



Icelandic CSO Evaluation: ICA Support in Uganda

Final report

Cecilia M Ljungman

With contributions from:

Bjarni Gíslason

Selma Sif Ísfeld Óskarsdóttir

8 January 2018

Contents

- Contents 1**
- Abbreviations and acronyms 3**
- Executive Summary 4**
- 1. Introduction 7**
 - 1.1 Development assistance through Icelandic civil society 7
 - 1.2 Icelandic CSO evaluation 7
 - 1.3 ICA..... 8
 - 1.4 Evaluation process and methodology 8
 - 1.5 Limitations 9
- 2. The project..... 10**
- 3. Outcomes and impact..... 13**
 - 3.1 Behavioural and attitudinal changes 15
 - 3.2 Contributing factors..... 16
 - 3.3 Constraining factors..... 17
- 4. Efficiency and organisational effectiveness 19**
 - 4.1 Timeliness 19
 - 4.2 Cost consciousness..... 19
 - 4.3 Organisational effectiveness..... 19
- 5. Sustainability 21**
 - 5.1 Local ownership..... 21
 - 5.2 Durability..... 21
 - 5.3 Relations with local government 21
 - 5.4 Organisational sustainability 22
- 6. Relevance of the project..... 23**
 - 6.1 Needs of the target population..... 23
 - 6.2 Relevance to Icelandic development policies 23
- 7. Relevance and added value of support through ICA 25**
- 8. Conclusions and Recommendations..... 27**
 - 8.1 Conclusions 27

8.2	Recommendations	28
Annex 1 –	Evaluation Framework - ICA - Ethiopia and Uganda	30
Annex 2 –	List of persons met	37
Annex 3 –	Documents reviewed	38

Abbreviations and acronyms

ART	Antiretroviral Therapy
CIA	Children in Africa
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
ICA	Icelandic Church Aid
ICEIDA	Iceland International Development Agency
IceCross	Icelandic Red Cross
LWF	Lutheran World Federation
MFA	Ministry for Foreign Affairs
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
RACOBABO	Rural Action Community Based Organisation
SÍMAH	Association of Icelandic NGOs that work in development cooperation and humanitarian assistance
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNU-GEST	United Nations University Gender Equality Studies Training Programme
UNU-LRT	United Nations University Land Restoration Training Programme

Executive Summary

ICA has provided support to the Rural Action Community Based Organisation (RACOBABO), since 2007. RACOBABO is since 2008 a local civil society organisation based in Rakai, established as an offshoot of the Lutheran World Federation (LWF) project whose main goal was to reduce the incidence of HIV/AIDS transmission and mitigate the social impact of AIDS. RACOBABO operates in central Uganda (districts of Lyantonde, Rakai, Sembabule and Mityana).

RACOBABO's mission is "to promote human rights of the most vulnerable people through community empowerment, engaging duty bearers and advocacy for accountability and quality services in the targeted districts". It is a member of the ACT Alliance, Uganda Forum, which is comprised of both international and national ecumenical CSOs. RACOBABO has around half a dozen international donors at any one time and has also raised money from local donors. ICA has been one of its most steadfast donors.

The support from ICA has concentrated on constructing houses, providing basic sanitary facilities (water tanks, latrines, kitchens, and household items) for the most vulnerable AIDS-affected households. When funding has allowed, RACOBABO has also contributed goats, chickens, and seeds. Importantly, with funding from its other donors, RACOBABO supported the same families through e.g. voluntary AIDS counsellors, advocacy towards local government agencies, and village savings and loans schemes. Thus, the total support from RACOBABO to households has been more holistic than what has been covered by the ICA contribution.

The context of the districts that RACOBABO works in is one in which the exceptionally high prevalence of HIV/AIDS has torn the social fabric through morbidity, death, and abandonment. Food insecurity is high, poverty levels above the national average, water shortages are experienced during the dry season; and there is poor education and health service delivery.

By providing decent standard housing, latrines of good quality, and access to clean water next to the home; RACOBABO has provided safety, protection, healthier living conditions, better hygiene, and saved time for severely vulnerable families. The difference to their lives that the target group experiences has been extraordinary – giving families dignity, hope, and respect from members of the community from which they had previously been excluded.

Due to their circumstances, for many families there is a limit to what can be expected in terms of self-help or their ability to leverage the support from RACOBABO as a stepping stone to improving their lives further, since merely coping is a considerable feat for them. Thus, while the support has pulled the households out of extreme destitution, allowing them to survive, several remain highly impoverished and food insecure. Within these families, adolescent girls seem to be most at risk.

For another group of families, the support has improved their situation enough to scrape by –

they engage in more productive economic activities, produce more food, participate in saving and loans schemes, and so on. Then there is a small number of households that are succeeding and becoming leading figures in their community. These successes are not easily replicable as the exceptional mettle of the individuals in question is one of the underlying elements. However, in addition to the project support, an important contributing factor has been the support RACOBABO has provided outside of the ICA-funded project – in particular psycho-social counsellors, but also saving and loans schemes, agricultural support, and advocacy – all which the Icelandic funds have inadvertently leveraged, resulting in a more holistic support to the households.

RACOBABO has been highly relevant and responsive to needs. In relation to Iceland's policy, RACOBABO has been particularly strong in targeting the very poor and most marginalised people. It has also been apt at fostering local ownership and working competently with the local authorities. To a good but comparably lesser extent, RACOBABO's project has also been relevant to the Icelandic priorities of environmental sustainability, gender equality, human rights, and human rights principles.

Sustainability in terms of the durability of infrastructure support (houses, kitchens, latrines, and water tanks) is high. These have been made with due regard for quality. In terms of the future welfare of the households, the prospects are uncertain. The HIV/AIDS counsellors are committed but their capacity is limited and they are also not well off. The local authorities express strong moral support for the project, but government allocations to assist these types of households are meagre.

RACOBABO is a locally based CSO, with a sizable constituency base in its community. RACOBABO has managed to establish and consolidate itself over these years, growing organisationally and programmatically to become a competent community-based organisation. The staff and leadership are committed and proficient at implementing the support. It has a high standing in the community, is much appreciated by the local authorities, and enjoys a good relationship with ICA.

RACOBABO was one of several LWF projects that became "indigenised" as a local CSO. RACOBABO, however, is the only organisation that has managed the transition well and is still a functioning organisation. RACOBABO is, nevertheless, constrained by a fragmented resource base, consisting of short-term project funds with many donors that each support a sliver of its work. This undermines its ability to apply a consolidated and strategic approach in line with its theory of change and resulting priorities.

If ICA and MFA are serious about strengthening civil society in developing countries, it will be important to encompass organisational strengthening and longer-term programme support to CSOs in developing countries. RACOBABO and ICA have been partners for ten years. Building on this long history, it would seem suitable for the two organisations to **take the relationship to the next level**, basing the support on a broader strategic vision for change in the communities in which RACOBABO works, and supporting RACOBABO in its development

as an organisation. This will require a comprehensive dialogue among the parties to determine the shape, content, and form for a closer partnership. RACOBAAO and ICA need to be on the same page when it comes to a series of issues such as a theory of change, strategic priorities, programmatic areas, prioritise approaches, RACOBAAO's organisational development priorities, mechanisms to mitigate financial risk, etc.

Since many of the other organisations supporting RACOBAAO over the years have been ACT Alliance members, it would seem that there is an opportunity for ICA to join up with other "friends of RACOBAAO" that could provide more strategic support in an organisationally empowering way. The Nordic Lutheran organisations, which also are bound by Nordic government development policies to support the strengthening of civil society, would seem like suitable partners in such a venture.

1. Introduction

1.1 DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE THROUGH ICELANDIC CIVIL SOCIETY

Icelandic Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) constitute a channel for Icelandic development cooperation and humanitarian assistance. Icelandic development cooperation via CSOs is guided by *Iceland's Strategy for Development Cooperation* (2013) as well as the *CSO Guidelines for Cooperation with Civil Society* (2015, hereinafter referred to as the *CSO Guidelines*).

According to the *CSO Guidelines*, the intent of channeling support via Icelandic CSOs is:

“to utilise the expert knowledge of the organisations, their willingness, ability and social networks to successfully reach Iceland’s developmental objectives. The operations of civil society organisations are suitable to strengthen the grassroots and support democracy in the receiving states, as well as being the grassroots at home and gathering support for their cause and increasing interest among the public in Iceland.”

The principal objective of the civil society support is to contribute to an independent, strong and diverse civil society in low income countries that fights against poverty and safeguards democracy and human rights of poor and marginalised populations.

1.2 ICELANDIC CSO EVALUATION

Iceland’s Ministry for Foreign Affairs (MFA) has commissioned an evaluation of the support to Iceland’s two most internationally active CSOs that also have the largest development cooperation projects – namely, Icelandic Church Aid (ICA) and the Icelandic Red Cross (IceCross). The evaluation has the following purposes:

- Assessment of the performance and results on the ground achieved by four projects in four countries;
- Provide general lessons for MFA’s support to other CSO; and
- Raise the monitoring and evaluation capacity of MFA and the two CSOs by including representatives on the evaluation team and conducting a participatory process.

The four projects selected for evaluation by MFA and the CSOs represent two projects focusing on a few specifically targeted persons/households (Belarus and Uganda) and two community development projects (Malawi and Ethiopia). The projects have all been finalised, and most of them have fed into the design of new initiatives or new phases.

The evaluation is presented in five separate reports, one per project/country and one overall assessment. This evaluation report covers the support to RACOBABO, a CSO that operates in central Uganda.

1.3 ICA

Icelandic Church Aid (ICA) was founded in 1970 by the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Iceland, the National Church to initiate and coordinate relief/development work on behalf of the Icelandic clergy and congregation. It supports people in need in Iceland and abroad, regardless of race, faith, nationality or political ideas.

ICA is an independent foundation within the National Church of Iceland, governed by a council of representatives (63 in 2017) from different regions of the country. Each Parish can appoint its representative to the council of representatives, which in turn selects a three-member board of directors and two proxies, to take responsibility for the daily running of the institution. A director is employed by the board to run the institution with additional staff.

In addition to the support from The Ministry for Foreign Affairs, ICA depends mainly on public contributions for its income. This includes regular supporters – such as members of the clergy and parishes, who pay a certain amount every year – and companies paying for ads in ICA’s newsletter published four times a year. Another means of income is the sale of outdoor candles, the so-called “lights for peace”. The greatest source of income comes from public fundraising campaigns, the largest being at Christmas.

ICA works in Iceland, India, Ethiopia, Uganda and Malawi (ended in 2014).

For its efforts abroad between 2007 and 2017, ICA received a total of ISK 374.400.000 from MFA for the following projects:

- Ethiopia 2008-2017, Jijiga District Food Security and Livelihood Project, ISK 243,700,000.
- Uganda 2007-2014, LWF Rakai (RACOB AO) and Sembabule Community Based Aids projects, Sembabule ISK 38,400,000 Rakai (RACOB AO) ISK 42,700,000, Total 81,100,000.
- Malawi 2007-2012, Chikwawa Sustainable Water Livelihood Project, ISK 49,600,000.

1.4 EVALUATION PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY

To ensure that i) the evaluation gave high utility for all key stakeholders – Icelandic CSOs, MFA’s CSO desk officers, MFA evaluation unit; and ii) that it served as a hands-on learning process for all key stakeholders to build monitoring and evaluation capacity; the evaluation process has been as participatory as possible.

The evaluation team started with a short electronic questionnaire to gauge the expectations, needs and knowledge of the Icelandic stakeholders. This served as input for a workshop with all the stakeholders in Iceland that covered monitoring and evaluation concepts and results based management. At the workshop, the evaluators facilitated the discussion among the stakeholders to enable them to come to similar understanding of the evaluation’s purpose and identify each stakeholder’s expectations and priorities.

The workshop was followed by a full day of collaborative working within two teams – an ICA team and a Red Cross team, each including a staff member from MFA and an evaluator. These teams, with the facilitation of the evaluators, identified and formulated the evaluation questions. Over the course of the following weeks, the teams jointly developed the evaluation frameworks for the project evaluations. This is included in Annex 1.

The teams also undertook document reviews and administered a SWOT survey (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) to the country level implementing partners. The itineraries for the country level visits were devised by the country level partners, in consultation with the evaluation teams.

The team met with a mix of target groups in Uganda including those from earlier and later years; households that were struggling; and those who were coping or coping well (in total fourteen households, or about 20 percent of those assisted). Government officials and voluntary HIV/AIDS counsellors were also interviewed. Discussions were furthermore held with RACOBABO staff. Separate debriefing sessions were held with the RACOBABO team, LWF in Kampala, and staff at the Embassy of Iceland.

The findings and conclusions have been discussed among team members and the report has been jointly developed, although the independent evaluator has had the final say in cases of differences of opinion. The final report has been edited by the evaluator.

1.5 LIMITATIONS

In retrospect, given the findings of the evaluation, it would have been useful for the team to have met with RACOBABO's board or its chairperson as well as some of its other funding partners. Late realisation and time constraints hindered the possibility to arrange this. It will be important for ICA to engage with these going forward.

2. The project

The Rural Action Community Based Organisation (RACOBABO) is a local civil society organisation based in Rakai. It was established in 2008 as an offshoot of a Lutheran World Federation (LWF) project¹ whose main goal was to reduce the incidence of HIV/AIDS transmission and mitigate the social impact of AIDS. The transition was supported by DanChurchAid.

RACOBABO's mission is "to promote human rights of the most vulnerable people through community empowerment, engaging duty bearers and advocacy for accountability and quality services in the targeted districts". It is a member of the ACT Alliance, Uganda Forum which is comprised of both international and national ecumenical CSOs. Last year its institutional funders included the Independent Development Fund, Children In Africa (CIA), PATH, Finn Church Aid, Mildmay, Kindernothilfe, and Evangelical Lutheran Church in America – in addition to ICA. ICA has been one of RACOBABO's most steadfast donors. RACOBABO has also raised money from local donors.

RACOBABO works in the following thematic areas:

- Health i.e. advocacy for promoting quality, availability and accessibility to health services
- Water and sanitation
- Disaster risk reduction and humanitarian assistance
- Human rights protection
- Food security and nutrition
- Household and economic transformation
- Education for orphans and vulnerable children (OVCs)

RACOBABO operates in central Uganda (the districts of Lyantonde, Rakai, Sembabule, and Mityana), which is characterised by:

- High poverty levels that are 67 percent above the national average and 35 percent of the population living below the poverty line – a majority of whom are women and children;²
- Food insecurity;

¹ RACOBABO was one of several projects that became "indigenised" as local CSOs in that period. However, RACOBABO is the only organisation that has managed the transition well and is still a functioning organisation.

² Village Savings and Loans Association Assessment Report 2013.

- Water shortages during the dry season;
- Poor education and health service delivery.

Moreover, the area is considered the epicentre of the AIDS pandemic and other diseases such as malaria. The prevalence of HIV/AIDS is around 12 percent³ – considerably above the national rate that stands at 7.3 percent.⁴ Women aged 15 to 24 are three times more likely to be infected than young men of the same age.

Since AIDS prevalence has been high for several decades, the economic and social fabric of the area has been torn apart: it is not uncommon to find parents, grandparents, uncles, and aunts wiped out, leaving orphans living on their own. Without any relatives to look after them, orphans suffer from abuse, marginalisation, and exclusion. Over 40 percent of child-headed households live in abysmal unhealthy makeshift shelters with limited access to water and poor sanitation. School attendance becomes impossible.

Likewise, widows – mothers, grandmothers and great grandmothers – often HIV-infected, have great difficulties coping. With the loss of economically active household members, there is an increased dependency ratio and reduced labour capacity for agriculturally related activities, leading to food shortages. Indeed, HIV/AIDS typically reduces household production by 40 percent.⁵ The high morbidity and mortality of the most productive work force in the crop and livestock agricultural sub-sectors has furthermore led to loss of farming knowledge and skills and slow adoption of technologies. In addition, AIDS infected and affected individuals and families divert financial and human resources towards medical expenditure rather than investing in agricultural inputs and improved farming technologies.

ICA has provided support to RACOBABO, via LWF Uganda, since 2007. Between 2007 and 2014, the total budget was 66.5 million ISK. For this period, ICEIDA/MFA support amounted to about 42.7 million ISK (64%) and ICA to about 23.8 million ISK (36%). In 2016, ICA used its own funds to support RACOBABO with about 2.6 million ISK and in 2017 3.8 million ISK.

The support has concentrated on constructing houses and providing basic sanitary facilities (water tanks, latrines, kitchens, and household items) for the most vulnerable AIDS-affected households. When funding has allowed, RACOBABO has also contributed goats, chickens, and

³ National Behavioural Health Sero Survey 2011.

⁴ Uganda AIDS survey, 2011.

⁵ UNAIDS report 2001.

seeds. Importantly, through funding from its other donors, RACOB AO has supported the families through e.g. voluntary AIDS counsellors, advocacy towards local government agencies, and village savings and loans schemes. Thus, the total support from RACOB AO has been more holistic than what has been covered by the ICA contribution.

3. Outcomes and impact

RACOBABO's support has made a significant difference for the families that have benefited from it. Housing of decent standard, latrines of good quality, and access to clean water next to the home have provided safety, protection, healthier living conditions, and better hygiene. While there are no hard data, the families and their counsellors maintain that shelter, clean water, and proper latrines have reduced morbidity. They are saving significant amounts of time by having easy and relatively plentiful access to water. Moreover, with the basic needs being met, HIV patients have had improved adherence to antiretroviral therapy (ART). The support has had important psychosocial effects as well. The improved living conditions have allowed families to be better treated, respected, and seen in their communities. They are no longer as marginalised as they were before. The family members say they feel better, are less stressed, and are able to be more productive.

While the support has pulled the households out of extreme destitution, allowing them to survive, visits to the families reveal that many are still highly impoverished and food insecure. This is particularly true of grandmothers heading households, who are suffering from old age and sometimes AIDS and may be physically too weak to grow food or work as a farm labourer. The poverty leads young teenagers to leave the home, in several cases getting pregnant and unloading their children on their mother/grandmother. The team came across several cases of abandonment from husbands, children, and mothers (three mothers among the 14 families visited). These families are reliant on benevolence of neighbours and the volunteer AIDS counsellors.

Box 1: Struggling families – examples

AA is a serious quiet 12 years old. He lives with his grandmother, two siblings and two toddler nephews. His mother died of AIDS after RACOBABO completed their home, in 2011. He lives with his grandmother, who is ill and weak. She cannot take on enough manual labour to earn enough food for the family, even though RACOBABO has also supplied the family with five goats to supplement its income. With no own land to cultivate, she and her family are extremely poor. She is deeply worried how she will manage. Their neighbour, who is a volunteer counsellor and who donated the plot of land upon which their house now stands, sometimes provides them with food and school fees. Right now, AA is attending school, but he can only do so if he gets help to pay the fees. He wants to become a doctor. His (then young) teenage sisters abandoned the household after his mother died. They have returned only to leave babies for his grandmother to look after. They have also snuck into the home to steal from their family food supplies. AA says the biggest change since they got the house is protection from the rain.

BB has a contagious sunny disposition, although neither of her legs functions. She farms her small plot by crawling. She has three sons, allegedly by different men who would not marry woman with disabilities. One of them gave her HIV. She is working hard on the little land she has to send her boys to school and feed them. But it is not enough to cover their basic needs. She is too poor to be part of a saving and loans scheme and she would never be able to afford a solar lamp. She says if she had more land she would work as hard as anyone, tilling it on her hands and knees.

For other households, the support has been enough to improve their economic situation – although they are still barely scraping by. These households are able to grow more food; rear animals (such as goats or chickens donated by RACOBABO or pigs that they have purchased with a loan); engage in saving and loans schemes supported by RACOBABO; and/or take employment. These families still have an insecure income and may not always be able to pay school fees. Nevertheless, their situation has vastly improved since before the support, as shown in Box 2.

Box 2: Coping families - examples

CC has AIDS. She lived with her 8 children in a cramped leaking shelter, destitute and secluded. Often they were sick with fever. Since RACOBABO helped her build a house, she is healthier. She says, "I am a presentable person in the community" and is treated differently by everyone. She became well enough to rent an acre on which she grew beans and maize. She has water, food security and good hygiene. Through a savings and loans scheme she has reared and sold pigs and eventually has been able to buy the small plot that she has farmed. She has not always been able to pay school fees. Some of her teenage children have gone to town to find work.

DD lives with three grandchildren, which her daughter has abandoned. The father comes once in a while to visit, but does not contribute anything. Before she got the house, she was left on her own. No one came to visit. She was lonely. Her counsellor helped her get assistance for a mud and wattle house built by RACOBABO and a water tank in 2007. The kitchen and latrine were built a little later. She says she also received clothes, utensils, lovely bedding, and improved seeds. She was introduced to new vegetables to grow and a saving and loans scheme. She has made enough over the years to buy a solar panel, but at the moment she does not have enough income to repair parts of her house.

Then there are a small number of households that have, in comparison, excelled. The success seems to be partly due to the exceptional mettle of the individuals in question. However, the three succeeding households we met gave extensive credit to the counsellors that helped them get on their feet. The three individuals that are doing well include:

- An orphan head-of-household who managed to put himself through school and embark on a teaching career, as he continues to support his sibling through school;
- An orphan head-of-household who has become a local businessman; and
- A widowed mother living with AIDS who has become an active community leader, activist, and elected local politician.

Their stories are provided in Box 3, overleaf.

Box 3: Families that are managing well - examples

The EE family consists of three brothers and two sisters. They were all young (the youngest were toddlers) when their mother abandoned them after their father died of AIDS. They were living under a leaking thatched covering. Luckily, they had land that they could sell off parts of to pay school fees and buy school supplies and medicines with. RACOBABO assisted with goats and agricultural inputs. The eldest brother was able to complete school and attend university and is now working as teacher in the district. The other children are also completing their schooling.

When their father died of AIDS in 1999, FF and his sister were six and two, respectively. Their overwhelmed mother abandoned them. They were living under some banana leaves. A community counsellor sought help from RACOBABO. When the house was built, FF says things changed immediately. Neighbours started to help them with school fees and food. FF, however, eventually dropped out of school and began to cultivate his family's plot. He managed to get good harvests that allowed him to buy more land. He is now a flourishing businessman with several agricultural plots and is buying real estate in town. Upon hearing of their new house (built in 2007), his mother returned. FF is now married himself and has three children. He lives in a new house that he has constructed for his family. His sister, who has two children and is already a widow, lives in the old house with their mother.

GG's husband has died of AIDS. She was herself bedridden with AIDS and renting accommodation with her three children that she was soon to be evicted from. When she was offered a house from RACOBABO, she saw it mainly as something she would be able to leave behind to her children. But when she moved in she said her dignity was returned to her, she stopped worrying, and felt hope. She enrolled in an ART programme and her health started to improve. She felt inspired to run as a councillor in a local election. When people saw her debating skills, she was elected deputy speaker. She is now running a children's camp, campaigning for people to test themselves for HIV and started a saving and loans group for people living with HIV/AIDS.

3.1 BEHAVIOURAL AND ATTITUDINAL CHANGES

Some of the behavioural changes that the support has contributed to have been of a practical nature. For instance, the assisted families have adopted new household habits with the donations of bedding, utensils, kitchens, and water tanks. They have mostly changed their sanitation practices such as using their latrines instead of open defecation and preparing and storing food in a separate kitchen. The access to close and very clean water has had important time-saving consequences for the families. For many families, it gave the children time to attend school.

The households that the team encountered also all held that they had been transformed psychologically by the support. They say the happiness that they experience has been overwhelming – like winning the lottery, something they could never have imagined in their wildest fantasy. The support has given them dignity, self-esteem, and made them a respected member of the community – from which they had previously been excluded. Some also gained confidence. In some cases, this gave members of the household strength to improve their situation further, by for instance, taking a loan, planting new crops, rearing animals, attending school, and/or enrolling in ART. According to a government official interviewed by the team:

The biggest achievement of this support has been that the families have become part of the community.

In some cases, constructing new houses fostered family reunions. For instance, relatives returned children that had been separated from their surviving parents and siblings. The team also met with a mother that returned after abandoning her children.

The attitudes of some neighbours and community members towards the vulnerable households assisted by the project have changed. They are including these families in community affairs, visiting them, and treating them better.

3.2 CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

A number of aspects have contributed to the changes that RACOBABO has achieved. These are discussed in this section.

First, RACOBABO has been **highly responsive to needs**. It has had discussions with communities, local leaders, government representatives, HIV/AIDS counsellors, and the vulnerable households themselves. As one volunteer HIV/AIDS counsellor stated:

RACOBABO is able to reach the real grassroots and help with what these people really need.

In responding to needs, RACOBABO has developed a set of criteria to identify the neediest households. Feedback from stakeholders suggests that these are applied in a fair way that has withstood pressures from, for instance, political actors. Often the process starts with the RACOBABO volunteer/counsellor finding a family in bad condition, discussing with the village leaders and local authorities about the family's needs and then approaching RACOBABO for support.

Second, RACOBABO's approach to supporting vulnerable households has been **holistic** – even if the Icelandic funding contribution has been more limited in scope. In addition to assisting with shelter, water, and sanitation, RACOBABO tries to promote income generation (e.g. saving and loans schemes); food security, and healthier household practices; provide volunteer counsellors; undertake actions to promote child protection; raise awareness on e.g. health issues, HIV/AIDS, gender based violence; work with education and healthcare providers to improve services; and advocate on behalf of people affected by HIV/AIDS towards local government. Being essentially a community-based organisation is an advantage for this approach.

Third, RACOBABO has fostered **good relations with the local government offices**. Government officials spoke highly of the organisation, had a solid understanding of RACOBABO's different initiatives, and were very pleased with the good communication and working relationship they enjoyed with RACOBABO. RACOBABO always included and drew upon the district offices – in particular the technical engineer – to survey the foundation terrain; verify materials; and monitor the house and water tank construction to ensure quality and correct specifications.

A key part of the support – although not covered by the Icelandic funds – has been the **volunteer HIV/AIDS counsellors**. These people were trained by RACOBABO during the LWF

days. They live in the communities and visit the vulnerable families to counsel them on ARTs, sanitation practices, and advocate on their behalf when they can. While they are better off than the vulnerable families, they are still poor. Nevertheless, the team heard examples of the counsellors providing food, school fees or even plots of land. Most of those the team met with had been counselling 10 to 17 years. They receive no remuneration or per diems and have not attended any training initiatives for many years – although UNICEF donated gumboots to some of them several years ago. They are committed and seem to be driven by being able to make a difference to people in need.

The **quality of the houses** has developed over time. While initially building homes out of mud and wattle (a traditional approach), this proved time-consuming, difficult for contractors to construct, and resulted in less durable houses. Houses were subsequently built out of brick and then brick with plaster. The latter are the most expensive, but also considerably more durable – lasting up to 20 years.

There are also external factors working in RACOB AO's favour – the spread of HIV/AIDS is slowing down and ARTs are more readily available and are prolonging people's lives.

3.3 CONSTRAINING FACTORS

There are a number of factors that affect the project negatively. They include the following:

- RACOB AO is working with the **very poor and marginalised people** of the districts. These people are destitute with very limited opportunities. The context in which RACOB AO works in is one in which HIV/AIDS has **torn the social fabric** through morbidity, death, and abandonment. Coping mechanisms and safety nets in the form of the extended family are not there. The support can therefore not on its own pull the households out of poverty.
- Being as poor as they are, the target group has minimal capacity to claim their rights or **work on advocacy efforts** towards government institutions. While RACOB AO undertakes some advocacy at the local level, this has not been part of the Icelandic support via ICA. There is scope for more work in this area.
- The poverty among the households assisted is severe enough that, as the children reach teenage, they are either forced to seek work elsewhere or abandon their families. Many of the girls **get pregnant or marry early**. There is an opportunity to target girls as they approach adolescence with counselling and support so that they may perhaps avoid early motherhood/marriage and/or HIV.
- The type of support RACOB AO offers can be considered a form of welfare support that a functioning state would be expected to provide. However, the **local government is weak** and much of the funds for decentralised initiatives are managed at the Kampala level.
- RACOB AO's budget for helping the vulnerable households is **not large enough to serve all those in need**. It targets the worst off, but the households must also: i) be logistically reachable with building materials; and, ii) own the land the house is to be built upon or be

donated a plot from a friend or neighbour. This means that there are households in the districts who are potentially even worse off than the ones supported by RACOBABO.

- The households that receive support can sometimes experience **jealousy** from community members who sabotage or steal water. This was particularly common in the earlier years. RACOBABO has tried to address this by encouraging households to share their water with neighbours.
- **Road access** to households can be challenging, particularly during the rainy season. The volunteer counsellors, who visit their clients on foot, often face long walks that are difficult during rainy weather.
- The districts sometimes face too much rain or drought. Both forms of **inclement weather** present obstacles for the project.

4. Efficiency and organisational effectiveness

4.1 TIMELINESS

RACOB AO has for the most part been able to implement the project in a timely manner, reaching targets as expected. Over the years, there have been slight delays as a result of weather conditions and contractors that have not delivered as expected. Planned activities have generally been completed.

4.2 COST CONSCIOUSNESS

The team did not come across evidence of lack of **cost consciousness**. Rather, RACOB AO ensures cost-consciousness through a procurement process that involves collecting proposals – based on construction specifications set by the local government – from three contractors that are presented to a procurement committee. Over the ten years, the cost for each unit has, however, increased, driven by inflation and in particular higher fuel prices.

While RACOB AO has also built cheaper houses (no water tank or separate kitchen) with funds from other donors, once these funders have seen the homes built with Icelandic funds, RACOB AO says they want to build houses of the same standard.

The change to brick and then brick and plaster houses from the original mud and wattle houses has contributed to longer term efficiency – the mud and wattle houses were difficult to procure and took a longer time to build, and last for fewer years – although the material was cheaper.

4.3 ORGANISATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

RACOB AO has a hard-working highly **committed staff**, many of which are from the area. They have acquired important experience, know the communities well, and they are open to new approaches. The leadership is competent, professional and dynamic. The fact that RACOB AO is the only former LWF project that has transitioned into a local CSO and weathered three changes of leadership since it was founded, is a testament to its strength and capacity. While it has consolidated itself, and is exploring ways to grow into new thematic and geographic areas, it is, however, still a young organisation that could benefit from systematic organisational support.

ICA relies on **LWF's fiduciary responsibility** and channels the funds via LWF. For this service, which includes some monitoring and capacity building of LWF's financial administration staff, LWF Uganda takes an overhead of ten percent.

RACOB AO's **communication** with ICA and LWF appears good. It seems that LWF gave RACOB AO space to develop as its own independent organisation with its own donors and governance. Its reporting to ICA is adequate, but could include more on how the ICA supported efforts have been combined with other initiatives (saving and loans schemes, raising capacity in health centre etc.).

RACOBABO has a **board** of two women and four men that are church and business leaders. The most recent member is a HIV/AIDS counsellor that counsels some of the households that have been assisted. The evaluation team did not meet with RACOBABO's board chairperson. The board has received training from PATH. It appears relatively active, exercising its oversight role by undertaking spot monitoring visits in the community and to the RACOBABO office.

RACOBABO is not a membership organisation but has a **grassroots constituency** in the form of an Annual General Assembly, with 70 participants, mostly women from the community. This body elects the board from candidates identified by staff members and former board members. The participants have been invited by RACOBABO (communities are asked to suggest names of relevant people), and are typically involved in the RACOBABO projects in one way another – as HIV/AIDS counsellors, community mobilisers or health workers. RACOBABO has considered the idea of becoming a membership organisation, but has held off on this as similar organisations that have done so have very soon become targets for political operators.

RACOBABO's **resource base** is fragmented. Although it is a small organisation, it handles seven to nine mostly small-scale short-term grants from different donors each year. This constitutes a significant administrative burden for a small organisation, particularly since each organisation requires different forms of reporting. None of the donors have provided core funding – although certain years some donors have supported one-off small-scale core function activities such as staff training, training of the board, and development of a strategic plan.

Short-term project-driven uncoordinated funding is disempowering for a CSO. The risk is high that it ends up doing what donors will fund, rather than following its own strategic vision and priorities. Several of RACOBABO's donors over the years have been Nordic CSOs which are governed by Nordic CSO policies that explicitly promotes strengthening CSOs. Moreover, many of RACOBABO's donors are under the solidarity umbrella of the ACT Alliance, of which RACOBABO is a member through the Uganda Forum. For some of RACOBABO's funding partners to come together and coordinate longer-term core support in line with RACOBABO's strategic plan – including a component for organisational development – would therefore seem both relevant and reasonable.

What has empowered RACOBABO is that after having had its proposal for building its own premises (to reduce running costs) rejected by donors a few years ago, it has since been able to acquire land; raise funds locally; and earn income through selling physical assets to finance the construction of its own office. RACOBABO expects to move in before the end of the year. RACOBABO is also looking into using parts of the grounds and machinery it has acquired from an old LWF project related to vocational training to set up a carpentry business that can generate profit for RACOBABO's benefit.

5. Sustainability

This chapter assesses sustainability in relation factors that affect prospects for sustainability: local ownership, durability of donated assets, relations with the local government, and organisational sustainability.

5.1 LOCAL OWNERSHIP

Local ownership is assured by several aspects of the support. First, the targeted families are involved throughout the whole construction process; granted psychosocial counselling and close follow-up by the volunteer counsellors; and given full ownership of the assets. In some cases, older siblings in households are contracted by the construction company to actually help build the house. Second, RACOB AO undertakes measures to ensure community concurrence. To start off, there are substantial community consultations in the process of selecting vulnerable households – usually the targeted family is so obviously destitute that there is no disapproval. Then contractors are requested to buy as much material as possible from the local community. Of solid quality, the constructions are of a style that are suitable in the given context. Since neighbourly jealousies have on occasion led to vandalism, supported families are encouraged to share their water (from water tanks) with neighbours.

5.2 DURABILITY

The houses, tanks, latrines, and kitchens are mostly still in good condition. Some of the first houses – which were built with wattle and mud – need some maintenance. Families have some possibilities to undertake repairs. Most of the later houses are in good condition. It appears that the earlier beneficiaries have been able to replace utensils.

5.3 RELATIONS WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Local government has been on board throughout the process. As discussed in section 3.2, they are in close dialogue and cooperation with RACOB AO and the communities, providing advice and follow up. RACOB AO also works with local officials in relation to its other activities, such as supporting the health centres and advocating for HIV/AIDS testing.

The government officials interviewed by the team showed knowledge, enthusiasm, and a degree of commitment to RACOB AO's efforts.⁶ They admitted that supporting the vulnerable

⁶ The team was informed that a few former RACOB AO staff have over the years entered politics and won positions within the local government structures.

household should be their responsibility, but they do not have the resources needed. Indeed, a key challenge for sustainability is the weak local government, in part due to the inadequate commitment to decentralisation of resources in Uganda. The capacity of the authorities to follow up and further assist is therefore in practice limited.

Meanwhile, the ability of the target group – people living with HIV and AIDS – to claim their rights is also weak.

5.4 ORGANISATIONAL SUSTAINABILITY

As discussed in Chapter 4, RACOB AO has shown organisational sustainability by being able to transform itself from a LWF project and endure leadership changes. Financially, however, the organisation struggles, with little predictable funding and no core support. It is dependent on several short-term project-related donations, which generally affects sustainability negatively, but at least ensures that not all “eggs are in one basket”. Meanwhile, management has shown creativity and skilled negotiations to acquire access to land and financing to build a new office. The planned income generating carpentry business venture to secure future core funds shows innovation and improves prospects for sustainability.

6. Relevance of the project

This section examines the relevance of the support in relation to the needs of the target population and to the priorities outlined in Iceland's *CSO Guidelines*.

6.1 NEEDS OF THE TARGET POPULATION

RACOBABO's support is highly relevant to the needs of its target group. Community consultations and the participatory process involved in the implementation of the support have further ensured relevance. During the course of implementation, RACOBABO has also modified the way the support has been implemented according to needs, to improve relevance. Good and regular communication with the target group and close monitoring by counsellors has also ensured relevance.

The support provides very basic needs to destitute and vulnerable households– shelter, water, hygiene, safety, and psychosocial well-being. It is making an important difference to health and facilitating and indirectly promoting the right to education. These needs are a prerequisite for the people to survive and cope.

6.2 RELEVANCE TO ICELANDIC DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

The principal objective of development support through Icelandic civil society organisations is to contribute to an independent, **strong and diverse civil society** in low income countries that **fight against poverty** in its various forms. The support furthermore aims to support civil society in safeguarding democracy and the human rights of impoverished and marginalised populations. The Icelandic *CSO Guidelines* highlight income generation, provision of basic services, capacity building, and advocacy as means to reduce poverty and realise human rights. In addition, the *CSO Guidelines* confirm the importance of promoting **gender equality** and **environmental sustainability** – key priorities areas in the Icelandic development cooperation strategy; draws attention to the **human rights principles** – non-discrimination, participation, accountability and transparency; and raise the importance of **local ownership**.

The extent to which the project is relevant to the Icelandic *CSO Guidelines* is discussed below:

Poverty reduction: The support is strongly guided by the aim of addressing the needs of the most poor, vulnerable, and marginalised people in the communities it works in. RACOBABO applies a set of criteria to identify the neediest households.

Strengthening civil society: The support was not granted to RACOBABO with the intention to strengthening civil society since this did not become an Icelandic priority until recently. However, having worked with RACOBABO since it was founded, ICA has followed the organisation through its growth and consolidation. At one point, ICA was considering supporting RACOBABO's institutional development by providing funds for constructing its own building. This was dropped when ICA failed to secure a grant from MFA.

Given the many years of collaboration and the satisfactory work to date, it would seem appropriate to consider support to RACOBABO that allows it to develop institutionally as a civil society organisation.

Gender equality: Vulnerable women are targeted by the support. Here is, however, scope to give special attention to adolescent girls who in discussions seem to be particularly vulnerable. RACOBABO works with young mothers and girls in its efforts to improve health services in the districts. It also has undertaken efforts related to sex workers, gender based violence, and gender stereotypes. It would therefore fit well for it to address adolescent/pre-adolescent girls.

Environmental sustainability: The support is relevant to environmental sustainability in that clean water and sanitation are key components of the support. As part of its wider support, RACOBABO is starting to work with disaster risk reduction.

Local ownership: As discussed in section 5.1, the project strongly promotes local ownership.

Human rights: In recent years, with support from DanChurchAid, RACOBABO is working towards applying a human rights based approach. In terms of the four human rights principles, the team has made the following observations:

- **Participation:** Participation is a central component of RACOBABO's approach, as discussed in section 5.1.
- **Non-discrimination:** The project is strongly guided by the aim of addressing the poorest and most marginalised members of the community.
- **Accountability:** RACOBABO has introduced a complaints handling mechanism through suggestion boxes. The extent these are used and responded to was beyond the scope of the evaluation. The Annual General Forum, in which 70 community members participate, is a structure that promotes accountability towards (and participation of) the community.
- **Transparency:** The process of identifying target households is, according to stakeholders interviewed, fair and open. The budget for each house is shared with the intended beneficiaries and sub-county officials.

7. Relevance and added value of support through ICA

Iceland's *CSO Guidelines* emphasises the importance of utilising “the expert knowledge of the (Icelandic CSOs), their willingness, ability and social networks to successfully reach Iceland's developmental objectives.” It highlights the links that can be made between the grassroots in Iceland with the grassroots in developing countries, through this type of support. To be eligible for support, the Icelandic CSOs must “be able to show that their participation will increase the value of the development cooperation”, not least by contributing towards an Icelandic public that is well-informed through dissemination of information and educational activities about developing countries and development cooperation. The CSOs should also support Iceland's development cooperation through engagement in the country's aid programmes by providing expertise and insights in the country's development discourse.

In relation to ICA's support to Uganda and Ethiopia, ICA is adding value to Iceland's civil society support in the following ways:

Additional funding: Effectively, the MFA funds and ICA's own funds are able to leverage each other to have greater effect. In recent years, the Icelandic contributions to the projects have been 80 percent from the MFA and 20 percent of ICA's own funds.⁷ In recent years, MFA has allowed ICA to spend three percent of the project funds for information dissemination activities, as well as travel costs for monitoring visits; otherwise all of ICA's additional headquarter costs associated with its development cooperation efforts come from its own funds that are external to the joint MFA-ICA contribution to the projects.

Monitoring and administration of the support: ICA monitors the projects and reports back to the MFA regularly. The CSO desk at the MFA is a small unit which does not have the capacity to undertake monitoring and administration of the support in a way that ICA does.

Reduced financial risk: With the addition of ICA's funds and the monitoring support it supplies, MFA reduces the financial risk involved in supporting civil society organisations in developing countries. If MFA were to support CSOs directly in developing countries, it is likely it would have to support more established organisations with strong capacity – especially in countries where it does not have an embassy.

Information dissemination and awareness-raising in Iceland: ICA is well known in Ice-

⁷ In 2007-2011, ICA's contribution was as much as 40%, by 2012-2015 it was 30% and from 2016 it has been 20%.

land and has been considered one of the major pillars of Icelandic development cooperation and humanitarian aid for the last decades. A Gallup survey from April 2017 indicates that 89,5 percent of the public knows of ICA. Of five organisations working in development only the Icelandic Red Cross is better known with 96,9 percent.

In its awareness-raising and public education, ICA promotes the collective responsibility for peaceful and prosperous co-existence. It has suggested ways of welcoming newcomers of all faiths to Icelandic society through communal work of parishes all over the country. The bishop of Iceland has conveyed these suggestions to all pastors of the National Church of Iceland. It furthermore provides information on the vision and strategy of Iceland's development cooperation, disseminating the message to schoolchildren, confirmation classes, NGOs, the elderly and to pastors in parishes all over Iceland. Some of its activities include the following:

- Twice a year ICA publishes a 12 page supplement on its work in developing countries in one of the country's biggest newspapers. It is distributed to more than 70,000 households and public places.
- A news magazine (16 pages) is distributed to 6000 households twice a year.
- ICA staff give presentations on their projects and ICA staff are also active in writing media articles on development issues.
- ICA staff engage in active discussions on development with confirmation classes which run throughout the year. For the past 19 years, the confirmation classes have also been involved in fundraising for the ICA development projects and every second year the classes receive a visit from someone from the project area, usually a young individual, to share their experience with the class.
- From its online shop the public can learn about its development activities and can buy the *Gjöf sem gefur*, (the gift that gives) – a donation of the same value as a goat or chicken. This has proven to be popular Icelandic Christmas presents.

Active in the development cooperation community in Iceland: ICA has participated in different development fora:

- It is a member of the Association of Icelandic NGOs that work in development cooperation and humanitarian assistance – SÍMAH.
- It participates in MFA's Development Cooperation Committee.
- It used to participate in the annual week-long public awareness campaign on development issues – *Þróunarsamvinna ber ávöxt* – with former ICEIDA and other Icelandic CSOs, which ended with the merger with the MFA in 2016.

Engaged in international solidarity and international networks: ICA is a member of two transnational church organisations –the Lutheran World Federation and the ACT Alliance. It furthermore engages with the other Nordic Lutheran organisations, which hold annual directors' meetings, collaborate on common strategies, and on occasion make joint statements.

8. Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1 CONCLUSIONS

The context of the districts that RACOBABO works in is one in which HIV/AIDS has torn the social fabric through morbidity, death, and abandonment. Coping mechanisms and safety nets in the form of the extended family are in many cases absent. By providing decent standard housing, latrines of good quality, and access to clean water next to the home, RACOBABO has provided safety, protection, healthier living conditions, better hygiene, and time saving for severely vulnerable families. For these families, the difference they experience to their lives has been extraordinary – giving them dignity, hope, and fostering return as respected members of the community from which they had previously been excluded.

Due to their circumstances, for many families there is a limit to what can be expected in terms of self-help or their ability to leverage the support from RACOBABO, as a stepping stone to improving their lives further, since merely coping is a considerable feat for them. Thus, while the support has pulled the households out of extreme destitution, allowing them to survive; for many families, it has not pulled them out of poverty – they remain highly impoverished and food insecure. Within these families, adolescent girls seem to be most at risk. For others, the support has improved their situation enough to scrape by – engage in more productive economic activities, produce more food, participate in saving and loans schemes, and so on. Then there are a small number of households that are succeeding, becoming leading figures in their community. These successes are not easily replicable as the exceptional mettle of the individuals in question is one of the underlying elements. However, an important contributing factor has been the support RACOBABO has provided outside of the ICA-funded project – in particular psycho-social counsellors, but also saving and loans schemes, agricultural support, and advocacy – all which the Icelandic funds have inadvertently leveraged, resulting in a more holistic support to the households.

RACOBABO has been highly relevant and responsive to needs. In relation to Iceland's policy, RACOBABO has been particularly strong in targeting the very poor and most marginalised people. It has also been apt at fostering local ownership and working competently with the local authorities. To a good but comparably lesser extent, RACOBABO's project has also been relevant to the Icelandic priorities of environmental sustainability, gender equality, human rights, and human rights principles.

Sustainability in terms of the durability of infrastructure support (houses, kitchens, latrines, and water tanks) is high. These have been made with due regard for quality. With regard to the sustainability of the future welfare of the households, the prospects are uncertain. The HIV/AIDS counsellors are committed, but their capacity is limited and they are also not well off. The local authorities express strong moral support for the project, but government allocations to assist these types of households are meagre.

RACOBABO is a locally based CSO, with a sizable constituency base in its community. RACOBABO has managed to establish and consolidate itself over these years, growing organisationally and programmatically to become a competent community-based organisation. The staff and leadership are committed and proficient at implementing the support. It has a high standing in the community, is much appreciated by the local authorities, and enjoys a good relationship with ICA. RACOBABO is, however, constrained by a fragmented resource base, consisting of short-term project funding with many donors that each support a sliver of its work. This undermines its ability to apply a consolidated and strategic approach in line with its theory of change and resulting priorities.

If ICA and MFA are serious about strengthening civil society in developing countries, it will be important to encompass organisational strengthening and longer term programme support to CSOs in developing countries. RACOBABO and ICA have been partners for ten years. Building on this long history, it would seem appropriate for the two organisations to **take the relationship to the next level**, basing the support on a broader strategic vision for change in the communities in which RACOBABO works, and supporting RACOBABO in its development as an organisation. This will require a comprehensive dialogue among the parties to determine the shape, content, and form for a closer partnership. RACOBABO and ICA need to be on the same page when it comes to a series of issues such as a theory of change, strategic priorities, programmatic areas, prioritise approaches, RACOBABO's organisational development priorities, mechanisms to mitigate financial risk, etc.

Since many of the other organisations supporting RACOBABO over the years have been ACT Alliance members, it would seem that there is an opportunity for ICA to join up with other "friends of RACOBABO" that could provide more strategic support in an organisationally empowering way. The Nordic Lutheran organisations, which also are bound to support the strengthening of civil society in line with the different Nordic bilateral development cooperation policies, would seem like suitable partners in such a venture.

8.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation (RACOBABO) 1: RACOBABO should consider how it can work with **pre-pubescent and adolescent girls in the vulnerable families** that it supports. Girls are particularly at risk: they are typically getting pregnant young, leaving in search of work, and/or dropping out of school. They are vulnerable to exploitation and HIV infection. Many of the families encountered suggest a perpetuation of vulnerability, from mother to daughter. With its household support, its other sexual and reproductive health efforts, and its awareness-raising on gender issues, RACOBABO is well placed to particularly target this group in society, which in turn can break the inter-generational cycle of vulnerability.

Recommendation (RACOBABO) 2: RACOBABO could improve its reporting and further enhance its standing by providing **reporting** that shows the intersections of its different projects with different donor funds. Letting its donor partners understand how their funds are leveraging RACOBABO's other efforts to provide a holistic community support would better show how RACOBABO adds value.

Recommendation (RACOBABO and ICA) 3: ICA should consider **supporting RACOBABO in a more strategic way** – based on RACOBABO's own strategic objectives. In this way, ICA's support would not be limited to a slice of RACOBABO's total effort, but rather bolster RACOBABO's work on several fronts, including its organisational consolidation. It would also be concretely contributing to strengthening a part of Uganda's civil society. Before such support can take place, RACOBABO and ICA need to engage in a comprehensive dialogue on priorities, organisational needs, and the form of the partnership. While a longer-term (e.g. three to five year support) should be aimed for, as RACOBABO and ICA figure out its new form of collaboration, starting with bridge funding for one year would be appropriate.

Recommendation (ICA) 4: As one of several Lutheran church organisations supporting RACOBABO, ICA should consider **advocating** among them for joint strategic funding of RACOBABO.

Recommendation (RACOBABO, ICA, MFA) 5: There are potentials for **synergies** between RACOBABO and Iceland's support to Uganda via UNU-GEST and UNU-LRT. First, there is an opportunity for alumni from these programmes to interact with RACOBABO's efforts. There is also an opportunity for RACOBABO to suggest candidates for these training programmes from its own organisation, partners, local government partners, and beyond.

Annex 1 –

Evaluation Framework - ICA - Ethiopia and Uganda

Evaluation Question	Areas of inquiry/indicators	Methods	Potential sources	Comments
Relevance				
<p>1. To what extent is the support relevant to dialogue on and awareness-raising/public education of Iceland development assistance efforts? To what extent does ICA's awareness-raising in Iceland add value to Iceland's development cooperation effort?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What types of information and public education initiatives that ICA has undertaken to inform public? What are the types of constituencies that ICA has tried to reach with information? Has ICA undertaken or been involved in any specific campaigns to raise awareness about development? What have been the costs of these activities? To what extent has ICA participated in different development fora (e.g. CSO networks, meetings with MFA, special development seminars or initiatives in Iceland, fairs, etc.) What evidence is there that the public is well informed about ICA and Icelandic development cooperation? 	<p>Desk based research</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Sample a few confirmation students and/or school students, ICA focal points in congregations</p>	<p>ICA Information material</p> <p>Media clippings</p> <p>Internet</p> <p>ICA Records of meetings, seminars, etc. with public, constituencies, networks, schools</p> <p>ICA</p> <p>External informants</p> <p>MFA</p> <p>completed CSO survey</p>	<p>ICA will need to play a key role in compiling data on the work it has undertaken in this area.</p> <p>The team will not be able to measure the effect of the information efforts on Icelanders but could potentially undertake some very random sampling of members of the public.</p> <p>Beyond scope to look at how the support has built capacity of the CSOs in Iceland</p>
<p>2. To what extent do the CSOs add value as a modality for the Icelandic Development Cooperation?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> What are likely consequences on the programme if the MFA would transfer the funds directly to LWF/RACOBQA? Incl. but not limited to cost effectiveness, quality of monitoring, quality of the project. What are the specific contributions of ICA to the project? 	<p>Interviews</p> <p>Document review</p>	<p>ICA,</p> <p>LWF, RACOBQA</p> <p>ICEIDA representative in Uganda</p> <p>Financial reports</p>	

<p>3. To what extent is the support relevant to the objectives and priorities outlined in Iceland's strategic guidelines for CSO support?</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Strong, diverse, independent civil society in LDCs Capacity of CSOs in LDCs to promote democracy & human rights of poor & marginalised Strengthen the proficiency and ability of Icelandic CSOs <p>Focus areas</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Promote environmental sustainability Promote gender equality Promote human rights principles of transparency, non-discrimination, accountability and participation Promote local own- 	<p>The extent to which the support is contributing to an independent, strong and diverse civil society in low income countries that fights against poverty.</p> <p>The extent to which the support is contributing to civil society's capacity to safeguard democracy and human rights of marginalised people.</p> <p>The extent to which the support is taking into account the specific needs of girls, boys, men and women and marginalised groups.</p> <p>The extent to which the support is promoting environmental sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable farming practices in Ethiopia Energy saving cook stoves Learn about environment Sanitation practices Environment protection activities <p>The extent the support promotes local ownership – see question 6</p> <p>The extent the support promotes human rights principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transparency Participation Accountability Non-discrimination <p>Awareness raising and public education – see question 1</p> <p>The extent the support empowers the Icelandic CSOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides CSOs with opportunities to build capacity in areas such as development cooperation approaches, practices, policies; public ed- 	<p>Documentation analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus group discussions</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Annual reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target groups Community organisations ICA LWF RACOB AO 	<p>The range of issues that are addressed in the policy are broad. There could be a good case to prioritise the policy principles that the evaluation should focus on.</p> <p>There are some unclear aspects in the strategic guidelines. This could be a translation issue. For instance, there are two sets of objectives in different parts of the document. One seems of focus on country level CSOs and the other on objectives for Icelandic CSO support. Moreover, the target group is defined as “civil society in low income countries, especially those who are poor or marginalised.” Those that are poor and marginalised are not civil society,</p>
---	--	--	---	--

<p>ership</p> <p>h. Undertake awareness raising and public education</p> <p>i. Icelandic CSOs are empowered</p> <p>j. Activities of services, income generation, advocacy and capacity building</p>	<p>education and outreach; networking in Iceland and abroad; understanding of country contexts</p> <p>The extent the support addresses the prioritised activities of: Basic services, creation of income, building local capacities, advocacy</p>			<p>unless they are organised in groups.</p>
<p>4. To what extent is the support relevant to the needs and priorities of the target groups?</p>	<p>The extent that target groups have been consulted and been given opportunities to express their needs and priorities</p> <p>The extent the support has taken into consideration the specific needs and priorities of girls, boys men and women, orphans, widows</p> <p>The method for selecting target households</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Direct observation</p> <p>SWOT survey and discussion</p> <p>Focus groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final report • Annual reports • LWF staff • RACOBABO • Village councils, village committees, religious leaders • Women's groups, target populations/ households • District authorities responsible for water and sanitation, health, social services • Site visits 	
Outcome /impacts				
<p>5. What intended, unintended, positive and negative effects has the support had on people, communities and partners?</p>	<p>Water access and availability Jijiga improved</p> <p>Situation changed for women</p> <p>Health of animals improved</p> <p>Food security improved</p> <p>Women's groups</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Direct observation</p> <p>SWOT survey and</p>	<p>Final report</p> <p>Annual reports</p> <p>LWF staff</p> <p>RACOBABO</p>	

	<p>Women more voice, more respect, more influence?</p> <p>Women and girls more aware of their rights? Are they demanding more? Attitude change towards women and girls?</p> <p>Health improvement of communities?</p> <p>Changes for orphans, single guardians –</p> <p>Attitude change vis à vis HIV families</p> <p>Better opportunity for education, livelihood, voice, participation in community,</p> <p>Have they managed to keep and maintain the assets received?</p> <p>Health, nutrition, sanitation practices</p> <p>Income?</p> <p>Gained time efficiency</p> <p>Relations with local authorities</p> <p>Orphan awareness of rights</p> <p>Changed behaviour in relation to HIV risks – nutrition, sexual behaviour</p>	<p>discussion</p> <p>Focus groups</p>	<p>Village leaders, village committees</p> <p>Women's groups, target populations/ households</p> <p>District authorities responsible for water and sanitation and health</p> <p>Site visits</p>	
Effectiveness				
<p>6. To what extent were objectives achieved / will objectives likely be achieved? What factors are contributing/hampering the achievements of results?</p>	<p>The extent that the planned activities and outputs were undertaken according to plan.</p> <p>The extent that the projected numbers and percentages in work plans have been achieved</p> <p>The extent that expected outputs (e.g. access to water, vaccination of livestock, etc.) has led to the expected better health</p> <p>The extent internal factors (organisational issues, human</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Direct observation</p> <p>SWOT survey and discussion</p>	<p>Final report</p> <p>Annual reports</p> <p>Village leaders, village committees</p> <p>Women's groups, target populations/households</p>	

	resources, etc.) and external factors (social, political, environmental, economic/market etc.) are contributing or hampering the achievement of results	Focus groups		
Sustainability				
7. To what extent and how has local ownership been promoted? <i>(note overlap with relevance question related to CSO strategy)</i>	<p>The extent communities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have been consulted • have influenced the project • are engaged in work within the project 	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Direct observation</p> <p>Focus groups</p> <p>SWOT survey and discussion</p>	<p>LWF staff</p> <p>RACOBABO</p> <p>Village leaders, village committees</p> <p>Women's groups, Target populations /households</p>	
8. To what extent and in what ways has the support been supported by local government authorities?	<p>The extent the local authorities have been involved in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning • Implementation • Assessment/follow up <p>The extent local authorities have been supportive in granting permission</p> <p>The extent local authorities are an engaged stakeholder in the exit strategy / post-project follow-through</p> <p>The extent the project is well integrated in local government plans and systems</p>	<p>Interviews</p>	<p>Periodic reports</p> <p>LWF staff</p> <p>Local government officials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water & sanitation - Health - Social services/women, children <p>RACOBABO</p>	
9. To what extent has the support been well integrated with the local social/cultural context?	<p>The frequency and quality of dialogue with different community groups and religious/community leaders. (Women's groups, water committees, village councils, schools, etc.)</p> <p>The frequency and quality of interaction with target groups.</p>	<p>Interviews</p> <p>Direct observation</p> <p>SWOT survey and discussion</p>	<p>Women's groups, target populations/households</p> <p>Village councils, village committees, religious leaders</p> <p>Schools</p> <p>RACOBABO</p>	

	<p>Extent of participation of target groups</p> <p>Extent communities have influenced the planning and implementation</p> <p>Extent community groups are contributing vs hindering the achievement of desired outcomes (e.g. neighbours, leaders, etc.)</p>		Site visits	
10. To what extent are the infrastructure /assets provided by the support still functioning and being maintained?	<p>The extent assets continue to function: e.g. water facilities, sanitation facilities, housing, kitchen assets, farming tools, livestock, nurseries, beehives, improved forage, protected natural resources, seeds</p> <p>The extent to which the assets are being maintained.</p> <p>Availability and affordability of spare parts</p>	<p>Documentation review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Focus groups</p> <p>Direct observation</p>	<p>Periodic reports</p> <p>Site visits</p> <p>Village councils, village committees</p> <p>Women's groups, target populations /households</p> <p>RACOBABO</p>	
Efficiency				
11. What have been the strengths and weaknesses of the dialogue, communications processes and overall relations between the CSO and MFA, and the CSO and country level partners?	<p>Frequency, type and quality of exchanges among the partners</p> <p>Responsiveness and feedback to communication</p> <p>Level of openness, trust and respect among partners</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>SWOT survey & discussion</p>	<p>Periodic reports</p> <p>Correspondence between partners</p> <p>MFA</p> <p>ICA</p> <p>LWF</p> <p>RACOBABO</p>	
12. What have been the strengths and weaknesses of the results based man-	<p>The extent the project results framework is used and revised</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Periodic reports</p>	

<p>agement processes, including monitoring & reporting?</p>	<p>The quality of the project planning process</p> <p>The frequency, content and usefulness of monitoring and reporting activities</p>	<p>SWOT survey & discussion</p>	<p>Work plans, Monitoring plans</p> <p>Interviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MFA • ICA • LWF • RACOB AO 	
<p>13. What factors in the project management/administration have promoted / promotes or hinders efficiency?</p>	<p>ICA/LWF policies and practices that promote/hinder efficiency</p> <p>The extent ICA and partners apply cost conscious approaches/ procurement</p> <p>Effect of geography/logistics on efficiency</p> <p>The extent to which cultural and societal practices have promoted/hindered efficient project implementation</p> <p>Govt rules and regulations that promote/hinder efficiency</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>SWOT survey & discussion</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MFA • ICA • LWF • RACOB AO 	

Annex 2 –

List of persons met

RACOB AO staff

1. Abdulhaq Makumbi Bugembe, Director
2. Vincent Mayega, Head of Programmes
3. Kasozi Lillian, Head of Finance & Administration
4. Sendagire Gordon, Field Assistant
5. Gowan Kalamagi; Monitoring & Evaluation Officer
6. Goretti Namubiru; Accountant
7. Douglas Lubega; Field Officer
8. Robert Kiyaga; Field Officer
9. Nakibuule Teddy; Volunteer
10. Melina Rauscher; Volunteer

Households visited

1. Forkutawo Rwenkoma
2. Kakuba
3. Kamyia Joseph
4. Kengabirano Maria Rhoda
5. Komeza Ronaldj
6. Komugisha Sadres
7. Mbabazi Olivah
8. Nabweteme Jovanis
9. Nakaweesi Harriet
10. Namutawe Rose
11. Nansubuga Harriet
12. Nassazi Getrude
13. Sekabira Joseph
14. Stellan Kacicwamba
15. Unnamed

RACOB AO Volunteers/counsellors

1. Jean Mishabu
2. Jane Ninshaba (17 years' experience),
3. Joram Baryagwa (10 years' experience),
4. Muwonge Charles Katongol (9 years' experience),
5. Lydia Twebingye (10 years' experience),

Local government representatives

Lyantonde District Headquarters

- Deputy Chairperson Joseph Juuko
- District Engineer Francis Xavier Kiwanuka

Kinuuka sub-county Headquarters

- Jackson Serukeera

Rakai District Headquarters

- Chairman Ahmed Mbaziira
- Sub County Chief Lwamaggwa Grace Nakimwero

Annex 3 – Documents reviewed

Uganda	Year			
Budget Sembabule/Rakai	2013-2015			
End of project report Sembabule	2007-2010			
LWF Annual monitoring report Sembabule	2011			
LWF Annual Performance Report Rakai district	2011	2014		
LWF Annual Performance Report Sembabule	2014	2011		
LWF Annual Reports	2008	2009	2010	
LWF Project Document(one for each district)	2007-2009	2013-2015		
LWF Uganda Programme Financial Statements	2014			
RACOB AO Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Welfare Initiative Project	2017			
RACOB AO Advocacy Strategy	2017			
RACOB AO Annual monitoring	2012	2013	2014	
RACOB AO Annual Report	2010			
RACOB AO End of project report Rakai	2007-2010			
RACOB AO Financial statement 2016				
RACOB AO Gender Based Violence Programming Orientation	2017			
RACOB AO Project Plan The Household welfare initiative	2017			
RACOB AO Start Local Activism Presentation - Identifying local activists	2017			
RACOB AO Start Local Activism Strategy	2017			
RACOB AO Start Local Activism Asset Mapping	2017			
RACOB AO Strategy Plan 2015-19	2015			
RACOB AO Wash Project Selection Criteria/Exit Strategies	2014			
Sembabule Criteria and Exit Strategy	2013-2015			
Uganda documents in Icelandic				
Application to MFA Iceland from ICA for WASH Project Rakai	2014			
Contract between MFA and ICA for Rakai Project	2014			
Cover letter for final report	2014			
Cover letter with application	2014			