

The Second Generation Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs II)

The Case of Uganda



African Forum and Network
on Debt and Development

About AFRODAD

AFRODAD Vision

AFRODAD aspires for an equitable and sustainable development process leading to a prosperous Africa.

AFRODAD Mission

To secure policies that will redress the African debt crisis based on a human rights value system.

AFRODAD Objectives include the following:

- 1 To enhance efficient and effective management and use of resources by African governments;
- 2 To secure a paradigm shift in the international socio-economic and political world order to a development process that addresses the needs and aspirations of the majority of the people in the world.
- 3 To facilitate dialogue between civil society and governments on issues related to Debt and development in Africa and elsewhere.

From the vision and the mission statements and from our objectives, it is clear that the Debt crisis, apart from being a political, economic and structural issue, has an intrinsic link to human rights. This forms the guiding philosophy for our work on Debt and the need to have African external debts cancelled for poverty eradication and attainment of social and economic justice. Furthermore, the principle of equity must of necessity apply and in this regard, responsibility of creditors and debtors in the debt crisis should be acknowledged and assumed by the parties. When this is not done, it is a reflection of failure of governance mechanisms at the global level that protect the interests of the weaker nations. The Transparent Arbitration mechanism proposed by AFRODAD as one way of dealing with the debt crisis finds a fundamental basis in this respect.

AFRODAD aspires for an African and global society that is just (equal access to and fair distribution of resources), respects human rights and promotes popular participation as a fundamental right of citizens (Arusha Declaration of 1980). In this light, African society should have the space in the global development arena to generate its own solutions, uphold good values that ensure that its development process is owned and driven by its people and not dominated by markets/profits and international financial institutions.

AFRODAD is governed by a Board of seven people from the five regions of Africa, namely East, Central, West, Southern and the North. The Board meets twice a year. The Secretariat, based in Harare, Zimbabwe, has a staff compliment of Seven programme and five support staff.

The Second Generation Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers

(PRSPs II)

The Case of Uganda

ISBN 978-0-7974-3465-3

EAN 9780797434653

© 2007

All rights reserved to AFRODAD

African Forum and Network on Debt and Development

31 Atkinson Drive, Hillside,
PO Box CY1517, Causeway, Harare, Zimbabwe
Telephone 263 4 778531, 778536 Telefax 263 4 747878

E-Mail afrodad@afrodad.co.zw

Website: www.afrodad.org

Preface

National poverty reduction plans, known in the development community as PRSPs, or Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, have evolved since the late 1990s as key instruments that provide the basis for concessional assistance from the World Bank, IMF, UNDP and other donors. This occasional renaming of PRSP is significant in that the designers of the approach expect that PRSPs are to be country-driven, locally owned and based on broad participatory processes for their design, implementation and monitoring. The expectation is that governments will design and direct poverty reduction strategies for their countries in consultation with local government, civil society and communities. PRSPs despite their shortcomings have been adopted in a number of countries as country development programmes, around which donor support is anchored.

The rationale for adopting Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSs) as a key instrument for achieving the MDGs is clear. PRSs provide an opportunity for policymakers to formulate coherent, focused strategies and policy measures to address issues of national priority; including the achievement of the MDGs. African countries have achieved varying degrees of alignment of their PRSs to the MDGs. Drawing on case studies undertaken by the AFRODAD, this report on Uganda highlights the opportunities and challenges associated with Uganda's second PRSP and how it aligns to the MDGs and other development initiatives.

AFRODAD has embarked on studying the second generation PRSPs as a follow-up to its earlier work in 10 Sub-Saharan Africa countries on the first generation of PRSPs. This study on Uganda examines the particular challenges and opportunities -especially participation, poverty diagnosis, content, public expenditure management, and capacity issues and donor behaviour. -confronting countries that are formulating and implementing their 'second generation' PRSPs. While there is clearly an element of continuity in the technical, institutional and political context confronting the second generation of PRSPs, they also differs from the first in a number of respects: one of which is the way the various stakeholders- government, donor and civil society organizations- have been geared and prepared to engage with the process after the first PRSPs shortfalls. This case study thus aims to make a contribution to the debate on the relevance of the PRSP approach to sustainable development in Africa and elsewhere in the developing world.

To improve ownership, leadership and accountability, the study among other things recommends genuine representation of stakeholders and improved quality of their participation in the design, formulation, implementation and monitoring of national development strategies by building and enhancing technical capacity for policy design, decision making, implementation and monitoring. It further calls for improved accountability to parliaments and the citizenry in the spirit of strengthening domestic accountability.



Charles Mutasa

Executive Director

AFRODAD

Acknowledgements

AFRODAD wishes to acknowledge their great debt of gratitude to Basil Kandyomunda of Development Options team for investing considerable time and effort in the research process of this report. Many thanks also goes to those in the Ugandan government, civil society, the UN family, international financial institutions, donor community and private sector who contributed to the research outcome through interviews or responding to questionnaires. We also remained indebted to Dr. Nancy Dubosse for helping in the final edit and proof-reading of this report.

The central support of EED and Oxfam Netherlands was invaluable to the project. The report benefited greatly from the facilitation of Taurai Chiraerae at AFRODAD secretariat. Many thanks to many of our colleagues whom we can not all name but whose input into the national research remains vital to this output.

Table of Contents

1.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
2.0	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	8
3.0	SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PEAP I AND PEAP II	9
3.1	Similarities	9
3.2	Differences	9
3.3	Key Stakeholder Institutions In The Formulation Of The PEAP	12
3.4	Institutional Capacity Gaps And Needs In The Formulation Of The PEAP	12
3.5	Addressing The Institutional Capacity Gaps During The PEAP Revision	14
3.6	Planning Instruments For Stakeholder Participation In The PEAP Processes	15
3.7	Institutionalization Of Government, Cso And Private Sector PEAP Consultation	16
3.8	Monitoring And Evaluation Mechanisms	16
4.0	STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION: CAPACITY ISSUES	17
4.1	Parliament	17
4.2	Civil Society Organizations	17
4.3	Donors	18
5.0	THE LINK BETWEEN THE PRGF AND THE REVISED PEAP	19
6.0	LINKAGE OF THE REVISED PEAP WITH THE MDGS	20
7.0	RECOMMENDATIONS	22
8.0	REFERENCES	23

List of Abbreviations

APIR	Annual PEAP Implementation Review (APIR).
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
FDS	Fiscal Decentralization Strategy
HIPC	Highly Indebted Poor Countries Initiative
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LICS	Low Income Countries
MDRI	Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative
MFPED	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
NIMES	National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy
NPA	National Planning Authority
PAF	Poverty Action Fund
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PPAs	Priority Programme Areas (PPAs)
PSI	Policy Support Instrument
SAPRI	Structural Adjustment Participatory Review Initiative
SEP	Strategic Exports Programme
UPPAP	Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project
WB	The World Bank

1.0 Executive Summary

The study was a review of Uganda's experience with the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) process. It was undertaken over a month's period. The methodology used in the study included both a critical review of literature and interview of selected Government, donor, Parliament, Private Sector and civil society officials.

From the findings it was clear that while both the interim PRSP/Uganda's Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) and the first generation of PEAP were put together rather hurriedly and with limited stakeholder participation, the formulation of the second generation of PEAP involved wider consultations. That said, it was more open and responsive to stakeholder participation than the first generation. Indeed the broad goals of the second generation of the PEAP were expanded to five stakeholder groups, unlike the first generation of PEAP that had only four. A mechanism for assessing the performance of the second generation PEAP was also constituted.

Inherently, however, the PEAP formulation processes are inclined towards the guidance of the donor groups, particularly the IMF and The World Bank. The PRGF and its role in the formulation of the second generation of PEAP in Uganda can be a case in point.

In a nutshell, the formulation process of the PEAP generations in Uganda has become increasingly open and accommodative, to reflect the development aspirations of Ugandans, to a larger extent. The realization of the effectiveness of the second generation of PEAP is expected to be through the Annual PEAP Implementation Review Process.

2.0 Introduction and Background

Uganda, with her drive of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) in the early 1980's, undertook a series of fundamental policies, which charted the development path for Uganda for the 1980s and 90s. Real implementation of SAPs however started in 1987 and by 1995 poverty eradication had emerged as the fundamental goal of the government, hence the decision to make the process of formulating Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) starting with a participatory poverty assessment. Uganda's Poverty Eradication Action Plan was, therefore, a strategic framework action plan for addressing and defining the country's development agenda whose goal was to eradicate poverty by the year 2017.

By definition, therefore, the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) is Uganda's national planning framework guiding and coordinating government/ public investment for poverty eradication. The Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development plays the oversight role for the implementation and revision of Uganda's PEAP. The PEAP is the country's PRSP and Comprehensive Development Framework whose revision is undertaken after every three years.

At the global level, the IMF and World Bank were also reviewing their structural adjustment policies and PRSPs were emerging as a new framework through which these institutions could provide assistance and relief to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries. By coincidence, Uganda's completion of the PEAP came at a time that made it look amenable for piloting the HIPC. As a result, this made Uganda the first country to benefit from such debt relief under the Heavily Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) Initiative. Subsequently, Poverty Action Fund (PAF) was introduced in 1998 to channel resources for priority programs with direct impact on poverty alleviation, mainly using the savings from HIPC.

Without losing sight of public goods for poverty eradication, the PEAP promotes economic efficiency, equity and growth, through emphasis of the private sector as the fulcrum for this realization. This is, for example, reflected in the Medium-Term Competitive Strategy, such as the Strategic Exports Programme (SEP) and the Poverty Action Fund (PAF) programmes which include the Plan for Modernization of Agriculture, Universal Primary Education, water and sanitation, Primary Health Care and rural feeder roads programmes. From this study, nonetheless, the extent to which equity is practically reflected through some of the programmes as highlighted, for example, is highly questionable and seems to be more of a myth than a reality.

However, over the three years of implementation, the operational environment posed new challenges that called for its revision in the year 2000 that included but were not limited to: consolidation of national security, restore sustainable growth in the incomes of the poor, build a strong social and economic infrastructure, enhancing human development through efficient use of public resources.

2.1 Research Objectives and Methodology

This study is meant to give a general background of Uganda's experience and engagement with the PRSPs, while identifying and critically discussing the key similarities and differences in the first generation and second generation PRSPs. It addresses the extent to which institutional capacity needs of the various stakeholders that were not addressed in the first PRSP were addressed by the second generation PRSP, elaborates on the planning instruments of partner governments and that of donors, and identifies the degree of institutionalisation of CSO and private sector consultation. Finally, it is meant to link the formulation of the second generation PRSP with and promotion of the MDGs campaign.

The report is based on information obtained from desk research and interviews. The respondents are listed in Annex 1.

The second Generation PRSP in the case of Uganda is characterised by the 2004/2005 PEAP revision which generated the revised PEAP (PRSP) 2005 - 2008. Likewise, it was also a response to the emerging challenges experienced in the previous PEAP period. In this paper therefore we take the PEAP preparation and revision exercise of 2000 to constitute the first generation PRSP while the 2005 revised PEAP to refer to the second Generation PRSP. However, since the PRSP in Uganda is generically referred to as the PEAP we shall maintain that nomenclature or use them synonymously.

3.0 Similarities and Differences: PEAP I vs PEAP II

3.1 Similarities

Looking at the similarities, both the first and second PEAPs have had their planning framework within the Sector Wide Approaches (SWAPs) and the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF). The SWAPs are about having the entire stakeholder in a given sector work together to rationalize their contribution. The MTEF is basically about ensuring expenditure estimates to guide planning within the short to medium term. For Uganda, the MTEF is a three-year rolling expenditure plan.

Both the first and second PEAP have a similarity in the name. They are both referred to as Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP), with an explicit focus on poverty reduction, rather than, for example, socio-economic transformation, or prosperity, as was recommended by the CSOs that participated in the formulation of the second PEAP. The wording of the two PEAP generations reflects the multi-stakeholder priorities, but the implementation does not.

Furthermore, while macro-economic stability is no longer the dominant pillar to which the rest of the pillars subsume, in the revised PEAP, the macro-economic targets such as inflation and growth, have remained unchanged. Even when those targets have been heavily challenged by stakeholders, the government and the Bretton Woods institutions remain adamant and see these as crucial elements in the development strategy. Subsequently, the macro-economic framework that sets sector ceilings is still not needs-based but largely resource envelope-based.

In relation to the above and like in the first PEAP, the resource allocation section of Uganda's second PEAP still does not reflect the priorities as set in the rest of the document. Budgetary allocations to, for example, the defense sector, statehouse, the presidency and public administration still take the lion's share of the national budget, as compared to, say the agricultural sector. Yet about 80% of Uganda's population obtains its livelihood from the agricultural sector. This is appreciated by the stakeholders that ensured that the sector was strongly reflected upon in the second Generation PEAP, for example that, "...one of the main forms of industrialization will be value-addition by processing agricultural products". In this regard, for both the first and second Generations PEAPs, key ministries perceived by stakeholders as important for Uganda's socio-economic transformation remain non-core, including Agriculture, Trade and Tourism.

Worth noting too, is that both the first and second PEAPs bear similar names of the broad goals or pillars although the latter has one more pillar which was included at the behest of the CSOs.

During their formulation, both PEAPs underwent relatively long consultative processes. This, nonetheless, does not negate the fact that the various participating institutions had different endowments and constraints as will be explained later on.

3.2 Differences

In spite of the similarities noted above, the first and second PEAPs have some key noticeable differences as follows:

3.2.1 Structural Differences

The first PEAP had four pillars or broad goals as follows:

- a) Rapid and sustainable economic growth. This pillar covers the aspects of ensuring macro-economic stability (e.g. control of inflation, limiting public sector spending within the parameters of domestic revenues and external resources; improving resource allocation (e.g. through the Medium Term Expenditure Framework); efficient and equitable taxation; and limiting external debt burden through a favorable and accountable loan contraction and debt management process, with emphasis on the Parliamentary role and taking only highly concessional loans; and private sector support, with good physical, financial and marketing infrastructure.
- b) Good governance and security. Security was basically considered as the presence of an environment in which people's rights and property are protected while governance was the efficient, effective and accountable exercise of political, administrative and managerial authority. Other aspects included democracy and decentralization, transparent and efficient public expenditure, justice, law and order.

- c) Increasing the ability of the poor to raise their incomes. This was largely intentioned towards agriculture and rural development through, cattle restocking, access to land by the poor people, rural financial services, improving rural transport, agricultural advisory services, research and technology. Others included environmental policy and natural resource management, rural electrification and vocational education.
- d) Enhancing the quality of life of the poor. The focus was the poor people, through health care services, primary and secondary education, adult literacy, water and sanitation, housing and domestic energy, family planning and reproductive health.

Therefore, whereas the first PEAP had four pillars, the revised one has five, with no fundamental shift, but classified elaboration of the related sector and, development priorities from the first PEAP. Below are the highlights of the pillars for the second PEAP:

- a) Economic management; looks at financial and macro-economic management, the tax policy, investment and trade policy.
- b) Enhancing production, competitiveness and incomes; with a focus on public expenditure for boosting production, incomes and private sector participation.
- c) Security, conflict resolution and disaster management; looks at security and defense, conflict-resolution, disaster preparedness and aftermath management.
- d) Good governance; with a focus on democracy, human rights, political governance, justice, law and order and public sector management.
- e) Human development; focuses on education and skills development, health, water and sanitation, and social services development.

Furthermore, the second PEAP used more critical nationally obtained information than the first PEAP. For example, while the first PEAP was informed by specific studies commissioned by various stakeholders together with data generated by the first participatory poverty assessments, the second generation PEAP utilized up-to-date findings of the National Census data (2002) and Uganda National Household Survey (2002/3) for quantitative research and evidence. The findings of the second participatory poverty assessment processes that were more analytical and comprehensive (more districts, sites and regions of study) in methodology than the first also provided resourceful qualitative data for the PEAP revision process and formulation of the second PEAP. This particular PEAP even benefited from the experiences of Structural Adjustment Participatory Review Initiative (SAPRI) studies that were undertaken in various African countries, including Uganda.

3.2.2 Content and Qualitative Differences

Comparatively different from the first PEAP, the revised PEAP streamlines the pay procedures between the agencies created by the PRSP modalities and the mainstream public service. The revised PEAP, for example, introduced a single-pine approach to the positions across public service. This was to correct the anomalies in remuneration variations where the public officials under the structures emanating from the first PEAP were earning much more than the previous structures and positions, thus leading to rivalry for positions under the PEAP. In any case, the revised PEAP discourages creation of new public service structures. Rather, it promotes its implementation through the existing structures, to reduce anomalies and a big cost for public administration in Uganda.

Furthermore, whereas the first PEAP placed emphasis on social spending, and funding of the Local Governments by the central government through Conditional Grants, the revised PEAP allows some degree of flexibility and funding priorities of a given Local Government. This is under the Fiscal Decentralization Strategy (FDS). In fact, there was a somewhat ideological re-orientation from over emphasizing the social sector, to striking a balance between social and productive sector spending, in the revised PEAP.

The other key difference is that unlike in the first PEAP, the revised PEAP pays, "more focus on linking public expenditure to the PEAP priorities: PEAP 2004 provides a clear link between the PEAP priorities and public expenditure. A new chapter that focuses on issues of public expenditure and the PEAP implementation has been added" .

Besides, whereas the Sector-Wide Approaches (SWAPs) were prominent, adopted and practiced in the first PEAP, it was basically for some sectors. This made some sectors stronger in performance and others much weaker. Indeed, the revised PEAP, indicates that:

"...the main successes in public expenditure have come from those sectors with strong sectoral approaches, such as health and education, and the main difficulties have arisen in those sectors where the sectoral approach is weak. For this reason, Government will ensure that in the next two years all remaining sectors adopt a sector-wide approach in which the sector as a whole prioritises its activities and allocates resources accordingly" .

Additionally, the revised PEAP is more functional. As a point of departure from the previous PEAP, the current or revised PEAP places emphasis on the grouping based on the functional implementation of related sectors under a given pillar or broad objective. The value added by this arrangement is that, "In this way the PEAP 2004 is now a document that allows sectors to relate to various parts of the PEAP in the implementation process" . With this kind of grouping, there is an improved rationalisation of pillars.

Furthermore, one other key difference between the two PEAPs is that the revised PEAP is results-oriented and has a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation framework. The PEAP document refers to this framework as the "PEAP Results and Policy Matrix". This provides indicators upon which progress or lack of it is easily assessed. The various stakeholders easily find the area of interest and produce their independent reports on the status of each of the indicators. An example is where some of the national civil society organizations have formed a consortium and sub-divided themselves to focus on their respective areas of interest, to undertake independent verifications and submit reports to the various annual sector reviews.

It should also be noted that, whereas the first PEAP did not strongly provide for the various cross-cutting development issues, the revised PEAP has made such issues part of its central agenda. The formulation of the first PEAP had tendencies of in-built exclusion of some of the existing and cross-cutting policies such as the National Action for Children and the National Gender policy. With a risk of perceiving such policies as independent efforts for poverty reduction, the revised PEAP is cognizant of the need to integrate the several cross-cutting issues that have bearing on the people's livelihoods and impact on the context of the PEAP as a national development framework. Subsequently, such aspects as HIV/AIDS, the environment and gender have been reflected in Uganda's revised PEAP.

Looking at the 1st PEAP and the revised one, it is evident that the previous formulation processes and implementation had funding strong characteristics of direct project and sector support and to Local Governments. The revised PEAP, albeit, lays emphasis on the General Budget Support. This move is expected to allow government be the vanguard of critical budget and expenditure decisions that are a priority for poverty reduction and national development. This can, for example, be illustrated by the fact that a special focus on the Poverty Action Fund (PAF) no longer features prominently in the revised PEAP, but is increasingly being mainstreamed within the PEAP programmes, as PAF General Budget Support. PAF refers to a mechanism established by the Government of Uganda to mobilize savings from debt relief resources of HIPC I and HIPC II, and donors to finance poverty priority areas identified as Priority Programme Areas (PPAs). The government has since the fiscal year 2004/05 integrated project aid and other support into the Medium Term Expenditure Framework budget and expenditure (recurrent and development) ceilings. This is expected to enhance democratic governance, since the spirit of the PRSPs are local ownership, technical competence and participation of various stakeholders.

Other than the content and differences in the formulation process of the first PEAP, it can be said about the revised PEAP that, "The process of consultation in the revision of the PEAP is probably the most detailed since the PEAP 1997 was developed. The PEAP 2004 is based on consultations with very many stakeholders" .

The era of PEAP 1997 marked the introduction of PRSPs as a new framework for their extension of development assistance to the poor developing countries by the Bretton Woods Institutions. Uganda was therefore asked to repackage its PEAP to suit the PRSP framework.

Hence, in a way, the year 2000 saw the first revision of the PEAP to meet the PRSP minimum conditions and this can be termed the first generation of PRSP in Uganda. This epoch therefore marked the first generation PRSP.

3.3 Key Stakeholder Institutions in the Formulation of the PEAP

The PRSP seemingly espouses benevolent principles, which state that the country PRSP should among others be:

- country-driven, promoting national ownership of strategies through broad-based participation of civil society;
- result-oriented and focused on outcomes that will benefit the poor;
- comprehensive in recognizing the multidimensional nature of poverty;
- partnership-oriented, involving coordinated participation of development partners (government, domestic stakeholders, and external donors); and
- based on a long-term perspective for poverty reduction

However, these were not home-grown but came as conditions. The process of generating the PRSP out of the already crafted PEAP was thus an externally driven exercise by the IMF and World Bank through the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MoFPED) and the CSOs associated with the debt relief campaign such as Oxfam and ActionAid.

In Uganda's case, it was also acknowledged that, "Uganda Debt Network (UDN) became the lead agency for civil society participation in the PEAP/PRSP process . UDN was formed in 1996, essentially to champion the campaign for debt cancellation and relief under HIPC Initiative; UDN also played a crucial advocacy engagement role with the donor agencies, Government of Uganda and the International Financial Institutions (IFIs), under the auspices of Jubilee 2000.

Other than debt relief related CSOs, the participation in the formulation of PEAP in Uganda was a domain of the international (e.g. Oxfam (UK), ActionAid International (UK) and VECO Uganda (Belgium) and national level organizations such as Uganda Women's Network and Catholic Medical Bureau. The range of non-finance, non-debt relief stakeholders was fairly limited. This is largely attributed to the fact that the PEAP formulation process was closely linked to the mechanism for utilisation of HIPC debt relief resources.

The donor and other development agencies like UNDP, DFID, IMF and The World Bank were also key in the PEAP formulation process. The World Bank played an emphatic role of ensuring that the Government facilitates a consultative/participatory process for the revision of the interim PEAP and formulation of the PEAP that would conform to the PRSP prescribed framework although they accepted to keep the nomenclature. The MoFPED was the host institution and convener of the PEAP formulation processes.

The private sector institutions, specifically under the umbrella of Uganda Manufacturers Association (UMA) and Private Sector Foundation (PSF) were also key in the formulation of PEAP, but their capacities in effectively influencing the process was equally inadequate as they were still relatively young institutions.

The Local Governments in Uganda, sectors and government departments further played pivotal roles, which was characterized by consultations and submission of their views for the PEAP formulation process.

3.4 Institutional Capacity Gaps and Needs in the Formulation of the PEAP

Right from the mid-1990s, when the process of participatory assessments were being undertaken up to the most recent PEAP revision, evidence on the ground shows a relatively low degree of technical expertise amongst various stakeholders including not only civil society organizations, but also the Government, Parliament and the private sector. For the PPAs, the lead agency (Oxfam, Great Britain) deliberately put resources towards capacity building for participating CSOs.

However, the PEAP formulation required a different level of economic literacy. The PEAP revision, engagement and formulation processes were of a high technical nature, with such jargon as enhanced HIPC and the IMF much-discredited Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility (ESAF) re-named Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF).

It should, however, be noted that on 5 October, 2005, the IMF Executive Board gave a green-light to the establishment of Policy Support Instruments (PSI) for policy support and dialogue for the LICs that neither wanted nor needed financial assistance from the IMF.

Preceding the PSI, was another instrument (in June 2005) called the Policy Support and Signaling in Low-Income Countries. It is noted that, "The IMF used the optimal moment of indebted countries' clamor for debt relief to introduce another domineering policy instrument. The Fund disguised the PSI framework as eligibility for Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF)..." . Clearly, therefore, a number of stakeholders required much more time, research and consultations to grapple with the application of such jargon. Yet WB and Government were quite often hastening the PEAP formulation process, in order for the government to qualify for certain loan facilities and concessions.

The limited capacity of some stakeholders in the technical understanding of certain aspects leading to the formulation of the PEAP resulted into their participation in the process being campaign-driven rather than presenting credible alternative views. This was compounded by the limited staff numbers of the stakeholders to do policy analytical work. The capacities were later enhanced, as discussed in the later sections.

Looking at the private sector institutions (e.g. Uganda Manufacturers Association and Private Sector Foundation) and civil society organizations in Uganda, for example, the questions of which institution was more technically competent and compliant for participating in PEAP formulation processes quite often led to a lead organization and coordination being quite often contested. Other than the above contestation, it was even more cumbersome to isolate and focus on key poverty areas as well as provide response for the utilisation of the required information for the PEAP formulation process. Citing one case, it was clear that though it was not the first time for the CSOs to be involved in influencing policy processes, the PEAP formulation consultations provided for the first time CSOs' deliberate engagement in policy design, planning and formulation.

The CSOs were perceived, by some of the multiple stakeholders like the MoFPED, as becoming champions of service provision as opposed to policy advocacy and engagement. This experience in isolating key critical concerns limited the capacity to occupy the policy space created. Thus, leaving the first PEAP formulation process skewed to the input of the International Financial Institutions (specifically The World Bank and International Monetary Fund).

Furthermore, there was a glaring time-constraint for participation in the first PEAP formulation process. As noted, "The demand to produce a PRSP within three months put Government officials under intermittent pressure from IMF and World Bank staff. This was because Uganda's qualification for the enhanced HIPC hinged on its being able to produce a PRSP in time" . This, therefore, demanded that all stakeholders match this pace with clear articulation and elaboration of their concerns. Coupled with limited staff numbers and policy analysis limitations, there was a significant time constraint for effective engagement.

Also, the stakeholders in the formulation of the first PEAP faced limited capacity to undertake monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the interim PEAP programmes. This would have otherwise provided field-based evidence and experiences of the assessment of the programmes, as to know what was working well and what was not. This would provide a basis for input into the formulation discourses of the first PEAP.

By and large, therefore, it can be said that the various stakeholders, save for the staff members of the IFIs and a few Government officials, had limited understanding of the PRSP processes. This caused limited understanding of the linkages with other knowledge bases and institutions. Not much experience, for example, had been gained from the global civil society on PRSPs and SAPRI, as to digest it for policy engagement in the formulation of Uganda's 1st PEAP.

In addition to the above, there was no optimal information flow amongst all the key stakeholders. This was due to poor reporting and feedback mechanisms to the next level and vice-versa. An example is where e-mails would be sent out for short notice meeting, yet not every stakeholder was technologically up-to-date. This meant that some stakeholders failed to participate at certain levels and contribute to key decision points within the formulation phases of the PEAP. There was a general technological capacity limitation of the various institutions to harmonize even the obtained information for more analytical policy work and engagement.

Other than the institutional capacity limitations of human resources and skills, amidst time constraints, there was a short supply of financial resources. This, therefore, meant that institutional consultation of their constituents was only limited. Likewise commissioning or hiring independent research and analytical processes for informing the formulation of the PEAP was limited in both scope and depth.

3.5 Addressing the Institutional Capacity Gaps During the PEAP Revision

Having learnt from the experiences of engagement during the formulation of the PEAP in 1999 and 2000, the stakeholders prepared accordingly for the formulation of the revised PEAP in Uganda. It should be noted that there was better coordination among the government, donor and other development agencies and other stakeholders with a properly constituted PEAP Revision Steering Committee and other sub committees.

Various other stakeholder groups were better organised and had also technically matured. For instance, the private sector was better constituted in terms of representation, where the Private Sector Foundation took the coordination and convener role for the interests of the private sector in Uganda's revision of the PEAP.

The Local Governments were also more informed and had the technical competence to participate in the PEAP revision process. The Local Governments were better organized institutionally to have a clear, unique voice under the auspices of the Uganda Local Authorities Association and Uganda Urban Authorities Association. These institutions put in place officers responsible to the PEAP revision and formulation activities and submissions.

Likewise, for the CSOs were better coordination under an umbrella organization, the National NGO Forum. However, specific lead organizations were also constituted to mobilize around the various sector working groups and themes for the new PEAP. This provided an avenue for synergy and capacity reinforcement amongst the CSOs with similar orientation, to maximize their technical expertise. It is evident that, CSOs had really taken stock of their capacity limitations and needs and learnt from the formulation of the first PEAP process. To address this challenge, the CSOs borrowed lessons from the Government example and set up their own technical and steering committees to grease/ quicken engagement with other stakeholder institutions and individuals that were central to the efforts of revision of the PEAP.

In any case, the technical expertise and interest of the stakeholders had already been built to comfortable levels for engagement in the processes for revision of the PEAP. The view of the civil society organizations on how their institutional capacity gaps were addressed during the formulation of the second generation of PEAP by is summarized in the following excerpt from the reflections of CSOs on the PEAP revision:

Having participated in the formulation of the original PEAP in 1995-7 and in its first revision in 2000, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) have been eager to be part of the PEAP Revision, 2003. Unlike previous processes, which were seriously constrained by time, the 2003 PEAP revision process was announced in good time giving CSOs time to lay strategies of how to utilize the space provided more productively. Also, this time round CSOs felt better equipped than before to engage on all issues of the PEAP, having become more conversant with the process, the issues at stake, and drawing on their experience in advocacy and monitoring of poverty in general and Poverty Action Fund (PAF) in particular. A lot of experience and knowledge has also been gained through networking with the global civil society on PRSPs and SAPRI.

CSOs have, over time undertaken, commissioned or become aware of in-depth studies on poverty issues. Instead of conducting rushed consultations, they opted to go for depth by drawing on studies already undertaken to deepen their understanding of issues. For example, this CSO input significantly draws on findings of a multi-country participatory assessment of Structural Adjustment undertaken jointly with The World Bank and participating Governments in Uganda and 8 other countries. The Structural Adjustment Participatory Review Initiative (SAPRI) was a four-year process of mobilization, consultation and research. This report also draws on the analytical work done on the conflict in northern Uganda by CSOs for Peace in Northern Uganda (CSOPNU) over the past four years .

Additionally, various stakeholders in the PEAP revision had more time to mobilize financial resources. This facilitated activities with specific areas of focus such as analysis of the first PEAP from a child rights perspective by Uganda Child Rights NGO Network, specific studies by the private sector on Uganda's potential in organic agricultural production for the export market, to inform the consultations on trade and the PEAP and the hindrances to assumptions made about Uganda's private-led sector growth in Uganda and how the role of investment institutions should be re-aligned.

CSOPNU's study of the conflict in Northern Uganda for instance and to a large extent influenced the creation of the fifth pillar on security, conflict resolution and disaster management.

Amongst the government institutions, the capacity gaps were addressed through building better inter-sectoral linkages or delegation to tap into specific knowledge bases within any government institution (e.g. Economic Policy Research Centre for analysis of the macro-economic sector and taxation policies in Uganda). There was also hiring of resource persons to deliver on specific Terms of Reference.

It should be noted that the availability of funding support from institutions like UNDP and other funding agencies further enabled the stakeholders to undertake validation exercises of existing data and information and enlarge the representation. In a similar manner, the PEAP policy areas have to an extent been integrated in other national processes, such as the National Planning Authority development plans, the Medium-Term Competitive Strategy and budget processes, as will be discussed later.

3.6 Planning Instruments for Stakeholder Participation in the PEAP Processes

Even though there is no explicit national policy on institutionalization of participation of stakeholders such as civil society and the private sector, there are various general instruments (policy guidelines, rules and regulations, institutions and legislation) in place for stakeholder participation in the different planning and PEAP processes. The participation of Local Governments is coordinated under the Local Governments Act 1997. The Act provides for the planning processes at the sub-county and district levels where the three-year rolling development plans (budgets and work plans), policies and actions are developed. It is through this format that the participation of Local Governments in PEAP revision and formulation processes is construed. At the national level, the PEAP document is the overarching framework for stakeholder participation, where different shades of opinion are put together for discussion and prioritization.

Meanwhile, there is an increasing reflection on the role of the National Planning Authority (NPA) being acknowledged as key in streamlining planning relationship with other government institutions. The NPA, for example, is key in the coordination of regional planning in Uganda and aligning it with the national development vision of the country. All this is expected to fit into the PEAP framework.

The Budget Act 2001 and Public Finance and Accountability Act 2003 also provide a framework for the management of public expenditure aimed at prudent utilisation of public resources, for effective delivery of the PEAP broad goals.

Article 38 of the 1995 constitution of Uganda provides that every Ugandan has a right to participate in peaceful activities to influence the policy processes in Uganda.

It is the above policy guidelines, rules and regulations, institutions and legislation on which particular planning instruments for the PEAP processes are premised. They inform the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) characterized by indicative planning figures and ceilings, public expenditure reviews, general budget support, Budget Framework Papers, Background to the Budget, etc. All these are aligned with a Local Governments process that feeds into the national budget process, where there is space for consultation and participation (formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation) of the stakeholders in the two processes.

Following the initial development of the PEAP, the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) was put in place in 1992/93. The MTEF is believed to be a key instrument in resource allocation guideline across sectors, seeking to avoid inflation and unplanned budget deficits in line with Government priorities by introducing progressive sector spending ceilings annually. Parallel to this, district plans (related to District MTEF) have been initiated, with the 1997 PEAP guiding the preparation of detailed sector plans.

Under the MTEF, expenditures should have a clear link to the strategic priorities of the PEAP; expenditures are prioritized for those alternatives with highest outcomes. Amongst other things, the MTEF guidelines in Uganda demand that spending should aim at utilizing the existing public structures rather than creating new ones. In-other-words, the MTEF planning modality lays emphasis on cost-benefit analysis, cost-effectiveness analysis, public-private substitution, econometric and participatory methodologies. These processes are key to stakeholder reflection, revision and formulation of the PEAP.

3.7 Institutionalization of Government, CSO and Private Sector PEAP Consultation

3.7.1 Consultations within and among Government Ministries

It is clear that the PEAP revision was by and large a government process. During the formulation, extensive consultative meetings involving the sector departments as well as the Local Governments among and between the line ministries together with the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development as the lead government institution. However, the Local Governments did their own consultations in their own local constituencies such as the opinion leaders, local civil society groups, the private sector and other ordinary citizens. The Local Governments then produced briefing and position papers that were presented and/ or submitted at the various consultative forums.

Likewise, the government ministries ensured preparation of the sector PEAP review briefing and position papers to inform the various consultative forums. Considering the MoFPED as a case in point, its commissioned studies of the Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project (UPPAP) were instrumental in informing the Ministerial position and input into the PEAP. It is such efforts that were harmonized into various positions. The positions then were integrated with the other stakeholders' positions to inform the final shape and production of the revised PEAP.

3.7.2 Civil society organizations and private sector consultations

Through this study, it has been established that the PEAP processes needed the civil society organizations and private sector stakeholder participation perhaps more than they needed the PEAP. The ownership of PEAP was critical and so the government bent over backwards to accommodate CSOs and other stakeholders. Donors also demanded it, given that stakeholder participation was one of the universal tenets of a PRSP process, together with poverty diagnostic studies and technical competences of the state officials. The participation and consultations with the civil society organizations and private sector stakeholders is still not institutionalized by any Government instrument but only through policy statements.

3.8 Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanisms

Various monitoring and evaluation mechanisms have been put in place by the International Financial Institutions, Government and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), over Uganda's second generation of PEAP.

Since public expenditure, through the budget, is one of the key areas for any national development endeavors, a Government-CSOs partnership has been constituted. It is called Partnership for Public Expenditure Monitoring (PPEM). The partnership aims consolidating, harmonizing and standardizing the different monitoring and evaluation tools and indicators that were hitherto being applied by different stakeholders to measure the progress of PEAP implementation in Uganda. The partnership is coordinated through a government department called the Poverty Analysis and Monitoring Unit, housed in the MoFPED.

Further, the Government of Uganda instituted a mechanism where the programme and sector reviews by different stakeholders are reflected upon during the Annual PEAP Implementation Review (APIR). The APIR informs the broader National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (NIMES). The NIMES is coordinated in the Office of the Prime Minister OPM). OPM is the overall coordinator of Government business in Uganda.

The IFIs, instituted monitoring and evaluation mechanisms that mainly focus on the macro-economic performance and status of Uganda. This is against the background that Uganda's PEAP is about 40% donor-supported (loans, grants and technical assistance). Keen in this area are the Brettonwoods institutions of IMF and WB. The actions of the WB are mainly guided by the policy recommendations and opinion of the IMF. For Uganda, the IMF instituted a Policy Support Instrument. Under the instrument the IMF undertakes bi-annual reviews with the Government, to ensure government's compliance to agreed upon macro-economic (financial) policies and actions. The monitoring and evaluation mechanisms of the IFIs, nonetheless, tend to involve government, disregarding other stakeholders such as the civil society groups and the media.

4.0 Stakeholder Participation: Capacity Issues

4.1 Parliament

The contribution of parliament was basically through making comments on the draft PEAP document during the various parliamentary workshops on PEAP 2004/05-2007/08. In reality though, the contribution of Parliament was limited, on the pretext that the PEAP document would still come before Parliamentarians for final approval, by which time it is a fait accompli.

However, the Parliament should have a bigger role to play. The role of Parliament would be to relate Sector Policy Statements to the PEAP. This would make the sectors very critical in establishing mechanisms and examining the extent to which sector investment plans are aligned to the PEAP objectives. Parliament also by law (e.g. the Public Finance and Accountability Act, 2003) has got a supervisory role over the executive arm of Government and ensuring accountability and prudent utilization of public resources. These are crucial areas for the successful implementation of the PEAP programmes.

4.2 Civil Society Organizations

An analysis of the impact of CSOs' participation in the PEAP revision process gives interesting revelations. The CSOs' contribution was by way of producing individual inputs and direct participation in the Sector Working Groups (SWGs) instituted by government. There were also joint CSO submissions into the revision of the PEAP. The CSOs produced an alternative PEAP document, "In Search of a New Development Path for Uganda, April 2004".

The CSOs' alternative PEAP document had the following six reconfiguration broad objectives:

- Delivering Quality and Equitable Social Services
- Enhancing Uganda's Productive Capacity
- Ensuring Democratic Governance
- Security, Conflict Reduction and Disaster Management
- Maintenance of a Good Macroeconomic Policy Framework

The above broad objectives of the CSOs' alternative PEAP document provided for such highlights as institutional mechanisms for the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the revised PEAP. The CSOs also asked for enhanced participation of the CSOs, not only in the PEAP formulation processes but also the general policy arena in Uganda, at the Local Governments and national levels.

Other proposals of the CSOs alternative PEAP included: strengthening fiscal transfer mechanisms and strengthening the decentralization process, striking a balance between public expenditure in social and productive sectors; enhancing access to post primary education whilst improving the quality of primary education and motivating facilitators of functional adult literacy. The CSOs PEAP document still provided for avoiding commercialization of water provision, national preference to grants as opposed to loans, with improved aid effectiveness; widening and deepening the financial sector; as well as enhancing productivity of workers.

The various contributions of the CSOs were taken into Uganda's revised PEAP. Integrated into the new PEAP was the renaming of pillars of the PEAP to make it more functional and agreeing on the need to balance social and productive sector spending. Others included were prudent economic management through emphasizing support grants with enhanced quality of spending, recognizing the centrality of agriculture to poverty reduction and national development, encouraging micro-finance institutions to move into remote areas.

Critical to mark on the CSOs contribution to Uganda's revised PEAP was where the Government adopted the whole CSOs proposal for a PEAP pillar on security, conflict resolution and disaster management, coupled with improving public accountability and pursuing the disarmament in Karamoja in the context of regional actions for small arms.

Beyond participation in the formulation of the PEAP, CSOs and the private sector should also be able to participate in the implementation and monitoring.

These institutions can be better organized and coordinated to participate in the processes for effective PEAP implementation. Key on the processes is the Annual PEAP Implementation Review (APIR). The APIR process is one of the operational mechanisms under the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (NIMES), for outcome and evidence-based planning and implementation, to keep PEAP implementation on track. The APIR is basically for informing the stakeholders about the progress being made in implementing the PEAP. It is based on linkages, synergies and complementary endeavour between and among the sectors and pillars. The APIR further informs the process that is coordinating various aspects of Government in the context of NIMES.

The CSOs too can ensure participation in the monitoring and evaluation of PEAP programmes and activities. This will be in the perspective of promoting public accountability and prudent utilisation of public resources. Further, the CSOs can promote civic awareness, given that, "CSOs play a central role in making citizens aware of their rights and responsibilities and preparing them to exercise those rights. They have the expertise, values and ethical underpinnings that can make the PEAP more responsive to the needs, rights and realities of minority groups."

The private sector still can take part in the implementation of PEAP programmes. The private sector can be a service provider in the delivery of PEAP programmes.

4.3 Donors

Various donor agencies provided and attached Technical Advisors to work closely with the sector ministries. DFID, for example worked closely with the MoFPED over the financing of the PEAP revision process. Other donors engaged at sector review meetings to contribute comments to an input into the PEAP formulation process. They did not necessarily operate parallel or consultations exclusive of other sector stakeholders. The UNDP was interested in ensuring that the PEAP document strongly captures and integrates the targets of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), rather than have their parallel articulation by Government. The UNDP made a strong contribution for this cause.

5.0 The Link Between The PRGF and the Revised PEAP

Against the much-discredited Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility (ESAF), the Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF) of the IMF was instituted in 1999. The PRGF was a construed as a concessional facility for low-income countries to provide funding for the "country-owned " poverty reduction strategies. The strategies were adopted in participatory processes involving civil society and development partners, even though the consultations were occasionally characterised by a rush, arising out of donor pressure (IMF and WB) for Uganda to have her PRSP prepared and attracting financial assistance. The strategies were articulated in a Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), for each PRGF-supported program to be consistent with a comprehensive framework for macroeconomic, structural, and social policies that would foster growth and reduce poverty. PRGF loans carry an annual interest rate of 0.5 percent, and are repayable over 10 years with a five-and-a-half-year grace period on principal payments. Uganda's arrangement was approved on September 13, 2002, with \$13.5 million of which, by end of 2003, only \$5 million had been drawn. On December 17, 2003, after completion of Uganda's second review of her economic performance under the three year Poverty Reduction Facility Grant (PRFG) programme approximately \$3 million was disbursed to the country, and Uganda's requests for waivers on non observance of performance criteria, pertaining to accumulation of domestic arrears, the development of a plan to clear those outstanding, and the privatisation of Uganda Development Bank was granted .

The PRGF was designed ostensibly to support the poverty reduction goals of the PRSP by providing Uganda with funds to eliminate trade protections for its domestic textiles and sugar industries, continuing with the privatization of the Ugandan Commercial Bank, eliminating the surcharges on cigarettes and other tobacco products, maintaining a low level of inflation (below 5 percent), staying within the agreed upon allocations in the three-year, revolving Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), and maintaining a reserves level four months' expenditures.

With the ending of the PRGF programme in Uganda, the Policy Support Instrument (PSI), a brand-new facility established by the IMF on October 5, 2005 has been introduced in Uganda. Thus it will have many of the same features as the former PRGF programs, including:

- A macroeconomic framework to guide budget and monetary policy implication;
- A timetable of supporting structural reforms;
- A semi-annual schedule of macroeconomic reviews by the IMF Executive Board; and
- Publication of these reviews, with government approval.

According to the IMF Press Statement (*ibid*), the policies pursued under the PSI will have the same goals as those under the preceding PRGF. The goals focus on promoting sustainable strong growth and poverty reduction. .

From the above analysis, it is clear that the PRGF is the underpinning mechanism not only for the financing of Uganda's first generation of PEAP but also the second generation. As already elaborated upon, the donor conditionality for Uganda to have in place a PRSP before qualifying for and accessing financial support mainly from the International Monetary Fund and The World Bank. The two institutions were the main architects and supervisors for the 1995/7 HIPC Initiative I, 2001 enhanced HIPC and the 2005 Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI). It is little wonder, therefore, that Uganda was a good student in her attempt to apply the PRSP participation and process principles.

6.0 Linkage Of The Revised Peap With The MDGs

With a per capita income of about US\$ 270 in 2005, Life expectancy of about 47 years and population growth at 3.5 percent, one of the highest in the world and Infant and Child (under five) mortality stay at around 80 respectively 138 per 1,000 live births, Uganda remains one of the Low Income Countries (LICs) globally.

Government, development partners and other stakeholders recognise that the Millennium Development Goals have a crucial part to play in reducing poverty and encouraging progress in the developing world. Hence a number of stakeholders ensured that the MDGs are integrated in the development of Uganda's second generation of PEAP. In fact, the second generation of PEAP is strongly reflects the MDGs .

The country's firm commitment to poverty reduction, as spelt out in the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP), Uganda's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, and the World Bank's and other Development Partners' contributions have brought the country to make more progress towards attaining the Millennium Development Goals:

- HIV/AIDS adult prevalence declined significantly over the last decade from about 18 percent in the early 1990s to 6.5 percent in 2005 (However, there have lately been small increases in prevalence rates in Uganda).
- Poverty declined rapidly from 1992 to 2003, as a result of high and broad-based economic growth. The poverty headcount dropped from 56 percent in 1992 to 38 percent in 2003. Poverty, however, remains undisputable high in rural areas and Northern and Eastern Uganda.
- An increase of net enrolment for primary Schooling from a total 62.3 percent in 1992 to 86 percent of girls and 87 percent of boys in 2004.
- Improvement of the gender gap (ratio of girls to boys) in primary and secondary schooling from 93 in 1992 to 99 percent today and from 67 percent in 1997 to 86 percent today, respectively.

Furthermore, and as already noted, UNDP was very much interested in aligning the revised PEAP with the MDGs. The Uganda NGO Forum has made an effort to make a comparative analysis of the two. The table below presents an extract of the comparative analysis mainly in terms of aligning the MDG goals with the PEAP targets.

Table 1: Comparison between the PEAP and MDGS

Millennium Dev't Goal	MDG Target	PEAP Target
1. Eradicate Extreme Poverty and hunger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce by half the proportion of people whose incomes are less than 1US dollar a day (in Uganda this would bring the figure to less than 28% by 2015) ▪ Reduce by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger by 2015 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce the proportion of Ugandans living in absolute poverty to less than 10% by 2017 ▪ No specific comparable target
2. Universal Primary Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure that by 2015, children everywhere, both boys and girls are able to complete a course of primary schooling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Net School Enrollment of 98% attained by 2003
3. Promote Gender Equality and Empower women	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005 and to all levels of education no later than 2015 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The PEAP target is 67% in 2003 and 100% by 2015 ▪ Have more women among key decision makers
4. Reduce Child Mortality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under five mortality rate (i.e. bring U5 mortality to 31/1000 deaths by 2015) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 78/1000 deaths by 2002 and 68/1000 deaths by 2005
5. Improve Maternal Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio (i.e. 31/100,000 deaths by the year 2015) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 354 per 100,000 live births by 2000
6. Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria and other diseases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS ▪ Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ HIV/AIDS incidence at 5% by 2005 ▪ No specific target for malaria
7. Ensure environmental Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources ▪ Reduce by half by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water ▪ Achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by 2020 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 65% and 80% of the rural and urban population respectively have access to clean and safe drinking water by 2005 and 100% by 2015 for both rural and urban populations ▪ 60% of the population have access to improved sanitation by 2004
8. Develop a Global partnership for Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An open, rules-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system. ▪ Address the special needs of developing countries including tariff and quota-free access for these countries' exports; enhanced programme for debt relief for HIPC's and cancellation of official bilateral debt ▪ Deal with the debt problems through national and international measures to make debt levels sustainable ▪ In cooperation with developing countries, develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth ▪ In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries ▪ In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications 	<p>Debt management through non-rash borrowing. Keep debt to exports ratio at 150%</p> <p>A medium term competitive strategy</p> <p>Promoting regional integration</p> <p>A medium term competitive strategy to support private sector led development</p>

7.0 Recommendations

7.1 Participation of the citizens is still generally paid lip-service by government. Government does not fund CSOs to mobilize communities to participate. This is contrary to their Constitutional mandate but also one of the conditions for PRSPs. Government therefore ought to provide adequate funding and ensure that the process of revising the PRSP takes a longer period of time to enable adequate consultations and participation.

7.2 The analysis has shown that the Parliament of Uganda has not participated effectively in the PEAP formulation and implementation processes. Yet the Parliaments are supposed to generate laws that generally direct overall development. Without effective participation, it means that they cannot enact the most relevant laws that can address the needs of the people who are supposed to be the beneficiaries of the PEAP. Parliament should have a committee responsible for the PEAP so that they can provide an alternative centre of power to engage with the executive and the donors.

7.3 In spite of the seemingly increased capacity, effective participation and ability to influence the PEAP demands reasonable competences in understanding macro-economics but boosted with financial resources to undertake research to inform and enable the stakeholders to effectively influence the process. There is therefore need for the various stakeholders to acclimatize themselves with the macro-economic literature and framework. This will enable them to have deeper analytical and advocacy competences so as to make the macro-economic perspectives of the PEAP formulation processes more needs based than simply technical. On implementation, focus should be on fighting corruption, misallocation, misuse and wastage of public resources.

7.4 There is a debate on whether indeed the poor are participating in the PEAP formulation processes. Expert analysis shows in Uganda that most organised groups like CSOs, the private sector groups do not necessarily represent the views of the masses. Civil Society groups are largely limited by the lack of resources. Therefore the PEAP revision is now perceived as an event and as soon as the revision exercise is complete, most CSOs forget about it until the next event. There is need to lobby development partners to channel resources to the CSOs and the private sector groups to continuously mobilize and provide a forum for the masses to voice their demands.

7.5 More effective formulation, monitoring and evaluation of the PEAP processes should lay emphasis on a strong Annual PEAP Implementation Review. The reviews would be based on the PEAP policy and outcome matrix. In terms of process flow, this requires robust baseline data to measure progress or lack of it. The review of the sectors would be the input for the pillar reviews. These reviews would then act as evaluation reports and sources for policy actions for a strong poverty reduction and responsive national development process.

8.0 References

- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Poverty Eradication Action Plan, 2004/05-2007/08, December 2004
- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Poverty Eradication Action Plan, A Summary Version, 2002
- Office of the Prime Minister, Plan for the Annual PEAP Implementation Review (APIR), August 2006
- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Poverty Eradication Action Plan, 2000-2003, 2001
- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Deepening the Understanding of Poverty, 2nd Report of the Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Processes, 2003
- Zie Gariyo, Participatory Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, The PRSP Process in Uganda, Discussion Paper No.5, Dec. 2002
- CSO Revision Liaison Office, In Search of a New Development Path for Uganda, Civil Society input into the 2003/04 PEAP Revision Process, April 2004
- www.prsp/guidelines/participation .
- www.imf.org/press
- www.millenniumdevelopmentgoals
- CSO PEAP Revision Liaison Office, CSOs PARTICIPATION IN THE REVISION OF PEAP 2003/04: What went in, what was left out and why? An analysis of the impact of CSOs' participation in the PEAP revision process, 2004
- ULRIKA BROBACK & STEFAN SJOLANDER, Programme Support and Public Finance Management, A new role for Bilateral donors in Poverty Strategy work, 2001
- AFRODAD, Macro-economic policy options in Sub-Saharan Africa; Linking PRSPs and the Millennium Development Goals, The case of Uganda, April 2006.
- The Republic of Uganda, The Public Finance and Accountability Act, 2003
- The Republic of Uganda, The Budget Act, 2001
- The Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995
- The Local Governments Act, 1997
- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Background to the Budget, For Financial Year 2004/05, 2004
- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Background to the Budget, For Financial Year 2005/06, 2005
- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Background to the Budget, For Financial Year 2006/07, 2006
- Lucy Hayes, Open on Impact? Slow Progress in World Bank and IMF poverty analysis, September 2005
- SAPRIN, Structural Adjustment, Zed Books, London and New York, 2004
- Uganda Debt Network, Uganda Still under IMF grip, in Policy Review Newsletter, vol. 5 Nov/Dec. 2005 Annex 1:

Respondents

1. Dr. Fred Opiyo, Executive Director, Uganda Debt Network
2. Warren Nyamugasira, National Coordinator, National NGO Forum
3. Arthur Larok, Programme Officer, National NGO Forum
4. Behangana John, Secretary General, Urban Authorities Association of Uganda
5. Constantine Baitwayiki, Director, National Planning Authority
6. Katungi David, Regional Coordinator, National Planning Authority
7. Zaa Namuli, Senior Information Scientist, Office of the Prime Minister
8. Maxwell Ogenho, Senior Principal Auditor, Office of the Auditor General
9. Ssentongo Peter, Assistant Commissioner, Office of the Prime Minister
10. Daniel Lukwago, Senior Policy Officer, Uganda Debt Network
11. Moses Isooba, Programme Coordinator, DANIDA
12. Regina Akello, Economics Unit & MDGs liaison office, UNDP
13. Richard Ssewakiryanga, Team Leader, Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Process (UPPAP)
14. Sylvia, Information Officer, Uganda Women's Network
15. Honorable William Okecho, Chairperson Parliamentary Budget Committee, Uganda
16. Honorable Geoffrey Ekanya, Chairperson, the Local Governments Accounts Committee
17. Honorable Nandala Mafabi, Chairperson, Public Accounts Committee
18. Sarah Nakibuuka, Communications Officer, Private Sector Foundation
19. Sam Wanyaka, Parliamentary Budget Office
20. Babale Adam, Economist, Uganda Local Government Finance Commission

