

SSU Results Report 2017

3 Annexes

3.1 Project Self-assessment

1. RELEVANCE: The degree to which the intervention is in line with local and national policies and priorities as well as with the expectations of the beneficiaries				
<i>In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least one 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B' = B; At least one 'C', no 'D' = C; at least one 'D' = D</i>				
Assessment RELEVANCE: total score	A	B	C	D
A				
1.1 What is the present level of relevance of the intervention?				
A	A	Clearly still embedded in national policies and Belgian strategy, responds to aid effectiveness commitments, highly relevant to needs of target group.		
	B	Still fits well in national policies and Belgian strategy (without always being explicit), reasonably compatible with aid effectiveness commitments, relevant to target group's needs.		
	C	Some issues regarding consistency with national policies and Belgian strategy, aid effectiveness or relevance.		
	D	Contradictions with national policies and Belgian strategy, aid efficiency commitments; relevance to needs is questionable. Major adaptations needed.		
1.2 As presently designed, is the intervention logic still holding true?				
A	A	Clear and well-structured intervention logic; feasible and consistent vertical logic of objectives; adequate indicators; Risks and Assumptions clearly identified and managed; exit strategy in place (if applicable).		
	B	Adequate intervention logic although it might need some improvements regarding hierarchy of objectives, indicators, Risk and Assumptions.		
	C	Problems with intervention logic may affect performance of intervention and capacity to monitor and evaluate progress; improvements necessary.		
	D	Intervention logic is faulty and requires major revision for the intervention to have a chance of success.		

2. EFFICIENCY OF IMPLEMENTATION TO DATE: Degree to which the resources of the intervention (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have been converted into results in an economical way				
<i>In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least two 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B', no 'C' or 'D' = B; at least one 'C', no 'D' = C; at least one 'D' = D</i>				
Assessment EFFICIENCY : total score	A	B	C	D
			C	
2.1 How well are inputs (financial, HR, goods & equipment) managed?				
	A	All inputs are available on time and within budget.		
B	B	Most inputs are available in reasonable time and do not require substantial budget adjustments. However there is room for improvement.		

	C	Availability and usage of inputs face problems, which need to be addressed; otherwise results may be at risk.
	D	Availability and management of inputs have serious deficiencies, which threaten the achievement of results. Substantial change is needed.
2.2 How well is the implementation of activities managed?		
	A	Activities implemented on schedule
	B	Most activities are on schedule. Delays exist, but do not harm the delivery of outputs
C	C	Activities are delayed. Corrections are necessary to deliver without too much delay.
	D	Serious delay. Outputs will not be delivered unless major changes in planning.
2.3 How well are outputs achieved?		
	A	All outputs have been and most likely will be delivered as scheduled with good quality contributing to outcomes as planned.
B	B	Output delivery is and will most likely be according to plan, but there is room for improvement in terms of quality, coverage and timing.
	C	Some output is/will be not delivered on time or with good quality. Adjustments are necessary.
	D	Quality and delivery of outputs has and most likely will have serious deficiencies. Major adjustments are needed to ensure that at least the key outputs are delivered on time.

3. EFFECTIVENESS TO DATE: Degree to which the outcome (Specific Objective) is achieved as planned at the end of year N

In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least one 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B' = B; At least one 'C', no 'D' = C; at least one 'D' = D

Assessment EFFECTIVENESS: total score	A	B	C	D
		B		

3.1 As presently implemented what is the likelihood of the outcome to be achieved?

	A	Full achievement of the outcome is likely in terms of quality and coverage. Negative effects (if any) have been mitigated.
B	B	Outcome will be achieved with minor limitations; negative effects (if any) have not caused much harm.
	C	Outcome will be achieved only partially among others because of negative effects to which management was not able to fully adapt. Corrective measures have to be taken to improve ability to achieve outcome.
	D	The intervention will not achieve its outcome unless major, fundamental measures are taken.

3.2 Are activities and outputs adapted (when needed), in order to achieve the outcome?

	A	The intervention is successful in adapting its strategies / activities and outputs to changing external conditions in order to achieve the outcome. Risks and assumptions are managed in a proactive manner.
B	B	The intervention is relatively successful in adapting its strategies to changing external conditions in order to achieve its outcome. Risks management is rather passive.
	C	The intervention has not entirely succeeded in adapting its strategies to changing external conditions in a timely or adequate manner. Risk management has been rather static. An important change in strategies is necessary in order to ensure the intervention can achieve its outcome.

D	The intervention has failed to respond to changing external conditions, risks were insufficiently managed. Major changes are needed to attain the outcome.
----------	--

4. POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY: The degree of likelihood to maintain and reproduce the benefits of an intervention in the long run (beyond the implementation period of the intervention).

In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: At least 3 'A's, no 'C' or 'D' = A ; Maximum two 'C's, no 'D' = B; At least three 'C's, no 'D' = C ; At least one 'D' = D

Assessment POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY : total score	A	B	C	D
		B		

4.1 Financial/economic viability?

	A	Financial/economic sustainability is potentially very good: costs for services and maintenance are covered or affordable; external factors will not change that.
	B	Financial/economic sustainability is likely to be good, but problems might arise namely from changing external economic factors.
C	C	Problems need to be addressed regarding financial sustainability either in terms of institutional or target groups costs or changing economic context.
	D	Financial/economic sustainability is very questionable unless major changes are made.

4.2 What is the level of ownership of the intervention by target groups and will it continue after the end of external support?

	A	The steering committee and other relevant local structures are strongly involved in all stages of implementation and are committed to continue producing and using results.
B	B	Implementation is based in a good part on the steering committee and other relevant local structures, which are also somewhat involved in decision-making. Likelihood of sustainability is good, but there is room for improvement.
	C	The intervention uses mainly ad-hoc arrangements and the steering committee and other relevant local structures to ensure sustainability. Continued results are not guaranteed. Corrective measures are needed.
	D	The intervention depends completely on ad-hoc structures with no prospect of sustainability. Fundamental changes are needed to enable sustainability.

4.3 What is the level of policy support provided and the degree of interaction between intervention and policy level?

	A	Policy and institutions have been highly supportive of intervention and will continue to be so.
B	B	Policy and policy enforcing institutions have been generally supportive, or at least have not hindered the intervention, and are likely to continue to be so.
	C	Intervention sustainability is limited due to lack of policy support. Corrective measures are needed.
	D	Policies have been and likely will be in contradiction with the intervention. Fundamental changes needed to make intervention sustainable.

4.4 How well is the intervention contributing to institutional and management capacity?

	A	Intervention is embedded in institutional structures and has contributed to improve the institutional and management capacity (even if this is not an explicit goal).
B	B	Intervention management is well embedded in institutional structures and has somewhat contributed to capacity building. Additional expertise might be required. Improvements in order to guarantee sustainability are possible.
	C	Intervention relies too much on ad-hoc structures instead of institutions; capacity building has not been sufficient to fully ensure sustainability. Corrective measures are needed.
	D	Intervention is relying on ad hoc and capacity transfer to existing institutions, which could guarantee sustainability, is unlikely unless fundamental changes are undertaken.

3.2 Decisions taken by the steering committee and follow-up

3.2.1 SSU-BE & SSU-IRE

#	Follow Actions of SC #5 (sept 2017)	Responsible	Deadline	Progress	Status & action required
1.	Track progress on gender policy and secure school on a quarterly basis	SSU PMT	Quarterly	SLE consultancy launched	Done
2.	Follow up with Ministry of Finance to receive confirmation on payment of 32m UGX of VAT	MOES PS	ASAP	Letter sent by Belgian Embassy to Ministry of Finance; pending response	Pending, follow required by RR/MOeS with Ministry of Finance / Government of Uganda
3.	Clarify with Ministry of Finance the VAT act amendment for future reference including co-management and own-management	MOES PS	ASAP	zero VAT procedure to be verified in letter from MoFPED; Enabel sent a letter to Secretary of Treasury to ask for explanation of interpretation of Circular shared	Pending: awaiting response of Treasury
4.	Add a representative of the Irish Embassy as a non-voting member & include a voting seat to MOES in the SC (in addition to the chair)	SSU SC	Next SC	Formalised at SC 5 meeting	Done

5.	Follow up on delays in infrastructure via a joint taskforce to investigate mitigating measures to reduce delays (including a move of construction to own management)	Joint Task Force chaired by Education Programme Coordinator, SSU, TTE, CMU, PDU, BTVET)	November 2017	Issue was discussed at BTC level during a backstopping mission from HQ. Joint Task Force meeting took place on 18 January 2017: agreement reached to move to own management; awaiting signature of Minutes	Pending; urgent decision required by SC as tender is pending
6.	Follow up on City & Guilds assessment for VTIs with ongoing programme within MOES	SSU PMT	ASAP	Awaiting final feedback from pilot by ARSDP project. TOR prepared jointly with USDP. Awaiting final OK to launch either in co or own management.	Pending; urgent decision required as tender is pending
7.	Share the investigation report and provide confirmation of the Principal of Nakapiripirit VTI	Commissioner BTVET	End of September 2017	Field visit undertaken (15 Nov. 2017); written confirmation is still pending	Pending
8.	Liaise with Nakapiripirit District to fast track obtaining the land title and agreement on the expansion of land to 7ha	Commissioner BTVET	End of September 2017	Field visit undertaken (15 Nov. 2017); confirmation of land title obtained in December 2017; request for additional land submitted to the district DEC in Nov 2017 who has attributed 4 acres; location to be confirmed and land title pending.	First land title done; 2 nd land title pending; urgent decision needed for construction tender.
9.	Initiate a letter to Ministry of Energy to ensure connection of Nakapiripirit VTI to the	Commissioner BTVET	End of September	Field visit undertaken; awaiting letter to be sent and confirmation	Pending; urgent decision needed for

	electricity grid.		2017	asap.	construction tender (SC to consider plan B)
10.	Implement infrastructure prioritization as per the agreed allocation	SSU & CMU	November 2017	Confirmed at SC5 meeting and integrated in design of 5 VTIs	Done
11.	Convene a meeting to ensure a smooth closure of construction works at UTC Kyema under the IDB project and agree a way forward towards SSU construction works	Assistant Commissioner CMU & Commissioner BTVET	by 1 st week of October 2017	Meeting took place end of 2017; follow up meeting foreseen in Feb 2018	Ongoing
12.	Remove intermediate co-signature for the Assistant Commissioner Accountant	MOES PS	September 2017	BTC/Enabel sent request letter to PS/MOES; response is pending, action is at MOES level	Pending
13.	Adopt the 2 additional VTIs in Karamoja as beneficiaries of SDHR programme and continue to build synergies with the SSU project	SDHR PMT & SC	ASAP	Confirmed at SC5 meeting and integrated in SDHR beneficiary organisations	Done
14.	Facilitate the SDF committee members as per the Public Service Standing Orders.	SSU PMT	Next SDF selection meeting	Confirmed at SC5 meeting and put in action at 2 nd meeting on 28 November 2017	Done
15.	Inform on change in guidelines and invite SDF members to appoint alternate for SDF members	SDF selection committee	Next SDF selection meeting	Announced on Selection Committee meeting on 28 Nov. 2017	Done

16.	Implement budget modification (see above)	SSU PMT	ASAP	Implemented Jan 2018	Done
17.	Provide progress report on recruitment of additional personnel for government VTIs under the SSU project.	Commissioner BTVET	Next SC	Pending confirmation from BTVET	Pending
18.	Provide progress report on 50% private sector representation.	Commissioner BTVET	Next SC	Verified at joint tracking of implementation of USDP-SSU meeting; no update	Pending
19.	Develop tripartite MOUs between VTIs, MOES and SSU	Joint task force, led by Education Programme Coordinator	1 st week of October 2017	File re-submitted to BTVET commissioner.	Pending, urgent to formalize and move ahead with support to VTIs

3.2.2 SSU-EU

Decision				Action			Follow-up
Decision	Identification period (mmm.yy)	Source*	Actor	Action(s)	Resp.	Deadline	Progress
1) Budget for field missions to be clarified	juil-17	SC 2		Implementing partners, EU and OPM will agree on the most suitable way to utilise SPRS-NJ travel budget for Steering Committee visits to the field, field visits for districts, etc. Indicative rates agreed in the forum of the Local Development Partners Group (LDPG) will continue to be applicable as reference for calculating individual expenses.	EU, OPM and ABC		work-in-progress
				<i>Insert a line here</i>			
2) Districts will be more informed on overall implementation	juil-17	SC 2		Regular exchange of progress overviews (e.g. shared with LCS and RDOs).	ABC		Regular meetings at field level. Opening of field office in Arua foreseen for Q4 2017
				Regular reporting tool to share progress with districts	ABC		work-in-progress
				<i>Insert a line here</i>			
3) District Local Government and OPM to assist with streamlining and providing guideline on land renting agreement that can be adopted between the refugees and the host communities where land is not available for the agricultural land.	juil-17	SC 2		land agreement streamlining	OPM, Districts		awaiting feedback
				<i>Insert a line here</i>			
4) Explore the possibility of spreading the project in the hosting community perhaps within the same sub-counties where the refugees are hosted.	juil-17	SC 2		review regional spreading of project	EU, OPM, ABC		spreading to be taking into account at SDF selection committee
				<i>Insert a line here</i>			
5) Issue was also raised regarding the conflict management component and how the local government and police are going to be integrated in this component.	juil-17	SC 2		Consortium initiating a close coordination ongoing between DRC and OPM to agree on the project implementation plan for the conflict management part and this will be implemented soon. This will include closer participation of the police and the local government authorities.	OPM, DRC		in progress
				<i>Insert a line here</i>			

3.3 Updated Logical framework

Updated M&E Monitoring Matrix including all 3 project components (BE, EU, IRE) attached in Excel file format

3.4 MoRe Results at a glance

Logical framework's results or indicators modified in last 12 months?	No
Baseline Report registered on PIT?	Yes
Planning MTR (registration of report)	Planned in POP
Planning ETR (registration of report)	N/A
Backstopping missions since 01/09/2015	Yes, Jan 2017 (EST ETE) and Nov-Dec 2017 (OPS)

3.5 Expenditure for reporting period

See annexed:

- Crystal Expenditure Report (2017)
- Forecast expenditure following period (2018)

3.6 Minutes of Steering Committee meetings

SSU-BE & SSU-IRE:

- **SIGNED MINUTES OF THE 4TH STEERING COMMITTEE HELD ON 15TH FEBRUARY 2017 ARE ATTACHED IN PDF FILE FORMAT**
- **SIGNED MINUTES OF THE 5TH STEERING COMMITTEE HELD ON 13TH SEPTEMBER 2017 ARE ATTACHED IN PDF FILE FORMAT**

SSU- EU:

- **MINUTES OF THE 2ND STEERING COMMITTEE HELD ON 18TH JULY 2017 ARE ATTACHED IN WORD FILE FORMAT**

3.7 Communication resources

- Updated report with overview of communication resources and media activities attached
- Approved Communication & visibility manual for SPRS NU attached

3.8 Updated job descriptions of long-term personnel as of February 2018

- Updated overview of long-term personnel as of Feb 2018 attached