

EN



This action is funded by the European Union

ANNEX

of the Commission Decision on the individual measure in favour of Uganda to be financed from the 11th European Development Fund

Action Document for EU support to the Democratic Governance Facility in Uganda

| | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| 1. Title/basic act/ CRIS number | EU support to the Democratic Governance Facility in Uganda – Extension Phase CRIS number: UG/FED/038-768 financed under 11 th European Development Fund | |
| 2. Zone benefiting from the action/location | Uganda The action shall be carried out at the following location: Uganda countrywide | |
| 3. Programming document | Uganda - 11 th European Development Fund (EDF) – National Indicative Programme (NIP) 2014-2020 | |
| 4. Sector of concentration/ thematic area | Good Governance | DEV Aid: Yes |
| 5. Amounts concerned | Total estimated cost: EUR 36 000 000 Total amount of EDF contribution EUR 7 500 000 This action is co-financed in joint co-financing by: - Austria for an amount of EUR 1 000 000 - Denmark for an amount of EUR 7 300 000 - Ireland for an amount of EUR 5 500 000 - Netherlands for an amount of EUR 3 000 000 - Norway for an amount of EUR 4 000 000 - Sweden for an amount of EUR 4 200 000 - United Kingdom for an amount of EUR 3 500 000 (minimum) ¹ | |
| 6. Aid modality(ies) and implementation modality(ies) | Project Modality - Indirect management with Austrian Development Agency (ADA) | |

¹ All amounts are indicative and subject to confirmation by development partners as well as to exchange rate, where applicable.

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 7. DAC code(s) | 15150 - Democratic participation and civil society | | | |
| 8. Markers (from CRIS DAC form) | General policy objective | Not targeted | Significant objective | Main objective |
| | Participation development/good governance | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | Aid to environment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Gender equality (including Women In Development) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Trade Development | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Reproductive, Maternal, New born and child health | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | RIO Convention markers | Not targeted | Significant objective | Main objective |
| | Biological diversity | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Combat desertification | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Climate change mitigation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Climate change adaptation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC) thematic flagship | | | | |

SUMMARY

This project will contribute EUR 7 500 000 to the Democratic Governance Facility (DGF) – Extension phase, a joint donor initiative in support of good governance in Uganda, currently co-funded by the EU, six EU Member States (Austria, Denmark, Ireland, Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom) and Norway, working in close collaboration with EU-funded actions in the same field.

The DGF started its operations in July 2011, with the aim of strengthening democratisation, protecting human rights, increasing access to justice, consolidating peaceful co-existence and improving accountability in Uganda, and thereby contribute to the overall objective of equitable growth, poverty reduction and long-term stability. In the current phase (July 2011- June 2016) the DGF has a budget of approximately EUR 100 000 000 and is providing support to over 80 state and non-state beneficiaries. The 2014 mid-term review assessed the facility as a big success, despite the deteriorating governance context. Building on this success, Development Partners have decided to extend its duration by 18 months (July 2016 - December 2017) and, as we write, are planning for a further extension of 5 years (DGF II - January 2018 – December 2022). All current partners have already formally committed to both extensions, as its new objectives and expected results are being developed.

The allocation of funds to the DGF Extension enhances the coherence, and curbs the duplication, of Development Partners efforts in support of the governance sector and in promoting the right to democracy in Uganda. It, therefore, reinforces the principles of aid effectiveness and donor

coordination which is in line with the interests of the Government of Uganda as well as those of the EU and other Development Partners.

1 CONTEXT

1.1 Sector/Country/Regional context/Thematic area

Uganda is a unitary state, comprising of the national government and four levels of sub-national government, with the president as head of government. Overall, Uganda has a sound institutional and regulatory framework in place in terms of democracy, human rights, rule of law, access to justice, accountability, civil society and media. However, a large implementation gap remains, and the political economy is characterised by a political patronage system dominated by President Museveni and the National Resistance Movement (NRM) regime, incumbent since 1986. Multi-party elections have been held since 2006, with the next Presidential elections due in February 2016. Uganda has witnessed significant economic growth and poverty reduction over the last two decades, although the post 2011 election period experienced a period of unstable inflation. Uganda's recent economic performance has been favourable with gradual GDP growth recovery, but still below the medium target and with some downside risks.

The Government, the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)², and other stakeholders acknowledge that whilst progress has been made in improving good governance, much remains to be done. Recent external analysis of the Ugandan context and its political economy suggests that the potential for systemic reform towards democratisation and accountability is limited and diminishing.³ The list of good governance challenges still faced in Uganda is therefore rather long and includes: Ensuring the capability of key governance institutions and the integrity of national elections; providing adequate checks and balances in the governance system; increasing accountability and transparency for the use of public resources; addressing problems with access to justice and the observance of human rights; overcoming barriers to citizen engagement in service provision; enabling free media to play a constructive role in society; ensuring reconciliation, peace and improved services in the north.

Fundamental freedoms such as freedom of expression, association and peaceful assembly are increasingly restricted by the ruling government and media freedoms curtailed. Legislations such as the Public Order Management Act 2013, the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Prevention and Control Act 2014, the annulled Anti-Homosexuality Act 2014 were enacted for the purpose of controlling actors and institutions rather than enabling them. The same is true for the Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO) Bill 2015, which is designed to restrict and control Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) work rather than to facilitate it.

² African Peer Review Mechanism, Country Report, May 2015

³ David Booth et al (2014) *East African Prospects: An update on the political economy of Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda*, ODI Report; Matt Andrews and Lawrence Bategeka (2013) *Overcoming the Limits of Institutional reform in Uganda*

1.1.1 Public Policy Assessment and EU Policy Framework

The Government of Uganda's democratic governance objectives and principles are laid out in the Constitution and expanded in the Second National Development Plan (NDP II) for 2015/16 – 2019/20. The NDP II features the strengthening of governance mechanisms and structures among its strategic directions and recognises both state and non-state actors as important players in the improvement of good governance. Its stated goal is good governance that is characterised by: accountability, transparency, responsiveness, participation by all, efficiency and effectiveness, equity, inclusiveness and observance of the rule of law. Good governance is considered key to supporting the Plan's agenda on building a competitive economy through creation of the required legal and socio-political environment to accelerate economic and social transformation.

Despite Uganda having ratified all International Conventions for the protection of Human Rights⁴, full enjoyment of human rights by all citizens has yet to be achieved. Eagerness to ratify the conventions has not always been accompanied by enactment of national legislation or by diligent reporting. Periodic violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and human rights abuses are still an issue in the country. The Uganda Human Rights Commission has a clear mandate to protect human rights, yet its ability to deliver is hampered by weak respect of the rule of law by government and by its limited capacities and financial resources.

The Domestic Violence Act, 2010 and the Prohibition of Female Genital Mutilation Act, 2010 were enacted as part of Government's strategy to promote Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE). However, effective implementation of national and international commitments on GEWE is weak and enforcement still remains limited. The proposed Action is in line with the Human Rights Country Strategy for Uganda⁵, and most of the activities under component II of the action will target the priority areas of the strategy. Furthermore, recommendations made by the EU EOM 2016 report will be taken into consideration and follow-up ensured to improve the election process and overall democratic processes in the country.

1.1.2 Stakeholder analysis

The Democratic Governance Facility (DGF) Extension Phase will provide support to state institutions providing the governance framework, organised civil society, the private sector and other social institutions to strengthen them as drivers of change. Women and children, as well as other vulnerable categories (People living with disabilities, HIV/AIDS, etc.), will be targeted to enhance their capacity to claim their rights, and take part in decision making processes at local and national level.

Main entities involved in democratic governance:

⁴ Uganda has ratified the African Charter for Human and Peoples' Rights, the International Covenant for Civil and Political Rights, the Convention for the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, the International Convention against all Form of Racial Discrimination, the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities among others.

⁵ Internal document (not for public dissemination)

Government: Several Government institutions are part of the Justice Law and Order Sector (JLOS)⁶. Engagement and support through the DGF have so far proved successful, although they vary greatly in the strength of their mandate, their institutional capacity and leadership.

Parliament: Indications are that Parliament is becoming both less able and willing to assert its independence from the Executive.

Electoral Commission: The newly renamed Independent Electoral Commission of Uganda is still perceived as a partisan institution. Concrete reforms with regard to its nomination and functioning will be required to render it a fully independent institution.

Human Rights Commission: Its ability to deliver is hampered by weak respect of the rule of law by government and by its limited capacities and financial resources.

Political Parties: The National Resistance Movement (NRM), President's Museveni party, continues to dominate the political landscape, while opposition political parties struggle to build broad-based constituencies or provide meaningful alternatives to the NRM.

The Media: the media plays an important role in disclosing information on human rights abuses, corruption cases and other misuse of power, but has been subject to repressive and often violent measures when challenging political elites.

CSOs: Uganda has a rather vibrant civil society with thousands of CSOs engaged at both service delivery and advocacy level. Although operating relatively freely, they often face difficulties when addressing institutional corruption and other vested interests.

1.1.3 Priority areas for support/problem analysis

The proposed action will support the Democratic Governance Facility Extension Phase - one of the biggest and broadest pooled funds working on governance, human rights and accountability in Sub-Saharan Africa. Priority areas for support of this programme will be fully aligned to those of the Democratic Governance Facility Extension Phase as a continuation of DGF, namely:

i) Deepening democracy [DGF Component 1] (More informed public debate and policy dialogue on issues in the public interest; Improved integrity of, and citizen participation (both men and women) in, key aspects of the electoral process; Improved capacity of citizens, political leaders and selected institutions to understand and play their respective roles and responsibilities in the democratic process);

ii) Rights, justice and peace [DGF Component 2] (Enhanced Human Rights understanding and advocacy by rights holders (men and women) and duty bearers and improved functioning of selected institutions promoting and protecting Human Rights; Provision of quality legal aid and promotion of access to justice for the poor and vulnerable (men, women, boys and girls); Selected transitional justice (TJ) processes and mechanisms supported; capacity of local peace actors strengthened to identify and mitigate conflict);

⁶ JLOS institutions comprise: Ministry of Justice & Constitutional Affairs, Judiciary, Centre for Arbitration & Dispute Resolution, Directorate of Citizenship & Migration Control, Directorate of Public Prosecutions, Judicial Service Commission, Law Development Centre, Ministry of Gender, Labor & Social Development, Ministry of Internal Affairs, Ministry of Local Government, Tax Appeals Tribunal, Uganda Human Rights Commission, Uganda Law Reform Commission, Uganda Law Society, Uganda Police Force, Uganda Prisons Service, Uganda Registration Services Bureau.

iii) Voice and accountability [DGF Component 3] (Enhanced citizen (men and women) competence to demand better service delivery from local and national government; More inclusive dialogue on natural resource management and increased awareness of environmental protection and human rights by duty bearers and rights holders).

In each of the three areas of support to the DGF Extension aim is to provide both financial and technical support to state and non-state actors to design and deliver new actions/programmes and services that aim to: Influence relevant laws, bills & policies by effective advocacy at local and national level; Increase confidence of citizens in claiming their civic and human rights; Improve levels of collective organisation of, and professionalism and stable space to operate for Civil Society working on governance issues; Duly address an increasing number of poor and vulnerable citizens' legal and conflict issues.

Through the above, the proposed action aims at contributing to improvements in accountable, responsive, rights-based governance through effective citizen participation (men and women) coupled with stronger institutions.

2 RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

| Risks | Risk level (H/M/L) | Mitigating measures |
|--|--------------------|--|
| Contextual risk: Civic space for CSOs to operate shrinks | M/H | Development Partners and Programme Management Unit (PMU) continue engagement with government/opinion leaders through existing fora. Leverage from other programmes, including possible budget support. |
| Programmatic risk: DGF fails to have a positive impact and to achieve programme objectives | L/M | Selection of DGF partners and projects follows a well-established and effective process. Scope for reallocation of funds. |
| State institutions unwilling or unable to fully cooperate | L/M | Relations with relevant state institutions are well established. Government of Uganda has seat on Board of DGF. |
| Government support for DGF decreases and operational freedom restricted | L/M | Development Partners and PMU continue engagement with government/opinion leaders through existing forum. Leverage from other programmes, including possible budget support. |
| Institutional risk: DGF partners unable to effectively plan, and budget and implement activities. | L/M | PMU to apply complete due diligence in pre-grant assessment, partner capacity building, and active partner monitoring. |
| Corruption and Fraud in partner institutions | L/M | External audits and anti-corruption policy and whistle-blower arrangements are in place. |

| Assumptions |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Wider civil society space to operate is maintained2. DGF and Development Partners are not excessively risk-adverse and are prepared to allow inevitable areas of failure3. Implementing partners have the capacity to use and account for funds in a timely and transparent manner |

3 LESSONS LEARNT, COMPLEMENTARITY AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

3.1 Lessons learnt

The proposed approach builds on 8 years of Development Partners experience of jointly funded governance programmes in Uganda, namely the DGF pool fund, which has been running since 2011, and the “Deepening Democracy Programme” (DDP) which ran from 2008 to 2011. The Democratic Governance Facility (DGF) Extension phase will benefit, not only from lessons learned through past and recent implementation but also from those learned from the implementation of 35 multi donor funds in Africa, Asia and Latin America⁷.

Lessons from DGF support in its current phase emphasise the importance of targeting both the supply and demand sides of governance. The support to DGF Extension will therefore focus partly on state institutions that act as pillars of the democratic governance system including: Parliament, Electoral Commission, the Judiciary and the Human Rights Commission. While complementing government efforts, the DGF Extension Phase will place particular emphasis on the role of non-state actors. Previous experience suggests there is considerable potential to develop civil society capability both to enhance the access of the poor to key services and to engage more directly at community level to build social networks and resources to enable poor communities to hold public service providers more accountable.

3.2 Complementarity, synergy and donor coordination

The Good Governance focal sector targets accountability, employing a portfolio approach to address all aspects of the 'accountability chain'. As the National Indicative Programme (NIP) outlines, this chain comprises (i) State Management (ii) Oversight (iii) Sanction, and thus necessitates support to both state and non-state actors.⁸ It is underpinned by a Rights-Based Approach that focuses on outcomes for rights holders, in particular those that are most impacted by lack of accountability (disadvantaged, women, children, etc.). On the supply side, the Financial Management and Accountability Programme (FINMAP) and Strengthening Uganda's

⁷ Study on Support to Civil Society through Multi-Donor Funds, Intrac, January 2014

⁸ A Sector Reform Contract (SRC) is envisaged as an overall umbrella to the governance portfolio, possibly addressing higher-level structural/horizontal issues, and aiming to measure Uganda's success in closing the 'implementation gap' between institutional framework and functional efficacy. A technical assistance component of the SRC will be envisaged to provide targeted support to institutions not covered by other projects (primarily in the Justice, Law & Order Sector). The SRC would strengthen our credibility as partners, increase our legitimacy and leverage, and provide both framework and benchmarks for assessing government performance. An SRC would also improve the predictability of financing and use of country systems, by introducing clear and measurable indicators. While the political, financial and operational risks would be higher than with a project approach, the SRC would also promote the visibility of the EU as a lead donor.

Anti-corruption Response (SUGAR) programme will provide support to Public Finance Management and Anti-Corruption actions respectively. Support to DGF will focus primarily (though not exclusively) on the demand side of accountability, through support to the non-state sector, accompanied by the NIP's civil society budget allocation. A governance component of the Northern Uganda Programme (NUP) will provide support to both supply and demand side actors at a local level.

EU joint programming exercises have identified 'Governance/Accountability' as a first priority area, and the majority of EU Member States (MS) are highly active. Development Partners coordinate in a number of fora, including the Accountability Working Group, Democracy and Human Rights Working Group, and a number of [public financial management](#) (PFM) related groups. A joint donor approach on Accountability was agreed in 2013.

The allocation of funds to the DGF Extension Phase enhances the coherence, and curbs the duplication, of Development Partners efforts in support of the governance sector. It, therefore, reinforces the principles of aid effectiveness and donor coordination which is in line with the interests of the Government of Uganda as well as those of the EU and other Development Partners. The programme will be implemented in full synergy and coordination with all funding Development Partners of the DGF Extension Phase. Development Partners representatives are members of the DGF Board and of the Steering Committee. The Board is tasked with determining the overall strategy and direction for the pool fund and the Steering Committee provides oversight of programme implementation.

3.3 Cross-cutting and other issues

Four main cross-cutting issues have emerged as priority themes that are relevant to all three components of the DGF Extension Phase. The proposed Action will be fully aligned to these themes which are: Land rights, conflict, gender and youth. Other cross cutting issues such as disabilities, HIV/AIDS, children will be mainstreamed across the supported projects. A rights based approach will inform the entire work of the proposed Action.

Land rights: Land rights will be addressed by the DGF Extension from three dimensions – (i) access to justice (ii) transitional justice and conflict resolution and (iii) voice and accountability, particularly with regard to extractive industries.

Conflict: Minimising the recurrence of conflict and insurgency requires a two pronged approach addressing legal aspects (i.e. transitional justice under Component 2) and social concerns (i.e. service delivery under Component 3).

Gender equality: DGF will be guided by a gender mainstreaming strategy that will adopt a two-pronged approach: the integrationist approach and the agenda setting approach. The integrationist approach will promote women's participation within the planned activities without necessarily altering the content of the programme's activities to reflect women's specific concerns. The agenda setting approach will address women's specific concerns in democratic governance.

Youth: Uganda has one of the youngest (and poorest) populations in the world, and it is important to ensure that youth are prioritised in all interventions under the three components.

A human rights based approach will facilitate the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues and will emphasise: Participation of various social categories that have a stake in the issues addressed under each component; Access to information; Equality, non-discrimination and equity;

Empowerment of marginalised and vulnerable groups, such as women, children, youth, and other special groups; Special attention to the empowerment of people living with disabilities.

4 DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

4.1 Objectives/results

The overall objective of the proposed action is to contribute to strengthened democratisation, protection of human rights, access to justice, peaceful coexistence and improved accountability.

The specific objective is: Improvements in accountable, responsive, rights-based governance through effective citizen participation coupled with stronger institutions.

Expected Results are:

For Component I – Deepening Democracy: Improved capacity of citizens (especially women and youth), political leaders and selected institutions to understand and play their respective roles and responsibilities in the democratic process; More informed public debate and policy dialogue on issues in the public interest; Improved integrity of, and citizen participation in, key aspects of the electoral process.

For Component II – Rights, Justice and Peace: Enhanced Human Rights understanding and advocacy by rights holders and duty bearers, and improved functioning of selected HR institutions; Provision of quality legal aid and promotion of access to justice for the poor and vulnerable, including in extractives-affected areas; Selected Transitional Justice processes and mechanisms supported; strengthened capacity of local peace actors to identify and mitigate conflict drivers and promote reconciliation.

For Component III – Voice and Accountability: Enhanced citizen competence to demand better service delivery from local and national government; More inclusive dialogue on natural resource management and increased awareness of environmental protection and Human Rights by duty bearers and rights holders.

4.2 Main activities

The Democratic Governance Facility (DGF) extension phase will support a wide range of activities, some of which can be summarised as follows (list not exhaustive):

- The delivery of civic education and other awareness raising activities that are absorbed by and that increase knowledge of a wide range of beneficiaries.
- Training that succeeds in changing knowledge and attitudes.
- Increased output of high quality political reporting that reaches larger audience numbers.
- Advocacy that is professional and credible, to which government institutions are prepared to grant an audience.
- Successful identification or creation and use of avenues for citizens to claim rights.
- Support to partners that leads to increased quality and provision of legal aid and mediation to poor and vulnerable beneficiaries who would not otherwise receive it.

- Support to community conflict resolution groups and institutions that improves their ability to function.
- Brokering of a wider range of stakeholders than would usually meet to negotiate a policy problem that achieves buy in from key actors and becomes an iterative process.

4.3 Intervention logic

The main mechanism for delivery of DGF extension's outputs involve the ability of its funding beneficiaries to translate activities into intermediate results from the services they deliver through their projects/actions. This aspect is linked to the assumption that DGF funding beneficiaries are given space by government authorities to conduct their activities.

The main mechanisms that will trigger change from output to outcome level are the ability of DGF to bring stakeholders to work together, to combine both project and core support and to work with a diversity of partners. Main assumptions at this level are the fact that the space for civil society work is not shrinking and the ability of CSOs to deliver evidence-based and credible work.

A more detailed description of the intervention logic is outlined in the attached Logical Framework.

5 IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Financing agreement

In order to implement this action, it is not foreseen to conclude a financing agreement with the partner country, referred to in Article 17 of Annex IV to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement.

5.2 Indicative implementation period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 4.2 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 30 months from the date of adoption by the Commission of this Action Document.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission's authorising officer responsible by amending this decision and the relevant contracts and agreements; such amendments to this decision constitute non-substantial amendment in the sense of Article 9(4) of the Regulation (EU) 2015/322.

5.3 Implementation of the budget support component

N. A.

5.4 Implementation modalities

5.4.1 Indirect management with a Member State agency.

This action may be implemented in indirect management with the Austrian Development Agency in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 applicable in accordance with Article 17 of the Regulation (EU) 2015/323. This implementation entails providing EU funds to the Democratic Governance Facility (DGF) extension phase, to oversee implementation in all its aspects, especially by participating in the steering committee meetings, board meetings, and all important decision making meetings, by carrying out monitoring visits, and to procure audit services at the end of the implementation phase. This implementation is justified because of ADA's experience in implementing agreements with the EU in Uganda and because of the positive implementation of a former agreement to channel EU contribution to the DGF.

The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-implementation tasks: managing and enforcing the contracts concluded and also running the procurement procedures preceding the conclusion of such contracts, including the award and rejection decision.

5.5 Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply.

The Commission's authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility in accordance with Article 22(1)(b) of Annex IV to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of products and services in the markets of the countries concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where the eligibility rules would make the realisation of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult.

5.6 Indicative budget

| | EU contribution (amount in EUR) | Indicative third party contribution, in currency identified |
|--|--|--|
| 5.4.1 Contribution to Democratic Governance Facility (DGF) Extension Phase | 7 435 000 | 28 500 000 |
| 5.10 Audit | 15 000 | |
| 5.11 Communication and Visibility | 50 000 | |
| Totals | 7 500 000 | 28 500 000 |

5.7 Organisational set-up and responsibilities

Both the EU and Austrian Development Agency (ADA) will be members of the Board and Steering Committee of the DGF extension phase pool fund.

EU and ADA will sign an agreement under which ADA will manage the EU's contribution and support the Democratic Governance Facility Extension Phase through its existing well placed structures and officers. ADA will assume the overall responsibility for compliance with the agreed monitoring, reporting, financial management (incl. auditing) and visibility requirements. ADA will have as implementing partner the Royal Danish Embassy. This entity is managing the Programme Management Unit (PMU) in charge of the DGF fund.

5.8 Performance monitoring and reporting

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process and part of the implementing partner's responsibilities. To this aim, the implementing partner shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its results (outputs and direct outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the log-frame matrix (for project modality). The report shall be laid out in such a way as to allow monitoring of the means envisaged and employed and of the budget details for the action. The final report, narrative and financial, will cover the entire period of the action implementation.

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

5.9 Evaluation

Having regard to the nature of the action, evaluations will not be carried out for this action or its components.

In case an evaluation is not foreseen, the Commission may, during implementation, decide to undertake such an evaluation for duly justified reasons either on its own decision or on the initiative of the partner.

The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner country and other key stakeholders. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.

The financing of the evaluation shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.10 Audit

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audits or expenditure verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

The financing of the audit shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.11 Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility of the EU is a legal obligation for all external actions funded by the EU.

This action shall contain communication and visibility measures which shall be based on a specific Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action, to be elaborated at the start of implementation and supported with the budget indicated in section 5.6 above.

In terms of legal obligations on communication and visibility, the measures shall be implemented by the Commission, the partner country, contractors, grant beneficiaries and/or entrusted entities. Appropriate contractual obligations shall be included in, respectively, the financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and delegation agreements.

The Communication and Visibility Manual for European Union External Action shall be used to establish the Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action and the appropriate contractual obligations.

APPENDIX - INDICATIVE LOGFRAME MATRIX (FOR PROJECT MODALITY) ⁹

The activities, the expected outputs and all the indicators, targets and baselines included in the logframe matrix are indicative and may be updated during the implementation of the action without an amendment to the financing decision. The indicative logframe matrix will evolve during the lifetime of the action: new lines will be added for listing the activities as well as new columns for intermediary targets (milestones) when it is relevant and for reporting purpose on the achievement of results as measured by indicators.

| | Intervention logic | Indicators | Baselines (incl. reference year) | Targets (incl. reference year) | Sources and means of verification | Assumptions |
|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|--------------------|
| Overall objective: Impact | Strengthened democratisation, protection of human rights, access to justice, peaceful co-hesitance and improved accountability | OO I1 Percentage of Ugandans expressing satisfaction with the way democracy works | OO I1 B170% - 2011 | OO I1 T1 75% - 2016/2017 | OO I1 S1 Afrobarometer`s Index of Demand for Democracy OO I2, I3 S1 Mo Ibrahim Index of African Governance | |
| | | OO I 2 Mo Ibrahim Index of African Governance Rule of Law Score ** | OO I2 B155.6 - 2011 | OO I2 T1 55 – 2016/2017 | | |
| | | OO I 3 Mo Ibrahim Index of African Governance – Accountability Score ** | OO I3 B1 35.5 - 2011 | OO I3 T1 37 – 2016/2017 | | |

⁹ Mark indicators aligned with the relevant programming document mark with '*' and indicators aligned to the EU Results Framework with '**'.

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| Specific objective: outcome | Improvements in accountable, responsive, rights-based governance through effective citizen participation coupled with stronger institutions | SO I1 Number of relevant bills and policies scrutinised by the Human rights committee of parliament | SO I1 B1 No influenced bills | SO I1 T1 15 bills and policies scrutinised by the Human rights committee of parliament | SO I1 S1 List and accompanying qualitative assessment of key relevant laws, bills and policies worked on by DGF with successful or unsuccessful outcomes | <p>Conducive environment for civil society organisations to operate</p> <p>Functioning court system and process and outcomes of cases is transparent, timely and neutral</p> <p>DGs and DGF are not excessively risk-adverse</p> <p>There is a sufficient emphasis on monitoring and learning across the components</p> |
| | | SO I2 Level of confidence of citizens (men and women) in claiming their civic and human rights | SO I2 B1 No data available from mini surveys SO I2 B2 DGF population level survey (2013) shows 70% citizens expressing confidence to raise issues with their LCIII councillors | SO I2 T1 80% - 2016/2017 | SO I2 S1 Mini survey: % citizens showing increase in confidence in DGF population level survey; SO I2 S2 Mini survey of beneficiaries; Qualitative case studies | |
| | | SO I3 Number of civil society partners active on governance issues and certified | SO I3 B1 Black Monday activities ¹⁰ ACCU – 2011 | SO I3 T1 The 92 CSOs certified are monitored. Another 50 CSOs certified – 2016/2017 | SO I3 S1 Collective actions taken by DGF partners about emerging rights issues: numbers of networks and movements emerging that have involved organisations supported by DGF. | |
| | | SO I4 Extent to which citizens (men and women) legal and conflict issues are duly addressed | SO I4 B1 60% | SO I4 T1 75% | SO I4 S1 EGF database, UHRC, EOC, JLOS satisfaction survey | |

¹⁰ Black Monday is a CSOs initiative to protest against corruption and to improve democracy in the country. Every Monday people that adhere to the initiative wear a black shirt or t-shirt.

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Outputs | Component I | CI R1 I1 Number of citizens who have received civic and voter education | R1 I1 B1 None - 2011 | R1 I1 T1 50% of respondents answer all questions correctly in Civic Education mini survey | R1 I1 and I1.2 S1 Partners reporting Surveys testing knowledge and understanding of selected partners | Civic Education interventions are comprehensive and implemented in a holistic manner (with DGF support). |
| | CI R1 Improved capacity of citizens, political leaders and selected institutions to understand and play their respective roles and responsibilities in the democratic process | CI R1 I1.2 Aggregate average score about key knowledge acquisition | | R1 I1.2 T2 50% of respondents answer all questions correctly in voter education end line survey – 2016/2017 | | Councillors in DGF supported districts respond to DGF interventions, better understand their roles and respond to citizens. |
| | | CI R1 I2 Average scorecard scores for councillors in DGF districts | R1 I2 B1 59 -2011 | R1 I2 T1 65 – 2016/2017 | R1 I2 S1 ACODE annual report, ACODE local Government scorecard initiative | Training programmes targeting women and youth are effectively implemented by partners. |
| | | CI R1 I3 Number of alternative policy statements produced and tabled by shadow cabinet | R1 I3 B1 None - 2011 | R1 I3 T1 30 - 2016/2017 | R1 I3 S1 Parliament Semi/Annual report | |
| | | CI R1 I4 Number of youth and women elected leaders trained about their roles, graduating from the leadership academy | R1 I4 B1 Academy not in place | R1 I4 T1 500 elected women and 800 elected youth representatives trained and 80 graduating from the academy | R1 I4 S1 Partners reporting, number of youths that receive certificates from the leadership academy | |
| | CI R2 More informed public debate and policy dialogue on issues in the public interest | CI R2 I1 Volume and reach of quality media reporting on issues in the public interest | R2 I1 B1 15,000 (URN) reports, 43 Media Houses, 120 Journalists trained 53 districts covered 5 million audiences covered – 2012 | R2 I1 T1 50,000 URN reports – 2016/2017 | R2 I1 S1 Partner reporting; R2 I2 S2 DGF commissioned study of audience numbers | |
| | CI R2 I2 Number of debates on issues in the public interest between citizens and leaders | R2 I2 B1 No baseline - 2011 | R2 I2 T1 20 debates between citizens and newly elected leaders - 2016/2017 | R2 I2 S1 DGF Partners reporting | Development partners continue to press for electoral reforms in line with the EU EOM recommendations. | |
| CI R3 Improved integrity of and citizen participation in key | CI R3 I1 Secure, transparent system of transmitting results (qualitative indicator) | R3 I1 B1 Electronic system functioned but had shortcomings in terms of transparency | R3 I1 T1 System tested and used - 2016 | R3 I1 S1 DGF partners reports and evaluations | EC is willing and able to undertake organisational reforms. | |

