



**BELGO-UGANDAN STUDY AND CONSULTANCY FUND**

UGA/01/004

**ANNUAL REPORT 2007**

FEBRUARY 2008



## Table of contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Project sheet</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Brief factual overview</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Overview of activity planning</b> .....	<b>6</b>
	3.1 <i>Table 1 Activity overview</i> .....	6
	3.2 <i>Analysis of activity planning (1 page)</i> .....	7
	3.2.1 <i>Comparison of current situation (year N) with planning (year N-1)</i> .....	7
<b>4</b>	<b>Financial overview</b> .....	<b>8</b>
	4.1 <i>Table 2. Overview of expenditure versus financial planning</i> .....	8
	4.2 <i>Analysis of financial planning (1 page)</i> .....	9
<b>5</b>	<b>Monitoring of the indicators</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Assessment of monitoring criteria</b> .....	<b>10</b>
	6.1 <i>Efficiency</i> .....	10
	6.2 <i>Effectiveness</i> .....	10
	6.3 <i>Sustainability</i> .....	11
<b>7</b>	<b>Measures and recommendations</b> .....	<b>12</b>
	7.1 <i>Overview of the assessment criteria</i> .....	12
	7.2 <i>Recommendations</i> .....	12
<b>8</b>	<b>Planning for the upcoming year (Year N+1)</b> .....	<b>13</b>
	8.1 <i>Activity planning year N+1</i> .....	13
	8.2 <i>Financial planning year N+1</i> .....	14
<b>9</b>	<b>Conclusions</b> .....	<b>15</b>
	9.1 <i>Activities and Finance</i> .....	15
	9.2 <i>Monitoring criteria</i> .....	15
	9.2.1 <i>Efficiency</i> .....	15
	9.2.2 <i>Effectiveness</i> .....	15
	9.2.3 <i>Sustainability</i> .....	15
	9.3 <i>Advice of the JLCB on the recommendations</i> .....	15
	9.3.1 <i>Recommendations on activity planning</i> .....	15
	9.3.2 <i>Recommendations on financial planning</i> .....	16
	9.3.3 <i>Recommendations on Logical Framework</i> .....	16
	9.3.4 <i>Other recommendations</i> .....	16
<b>10</b>	<b>Annexes</b> .....	<b>17</b>
	10.1 <i>Tracking Gantt view / Activities (Activity planning in report)</i> .....	17

10 2 *Baseline report / Activities (AdeptTracker) N/A* ..... 17

10 3 *Measuring indicators N/A* ..... 17

10 4 *Checklist efficiency* ..... 17

10 5 *Checklist effectiveness* ..... 17

10 6 *Checklist sustainability* ..... 17

10 7 *Input in PIT* ..... 17

10 8 *Logical framework year N/A* ..... 17

10 9 *Overview public contracts* ..... 18

# 1 PROJECT SHEET

## Reference documents

The study and consultancy fund is based on implementation agreement between DGDC and BIC and specific agreement which outlines the implementation modalities. Its set up did not require an operational technical and financial file to be developed. Since it involves a series of studies, for each study a detailed proposal with estimated budget is developed. It is against this proposal and budget in line with the specific agreement that the implementation is based.

## Project objective and results

The objective of this study fund is to finance consultancies in the framework of the Belgo-Ugandan Development Cooperation including identification, preparation and follow-up studies of projects and programs, investigations, missions, seminars and services.

The main results are the study reports which are owned and utilised by the beneficiary Institutions

**Location:** Kampala, Uganda

## Target groups

The only beneficiaries of the Fund are line Ministries and Government Agencies of Uganda. The use of this fund is proposed through the ministries and Agencies to the Embassy of Belgium and the Ministry of Finance, Planning & Economic Development (MoFPED), who jointly approves the proposed studies and their budgets.

## Budget

Original budget (co-managed)	750,000 EUR
(regie)	67,500 EUR
Additional Budget	500,000 EUR
Total budget	1,317,000 EUR

## Key Contacts

Mr. Keith MUHAKANIZI  
Deputy Secretary to the Treasury/Fund Director  
Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MoFPED)  
P O Box 8147  
Kampala, Uganda  
Tel: +256 (0) 414 230 290  
Email: [keith.muhakanizi@finance.go.ug](mailto:keith.muhakanizi@finance.go.ug)

Mr. Koen GOEKINT  
Resident Representative/Fund Co-Director  
Belgian Technical Cooperation (BTC)  
P.O Box 40131  
Kampala, Uganda  
Tel: +256 (0)414 230 543  
Email: [koen.goekint@btcctb.org](mailto:koen.goekint@btcctb.org)

## Partner Institution

Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Kampala, Uganda

## 2 BRIEF FACTUAL OVERVIEW

N/A

### 3 OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITY PLANNING

3.1 Table 1. Activity overview

Title	Duration	Sector	Institution	Consultant	Status
Rapid Inventory Method to Derive Agriculture Sector Data Phase II, Trial Integrated Land use Survey (TILUS)	June 2006-May 2007	Agriculture Livestock	Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS)	Ecosystem Consultants	Complete
Support for ENRS SWAP/SIP Project	December 2005-December 2007	Environment	Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE)	Devt Consultant International & Greenbelt	Complete
Support the Development of a Long Term Plan for Training and Development of Staff in the Local Government Sector	March 2006-June 2008	Local government Capacity building (MoLG)	Ministry of Local Government (MoLG)	Winsor Consult LTD	on going
Support the Re-organization of MoLG's Directorate of Local Governments Administration and Inspection	March 2006-June 2008	Local government (MoLG)	Ministry of Local Government (MoLG)	Business Synergies	on going
Support the Development of a Strategy for Promoting Investment and Local Economic Governments in Uganda	March 2006-June 2008	Social Economy, Local Economic Development (MoLG)	Ministry of Local Government (MoLG)	Mentor Consult LTD	on going
Bonus payments to Health Centres and Medical Bureaus	September 2006- March 2007	Health	Ministry of Health (MoH)	N/A	Complete
Development of an Environmental Sensitivity Atlas of the Albertine Graben in Uganda	January 2007-December 2008	Environment	Ministry of Water and Environment	AGRER s.a.n.v	On going
Sensitization Workshop for the Belgo-Ugandan Study and Consultancy Fund	September 2007-August 2009	Administration	Ministry of Finance	N/A	on going
Consultancy for an integrated information and document management system for Education Service Commission (ESC)	September 2007-Dec 2008	Education	Education Service Commission	Not yet selected	on going
The Impact of the Energy Supply Shortfall on the Uganda Economy	November 2007-Dec 2008	Administration	Ministry of Finance	Not yet selected	on going
Capacity building on public procurement and disposal	November 2007-Dec 2008	Procurement	PPDA	Not yet selected	On going

## 3.2 Analysis of activity planning (1 page)

### 3.2.1 Comparison of current situation (year N) with planning (year N-1)

The study fund planning is based on prior approved studies within the planning quarter, however within the year a number of new studies may be approved and implemented. This poses a challenge in planning activities for the study fund as determining or estimating the numbers and costs of new studies that may be approved is not possible. By the end of fourth quarter 2006, six (6) studies were planned but within 2007, five (5) new studies were approved and implementation launched. Therefore the total numbers of studies implemented in 2007 are eleven (11) out of which three (3) have been successfully completed and the rest on going.

Two studies i.e Rapid Inventory Method to Derive Agriculture Sector Data Phase II, Trial Integrated Land use Survey (TILUS) and Support for ENRS SWAP/SIP Project have had remarkable delay in the implementation mainly due to:

- ❖ Delay by the beneficiary institutions to review and approve the consultancy reports (drafts and final).
- ❖ Minimum support from the beneficiary institutions in creating avenues for consultations with the stakeholders.
- ❖ Some of the consultants do not follow or respect the time framework set out in their contracts. This was because the previous contracts did not provide for penalty clause which has been introduced in current contracts.

However, despite of the above delays in implementation, the above studies were successfully completed and the results launched for use by the beneficiaries.

## 4 FINANCIAL OVERVIEW

4.1 Table 2. Overview of expenditure versus financial planning

Title	mode	Budget 2007 in Q4 2006 FP	Expenditure in 2006	Currency in '000 EUR								Available Balance from 2007 FP	% spent in 2007	Risk
				Expenditure in 2007				Total	Available Balance from 2007 FP	% spent in 2007	Risk			
				Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4							
Rapid Inventory Method to Derive Agriculture Sector Data Phase II, Trial Integrated Land use Survey (TILUS)	cogestion	28	13.383	11.5	0	0	13.166	24.666	3.334	88.1	low			
Support for ENRS SWAP/SIP Project	cogestion	45	17.059	16.88	4.05	4.27	0	25.2	19.8	56.0	high			
Support the Development of a Long Term Plan for Training and Development of Staff in the Local Government Sector	cogestion	60	0	0	0	11.02	10.5	21.52	38.48	35.9	high			
Support the Re-organization of MoLG's Directorate of Local Governments Administration and Inspection	cogestion	35	0	0	0	8.42	0	8.42	26.58	24.1	high			
Support the Development of a Strategy for Promoting Investment and Local Economic Governments in Uganda	cogestion	55	0	0	0	9.09	21.21	30.3	24.7	55.1	high			
Bonus payments to Health Centres and Medical Bureaus	cogestion	0	17.175	0.24	0	0.27	0.224	0.734	-0.734					
Development of an Environmental Sensitivity Atlas of the Albertine Graben in Uganda	cogestion	0	0	0	0	1.523	0	1.523	-1.523					
Sensitization Workshop for the Belgo-Ugandan Study and Consultancy Fund	cogestion	0	0	0	0	0	2.01	2.01	-2.01					
Consultancy for an integrated information and document management system for Education Service Commission (ESC)	cogestion	0	0	0	0	0	0.855	0.855	-0.855					
The Impact of the Energy Supply Shortfall on the Uganda Economy	cogestion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Capacity building on public procurement and disposal acts	cogestion	0	0				0	0	0					
Technical expertise	Regie	0	0	0	0	1.718	0	1.718	-1.718					
Expenses of other studies completed in 2006	Cogestion	0	136.195	0	0	0	0	0	0					
<b>Total budget/expenditure</b>		<b>223</b>	<b>183.812</b>	<b>28.62</b>	<b>4.05</b>	<b>36.311</b>	<b>47.965</b>	<b>116.946</b>	<b>107.772</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>high</b>			



## 4.2 Analysis of financial planning (1 page)

As seen from table 2, studies with zero budgets in the column of budget 2007 in fourth quarter 2006 financial planning indicate that at the time of this planning, these studies were not yet approved. These are studies that were approved within 2007 and implementation began. Since each study is independent of the other, the most important is to compare total expenditure in 2006 with that of 2007 to be able to make proper analysis.

The financial planning for 2007 as of Q4 2006 planning was too ambitious and at the end of 2007, only 52.4% execution rate was realized, even with the unforeseen expenditures from the new studies. Apart from TILUS, there were remarkable deviations in financial planning for all the remaining studies falling within the high risk brackets.

The main cause of the deviation is from the three studies under Ministry of Local Government i.e. long term capacity building plan, Re-organization of MoLG and investment and LED that took long to be launched. This was due to internal changes within MoLG where the contact official who had originated the proposals was transferred. Secondly the terms of references for the studies were not clear and exhaustive and therefore had to be revised by technical expert causing a lag in implementation for over 6 months. According to the financial planning, these studies should have been completed in 2007 but most of the funds were not spent and have been forwarded to 2008.

Although approval of study fund is unpredictable and some new studies that were not originally planned for 2007 were approved and implementation launched i.e. sensitization workshop on study fund, their expenditures were very negligible and did not have major positive effect on the execution rate. Most of the studies had the procurement process launched and only costs associated with advertisement were paid.

Lastly, BTC and MoFPED are looking into optimal way for fund disbursement to improve efficiency in release of fund. This would go along away improving achievement of financial planning.

## 5 MONITORING OF THE INDICATORS

The set up of the study and consultancy fund did not contain technical and financial file being developed. This therefore means no logical framework was developed. However the objective of this project was very clear on the results to be achieved. Therefore the assessment of the monitoring criteria below was based on this understanding.

## 6 ASSESSMENT OF MONITORING CRITERIA

### 6.1 Efficiency

To determine the efficiency of the study fund is difficult given the design and set up of the project. The study fund does not have operational document in place and therefore lacks logical framework. In addition, the design of study fund does not warrant a baseline survey and therefore the project has neither developed nor implemented an effective monitoring and evaluation plan to determine the efficiency and effectiveness of the project interventions. This report therefore determines monitoring criteria at different levels of implementation.

The majority of the planned project activities have not been successfully implemented within the proposed timeframe. The reasons for this are mainly related to the delays or failure by some beneficiary institutions to develop well elaborated terms of reference for the study; lack of commitment by the beneficiaries in implementation of activities and follow up of results; and in some cases failure/ refusal of the beneficiary institution to understand the implementation modalities outlined in the funding agreement.

Although the timeframe during implementation is not being respected, the results of good quality are being achieved. This should be seen as an achievement. The quality of the outputs is being controlled by the beneficiary institutions and where necessary BIC has supported using the available experts at headquarters and external consultants to provide specific technical expertise. To improve further the quality of the results, for highly technical studies, beneficiary institutions are encouraged during preparation of terms of reference to use expertise. The budget for this kind of expertise can either be incorporated in the approved study fund or financed through separate own managed budget line by BIC depending on the cost.

In order to improve further the efficiency of the project, the cost estimation during the development of the proposals should be more general focusing only on achievement of results and not split budgets per activities. The elaboration of the budget would then be done during the implementation stage.

### 6.2 Effectiveness

The beneficiaries include line ministries and government agencies. The institutions that have benefited so far include Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE), Ministry of Health (MoH), Ministry of Local Government (MoLG), Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES), Ministry of

Finance Planning and Economic Development (MoFPED), Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS), Public Procurement and Disposal Authority (PPDA) and Education Service Commission (ESC) who are involved in Belgo-Uganda Development cooperation activities. These institutions request for funding by submission of study proposals and after the approval of the studies, implementation is carried out in collaboration with BTC. These institutions are involved in monitoring the contract and ensuring that results of high quality are achieved. All the studies are priority areas and the results are owned and utilised by these institutions.

The study and consultancy have supported government of Uganda institutions in preparation of new projects, evaluation of projects, development sector investment plans, capacity building, development of strategies for promoting new government initiatives for example local economic development. The results of these studies have enabled government to produce quality identification documents, sector investment plans and strategies have directed government on priority areas of sector expenditures that have been incorporated into budget framework paper, which is in line with project objective of funding consultancies in the framework of the Belgo-Ugandan Development Cooperation.

Many partner institutions are becoming aware of the fund availability and many proposals are being submitted to the Belgian Embassy and Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development for funding. Previously some of these proposals were being rejected on the ground that they do not fall within the specific objectives of the study fund. However, the study fund sensitization workshop that was conducted in September 2007 by Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development in collaboration with Embassy of Belgium and BTC for publicity of study fund enlightened the partners on the priority areas of the fund. It is hoped that through this workshop, awareness has been created and the number of proposals being submitted and approved will eventually increase.

### 6.3 Sustainability

The study and consultancy fund by design is sustainable. The study proposals are generated by the beneficiary institutions to target specific area of interest for which these institutions lack technical capacities. It is well integrated within the institutions' mandate and portfolio to bridge the gap in the policies, strategies, investment plans or processes. The study funds have also been used to operationalise government policy and draw up strategies for implementation.

This Project is designed to strengthen the capacities of the beneficiary institutions enabling them to produce quality documents that will enhance policy decision and attract further funding. Through the results of these studies, these institutions have been able to design projects that have captured donors' interest for funding. Donors have used the results of the studies as a negotiating tool for making commitments for future funding e.g. World Bank is using the result of the ENR SIP to pledge funding to support MoWE.

Lastly the approval of the proposals and administration of fund is being undertaken by MoFPED. The steering committee is chaired by representative from MoFPED and other members include Ministry of foreign Affairs and BTC.

## 7 MEASURES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 7.1 Overview of the assessment criteria

The result of assessment of monitoring criteria indicates that the project is efficient, effective and sustainable. However further action needs to be taken to avoid unnecessary delays during implementation. One of the measures so far being implemented in this regard was to introduce penalty clause in the consultants' contracts. Future recommendation to avoid delays caused by the beneficiaries is to respect the implementation deadline proposed during the approval of the studies.

BTC and beneficiary institutions have put a lot of emphasis on control of quality of reports, however, this control should be emphasized prior to launch of the study. Where the subject matter is too technical, experts should be used to develop the TORs enabling procurement process identify suitable consultants who are able to deliver quality results. So far this system of control is being appreciated by some institutions; however, others think external support would lead to lack of ownership of the study.

### 7.2 Recommendations

Field	Recommendation
Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Realistic deadlines should be set and respected</li> </ul>
Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In addition to BTC managed funds, for highly technical studies additional funds should be provided within the proposal for expertise to assist in developing/fine tuning TOR.</li> <li>- General cost estimation at the development of the proposals should be sufficient</li> <li>- BTC and MoFPED to look into optimal way to disburse funds.</li> </ul>
Institutions	<p>Beneficiary institutions should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- be more committed to the studies</li> <li>- accord the consultant enough time for consultations and provide prompt feed back on draft reports</li> <li>- Review the implementation modalities prior to implementation ensuring that both parties are in harmony with the procedures</li> </ul>

## 8 PLANNING FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR (YEAR N+1)

### 8.1 Activity planning year N+1

Title	Activity planning 2008				Total Budget Estimate €	Remarks
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		
Support the Development of a Long Term Plan for Training and Development of Staff in the Local Government Sector					60,000	Study is at final stages
Support the Re-organization of MoLG's Directorate of Local Governments Administration and Inspection					35,000	Draft report produced, wider consultation yet to be carried out to improve draft report
Support the Development of a Strategy for Promoting Investment and Local Economic Governments in Uganda					55,000	Study completed, document yet to be printed and distributed
Development of an Environmental Sensitivity Atlas of the Albertine Graben in Uganda					62,000	Contract awarded, consultants expected to begin early Feb 2008
Sensitization Workshop for the Belgo-Ugandan Study and Consultancy Fund					9,136	Sensitisation workshop was held, remaining fund to support study fund secretariat
Consultancy for an integrated information and document management system for Education Service Commission (ESC)					56,500	Procurement of the consultants is on going
The Impact of the Energy Supply Shortfall on the Uganda Economy					58,413	Implementation on going
Capacity building on public procurement and disposal					125,504	Quarterly training planned
<b>Total budget/expenditure</b>					<b>461,553</b>	

## 8.2 Financial planning year N+1

Title	Currency in '000 EUR										Available balance at end of study	
	Total Budget Estimate	Quarterly financial planning 2008				Total planning 2008	Expenditure to date					
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4							
Support the Development of a Long Term Plan for Training and Development of Staff in the Local Government Sector	60.00	14.00	8.00	0.00	0.00	22.00	21.49				16.51	
Support the Re-organization of MoLG's Directorate of Local Governments Administration and Inspection	35.00	20	5.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	8.80				1.20	
Support the Development of a Strategy for Promoting Investment and Local Economic Governments in Uganda	55.00	12	5.00	0.00	0.00	17.00	18.30				19.70	
Development of an Environmental Sensitivity Atlas of the Albertine Graben in Uganda	62.00	19.00	19.00	22.00	0.00	60.00	1.50				0.50	
Sensitization Workshop for the Beigo-Ugandan Study and Consultancy Fund	9.14	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	3.50				1.64	
Consultancy for an integrated information and document management system for Education Service Commission (ESC)	56.50	17.00	17.00	21.00	0.00	55.00	1.50				0.00	
The Impact of the Energy Supply Shortfall on the Uganda Economy	58.41	20.00	20.00	18.41	0.00	58.41	0.00				0.00	
Capacity building on public procurement and disposal	125.50	21.00	42.00	42.00	21.00	126.00	0.00				-0.50	
Regie budget	20	5	5	5	5	20						
<b>Total budget/expenditure</b>	<b>481.553</b>	<b>97.00</b>	<b>122.00</b>	<b>109.41</b>	<b>27.00</b>	<b>387.41</b>	<b>55</b>				<b>39.05</b>	

## 9 CONCLUSIONS

### 9.1 Activities and Finance

It is hoped that the planned activities and finances will be realized within the specified timeframe without any major constraints.

### 9.2 Monitoring criteria

#### 9.2.1 Efficiency

The resources have been utilized in the most efficient manner. Although the timeframe have not been respected, high quality results have achieved due to the commitment of the beneficiary institutions in controlling the quality of activities being implemented. The efficiency of the project could be further improved through respecting the set deadlines and contractual arrangements with the consultants.

#### 9.2.2 Effectiveness

The results of the studies have been beneficially utilized by the requesting institutions and are contributing to achieving specific objective of the project.

#### 9.2.3 Sustainability

The project being owned by the beneficiary institution and requested for specific purpose, have been use as a tool for further funding to these institutions.

### 9.3 Advice of the JLCB on the recommendations

#### 9.3.1 Recommendations on activity planning

- ❖ BTC has been using a separate own managed budget line to support these institutions in fine tuning IOR which are highly technical, however these funds are limited. It is therefore recommended that for such studies which may require technical expertise to develop IOR, such budget should be born by the specific study itself.
- ❖ Beneficiary institutions should be more committed to the studies and accord the consultant enough time for consultations and provide prompt feed back on reports. Any delays caused by the beneficiary institution will immediately be reported to Project Director for his action.
- ❖ Beneficiary institutions should review and understand the implementation procedure prior to commencement of the study.
- ❖ Proposals should indicate broad budget which would be detailed during the implementation stage.

9.3.2 Recommendations on financial planning

None

9.3.3 Recommendations on Logical Framework

N/A

9.3.4 Other recommendations

None



## 10 ANNEXES

- 10.1 Tracking Gantt view / Activities (in report)
- 10.2 Baseline report / Activities (AdeptTracker) N/A
- 10.3 Measuring indicators N/A
- 10.4 Checklist efficiency
- 10.5 Checklist effectiveness
- 10.6 Checklist sustainability
- 10.7 Input in PIT
- 10.8 Logical framework year N/A

Efficiency refers to the way in which the resources of the cooperation intervention are converted through the project activities into the expected results.

To be completed by the Project

1 Facts about the result indicators:	% expected realisation	actual % of realisation	difference*
Indicators for Result 1	0	0	0
Indicators for Result 2	0	0	0
Indicators for Result 3	0	0	0
Indicators for Result 4	0	0	0
Indicators for Result 5	0	0	0
Indicators for Result 6	0	0	0
Indicators for Result 7	0	0	0

Not applicable

\* (% expected realisation - actual % of realisation)

2 Achievements of the results referring to the indicators	Yes	No	NA
Are these indicators formulated in a smart way ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are all indicators monitored ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is there a baseline to compare with for each indicator ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3 Facts about activities:	Implementation is on schedule	Implementation is delayed	Implementation is in advance	Explanation
for Result 1		X		have been delayed but the delays have not affected
for Result 2				
for Result 3				
for Result 4				
for Result 5				
for Result 6				
for Result 7				

4 The activities are implemented as planned	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Some activities will need more time to be completed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Some activities can be implemented within a shorter period of time	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any occurred delay will be caught-up before the project ends	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Detected deviations will influence seriously the achievement of results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5 The general quality of the project activities is perceived as:	satisfactory <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	sufficient <input type="checkbox"/>	problematic <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

6 Do activities contribute to reach the planned results ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If not explain why:			

7 Is it possible to plan the activities in a more optimal way ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If so explain how:			

8 Facts about the expenses:	% of total budget	% of annual budget	date of latest adjustment	Explanation	% of financial planning year X
for Result 1	29				
for Result 2					
for Result 3					
for Result 4					
for Result 5					
for Result 6					

for Result 7				
Total budget				

		Yes	No	NA
9	Financial resources are managed as planned			
	Some estimated costs are not sufficient, extra resources are needed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Important financial means remain, they need to be replanned	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Some financial risks have been identified regarding expenses (crédits . . )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Detected financial risks are under control	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Activities could be implemented with less financial resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Partner contribution in financial terms is respected	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10	Is it possible to manage financial resources in a more optimal way? If so, explain how:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11	Human resources are managed as planned:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	The project staff is complete	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	The project staff is not stable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	The planned personnel is not sufficient, extra resources are needed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Some personnel execute tasks not conform to their job description	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Activities could be implemented with less human resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	There is a gender balance within the project staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12	Is it possible to manage human resources in a more optimal way ? If so, explain how:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13	Goods and equipment are managed as planned:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	The equipment is inventorised and insured	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Important amounts of goods will not be used	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Insufficient goods and equipment, extra resources are needed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Some equipment or goods are not adapted to local conditions/use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14	Is it possible to manage goods and equipment in a more optimal way ? If so, explain how:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15	The organisational structure of the project is perceived as: Not applicable			
	satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	sufficient	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	problematic	<input type="checkbox"/>		
17	Have unexpected problems regarding the planning been solved ? If so, explain how the planning has been adapted:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
16	Can the efficiency of the project be improved ? If so, explain how:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Lessons learned</b>	The study fund have achieved value for money in procurement of consultants as result of close support from BTC
<b>Best practices</b>	Quality control of the studies being handled by the partner institution

**Recommendations**

As per the narrative report

Effectiveness assesses if the results of the project are delivered and if they contribute to the achievement of the specific objective. It investigates if the occurred changes within the project area are caused by the project. It also assesses if the beneficiaries use the results delivered by the project.

To be completed by the project	Yes	No	NA
1. Concerning the indicators of the specific objectif:			
Are there any indicators for the specific objective ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the indicators of the specific objective smart ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the indicators of the specific objective monitored ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is there a base-line to be compared with ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Are the indicators of the specific objective reached ?			
	% expected realisation	actual % of realisation	difference*
Indicator 1	0	0	0
Indicator 2	0	0	0
Indicator 3	0	0	0
Indicator 4	0	0	0
* (% expected realisation - actual % of realisation)			
3. Will the specific objective be realised purely thanks to the results delivered ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Are there any side effects caused by the results ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If there are any side effects, do they influence the specific objective ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
in a positive way		in a negative way	Not applicable
5. Are there any external factors influencing the specific objective ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
in a positive way		in a negative way	Not applicable
6. What are the characteristics of the beneficiaries involved in the project ?	the poor the better off men women ... explain: The study fund supports government initiatives related to Belgo U		
7. The groups who are (or who will be) benefiting from the specific objective are:	intended, unintended, ... explain: Benefits Line ministries and government agencies		
8. Do the beneficiaries have access to the results delivered by the project ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If not, explain why (for the results in question):			
9. Are the beneficiaries using the results delivered by the project ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If not, explain why (for the results in question):			
10. Are the beneficiaries satisfied with the results delivered by the project ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If not, explain why:			

<p>11 Is the project implementation responding to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the problems of the beneficiaries</li> <li>- the priorities of the beneficiaries</li> </ul>	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
<p>12 Do the proposed solutions solve the problems of the beneficiaries ?</p>	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
<p><b>Lessons learned</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Active involvement of the partners leads to stronger ownership of the project</p>								
<p><b>Best practices</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Partner institute taking lead role during the implementation of the studies with facilitation from BTC</p>								
<p><b>Recommendations</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">As per the narrative report</p>								

Sustainability refers to the likelihood that the benefits from a development cooperation intervention will be maintained and reproduced after the withdrawal of donor support.

To be completed by the project	Yes	No	NA
1. Is the partner institution participating actively in:			
reporting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
decision-making	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
planning of activities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
financial management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
implementing the project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
monitoring and evaluation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
human resource management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
management of material resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Are resources and capacities available for the maintenance and reproduction of the results ? Not applicable			
Human resources	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Financial resources	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Equipment	<input type="checkbox"/>		
3. Is the partner institution taking the necessary dispositions to take over the project ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Is there a plan for the integration of the project in the partner institution ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If so, explain: All the studies are integrated into partner institutions portfolio and mandate			
5. Is the project providing institutional training for the partner institutions ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Is the trained personnel staying in place ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Is the project providing capacity building for organisations regarding ?			
Management of systems	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Process management	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Transfer of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Networking	<input type="checkbox"/>		
8. Is the project providing the necessary capacity building for individuals regarding ? Not applicable			
Transfer of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Exchange of experiences	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Exchange of values	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Empowerment	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Networking	<input type="checkbox"/>		
9. Is the project supported by the following local institutions ?			
Political institutions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Partner institutions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Civil society institutions	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Cultural institutions (religious, ethnic, traditional...)	<input type="checkbox"/>		

10. Are the aid modalities strengthening the sustainability ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Are the execution modalities strengthening the sustainability ?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Is the project contributing to the sustainability in following dimensions ?			
	Political	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Social	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Institutional	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Organisational	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Cultural	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Economic	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Technical	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
13. Is the project linked to donor conditions ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If so are these conditions deducted from national strategies ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Is the project respecting the principle of untied aid ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. Is the Partner Institution respecting its contribution ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>Remarks</b>	All the studies are integrated within the partner institutions to fill gaps in policies, strategies and procedures. The project being owned by the beneficiary institution and requested for specific purpose, have been used as a tool for further funding to these institutions.
----------------	--



<b>Project:</b>	Belgo-Ugandan study and consultancy fund
<b>Country:</b>	Uganda
<b>Navision code:</b>	UGA/01/004
<b>GEO advisor:</b>	Rudi POULUSSEN
<b>Year:</b>	2008
<b>Meeting JLCB:</b>	26-févr-08

<b>To be completed by the Project</b>	Yes	No	NA
1. Is the Follow-up memo dispatched to the concerned parties ?		No	
2. Are there any risks that should be taken into account ?		No	
3. Are the responsables for the follow-up of the recommendations assigned ?	Yes		
4. Is the new planning of the activities distributed to the concerned parties ?	Yes		
5. Is the new financial planning distributed to the concerned parties ?	Yes		
6. Is the new logical framework distributed to the concerned parties ?			NA
7. Has the FIT been adopted ?		No	
<b>Please give your additional comments:</b>	The study fund does have logframe		

**Project:** Belgo-Ugandan study and consultancy fund  
**Country:** Uganda  
**Navision code:** UGA/01/004  
**GEO advisor:** Rudi POULUSSEN  
**Year:** 2008  
**Meeting JLCB:** 26-févr-08

**To be completed by the Project**

1. Is the activity calendar respected ?

- Delay
- In time
- In advance

deviation in months

-9; -6; -3; 0; +3; +6; +9

2. What is the realisation degree for the indicators ?

Result 1  
 Not applicable  
 Result 2  
 Indicator 1  
 Indicator 1

Projection	Realisation	Difference

**A. ASSESSMENT OF THE CRITERIA**

1. Assess **relevance**

A

- A= the project is relevant. maintain the efforts
- B= the project is relevant. intensify the efforts
- C= measures should be taken to enhance the relevance
- D= the project is not relevant. measures should be taken
- NA= the criterion 'relevance' has not been assessed

Measures to take: NA

2. Assess **efficiency**

B

- A= the project is efficient. maintain the efforts
- B= the project is efficient. intensify the efforts
- C= measures should be taken to enhance the efficiency
- D= the project is not efficient. measures should be taken
- NA= the criterion 'efficiency' has not been assessed

Measures to take: The efficiency of the project could be further improved through respecting the set deadlines and contractual arrangements with the consultants.

3. Assess **effectiveness**

A

- A= the project is effective. maintain the efforts
- B= the project is effective. intensify the efforts
- C= measures should be taken to enhance the effectiveness
- D= the project is not effective. measures should be taken
- NA= the criterion 'effectiveness' has not been assessed

Measures to take: NA

Comments

The study fund is on track being implemented effectively and efficiently.

## 10.9 Overview public contracts

BTC Tender number	UGA050
Tendering mode	Selective bidding
Date of the award	13/11/06
Name of the Consultant/company/firm	Greenbelt
Object of the contract	Development of Environment and Natural Resource Sector Investment Plan
Duration of the contract	2 months
End of service/ supply	Dec 2007
Estimated cost	N/A
Contract cost	13,200 EUR
Reimbursable	N/A
Final cost	13,200 EUR
Comments/Recommendations	Contract execution was slow due delay in providing information by the ENRS sub sectors to the consultant

BTC Tender number	UGA067
Tendering mode	Direct bidding
Signing date of the contract	June 2006
Name of the Consultant/company/firm	Ecosystem consultants
Object of the contract	Rapid Inventory Method to Derive Agriculture Sector Data ; Phase II, Trial Integrated Land use Survey (TILUS)
Duration of the contract	6 months
End of service/ supply	Nov 2007
Estimated cost	44,200 EUR
Contract cost	36,420 EUR
Reimbursable	7,780 EUR
Final cost	38,049 EUR
Comments/Recommendations	There were been delays in disbursement of funds which affected the execution of contract by a lag of 6 months.

BTC Tender number	UGA0086
Tendering mode	Selective bidding
Date of the award	27/07/07
Name of the Consultant/company/firm	Business Synergies
Object of the contract	Support the internal Re-organisation of the Ministry Departments responsible for administration and inspection
Duration of the contract	2 months
End of service/ supply	On going
Estimated cost	35,000
Contract cost	29,639
Reimbursable	5,000
Final cost	On going
Comments/Recommendations	The consultant has experienced delays in approval of his draft report as this is a sensitive area within Ministry of Local Government

BTC Tender number	UGA087
Tendering mode	selective bidding
Signing date of the contract	27/07/2007
Name of the Consultant/company/firm	Winsor Consult Ltd
Object of the contract	Support the Development of a Long Term Plan for Training and Development of Staff in the Local Government Sector
Duration of the contract	2 months
End of service/ supply	on going
Estimated cost	60,000 EUR
Contract cost	35,810 EUR
Reimbursable	6,000 EUR
Final cost	on going
Comments/Recommendations	Although with 3months delay, the consultant is progressing on well and will be able to finalise assignment by first quarter 2008

BTC Tender number	UGA088
Tendering mode	Selective bidding
Date of the award	27/07/07
Name of the Consultant/company/firm	Mentor Consult Ltd
Object of the contract	Strategy for Promoting Investment and Local Economic Development in Local Governments
Duration of the contract	2 months
End of service/ supply	Dec 2008
Estimated cost	55,000 EUR
Contract cost	30,300 EUR
Reimbursable	0
Final cost	30,300 EUR
Comments/Recommendations	Study successfully implemented

BTC Tender number	UGA090
Tendering mode	Open bidding
Date of the award	11/12/07
Name of the Consultant/company/firm	AGRER S.A.N.V
Object of the contract	Development of an Environmental Sensitivity Atlas of Albertine Graben, Uganda
Duration of the contract	6 months
End of service/ supply	On going
Estimated cost	62,000
Contract cost	59,100
Reimbursable	0
Final cost	On going
Comments/Recommendations	Notification of award has been sent, contract yet to be signed.