing and implementing strategic development plans and frameworks and complying with NDPII Priorities. B: 1(2013); T: 5; S: Sector review reports; F: Annual	Quarterly/Annual Reviews	At the end of every quarter/year
1.3.1.2: No. of new PPPs providing innovative solutions for development : (IRRF 7.6.1); B: 0 (2014); T: 3; S: Sector review reports; F: Annual	Review of periodic performance reports for respective activities	At the end of every quarter/year
1.3.1.3: Existence of strategic functional management information system informing policy direction: B: No (2013); T: Yes; S: Sector review reports; F: Annual	Review of report of benchmarking activities	At the end of every quarter/year

OUTPUT 1: Selected Ministries, Department and Agencies /sectors effectively coordinate and implement targeted public sector reforms by 2020		
Activity Result 3 (Atlas Activity ID)	**Activity Result 3:** Capacity Development for Aid Effectiveness and Country Program Implementation	Start Date: April 2016 End Date: December 2020:
Purpose	To enhance technical capacities and tools of MoFPED and UNDP CO to effectively coordinate development aid and implement the Country Programme	
Description	The following activities will be completed under this activity results: **1. Generate current knowledge and best practices on ODA coordination** **2. Undertake Country office programme oversight and management, in line with UNDP's policies and procedures**	
Quality Criteria How/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?	**Quality Method** Means of verification. What method will be used to determine if quality criteria has been met?	**Date of Assessment** When will the assessment of quality be performed?
% of staff (government/UNDP) equipped with knowledge and skills in ODA/AID coordination and management & skills in Country program management and oversight	Annual review of courses completed by the UNDP country team and government counterparts.	At the end of every year
% of target IPs micro-assessed	Review of micro-assessment report	Once prior the implementation phase

Existence of HACT micro-assessment plan/Assurance plan	Review of HACT micro-assessment/assurance plans	Once prior the implementation phase
Existence of report on financing for SDGs	Review of reports for SDGs	Annually, at the end of every year
Existence of UNDP annual portfolio review report	Portfolio review report	Annually, at the end of every year
Existence of a Country programme evaluation plan	Review Country programme evaluation plan	Once, in the final stage of CP
Number of evaluations completed	Review of evaluation reports	At least twice, in the project life time (mid-term & terminal)
Number of projects audited	Review of audit reports	At least twice, in the project life time
% of Programme delivery	regular production & review of programme delivery status reports	done routinely, quarterly & annual review

OUTPUT 2: By the end of 2020 targeted accountability institutions (MDAs, CSOs and media) uphold and reinforce standards of accountability, transparency and integrity		
Activity Result 4 (Atlas Activity ID)	**Activity result 4:** 2020, selected MDAs and CSOs with adequate technical, operational and financial capacities to engage relevant CSOs, media, private sector and academic institutions to raise the consciousness of the public to articulate their needs, defend their rights and demand for accountability and transparency in public affairs.	Start Date: April 2016 End Date: December 2020
Purpose	To enhance technical, operational and financial capacities of MDAs and CSOs to engage relevant CSOs, media, private sector and academic institutions in raising the consciousness of the public to articulate their needs, defend their rights and demand for accountability and transparency in public affairs.	
Description	The following activities will be completed under this activity results: 1. **Create an enabling environment for the CSOs and the media to effectively engage the public to demand for transparency and accountability** 2. **Stimulate the vigilance of the citizenry including women and youths in demanding and enforcing accountability and good governance of public sector institutions**	

Quality Criteria How/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?	**Quality Method** Means of verification. What method will be used to determine if quality criteria has been met?	**Date of Assessment** *When will the assessment of quality be performed?*
Existence of service delivery standards for key extractives and infrastructure (housing and roads) sectors:	Review of draft and final reports of service delivery standards	At the end of 2019
No. of CSOs that are QUAM certified and participate in ensuring compliance with national standards	Review of compliance certificates issued	At the end of each year

% of targeted MDAs effectively monitoring (complying with) implementation of the 'Leadership Code';	Annual reports	At the end of each year
No. of accountability institutions with functional mechanisms for detection, prevention and redress of corruption	Review of tools and other mechanisms developed to detect, prevent and redress corruption	Quarterly/annually

OUTPUT 3: Capacity Development for Aid Effectiveness and Country Program Implementation		
Activity Result 5 (Atlas Activity ID)	**Activity result 5: Activity Result 7: Current knowledge and best practices on ODA coordination attained**	Start Date: April 2016 End Date: December 2020
Purpose	To enhance the capacity of DARC, IPs and UNDP to be better placed to deliver on the CPD by ensuring effective and efficient aid coordination, as well as Project/programme Quality Assurance.	
Description	The following activities will be completed under this activity results: 1. **Training of staff DARC and UNDP to enhance technical competencies / skills for effective programme implementation, quality assurance and results reporting** 2. **Enhance capacities of implementing partners and UNDP staff through regular orientation, training, office retooling and learning events attendance** 3. **Support the functional monitoring and evaluation mechanism for aid coordination and management** 4. **Support the MoFPED in domestic resource mobilisation (domestic borrowing)**	

Quality Criteria *How/with what indicators the quality of the activity result will be measured?*	**Quality Method** *Means of verification. What method will be used to determine if quality criteria has been met?*	**Date of Assessment** *When will the assessment of quality be performed?*
- % of staff (government/UNDP) equipped with knowledge and skills in ODA/AID coordination and management & skills in Country program management and oversight	Review of annual reports	At the end of 2019
- % of target IPs micro-assessed	Review of annual reports	At the end of 2016
Existence of UNDP annual portfolio review report	Review of annual reports	At the end of 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020

Annex 2: Social and Environmental Screening

Part A. Integrating Overarching Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability

QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Overarching Principles in order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?
Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams the human-rights based approach
Project preparation process involved consultation with Human Rights Experts from within the UN and Government departments. As part of design, the project has identified a human right issue e.g. weak public demand for transparency, accountability and efficacy in the management of public affairs by the citizens and prescribed interventions to address these human rights issues. In addition the project will support relevant ministries, departments and agencies of government and selected Local Governments to engage with relevant civil society organizations, media, private sector and academic institutions to raise consciousness of the public to articulate their needs, defend their rights and demand for accountability and transparency in public affairs.
Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women's empowerment
The project design and implementation of project interventions shall purposely target and benefit both women and men. Specific interventions targeted at improving gender equality and empowerment of women will be undertaken. For instance, the process to revise and formulate policies, regulations and strategic development plans will involve the consultation and participation of both women and man; and integrate gender concerns in the policies and regulations formulated. Further, the interventions aimed at strengthening gender responsive evidence based decision making in public sector will be undertaken. The project will also support interventions aimed at strengthening the District Local Government capacities for gender responsive planning and budgeting.
Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability
UNDP Country Office Environmental Focal Point organized a training session for UNDP staff on environmental and social screening procedure. This provided the necessary skills to the Programme team to identify environmental issues related to the project. The draft project document was subjected to social and environment screening procedure to identify if there any activities with potential adverse impact on the environment and prescribe mitigation measures. Output 3 is focused on enhanced capacities of targeted public institutions and CSOs to effectively women, youth and peace building, democratic processes sustainable production and natural resource management by 2020.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks? *Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any "Yes" responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note "No Risks Identified" and skip to Question 4 and Select "Low Risk". Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.*	**QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?** *Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6*			**QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?**
Risk Description ***No risks identified***	***Impact and Probability (1-5)***	***Significance (Low, Moderate, High)***	***Comments***	***Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.***
Risk 1:	I = P =			
[add additional rows as needed]				

	QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?		
	Select one (see SESP for guidance)		**Comments**
	Low Risk	☒	
	Moderate Risk	☐	
	High Risk	☐	

	QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?		
	Check all that apply		**Comments**
	Principle 1: Human Rights	☒	
	Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	☒	
	1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management	☒	

	2. ***Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation***	☐	
	3. ***Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions***	☐	
	4. ***Cultural Heritage***	☐	
	5. ***Displacement and Resettlement***	☐	
	6. ***Indigenous Peoples***	☐	
	7. ***Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency***	☐	

Final Sign Off

Signature	Date	Description
QA Assessor	5th Feb 2016	UNDP staff member responsible for the Project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. Final signature confirms they have "checked" to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted.
QA Approver		UNDP senior manager, typically the UNDP Deputy Country Director (DCD), Country Director (CD)**,** Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), or Resident Representative (RR). The QA Approver cannot also be the QA Assessor. Final signature confirms they have "cleared" the SESP prior to submittal to the PAC.
PAC Chair		UNDP chair of the PAC. In some cases PAC Chair may also be the QA Approver. Final signature confirms that the SESP was considered as part of the project appraisal and considered in recommendations of the PAC.

SESP: Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks		**Answer (Yes/No)**
Principles 1: Human Rights		
1.	Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	No
2.	Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? [14]	No
3.	Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?	No
4.	Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	No
5.	Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?	No
6.	Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	No
7.	Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process?	No
8.	Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	No
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment		
1.	Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	No
2.	Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	No
3.	Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process and has this been included in the overall Project proposal and in the risk assessment?	No
4.	Would the Project potentially limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? *For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being*	No
Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability: Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below		
Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management		
1.1	Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? *For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes*	No
1.2	Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities?	No

[14] Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to "women and men" or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexuals.

1.3	Does the Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5)	No
1.4	Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?	No
1.5	Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?	No
1.6	Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?	No
1.7	Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	No
1.8	Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? *For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction*	No
1.9	Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)	No
1.10	Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	No
1.11	Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area? *For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g. felling of trees, earthworks, potential relocation of inhabitants). The new road may also facilitate encroachment on lands by illegal settlers or generate unplanned commercial development along the route, potentially in sensitive areas. These are indirect, secondary, or induced impacts that need to be considered. Also, if similar developments in the same forested area are planned, then cumulative impacts of multiple activities (even if not part of the same Project) need to be considered.*	No
Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation		
2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant[15] greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change?	No
2.2	Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?	No
2.3	Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental vulnerability to climate change now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)? *For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding*	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions		
3.1	Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities?	No
3.2	Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	No
3.3	Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)?	No
3.4	Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)	No
3.5	Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions?	No

[15] In regards to CO_2, 'significant emissions' corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.]

3.6	Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)?	No
3.7	Does the Project pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, and radiological hazards during Project construction, operation, or decommissioning?	No
3.8	Does the Project involve support for employment or livelihoods that may fail to comply with national and international labor standards (i.e. principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions)?	No
3.9	Does the Project engage security personnel that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals (e.g. due to a lack of adequate training or accountability)?	No
Standard 4: Cultural Heritage		
4.1	Will the proposed Project result in interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	No
4.2	Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement		
5.1	Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?	No
5.2	Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?	No
5.3	Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions?[16]	No
5.4	Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	No
Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples		
6.1	Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?	No
6.2	Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.3	Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)? *If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is "yes" the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.*	No
6.4	Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?	No
6.5	Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.6	Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?	No

[16] Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections.

6.7	Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	No
6.8	Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.9	Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?	No
Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency		
7.1	Would the Project potentially result in the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts?	No
7.2	Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	No
7.3	Will the proposed Project potentially involve the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials? Does the Project propose use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs? *For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol*	No
7.4	Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	No
7.5	Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	No

Annex 3: Risk Management and Risk Analysis

Government Entity (NIM)

1. Consistent with the Article III of the SBAA *[or the Supplemental Provisions]*, the responsibility for the safety and security of the Implementing Partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP's property in the Implementing Partner's custody, rests with the Implementing Partner. To this end, the Implementing Partner shall:
   c) put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
   d) assume all risks and liabilities related to the Implementing Partner's security, and the full implementation of the security plan.

2. UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of the Implementing Partner's obligations under this Project Document [and the Project Cooperation Agreement between UNDP and the Implementing Partner][17].

3. The Implementing Partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that no UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq_sanctions_list.shtml. This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under/further to this Project Document.

4. Consistent with UNDP's Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures, social and environmental sustainability will be enhanced through application of the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (http://www.undp.org/ses) and related Accountability Mechanism (http://www.undp.org/secu-srm).

5. The Implementing Partner shall: (a) conduct project and programme-related activities in a manner consistent with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, (b) implement any management or mitigation plan prepared for the project or programme to comply with such standards, and (c) engage in a constructive and timely manner to address any concerns and complaints raised through the Accountability Mechanism. UNDP will seek to ensure that communities and other project stakeholders are informed of and have access to the Accountability Mechanism.

6. All signatories to the Project Document shall cooperate in good faith with any exercise to evaluate any programme or project-related commitments or compliance with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards. This includes providing access to project sites, relevant personnel, information, and documentation.

[17] Use bracketed text only when IP is an NGO/IGO

Table 3: Risk Log

#	Description	Date Identified	Type	Impact & Probability	Countermeasures / Management response	Owner	Submitted & Updated by	Last Update	Status
1	Inadequate number staff in participating MDAs and CSOs to timely implement the Programme activities	1 Feb., 2016	Operational / organisational	P = 3 I = 2	Establish strategic collaborations between Programme partners to augment their capacities UNDP in collaboration with the partners recruit additional staff to support Programme implementation	All Participating partners	Programme Formulation Team		
2	Political activities interrupting program implementation especially in year 1	1 Feb., 2016	Political	P = 5 I = 2	Effective mobilisation of all key program stakeholders, including beneficiaries, to remain politically neutral	All Participating partners	Programme Formulation Team		
3	Stringent legal and administrative procedures such as requirements of the POMA are likely to limit the participation of CSO	1 Feb., 2016	Regulatory	P= 3 I = 5	Effective mobilisation of top-level political and administrative support coupled with an effective publicity and communication strategy about all Programme activities	All Participating partners	Programme Formulation Team		
4	Delay in the release of funds between UNDP and partners	1 Feb., 2016	Financial	P = 2 I = 3	Enforce timely accountability and reporting practices to facilitate prompt release of funds by UNDP Timely release of funds between the partners to be made a quality assurance parameter for the project	UNDP / Partners	Programme Formulation Team		

Annex 4: Capacity Assessment (HACT Micro Assessment)

HACT Micro Assessments were conducted for the purposed IP and RPs, that is; OPM, MPS, DEI and ACCU. Please refer to the attached addendum on "Capacity Assessment (HACT Micro Assessment)" document.

Annex 5: Programme Board Terms of Reference; Key Management Positions

Programme Board

The Board will be responsible for making by consensus, management decisions for a programme when guidance is required by the Programme Manager, including recommendation for UNDP/Implementing Partner approval of programme plans and revisions. In order to ensure UNDP's ultimate accountability, Programme Board decisions will be made in accordance with standards that will ensure management for development results, best value money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. In addition, the Programme Board plays a critical role in UNDP commissioned programme evaluations by quality assuring the evaluation process and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning. Based on the approved annual work plan (AWP), the Programme Board may review and approve programme quarterly plans when required and authorizes any major deviation from these agreed quarterly plans. It will be the authority that signs off the completion of each quarterly plan as well as authorizes the start of the next quarterly plan. Potential members of the Programme Board will include:

Programme Director*:* individual representing the programme ownership to chair the group. There is only one project executive, who will be a national counterpart. Typically held by Government Cooperating Agency or UNDP.

Development Partners: individuals or groups representing the interests of the parties concerned which provide funding and/or technical expertise to the project. Typically includes Implementing Partners, UNDP, and donors.

Beneficiary Representative: individuals or groups of individuals representing the interests of those who will ultimately benefit from the project. The primary function within the Board is to ensure the realization of project results from the perspective of project beneficiaries. Often CSO representative(s) can fulfil this role.

Programme Assurance: Programme Assurance is the responsibility of each Programme Board member; however the role can be delegated. The project assurance role supports the Programme Board by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed. Project Assurance will be independent of the Project Manager; therefore, the Project Board cannot delegate any of its assurance responsibilities to the Project Manager. A UNDP Programme Officer, or M&E Officer, typically holds the Project Assurance role on behalf of UNDP.

Programme Manager: The Programme Manager has the authority to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Implementing Partner within the constraints laid down by the Board. The Programme Manager is responsible for day-to-day management and decision-making for the programme. The Programme Manager's prime responsibility is to ensure that the programme produces the results (outputs) specified in the programme document-, to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost. The Implementing Partner appoints the Programme Manager, who should be different from the Implementing Partner's representative in the Outcome Board. Prior to the approval of the programme, the Programme Developer role is the UNDP staff member responsible for programme management functions during formulation until the Programme Manager from the Implementing Partner is in place.

Programme Support: The Programme Support role provides project administration, management and technical support to the Programme Manager as required by the needs of the individual programme or Programme Manager. It is necessary to keep Programme Support and Programme Assurance roles separate in order to maintain the independence of Programme Assurance.

Annex 6: Terms of Reference: Programme Manager

Location:	OPM, Kampala, Uganda
Additional Category:	Inclusive Effective Governance
Type of Contract:	Service Contract
Languages Required:	English
Starting Date:	As Soon As Possible
Duration of Initial Contract:	1 Year (Renewable)

Background

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the UN's global development network, advocating for change and connecting countries to knowledge, experience and resources to help people build a better life. Today, UNDP operates in 177 countries across the globe.

Particularly in Uganda, UNDP supports the implementation of the Government's Second National Development Plan (NDP) and contributes to the UNDAF 2016-2020 outcomes, while targeting its assistance in areas where UNDP has a comparative advantage and demonstrated capacity. UNDP's support in Uganda is being delivered through two main programme components: i) Inclusive Effective Governance, and ii) Sustainable Inclusive Economic Development.

The Inclusive Effective Governance component addresses the impediments of growth through strengthening Rule of Law and Constitutional development; Public Service Effectiveness, Transparency, accountability and Anti-Corruption; and Peace Security and Systems Resilience as well creating an enabling environment for resource mobilization and coordination of aid flows. At the same time, it addresses cross-cutting issues such as gender equality and women empowerment. Cumulatively, interventions focusing on these areas are expected to strengthen capacities and respond to the critical governance gaps.

Against the above background UNDP/OPM Uganda is looking for a dynamic candidate to contribute to the delivery of the Inclusive Effective Governance component, in the position of Programme Manager at OPM PMU. The selected candidate will work under the overall guidance of the Country Director and direct supervision of the Permanent Secretary Office of the Prime Minister. S/he will work with the other Ministries and Departments and Agencies (MDAs), Civil Society Organisations (CSO), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and Local Governments to support the Programme Management Unite (PMU) in ensuring timely implementation of programme strategies; Documentation and M&E Function for the project at OPM, relevant MDAs and CSOs and feeding the Information to UNDP data base. The programme manager, additionally, will provide technical guidance to project Implementation; Working with, PS OPM and other project officers and LGs to create strategic partnerships and implementation of the resource mobilization strategy and provision of top quality advisory services to government.

Duties and Responsibilities

The programme manager is responsible for the day-to-day planning, implementation and monitoring of the programme as approved by the Programme Board through Annual Work Plans within the context of the programme document.

Specific duties and responsibilities:

i. Provide technical assistance to programme implementation
ii. Advisory services

Programme Implementation

- Day-to-day management of the project to implement programme activities according to the approved work plan and execute programme actions approved by the Programme Board
- Provide leader to the programme support team, coordinate activities across components RPs and supervise RPs for the respective activities/result areas
- Provide substantive guidance on programme activities
- Prepare programme work plans, progress reports and other related programme documentation
- Track programme progress and effectively use the results framework, attend to monitoring and evaluation needs.

- Developing results-based AWP that clearly set out the quarterly and output targets, indicators, activities, resources requirements, and budget
- Manage financial and human resources according to UNDP rules and regulations for national implementation, and ensure timely accountability of funds disbursed.

Advisory Services
- Identification and synthesis of best practices and lessons learnt directly linked to Inclusive Effective Governance component.
- Provide high quality policy advisory services to UNDP and relevant partners to facilitate knowledge management focusing on the following results:
- Development of adequate technical capacity to support a highly professional and high quality programme portfolio.
- Make substantive contributions to knowledge networks and communities of practice in regard to Inclusive Effective Governance
- Contribute to the preparation of high-quality communication products for programme implementation to publicise the progress and performance of the Inclusive Effective Governance in view of UNDP and GoU undertakings.

Working Arrangements

a. The Programme Manager will be supervised by the Permanent Secretary Office of the Prime Minister and Team Leader Governance Unit
b. S/he will report to UNDP on a regular basis on the progress of the support provided towards successful implementation of the Governance programme outputs;
c. OPM will facilitate the Programme Manager with the following:
   i. Office space;
   ii. Transport for authorized travel within and outside Kampala;
   iii. Daily substance allowances for authorized travel outside Kampala at a GoU prevailing rate;
   iv. Communication facilitation (Email and telephone).

Competencies.

Corporate Competencies:
- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards;
- Advocates and promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UN;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

Functional Competencies

Technical Expertise
- Focuses on impact and results for client and responds positively to feedback;
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive constructive attitude;
- Demonstrates strong oral and written communication skills;
- Builds strong relationships with clients and external actors;
- Remain calm, in control and good humored even under pressure
- Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities.

Development and Operational Effectiveness:
- Ability to contribute to strategic planning, results-based management and reporting
- Ability to contribute to formulation, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation development programmes and projects, mobilize resources.
- Ability to coordinate and work with project stakeholder including Government, UN agencies and CSO.
- Good knowledge of the Results Management Methods.
- Ability to advocate and provide policy advice on the thematic area of gender equality and women's empowerment.

Knowledge Management and Learning:
- Promotes knowledge management through leadership and personal example;

- In-depth practical knowledge of inter-disciplinary development issues;
- Actively works towards continuing personal learning and development in one or more Practice Areas, acts on learning plan and applies newly acquired skills.

Leadership and Teamwork
- Leads the team effectively;
- Works well with a diverse group of people
- Encourages risk-taking in the pursuit of creativity and innovation

Required Qualifications
Education:
Master's Degree in Public Administration; Business Administration; Development Studies; or any other related field.

Experience:
- Minimum ten (10) years of professional working experience involving programme/project development and management, advice on policy and partnership development with focus on the democratic governance practice area.
- Knowledge of the Uganda and the sub-saharan Africa development context, especially in relation to Inclusive and effective governance.
- Experience in the use of computers and office software packages as well as web-based information management systems.
- Excellent writing, research, analysis and presentation skills.
- Prior work with UNDP/UN will be an added advantage

Language requirement: Excellent written and spoken English

Annex 7: Terms of Reference: Programme Officer
(Transparency, Accountability and Anti-Corruption)

Location:	UNDP, Kampala, Uganda
Additional Category:	Inclusive Effective Governance
Type of Contract:	Service Contract
Languages Required:	English
Starting Date:	As Soon As Possible
Duration of Initial Contract:	1 Year (Renewable)

Background

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the UN's global development network, advocating for change and connecting countries to knowledge, experience and resources to help people build a better life. Today, UNDP operates in 177 countries across the globe.

Particularly in Uganda, UNDP supports the implementation of the Government's Second National Development Plan (NDP) and contributes to the UNDAF 2016-2020 outcomes, while targeting its assistance in areas where UNDP has a comparative advantage and demonstrated capacity. UNDP's support in Uganda is being delivered through two main programme components: i) Inclusive Effective Governance, and ii) Sustainable Inclusive Economic Development.

The Inclusive Effective Governance component addresses the impediments of growth through strengthening Rule of Law and Constitutional development; Public Service Effectiveness, Transparency, accountability and Anti-Corruption; and Peace Security and Systems Resilience as well creating an enabling environment for resource mobilization and coordination of aid flows. At the same time, it addresses cross-cutting issues such as gender equality and women empowerment. Cumulatively, interventions focusing on these areas are expected to strengthen capacities and respond to the critical governance gaps.

Against the above background UNDP/OPM Uganda is looking for a dynamic candidate to contribute to the delivery of the Inclusive Effective Governance component, in the position of Programme Manager at OPM PMU. The selected candidate will work under the overall guidance of the Country Director and direct supervision of the Permanent Secretary Office of the Prime Minister. S/he will work with the other Ministries and Departments and Agencies (MDAs), Civil Society Organisations (CSO), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and Local Governments to support the Programme Management Unite (PMU) in ensuring timely implementation of programme strategies; Documentation and M&E Function for the project at OPM, relevant MDAs and CSOs and feeding the Information to UNDP data base. The programme manager, additionally, will provide technical guidance to project Implementation; Working with, PS OPM and other project officers and LGs to create strategic partnerships and implementation of the resource mobilization strategy and provision of top quality advisory services to government.

Duties / Responsibilities

Specific duties and responsibilities:

i. Contribute to programme and projects development
ii. Contribute to programme and projects management
iii. Provide advisory services
iv. Contribute to developing strategic partnerships and resource mobilization

Programme Development

- Thorough analysis and research of the political, social and economic situation in the country and preparation of substantive inputs to CCA, UNDAF, CPD, CPD and other documents.
- Identification of areas for support and interventions within the thematic/sectoral areas of Transparency Accountability and Anti-Corruption.
- CO business processes mapping and preparation of the content of internal Standard Operating Procedures in Results Management.

Programme / Projects Management

Ensures effective management of the CO programme within the thematic/sectoral areas of Transparency Accountability and Anti-Corruption focusing on quality control from formulation to implementation of the country programme achieving the following results:

- Effective application of RBM tools, establishment of management targets (BSC) and monitoring achievement of results.
- Design and formulation of CO programme within the area of responsibility, translating UNDP's priorities into local interventions. Coordination of programme implementation with the executing agencies. Introduction of performance indicators/ success criteria, cost recovery, targets and milestones.
- Initiation of a project, presentation of the project to PAC, entering project into Atlas (in small offices), finalization of contribution agreement; determination of required revisions; coordination of the mandatory and budget re-phasing exercises, closure of projects through review. Programme Officer can perform functions of Manager Level 1 in Atlas for POs and vouchers approval, participates in recruitment processes for projects.
- Financial and substantive monitoring and evaluation of the projects, identification of operational and financial problems, development of solutions. Participation in audit of NEX projects.
- Follow up on audit recommendations. All exceptions are timely reported.
- Aggregate reports are regularly prepared on activities, outputs and outcomes. Preparation of donor reports.

Strategic Partnerships and Resource Mobilization

Ensures creation of strategic partnerships and implementation of the resource mobilization strategy in cooperation with the Management Support and Business Development Team focusing on achievement of the following results:

- Development of partnerships with the UN Agencies, IFI's, government institutions, bi-lateral and multi-lateral donors, private sector, civil society in the specific thematic areas based on strategic goals of UNDP, country needs and donors' priorities.
- Analysis and research of information on donors, preparation of substantive briefs on possible areas of cooperation, identification of opportunities for initiation of new projects, active contribution to the overall office effort in resource mobilization.

Advisory Services

Ensures provision of top quality advisory services and facilitation of knowledge building and management focusing on achievement of the following results:

- Identification of sources of information related to policy-driven issues on of Transparency Accountability and Anti-Corruption.
- Identification and synthesis of best practices and lessons learnt directly linked to programme country policy goals.
- Support to development of policies and institutions that will address the country problems and needs in collaboration with the Government and other strategic partners.
- Sound contributions to knowledge networks and communities of practice.
- Organization of trainings for the operations/ projects staff on programme issues.

Competencies.

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards;
- Advocates and promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UN;
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
- Treats all people fairly without favouritism.

Functional Competencies

Technical Expertise

- Focuses on impact and results for client and responds positively to feedback;
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive constructive attitude;
- Demonstrates strong oral and written communication skills;
- Builds strong relationships with clients and external actors;

- Remain calm, in control and good humored even under pressure
- Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities.

Development and Operational Effectiveness:
- Ability to contribute to strategic planning, results-based management and reporting
- Ability to contribute to formulation, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation development programmes and projects, mobilize resources.
- Ability to coordinate and work with project stakeholder including Government, UN agencies and CSO.
- Good knowledge of the Results Management Methods.
- Ability to advocate and provide policy advice on the thematic area of gender equality and women's empowerment.

Knowledge Management and Learning:
- Promotes knowledge management through leadership and personal example;
- In-depth practical knowledge of inter-disciplinary development issues;
- Actively works towards continuing personal learning and development in one or more Practice Areas, acts on learning plan and applies newly acquired skills.

Required Qualifications

Education:

A minimum of a Bachelor's degree in anyone of the following fields - Law, Social Science (Political Science, Public Administration or Development Studies etc.). Master's degree in the aforementioned areas is desirable.

Experience:

- Minimum five (05) years of professional working experience involving programme/project development and management, advice on policy and partnership development with focus on the democratic governance practice area.
- Knowledge of the Uganda and the sub-Saharan Africa development context, especially in relation to the area of governance
- Demonstrates experience in the use of computer and office software packages as well as web-based information management systems
- Excellent writing, research, analysis and presentation skills.

Language required: Excellent written and spoken English

Annex 8: Terms of Reference: Finance Associate

Location:	OPM and NPA, Kampala, Uganda
Additional Category:	Inclusive Effective Governance
Type of Contract:	Service Contract
Languages Required:	English
Starting Date:	As Soon As Possible
Duration of Initial Contract:	1 Year (Renewable)

Background

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the UN's global development network, advocating for change and connecting countries to knowledge, experience and resources to help people build a better life. Today, UNDP operates in 177 countries across the globe.

Particularly in Uganda, UNDP supports the implementation of the Government's Second National Development Plan (NDP) and contributes to the UNDAF 2016-2020 outcomes, while targeting its assistance in areas where UNDP has a comparative advantage and demonstrated capacity. UNDP's support in Uganda is being delivered through two main programme components: i) Inclusive Effective Governance, and ii) Sustainable Inclusive Economic Development.

The Inclusive Effective Governance component addresses the impediments of growth through strengthening Rule of Law and Constitutional development; Public Service Effectiveness, Transparency, accountability and Anti-Corruption; and Peace Security and Systems Resilience as well creating an enabling environment for resource mobilization and coordination of aid flows. At the same time, it addresses cross-cutting issues such as gender equality and women empowerment. Cumulatively, interventions focusing on these areas are expected to strengthen capacities and respond to the critical governance gaps.

Against the above background UNDP/OPM Uganda is looking for a dynamic candidate to contribute to the delivery of the Inclusive Effective Governance component, in the position of Programme Manager at OPM PMU. The selected candidate will work under the overall guidance of the Country Director and direct supervision of the Permanent Secretary Office of the Prime Minister. S/he will work with the other Ministries and Departments and Agencies (MDAs), Civil Society Organisations (CSO), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and Local Governments to support the Programme Management Unite (PMU) in ensuring timely implementation of programme strategies; Documentation and M&E Function for the project at OPM, relevant MDAs and CSOs and feeding the Information to UNDP data base. The programme manager, additionally, will provide technical guidance to project Implementation; Working with, PS OPM and other project officers and LGs to create strategic partnerships and implementation of the resource mobilization strategy and provision of top quality advisory services to government.

Against the above background UNDP/OPM Uganda is looking for a dynamic candidate to contribute to the delivery of the Inclusive Effective Governance component, in the position of Finance Associate at NPA PMU. The selected candidate will work under the overall guidance of the Country Director and direct supervision of the Executive Secretary of the National Planning Authority.

Duties and Responsibilities

- Implementation of operational and financial management strategies
- Administration of budgets and cost-recovery system
- Accounting, finance and administrative support
- Global payroll
- CO cash management
- Facilitation of knowledge building and knowledge sharing

Implementation of Operation and Financial Management Strategies

Ensures implementation of operational and financial management strategies, adapts processes and procedures focusing on achievement of the following results:

- Full compliance with UN/UNDP and GoU rules and regulations of financial processes, financial records and reports and audit follow up; implementation of the effective internal control framework.
- CO finance business processes mapping and elaboration of the content of internal Standard Operating Procedures in Finance in consultation with the direct supervisor and office management.
- Provision of inputs for implementation of cost-saving and reduction strategies in consultation with the office management.
- Preparation of cost sharing and trust fund agreements, follow up on contributions within the CO resource mobilization efforts.

Administration of Budgets and Cost-recovery System

Ensures administration of budgets and functioning of optimal-recovery system focusing on achievement of the following results:

- *Preparation and modifications of budgets for UNDP management projects, follow-up with HQs on ASL for management projects.*
- Presentation of researched information for planning and status of financial resources of the CO.
- Sending project budget to KK if authorized by the Senior Management (can be done only on the basis of signed programme documents and project budgets).

Accounting, Finance and Administrative Support

Provides accounting and administrative support to the Finance Unit and performs Global payroll functions focusing on achievement of the following results:

- Proper control of the supporting documents for payments and financial reports for NEX projects; preparation of all types of vouchers; Pay Cycle and payments execution.
- Proper receipting of goods and services and establishment of accruals.
- Maintenance of the internal expenditures control system which ensures that vouchers processed are matched and completed, transactions are correctly recorded and posted in Atlas; payrolls are duly prepared and processed; travel claims, MPOs and other entitlements are duly processed
- Timely accounts closure
- Timely corrective actions on unposted vouchers, including the vouchers with budget check errors, match exceptions, unapproved vouchers. Timely response to HQ requests to resolve financial data issues.
- Timely corrective actions on erroneous data in Atlas. Preparation of financial reports as required.
- Maintenance of the Accounts Receivables for UNDP projects and follow-up with partners on contributions, deposits creation
- Timely VAT reimbursements, payment of GLOC by the Government.
- Preparation of vouchers for management projects and PO vouchers for management and development projects in large offices can be performed by Finance Assistants. Voucher creation functions in the offices with Service Centres or Project offices, can be performed either Service Administrators of Service Centres of Finance Assistants of Project offices.

Cash Management Functioning

Ensures proper CO cash management functioning focusing on achievement of the following results:

- Alternate to Finance Associate (ICS-7) for timely review of cash position for local accounts to ensure sufficient funds on hand for disbursements. Timely identification and recording of receipts for income application.
- Alternate to Finance Associate (ICS-7) for daily review of zero-balance account bank statements in Atlas to monitor imprest level; identification and recording of contributions.
- Preparation of monthly UN exchange rate report to Treasury.
- Timely and accurate preparation of bank reconciliations.
- Alternate to Finance Associate (ICS-7) for timely preparation of monthly cash flow forecast for use by Operations Manager/ Finance Analyst. Liaison with UN Agencies to obtain estimate of their cash requirement.
- Initiation of bank transfers and deals in Atlas.
- Creation of bank transfers (replenishment), deals and bank reconciliation processing in large offices can be performed by Finance (Treasury) Associates.

Facilitation of Knowledge Building and knowledge sharing

- Organization of trainings for the operations/ projects staff on Finance.
- Synthesis of lessons learnt and best practices in financial management.
- Sound contributions to knowledge networks and communities of practice

Competencies

Functional Competencies:

Building Partnerships

Maintaining information and databases

- Tracks and reports on mobilized resources

Promoting Organizational Learning and Knowledge Sharing

Basic research and analysis

- Researches best practices and poses new, more effective ways of doing things
- Identifies and communicates opportunities to promote learning and knowledge sharing

Job Knowledge/Technical Expertise

Fundamental knowledge of processes, methods and procedures

- Understands the main processes and methods of work regarding to the position
- Possesses knowledge of organizational policies and procedures relating to the position and applies them consistently in work tasks (specialized knowledge related to financial resources management, including formulating budgets, maintaining Accounts Receivables and Accounts Payables, reporting).

- Strives to keep job knowledge up-to-date through self-directed study and other means of learning
- Demonstrates good knowledge of information technology and applies it in work assignments

Promoting Organizational Change and Development

Presentation of information on best practices in organizational change

- Documents 'best practices' in organizational change and development within and outside the UN system
- Demonstrates ability to identify problems and proposes solutions

Design and Implementation of Management Systems

Data gathering and implementation of management systems

- Uses information/databases/other management systems
- Makes recommendations related to work procedures and implementation of management systems

Client Orientation

Maintains effective client relationships

- Reports to internal and external clients in a timely and appropriate fashion
- Organizes and prioritizes work schedule to meet client needs and deadlines
- Responds to client needs promptly

Promoting Accountability and Results-Based Management

Gathering and disseminating information

- Maintains databases

Core Competencies:

- Demonstrate corporate knowledge and sound judgment
- Self-development, initiative-taking
- Acting as a team player and facilitating team work

- Facilitating and encouraging open communication in the team, communicating effectively
- Creating synergies through self-control
- Managing conflict
- Learning and sharing knowledge and encourage the learning of others.
- Promoting learning and knowledge management/sharing is the responsibility of each staff member.
- Informed and transparent decision making

Recruitment Qualifications
Education: Secondary Education, with specialized certification in Accounting and Finance. University Degree in Finance, Business or Public Administration desirable, but it is not a requirement. Part-qualified accountants from an internationally recognized institute of accountancy will have a distinct advantage. UNDP Accountancy and Finance Test is required.

Experience: Minimum three years of progressively responsible finance and accounting experience in the field of government entities is required. Experience in the usage of computers and office software packages (MS Word, Excel, etc.) and advance knowledge of spreadsheet and database packages, experience in handling of web based management systems and ERP financials, preferably PeopleSoft.

Language: Fluency in spoken and written English

Annex 9: Communication Plan

Introduction
UNDP in Uganda works in partnership with Government and various other actors to eliminate poverty, inequality and exclusion, with the aim of transforming Uganda into an upper-middle income country by 2040.

In the next five years, UNDP under its new programme will do this under two portfolio areas:

- The Inclusive and Effective Governance (IEG)
- The Sustainable Inclusive Economic Development (SIED)

Under the IEG portfolio, Strengthening Institutional Effectiveness has been identified as a strategic area that will enable Uganda to reach middle income status as planned in both the National Vision 2040 and the Global Agenda 2030.

The purpose of the communication plan is to ensure that "**Institutional Effectiveness Programme**" provides relevant, accurate, and consistent project information to its stakeholders and other appropriate audiences. It is intended to draw the support and cooperation of each stakeholder group to the accomplishment of the project work. The plan provides a framework to manage and coordinate the wide variety of communications that will take place during the project. It covers who will receive the communications, how the communications will be delivered, what information will be communicated, who communicates, and the frequency of the communications.

Goal of IE Programme
The ultimate goal of the Institutional Effectiveness Programme is to improve the performance of the government in critical areas such as human capital development (including service delivery effectiveness), which is a pre-requisite to realizing an inclusive and sustainable economic growth in Uganda.
For further elaboration, the Programme's specific objectives are:

- To strengthen public sector policies, develop legal and regulatory frameworks and operational mechanism to foster effectiveness in public sector management
- To promote institutional effectiveness and efficiency at a central and decentralised level and a culture of transparency, accountability and zero tolerance to corruption

- To raise the consciousness of the public to articulate their needs, defend their rights and demand for accountability and transparency in public affairs

To achieve these goals, it is important to raise awareness and also ensuring effective participation of all stakeholders involved. Specific audiences will be targeted with particular messages.

Target Audiences

External Audience	Internal Audience
• Government • Development Partners • Civil Society • Academia • Media • General Public	• UNDP CO: Senior Management and Staff • UN Agencies

Key Messages

- UNDP believes that to achieve sustainable development and Uganda's Vision 2040, public institutions should be effective and able to deliver required services to all Ugandans.
- To attain upper-middle income status as envisioned by Vision 2040, effective policy and legal regulatory frameworks must be in place as they have significant impact of achieving development.
- Although Uganda has been said to have some of the best policies in Africa and in some cases globally, policy implementation is still a challenge which can be overcome through building strong and effective institutions.
- To achieve strong institutional effectiveness, transparency and accountability are necessary elements. Therefore, it is important that citizens are empowered to demand for transparency and accountability.

Communication Matrix

Audience	Objective	Message	Outcomes	Channels	Monitoring Indicator
Government (IP and RPs, selected MDAs)	• Effective programme implementation • Ownership and sustainability	• UNDP believes that to achieve sustainable development and Uganda's Vision 2040, public institutions should be effective and able to deliver required services to all Ugandans. • To attain upper-middle income status as envisioned by Vision 2040, effective policy and legal regulatory frameworks must be in place as they have significant impact of achieving development. • Although Uganda has been said to have some of the best policies in Africa and in some cases globally, policy implementation is still a challenge which can be overcome through building strong and effective institutions.	• Public institutions and Public-Private Partnerships are fully functional, inclusive, resourced, performance-oriented at all levels • Transformational development planning supported by strategic evaluation function • Culture of mutual accountability, transparency and integrity establishing within the Uganda population	• Portfolio review meetings • Policy briefs • Project packs including a folder, brochures, success story write-ups and info graphs • One on one meetings, workshops, trainings, and conferences • Media (Newspaper, radio, TV, SNS) • Online Tools (Social media, Email and website)	• Number of government policies substantially implemented • Number of MDAs and LGs developing and implementing strategic development plans and frameworks and complying with NDPII Priorities • Number of accountability institutions with functional mechanisms for detection, prevention and redress of corruption
Development Partners	• Mobilise resources for IE Programme • Demand for effective implementation of policies and support transparency, accountability, and effective control of corruption			• Funding proposals • Meetings • Project briefs, brochures and info graphs • Media (Newspaper, radio, TV, SNS) • Online Tools (Social media, Email and website) • Documentaries, short videos on specific areas in the project • If there are funding partners, ensure to include them in project events and brandings. In addition, incorporate their communication guidelines with UNDP's	• Number of donors and development partners supporting the programme
Civil Society / Media	• Support implementation and monitoring the level of implementation of government policies • Demand for effective implementation of			• Meetings, workshops, trainings and conferences • Project packs including a folder, brochures, success story write-ups and info graphs • Banner, car stickers and other branded materials • Press briefings	• Number of CSOs that are QUAM certified and participate in ensuring compliance with national standards • Number of discussions in media and public spaces

	policies and support transparency, accountability, and effective control of corruption	• To achieve strong institutional effectiveness, transparency and accountability are necessary elements. Therefore, it is important that citizens are empowered to demand for transparency and accountability.		• Media (Newspaper, radio, TV, SNS) • Online Tools (Social media, Email and website) • Documentaries, short videos on specific areas in the project	
UNDP CO / UN Agencies	• Inform progress on scheduled tasks • Lessons learnt: knowledge sharing and management			• Portfolio review meetings • Project packs including a folder, brochures, success story write-ups and info graphs • Media (Newspaper, radio, TV, SNS) • Online Tools (Social media, Email and website) • Documentaries, short videos on specific areas in the project	• Number of portfolio reviews • Number of project packs distributed and documented
General Public	• Fully enable empowerment to demand transparency, accountability, and effective control of corruption from duty bearers • Inclusive Citizens' (Women, Youth and PWDs) participation in constitutional Democracy			• Documentaries, videos and audios on specific areas in the project • Infomercials on specific issues key communication channels in the country (e.g. Radio for upcountry) • Branded materials • TV and Radio Talk Shows • Community Barazas and trainings.	• Number of women and youth participating in community barazas and trainings
Academia	• Research and documentation of best practices			• Meetings and Conferences • Reports • Infopacks	• Number of policy dialogues developed