

## Part 2: Main Application Form

### Instructions

GPSA requires that all grant applications be submitted using an online electronic platform. Part 1: Proposal Basic Information must be filled out in the online platform. Part 2: Main Application must be completed using this form, and uploaded in the “Attach Files” section of the platform. Part 3: Proposal Budget must be completed using the Excel template, also available at the online platform ([www.gpsa/worldbank.org](http://www.gpsa/worldbank.org)).

Please make sure you read the guidance included in the endnotes section, which will help you in answering the questions. Refer also to the GPSA Application Guidelines before completing your application.

The Proposal must provide clear and concise answers that directly address the application’s questions. Use the “word count” to comply with the word limit set for each question. Do not change the formatting of this application form.

You may contact the GPSA Helpdesk at [gpsa@worldbank.org](mailto:gpsa@worldbank.org) for questions about the grant application process.

---

#### 1. Define the overall objective(s) of the proposal.<sup>1</sup> State clearly:

- (a) What are the governance and development challenges the proposal will contribute to solving? Specify the public policy problem or issue being targeted, including available data evidencing the problem.
- (b) What is/are your proposed solution(s)? What type of changes (in public policies and processes, programs, service delivery, institutions, skills and behaviors) you intend to achieve in the proposal’s timeframe?
- (c) Who are the sectors of the population that would benefit from these changes and in which ways (e.g. observable benefits in the form of infrastructure, service delivery, etc.)? Are poor/extreme poor and vulnerable groups (e.g. women, children, persons with HIV, etc.) included amongst those sectors?
- (d) What is the proposal’s geographic scope? Provide information that may help us understand the proportion of the targeted population and administrative/political organization (e.g. # municipalities, # districts, # provinces, etc) in relation to the country’s total population and overall administrative/political organization.

Please apply SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, Time bound) criteria when defining the objectives. Make sure to answer all the above sub-questions.

[MAX. 600 WORDS]

Poor governance poses a major obstacle to Uganda's development and provision of social services. The lack of appropriate checks and balances and citizen voice and participation triggers widespread bureaucratic, political, and grand corruption. Public procurement and contracting, one of the key areas where the public and private sector interface financially, is a prime candidate for collusion, cronyism, as well as outright bribery<sup>1</sup>. Corruption in public procurement and contracting manifests itself in unnecessary projects, substandard and unnecessarily expensive work, the diversion of resources, and unjustified or unexpected price increases resulting into inequity and inequality<sup>2</sup>. In the absence of appropriate accountability mechanisms in this strategic area, ghost projects will be funded, poor quality roads, schools and hospitals will be built, while essential medicines and services will not be delivered.

Uganda's expenditure on public procurement and contracting is estimated at 55% of the national budget. In 2012 this was equivalent to USD 2.4 billion.<sup>3</sup> An integrity survey carried out by the Public Procurement and Disposal of Assets Authority (PPDA) found that 69.8% of service providers agreed that corruption influenced procurement.<sup>4</sup> Also, according to the Inspectorate of Government, corruption in public contracting and procurement amounts to 9.4% of the total value of contracts, equivalent to UGX 56.4 billion in 2012.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, public contract performance leaves much to be desired. For example, only 0.7% of the contracts in 2011/12 were implemented without cost overruns, and only 29.4% of the contracts were completed on time.<sup>6</sup>

Uganda's supply-side or government-led governance and anti-corruption framework is stronger on paper but weak in actual practice. According to Global Integrity, it is characterized by one of the largest implementation gaps in the world. In order to close this gap, the country's supply-side and anti-corruption framework needs to be supplemented by demand-side or citizen-led accountability interventions. Contracting and procurement that is more transparent and overseen by citizens can be more efficient, effective and less corrupt. Examples from other countries show how contract monitoring can contribute to better procurement processes, roads, schools, hospitals and services<sup>7</sup>.

To address these challenges, this project aims to institutionalize citizen-government engagements to solve key governance and contracting issues in education, health and agriculture. It will benefit 2,537,100 people living in Ugandan districts of Lira, Oyam, Arua (northern) Kabale and Ntungamo (western). The project will further institutionalize procurement monitoring through citizen capacity building to credibly monitor public procurement and contract implementation and provide feedback to government so that corrective actions can be taken. It will also support constructive engagement between CSOs and governments to generate meaningful responses to citizen concerns regarding public contracting such that the accountability loop is closed. Activities will include development of monitoring tools, training and supervision of community monitors, monitoring of contracts and services, and the facilitation of cooperation between government and civil society.

The project aims at:

1. Enhancing performance of public contracts and services in agriculture, education and health through citizen monitoring.
2. Strengthening the capacity of citizens to demand accountability and value for money in public contracts.
3. Deepening the institutional and technical capacity of the Uganda Contracts Monitoring Coalition (UCMC) to monitor public contracts.

<sup>1</sup> The Benefits of Open Contracting, U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Center, 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid

<sup>3</sup> Inspectorate of Government. 2012. The Third Annual Report on Tracking Corruption Trends in Uganda: Using the Data Tracking Mechanism.

<sup>4</sup> The Public Procurement and Disposal of Assets Authority. 2010. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Procurement Integrity Survey.

<sup>5</sup> Inspectorate of Government. 2012. The Third Annual Report on Tracking Corruption Trends in Uganda: Using the Data Tracking Mechanism.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid

<sup>7</sup> Open Contracting: Theory of Change Report (2012), Integrity Action (2012) The Fix-Rate

**2. Which public sector institution(s) and agency(ies) [e.g. Sector Ministry, National Program, Local Governments, Parliamentary Office/Committees, Supreme Audit Institution, Regulatory Agency, Ombudsman, etc.] will use the project's feedback to solve the identified problem?<sup>2</sup> Explain clearly:**

- (a) If you have already engaged with these actors to find out what kind of information and citizen feedback is needed and how it would be used to implement changes that would help to solve the problem.
- (b) What are the incentives these actors have to do something with such information? Why should they use the information produced by the project and what concrete benefits would derive from using it?
- (c) How do you propose to work with these institutions/agencies?

**[MAX. 500 WORDS]**

The main Government agencies that will use Uganda [Contracts Monitoring Coalition \(UCMC\)](#) feedback are Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Authority (PPDA), Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES), Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), Ministry of Health (MoH), Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MoFPED) National Agricultural Advisory Services Secretariat (NAADS), National Agricultural Research Organisation, Ministry of Ethics and Integrity (DEI) Ministry of Local Government and respective district Local Governments of implementation.

UCMC is supported by and has partnership with PPDA, which has hosted all its general meetings, provided training for UCMC members on PPDA Act and regulations, made inputs on the different monitoring tools that UCMC has developed, and provided general support to the coalition. PPDA has indicated that in future it could take into account UCMC contract monitoring reports for its statutory contract audits.

UCMC collaborated with MoES in conceptualising, development and pilot testing citizens' classroom construction monitoring tool. MoES discussed the need for the tool, reviewed terms of reference for consultant, made comments and provided a sample from which UCMC selected final schools where the tool was tested. MoES provided UCMC with a list of 222 secondary schools being constructed across the country. The Ministry has invited UCMC to make a presentation of its work to the Ministry's top policy organ meeting.

With MAAIF, UCMC is in advanced stages of signing memorandum of understanding (MOU) and also enjoys strong relations with DEI, NAADS and Local Governments, leading to their provision of inputs into draft tools, sharing contract information and receipt of monitoring results. UCMC through its health cluster enjoys good relations with MoH. With World Bank's funding, AFIC and UNHCO conducted a client satisfaction survey in 10 districts on the basis of which a communication strategy for the sector was developed. This will be implemented under the proposed project.

OPM has welcomed UCMC and invited us to train community monitors and under the Baraza Presidential Initiative. Under the initiative districts organise public fora at which citizens are informed about resources from the Central Government and how these have been used.

UCMC results will be used by respective government agencies to take corrective measures on specific contracts and to design strategies to strengthen information disclosure and citizen participation.

Based on these relationships, UCMC is discussing specific MoUs with MAAIFs, Uganda National Roads Authority, MoES, OPM and Masaka District Local Government. MoUs will establish a framework for constructive engagement with respective agencies. UCMC plays a prominent role in Governance and Accountability Action Plans within World Bank-financed projects in health, education, roads, and agriculture. For purposes of the proposed project UCMC will focus on monitoring renovation health facilities; provision of medical supplies; improve capacity for operations and maintenance and strengthen the referral system under the Uganda Health Systems Strengthening Project (UHSSP), construction of schools under the Uganda Post Primary Education Training Project (APL1) and the Agricultural Technology and Agribusiness Advisory Services Project (ATAAS) implemented by NAADS Secretariat and MAAIF.

**3. What is the social accountability approach<sup>3</sup> that will be used to generate the feedback needed to solve the identified problem? Explain clearly:**

- (a)** The proposed social accountability process, including formal and informal mechanisms for gathering citizen's feedback, and other complementary strategies, such as communications and media work, research and data analysis, negotiation and consensus-building, among others. Specify, if applicable, if you're planning to use any ICTs (information and communication technologies) for gathering or organizing citizens' feedback to complement the latter. Please note that the use of ICTs is not a requirement.
- (b)** Why would the proposed approach work, and how is it different or better from previous or existing attempts at solving the problem by engaging citizens? How would it complement and/or add value to existing initiatives implemented by other stakeholders (including the government, CSOs and other donor-supported projects)?
- (c)** If this approach can work to help solve the problem, how would it become sustainable beyond the project's duration?
- (d)** If you're proposing to work in a subset of geographic areas, how would this approach be replicated at a larger scale?

[MAX. 500 WORDS]

The project adopts the Open Contracting Model which fits well Uganda's context. A detailed context analysis of the general governance environment, key stakeholders, and potential risks in order to adequately understand the playing field, stakeholders and their current capacities and incentives for enhancement of contract transparency and performance will be done. This will involve constructive engagement, strategically reaching out to key players in government agencies and non-state actors at central and local government level whose work and interests show up in the playing field. This analysis will also identify relevant risks and provide a framework and mechanism for tracking progress and impact.



Contract monitoring, analysis and reporting will involve constructive engagement of stakeholders who will be part of monitoring, use disclosed and collected information, make sense of such information to identify elements in the contracting cycle that have performance deviations and need attention and corrective action. This concrete evidence will constitute basis of recommendations to contract parties for action.

Tracking process and impact of UCMC contract monitoring will form an important part of the project in order to inform how effectively the project contributes to attainment of contract goals. This learning will also provide important reflections for broader reforms in the policy environment.

Results of monitoring, analysis and reporting will be used for advocacy first and foremost to improve the performance of specific contracts

being monitored in education, health and agriculture. Secondly, advocacy will aim at improving the general policy environment for disclosure and citizen participation in public contracting through monitoring. As such the five respective local governments where monitoring will be done together with strategic central government ministries and agencies like Agriculture, Health, Education, Local Government, Finance, Ethics and Integrity, OPM, and PPDA among others will be targeted in this advocacy. An adequate response from these key agencies and ministries closes the loop and improves the performance of specific contracts and contributes to the betterment of the general policy environment. Both advocacy and closing the loop provide incentives for stakeholders to invest in their capacities and committed to constructive engagement, providing new inputs to the context analysis in a new contract monitoring cycle.

This approach provides a higher chance of success over other models for three unique reasons: It provides incentives for all players (public, private sector and citizens) to invest in strengthening respective capacities, identifies risks (e.g. mistrust) and provides for building trust through constructive engagement and enhances information disclosure and citizen participation. These very features are essential for sustainability. Capacities of the different actors are enhanced, trust is built, reforms are initiated all of which impact results on individual contracts and the environment hence their sustainability.

Replication to a larger scale will be promoted through advocacy for reforms at national level as well as dissemination to key stakeholders in targeted districts. Knowledge and learning is a key component of this project and lessons will be documented and shared with different audiences at local, national and international level (e.g. Open Government Partnership, Open Contracting Partnership).

- 4. Partnerships.**<sup>4</sup> Describe the nature and purpose of the proposed partnering arrangements, including what each partner will do and how the partnership will be governed. Be as specific as possible in clarifying the lines of responsibilities and accountability within the project.

**[MAX. 300 WORDS]**

The project will be implemented in the framework of UCMC strategic plan and governance structure which includes a MOU of members, a draft Code of Conduct and a Host Institution Agreement which appoints AFIC as Secretariat of UCMC. UCMC brings together 22 civil society organizations monitoring contracts in education, health, agriculture, works and roads, water and environment, and extractives. Each of these thematic areas forms a specialized technical cluster for monitoring contracts. UCMC has partnership with the World Bank Institute.

INFOC and Transparency International (TIU) will be sub granted to monitor contracts in agriculture, education and health respectively. Each has vast sector specific experience in contracts monitoring and will mentor other cluster members who have limited experience in monitoring but are well connected at community level. UCMC has citizen monitoring tools for education and agriculture contracts under the National Agriculture Advisory Services (NAADS). INFOC and TIU will mentor cluster members, mobilize communities, train community monitors, supervise ongoing data collection and analysis, and engage with respective authorities on process, outcomes and recommendations of monitoring. Each will report to UCMC Steering Committee on a monthly basis. AFIC will have overall responsibility for coordinating implementation, monitoring and donor, Steering Committee and General Assembly reporting. It will be responsible for coalition wide capacity building actions, strategic engagements with government agencies and communications. A specific MOU for the implementation of this project specifying roles and responsibilities of each partner has been agreed.

This model was tested and proved successful in developing community monitoring tools for roads, extractives and agriculture as well as elaboration of UCMC strategic plan when AFIC sub granted INFOC, URSSI and CRED. These tools have been embraced by government agencies.

- 5. If your proposal is part of an ongoing project in your organization explain how GPSA's support would add value to it: what are the specific activities that would be funded by GPSA and how are these different from what you're already doing? If your proposal is a new project for your organization: how does it relate to what you've been doing until now?<sup>5</sup>**

**[MAX. 300 WORDS]**

With World Bank funding, UCMC developed social accountability tools to support citizen contracts monitoring in [agriculture, education and extractives](#) sectors. These tools were pilot tested on projects and proved quite effective in providing feedback and strengthening contract performance. UCMC also carried out client satisfaction survey in health sector. In 2013 UCMC elaborated its five-year [strategic plan](#) which prioritises programme development and its institutional capacity strengthening.

The proposed project under GPSA will support scaling up and application of these tools by monitoring contracts in five districts in two priority regions of the country (Northern and Western Uganda). Specifically, the project will facilitate recruitment, training and monitoring of 71 contracts ([26 in education](#) [15 in health](#) and [30 in agriculture](#)). Further, it will among others facilitate development of a specific tool to monitor construction of health infrastructure, communication strategy, training of CSOs on access to information, constructive engagement and fundraising. UCMC governance documents will be updated and enhanced in line with its strategic plan.

Government through the Office of the Prime Minister has invited UCMC to partner with it in training community monitors under Government Baraza Initiative as well as development and implementation of [askyourgov.ug](#), an on line tool to promote citizens' access to information. The Ministry of Education and Sports has following the joint development of a citizen classroom construction tool invited UCMC to present its work programme to the Ministry's top policy organ. UCMC through its members is a member of Anticorruption Public Private Partnership and Inter-agency Forum, the policy organ for anticorruption and accountability sector. This project will provide the necessary resources and capacity to effectively make use of these platforms.

- 6. Institutional strengthening.<sup>6</sup> Does the proposal include activities for strengthening your organization's internal management and planning capacities (e.g.: fundraising, strategic planning, financial management, Board strengthening, human resources training, etc.)? If not, indicate "No".**

**[MAX. 300 WORDS]**

Capacity building is an integral part of this program. Uganda Contracts Monitoring Coalition operates as a network of twenty two CSOs; capacity building and learning are key for the UCMC as per the Coalition's five year strategic plan. Under this project, the UCMC will invest its network structures and activities to ensure that all members can benefit from this project, share lessons learnt and resources developed widely among all members. Specifically the project will facilitate training of all UCMC members in social accountability, constructive engagement with public officials, strategic communications, advocacy and fund raising. These needs were identified in the Coalition's SWOT analysis and prioritized in its five year strategic plan.

In addition, the project will support UCMC to strengthen its governance structures through reviewing and updating the Coalition's Memorandum of Understanding, Host Institution Agreement and finalization of Code of Conduct for members. Internal coordination will be strengthened by facilitating Steering Committee and General Assembly of Members meetings, as well as information sharing and networking.

It is expected that these interventions will strengthen internal capacity of UCMC, enhance the impact of its work on disclosure, citizen participation and performance of contracts. The project will also empower members to document and share lessons from the coalition's experience. This will also enhance the effectiveness in the use of the Coalition's tools such as its website, listserv, Twitter and Facebook pages.

#### **7. Project areas/components: how do you propose to organize your project?<sup>7</sup>**

Area/Component 1	
	Contract monitoring in agriculture in 5 priority districts (2 regions)

<b>Activities</b>	<p><b>Enhancing faith-based leaders, women and youth capacity to participate, jointly monitor and give feedback on farmer needs, supply, equitable delivery of advisory and extension services and distribution of goods in agricultural zones under ATAAS program.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>First Year Consensus Building</b> - National Project coordinators confirm participation of targeted stakeholders; 5 local government district and sub county NAADs departments, local organized women and youth agriculture groups, Religious Institution social service departments, MAAIF and NAADs secretariat to establish interests, capacity needs, build consensus on specific stakeholders expected inputs, outputs, project outcomes; roles and responsibilities.</li> <li>2. National Project coordinators organize and hold 1 national consensus building inception meeting to agree and adopt the final project design and stakeholders engagement plan.</li> <li>3. District project coordinators organize and hold 5 consensus building inception meetings to agree and adopt the final project design and stakeholders engagement plan at district level</li> <li>4. <b>Information Gathering</b> - M&amp;E officers together with National and district coordinating teams jointly establish the local area baseline indicators on access and use of advisory and extension services through field visits, 25 community feedback and consultation forum and interviews with key respondents. Three (3) questionnaires will be applied to gather data.</li> <li>5. <b>IEC resource material and Tools Development</b> - Selected technical resource team develops IEC resource material and specific contracts monitoring tool, print and disseminate to the local joint monitoring teams. Expected products include; 1 Specific Access and Use monitoring tool, NAADs Access and Use Policy handbook, Agriculture Clients Charter and Citizens Feedback Form.</li> <li>6. Capacity Building - The technical resource team facilitates field exposure study tours applying learning by doing method of training 200 leaders of the joint monitoring teams (both 75 state and 125 non state monitors) in application of tools, develop monitoring skills, budget tracking, feedback, reporting and policy advocacy skills. National Project coordinators backstop post training monitoring and budget tracking activities to develop skills.</li> <li>7. Second and third Year Capacity Enhancement - In the second and third years, District Project coordinators share lesson learnt and backstop monitoring and budget tracking activities at local level to sharpen skills</li> </ol> <p>Strengthening joint monitoring and application of Citizens Forum for budget transparency, constructive engagement on access and use of advisory service, recovery issues, negotiate, demand for answerability from NAADs service providers and policy advocacy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In all years, Sub County joint monitoring committees monitor beneficiary registration and enterprise selection, advisory and extensions service delivery contracts, service use, clients satisfaction and recovery.</li> <li>2. District Technical Committees and Sub County joint monitoring teams mobilise and empower citizens' to effectively participate in the open district budget conferences through prayer centres, media and other public audiences.</li> <li>3. In all years, the Sub county joint monitoring committees organise and hold quarterly community days to consult service users, beneficiaries and gather feedback on the local area budgets and monitoring reports.</li> <li>4. In all years, the sub county joint monitoring committees present monitoring reports and issues papers, mobilise community participation to compliment and demand for answerability on unmet need and accountability issues from service providers at the Barazas (Citizens Forum/Juries) organised and held by the local government bi annually.</li> <li>5. In second year, Sub County coordinators design and identify locations for 25 community information walls detailed with calendar of events and participation areas in the procurement and NAADs.</li> <li>6. In all 3 years, district coordinators make field visits to validate sub county monitoring reports to prepare and present policy issues papers for feedback sessions both at district and sub county levels.</li> <li>7. Project coordinators hold National Citizens Forum bringing together MAAIF/NAADS, Local governments, UCMC, MoPs, MoLG and Parliament to agree on policy issues and corrective strategies.</li> <li>8. M&amp;E officer and technical resource team track implementation of adopted recommendations and reforms to assess impact of the project outcomes and disseminate to inform sector reviews annually.</li> </ol>
-------------------	--



<b>Outputs<sup>8</sup></b>	<p><b>Main outputs</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 18 ACMC planning meetings</li> <li>2. 20 Consensus Building Meetings</li> <li>3. 7 MoUs – MAAIF, Lango Diocese and 5 Local Governments</li> <li>4. Integrity Pacts</li> <li>5. 5 district inception meetings</li> <li>6. 1 National Inception meeting</li> <li>7. Stakeholder engagement plan</li> <li>8. Inception report</li> <li>9. 1000 Agriculture Contracts Monitoring Tool</li> <li>10. 1000 Specific Access and Use monitoring tool</li> <li>11. 1000 NAADs Access and Use policy handbook</li> <li>12. Agriculture Clients Charter disseminated</li> <li>13. Citizens Feedback Form disseminated</li> <li>14. 200 farmers trained in application of Generic and Specific monitoring Access and Use</li> <li>15. 25 Study tours conducted</li> <li>16. 2.1 Community days organized and held to gather feedback on NAADs and registration of expressed need and demand for advisory and extension services</li> <li>17. 2.2 Backstopping 3<sup>rd</sup> party monitors participation in budget conferences</li> <li>18. 2.3 25 Community Information walls</li> <li>19. 2.4 60 Media Talk shows</li> <li>20. 25NAADs Monitoring reports</li> <li>21. 30 Citizens Forum/Jury reports</li> <li>22. 15 Policy Issues Papers produced and corrective strategies developed</li> <li>23. 3 Registered Changes report</li>   <li>24. 1 Monitoring and Evaluation plan</li> <li>25. 6 M&amp;E reports on effected changes and registered improvement as per the registered baseline indicators.</li> </ol>
<b>(Intermediate) Outcomes<sup>9</sup></b>	<p>The project will generate the following results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collaborative partnership strengthened following the effective implementation of the adopted stakeholders’ engagement plan, number of signed and adopted Memorandums of Understanding and Integrity Pacts applied.</li> <li>2. Strengthened capacities of trained faith based leaders, women and youth monitors, on the basis of effective application of the produced and adopted monitoring tools, NAADs Access And Use policy guidelines disseminated, number of monitoring exercises conducted and reported on, and quality of reports on access and use of advisory service received by National secretariat from the district coordinators.</li> <li>3. Increased community participation in monitoring and constructive engagement for relevant policies minimizing political interference in NAADs beneficiaries management, more transparent procurement and contracting processes on the basis of increased access to information and regularized two way feedback community days/citizens forum.</li> <li>4. Enhanced Government responsiveness on the basis of increased service users’ feedback and demand for answerability on the basis of effective tracking of implementation of adopted corrective strategies and effected reforms.</li> <li>5. Equity enhanced on the basis improved beneficiary management increasing the number of accessing and using advisory and extension services due to regular community monitoring, feedback and constructive engagement for timely positive reforms.</li> </ol>

<b>Area/Component 2</b>	Contract monitoring in education and health in 5 priority districts (2 regions)
-------------------------	---

**Activities****Establish a network of health and education project community monitors in the five targeted districts**

Resource persons conduct mapping exercise of stakeholders in open contracting in education, agriculture and health in each of the 5 targeted districts

Project coordinator conduct 5 stakeholders workshops each 30 participants focusing on citizen monitoring of health and education infrastructure projects

Resource persons train 200 community based monitors selected taking into account gender, ability, availability and social standing (selection criteria to be refined with involvement of District and community leaders)

Resource persons train 160 district community and civil society leaders using [Open Contracting Guide](#) and national laws in a 2 days' training workshop on public procurement and open contracting

**Equip community monitors with the necessary tools and skills to monitor infrastructure contracts in education and health**

1. Resource persons train 150 CSO leaders on access to information using [AFIC Access to Information Training Manual](#), and [AskyourGov.ug](#)
2. Resource persons Conduct 5 district follow- up ATI review workshops in five project districts
3. 200 community monitors trained using existing and new UCMC citizen monitoring tools and other social accountability tools like score cards
4. Resource person develop a computer based system to support contract monitoring data entry and analysis
5. Consultant develop a specific citizen contract monitoring tools to monitoring construction of health infrastructure
6. District coordinators backstop district community monitors in education and health five districts
7. Component manager analyse and produce monitoring reports on the basis of monitoring activities. Provide for disaggregated data on status of projects by district and by issues.
8. Community monitors hold 150 district (30 in each district) monthly review and reporting meetings of community monitors
9. 45 quarterly feedback meetings (6 in each district) with public sector leaders to share monitoring results and citizen feedback on contracts and services.

**Advocacy and policy engagement**

UCMC seeks to influence public policies and practices towards institutionalization of contract information disclosure and citizen participation through monitoring. In this regard, UCMC will use existing local and central government platforms to engage policy process (Ministry of Education and Sports has already invited UCMC to make a presentation on partnership with the Ministry). The following advocacy activities will be implemented.

1. Project Coordinators present UCMC reports with recommendations to District Technical Planning Meetings, Ministry Top Management Policy Meetings,
2. Project Manager and communications Officer present UCMC reports with recommendations presented at Annual Joint Agriculture, Education and Health Sector reviews by government, development partners and other stakeholders.
3. Knowledge and Communications Officer produce and disseminate information, education and communication materials and messages on open contracting and access to information
4. Knowledge and Communications Officer and project officer conduct quarterly radio sensitization programmes (talk shows) key on open contracting, access to information, public procurement and whistle blowing in each of the 5 districts.
5. Knowledge and Communications Officer organise radio quiz on open contracting and access to information around agriculture, health and education
6. Project Manager and Knowledge and Communications Officer organise national policy dialogue on transparency and accountability in education, agriculture and health sectors

<b>Outputs</b>	<p>List the main outputs that will be delivered as a result of the activities described above. Outputs may include milestones to be realized within the Project's timeframe.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Matrix of stakeholders by district by sector</li> <li>2. MOU signed at national level</li> <li>3. 5 MOUs signed at District level</li> <li>4. 5 stakeholder district workshops</li> <li>5. 200 community monitors for health and agriculture</li> <li>6. 160 district community and CSO leaders trained on open contracting</li> <li>7. 5 district ATI workshops, each 30 participants</li> <li>8. 5 district ATI follow-up workshops, each 30 participants</li> <li>9. Data entry mask and analysis tool</li> <li>10. Health infrastructure monitoring tool</li> <li>11. 30 district monthly meetings of monitors</li> <li>12. 12 community monitors' reports</li> <li>13. 12 Monitoring reports with findings and recommendations</li> <li>14. 9 district leaders and citizen quarterly feedback meetings</li> <li>15. 2000 IEC materials on Open contracting and ATI</li> <li>16. 20 quarterly live radio phone-in programmes</li> <li>17. 90 quiz questions</li> <li>18. 3 National dialogues on transparency and accountability in health, education and agriculture.</li> </ol>
<b>(Intermediate) Outcomes</b>	<p>Define the main Component-level outcomes that are expected to be achieved as a result of the outputs described above.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stakeholders mobilized and sensitized on contracts monitoring and access to information</li> <li>2. Community monitors equipped with knowledge, skill and tools to monitor contracts</li> <li>3. Citizens access to contract information improved</li> <li>4. Respective public agencies provided with monitoring reports and recommendations on improving contract performance</li> <li>5. Policy recommendations for improving disclosure of public information and citizen participation in contracting generated.</li> <li>6. Influence at least 2 government policies regarding disclosure and citizen participation in contracting</li> </ol>
<b>Area/Component 3 Knowledge and Learning (K&amp;L)<sup>10</sup></b>	UCMC tools, methodologies and lessons documented

<b>Activities</b>	<p>This component is intended to capture and share the lessons learnt from the piloting experience in monitoring contracts in agriculture, education and health with other UCMC members, CSOs and government agencies in Uganda and other African countries. The UCMC will capture, synthesize and share monitoring reports, tools developed and lessons learnt. AFIC is a global knowledge partner of the GPSA and an active member of the Open Contracting community of practice, an online group of practitioners with over 600 global members. It also promotes and coordinates Open Government knowledge and capacity sharing efforts in Africa. Through these fora the UCMC will share its lessons and experiences, tools and methodologies. In addition the following knowledge sharing activities will be carried out.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Communication and Advocacy Officer develop Frequently Asked Questions on open contracting and access to information</li> <li>2. Host a series of interactive learning events such as video conferences, conference calls and learning events</li> <li>3. Knowledge and Communications Officer In partnership with WBI document and disseminate social accountability best practices in Uganda (e.g. video, pictorial, reports, case studies, etc)</li> <li>4. Monitoring and Evaluation Officer analysis and dissemination of AskyourGov.ug reports</li> <li>5. Produce video of best practices in contracts monitoring in agriculture, health and education projects</li> <li>6. Project Manager and Knowledge and Communications Officer share project experiences at regional and international fora of <a href="#">Open Government Partnership</a></li> <li>7. Project Manager and Knowledge and Communications Officer share UCMC coalition building experiences with sister coalitions in Kenya, Zambia and Ghana.</li> <li>8. Project Manager and Knowledge and Communications Officer share lessons, experiences through UCMC website and listserv, OGP and FOI regional and international listservs and blogs.</li> </ol>
<b>Outputs</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Produce 2 records of best practice of social accountability</li> <li>2. Disseminate best practices to at least 4% of the district population and 100% of targeted stakeholders</li> <li>3. Produce 6 ATI reports the basis of AskyourGov.ug tool</li> <li>4. Disseminate all reports of experiences through ucmc.ug</li> </ol> <p>List the main outputs that will be delivered as a result of the activities described above. Outputs may include milestones to be realized within the Project's timeframe.</p>
<b>(Intermediate) Outcomes</b>	<p>Define the main Component-level outcomes that are expected to be achieved as a result of the outputs described above.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At least 3 CBOs in targeted districts adopting UCMC tools and methodologies</li> <li>2. By year 3, community of practice membership increases by 150%; 30% of community members contribute to online and offline exchanges;</li> <li>3. Increased number of knowledge tools and products available for reference and capacity building by 50%.</li> </ol> <p>Baseline: Online community currently has 600 members and 8 knowledge products that were developed by members.</p>
<b><u>Add additional areas/components (max. 2)</u></b>	<b>Enhancing Uganda Contracts Monitoring Coalition Technical and Institutional Capacity</b>

<b>Activities</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Resource person strengthen governance of UCMC by reviewing and facilitating dialogue on UCMC governance documents ( MoU, Host Institution agreement, Code of Conduct for members) in line with UCMC strategic plan</li> <li>2. Project Manager hold two consultation meetings on UCMC Governance documents</li> <li>3. Resource Person conduct one training workshop on constructive engagement for all UCMC members</li> <li>4. Organise one training workshop for all UCMC members on strategic communication and use of new media</li> <li>5. Resource person in partnership with WBI train all UCMC members in social accountability tools</li> <li>6. Organise one advocacy training for all UCMC members</li> <li>7. Resource person conduct training for all UCMC members in proposal writing and fundraising</li> <li>8. Knowledge and Communications Officer develop and implement CMC communication strategy.</li> <li>9. Project Officer organize monthly UCMC Steering Committee meetings</li> <li>10. Project Officer organize quarterly UCMC general meetings</li> </ol>
<b>Outputs</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. UCMC Memorandum of Understanding and Host Institution Agreement Host Institution agreement revised and signed by host institution and UCMC steering Committee</li> <li>2. Members' ownership and consensus on contents of key governance documents obtained.</li> <li>3. 22 UCMC members equipped with constructive engagement skills and adequately engaging on open contracting</li> <li>4. 22 members of UCMC actively engaging target audiences using traditional and new media</li> <li>5. Each of the 6 UCMC clusters developed and implements cluster advocacy strategy with various audiences.</li> <li>6. 22 UCMC members trained in fundraising and proposal writing;</li> <li>7. UCMC work reasonably funded as a result of skills training</li> <li>8. Impact of UCMC work referenced in the various sectors</li> <li>9. Methodologies and lessons learnt on from the project documented and disseminated.</li> <li>10. 36 UCMC Steering Committee meetings</li> <li>11. 12 CMC General meetings</li> </ol>
<b>(Intermediate) Outcomes</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased funding for UCMC by 100% by June 2017</li> <li>2. UCMC membership increased by 50%</li> <li>3. MoUs with at least 8 Local and Central Government agencies</li> <li>4. UCMC recommendations and positions accepted and respected.</li> <li>5. Atleast 5 public and CSOs adapting or referencing UCMC tools and methodologies</li> </ol>

**2. Action Plan.**<sup>11</sup>Use the Gantt chart below to present your proposal's Action Plan. Please refer to the examples provided in the endnotes.

Key Activities <sup>12</sup>	Main Outputs/Deliverables <sup>13</sup>	Estimated Schedule <i>(use years applicable to proposal's duration)</i>									
		Year 1 Jul 2014-June 2015		Year 2 Jul 2015-June -2016		Year 3 Jul 2016- Jun 2017		Year 4		Year 5	
		Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2
<b>Component 1:</b>											
1. Consensus Building	1. 18 ACMC planning meetings										
	2. 20 Consensus Building Meetings										
	3. 7 MoUs- with MAAIF, Lango Diocese and 5 Local Governments										
	4. Integrity Pacts										
	5. Stakeholder engagement plan										
	6. 5 district inception meetings										
	7. 1 National Inception meeting										
2. Information gathering	8. Inception report										
3. IEC material/Tools Development	9. 1000 Agriculture Contracts Monitoring Tool										
	10. 1000 Specific Access and Use monitoring tool										
IEC material	11. 1000 NAADs Access and Use policy handbook										
	12. Agriculture Clients Charter disseminated										
	13. Citizens Feedback Form disseminated										
4. Capacity Enhancement	14. 200 farmers trained in application of Generic and Specific monitoring Access and Use										
	15. 25 Study tours conducted										
5. Quarterly Community days/Barazas	Community days organized and held to gather feedback on NAADs and registration of expressed need and demand for advisory and extension services										
6. Participatory Budget Tracking	Backstopping 3 <sup>rd</sup> party monitors participation in budget conferences										
7. Community Information Walls	25 Community Information walls										
8. Media education program	60 Media Talk shows										
9. Bi-Annual Joint Agriculture Contracts Monitoring	25 Monitoring reports										

Key Activities <sup>12</sup>	Main Outputs/Deliverables <sup>13</sup>	Estimated Schedule <i>(use years applicable to proposal's duration)</i>									
		Year 1 Jul 2014-June 2015		Year 2 Jul 2015-June -2016		Year 3 Jul 2016- Jun 2017		Year 4		Year 5	
		Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2
9. Citizens Forum/Juries	16. 15 Policy Issues Papers produced and corrective strategies developed										
	17. 125 Citizens Forum/Jury reports										
10. Tracking reforms	18. Registered Changes tracking report										
11. Monitoring and Evaluation	19. 1 M&E framework 20. 6 M&E Reports										
<b>Milestones<sup>14</sup></b> <i>[List milestones in this column. Add rows as needed] Shade cells to indicate milestone achievement estimated timeframe.</i>											
	1. 18 ACMC planning meetings	20									
	2. 20 Consensus Building Meetings		7								
	3. 7 MoUs– with MAAIF, Lango Diocese and 5 Local Governments										
	4. Integrity Pacts										
	5. Stakeholder engagement plan		1								
	6. 5 district inception meetings		5								
	7. 1 National Inception meeting		1								
	8. Inception report										
	9. 1000 Agriculture Contracts Monitoring Tool	1000									
	10. 1000 Specific Access and Use monitoring tool	1000									
	11. 1000 NAADs Access and Use policy handbook	1000		E.g.							
	12. Agriculture Clients Charter disseminated		25								
	13. Citizens Feedback Form disseminated		25								
	14. 200 farmers trained in application of Generic and Specific monitoring Access and Use		200								
	15. 25 Study tours conducted		25								
	16. Community days organized and held to gather feedback on NAADs and registration of expressed need and demand for advisory and extension services	25	75	125	175	225	275				
	17. Backstopping 3 <sup>rd</sup> party monitors participation in budget conferences		10		20		30				
	18. 25 Community Information walls		25								
	19. 60 Media Talk shows	10	20	30	40	50	60				
	20. 25 Monitoring reports		5	10	15	20	25				
	21. 15 Policy Issues Papers produced and corrective strategies developed		5		10		15				
	22. 125 Citizens Forum/Jury reports		25	50	75	100	125				



Key Activities <sup>12</sup>	Main Outputs/Deliverables <sup>13</sup>	Estimated Schedule <i>(use years applicable to proposal's duration)</i>												
		Year 1 Jul 2014-June 2015		Year 2 Jul 2015-June -2016		Year 3 Jul 2016- Jun 2017		Year 4		Year 5				
		Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2			
23. 3 Registered Changes report 24. Monitoring and Evaluation			1		2		3							
<b>Component 2:</b>														
Stakeholder mapping	Matrix of stakeholders by district by sector													
Sensitization workshops of leaders	5 workshops each 30 participants													
Selection of community monitors and resource persons	200 community monitors selected													
Sensitization of community and district leaders on public procurement, access to information and open contracting	160 leaders sensitized													
Train CSOs on ATI and making information requests on contracts and services under the Access to Information Act 2005 using AskyourGov.ug and other means.	30 participants in each of the 5 districts													
Follow-up ATI workshops in districts	5 district ATI workshops; 150 participants  At least 100 information requests and responses evaluated.  2 annual ATI alternative reports to Parliament under article 43 of ATIA													
Develop monitoring tool for monitoring construction of health infrastructure	Health infrastructure community monitoring tool													
Develop computer based system to support monitoring data entry and analysis	Data entry and analysis mask													
Train district community monitors on gathering data	200 community monitors trained													

Key Activities <sup>12</sup>	Main Outputs/Deliverables <sup>13</sup>	Estimated Schedule <i>(use years applicable to proposal's duration)</i>									
		Year 1 Jul 2014-June 2015		Year 2 Jul 2015-June -2016		Year 3 Jul 2016- Jun 2017		Year 4		Year 5	
		Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2
using UCMC tools											
Analyse and produce monitoring reports on the basis of monitoring activities. Provide for disaggregated data on status of projects by district and by issues.	12 monitoring reports										
Backstop district community monitors in education and health five districts	Monthly project site monitoring reports										
Hold monthly review and reporting meetings of community monitors	150 monthly monitors' meeting ( 30 in each district)										
Hold feedback meetings with public sector leaders to share monitoring results and citizen feedback on contracts and services	45 meetings held										
Present UCMC reports with recommendations to District Technical Planning Meetings, Ministry Top Management Policy Meetings	30 feedback reports										
Produce and disseminate IEC materials and messages on open contracting and ATI	2000 Posters 10 Information walls										
radio sensitization programmes (talk shows) key on open contracting, access to information and	90 radio talk shows										

Key Activities <sup>12</sup>	Main Outputs/Deliverables <sup>13</sup>	Estimated Schedule (use years applicable to proposal's duration)									
		Year 1 Jul 2014-June 2015		Year 2 Jul 2015-June -2016		Year 3 Jul 2016- Jun 2017		Year 4		Year 5	
		Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2
open contracting											
Organise radio quiz on open contracting and access to information around agriculture, health and education	90 quiz questions ( on five radio stations/ districts)										
District dialogues on transparency and accountability in education and health sectors	10 dialogues per year each 40 people										
National policy dialogue on transparency and accountability in education and health sectors	3 national dialogue per year each 60 participants										
<b>Milestones</b>											
Launch of project with stakeholder workshops in each of the 5 districts											
Training and deployment of community monitors deployed											
Citizen monitoring reports											
Discussion of feedback with district officials											
Reports to Annual Joint Agriculture, Education and Health Sector reviews											
End of project district stakeholder workshops in each of the five districts.											
<b>Component 3:</b>											
Develop Frequently Asked Questions on open contracting and access to information											
Host a series of interactive learning events such as video conferences, conference calls and learning events	2 Video conferences 2 conference calls										

Key Activities <sup>12</sup>	Main Outputs/Deliverables <sup>13</sup>	Estimated Schedule <i>(use years applicable to proposal's duration)</i>									
		Year 1 Jul 2014-June 2015		Year 2 Jul 2015-June -2016		Year 3 Jul 2016- Jun 2017		Year 4		Year 5	
		Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2
In partnership with WBI document and disseminate social accountability best practices in Uganda	2 records of best practice of social accountability										
Popularise ASkyourGov.ug as a tool for promoting public access to information	At least 30 information requests per project district per year										
Analyse and disseminate ASkyourGov.ug reports	6 ATI reports the basis of ASkyourGov.ug tool										
Produce video of best practices in contracts monitoring in agriculture, health and education projects	At least 4% of the district population and 100% of targeted stakeholders										
Share project experiences and lessons at regional and international fora of <a href="#">Open Government Partnership</a>	All reports shared in UCMC fora and on UCMC website										
Share UCMC coalition building experiences with sister coalitions in Kenya, Zambia and Ghana	All reports shared in UCMC fora and on UCMC website										
Share lessons, experiences through UCMC website and listserv, OGP and FOI regional and international listserves and blogs	6 reports of experiences through ucmc.ug										
<b>Milestones</b>											
Key stakeholders at district and national level constructively engaged											
Community members mobilized and empowered to monitor contracts and services											
Contract performance and value for money enhanced											

Key Activities <sup>12</sup>	Main Outputs/Deliverables <sup>13</sup>	Estimated Schedule (use years applicable to proposal's duration)									
		Year 1 Jul 2014-June 2015		Year 2 Jul 2015-June -2016		Year 3 Jul 2016- Jun 2017		Year 4		Year 5	
		Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2
<b>Component 4:</b>											
Strengthen Governance of UCMC	Memorandum of Understanding, Host Institution Agreement and Code of Conduct										
Hold 2 consultative meetings on UCMC Governance documents	MoU, Host Institution agreement and Code of Conduct owned and endorsed by members										
Conduct one training workshop on constructive engagement for all UCMC members	22 UCMC members equipped with constructive engagement skills										
Organise one training workshop for all UCMC members on strategic communication and use of new media	22 members of UCMC actively engaging target audiences using traditional and new media										
Organise one advocacy training for all UCMC members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>22 members of UCMC trained in advocacy and active engage target audiences</li> <li>UCMC members implement advocacy strategy with various audiences.</li> </ul>										
Conduct training for all UCMC members in proposal writing and fundraising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>22 UCMC members trained in fundraising and proposal writing</li> <li>UCMC work reasonably funded as a result of skills training</li> </ul>										
Develop and implement CMC communication strategy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact of UCMC work referenced in the various sectors UCMC methodologies and lessons documented and disseminated.</li> </ul>										
Monitoring & evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M&amp;E plan with indicators</li> <li>Midterm review report</li> <li>End of project evaluation report</li> </ul>										
Hold monthly UCMC Steering Committee meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>36 Steering committee meetings held</li> </ul>										
Hold quarterly UCMC general meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12 meetings held</li> </ul>										

Key Activities <sup>12</sup>	Main Outputs/Deliverables <sup>13</sup>	Estimated Schedule <i>(use years applicable to proposal's duration)</i>									
		Year 1 Jul 2014-June 2015		Year 2 Jul 2015- June -2016		Year 3 Jul 2016- Jun 2017		Year 4		Year 5	
		Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2	Sem. 1	Sem. 2
<b>Milestones</b>											
	Revised UCMC MoU, Host Institution Agreement; Code of Conduct developed	3									
	Improved access to contracts		15	42							
	Improved contract performance in agriculture(16 contracts), health (15 contracts) and education (26 contracts)in five project districts		57	57	57	57	57				
	Better quality of dialogue between Ministry of Education, Health, Office of the Prime Minister, PPDA, District Local Governments			5	5	5	5				
	Use of UCMC recommendations by Ministries of Education, Health, Agriculture and Office of the Prime Minister			3	3	3	3				

**Monitoring and evaluation:**

How do you define the proposal's success indicators? Identify the most critical ones and link them to the outputs and outcomes presented in questions 1 and 3.

How will you monitor the proposal's progress? Describe the methods and tools that will be used.

What will you evaluate and what type of evaluation(s) will be used? Specify if you plan to carry out an independent evaluation.

**[MAX. 500 WORDS]**

In order to monitor the development of the project a project monitoring and evaluation plan together with the necessary tools will be designed. This will guide project participants at district and national level to follow and ensure that planned activities are being implemented, outputs are being delivered, lessons are documented and changes are recorded.

Indicators for each of the planned activities and outcome areas (disclosure, accountability, participation and capacity strengthening) will be developed and refined following initial inception activities to ensure they are accurate and appropriate.

Baseline information on each of the planned outcome areas (disclosure, accountability, participation and capacity strengthening) will be collected at the commencement of the project to facilitate progressive tracking of inputs, results and lessons.

The Monitoring officer will then train project teams to ensure that ongoing collection of information on the basis of indicators is done and accurately filled in respective forms. Each team will fulfill a dossier in base of this guideline. Project management team comprised of AFIC and respective component managers will meet every 3 months review progress of implementation and take corrective measures in case of variations to ensure that the project remain relevant and is delivering planned objectives.

To track the impact of the specific activities/interventions different instruments will be established for each area. The aim is to evaluate the improvement in the disclosure, participation, accountability, and improvement in service delivery in EACH AREA. A Baseline will be established in base of the context analysis and from the baseline from 3 to 5 indicators will be established; all this will be keeping in mind the funds and capacities of the project and organizations. Some of the indicators will be the following: # of contracts disclosed by district, # of CSOs / communities monitoring X # of contracts / projects by district; Total # of multi-stakeholder meetings held to resolve non-compliance with contracts / problems identified during the monitoring activities by district, % of problems fixed as a consequence of our intervention.

At Coalition level, monitoring and evaluation is a vital component within UCMC's operations. Our clear results framework allows us to determine not only whether the desired changes have been achieved, but also whether those changes can be reasonably attributed to our open contracting interventions.

In line with our operations, our results framework focuses on the following key areas:

Disclosure: Increased access to contracts or contract information.

Citizen participation: Increased participation by citizens in contract monitoring activities.

Accountability: Increased mechanisms for accountability; for instance, the number of multi-stakeholder forums in which community monitors can present the results of their monitoring activities.

Actual impact / improvement in service delivery:

Greater compliance with contracts.

Greater compliance with procurement laws.

Increase in the % of identified problems that were fixed by education, health, and agriculture authorities .

Increase in the % of citizen satisfaction with services.

Our indicators per each of areas above are SMART, that is specific, measurable, relevant, and time bound. For instance, when monitoring school construction we will measure the



reduction by X% in time and cost overruns in school construction contracts in Y district in 2015. Equally, UCMC invests significant time and resources in determining baselines against which to track progress and impact. These baselines can be related to a set of specific objectives within the broader enabling environment (macro), within the contracting process, or even within a particular contract (micro). As an example of the former, the UCMC will determine the # of functioning online and offline information systems facilitating contract disclosure in Uganda and across districts. As an example of the latter, the UCMC will measure the level of satisfaction by communities affected by X health contact in Y district. Furthermore, the UCMC is cognizant of the need to create effective verification mechanisms like, for instance, empirically sound community satisfaction surveys, photographic evidence of problems solved, etc. In what follows, we provide a sample results matrix:

Sample Contracts Monitoring Results Matrix				
Impact area	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Means of verification
Disclosure	# of total contracts disclosed # of contracts disclosed by district 40 contracts in education, health and agriculture	0	71 of total contracts disclosed # of contracts disclosed by district 26 contracts in education 15 contracts in health and 30 contracts in agriculture	The contracts themselves. On sight visits
Participation	Total # of CSOs / communities monitoring X # of contracts / projects. # of CSOs / communities monitoring X # of contracts / projects by district. 16 CSOs per district x 40 contracts	0	X # of CSOs / communities monitored X # of contracts / projects. X # of CSOs / communities monitored X # of contracts / projects by district. 4 CSOs X 4 districts X 40 contracts	Contract monitoring reports / monitoring tools filled out by participants. Photographic evidence of monitoring activities Documentation video and pictorial reports
Accountability	Total # of multi-stakeholder meetings held to resolve non-compliance with contracts / problems identified during the monitoring activities. Total # of multi-stakeholder meetings held to resolve non-compliance with contracts / problems identified during the monitoring activities by district. 20 ACMC meetings 20 meetings for Education and health	0	X # of multi-stakeholder meetings held to resolve non-compliance with contracts / problems identified during the monitoring activities. X # of multi-stakeholder meetings held to resolve non-compliance with contracts / problems identified during the monitoring activities by district. 20 ACMC meetings 20 meetings for Education and health	Meeting reports Photographic evidence of meeting Consensus building reports Stakeholders directory
Impact / improvement in service delivery	Total Increase in the % of compliance with contracts. Increase in the % of compliance with contracts by district.	For the first three indicators, the baseline would be based on our monitoring activities. The idea is to measure the	X % increase in compliance with contracts. X % increase in compliance with contracts by district.	Photographic evidence of problems fixed. Citizen satisfaction surveys.

	<p>% of problems fixed as a consequence of our intervention.                  % of problems fixed in a given project / district as a consequence of our intervention.                  Increase in the level of citizen satisfaction with a given project.</p>	<p>level of non-compliance before your intervention and the level of compliance after it. The same holds for the % of problems fixed.                  For the last one, we will conduct a survey to measure citizen satisfaction before and after our intervention.</p>	<p>% of problems fixed as a consequence of your intervention.                  % of problems fixed in a given project / district as a consequence of our intervention.                  X% increase in the level of citizen satisfaction with a given project.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Project Team. Explain clearly:

- (a) Describe how you will assemble the Project Team. Indicate if the Team members are part of your current staff, and explain which new positions, if any, will need to be hired. Include any relevant positions that will be hired as consultant positions as well. Refer to the Proposal Budget for guidance.
- (b) If the Proposal includes a Partnership and/or MenteeCSOs, explain what positions and roles they will perform as part of your Project team.

**[MAX. 500 WORDS]**

AFIC, the applicant and host institution of UCMC has a host institution agreement as a fiscal agent of the Coalition. This was affirmed by the coalition’s general assembly meeting that discussed GPSA application. It will provide the project’s overall Project Manager, Accountant, Project Officer, Knowledge Officer and Finance Assistant. The Project Manager and Finance Officer are already part of the organization and will dedicate part of the time to this proposed project. Knowledge officer will contribute 70% of staff time to the proposed project and 30% to AFIC. AFIC will contribute 30% of salary. Programme Officer and Finance Assistant will be recruited and paid for by this project.

INFOC Uganda, one of the two sub grantees will lead implementation of actions under component 1. INFOC will provide staff to deliver activities under component1. In particular, the component manager, project Officer, Project Assistant Officer, Accountant, Accounts Assistant and Project Administrative Secretary will be provided by INFOC. The Diocesan Project’s Officer will be provided by PDR, one of the members in the cluster and a strategic institution for mentoring. All staff are already in place and will provide part of the time to the project. At community level the project will be supported by a network of community volunteers. They will not be part of the organizations but community members supporting the project.

Transparency International Uganda, the second sub grantee will lead implementation actions under component 2. Staff to be committed by TIU include the Component Manager, two programme officers and accountant. Yommit, one of the cluster members will provide an additional programme officer to deliver the project. All earmarked staff are part of the two organizations and have were involved in developing UCMC citizen monitoring tools. No new recruitment will be done apart from a consultant who will be hired to support development of citizen monitoring tool for health infrastructure.

This arrangement will provide for mentoring of other members of UCMC who are members of the education and health cluster but are not sufficiently experienced

in contracts monitoring and constructive engagement.

**10.1 Please fill out the table below:**

Team member name*1	Position	Time devoted to Project*2	Project Components	Project Main Responsibilities
Charlotte MwesigyeBagorogoza	Component Manager	- 35% personnel time Full project duration	Component 1	Overall component coordination applying strategic engagement plan Main Project contact with state and non-state actors Supervise Project team's performance Lead periodic strategic planning team meetings and approve adjustments to Project's flow Capacity Building role Monitoring and Evaluation
Emmanuel Twinamasiko	Project Officer	50% - personnel time Full project duration	Component 1	Deputize in Project coordination Assist - Project contact with state and non-state actors Reporting and Feedback Participate in periodic project review Convene planning team meetings to approve adjustments to Project's flow
Janet Asaba	Accountant	25% - personnel time Full duration	Component 1	Financial Accounting and Records manager; Monitoring and Evaluation of project activity progress
<i>Peter Wandera</i>	Component manager	20% personnel time	Component 2	Overall component coordination Main Project contact with state and non-state actors Supervise Project team's performance Lead periodic strategic planning team meetings and approve adjustments to Project's flow
<i>Francis Ekadu</i>	Programme Officer	60% personnel time	Component 2	Project planning, coordination and implementation Liaison with AFIC on day to day implementation Engagement with district stakeholders Project reporting to AFIC
<i>Christopher Mwesigwa</i>	Programme Officer	50% personnel time	Component 2	Training community monitors Engagement with district and respective ministry officials Monitoring and evaluation
<i>George Emoit</i>	Finance Officer	35% personnel time	Component 2	Finance planning, processing and reporting
Gilbert Sendugwa	Project Manager	35% personnel time	Component	Overall Project coordination, planning and reporting (component 1,2,3 &4)

		Full duration	1,2, 3 & 4	Main Project contact with state and non-state actors, UCMC Steering Committee, General Assembly and donor relations Strategic engagements Supervise Project team's performance Capacity Building role Monitoring and Evaluation
Peter Nsenkeng	Programme Officer	70% personnel time 30 months	Component 3 & 4	Day to day implementation of actions under component 3 &4 Liaising with project coordinators under component 1 & 2 Project monitoring Project planning and reporting
Pamela Muganzi	Programme Accountant	60% personnel time Full duration	Component 1,2, 3 & 4	Financial planning, maintenance of accounts, disbursements to sub grantees, preparation of financial statements Training Accounts officers of sub grantees Financial monitoring & reporting
Finance Assistant	To be hired	60% personnel time Full duration	Component 1,2, 3 & 4	Finance and Administrative duties
Knowledge and Communications Officer	To be hired	70% personnel time Full duration	Component 1,2, 3 & 4	Documentation of project lessons and experiences, case studies, impacts and processes Updating content on ucmc.ug website Facilitating knowledge sharing through new and traditional media

**\*1** | You must list all the Project Team, including existing staff, staff to be hired, and individual consultants. If you're proposing to hire consulting firms to deliver specific tasks that are critical to the project (e.g. Project evaluation, ICT products/services, etc.) you MUST also include them in the table.

**\*2** | Indicate (a) if full or part-time, (b) if CSO personnel or consultant, and (c) if team member will be employed for the full duration of the Project or for specific periods or tasks.

## Guidance for Answering Part 2: Main Application Questions

<sup>1</sup>**Question 1: Proposal's overall objectives.** The proposal's theme must be aligned with one or more of the priority areas identified in the country call for proposals. Within the chosen theme or sector, the specific issue(s) or problem(s) that will be addressed through social accountability must be clearly spelled out. For example:

- If the proposal focuses on monitoring health service delivery, identify the specific services or issues that will be monitored, such as service inputs (e.g. availability of vaccines for children 0-5 years old, of micro-nutrients for pregnant women, antiretroviral treatments for HIV patients, etc.), or service access (e.g. hours of operation at local health clinics, availability of doctors and nurses, infrastructure conditions, etc.)

- 
- If the monitoring process encompasses budget monitoring, the precise issues to be covered must also be indicated: following the latter example, the social accountability approach may include gathering information about sector transfers to health clinics, procurement of inputs and contract supervision, among others.
  - For budget monitoring as a more general theme, the specific issues to be monitored must also be spelled out: for instance, enforcement of budget accountability laws and regulations at the sub-national level, citizen participation mechanisms for agreeing on local spending priorities, budget allocations for public investments in critical basic infrastructure, procurement and contract monitoring, etc.

In this question, the reference to the proposed solution(s) must briefly and concisely explain (a) *what social accountability approach will be used to (b) achieve what type of changes in the proposal's lifetime. Point (a) must clearly define the type of citizen feedback that will be generated to address the issue or problem.*

Citizen "feedback" is understood as the information provided by citizens and is based on their experiences in accessing or using a certain service or program delivered by the state or a third party contracted out by the state. Information about a public service or program is also generated indirectly by analyzing and systematizing information either from data that is proactively made available to the public, or from requests for access to such public information. Whether the feedback is produced directly or indirectly, it is intended to be used as a basis for the improvement of a specific public service or program.

The justification of the need for this feedback should be briefly mentioned here, and expanded on questions 2 and 3.

Suggested guidance for defining the proposal's strategic objectives: "The Super Duper Impact Planning Guide", by Albert Van Zyl, International Budget Partnership, available at <http://internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/Super-Duper-Impact-Planning-Guide.pdf>

<sup>2</sup>**Question 2: role of government and public sector institutions.** The answer must provide a justification for the proposed solution(s) put forth in question 1 by answering all the sub-questions. By reading the answer it should be clear (a) *who in the public sector (including institutions within and outside the Executive branch) is/are interested in obtaining the type of citizen feedback that would be generated by the project, (b) why do they need this information and in which ways will this information benefit their positions and interests in order to motivate or incite them to take action.*

<sup>3</sup>**Question 3: social accountability** is approached<sup>3</sup> as a process encompassing (a) the use of a combined set of mechanisms and "tools", including formal (i.e., mandated by laws and regulations) and informal (set up or organized by CSOs and citizen groups themselves), (b) whereby the choice of mechanisms and tools is grounded on several considerations, such as a cost-benefit analysis of alternatives, an analysis of the political-institutional context, an assessment of needs and problems regarding the service delivery chain or the management process, among others, as well as of "entry points" for introducing the process, and of existing capacities and incentives of the actors to be engaged, including service users, CSOs, service providers and public sector institutions.

---

The approach thus assumes that in order to be effective the social accountability process must engage citizens and public sector institutions, especially those with decision-making power to address the issues raised by citizens and CSOs. It is a double-way process, and as such, it cannot rely only on the assumption that the solution rests on building citizen capacities to generate feedback, or on the generation of such feedback by itself; these are necessary, albeit not sufficient conditions for generating the changes needed to improve or solve the issue. Therefore, the proposed process must be as explicit regarding the actions on the part of public sector institutions (and of other relevant stakeholders such as the private sector, the media, etc.) that will be required for it to be considered a plausible and realistic approach.

Suggested guidance for defining capacity-building activities: “The Capacity Development Results Framework. A strategic and results-oriented approach to learning for capacity development”, by Samuel Otoo, Natalia Agapitova and Jay Behrens, World Bank Institute, June 2009. Available at the GPSA website.

**<sup>4</sup>Question 4: Partnerships.** The GPSA encourages applicants to identify partners who may complement the applicant’s expertise, outreach capacity and influence in working towards achieving the proposed objectives. It is assumed that governance and development challenges call for multi-stakeholder coalitions, encompassing stakeholders from diverse sectors, to work together in order to solve them. Partnership arrangements may include “mentoring” schemes, whereby the main applicant CSO has identified one or more “mentee” CSO(s), that are usually nascent, or with less social accountability experience, and puts forth a capacity-building process that uses the proposed operational work as a means for the mentee(s) to “learn by doing”. Partnerships with other CSOs with specific, complementary expertise, outreach and influence may also be put forth. If partners will take on specific responsibilities within the proposal, that are directly related to its planned activities, outputs and outcomes, they must be included as part of the project team (see Question 10) and are expected to participate in a funds’ sharing scheme (see the Proposal Budget guidance).

**<sup>5</sup>Question 5: Ongoing/new project.** For ongoing projects, the answer should clearly explain the value added of GPSA support, and what would GPSA funding support within such project. A summary of the ongoing project achievements and challenges should also be included here, as well as a clear explanation of its sources of funding. For new projects, the answer should relate the proposal to the organization’s experience on social accountability and in related projects.

**<sup>6</sup>Question 6: Institutional strengthening.** GPSA support may include activities aimed at investing in the applicant CSO’s institutional capacities that will ensure the organizations’ sustainability of operations beyond the proposal’s duration. CSOs working on social accountability usually operate in contexts of limited resources and one of GPSA’s central objectives is to offer “strategic and sustained support” that may allow for mid to long-term strategic planning. The GPSA gives special consideration to the ability of the applicant CSO to relate the proposal to the organization’s current state of development, including efforts to invest in strengthening staff’s capacities on social accountability, but also other activities such as those mentioned in the question.

**<sup>7</sup>Question 7: Project areas/components.** The proposal should be structured around areas or components, which consist of sub-sections that are organized together because of their direct relation to one or more intermediate outcomes. A Project component must thus group those activities and outputs that can be directly linked to specific intermediate outcomes as defined in the proposal’s results framework. By reading the Project component one must be able to

---

understand the linkages between the activities included therein, as well as the relationship between the expected outputs and outcomes. See footnotes 7 and 8 below.

<sup>8</sup>Outputs are the direct products of project activities and may include types, levels and targets of services to be delivered by the project. The key distinction between an output and an outcome is that an output typically is a change in the supply of services (E.g. # of CSOs trained on social accountability, # of meetings with government officials, website set up and running, etc.), while an outcome reflects changes derived from one or more of those outputs (E.g. CSOs apply the skills learnt by implementing a social accountability process, XX Government actor introduces X change/s in the delivery of X service, Supply of X service is increased by X%, Quality of X service is improved as measured by XX, etc.)

<sup>9</sup>Outcomes are the specific changes in project participants' behavior, knowledge, skills, status and level of functioning; they should be defined in a SMART way: strategic, measurable, action-oriented, realistic, and timed. Intermediate outcomes are attributable to each component, and would contribute to the achievement of final outcomes at the Project level. An intermediate outcome specifies a result proximate to an intended final outcome, but likely more measurable and achievable in the lifetime of a project to an intended final outcome. To ensure the accuracy of assigned intermediate outcomes, the consideration of each proposed outcome should include reviewing who is best situated to achieve the outcome (that is, is this within or outside the scope of this intervention?) and how the outcome might be effectively measured. Example: Teachers use the new teaching methods (intermediate outcome) to improve learning among students (final outcome).

10

---

**Guidance for designing the Knowledge & Learning (K&L) Component**

---

A key GPSA objective is to contribute to the generation and sharing of knowledge on social accountability (SAcc), as well as to facilitate knowledge exchange and learning uptake across CSOs, CSOs networks, governments and other stakeholders. GPSA aims to support its grantees with the best knowledge available on social accountability tools and practices, and also to develop and disseminate them widely among practitioners and policy-makers in order to enhance the effectiveness of SAcc interventions.

GPSA will promote K&L activities such as nurturing practitioner networks and peer learning, especially South-South exchanges through events, on-line resources, and technical assistance. An online Knowledge Platform will provide access to knowledge, support sharing of experiences, facilitate learning, and networking.

*GPSA requires that grant proposals include a K&L Component, whereby applicants develop a plan in which the proposed interventions include opportunities for advancing knowledge about strategies and pathways for promoting transparency, accountability and civic engagement. Special emphasis should be made on learning mechanisms (internships, peer-to-peer reviews, Communities of Practice, etc.) focused on grant recipients and partner CSOs, as well as on key external audiences.*

Some key questions to answer in designing the K&L Component are:

- ✓ What particular contribution to K&L on SAcc will our proposal make, such as developing tools, replicable models, impact indicators etc., which may have broader usage?
- ✓ What are our K&L needs and knowledge gaps? While proposals are being assessed on their strengths, the proponent's ability to recognize needs and weaknesses is an important aspect as well.
- ✓ What K&L resources do we have? Are they effective in achieving the objectives for which they were developed or do we need to improve them? Are we prepared to share these resources?
- ✓ Who are the specific audiences that we would like to engage in our K&L plan? What are their specific needs and what are the objectives we seek to accomplish in terms of K&L devised for them?
- ✓ How will we realistically develop and disseminate K&L derived from our project? How will we build sustained capacity with our project participants/beneficiaries and key audiences beyond, for example, one-time training or capacity building events?

<sup>11</sup>**Question 8: Proposal Action Plan.** The action plan should provide a clear summary of your proposal's operational roadmap. By reading it, it should be possible to understand (a) the activities and outputs that are considered critical for project implementation; (b) the sequencing logic devised (whereby a set of critical activities would lead to X outputs, that must be completed in order to proceed to deliver Y activities and outputs) which should be reflected in the planned calendar; and (c) the milestones that will flag the component's progress towards your expected outcomes. See endnote 14 below for examples.

<sup>12</sup> List only the key activities that best reflect the Component's successful implementation throughout the project's lifetime.

<sup>13</sup> List only the key outputs that best reflect the successful delivery of planned activities.



---

<sup>14</sup>Milestones must be linked to the outputs and expected Component-level intermediate outcomes:

- They should summarize the Component's critical achievements by year geared to achieving key project-level outcomes by the end of the project.
- While a planned output will indicate the project's progress towards achieving a certain level of completion of an activity, for example, the target you have defined for training local CSOs and other stakeholders on the use of a social accountability tool or mechanism (E.g. 5 in Year 1, 10 in Year 2, and so on), a milestone would be achieved when these groups are able to actually use the tool or mechanism which would enable you to assess whether the participants have learned the skill and are able to implement it with increasing levels of independence, and whether these activities are leading up to certain outcomes that you expect to achieve incrementally throughout the project's lifetime.
- Similarly, you may need to define certain outputs for the process of engaging decision-makers, service providers and others power-holders; these outputs may range from sharing systematized data or information that you have produced independently (E.g. independent budget analyses) or that has been generated jointly by community stakeholders (users of a specific service) and service providers as a result of the implementation of a social accountability tool (E.g. Action Plans derived from community scorecards processes), to other type of outputs that are considered critical such as setting up a civil society-government (or multi-stakeholder) working group, or participating in X number of public hearings, among others.
- The milestones related to all these outputs, however, should help you identify the actions and events that would indicate that the project is progressing towards its expected outcomes. In relation to the examples provided, some questions that you may ask would be:
  - What do we expect will happen if we share independent budget analyses with XX decision-makers? What would progress mean to us? Could we use certain standards -for instance, we expect sector budget allocations or allocations to fund a specific service within a sector to change in any way- in order to define incremental measures or targets of progress?
  - How would we define progress as a result of the implementation of Action Plans agreed upon in the framework of a community scorecards process?
  - If a multi-stakeholder working group is set up, what are the measures of progress that would indicate that the working group is really functioning?
- There are also process-related milestones that may be critical for the project, such as, for instance, reaching an agreement with a certain government or public sector agency on the local-level service centers (E.g. schools, health centers, etc.) that will be targeted incrementally by the project; integrating the results of the project's end of Year 1 initial assessment (an output of the project's M&E system) into the project's operational plan, including by adjusting planned activities and outputs; etc. etc.