



**Survey to assess Beneficiary Participation and
Accountability under the Second Local
Government Development Programme (LGDP II)
And
Baseline for Local Government Management and
Service Delivery Program (LGMSDP)**

**REPORT ON THE STAKEHOLDERS WORKSHOP
7th MARCH 2008**

Uganda Bureau of Statistics
P.O. Box 7186, Kampala
Tel: 0414 706 000
Fax: 0414 237 553
E-mail: ubos@ubos.org

Introduction

The LGDP II stakeholders' workshop was held on the 7th March 2008 at Grand Imperial Hotel Kampala. The participants included Development Partners, District Chairpersons, Chief Administrative Officers, District Planners, Town Clerks, Chairmen of Urban Councils, Ministry of Local Government Officials and Uganda Bureau of Statistics officials

The purpose of the workshop was to discuss the findings from the Local Government Development Programme II Beneficiary Assessment and Participation Survey that was conducted by Uganda Bureau of Statistics on behalf of the Ministry of Local Government.

Below are the Issues that arose from the workshop participants and the respective actions that have been taken in response to each of them.

Issue:

Describe how during the survey, LGDP II projects were isolated from other interventions

Response:

- A list of LGDP II projects that had been implemented in the selected districts was obtained from ministry of Local government. The field teams used this list to cite examples of projects as interviews were conducted.

Issue:

The stakeholders wanted to know if there is the possibility of having another study in future to determine the trends in beneficiary satisfaction, accountability, and transparency among other issues.

Response:

- It was explained that it is possible to have follow up studies. The sampling methodology catered for the follow-up study.
- In addition, lists of enumeration areas covered by the study have been provided to enable tracking of respondents.

Issue:

To provide baseline data for the Local Government Management and Service Delivery Programme (LGMSDP) in a matrix

Response:

- A matrix of indicators has been provided for in the final report (Chapter 11).

Issue:

To explain why the services are nearer to the people in the new districts compared to the old districts

Response:

- This finding only emerged after analysis of data. The need for this explanation was not evident during the questionnaire design, and as such

no question was included in the interview for purposes of explaining the reason behind this finding.

Issue:

Why not compare the findings between the regions instead of having new and old district comparisons?

Response:

- The three stratum used were based on the fact that the assessment of Local Governments has always considered districts by these groupings. Regional estimates would require four strata; namely Central, Western, Eastern and Northern. This would require a larger overall sample size.
- Responses were bound to vary for these three groupings considering that they received funding under different tranches.

Issue:

To provide evidence of low participation by the people such that the results are not contested

Response:

- This finding emerged after analysis of data. Questions on reasons for low participation were not included during questionnaire design.

Issue:

Explain the contradiction concerning community participation and awareness being rated low while satisfaction is rated high.

Response:

- Satisfaction was only based on those respondents who were aware of LGDP II projects. The few that were aware had high levels of satisfaction and this is presented in the final report (Chapter 8).

Issue:

It is important to establish whether it is really true that 78 percent of respondents were not aware of LGDP II. Some local government officials argued that some people might be aware of the projects funded under LGDP II but may not know the name of the programme. Others may associate the projects with politicians instead of LGDP.

Response:

- The high percentage of respondents not aware of LGDP II funded projects was due to the fact that the question on awareness was meant to derive spontaneous responses from the respondent without citation of any examples of LGDP II projects. However it was established that 73 percent of the respondents were indeed aware that most projects in their communities are funded by the government.

Issue:

Explain why the majority of respondents consider the government as the highest performer in service delivery

Response:

- The reasons why Government was considered as the highest performer in service delivery have been provided in the report (See Chapter 8).

Issue:

The language of the report should give more of a positive picture than being negative. The language used ought to be changed. For example quoting the 33% that were not satisfied instead of the 66% who were satisfied with LGDP II services

Response:

- This has been taken care of in the final report (See whole report).

Issue:

Explain why the village councils were the highest source of information.

Response:

- This finding was as a result of data analysis. A question soliciting reasons village councils were the highest source of information was not included during the questionnaire design because we could not predetermine this outcome

Issue:

Correct the impression that technical officers do not reach the communities as portrayed in the report

Response:

- This has been taken care of in the final report (See Chapter 5).

Issue:

Explain why projects for school desks were reported as the most common LGDP II projects

Response:

- Questions to capture predominance of specific projects were not included in the questionnaires.

Issue:

The data needed to be adequately utilised in the report. UBOS was asked to explain the reasons behind the figures and explain the type of respondents interviewed and why they gave such responses.

Response:

- This has been taken care of in the final report. The reasons behind some figures have been provided for in the report basing on the qualitative information. Information on characteristics and number of respondents interviewed has been provided for in Chapter One.

Issue:

The report was silent on issues regarding; accountability, maintenance, sector specific indicators and the socio-economic characteristics.

Response:

- This has been taken care of in the final report in Chapter 6, Chapter 8 and Chapter 9

Issue:

UBOS was requested to consult the stakeholders as necessary in the process of writing the final report so that they can have an input

Response:

- A meeting with stakeholders from Ministry of Local Government was held in a bid to finalise the report. All necessary comments have been incorporated in the final report.

Issue:

Inconsistencies existed between the Local government guidelines and some of the issues presented. For Example the role of the politicians in decision making and the position of the project management committees in LGDP implementation

Response:

- Inconsistencies arose because UBOS didn't access relevant literature from MOLG during questionnaire design and report writing. UBOS

presented was a finding provided by respondents at both the Lower and Higher Local Government levels.

ATTENDANCE LIST:

No.	NAME	TITLE	ORGANISATION	TEL. CONTACT + EMAIL
DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS				
1	Martin Onyach-Olaa	Urban/Local Government Specialist	World Bank	monyacholaa@worldbank.org
2.	Jenifer Bukokhe	NPO	UNCDF/UNDP	0772452142
3.	Eng. Charles Drazu	Adviser	Embassy of the Kingdom of Netherlands	0414346000 0772949479 charlesdrazu@minbua.nl
4.	Daniel s. Iga	PSM Adviser	Irish Embassy	Daniel.iga@dfa.ie
5.	Apollo Timwijukye	PSO	Irish Embassy	Apollo.timwijukye@dfa.ie
LINE MINISTRIES				
6.	Mrs Jane Ekapu	PGO	MGLSD	0772-359220
7.	Katungi David	C/DDP	National Planning Authority	0772-447475
8	Muwonge James	Manager SES	UBOS	0772407860
9	Angela Kiconco	Statistician	UBOS	0712457975
10	Mugole Emmanuel	Researcher	UBOS	0772457975
11	Ntale P S	Senior statistician	UBOS	0772462457
12	Lutaaya Jane Rose	Researcher M& E	UBOS	0712890167
13	Kibira Simon	Statistician	UBOS	0712983275
14	Katikajiira Hamidu	Statistician	UBOS	0772482004
15	Bateesa Kenneth	Researcher	UBOS	0772447819
16	Okua Bob	Researcher	UBOS	0772409671
17	Rutonguhe G	Senior Off. Stat. Coordination	UBOS	0712034764
18	Mukulu Andrew	DPSS	UBOS	0772407923
19	Kalibbala	Senior Statistician	UBOS	0772487049
20	Wasswa Hassan	Statistician	UBOS	0772892285
DISTRICT CHAIRMAN				
21	Semanda Moses	Sec/Finance	Lyantonde District LG	0772442138

	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS			
22	Mubiru P	CAO	Nakasongola	0772470843
23	Bbaale J C	D/CAO	Masaka DLG	0772386040
24	Naika W R	D/CAO	Mayuge DLG	0772498942
25	Batemyetto Jacob	PAS for CAO	Mityana DLG	0714941756
	DISTRICT PLANNERS			
26	Kasumba Stephen	D/Planner	Wakiso	0772606269
27	Mubiru Nathan	D/Planner	Jinja	0772586258
28	Birigenda Peter	D/Planner	Mukono	0772464554
29	Kabanda Peter	D/Planner	Kayunga	0772427430
30	Asiimwe K Ruth	D/Planner	Lyantonde	0772605632
	TOWN CLERKS			
31	Kyangwa Mercy	Sen/Planner	Jinja Municipality	0772518903
	CHAIRMEN/ URBAN COUNCILS			
32	Tumwesigye	Chairman	Lugazi TC	0772430392
33	Muyanga John S	Chairman	Mukono T/C	0772601090
	MINISTRY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT			
34	Amule Samuel	C/LAI	MOLG	0712456290
35	Kasule Mukasa Paul	C/PST	MOLG	0772445418
36	Imagara Elizabeth	PPA	MOLG	0712810524
37	Anthony Mwanje Kintu	Consultant	MOLG	0772644546
38	Wright Charles	TA	MOLG	078257146
39	Keera Sylvia	MES	MOLG	0414232471
40	Kaggwa Catherine	Sec	MOLG	0414232741
41	Ssentongo Charles	Driver/ PST	MOLG	0414232741