

**COMPREHENSIVE REPORT OF THE FIRST STAGE OF THE
ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CITIZENS FORUM,
A CITIZENS' ANTI-CORRUPTION ACTION PROGRAM
APRIL 2005 – SEPTEMBER 2006**

Submitted by
Uganda Joint Christian Council
Plot 5 Berkley Road, Old Kampala
P.O Box 30154
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: 256-41-254219, 256-752 692544
Email: infocuganda@infocom.co.ug

CITIZENS' FORUM PROJECT

**Implemented by: Uganda Joint Christian Council
(UJCC)**

**Supported by: Partnership for Transparency Fund
(PTF)**

**Initiated by: Interfaith Based Action for ethics and
Integrity (INFOC Uganda)**

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms	4
1.0 Introduction	5
2.0 Institutional Background	
2.1 Guarantors	5
2.2 Partnership for Transparency Fund – PTF	6
2.3 Goal of Citizens’ Anti Corruption Programme	7
2.4 Objectives for Citizens Forum	7
2.5 Theme	7
2.6 Procedure	7
3.0 Planned Activities and Achievements for the Reporting Period	
3.1 Phase I Collect resource material and develop monitoring tool	8
3.2 Phase II Train monitoring agents	9
3.3 Phase III Data collection	10
3.4 Phase IV Analysis of data and preparation of a report on Findings and drafting a Monitoring and Public Accountability Strategy	14 10
3.5 Phase V Discussion of report at a Citizens Forum	24
3.6 Phase VI Follow-up actions and dissemination to implement the Strategy	27
4.0 Additional Achievements – Awareness raising	27
5.0 Impact Assessment	28
6.0 Constraints	28
7.0 Lessons Learnt, Challenges and Recommendations	29
8.0 Future Plans	29
9.0 Matrix – Financial statement	30
Annexes	37
Self Assessment Matrix	

List of Acronyms

CIFOR	-	Citizens Forum
CMU	-	Construction Management Unit
DEI	-	Directorate of ethics & Integrity
DEO	-	District Education Officer
EJAC	-	Ecumenical Joint Action Committee
EJMPAS	-	Effective Joint Monitoring and Public Accountability Strategy
EPRC	-	Economic Policy Research Center
IGG	-	Inspector General of Governments Office
INFOC-U	-	Interfaith Based Action for Ethics and Integrity - Uganda
MoES	-	Ministry of Education and Sports
MoFPED	-	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
MoLG	-	Ministry of Local Government
MoWHC	-	Ministry of Works and Housing Corporation
OAG	-	Office of the Auditor General
PAF	-	Poverty Action Fund
PEAP	-	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PMO	-	Prime Minister's Office
PPDA	-	Public Procurement and Disposal of Assets Office
PTF	-	Partnership for Transparency Fund
RDC	-	Resident District Commissioner
SEMTs	-	Sub-county Ecumenical Monitoring Teams
SFG	-	School Facility Grants
SMC	-	School Management Committee
SOBIDEC	-	Southern Buganda Inter-Diocesan Education Committee
TDMS	-	Teachers Development Management Scheme
TOT	-	Training of Trainers
UJCC	-	Uganda Joint Christian Council
UNDP	-	United Nations development Programme
UPE	-	Universal Primary Education

1.0 Introduction

Uganda Joint Christian Council (UJCC) on behalf of Interfaith Based Action for Ethics and Integrity with support from Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF) is implementing the Citizens' Forum project. The Citizens Forum project is one of the proposed strategies to enhance Citizen Participation aimed at fighting corruption.

The Citizen's Forum is a public information and accountability forums promotes Transparency and Public Accountability. The initiative is geared towards the establishment of a citizens anti corruption programme that minimizes the blame game and upholds the value of teamwork in solving social problems like corruption on a multi sector approach or a collective basis.

The first stage of the citizens forum project has been laying of the foundation at the grassroots level for local ownership of the initiative. This report covers a brief summary of six phases that have been implemented. The major activity of the first stage was tracking primary education expenditure in order to identify gaps in monitoring and public accountability. The pilot project was conducted in Masaka district in the Central Region of Uganda. The key output at this level is an Effective Joint Monitoring and Public Accountability Strategy (EJMPAS). This aims at bridging the gap between the Citizens and Government.

2.0 Institutional Background

2.1 Guarantors

Interfaith based Action for ethics and Integrity (INFOC Uganda) is a coalition of faith based organizations fighting corruption. INFOC Uganda promotes a value-based approach and faith based advocacy for accountability and transparency as characteristics of Good Governance.

Uganda Joint Christian Council, a member organization of INFOC Uganda implemented the Citizens Forum pilot project. UJCC is made up of three mainstream Christian Churches: the Roman Catholic Church, the Uganda

Orthodox Church and the Anglican Church of Uganda. The members of the three churches constitute about 75% of Uganda's population.

The pilot project was coordinated by the Organizing Secretary of INFOC Uganda.

The key stakeholders list included Line Ministries of education and Sports (MoES), Local Government (MoLG), Office of the Auditor General (OAG), Inspector General of Government's Office (IGG), Directorate for Ethics and Integrity (DEI), Ecumenical Joint Action Committee (EJAC Masaka, INFOC members, Southern Buganda Inter-diocesan Education Committee (SOBIDEC, Sub-county ecumenical Monitoring Teams (SEMTs, Local Government – Masaka District, dioceses, Public Procurement and Disposal of Assets Office.

Southern Buganda Inter Diocesan education Committee (SOBIDEC) the education working committee of EJACs coordinated the project at the district level.

The Sub-county Ecumenical Monitoring Teams are in charge of local mobilization and continuous monitoring at the sub-county level.

2.2 Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF)

Uganda Joint Christian Council requested for financial support from the Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF) to fund the Citizens Forum initiative.

PTF granted US\$ 20,000 towards implementation of the first stage of the Citizens Forum. This was disbursed in three tranches of \$10,000, \$9,000 and the \$1,000, which will be disbursed upon the receipt of this report.

2.3 Goal of the Citizens' Anti Corruption Programme

The targeted outcome of the Citizens Anti-corruption programme is a vibrant civil society proactively demanding for good Governance.

This entails enhancement of quality citizen participation demanding for quality social service delivery and public accountability through institutionalized participatory advocacy for a.

2.4 Objectives of Citizens Forum

1. To create space for effective citizen participation in community development programmes
2. To enhance transparency and downward accountability from Government
3. To promote coordinated citizen participation
4. To enhance quality presentation of advocacy cases in community planning for a
5. To establish a feedback mechanism and effective dialogue at local level
6. Generate citizens trust and appreciation of the progress in anti-corruption struggle.

2.5 Theme

“Working Together for Sustainable Development”.

2.6 Procedure

The Citizens' forum has three implementation stages namely the baseline survey, testing of the proposed strategy and lastly the evaluation stage.

- The baseline survey was aimed at identifying the gaps in monitoring and public accountability of the primary education fund. The data gathered informed the development process of proposed Effective Joint Monitoring and Public Accountability strategy (EJMPAS).

- Testing the proposed EJMPAS strategy is the business for the second step.
- The third step is the analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the Citizens' Forum in enhancement of public accountability and information sharing forum using the enhanced participatory development.

3.0 Planned Activities and Achievements for the Reporting Period

3.1 Phase I: Collect resource material and develop Monitoring Tool

The key activity under Phase one was the development of resource materials to inform, educate and create public awareness of the Civic duty to monitor public expenditure.

The key achievements under this phase included the following:

- Production of a status report on monitoring UPE funds management
- Production of 5,600 copies of a Citizens' Monitoring Handbook. The Citizens Monitoring Handbook covers four basic topics of MONITORING, ADVOCACY, GOVERNANCE and DEVELOPMENT. The key purpose of producing a simplified Citizens Monitoring Handbook was to empower the targeted monitoring agents with monitoring skills. The content of the book was put together from many resource books and based on real experience shared by the different monitoring units.
- Third output was the survey instruments.

The key achievement was the realization of consensus building and increased ownership of the initiative following the inception workshop that was organized and held, the participatory process through a joint consultative and tools review workshops held between the state and non-state stakeholders. This led to a general agreement that the tools could be used until further review after testing them in the field. The approval of the tools led to the development of the guidelines to the pilot project.

3.2 Phase II: Train Monitoring Agents

Capacity building was a prerequisite to the first stage of the initiative in order to minimize mediocrity during the course of orientation of the local constituents and conduct of the baseline survey.

A criterion for selection of the local monitoring trainers' in relevant information gathering skills was developed at the consultative workshop. The TOT workshop in Advocacy and Monitoring was conducted in two phases. First and second batch of trainers in monitoring took place between August 26th – 29th 2005 in Kampala and from the 25th – 26th November 2005 in Masaka district respectively. The objective of training the targeted monitoring agents was to empower them for effective leadership and mobilization of their local communities to participate in monitoring the local community development programs.

Ninety men and women were empowered altogether in the monitoring and advocacy skills. Twenty one (21) men and 4 women from Masaka district and staff from the secretariat attended the first TOT workshop. The second batch of 70 participants was held at Dembe Lyo Hotel in Masaka. These included retired civil servants, teachers and community leaders.

The module covered a number of topics including overview of the UPE program, Monitoring. Linkage between monitoring, governance, advocacy and development, data analysis and report writing. The training was participatory and experiential learning methodologies were used. The key output of the training was a shortlist of indicators for monitoring UPE programme and draft tools for data collection.

Documentation skills and presentation of the facts and findings to the respective stakeholders and the targeted authorities at the Citizens district

forum were developed. The trainees got a deeper understanding of the significance of monitoring local economic development.

Sub-county Ecumenical Monitoring Teams (SEMTs)

The second batch of trainees elected members to the Sub-county ecumenical Monitoring Teams (SEMTs). The SEMTS are composed of seven people with differing positions and roles at the local community level. The committee is composed of representatives of head teachers, Religious leaders, local Council members, educationists, inspectors and representatives of the youth and women groups. The key role of the SEMTs is to mobilize and empower the independent citizen monitors within their local communities. The SEMTs will monitor the implementation of the proposed EJMPAs strategy.

The Chief guest at this function was the Resident District Commissioner (RDC) flanked by the District Education Officer (DEO).

The key achievement under the capacity building phase was making an output of trained monitoring agents four fold the initial set number of twenty.

3.3 Phase III: Data Collection

Desk Research

This activity was launched with a desk research to gather relevant information on our area of focus before we engage into activities in order to avoid duplication of work and misallocation of resources in activities that do not add value added to accountability for UPE public funds.

There was an intensive literature review of at least 10 major reports on monitoring and tracking public funds from the line ministries, independent researchers, networking partners and internet surfing.

A lot of information was acquired through informal interviews with education stakeholder on the current status of accountability for UPE programme. The findings helped us to refocus our targeted pilot project and enhanced a deeper understanding of the challenges of enhancing monitoring and public accountability of the public funds.

Some of the reports/literature analysed

- Report of a study to track use of and accountability for UPE capitation Grants Commissioned by Ministry of Education and Sports – done by International development consultants ltd.
- Report presented by Monitoring Unit of the Ministry of Finance on UPE program
- Framework for monitoring and Evaluation of UPE by Ministry of Education
- Result Oriented Monitoring and Evaluation by UNDP
- World Education Forum Report
- Use of and Accountability for Capitation Grants report in follow up of the report number 1 above.
- Directorate of Ethics and Integrity report May 2005
- Monitoring Handbook by UNDP
- Tracking the flow of UPE funds by Ministry of Education and Sports
- Monitoring of the Procurement process in the Poverty Action Fund/School facilities Grant report.

The key output of the desk research was a status report on management and monitoring of UPE funds. The key achievement was the informed selection of the pilot project focus area and avoidance of duplication of services. The status report equally facilitated the consensus building process at the inception workshop too.

The inception workshop served as the mini launch of the project. This brought about increased ownership of the initiative and a clearer

understanding of the justification for this intervention. Forty five (45) participants including the media, government, and civil society representatives attended the inception workshop.

Baseline Survey

Tracking public funds expenditure to curb corruption based on the diplomatic relationship between state and civil society is the core of the Citizens forum project. The survey team tracked primary education expenditure in Masaka District. The data gathered informed the designing of the EJMPAs proposal.

A baseline survey was conducted to gather real facts on the ground that would feed the development of an Effective Joint Monitoring and Public Accountability Strategy proposal. This involved the consultations to help identify the existing gaps in the existing monitoring and public accountability systems. The survey process was highly interactive at all levels.

The second phase of data collection was essentially the fieldwork. External consultative meetings were held to get technical guidance from the research fellows.

The baseline survey was carried out by 70 monitoring agents coordinated by 5 members of SOBIDEC with prior training from the first TOT that was carried out during the 2nd phase of the project. The district was divided into 5 zones for better management and mobilization.

This differed from the initial plan of using 5 technical people to conduct the survey. This change followed the need to enhance sustainability of the project. It also gave the trained monitoring agents an opportunity to test themselves in field work and actual monitoring skills required. The SEMTs were facilitated to collect the relevant data.

The previous reports on tracking use of UPE funds revealed that the biggest moral and practical hazard was lack of consistency in monitoring and downward accountability. Whereas there is provision for systems for public oversight and therefore a structured mechanism for demanding for accountability, there are substantial gaps that hinder its effective implementation.

The Capitation Grant and School Facilities Grant (SFG) were tracked from Ministry level to School level in order to identify the gaps in monitoring and public accountability that lead to the misappropriation of the same funds. Facts were gathered on the flow of Capitation grant and outcomes of School Facility Grant (SFG).

The survey team reached at least 67 schools only due to limited funds. There are 23 sub-counties in Masaka and a minimum of two schools were visited in each sub-county.

The data collection methods were basically three; literature review, focused group discussions, questionnaires and interview from both the primary and secondary sources of data. Interview guides were used on key informants.

3.4 Phase IV: Analysis of Data and Preparation of a report on findings and drafting a Monitoring and Public Accountability Strategy

The research assistants and the technical committee members did the report production on a participatory basis. A quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data collected was done. The SPSS computer programme was used for data entry. The analysis of raw data lasted four months of the calendar year beginning in January with the research assistants that guided the rest on the scientific approach. Data review and consultative meetings were held at various levels. The key output of the review meetings was the draft survey

report and short list of issues identified for presentation to the wider stakeholders' consultative workshop.

A stakeholder's consultation workshop was organized at Masaka district on the 7th of April 2006 to discuss the issues identified and propose solutions. Secondly, strategies were proposed and recommendations given to enhance monitoring and public accountability. Recommendations developed from the focused group discussions informed draft joint monitoring strategy. The participants included the Local Government officials, SOBIDE, EJACs, representatives of the Bishops from both West Uganda and Kako dioceses and the Sub-county Ecumenical Teams.

Summary of Issues Identified – Findings

Functionality of Monitoring Organs

The Ministry of education and sports is an exception compared to others in that it has a newly developed monitoring framework and training packages for its' monitoring agents. The commonest gap was absence of monitoring plans, lack of access to timely information, lack of resources and absence of feed back mechanisms.

The greatest concern was on the School Management Committees, with the duty of daily internal monitoring of the SFG projects and utilization of Capitation grants. The SMC members who were interviewed admitted that they are not effective in the monitoring role. Committees that have active and well-educated Chairpersons were reported to be better than others. This confirmed the need that irrespective of serving on the SMC being voluntary there is need for setting minimum qualification for its SMC leadership. Monitoring the flow of funds, SFG construction and stocktaking, which are part of the SMCs' duties, are left to the Chairman of the Committee who is signatory to the bank accounts.

There is need to build the required capacity of the monitoring agents if good work is to be expected. Most of the agents do not have the basic skills of monitoring and auditing finances and stock taking. Most of the monitoring agents do not have access to and understanding of the financial regulations and standards of accountability.

Coordination of Monitors

The monitoring agencies are not coordinated thus working in isolation. The respective monitoring plans are not linked causing massive duplication of work because the reports and findings are not well disseminated to pertinent stakeholders in the monitoring field.

The state monitors include the Central Ministries – Ministry of education and sports, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Ministry of local Government, Ministry of Works and Housing Corporation and Prime Ministers Office. They monitor public funds management, UPE funds inclusive, through their representatives like the Construction Management Unit, RDC, School Management Committees and District Education Office. Local community monitoring is left to the Village Council Chairpersons.

There is need for a coordinating unit of registered monitoring agencies to enhance harmonization of their interests and development of a common goal. This will build a synergy that comes with so many value additions to the supplementing members.

Information access

There is no centralized data bank on public funds management to improve on information access by either monitors or the general public. The chain of command to authorize information release is lengthy, rendering the costs of monitoring very high both financially and in terms of time consumption to develop comprehensive reports. This renders monitoring unsustainable,

validation of reports and reconciliation of statements is a lengthy process. This makes it difficult to draw conclusive recommendations.

The key recommendation is to establish a centralized public database that provides all relevant and regularly updated information concerning public funds management issues.

A coordinated effort led by the Directorate of Ethics and Integrity (DEI) is required to fasten up the process of making access to Information Act that was passed by the 7th Parliament operational.

The key recommendation here is to broaden the capacity building programme beyond advocacy to include effective monitoring, evaluation data management and use of information if any value addition is to be realized.

Public Procurement and Disposal of Assets is still a highly closed process to external monitoring. The procurement and disposal of public assets area is not attractive to most of the independent monitors because of the low understanding of the backup systems and relevant legislation that supports their work in this area.

The key recommendation is development of a communication strategy that enhances independent monitoring of the public procurement and disposal of public funds.

There is need for a linkage and coordination between the external monitors and the internal monitors. This justifies intensifying the whistle blowing campaign for information volunteers.

Public Accountability strategies in place are not effective following economic limitations. The key strategy at hand for public accountability is public notice

boards and media. Media is very expensive for the monitoring agencies which limits the utilization of their services. This equally limits the supply and demand for the relevant information to enhance timely interventions.

The head teachers explained that newspapers as a medium of information dissemination by Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development is not effective because the schools do not have a budget for newspapers.

In addition to the above limitation, the local community members have communication barrier once English the secondary language is used in public notices.

The key recommendation here is the advocacy for Government to consider subsidization of a national news paper charged with release and dissemination of public information relevant to public accountability and enhancement of monitoring agencies work. If need be the Ministry of Education and Sports may put in place a policy that each school gets a free copy of the newspaper with the important and relevant information if it can afford the extra cost implication on their basic budget.

Secondly, to simplify the English used and introduce the translated versions of important information like the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development has done in the case of the Citizens Guide to National budget book lets.

Conclusions

The data analysis led to the following conclusions:

A. Functionality of the Monitoring Groups/Organs

There are a few agencies monitoring public funds management such that their impact is small to create sensitivity of the service providers to

the risk of detection and prosecution. The level of organization, quality and capacity of the monitoring agencies has room for improvement.

The causative factors include absence of codes of conduct and service charters which would serve as a basis and guide for monitoring organs to identify gaps in performance and accountability for public funds.

On analysis it was concluded that most SMCs are not accountable and compliant too because the members are volunteers.

The scope of work is still too big for the resources at hand and existing size of monitoring sector.

B. Integration and Coordination of Monitoring and Public Accountability Programmes

There are few monitoring organs and not well coordinated to share areas and levels of operation so as to add value to each other's work for results. Specialization would enhance efficiency in monitoring.

C. Information Management and Public Accountability

Lack of communication cycle linking the Ministries, Local Governments, Schools and independent monitoring agencies breaks the information flow keeping important information away from the stakeholders. This makes it very hard to identify the problem, draw conclusions in order to make practical recommendations.

Lack of publicity of service charters that define the minimum standards of performance to expect from the service providers leaves the information cycle incomplete to independent monitors. This makes it very hard for the local community members to hold them accountable if

they have not publicly declared their services, functions and minimum standards of performance.

The procurement and disposal of public assets sector faces a big challenge at the school level where head teachers have no clear Procurement and Disposal systems. The accounting principles were violated when most of the headmasters were given conflicting roles. You find it's the same person requisitioning for funds, spending it, keeping record and accounting for it.

There were many gaps in the records as established by the track on the funds flow. This made it very difficult for the monitoring teams to draw conclusions without asking a lot of questions.

There are established practices of communication, however most of them have no communication and anti-corruption strategies.

D. Effective Joint Monitoring and Public Accountability (EJMPAS)

The EJMPAS strategy to improve on monitoring and public accountability of public funds is the first one to be jointly developed by the different monitoring agencies. The stakeholders discussed the proposal through their representatives at the Citizens Forum held at Hotel Bravad Masaka district on the 25th May 2006.

A consultative process was used in preparing this strategy. This involved the stakeholders at district level. The issues covered during the consultation made up the content of strategy. These included:

- 1.1.1 Low community participation
- 1.1.2 Functionality of the monitoring organs
- 1.1.3 Wastage of resources through uncoordinated monitoring and duplication of work

- 1.1.4 Poor facilitation of monitors
- 1.1.5 Lack of capacity to monitor
- 1.1.6 Lack of transparency of the procurement systems
- 1.1.7 Poor information management
- 1.1.8 Conflict of interest and conspiracy.

The strategy is a deliberate effort to enhance collaboration and linkage between the different monitoring organs that are responsible for testing and implementing through their respective institutions.

The EJMPAS discusses the priority areas of concern as gaps identified in monitoring and public accountability of the public funds. It is believed that the raised issues are the weak areas responsible for poor monitoring and lack of public accountability providing space for corruption. The EJMPAS establishes the link between monitoring and fighting corruption.

Development and implementing of the proposed joint monitoring strategy is the first and second business of the Citizens Forum towards enhancement of effective monitoring and public accountability.

The strategy seeks to address the aspect of citizen participation in preventing corruption. This calls for commitment, consistency and sustainability of the monitoring programmes to make real impact on the current misuse of public funds.

Effective monitoring and public accountability strategy will raise the risk of detection and increase prevention of corruption cases. The key challenge to civil society is the development of ability to translate monitoring skills into best practices.

The key result is the maximum utilization of the synergy, information and experience sharing enhancing transparency and public accountability. This will back up the institutional planning, strategy development and harmonization of the interests and goals of protecting their people.

The strategy recognizes the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders and it is on this basis that the strategy will emphasize strategic alliance, coordination and joint working. This will promote dialogue and participation of the citizens. The draft proposal of the EJMPAS strategy was presented to the wider group of stakeholders at the Citizens Forum for further discussion.

Recommendations – Functionality of Monitoring Organs

- It was recommended that a mechanism of checking on the performance of the monitoring organs/agents be put in place. This will render increased accountability from monitoring agents.
- The appointing bodies that forward representatives to the monitoring organs like SMCs should review the criteria of selection to protect the factors of quality, capacity and ability of the representatives to detect the gaps.
- The level of organization and professionalism has to be enhanced using a well thought out training package to contain the challenge of scope of work with low numbers of monitoring organs.
- A regular joint review forum between the monitoring agencies and the Local community members to discuss plans, progress reports and receive comments is required to enhance public accountability and feed back.

- Educate the masses on the importance of truth, honesty and loyalty as nationals to expose areas of weakness and report incidences of corruption detected.
- Educate masses the importance of Citizens Charters and supportive legislation of Whistle blowers Act.

Coordination of Monitoring Agencies

- It is recommended that a coordinating unit for the caucus of monitors be established to bring together the monitors for harmonization of interest as a national team.
- Caucus of the monitoring organs is required for purposes advancing the organization of a national movement specializing in tracking public funds management.
- This justifies the need for regularizing the Citizens Forum where the monitoring agencies can come together to compare notes on gaps identified, threats, weaknesses and ideas on lasting solutions to the outstanding issues.

Information Management and Public Accountability

- The government needs to subsidize the National Media Education houses to make their services affordable
- Launch Citizens Charters publicity campaign
- Launch Whistle blowers campaign
- The Coordination unit should develop a monitoring road map
- Monitoring Agencies to come up with communication strategies
- The public service providers to come up with internal anti-corruption strategies
- Review the roles of headmasters in the accounting system at school level
- Organize and hold regular Citizens Forum

- Diversify to communication in key regional primary languages
- A policy on Centralized public information resource centers is needed.

3.5 Phase V: Discussion of Report at a Citizens Forum

The Citizens Forum brought together stakeholders to collectively review and develop corrective solutions in address of issues that were raised in the survey report. The proceedings at the citizens forum were characterized by presentation of reports and recommendations and discussion of the same. The plenary discussions enabled the participants to make their inputs and share brilliant ideas on the way forward.

Stakeholders that attended the Citizens Forum were from the networking organizations, Local Government, Church and education sector. They convened in Masaka on the 7th of April 2006 and discussed the issues outlined in the proposed Effective Joint Monitoring and Public Accountability Strategy. Accountability is the key issue of concern to the taxpayers and entire citizenry.

The Guest of Honour, Hon. Justice Faith Mwendah, and the Inspector General of Government called upon the citizens to give equal attention to procurement and disposal of public assets. She emphasized the lack in monitoring and accountability for returns and savings from the disposal of Public assets.

The specific objectives of the Citizens Forum were to:

- (a) Disseminate the findings from the baseline survey and discuss the areas of high concern.
- (b) The stakeholders to identify the possible interventions to close the identified gaps and how to take advantages of the opportunities at hand

- (c) To prepare the stakeholders on their roles and undertakings in solving the raised issues
 - (d) To create space for focused advocacy by the citizen monitors.
- (i) Stakeholders agreed that there was need to coordinate the monitoring organs to promote specialization according to the comparative advantage of each player.

Recommended action points:

- Organizing and holding sector focused discussion groups on the roles and responsibilities specified in the joint monitoring strategy
 - Developing relevant strategies that show linkages to other monitors
 - Monitoring and evaluation strategies
 - Communication strategies
 - Anti-corruption strategies
 - Form a caucus for monitors to share roles in implementation of proposed strategy to minimize duplication of roles and wastage of resources
 - Regular organization and attendance of the citizens forum for progress review
 - Develop and disseminate register for monitors and their area of work
- (ii) The functionality of the School Management Committees was the case study for the issue of Functionality of the monitoring organs

Recommended action points;

- Develop and publicize Codes of conduct and service charters to guide and focus the Monitoring organs on the expected services and minimum standards of performance
- Service Charters – Citizens Charters and Code of Ethics for service providers to be developed and publicized to focus independent monitors
- Organize Citizens forum for monitoring organs to share progress reports

- Build capacity to monitor and increase the level of organization
 - Mobilize resources to facilitate the monitoring programmes
 - Establish Ethics committees to monitor process and compliance to Code of Ethics.
- (iii) The stakeholders recognized the need and importance of good information management. Both the state and non-state actors freely shared on modalities of improving information management

Recommended action points:

- Increase transparency of the procurement and disposal of public assets processes by establishing a feed back and public accountability mechanism to share information on plans, progress reports, achievements and challenge.
- Develop and implement communication strategies
- Establish centralized public data bank
- Advocate for subsidized media rates for monitors to share success stories and plans so as to impress upon service providers that the monitors are organized and watching them
- Display widely simplified information guiding the citizens on the flow of different public funds and management according to plans for public oversight
- Establish information collection centers for feed back from the people
- Launch Integrity help lines
- Launch whistle blowers campaign
- Organize regular public dialogues and debates on issues at hand
- Organize regular Citizens Forum for information sharing and progress review.

3.6 Phase VI: Follow-up actions and dissemination to implement the strategy

1. The EJMPAS strategy has been disseminated to relevant institutions but not yet reviewed and discussed with the respective institutions due to lack of funds to organize the focused group discussions
2. A second Citizens Forum would be organized to bring together the players to look at their final positions as per the EJMPAS before it can be implemented
3. A workshop would be held to develop a comprehensive monitoring plan and disseminate it
4. Quarterly Citizens Forum would be organized to review progress.

4.0 Additional Achievements – Awareness raising Campaign

There was opportunity of sharing the concept of joint monitoring at four well attended workshops. The workshops were held at Entebbe, Wesunire, Luwero and Masaka, at least 300 Education stakeholders participated. The participants were reminded of their civic duties of monitoring and other responsibilities ad education stakeholders.

The Regional ecumenical Education working team called SOBIDEC was established to coordinate the education projects at the districts. A stakeholder's forum was organized on the 22nd of September 2005 at Blessed Sacrament Hall, Kimanya Masaka. The two Bishops and the District education Officers graced the function. The forum attracted 400 technical people in the education sector from the central region of the four districts. The participants were reminded of the challenges of enhancing quality education and development through increased public accountability and integrity.

5.0 Impact Assessment

The objective attainment is above average. We hope it will be better in the second stage of testing the strategy.

The friendly approach of addressing issues through the Citizens Forum and dialogue among the diverse groups has promoted inclusiveness. This has been evidenced through the reciprocal actions by some of the targeted authorities like Ministry of Education and Local Government to participate in their planning activities as stakeholders.

A sense of belonging has been enhanced through joint action planning. This is aiming at joint position development, decisions taken according to the information shared and furnished by the relevant stakeholders.

The Citizens forum achieved its aim of bringing together stakeholders. This attracted the medias attention and thirst for progress reports. Written requests and follow up calls have been made to us requesting for updates.

The sub-county monitors have appreciated the importance of sharing local community development plans and progress reports. These activities have been integrated in the sub-county monitoring plans.

6.0 Constraints

The resources had been grossly underestimated compared to the demand that was there for a successful and timely implementation of the project. There was a shortage of human resource which was the biggest contributing factor to violation of the timeframe. Time was the greatest limitation in implementation of the first stage of the project. The project work was far too involving demanding for much more time than allocated during the planning session.

The same was the low estimate of the financial resource that would be required to attract the targeted consultants to implement the project. This consequently had a severe effect on the delivery of the planned outputs.

7.0 Lessons Learnt/Challenges and Recommendations

- The top down approach was good for preparing the targeted authorities but the bottom up approach will serve better for local mobilization and creation of ownership. This would promise sustainability of the initiative too.
- The appointment of core leaders at the local level may limit free participation of the local community members. This has prompted an alternative strategy of organizing open public forums that will give freedom to the local people to choose their representatives to the Citizens Forum at higher levels depending on the issues at hand.
- The greatest challenge is mobilization of the required resources to organize public forums
- The other key challenge is the mobilization and involvement of the private sector on a direct basis.
- The launch for the prepared help line and post box was suspended due to the limited budget that would result into a break of services in three months. This would demoralize the targeted participants.
- The second stage needs an effective resource mobilization strategy
- The Citizens Forum project needs officers and a fully-fledged coordinating unit for effective results to be realized after the three years of establishment.

8.0 Future Plans

- Establish a coordinating unit with at least two full time officers
- Organize Focused group discussions for review of report and proposed EJMPAS
- Organize Citizens Forum to adopt final strategy
- Develop monitoring tool for implementing the EJMPAS strategy
- Translate Citizens Monitoring handbook

- A postal mail box number and help line for improved feedback mechanism will be launched too at the beginning of the testing phase.
- Establish information collection centers
- Launch whistle blowing campaign
- Promote use of Citizens Charters
- Organize focused group discussions with targeted implementers of the EJMPAS strategy
- Organize a follow up Citizens Forum to look at the final EJMPAS before it can be implemented
- Organize a workshop to develop a comprehensive monitoring plan and disseminate it
- Organize quarterly Citizens Forum to review progress
- The monitoring caucus enter a Memorandum of Understanding to work together
- Intensify resource mobilization.

Summary Financial Report

	ACTIVITY	BUDGETED	ACTUAL	VARIANCE
Phase 1	Resource material development	10,400,000	8,612,900	1,787,100
Phase 2	Training of Trainers	6,150,000	6,181,000	(31,000)
Phase 3	Data Collection	6,075,000	6,202,550	57,550)
Phase 4	EJMPAS Development	850,000	3,506,950	2,506,950
	Mass Media	3,600,000	300,000	Others spread
Phase 5	Citizens Forum	4,150,000	3,667,100	482,900
Phase 6	Awareness raising	4,850,000	5,523,500	(673,500)
	Pool Fund for office utilities		1,500,000	
		36,075,000	35,494,000	(1,294,000)

Item	Requisition	Actual	Variance	Remarks
A1. Inception Workshop	1,360,000	1,500,400	(140,400)	Media inclusive
A2. Tools review by Civil Society	2,100,000	1,855,000	245,000	
A3. Tools review by Government partners	280,000	757,500	(477,500)	Increased on number of participants
A11. Printing Handbook	5,600,000	4,200,000	1,100,000	Reduced quality of material used
Book illustrations		300,000		The artist who developed book illustrations
	9,340,000	8,612,900	727,100	
Phase 2				
A4. Training of Trainers Workshop	6,150,000	6,181,000	(31,000)	According to original budget
Phase 3				
A5 Data Collection – pilot district	6,075,000	6,202,550	(57,550)	According to original budget
Phase 4				
A6 Technical members meetings Rakai	595,000	631,000	(36,550)	Data review
A7 Technical committee meeting Masaka	180,000	250,000	70,000	Data review by SOBIDEC
A8 Consultative Workshop	2,200,000	2,200,950	(950)	Stakeholders consultation on issues identified
A9 Accountability to EJAC	410,000	425,000	(15,000)	SOBIDEC reports to EJAC
	3,385,000	3,506,950	(121,950)	Scope of data review was much bigger than anticipated
Phase 5				
A10. Citizens Forum	3,580,000	3,667,100	(87,100)	Media coverage inclusive
Core fund for phases 2, 5, 6		1,500,000		For office utilities
Phase 6				
A12 Awareness raising	4,850,000	5,523,500	(673,500)	Orientation of targeted agents from sub-counties/media
A13 Media at SOBIDEC launch		300,000		Over 400 people made aware
Gross Total	33,380,000	35,494,000		

SCORE AGAINST THE SET IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Specific Objective and Result Indicator	Planned Activities	Output/Outcomes	First Stage Achievements	✓ Done ✗ Not Yet Done
Empower citizens and build their confidence to enhance effective deliberative participation and timely interventions	Workshop to develop resource material for monitoring agents to use and empower the citizens too. Workshop to train the trainers that will compose the liaison and action committees at lower level. The stakeholders will hold several review and planning meetings	Handbook developed Data collection monitoring tool 20 Monitoring agents of change equipped by facilitators and set up ethics desks in visited and oriented schools. Strategic implementation plans will be developed	Handbook developed Data collection monitoring tool 90 Monitoring agents trained Ethics desks visited and oriented schools were not set up yet because it is a policy issue that had to be discussed first. Several review and planning meetings	✓ ✓ ✓ ✗ ✓
Ensure institutional public accountability and transparency to sustain the relationship between the stakeholders in the anti-corruption struggle	Produce quarterly reports (both financial and performance) and regular news lets to public, donors and networking members.	Dissemination registers Hotlines, toll free lines and prepaid postal services Public reports, updates, briefs, news lets and success stories will be released through media	Dissemination register in place Hotline and prepaid facilities were put in place due to lack of funds for continuity Press conferences	✓ ✗

Specific Objective and Result Indicator	Planned Activities	Output/Outcomes	First Stage Achievements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Done <input type="checkbox"/> Not Yet Done
increased access to information and effective dialogue at local level			second Citizens Forum.	

Annexes

Photo Gallery

Awareness raising – SOBIDEC launch

Civil Society Tools review Workshop held on the 19 – 20 August 2005

Training of Trainers Workshop 23 – 27 August 2006

SFG OUTPUTS

DATA REVIEW PROCESS

CITIZENS' FORUM PARTICIPANTS

CITIZENS' FORUM

The Inspector General of Government and Resident District Commissioner launch community monitoring handbook Handed over by the organizing Secretary