



PARTNERS FOR RESILIENCE

Working together on disasters, climate, ecosystems



The Netherlands
Red Cross



care

Cordaid



Climate
Centre



Wetlands
INTERNATIONAL



In cooperation with
Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken

Annex 8

Country Case Study Uganda

External End Evaluation

Partners for Resilience

2016-2020 programme

Final

25 June 2020

Matthias Deneckere & George Kasumba

By the European Centre for Development Policy Management

ecdpm

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Table of Contents | 0 |
| 1.Introduction | 0 |
| 2.Methodology..... | 0 |
| 3.Overview of the PfR Uganda programme | 1 |
| 3.1. From PfR I to PfR II in Uganda | 1 |
| 4.Programme design, its assumptions and limitations..... | 30 |
| 5.The PfR partnership | 31 |
| 6.Lobby & advocacy and capacity strengthening | 32 |
| Bibliography | 33 |
| Annexes | 34 |
| Annex A – Outcome harvesting process | 34 |
| Annex B - List of interviewees | 54 |

1. Introduction

This report presents the findings and analysis from the evaluation of the PfR II Uganda country case. It is one of five case studies that were requested in the Terms of Reference (ToR) and subsequent exchanges with the PfR Evaluation Management Team (EMT) during the inception phase. The report starts with a short description of the PfR II Uganda country programme, followed by a clustering of findings and judgements along the structure of the evaluation matrix which had been agreed upon with the PfR EMT during the inception phase. The report ends with a section that lists a number of emerging observations and preliminary conclusions from this case. The annex compiles the documents reviewed, the persons interviewed and the results of the outcome harvesting workshop which was conducted at the end of the Uganda country visit. This visit was carried out by Mr George Kasumba, local consultant, and Mr Matthias Deneckere, ECDPM. The Uganda evaluation was supported by desk research conducted by ECDPM staff members Matthias Deneckere and Ashley Neat prior to the country visit.

2. Methodology

Findings and analysis are based on desk research, project document reviews and face-to-face and Skype-based interviews in The Hague. More interviews were conducted during a country visit that took place from 12 to 20 March. During this visit, interviews were conducted with a wide range of PfR partners and IRM stakeholders in Kampala, Uganda, as well as with partners and stakeholders based in different parts of the country where the PfR programme is implemented (Otuke, Soroti, Mbale. Interviewees included PfR project staff, officials from central and district-level government, members of parliament and members of community structures.

Due to the outbreak of the coronavirus pandemic across the world, the country visit faced a number of significant challenges and limitations. First, one member of the evaluation team, Matthias Deneckere, had to leave the country one week earlier due to tightening measures and travel restrictions both in Europe and Africa. This meant that only one evaluation team member (George Kasumba) was able to participate in the visits outside Kampala. This limited capacities to conduct interviews during the second half of the visit. As a consequence, a number of interviews could not take place and had to be conducted after the end of the mission via Skype.

Second, as measures against the spread of the coronavirus also tightened in Uganda, the planned outcome harvesting workshop with PfR team members and beneficiaries, which was foreseen for Thursday 19 March, had to be cancelled. As an alternative, a process for online review and discussion was rolled out. This consisted of a written review of a draft outcome matrix that aimed to capture the main outcomes per trajectory, their significance and the contribution of the PfR programme, followed by a 2-hour Skype call (see Annex A). The Skype call was held with a more limited group consisting of representatives from the main PfR Alliance partners that are leading a trajectory. The videoconference focused on discussing a number of outstanding cross-cutting topics with the purpose of capturing additional perspectives from PfR project staff, while also facilitating learning, also with a view towards a possible continuation of the PfR programme.

3. Overview of the PfR Uganda programme

3.1. From PfR I to PfR II in Uganda

The PfR I programme concentrated on community engagement projects, on climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction. It included action on conducting comprehensive community risk assessments in local communities using participatory assessment tools, livelihood enhancement projects by organising communities in village saving and lending groups, setting up community-managed early warning systems using both scientific and traditional weather and climate forecasts. Moreover, it included the promotion of resilient livelihood practices such as drip irrigation, or commodity diversification, and the establishment of disaster risk preparedness and management committees, wetland management committees, and district multi-stakeholder platforms. Efforts were also deliberated in contributing towards the development of the National Climate Change Policy (2015).

As implementation of PfR I went along, the question on how to upscale programme practices came more explicitly to the fore and lobby and advocacy became a more central element in the programme, laying the ground for PfR II. For instance, PfR started supporting community organisations in the form of community-managed disaster risk reduction committees that played leadership roles in mobilising communities to undertake risk reduction measures. PfR II was also seen as an opportunity to use documentation of PfR I practices that helped to increase community resilience and engage in evidence-based advocacy to promote the practices in district planning and budgeting (e.g. on the use of weather and climate data, capacity building in climate smart agriculture, or the use of village saving and lending associations to help farmers deal with climate shocks).

At the same time, opportunities were identified to influence policies at the national level in relation to climate change, Disaster Risk Reduction and ecosystems management (the review of the National Climate Change policy, the National Disaster Preparedness and Management Policy and Bill, the Draft Wetlands Policy, as well as discussions with PfDRR on the Disaster Policy implementation) and

raised awareness in communities and in district local governments. Yet early experiences already revealed a lack of funds from the national government to engage and a generally limited awareness at the district level on national policies (which had not been disseminated across all districts). Additionally, opportunities were identified in PfR I to influence policies at the district level with some districts supporting the idea of establishing bye-laws on Natural Resource Management, and cross-learning on Natural Resource Management was achieved through district exchange visits. As part of the advocacy, PfR also combined with Africa Climate Change Resilience Alliance (ACCRA) and the government to undertake the study “Tracking, Adaptation and Measuring Development in Uganda: District Climate Change Adaptation Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators” (2014).

In this way, the PfR II programme builds on the legacy of the PfR I programme, but is reoriented towards a core focus on lobby and advocacy. PfR II aims to scale up by linking community-level practice to the level of national policy-making and investment. The design of the programme therefore combines a significant focus on influencing national legislation and policy processes, while also comprising a practice trajectory focused on implementation that backs up lobby and advocacy processes e.g. through showcases. Most PfR Alliance local partners currently working under PfR II were already involved in the identification phase, especially those involved in community engagement projects. PfR local partners at the district levels continued to be involved to deliver on advocating for scaling up good IRM practices and models at the local level and from a practice perspective.

Yet to address the stronger focus on lobby and advocacy at national level, a number of other organisations were attracted to join the PfR Alliance as local partners that have more experience with such activities (e.g. PFCC joined in 2016 because of its closeness to the climate change policy process as a champion in terms of policy-making, oversight, budget appropriations and representation). PfR partners also benefited from a regional advocacy training for PfR countries in the Horn of Africa, led by CARE Netherlands.

In accordance with the IRM approach, communities are put at the centre of the programme, especially by focusing on vulnerable communities (e.g. districts prone to landslides, droughts) or groups of society (e.g. women). In light of Uganda’s ambition to become a Middle-Income Country by 2040, the Uganda country programme also comprises a focus on promoting more risk-proof public and private investments as a separate trajectory.

A note on terminology regarding ‘partners’ and ‘stakeholders’

The PfR II programme heavily relies on working with a range of different actors and building partnerships with stakeholders (governmental actors, civil society organisations, community-based organisations...) to promote the uptake and upscaling of IRM in policy, investments and practice. In doing so, the 5 core PfR member organisations (Netherlands Red Cross, Cordaid, CARE, Wetlands International and the Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre) involve local partner organisations in the PfR programme implementation by engaging in a contractual relationship and are considered to be part of the PfR II Uganda country team (e.g. they participate in PME workshops). The PfR II Uganda programme has involved several local organisations in this way, notably including ECO, the Parliamentary Forum on Climate Change (PFCC), PELUM, SOCADIDO, the Uganda Red Cross Society, FAPAD and EMLI. In this report, the terms **‘PfR Alliance local partners’** or **‘PfR local partners’** are used to refer to this group of contracted organisations, underlining the nature of their involvement with the PfR II programme in the form of a formal contractual partnership. When the report only refers to the five international PfR core members listed above, the term **‘PfR international partners’** is used. The term **‘PfR partners’** or **‘PfR Alliance partners’** refers to the PfR country team as a whole, comprising both the international and local partners. When referring to other organisations (e.g. community structures or platforms, other CSOs not formally affiliated to PfR or key government offices) that participate in PfR activities (e.g. in terms of capacity strengthening, advocacy, policy dialogue) but have not entered in a formal relationship with the PfR and do not implement PfR programme funds, the term **‘IRM stakeholders’** or **‘strategic partners’** is used.

Theory of Change for Uganda 2016-2020

The ToC for Uganda defines as overall impact: *“The effect of climate change and disasters on vulnerable groups is reduced by mainstreaming IRM in policies, practices and investments; needs of target vulnerable groups are better addressed by more IRM-sensitive policies, practices and investments in the domains of climate change adaptation, ecosystems management and restoration, and disaster risk reduction.”*¹

The ToC further distinguishes five trajectories, covering the three domains of policy, investment and practice, and each contributing to the overall impact. These trajectories are:

- **Trajectory 1:** Uganda Climate Change Bill is adopted with IRM approach mainstreamed; District-level ordinances, plans and budgets are more IRM-sensitive and mainstream climate change indicators.
- **Trajectory 2:** IRM is mainstreamed in the Uganda Wetlands Policy/Bill.
- **Trajectory 3:** IRM is mainstreamed in the Uganda National Disaster Preparedness and Management Policy /Bill.
- **Trajectory 4:** Public and private investments are IRM proof and earmarked for IRM.
- **Trajectory 5:** IRM practice enhanced in target development programmes and projects; district plans and budgets and community activities are IRM-sensitive.

Initially, the trajectories were defined in more general terms (e.g. “mainstream IRM in climate-, wetlands- and DRR-related development policies”), yet as the policy development context saw various opportunities due to ongoing or dormant legislative and policy (review) processes, a more

¹ See Partners for Resilience. 2019. ToC PfR Uganda visualisation.

specific focus on engaging with these processes was carved out, concentrating on building awareness and opening (political) will and to integrate IRM concepts and principles into these processes.

The Theory of Change as outlined relies on the assumption that: **if** capacities of CSOs and government authorities on IRM-based programmes, projects and safeguard mechanisms are enhanced through continuous trainings, follow up support, documenting and sharing of best practices from PfR I and other relevant experiences, **then** PfR partners would be able to engage in IRM dialogue with relevant government offices leading to flagship programs and projects to improve their practices. This would, so the ToC assumes, **result** in improved budget allocation for IRM practices, the adoption and replication of best practices and improvements in flagship programmes and projects. It assumes so **because** PfR experience shows that CSOs themselves are best placed to put IRM on the political agenda at all levels, influence policy-making, advocate for vulnerable communities and share evidence-based knowledge.

Within the design of this ToC, a division of labour has been agreed upon, which puts Cordaid in the lead of the climate change trajectory (Trajectory 1), Wetlands International for the wetlands-trajectory and the investment trajectory (2 and 4), CARE for capacity strengthening and advocacy (trajectory 5), and The Ugandan Red Cross Society (URCS) for the disaster risk preparedness and management trajectory (3). At the same time, the programme design opts for a collaborative approach with other PfR partners contributing to other trajectories as well from their respective points of expertise. As for Trajectory 5, CARE leads but all PfR partners participate in this trajectory from a specific focus (e.g. CARE for financial services, Cordaid and RCCC for climate smart agriculture, weather forecast, and wetland management and restoration, Cordaid for resilient livelihoods, and Wetlands International for wetlands management). This design reflects the horizontal nature of Trajectory 5, which aims to build links between policy processes and the practice on the ground by providing showcases and bottom-up upscaling.

Building on annual reports and interviews, the following main target stakeholders can be identified:

- Ministry of Water and Environment - Climate Change Department
- Ministry of Water and Environment – Wetlands Department, leading on the development and process of the wetlands management policy and bill
- Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development
- Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries
- Bill drafting technical committees
- Office of the Prime Minister - Department of Disaster management
- Uganda National Meteorological Authority
- Members of Parliament (esp. the Commissions on Climate Change, on Natural Resources, and on Oil and Gas)
- District governments (natural resources sector, production sector, ...)
- Community structures and networks for DRR, IRM, wetlands, and model farmers.

At local level the PfR partners in Uganda focus on Karamoja, Teso and Lango regions in the north-east and east of Uganda.

EQ 1 – On relevance and coherence: To what extent was the PfR II programme relevant and coherent for the promotion of IRM?

The PfR II programme in Uganda has overall been relevant and coherent for the promotion of IRM at country and local level. The experience from the practice level (dating back to PfR I), the broadening of the team to include partners with experience in national policy advocacy research and the emergence of opportunities of policy processes across the three dimensions of IRM has provided good opportunities to engage in evidence-based lobby and advocacy at the national level for the promotion of IRM in a way that aligned with national priorities and policy processes. The inclusion of a separate investment trajectory also is responsive to the government's agenda of attracting new investments in view of its ambition to become a middle-income country, although implementation of the investment trajectory has lagged behind considerably. Activities at the practice level, have provided a basis for upscaling and evidence-based advocacy, although observers have noted a need to draw more explicit linkages with revenue-generating activities and livelihoods or increasing local governments' financial capacity. PfR partners in Uganda overall proved to share a common vision and coherent approach to promoting IRM that made complementary use of PfR partners' respective areas of expertise through regular interaction, information-sharing, learning and support. Yet advocating for IRM in a coherent way also sometimes met with institutional barriers, requiring pragmatic solutions to guarantee uptake by government officials. PfR activities in Uganda were also strongly aligned with globally agreed priorities on climate change (UNFCCC), Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), wetlands management (Ramsar convention) and DRR (Sendai Framework) and contributed to their domestication. Evidence on alignment with other global frameworks is weaker and limited to generic references. No evidence is found on explicit alignment with regional frameworks. Finally, there is overall good evidence that inputs from vulnerable and marginalized groups have been included, represented, addressed and mainstreamed in the design and implementation of the PfR Uganda programme, both by prioritising marginalized groups in the geographical focus on the programme and by facilitating consultation and uptake of community voices in national policy processes. Partners' understanding of gender issues has been strengthened throughout the programme and has resulted in a greater involvement of women, but there are still needs to further increase capacities on gender sensitivity in IRM with a stronger focus on gender equity.

JC 1.1: The PfR II programme was adapted to local context and has shown responsiveness and adaptiveness to the priorities and needs of their implementing partners and communities in terms of their capacity strengthening and to communities in terms of tackling IRM challenges

Summary: The design of the PfR II programme in Uganda was overall rather well adapted to the local context and the associated needs and priorities of PfR local partners and communities. It has been able to identify and engage with relevant legislative policy processes at the national level across the three dimensions of IRM, viz. climate change adaptation, ecosystems management and restoration and disaster risk reduction. This has also been the result of involving new partners with experience in national-level advocacy early in the identification phase of the programme. The inclusion of a separate investment trajectory also

is responsive to the government's agenda of attracting new investments in view of its ambition to become a middle-income country as well as an emerging government practice of risk financing focused on climate change and disaster risk reduction. Yet implementation of the investment trajectory has throughout the programme's implementation lagged behind considerably. At the practice level, PfR II largely continued activities from PfR I, yet with a greater focus on upscaling and documentation for evidence-based advocacy. In order for this to be successful, observers have noted a need to draw more explicit linkages with revenue-generating activities and livelihoods, the operationalization of the contingency funds, scaling up IRM approaches in the landscape, creating a nexus between long term and humanitarian development, and increasing local governments' financial capacity. PfR II in Uganda has only to some extent been able to respond to such needs.

The design of the PfR II programme in Uganda was overall rather well adapted to the local context and the associated needs and priorities of PfR local partners and communities. In making the transition from PfR I to PfR II, the country team already involved new partners (PELUM and the Parliamentary Forum for Climate Change – PFCC) early on during the identification stage. PELUM and PFCC were notably selected because of their knowledge and experience on lobby and advocacy at the national level, especially on climate change, which helped make the transition from the practice-oriented PfR I to PfR II. The Uganda Red Cross Society was a key partner here who doubles as an entity established by an act of Parliament as part of the disaster management set up at government level. With their foot in the door of the Office of the Prime Minister (the responsible body at government level on disaster management), the URCS had easy access to lobbying on disaster management with the technocrats in government. Additionally, EMLI was recruited with unique expertise in research and advocacy in tracking adaptation financing by multilateral and bilateral cooperation to Uganda under the Paris Agreement. This helped to mirror foreign inflows against commitments by donors and the impact of these large programmes on vulnerable communities. Thus, this was a complementing transition from PfR I to PfR II by building the capacity of CSOs and government with critical information for lobbying and advocacy at national and global levels and advancing the IRM agenda.

Involving new local partners thus helped identify concrete national policy processes for the PfR II team to engage with across the three dimensions of IRM, viz. the Climate Change Bill, the Wetlands Policy and Bill, and the National Disaster Preparedness and Management Policy and Bill. By identifying three separate trajectories for the promotion of IRM in each of these policy processes, the PfR Uganda programme responded well to the local policy environment and could easily translate the PfR objectives in an advocacy agenda at the national level that is aligned with national priorities. The PfR team hereby also made full use of the new CSO act, adopted in 2016, which provides a formal framework for CSO engagement in policy-making through consultation processes. Although some CSOs also noted that the new act comes with lengthy registration processes and possibilities for government interference in project design, PfR partners have made overall good use of the opportunities it provides in terms of CSO engagement with ministries (e.g. the Ministry of Water and Environment) at the technical level and an overall growing willingness among government officials to involve CSOs in their day-to-day work.

Moreover, the inclusion of a separate investment trajectory in the project design was also responsive to Uganda's ambition to industrialise and reach middle income country status by 2040 by attracting new investments. The PfR Uganda programme responded to this by including a focus on promoting risk management and reduction measures for new investments as part of a separate trajectory. It hereby also responded to an emerging practice within the Office of the Prime Minister to start

promoting risk financing approaches focused on DRR and climate change. Yet implementation of the investment trajectory has faced many challenges and has lagged behind considerably.

At the practice level, activities built on the PfR I programme and continued to promote climate-smart agriculture practice, wetlands management and restoration, financial inclusion, value chains on Shea nuts and honey in Nabilatuk (Karamoja region), and the dissemination and use of weather and climate data, among other things. Practice-level activities were designed to go hand in hand with the policy trajectories by forming a basis for evidence-based advocacy. While this to a large extent has been successful, observers noted a need to go beyond the limited focus on the three nodes of IRM (climate change adaptation, ecosystems management and restoration, and disaster risk reduction) to also integrate other closely linked issues such as linking action against tree-cutting with responding to communities' energy demands where there is no electricity, linking sustainable wetlands management with questions of livelihoods, or addressing limited revenue base of district authorities as a condition of scaling up IRM practice. In some instances, the PfR programme has been able to respond creatively to such questions, e.g. through promoting other income-generating activities and market linkages (e.g. beekeeping in Otuke district) or by supporting local governments' revenue enhancement to increase their financial capacity by CARE. For the refugee situation, Cordaid invested in DRR and awareness raising in IRM among refugees and ghost communities, trained district officials and refugee leaders, and focussed on actions gearing towards the formation of a knowledge platform in the Arua district. Other activities planned may not occur due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the eminent end of the programme. Yet overall, it seemed that broader issues of livelihoods and government revenue and spending were insufficiently covered in the overall programme design.

Aware of the existence of the NCC policy and non-linear approach to lobbying and advocacy for IRM in policy and investments, the programme also invested in facilitating research on behalf of the government and developed "Standard National Climate Change Indicators and Reference Sheets" (2018) which integrate IRM approaches. These are currently used for monitoring performance of sectors. Approval of the NCC Bill will tap into this to finance activities

In general, it is observed that several moments of reflection on contextual dynamics and their impact on the programme took place throughout programme design and implementation. At the beginning of the programme, PfR partners participated in a training (facilitated by CARE), which included a module on local context analysis, covering questions such as the impact on the project of changes in global development policy and practice, and global and regional trends in investment climate and the associated risks and opportunities. Regular PME meetings also proved to be good opportunities to take stock of political developments such as legislative developments, a broader trend of shrinking space for civil society and its impact on implementation of the programme, increasing influx of refugees from South Sudan and internal migratory movements that have impact on livelihood opportunities, and growing foreign investment leading to land grabs.² Yet no major changes in the overall programme design in response to contextual changes could be observed after the initial start of the programme.

JC 1.2: The PfR alliance programme has been aligned with the regionally and globally agreed priorities on IRM

² See e.g. Partners for Resilience. September 2017. (Semi) Annual Report 1st half 2017 & Annual Plan 2018. P. 31-32; Partners for Resilience. October 2018. Semi-annual report 2018 & annual plan 2019. P. 51.

Summary: There is overall good evidence that PfR activities in Uganda were aligned with globally agreed priorities on IRM. This is especially true for climate change, where PfR was also actively involved in the domestication process of the UNFCCC, SDGs, and also for the Sendai Framework through engagement on the Disaster Preparedness and Management policy and bill. Evidence on alignment with other global frameworks is weaker and limited to generic references. No evidence is found on explicit alignment with regional frameworks.

There is overall good evidence that PfR activities in Uganda were aligned with globally agreed priorities on IRM, especially in the domain of climate change. Most notably, PfR partners have supported CSOs, media, and a parliamentary delegation to the Conference of the Parties of the UNFCCC in Katowice (CoP 24 2018) and Madrid (CoP 25 2019) and participated in the CoP meeting and side events. PfR has also contributed to the domestication of international frameworks such as the UNFCCC through trainings to members of parliament working in climate change and foreign affairs. CSOs and PfR partners have also brought into the domestication of the UNFCCC through involvement in the development of the National Adaptation Plan for Agriculture (NAP-Ag), where PfR local partners PELUM and EMLI represented civil society in the technical committee and pushed for the integration of IRM principles. Further domestication of global frameworks has been achieved through CARE's work in facilitating the review of the 'National Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) Programme' and development of the 'National CSA Community of Practice Guide and Practitioners Catalogue' in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries and INGO Africa Climate Smart Agriculture (INGO ACSA) Alliance (comprising of CARE, OXFAM, CRS and World Vision).

There is also more general evidence of references to alignment of PfR activities with global frameworks such as the Sendai Framework (by engaging in the national Disaster Preparedness and Management policy and bill), the SDGs and, to a lesser extent, the risk-informed investments initiative. Alignment with the Ramsar convention on wetlands and waterfowl and contribution to its domestication was also mentioned. No explicit linkage with the New Urban Agenda is made due to the overall focus of PfR Uganda on rural communities.

One specific reference has been found in relation to alignment with regional IRM priorities or frameworks. The National CSA Community of Practice Guide and Practitioners Catalogue aligns to the regional CSA framework.

JC 1.3: PfR alliance partners in Uganda share and align their approach regarding IRM

Summary: PfR partners in Uganda overall share a common vision and coherent approach to promoting IRM. While partners have their different backgrounds and domains of expertise, there is a good common understanding of the IRM concept and principles, and overall solid interaction between the different trajectories. This is evidenced by various examples of partners providing technical input into other policy trajectories, complementary support or exchanges of experiences or learning. Yet despite the internal cohesion and complementarity within the PfR team, advocacy and lobbying activities also met some barriers largely related to institutional fragmentation within governments and bureaucratic dynamics that are not conducive to collaborative action or integrated thinking. As a result, more pragmatic approaches often had to be used by breaking down the IRM approach in its constitutive elements to ensure relevance for government stakeholders.

PfR partners in Uganda overall share a common vision and coherent approach to promoting IRM. While each partner comes with its specific domain of expertise and focus, there is solid evidence of a strong shared ownership over all the dimensions of the programme. While different partners take the lead over different trajectories, evidence points at a rather strong complementarity, interaction and learning between different partners and trajectories. This is notably evident from the various examples of cross-trajectory interactions to provide expert input across policy processes (e.g. Wetlands International providing input in the climate change policy trajectory), complementary support (in the form of technical or financial support, mobilisation capacity...) or engage in experience-sharing and learning (e.g. one policy trajectory learning from the other's experience on engagement with government and parliament). The complementarity also emerged between policy trajectories and the practice level, where practice-level experiences were used to inform policy activities as a basis of evidence-based advocacy e.g. to sensitise members of parliament using practical examples.³ This is also the result of much effort that has been put into creating a common understanding among PfR partners on the IRM concept and its constitutive principles through internal training. Good informal communication between PfR Alliance partners (e.g. using social media such as Whatsapp) has also contributed to facilitating information exchanges throughout the programme's duration.

Yet the internal cohesion and complementarity within the PfR team and programme design also saw limitations in the implementation of the lobby and advocacy activities vis-à-vis government instances. The promotion of IRM as an essentially inter-sectoral concept has often faced the realities of bureaucratic barriers. For instance, climate change department staff may not join hands with colleagues from the wetlands department or even clash as a result of internal institutional dynamics and incentives relate to separate budgets, mandates and lines of accountability. This lack of complementarity was found to be particularly strong at the national level, but less at the district level, where district officers found it easier to coordinate with each other, although conflicts may arise between local and municipal governments. A consequence is that policy activities at times require the IRM concept to be broken down in its three components (climate change adaptation, ecosystems management and DRR) to reveal its essence and relevance for government officials or other IRM stakeholders and encourage its uptake.

JC 1.4: Gender considerations and inputs from vulnerable and marginalised groups have been included, represented, addressed and mainstreamed in design, implementation and M&E

Summary: There is overall good evidence that inputs from vulnerable and marginalized groups have been included, represented, addressed and mainstreamed in the design and implementation of the PfR Uganda programme. At the programme design level, this was done through a geographical focus on vulnerable communities in the programme's local activities and by identifying the centrality of community voices as a key principle of IRM in advocacy activities. In implementation, efforts were made to ensure inclusion of community voices in national policy-making by facilitating civil society and community consultation, conducting gap analyses of draft policies or bills and at times mobilising political pressure to ensure uptake of civil society or community-level recommendations. As regards gender, the PfR team benefited from expertise from the partner CARE in applying a gender lens in the programme design and implementation to ensure greater involvement of women in planning and leadership in decision making. Yet overall, room for improvement has been identified in terms of strengthening expertise and capacities on gender sensitivity within IRM and with a stronger focus on gender equity and diversity.

³ See e.g. PELUM Uganda. no date. Policy brief: understanding climate change impacts in selected climate vulnerable hot spots in Uganda. Kampala: PEPLUM.

Inputs from vulnerable and marginalised groups have been included both in the design and implementation of the PfR Uganda programme. At the level of programme design, this has notably been done by focusing local-level activities on areas most vulnerable to e.g. droughts, landslides or other disasters (e.g. Otuke district, Karamoja) and including partners in the PfR team that have local presences in these areas and can reach out to disadvantaged communities. In the programme implementation, a strong focus was put on community engagement as a core principle of the IRM approach. Concretely, this meant PfR promoted inclusion of disadvantaged communities both as a general principle in its advocacy and actively supported consultation and uptake of vulnerable community voices in policy-making processes at the national level. This happened either by facilitating participation in formal regional consultation processes (as part of the government-led consultation processes) or by initiating such consultation events where no government-led consultation was foreseen. For instance, no PfR partners organised a civil society consultation event around the climate change bill where no such consultation was initially earmarked in the government roadmap. Other activities to ensure inclusion of marginalised community voices included conducting gap analyses e.g. of the draft climate change bill.⁴ In at least one instance (the Uganda Climate Change Bill) where CSO recommendations from gap analyses or consultations were not picked up by technical drafting teams, the PfR team was able to mobilise political pressure e.g. via the PFCC chair (a senior Member of Parliament who also chairs the Parliamentary Committee on Climate Change) to integrate CSO recommendations.

As regards gender, CARE has provided support to other PfR partners on how to apply a gender lens in programme activities. This has been overall seen as successful in terms of improving attention to gender issues in the design of activities by ensuring greater involvement of women in planning and decision making. Some steps have also been made to engage boys and girls in schools in adopting IRM practices. Gender-related actions included a comprehensive gender analysis on climate change adaptation finance and climate and strengthened meaningful participation of women in decision-making. However, team members also agreed that the gender dimension could still be improved through more targeted training and sensitisation on gender dimensions in specific policy domains covered by PfR and a stronger focus on gender equity, rather than just women representation as per the initial design of the programme. The application of the CARE gender marker as a self-assessment tool has also revealed that much work remains to be done towards being gender-transformative both in design, implementation and M&E.⁵ PfR Uganda country reports also only inconsistently reported on gender and marginalised groups.⁶

EQ 2: On efficiency and coordination: To what extent were the internal governance mechanisms, management approaches and working processes of the PfR alliance efficient and well-coordinated?

The PfR II programme in Uganda was overall well-coordinated and managed. The management structure of the programme is described as a loose framework that provides flexibility to manoeuvre, with overall smooth interaction and operational coordination between PfR partners. The overall governance of the programme underwent important changes since its start in terms of Southern ownership and has increasingly involved local partners in planning and decision-making by putting all partners on an equal footing. For PfR local partners, this has provided the benefit of a partnership approach that does not just give them access to

⁴ PELUM Uganda. 2017. Integrated risk management (IRM) gap analysis of the draft national climate bill. Kampala: PELUM Uganda.

⁵ Partners for Resilience. September 2017. (Semi) Annual Report 1st half 2017 & Annual Plan 2018. P. 28-29.

⁶ Partners for Resilience. Annual Report 2018. P 9.

funding, but also a platform to propose ideas, influence agendas and engage in joint reflection. Timeliness and efficiency also has improved over the years since the start of the implementation as a result of growing trust and simplified procedures. Although delays still occur as a result of external factors that are difficult to control and illustrate the complexity of engaging in policy advocacy and lobbying. The PME process has been the main tool for coordination, accountability and learning. It added to the programme's responsiveness and flexibility, although its complexity meant that the capacities in terms of theories of change or outcome harvesting were not always present within the team to use the template for more than an activity reporting tool. The use of the PME template for learning and coordination has been overall suboptimal.

JC 2.1: The PfR programme has been delivered in a timely manner, against reasonable overhead costs and, given the resources available, been spread appropriately across regions and countries (incl. the focus on facilitating Southern ownership and South-South cooperation, and linking/ creating synergy of our work at the different levels, i.e. local to regional to global)

Summary: Timeliness and efficiency has improved over the years since the start of the implementation. While complex disbursement procedures at headquarters level initially caused delays, at times negatively impacting the advocacy activities of local partners, flexibility has increased over the years as trust grew and procedures were simplified. Yet as budgets continue to be largely set at the headquarters level, a need has been identified to build in more flexibility in the budgeting to allow partners to respond to unforeseen challenges or windows of opportunity. The country lead's administrative budget partially already fulfilled this function, but PfR partners agreed that more flexibility would be beneficial. Also external political dynamics or events impacted the timeliness of delivery especially in the policy trajectories, requiring partners to adapt to often changing timelines. Finally, the investment trajectory has seen major implementation challenges as a new area that required new expertise and new networks to be built.

The assessment on this Judgement Criterion is rather positive and shows improvements over time since the start of PfR II. Various PfR local partners characterised the early stages of the programmes as a 'donor-beneficiary' relationship centrally steered from the PfR international partners' headquarters and with limited attention to Southern ownership. Yet there is consensus that this has significantly improved over the years towards a real partnership approach. Local partners notably cite growing flexibility in terms management and funding disbursements. Early stages of the programme still saw some delays in the release of funds due to complex approval procedures at headquarters level. Partners here mentioned negative effects of such delays on their engagements with local governments, whose limited availability of resources require funding to arrive on time to ensure continuous cooperation. Growing trust and simplification of procedures have reduced such delays and smoothened cooperation between PfR international and local partners.

That said, the availability of resources for the programme has throughout been dependent on financial caps set by the headquarters PfR team, rather than being driven by the country-specific theory of change or contextual needs or activity plans. Instead, each partner developed its own activity plan based on the financial cap received from its headquarters. In some cases, Cordaid as PfR country lead has been able to flexibly mobilise resources from its administrative budget to finance activities that were initially not planned. A wish was expressed by interviewees that a potential future

programme would allow for more flexibility to mobilise resources when important windows of opportunity arise. That said, the degree of flexibility offered by the donor is overall qualified as good.

Beyond reasons of internal programme governance, also a number of external factors have contributed to delays. This is especially true for the national policy trajectories, where broader political dynamics have led processes to be stalled. These have included cabinet reshuffles, prioritisation of other legislative processes or more recently the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic. All this illustrates the complexity and non-linearity of policy influencing processes, which are often shaped by broader dynamics and factors that cannot be controlled and require a degree of flexibility and creativity of PfR partners to adapt. Also the investment trajectory has faced significant delays and implementation difficulties as it faced challenges to move from PfR I to a focus on large scale promotion of risk-proof investments and new networks had to be established in an area rather new to most PfR partners. There was also a high ambition in setting targets to work with.

JC 2.2: The PfR programme has been operationally coordinated across the five PfR alliance partners at global, regional as well as national levels

Operational coordination has overall been reasonably effective, although there is room for improvement in making joint planning and coordination more proactive and ToC-driven. PfR partners mention a good interaction between them on operational matters, including sharing of inputs from their specific fields of expertise, joint action papers and broad consultation within the PfR team. This is facilitated by good communication between partners using informal channels such as Facebook and WhatsApp. At the same time, there is some evidence in the PfR reports that suggests that beyond specific trajectories or activities, the PfR alliance is affected by different visions and approaches on implementation as well as a degree of competition on claiming achievements.⁷ For example, at the start of PfR II, new partners were not well grounded in the arrangement of the PfR programme. This set some competition amongst partners to be seen delivering more than others. PME reports would be skewed towards certain partners overshadowing work of others.

When it comes to planning, work plans are mostly determined by each PfR partner separately, building on the budget cap they receive from their respective headquarters. Activity plans are not subject to any approval by the country team, but PME workshops and other country team sessions are used to help coordinate activities as a country team. This also means that budgeting is not influenced by the country Theory of Change, as budgets are already set before trying to fit activities within the ToC or country needs. When budgets are really insufficient, partners sometimes mobilise their own resources from their own funds or through the administrative budget from the country lead.

However, country teams were told by the PfR global team from the outset to plan and budget for what is manageable within the available budget. This was also another reason for why the PfR alliance was formed, so that partners and country teams could complement each other's efforts in the most effective and efficient manner.

There is some evidence of synergies between the country programme and the global programme (e.g. in relation to the UNFCCC CoP 2019 in Madrid), but this evidence remains largely anecdotal and does not necessarily illustrate a common practice.

⁷ Partners for Resilience, Annual Report 2018, Uganda, January-December 2018. p22.

JC 2.3: The PfR support has been monitored for accountability and learning on a regular basis to identify and report on results and blockages/problems at the three intervention levels (national, regional, global) and notably at South-South cooperation level

Summary: The PfR programme has been using several tools for monitoring, accountability and learning, of which the PME process has been the main one. PfR partners have used the PME template largely for detailed documentation of activities and outputs. There are good examples of where the PME process added to learning and informed the planning of activities asked on previous experiences or exchanges between PfR partners. Yet overall, it appears that the PME process has been used less systematically for monitoring progress of results at the outcome or impact level as per the Theory of Change. The multifunctional design of the PME template as a tool for accountability, results monitoring, learning, ToC revision and joint planning has meant that partners often found the process too heavy and lacked guidance and support (e.g. on results-based monitoring, development and use of theories of change or outcome harvesting) to make optimal use of the tool beyond the reporting function. Parallel requirements to report via other tools as well (e.g. the global activity log sheet, the internal PfR newsletter and parallel reporting requirements for PfR local partners vis-à-vis international partners) was overall found to be inefficient. In terms of South-South learning, Cordaid's organisation of a cross-country visit involving the PfR Mali and Philippines teams can be mentioned as a good example.

The six-monthly PME reports serve as the main tool for accountability and, to some extent, learning. The reports build on workshops of 3 to 4 days, with PfR partners in the country, which aim to serve various functions, including tracking progress, sharing experiences, best practices and lessons learned, and coordinating future actions. PfR partners have described the PME process as very heavy and time-consuming. PME reports tend to provide detailed documentation of individual activities and outputs, yet do not consistently present progress in a more systematic and aggregate way at the outcome or impact level. Although partners are invited to assess satisfaction with progress using a scoring system, the meaningfulness of such scoring is doubtful as no guidance on how to measure it seems to be provided. The level of detail of input provided is also highly diverse between trajectories. Partners also mentioned the PME process as useful for exchange of best practices and learning among all PfR partners on the basis of documented outcomes and refocus activities where needed (e.g. a heavier focus on climate change budget advocacy was mentioned as a result of joint PME reflections). In that sense, the PME process also added to the flexibility and responsiveness of the PfR programme. Yet overall, PME documents appear to be more used as a reporting tool than as a tool to stimulate learning or planning.

The complexity and multi-purpose nature of the PME process and template also required PfR partners, especially local ones, to go through a learning process on how to properly use the template for their own benefits. PfR local partners stated that the template was not always adapted to their specific needs and reported limited guidance and support using the PME template as a tool for context analysis, learning, ToC revision and future planning. This finding is also confirmed by analysis of the PME reports themselves, which provide overall little evidence of learning, ToC revision or joint planning. Overall, evidence points at limited knowledge and capacities on results-based monitoring, outcome harvesting and the development and use of Theories of Change within the PfR Uganda team, leading to a suboptimal use of the ToC and the PME template as a tool for learning and planning.

Beyond the PME process, interviewees mentioned a number of other reporting tools. This included a log sheet used as an activity tracking tool for the headquarters team to build the overall narrative. Partners qualified this log sheet as heavy to use and not everyone used it systematically. In addition, an internal PfR newsletter is used for internal communication and learning, to which every partner can submit stories to share with PfR partners globally. Cordaid, as Uganda country lead, is also responsible for providing input on regular narrative and financial reporting to the Dutch MFA. Such reporting requirements under the PfR programme also usually come in addition to other reporting requirements for locally contracted partners towards their international partners. The proliferation of parallel reporting requirements is overall found to be inefficient and overly time-consuming for some partners, but not all.

In terms of South-South learning, Cordaid's organisation of a cross-country visit involving the PfR Mali and Philippines teams can be mentioned as a good example.

JC 2.4: The PfR alliance was governed and managed appropriately and ongoing and past lessons related to governance and management were identified and taken up

Summary: The management structure of the PfR Uganda programme is described as a loose framework that provides flexibility to maneuver. The overall governance of the programme underwent important changes since its start in terms of Southern ownership and has increasingly involved local partners in planning and decision-making by putting all PfR partners on an equal footing. For PfR local partners, this has provided the benefit of a partnership approach that does not just give them access to funding, but also a platform to propose ideas, influence agendas and engage in joint reflection. An even greater emphasis on Southern ownership (e.g. in terms of budgeting) would be welcome, but would also require additional resources to implement.

In general terms, the management structure of the PfR Uganda programme is described as a loose framework that provides flexibility to maneuver. Evidence points out that the governance of the PfR II programme in Uganda is overall assessed positively and underwent important changes since the start. While especially PfR local partners initially qualified the partnership more in terms of a donor-beneficiary relation with the international PfR members, they also reported important developments towards greater Southern ownership and equal involvement of local partners in decision-making and planning. Whereas the five international PfR partners would initially often plan and take decisions among them, local partners were increasingly involved on an equal footing. Likewise, whereas the PME process was initially facilitated by PfR representatives based in the Netherlands with limited understanding of the local Ugandan context, a more localized approach was adopted later on. Local partners also reported a more open communication since 2018 between members in terms of contractual or budgetary issues. As a consequence, there is consensus that the PfR programme has greatly enhanced participation of local PfR Alliance partners in its internal governance to an extent that local partners feel on board and fully involved in joint activity planning and implementation as well as budgetisation. As such, the partnership has been qualified as a symbiotic process that not only benefits local partners in terms of access to resources but also as a platform to pitch ideas and engage in joint reflection, rather than having to fully buy into the priorities set by the contracting organisations. This view is also shared by smaller PfR partners that only came in later on in the process.

Despite a growing emphasis on Southern leadership, budgetary decisions continued to be steered from the North. This meant that budgets were decided first and action plans had to be fitted to the resource allocations made available to each partner. This also meant that PfR partners were not always able to flexibly respond to contextual needs or circumstances. Partners argued that more abilities to link budgeting with ToCs and activity planning in a context-sensitive way would be welcome. Yet it was also mentioned that, if more responsibilities would be transferred to Southern partners (e.g. in terms of budget discussions), more resources would need to be made at the disposal of Southern partners.

EQ 3: On value added and complementarity: To what extent has the PfR's support been of added value and complementary to what non-PfR programme actors have been doing in support of IRM and have the efforts of the PfR alliance and the NL MFA been complementary to each other and of added value to both?

There is evidence on the complementarity and added value of PfR vis-à-vis non-PfR programme actors in the domain of IRM. Several steps seem to have been taken by the PfR II Uganda team to explore complementarities with other projects or actors, e.g. there has been some degree of synergy with the Climate Action Network Uganda resulting in joint advocacy activities, as well as some synergy with IUCN in pushing the IRM agenda and joint lobby trajectories. In general terms, IRM stakeholders largely see the added value of the PfR in terms of its available expertise, its ability to mobilise and link community voices with national policy makers, and its innovative approach to linking practice and policy to promote upscaling of IRM practices. Although there is general complementarity of the PfR with other projects or partnerships funded by the Netherlands in Uganda (centrally or delegated funding), the potential of strategic engagement between the PfR team and the Netherlands embassy has also been largely untapped due to a combination of limited capacities at the Netherlands embassy and other bigger programmes implemented by the embassy which got more attention.

JC 3.1: The PfR support has been complementary and of added value to efforts of non-PfR supported actors for IRM at local, national, regional and global levels

Summary: There is some evidence of complementarity with non-PfR supported though information about the quality and depth of this complementarity is limited. Notable was some degree of synergy with the Climate Action Network Uganda resulting in joint advocacy activities. IRM stakeholders largely see the added value of the PfR in terms of its available expertise, its ability to mobilise and link community voices with national policy makers, and its innovative approach to linking practice and policy to promote upscaling of IRM practices.

There is evidence of complementarity with non-PfR supported though information about the quality and depth of this complementarity is limited. Several forms of collaboration had started during PfR I already. Notable was some degree of synergy with the Climate Action Network Uganda in terms of advocating for IRM in the national climate change policy and bill, which has led to joint advocacy activities.⁸ The PfR alliance in Uganda works closely on IRM with a range of government officials within the Ministry of Water and Environment, the Office of the Prime Minister, the Parliament, the National Environment Management Authority and the Uganda National Meteorological Authority, as

⁸ Partners for Resilience. October 2018. Semi-annual report 2018 & annual plan 2019. P. 12-13.

well government structures at district level and community structures. Many of these have been introduced to IRM through training and awareness-raising. This has been successful in a number of instances (e.g. the Manafa village DRR group reorganizing itself in the Manafa IRM club), yet in other instances, it has been difficult to translate an understanding of IRM at the conceptual level into IRM-informed programming or engagement due to limited bureaucratic mandates, lines of accountability and institutional incentives. The following box highlights collaborative efforts and engagements by one of the Alliance members, CARE, in more detail.

Collaborative engagements with non-PfR supported actors for IRM: examples from CARE

PfR has been working with other actors in promoting first DRR/CCA/EMR in PfR I and then later IRM in PfR II to complement each other's work. For example, during PfR I most partners worked at district level though CARE had planned to expand and engage at both district and national levels (the latter mainly in the domain of advocacy). At the national level, CARE joined efforts with the Africa Climate Change Resilience Alliance (the Alliance is composed of CARE, OXFAM, World Vision, Save the Children and Over Seas Development Institute). At the start, a national climate vulnerability capacity assessment was conducted which was for climate change related advocacy. Among others, the Alliance advocated for the Meteorology Department to be raised to an Authority, a proposal which passed 2012 by an Act of Parliament. The purpose was to have more resources and capacity to develop more reliable weather forecast and this has been achieved. Similarly, the team advocated for the Climate Change unit to be elevated to a Department which happened in 2014. These steps were in part a fulfillment of the UNFCCC requirement by member states and in line with the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) to promote adaptation and resilience.

Another example relates to the National Climate Change (NCC) Policy which lacked a monitoring tool. The Alliance developed two important documents: i) Tracking Adaptation, Measuring Development in Uganda: District Climate Change Adaptation Monitoring and Evaluation (2014) and ii) the Standard National Climate Change Indicators and Reference Sheets (2018). These form critical steps for the Ministry of Finance to allocate funds to implement the NCC policy.

CARE also joined the INGO ACSA alliance comprising of OXFAM, World Vision, CRS and reviewed the National Climate Smart Agriculture Programme to make it IRM-proof. This was followed by the development of a National Climate Smart Agriculture Community of Practice Guide and Practitioners Catalogue 2018. Further engagements are ongoing to advocate vis-à-vis the Ugandan authorities to fund the National CSA programme across all district local governments.

IRM stakeholders have qualified the added value of the PfR programme as a source of expertise, research and updated information available to government officials, members of parliament and both government and civil society actors at the local level. There are some observations that the added value of PfR is seen in its ability to multiply impact through IRM stakeholders and broaden outreach through media, its ability to mobilise others to collaborate on common agendas, and link community voices with national policy makers. Other observers also point out that upscaling of practices is often where other projects fail and that the PfR's combination of community-level practice actions with policy advocacy and lobbying is in that sense innovative and of considerable added value.

JC 3.2: The PfR programme and the resilience-related efforts of NL MFA were complementary to each other and of added value to both the PfR alliance and NL MFA

Summary: Although there is general complementarity of the PfR with other projects or partnerships funded by the Netherlands in Uganda (centrally or via delegated funding), the potential of strategic engagement between the PfR team and the Netherlands embassy has been largely untapped. Despite exploratory debates on setting up a structured interaction in terms of sharing information and lessons and increasing access to key IRM stakeholders, limited embassy capacities have meant that the interaction between the programme team and the embassy staff has been more limited. Opportunities are still seen for a more strategic engagement e.g. in the domain of water diplomacy.

There is general complementarity of the PfR II programme with the priorities of the Netherlands' bilateral country strategy for Uganda, which notably lists economic performance and resilience of farming systems as a priority outcome. The strategy also mentions strengthened governance for climate-smart planning and development and better anticipation and response to climate-related crises as a goal.⁹ The Netherlands also funds, through delegated funding, projects in Uganda on food security, rule of law, and sustainable trade and investment. In Uganda, The Netherlands also supports the centrally funded strategic partnerships 'Shared Resources Joint Solutions' and the 'Green Livelihoods Alliance', which aim to strengthen CSO capacity for lobby and advocacy to influence and advise policies and practice of government and private sector actors for achieving sustainable natural resources management.

A discussion took place in the early stages of the PfR II programme on how the Netherlands embassy could play a role in terms increasing access to governments, private sector and other IRM stakeholders to provide more opportunities for dialogue in IRM, to facilitate sharing of lessons and best practices among strategic IRM stakeholders, or to engage in dialogue on a range of wider items of concern, such as the shrinking space for CSOs in Uganda.¹⁰ In practice, evidence suggests that interactions between the PfR alliance and the Netherlands embassy has been very limited and does not have responded to early ambitions.

Despite a continued interest in a more structured dialogue with the PfR, embassy capacities have proven limited for this purpose. The Netherlands Embassy employs a regional climate change expert, which serves as the main counterpart for the PfR team. The expert attends relevant events and briefings of the PfR programme, but due to her wider geographical remit has only limited ability to engage in a more structured way with the PfR team. Interviews underline that the potential of the strategic partnership for the Dutch MFA has remained largely untapped, although opportunities are seen to engage with the PfR more strategically in water diplomacy, especially with ministries such as the Ministry of Water and Environment, which are usually not on the embassy's radar.

⁹ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands. No date. The Netherlands in Uganda. Multi-annual country strategy 2019-2022. Kampala: Royal Netherlands Embassy in Uganda.

¹⁰ Partners for Resilience. Programme Report Inception Phase January-August 2016. P.28.

EQ 4: Effectiveness of engagement (from inputs to results/ capacity strengthening support): To what extent has the PfR alliance been effective in applying good practices in the design, delivery and monitoring of capacity strengthening support for IRM to PfR contracted and non-contracted partners working at national and sub-national levels?

Evidence suggests that the PfR II Uganda team has overall been fairly effective in the design, delivery and monitoring of capacity strengthening support for IRM to both contracted partners non-contracted IRM stakeholders at different levels, although there is room to make the approach more structured and targeted. The Dialogue Capacity Frameworks (DCF) are overall seen as a useful tool to identify capacity gaps among PfR local partners and have served as a basis for planning activities during the PME workshops. Yet the DCFs only provide a flawed basis as the quality of input in the DCFs varies from partner to partner. A broader multi-stakeholder and participatory capacity diagnostic extending to non-contracted IRM stakeholders (e.g. community-based organisations) does not seem to have taken place in a structured way. As a result, the PfR II did not develop a single capacity strengthening plan or strategy directly informed by a broad diagnostic, although project reports do contain sections that both monitor progress and plan future activities in light of expected outcomes and relevance to the programme. Such capacity strengthening monitoring and planning sections have become increasingly detailed over the course of PfR II implementation, although monitoring has not been based on agreed benchmarks, indicators or milestones to establish goals and measure progress.

JC 4.1: The PfR has designed capacity strengthening interventions at country level on the basis of a structured and participatory capacity diagnostic exercise that has examined different dimensions of capacity and engaged local stakeholders in the diagnostic process, including taking account of local contextual/ political dynamics.

There is evidence that PfR partners have used the Dialogue Capacity Framework as a self-assessment tool, which has been described as an effective tool covering all needed capacities to implement the PfR Uganda programme. Team members have stated that the DCF helps the team reflect on how capacities are used and which ones need to be strengthened. The DCF therefore is seen as a useful diagnostic instrument and a basis for planning capacity strengthening activities. At the same time, the quality of input delivered by PfR local partners in the DCF is very diverse, with some having providing detailed self-assessments and others only very brief and general information with limited usefulness.¹¹ Moreover, interviews also revealed that some partners found that the DCFs added to the complexity of internal processes in the programme, but were able to rely on good guidance and mentorship from their contracting partners. Whilst some PfR partners (especially the ones that only joined the alliance later on, but already had participated in PME processes) mentioned that they had not seen any specific follow-up into their DCF input in the form of targeted training, others mentioned that a few DCF areas were tackled in phases. For example, phased trainings were planned and sometimes executed for newly recruited EMLI. These trainings included capacity to facilitate, capacity to mobilize, leadership, and decision making, and were carried out through training on "Adaptation Africa Regional Advocacy Consultative" workshop in Nov 2019. From their participation, EMLI won another contract with CARE Denmark to develop a NAP profile for Uganda. This plus the Tracking Adaptation Study report were presented at COP25 in Madrid, Spain, for

¹¹ See e.g. Partners for Resilience. May 2019. Dialogue Capacity Framework Uganda - all partners; Partners for Resilience. September 2019. Dialogue Capacity Framework Uganda - all partners.

resource mobilization by EMLI. Capacity strengthening activities also extended beyond the partner organisations within the PfR alliance and included, for instance awareness-raising or technical training benefitting key IRM stakeholders (e.g. government officials, members of parliament, community structures). Here, the PME process has been the main tool for identifying needs and planning activities accordingly, building on partners' observations regarding gaps and contextual factors, and in line with the broader identified objectives of the programme. Yet no evidence could be found that a broader and more systematic multi-stakeholder analysis had been performed to inform capacity-strengthening activities.

JC 4.2: The PfR has developed a capacity strengthening change strategy/ capacity strengthening plan at country level that reflects the findings of the capacity diagnostic process and which applies a range of complementary capacity strengthening tools/ instruments appropriate to addressing the identified capacity needs

The PfR II Uganda team does not appear to have developed an overarching capacity strengthening change strategy or plan that directly resulted from the diagnostic process. Instead, based on the PME workshops, project reports contain sections that describe the planning of capacity strengthening activities benefiting both PFR local partners and non-contracted IRM stakeholders, with details on activities, expected outcomes and relevance for the dialogue trajectories and set goals.¹² Such planning was informed by the outcomes of the DCF assessments, and the level of detail of these planning sections has increased over the years. Yet it is less clear how capacity strengthening for non-contracted IRM stakeholders (e.g. community-based organisations) were based on a structured and participatory diagnostic. Capacity strengthening activities use a variety of tools, including notably process facilitation and dialogues, training and sensitisation on specific policies and support to their implementation, documentation of best practices, training on IRM practice, exposure learning visits with the PfR II Mali and Philippines teams, and mentoring (especially for PfR local partners on internal PfR procedures e.g. PME or DCFs). Yet there is no direct evidence that the section of tools and instruments was justified on the basis of a clearly spelled out capacity strengthening plan.

JC 4.3: The PfR has developed a results framework and arrangements for progress monitoring (dialogue) that facilitate the tracking of changes in capacity over time, adjusting the sequencing and prioritisation of interventions (flexibility and responsiveness), and for reviewing the quality of the partnership (mutual accountability for results)

While growing attention to the development of detailed planning frameworks for capacity strengthening could be identified, evidence is more limited on the extent to which this also provided a solid basis for progress monitoring and adaptation of sequencing and prioritisation of interventions. The six-monthly PME project reports contain planning sections that describe the planning of capacity strengthening activities, with details on activities, expected outcomes and relevance for the dialogue trajectories and set goals.¹³ They provide evidence that regular monitoring has taken place, and that the level of detail of this exercise has increased over the years. Yet there has been no documentation of how the expected results are precisely defined and what the outcome and impact levels envisaged are beyond fairly general statements (e.g. 'knowledge management strengthened'), and how these

¹² Partners for Resilience. September 2017. (Semi) Annual Report 1st half 2017 & Annual Plan 2018; Partners for Resilience. 2019. Semi-annual report 2019 and annual plan 2020.

¹³ Partners for Resilience. September 2017. (Semi) Annual Report 1st half 2017 & Annual Plan 2018; Partners for Resilience. 2019. Semi-annual report 2019 and annual plan 2020.

relate to the broader objectives of the programme. Moreover, it is not clear to what extent agreed benchmarks or indicators were actively used to establish goals and measure progress.

EQ 5: Effectiveness and direct outcomes (capacity strengthening results & processes): To what extent have PfR implementing partners and communities built internal capacities and reached out, including with support of the five PfR partners, to advocate and lobby for IRM at local, national, regional and global levels?

The PfR II Uganda team has overall been very effective in reaching out at the local and national level to advocate and lobby for IRM. The success of the programme's advocacy work has to a significant degree built on pre-existing expertise and networks available within the PfR alliance's partners, providing ways to directly contribute to policy processes with technical input. The overall focus appears to have been more on direct advocacy engagement with key champions of change through IRM awareness-raising and training, rather than building enabling capacities of local IRM stakeholders. This is especially true at the national level, whereas at the local level there is somewhat more evidence of PfR engagement in capacity strengthening for community-based organisations to conduct lobby and advocacy activities. The approach taken by the PfR Uganda team can therefore be described as a mixed and pragmatic approach with an implicit goal of building advocacy capacities by 'doing'. At the same time, PfR partners have also acted as a facilitator by supporting regional consultation of communities with logistical and mobilisation assistance and, in some cases, with financial support to ensure better inclusion of civil society and community voices in the identified policy processes. PfR has also contributed to awareness-raising on both IRM practice and national policy processes at the community level and supported community-level abilities to engage. PfR also successfully engaged with district-level authorities on relevant policy processes.

JC 5.1: The PfR support contributed to strengthening capacity of PfR contracted partners and other CSOs for IRM at local, national, regional and global levels

Summary: The approach taken by the PfR Uganda team can be described as a mixed approach blending direct lobby and advocacy activities with capacity strengthening, although the overall focus appears to have been more on direct advocacy engagement with key champions of change through IRM awareness-raising and training, rather than building enabling capacities of local IRM stakeholders. This is especially true at the national level, whereas at the local level there is somewhat more evidence of PfR engagement in capacity strengthening for community-based organisations to conduct lobby and advocacy activities. Yet much of local-level capacity strengthening activities were of a more technical nature focused on helping local organisations adopt IRM practices. The approach taken by the PfR Uganda team can therefore be described as a mixed and pragmatic approach with an implicit goal of building advocacy capacities by 'doing' (i.e. involving PfR local partners directly in advocacy activities). In terms of effectiveness, evidence suggests that PfR activities have contributed to strengthened abilities of partner organisations in terms of advocacy and lobbying, mobilisation and coalition-building, whereas external communication is notably mentioned as a key domain still requiring more attention, despite progress already achieved.

An overall observation is that the orientation of the programme has been more on direct lobby and advocacy with government authorities by PfR member organisations, and somewhat less on building enabling capacities of local IRM stakeholders (e.g. community-based organisations) to conduct lobby and advocacy activities. The approach taken by the PfR II Uganda team therefore shows a fine line between lobby and advocacy to promote IRM on the one hand, and capacity strengthening on the other. Capacity strengthening activities have therefore often focused on sensitisation, awareness-raising and technical training on IRM concepts and principles, policies and practice with the direct purpose of promoting the uptake and upscaling of IRM among government IRM stakeholders. This builds on the logic that sensitising key champions (such as members of parliament or key government officials) on IRM concepts and principles can have a cascading effect in spreading the uptake of the IRM approach. This is particularly visible in the work of the Parliamentary Forum on Climate Change, which has in several instances been able to mobilise its members to push processes forward (e.g. putting the debate on the climate change bill back on the rails) and use political leverage, ensure uptake of IRM principles in policy processes or promote IRM-related practices (e.g. wetlands restoration) among their constituents.

Overall, PfR partners have stated that strengthening of enabling capacities of local IRM stakeholders was not always put at the forefront of the programme where PfR Alliance partners were found to be better placed to engage directly with key decision-makers in lobby and advocacy. This is especially true at the national level, whereas at the local level, several examples can be given of successful capacity strengthening, empowering local organisations to engage in advocacy e.g. capacity strengthening organised by CARE on engagement with SMEs as part of the investment trajectory. Yet much of these local-level capacity strengthening activities were of a more technical nature focused on helping local organisations adopt IRM practices. The training guide, which has been developed by the regional PfR Horn of Africa programme, has been a useful source for organising training on IRM, as has been local experience (e.g. on using weather data).

The approach taken by the PfR Uganda team can therefore be described as a mixed approach blending direct lobby and advocacy activities with capacity-strengthening. PfR partners also mentioned that a degree of capacity strengthening in terms of lobbying and advocacy happened by letting PfR local partners be involved in the process. This suggests a nuanced approach to capacity strengthening that is closely intertwined with the actual lobbying and advocacy work as part of the programme's trajectories. At the same time, it was suggested that skills-oriented training (e.g. advocacy, mobilisation) was not sufficiently done and should be prioritized in a potential next phase of the programme.

In terms of its effectiveness, progress reports on capacity development provide evidence to suggest that PfR local partners and supported communities have strengthened their ability to widen their support base/advocacy coalition for IRM. Both collaboration and capacity to mobilise are in most cases assessed as good, resulting in an expansion of the reach of the PfR organisation through networks and steering committees and enabled the reach to more IRM stakeholders, including mobilizing marginalized groups. There is also some evidence of a growing capacity to work with the media to document and disseminate information on IRM practice to a wider public, although external communication and media engagement has overall been identified as an important area in need of further attention.¹⁴

¹⁴ Partners for Resilience, Annual Report 2017, Uganda, January-December 2017; Partners for Resilience, Annual Report 2018, Uganda, January-December 2018; Partners for Resilience. October 2018. Semi-annual report 2018 & annual plan 2019.

JC 5.2: The PfR supported PfR contracted partners and other CSOs strategically engaged with IRM stakeholders in their environment at local, national, regional and global levels to promote IRM in policies, influence investment mechanisms in support of IRM and influence practice that takes of IRM.

Summary: The PfR II Uganda team has overall been successful in engaging with governmental and non-governmental actors to promote IRM principles and practice at national and local levels. The success of the programme's advocacy work has to a significant degree built on pre-existing expertise and networks available within the alliance's partners, providing ways to directly contribute to policy processes with technical input. At the same time, PfR partners have also acted as a facilitator by supporting regional consultation of communities with logistical and mobilisation assistance and, in some cases, with financial support to ensure better inclusion of civil society and community voices in the identified policy processes. PfR has also contributed to awareness-raising on both IRM practice and national policy processes at the community level and supported community-level abilities to engage. PfR also successfully engaged with district-level authorities on relevant policy processes.

The PfR II Uganda team has overall been successful in engaging with governmental and non-governmental actors to promote IRM principles and practice at national and local levels. As noted in the response to JC5.1, engagement has to a large extent been led by PfR alliance members, albeit often in collaboration with local organisations and targeting key champions within relevant government bodies.

In its engagement at the (national) policy level, the PfR has made use of the government's growing openness towards involving CSOs in policy-making processes and has participated in the formal consultation platforms by providing expert input, formulating recommendations and facilitating uptake of community voices. In its engagement, the PfR team has often been able to benefit from already established close cooperation between PfR organisations and government bodies (e.g. Wetlands International already had an established collaboration with the Ministry of Water and Environment's Wetlands Department, formalised in consecutive MoUs). Building on this long-term engagement, Wetlands International has been able to be closely engaged in the wetlands policy review process on behalf of the PfR alliance. Similarly, the NEMA (National Environment Management Authority) also approached Wetlands International to coordinate a CSO consultation on social risk impact assessment) as part of the review of the national environment act. In a similar way, PfR partner ECO has been invited to contribute to the development of Uganda's National Development Plan III and facilitate its greening, providing an opportunity to mainstream IRM-related issues and principles in the plan. Similarly, combining political access to key parliamentarians via the Parliamentary Forum on Climate Change (a PfR local partner) and the thematic expertise and civil society and community outreach capacity of PELUM has allowed to blow new life in the climate change bill process, where various PfR member organisations have contributed to civil society consultation processes (e.g. through mobilisation, financing of staff in the national consultation team) while also mobilising political pressure (via PFCC members) to ensure the uptake of their recommendations (e.g. on decentralising interventions and community participation).

The examples above show that throughout the implementation of PfR II, the success of the programme's advocacy work has to a significant degree built on pre-existing expertise and relations available within the alliance's partners, providing ways to directly contribute to policy processes with technical input. At the same time, PfR partners have also acted as a facilitator by supporting regional consultation of communities with logistical and mobilisation assistance and, in some cases, with financial support to ensure better inclusion of civil society and community voices in the identified policy processes.

PfR external communication activities also contributed to awareness-raising (e.g. through targeted media appearances such as participation in the people's parliament tv show on the NTV network) on both IRM practice through showcases and on national policy processes and their relevance for community actors. As such, PfR also contributed to stimulating a wider public debate at community level outside the political bubble.

At the local level, PfR has also successfully engaged with policy makers at the district level, e.g. through involvement in discussions on a new ordinance on natural resources management in Otuke district or on setting up disaster contingency planning for the local government in Mbale. It has also been found that PfR support had an overall positive impact on strengthening interaction between technical staff and community structures on the one hand, and civil society organisations on the other.

Engagement under the investment trajectory has been more difficult to implement. While some successes at the local level are reported, limited experience and capacity to engage with a new set of governmental IRM stakeholders as well as multinational companies has made this trajectory more difficult to implement.

The following list of engagements and their immediate outcomes further illustrate the type of short- and medium-term changes and outcomes which were realised during PfR II in Uganda, which displays the results of the evaluation's outcome harvesting exercise (a more comprehensive list is included in Annex A of this report).

- The climate change bill process has been reinstated, which would still be silent if it were not because of PfR intervention. The legislative process itself also helps sensitising people at the community level more about the importance of climate change (adaptation) and how to pursue it.
- The creation of a standing climate change committee in the Ugandan parliament, which eases discussion on climate change issues within the parliament.
- Members of parliament are better equipped to be champions on climate change and IRM in their own constituencies, e.g. to popularise tree planting, sensitising rice cultivators on use of and property rights over wetlands, promote restoration of drained wetlands
- Recommendations from PfR-facilitated civil society and community consultation on Climate Change Bill adopted
- Wetlands policy and Bill review process revived, which had been stalled due to lack of policy direction and institutional conflicts over mandates.
- Voices from community stakeholders, private sector and civil society captured in revised wetlands policy and bill as a result of a PfR-organised regional consultation process with communities
- District authorities are more able to translate national wetlands policy at the community level, e.g. in Otuke new district ordinance on natural resources management as a result of PfR technical support

- Office of the Prime Minister committed to fast tracking the National Disaster Preparedness and Management Policy/Bill making process as a result of PfR advocacy on DRR and a series of meetings
- Views on IRM and climate change integrated into the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment as a result of technical support and lobbying by PfR partners with the National Environment Management Authority and relevant policy makers.

JC 5.3: The five PfR alliance partners assisted and facilitated lobbying and advocacy for IRM beyond national borders with a view to influence decisions at regional and global levels

Evidence on this Judgement Criterion is limited, although there is some evidence that PfR team members participated in lobbying and advocacy for IRM at the global level in the context of the UNFCCC annual CoPs. PfR partners have financed participation in the annual CoPs, which is said to have contributed to a better information stream from the global level to the national level in terms of how global PfR contributions and their relevance for domestication at the national level. Through the PFCC, PfR has also provided support to the parliamentary delegation to the UNFCCC CoP in Madrid in 2019. Additionally, EMLI conducted a high-level study on tracking adaptation financing and engaged 21 CSOs. The study report was used by the government to produce a national status report to COP25, and the government also used the study report to establish a data base for foreign inflows. No evidence has been found of other examples of any assistance or participation of the PfR II Uganda team in advocacy and lobbying at the global or regional level or feedback and learning from the global or regional levels back to the national level.

JC 5.4: Potentially unintended positive and negative effects of PfR support have (not) been identified and addressed by the PfR alliance and its contracted partners and other CSOs

Almost no evidence could be found on unintended positive or negative effects of PfR support, although two examples of positive outcomes can be mentioned. First, the more intensive engagement with Members of Parliament on climate- and IRM-related issues through the PFCC has put climate change higher on the agenda of the Parliament's daily operation. This eventually resulted in the creation of a standing parliamentary committee on climate change, chaired by the PFCC chairperson. Although this was not a target outcome of the PfR programme, it is plausible that PfR activities on the climate change bill have contributed to this development and also had positive effects on the ability of the PfR alliance to put topics of interest on the Parliament's agenda and mobilise political support. Indeed, it was noted that parliamentary debates often reflected discussions already held within the framework of the PFCC. The PFCC also helped the parliamentary committee to engage in interaction with communities and CSOs.

Second, the support given the setup of community environment committees (e.g. in Otuke district) not only provided a platform for sensitisation reflection on natural resources management issues and the values of wetlands, and exchange best practices on IRM, but also provided a structure to manage conflicts over natural resources and reduce competition for grazing ground. Also this can be mentioned as an unintended yet positive outcome.

EQ 6: Longer-term outcomes and impact (change): To what extent has the enhanced advocacy and lobbying capacity (and activities) among PfR contracted partners and other non-contracted CSOs led to enhanced policies, better investment mechanisms and improved practices for IRM at national, regional and global levels and to more resilience of vulnerable communities at national level?

There is evidence that the PfR is contributing to change, although it is too early to tell whether provisional outcomes will eventually also have long-term impact. At the practice level, PfR activities have contributed to the promotion and uptake of IRM practices. PfR partners have also contributed to strengthened community capacities to reduce the impact of disasters and pursue IRM through empowering and supporting community structures and village saving and lending associations or SACCOs. As such, PfR has clearly contributed to building the foundations of increased resilience of vulnerable communities. The extent to which this is also translating into enhanced IRM policy and practice at the local/district level cannot be assessed at this point. Although there is growing awareness and buy-in among local government officials on IRM, there is only limited evidence on the extent to which this has resulted in IRM being mainstreamed and upscaled in district planning and budgeting. It appears that a number of additional conditions would need to be met for this to happen (e.g. enhanced revenue base for local authorities). Also at the national level, there is evidence that PfR engagement has contributed to uptake of IRM principles in IRM-relevant legislative and policy processes, although these outcomes remain provisional as such policy processes have not reached their final stages yet and because the ultimate enforcement and implementation of such laws and policies depends on other factors and dynamics as well. Yet although it is clearly too early to ascertain a long-term outcome and impact of PfR II interventions, relevant IRM stakeholders clearly recognise the important contributions that the programme has made to more awareness on IRM, growing uptake of IRM practices, empowering communities and successfully engaging in policy processes for the promotion of IRM.

JC 6.1: Over the course of the past 5 years, IRM policies have been enhanced, IRM investment mechanisms improved, and IRM practices changed for the better at national, regional and global levels and resulted in more resilience of vulnerable communities at national level

Summary: There is good evidence that PfR activities have contributed to enhancing IRM policies and the promotion of IRM practices at the national and local level and are contributing to more resilience of vulnerable communities, although such outcomes remain provisional and the longevity of the impact remains to be seen and will be dependent on a number of factors. At the local level, evidence is rather rich that projects are being implemented on IRM principles and that the PfR team has successfully promoted the uptake of IRM practices. PfR partners have also contributed to strengthened community capacities to reduce the impact of disasters and pursue IRM through empowering and supporting community structures and village saving and lending associations or SACCOs. Making use of past experiences and good practices, PfR has contributed to a wider uptake of IRM practices such as better diffusion of local weather and climate data or climate-smart agriculture. PfR partners also worked to advocate for the integration and mainstreaming of IRM among local (district) authorities, although despite growing awareness and buy-in among district officials, there is only limited evidence on the extent to which this has been mainstreamed and upscaled in district planning and budgeting. Also at the national level, there is evidence that PfR engagement has

contributed to uptake of IRM principles in legislative and policy processes on climate change, DRR and ecosystems management, although these outcomes remain provisional as such policy processes have not reached their final stages yet and because the ultimate enforcement and implementation of such laws and policies depends on other factors and dynamics (e.g. budgeting processes) that are at this point largely outside the scope of the PfR II programme.

There is good evidence that PfR activities have contributed to enhancing IRM policies and the promotion of IRM practices at the national and local level and are contributing to more resilience of vulnerable communities, although such outcomes remain provisional and the longevity of the impact remains to be seen and will be dependent on a number of factors.

Successes can notably be mentioned at the level of the practice trajectory. Several examples could be collected of how beneficiaries are applying IRM good practices in their daily activities at the individual level. At a more structural level, efforts have contributed to setting up new community-level structures to engage on IRM and supporting existing ones to better mainstream IRM principles in the daily operations of communities. For example, PfR practice activities have provided and scaled up access to more specific weather and climate data for farmers in targeted regions (e.g. by channelling weather forecast information through community-based monitors, individuals that collect and diffuse relevant information on a voluntary basis, support community structures, engage in knowledge management). PfR actors also contributed to the promotion of community DRR through capacitating community disaster committees as first responders in case of disasters and training them on contingency planning.

PfR local engagement also provided support to savings and lending schemes for farmers to turn them into formal SACCOs (micro-financing institutions). Through PfR support, this not only contributed to the financial inclusion of farmer associations, but it also provided a platform to exchange on IRM-related topics such as environmental management or organise training on climate-smart agriculture or sustainable exploitation of natural resources, and interact with district business officers. Successes in organising and empowering community structures has also contributed to more joint action to advocate for better enforcement of IRM-relevant local legislation and policies.

Evidence suggests that PfR partners have successfully lobbied district authorities to include IRM principles in a new ordinance on natural resources in Otuke district. At the same time, the ultimate impact of this success at the policy level on district-level budget plans and mainstreaming across district departments beyond specialised departments working on IRM sectors is not clear. As a result, there is at this point no evidence that policy advocacy at the local level has contributed to the wider mainstreaming and upscaling of IRM practice.

At the national level, there is evidence of increased awareness of policy makers of IRM and of a growing integration of IRM principles in relevant policies and laws, action plans, investment mechanisms and guidance documents and tools. Crucially, these are intermediate outcomes at best, and the ultimate long-term outcome and impact of PfR engagements at the national level will only become evident later on due to the complexity of processes in relation to legislation, policymaking and their operationalisation, where different dynamics are at play. Even after formal adoption of laws of policies, their implementation is also subject to wider political and institutional dynamics that will have an impact on the political drive and available resources to put documents into practice. A comprehensive overview of identifiable intermediate outcomes is provided in Annex A reflecting the results of the outcome harvesting exercise, but a few key observations are listed here:

- Growing awareness of the importance of IRM among policy-makers, government officials and civil society organisations working on climate change, wetlands management and DRR,
- IRM-relevant recommendations adopted in the draft Climate Change Bill,¹⁵
- Growing awareness among the wider population on the Climate Change Bill and its key features,
- IRM recommendations adopted in the National Adaptation Plan for Agriculture,
- IRM-informed risk management measures included in the draft Wetlands Policy,
- Views on IRM and climate change integrated into the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment.

JC 6.2: The enhanced capacity among PfR implementing partners and their networks and communities has contributed to the mainstreaming of IRM in sector policies, improved IRM investment mechanisms, changed IRM practices for the better at national, regional and global levels and resulted in more resilience of vulnerable communities at national level

Relevant IRM stakeholders interviewed agree that the PfR programme has contributed to helping vulnerable communities to become more resilient to disasters and the impacts of climate change and better organised to manage natural resources and address environmental degradation. This contribution of PfR support in promoting innovative IRM practices (e.g. improving access to climate-related information to farmers or introducing practices of climate-smart agriculture) is generally recognised, although the presence of various other support programmes in similar domains mean that successes cannot always entirely be attributed to PfR only. The PfR programme is also widely recognised for its support to the establishment of community structures that allow for better response, coordination and exchange of best practices and contribute to financial inclusion. There is also recognition of the contribution of PfR to an overall greater awareness on IRM-related issues (e.g. the value of sustainable wetlands management) among communities as a result of sensitisation campaigns. Yet while most IRM stakeholders recognise the positive impact of the PfR in advocating for IRM among local/district authorities and facilitating interaction between authorities and civil society and community organisations, they also consider that PfR has not yet been able to have a real positive impact on available resources (e.g. within district budgets) for IRM. Stakeholders also perceived a need for a growing prioritisation of livelihoods and alternative income-generating activities, as this is often linked with problems in relation to unsustainable natural resources exploitation. At the national level, government officials have qualified the PfR team as a facilitator of IRM policy process in terms of providing thematic expertise and embedding CSO perspectives and community voices. IRM stakeholders recognise the important contributions of the PfR team in terms of promoting IRM concepts and principles in ongoing policy processes as well as its role in facilitating regional and civil society consultations. In the investment domain, there is consensus that its impact has remained more limited, and that it has not been able to upscale small targeted successes.

¹⁵ See e.g. Partners for Resilience. no date. Experience 2016 to date. PowerPoint presentation.

EQ 7: Sustainability: To what extent has the PfR support contributed to a structurally strengthened and sustainable engagements of its implementing partners to promote IRM at national, regional and global levels?

Evidence suggests that PfR has contributed to setting the foundations of a strengthened and sustainable engagement of PfR partners and IRM stakeholders to promote IRM at both the national and local level in Uganda. The PfR programme has been to build on already existing foundations among PfR partners in terms of expertise and networks, and has contributed to a growing ownership over the IRM concept and its associated principles among PfR partners. There is also evidence to suggest that PfR partners are structurally well placed (in terms of capacities, expertise and networks) to continue engagements on IRM promotion at policy and practice levels also beyond the PfR programme. There is also evidence that beneficiary civil society organisations or community structures are increasingly adopting IRM principles and approaches in their mandates, planning and day-to-day operations, showing that the programme has contributed to strengthening foundations for continued engagements on IRM promotion. There is some evidence of growing recognition of IRM among IRM government stakeholders at local and national level. Although this has in at least some cases translated in the integration of IRM approaches in planning and budgets, overall evidence on IRM mainstreaming by district and national authorities is yet to materialise and may face a number of structural barriers in the future.

JC 7.1: The effects of the PfR support are owned by the PfR implementing partners

There is evidence that points at a growing ownership over IRM both among PfR local partners, beneficiary organisations or community structures and, to some extent, government structures. Generally speaking, there is evidence of a strong consensus among PfR implementing partners on the importance of the constituting principles of IRM (e.g. promotion of community self-management, stimulating learning, forming partnerships), even if some of them take a pragmatic approach towards using IRM terminology. For many local partners, PfR-supported activities respond to the organisations' core mandates, resulting in a strong ownership over the programme's activities and results.

There is also evidence of a growing ownership over IRM as a concept within both civil society organisations (within and outside the PfR team) and community structures. Interviews suggest that training on IRM is having a cascading effect through existing CSO networks and is leading several organisations to integrate IRM in their strategic plans. The Ugandan Red Cross Society has also integrated IRM in its revised mandate, showing strong ownership over the concept. At the community level, the Manafa village DRR group has rebranded itself in 2019 as the Manafa IRM club and has introduced other IRM-related activities (e.g. in the domain climate change adaptation) using an IRM framework in its daily work. Other examples have also been identified where community committees increasingly work across the nexus between DRR, climate change adaptation and natural resources management and see the direct relevance of doing so in their work.

At the policy level (district and national), a growing recognition of IRM principles can be witnessed, yet concerns have been expressed on the ability to overcome structural barriers within bureaucracies that are not conducive to putting the integrated nature of IRM into practice if a number of additional conditions are not met (e.g. a broader resource base, more political leadership). Some district authorities have integrated IRM in their district plans and budgets, although this seems to be the exception rather than the norm.

JC 7.2: PfR partners are able to lobby and advocate for IRM on their own and without the support of the PfR

Evidence on this Judgement Criterion is limited, yet there is overall good reason to assume that PfR partners are able to lobby and advocate for IRM even without PfR support. Members of the PfR team (international and local) are well-established organisations that enjoy recognition within the wider civil society community and among key IRM government stakeholders. Their expertise and legitimacy is often recognised by government stakeholders and has resulted in a structural cooperation (e.g. the MoU between Wetlands International and the Ministry of Water and Environment) that is likely to remain even after the PfR programme. For many of them, evidence suggests that they would be able to sustain internal capacities to continue their policy and practice activities using alternative resources, as PfR II largely built on activity strands within these organisations that were already in place (e.g. local partner PFCC also receives FAO funding to work on the National Adaptation Plan for agriculture, has a long-term programme with GIZ and works with NEPAD to provide climate information to Members of Parliament, whereas partner PELUM also has a fairly broad financing base to work on climate change adaptation policy and practice).

At the same time, the added value of the PfR programme to link policy and practice is also associated with the complementarity of the organisations involved in terms of thematic expertise and ability to reach out and mobilise in different regions and at different levels. It is at this point too early to tell whether cooperation between these PfR local partners will survive after the end of PfR support.

Emerging observations and preliminary conclusions

This section summarises a number of points emerging from the findings across EQs as well as from findings pertaining to the PfR II Uganda programme. These are case-specific findings and emerging observations, structured around a number of headings, which will feed into the overall/global evaluation of the PfR II programme. They can also be used to inform PfR internal reflections on the design and approach of the future PfR programme in Uganda in case funding for a PfR III programme is granted.

4. Programme design, its assumptions and limitations

The PfR II Uganda programme builds on the experience of PfR I but aims to promote the wider upscaling and uptake of IRM concepts, principles and practice by focusing on lobby and advocacy activities at the local and national level. The focus follows the general triple approach of PfR on policies, investments and practice. The logic of this setup is that engagement in IRM policy dialogue with relevant government offices at different levels will result in adaptation of government behaviour, replication of best practices and improved budget allocations for IRM implementation. This line of thinking is an assumption on which the expected impact of the programme heavily relies.

The findings presented above provide evidence that the PfR II Uganda programme has made successful contributions to the wider spread of IRM practice in targeted vulnerable communities, created more awareness on IRM among local policy makers and engaged in a constructive and meaningful way in national policy processes to promote IRM concepts and principles. Policy engagement at the district level has proven easier to conduct due to the proximity to the practice, compared to national level. Yet also at the national level, PfR activities have yielded visible results. This has been partly enabled by a growing openness of the government to engage with civil society organisations in policy making since the adoption of the 2016 CSO act, and partly by involving new partners in the PfR II team with solid expertise and relevant networks for national-level advocacy and an overall constructive cooperation between different members of the PfR Uganda team.

Yet although the engagement at the national level has yielded results, the complexity, long duration and non-linear nature of such national policy processes also means that a continued engagement would be required in order to guarantee long-term impact of PfR engagements. Indeed, major decisions take time and are often stalled due to political dynamics or other emerging priorities. As a result, a long time is needed – perhaps even longer than the duration of the programme – to reach tangible outcomes by way of policy change, behavioural change, ... to be realised.

Moreover, the programme design has formulated the assumption that inclusion of IRM in policies will lead to changed government behaviour, replication of best practices and improved budgetary allocations for IRM. Building on this assumption, most of the lobby and advocacy activities have focused on working with government departments at the technical level to sensitise and promote the adoption of IRM in ongoing policy processes. In reality, the translation of policies into changed government behaviour in favour of IRM is likely to be dependent on a number of other variables, including high-level political buy-in, available resources and creating institutional dynamics conducive to integrated action. So far, PfR has less engaged on such issues (e.g. influencing national budget), meaning that the ultimate impact of the PfR II programme in terms of national policies is likely to be dependent on continued action to ensure IRM uptake in government practice and budgetary allocations, beyond policy statements and legal frameworks. Likewise, it could be observed that at the district level, successful lobbying for the integration of IRM in policy statements did not always result in more IRM action by district governments because of limited available resources. A positive example was found where IRM promotion was linked with support on revenue base expansion for local governments, which could inspire future PfR action. For example, a revenue enhancement strategy was developed at a CARE site, and is now used to fund-raise. As a result, the Otuke district lobbied and secured large funds from the European Union under the Development Initiative for Northern Uganda (DINU) and are constructing a 5-story Governance and Business Centre. It will be used to generate income for the local government which can also be used for IRM activities.

Finally, while PfR activities have focused on the integration of climate change adaptation, ecosystems management and DRR as part of a single IRM approach, many IRM stakeholders regretted the limited scope available under the PfR II programme to engage in issues of livelihoods and income-generating activities, especially compared to PfR I. As it can be argued that the success in promoting the uptake of IRM practices at community level is likely to be dependent on the economic case (especially when livelihoods or household incomes depend on e.g. exploitation of wetlands or tree cutting), a greater scope to include action on alternative livelihoods or income-generating activities should be considered in a potential future programme. PfR II Uganda does offer promising examples at the practice level, e.g. through the promotion of financial inclusion through support to VSLAs and SACCOs, yet it could be considered to also address the issue of livelihoods in policy engagements beyond the 'usual suspects' (looking, for instance, beyond the Ministry of Water and Environment to also engage with ministries for economy, labour, commerce, agriculture...).

5. The PfR partnership

The PfR II Uganda team has benefited from a composition of PfR partners that is based on the respective strategic value in terms of technical expertise and/or access to policy spaces each organisation brings. Partners bring complementary expertise across the three main dimensions of IRM, as well as access to different policy levels and IRM stakeholders at national and/or local level, and across different regions within the country. For instance, Wetlands International comes with extensive experience in wetland management and restoration of ecosystems and has MoU with the Ministry of Water and Environment. Cordaid has expertise on resilient livelihoods and the interface between DRR and climate change adaptation, whereas CARE has expertise on policy and practice on natural resources governance, established communication with district authorities (e.g. in Otuke) and knowledge of applying a gender lens. The Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre works with the other alliance members especially with support to tools and capacity strengthening especially on climate change adaptation and joint implementation on advocacy. URCS has expertise on DRR, a good working relationship with the DRM directorate and a wide network of local branches. The country team has also responded effectively to the transition from PfR I to PfR II by integrating new organisations with L&A experience and capacities at the national level, such as PFCC, EMLI, and PELUM. Joint advocacy has also been seen to produce better results, for instance by pushing for the climate change bill as a consortium, a more unified and better respected PfR voice was developed which resulted in the acceptance of 40% of PfR proposals in the bill.

This has allowed for a division of tasks, with different PfR partners taking the lead over different trajectories within the overall setup of the country programme, and partners planning their own strands of activities and policy engagement in each trajectory. Yet there is also shared ownership over the IRM concept and the PfR programme as a whole, which has translated in a good practice of interaction between partners, consultation in policy processes, joint action or support in the form of thematic expertise (e.g. PELUM providing input from a climate change lens into a wetlands position paper), advice on processes and approaches and co-financing activities. Social media such as Facebook or Whatsapp also have helped to facilitate information-sharing and coordination through more informal channels.

For local organisations, the real value of the partnership has been in what it offers to them beyond access to financial resources. The relation between international and PfR local partners has evolved in the course of the programme beyond a donor-recipient relation. Whereas project processes (e.g. PME) and decision-making were initially not sufficiently adapted to local realities and challenges, local

partners have increasingly been involved in project processes and decision-making in a spirit of co-ownership. Local partners value the PfR not just as a provider of resources, but also as a platform to pitch ideas, share views and influence planning, therefore contributing to greater Southern ownership.

6. Lobby & advocacy and capacity strengthening

A key observation on the PfR II Uganda programme is that its approach to lobby and advocacy relied more on direct engagement by PfR Alliance members with the government, rather than through capacity strengthening of non-PfR local organisations. This approach was adopted building on the inclusion of two organisations in the PfR II team (that were not involved in PfR I) that have considerable experience and networks relevant for advocacy at the national level, as well as easy access by other PfR partners to networks at the local level (e.g. via the Ugandan Red Cross Society branches). At the same time, much of the capacity strengthening activities under the PfR II programme were focused on sensitisation, awareness-raising or technical training on IRM or IRM-related practices among decision-makers, government officials, private sector actors or community-based organisations. In this approach, capacity strengthening (which often comes in the form of sensitisation, awareness-raising and technical training on IRM) is not seen as something fundamentally different from advocacy, as both entail promoting IRM and changing attitudes of key change makers in- or outside government. This approach, which approaches capacity strengthening and lobbying and advocacy work as closely intertwined, provides an important lesson coming out of the Uganda country case. Similarly, the experience from Uganda highlights the importance of evidence that draws on practical experience, rather than abstract concepts for advocacy to be successful. This suggests, on the one hand, the soundness of the underlying assumption that experiences from practice can contribute to upscaling via evidence-based advocacy (although the availability of practical evidence is often a necessary, but not sufficient condition for successful advocacy given the complexity of policy processes - see point 1 above). It also highlights the importance of investing enough resources in documentation and sharing of knowledge and information and inform policy processes and using research as a tool to help build an evidence base.

Bibliography

- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands. No date. The Netherlands in Uganda.
- Multi-annual country strategy 2019-2022. Kampala: Royal Netherlands Embassy in Uganda.
- Partners for Resilience. 2018. Global Ambitions, Local Answers, Annual Report 2017, Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016-2020.
- Partners for Resilience. 2019. Local Realities, Global Ambitions Annual Report 2018, Strategic Partnership Dialogue and Dissent 2016 - 2020.
- Partners for Resilience. 2019. Semi-annual report 2019 and annual plan 2020.
- Partners for Resilience. 2019. ToC PfR Uganda visualisation.
- Partners for Resilience. Accelerating for Sustainable Impact. Annual Plan 2019.
- Partners for Resilience. Annual Report 2017 Uganda country programme. January-December 2017.
- Partners for Resilience. Annual Report 2018 Uganda country programme. January-December 2018.
- Partners for Resilience. May 2019. Dialogue Capacity Framework Uganda - all partners.
- Partners for Resilience. no date. Experience 2016 to date. powerpoint presentation.
- Partners for Resilience. October 2018. Semi-annual report 2018 & annual plan 2019.
- Partners for Resilience. September 2017. (Semi) Annual Report 1st half 2017 & Annual Plan 2018.
- Partners for Resilience. September 2019. Dialogue Capacity Framework Uganda - all partners.
- PELUM Uganda. 2017. Integrated risk management (IRM) gap analysis of the draft national climate bill. Kampala: PELUM Uganda.
- PELUM Uganda. no date. Policy brief: understanding climate change impacts in selected climate vulnerable hot spots in Uganda. Kampala: PEPLUM.
- The Netherlands Red Cross. 2016. Programme Report Inception Phase. January-August 2016, Netherlands Red Cross/ Partners for Resilience.

Annexes

Annex A – Outcome harvesting process

Introduction

This annex comprises details on the online outcome harvesting process that was conducted following the Uganda country visit. This online process was unrolled due to the inability of the evaluation team to organise a physical outcome harvesting workshop at the end of the country visit as a consequence of the COVID-19 crisis and the related confinement measures introduced in Uganda.

As an alternative, the evaluation team decided to pursue an online outcome harvesting process using a similar collaborative approach as was used in other case studies (Indonesia, Horn of Africa) of the PfR evaluation. Concretely, a two-step collaborative approach was used:

- Members of the PfR Uganda team provided input and comments on a draft outcome harvesting matrix prepared by the PfR Uganda evaluation team. This outcome harvesting matrix was designed to capture PfR programme outcomes along the five trajectories of the programme and describe the significance of change as well as the contribution of the PfR team to such change. A draft outcome harvesting document prepared by the evaluation team was shared with the PfR Uganda team on 27 March 2020. The PfR team had time to provide input and comments until 2 April 2020.
- On 3 April 2020, a 2-hour digital workshop was organised using Skype with representatives from the international PfR members to engage in a discussion on a number of cross-cutting issues selected by the evaluation team. The workshop was attended by 3 members of the PfR Uganda team, 1 representative of the PfR team in The Hague and 4 representatives from the evaluation team. Unfortunately, a number of PfR Uganda team members were not able to participate due to technical issues. The discussion was organised around four topics on the basis of a set of observations and questions prepared by the evaluation team and shared in advance with the PfR team.

This annex presents the content and main outcomes of the outcome harvesting process as described above. Part 1 presents the structure of the digital workshop, organised along 4 main topics. Under each topic, a number of observations and questions are listed that served as a basis for discussion, followed by the main points raised by the participants during the workshop.

Part 2 presents the outcome harvesting matrix that was prepared collaboratively with the evaluation team and the PfR team members. In this table, inputs provided by the PfR Uganda team are coloured red.

Part 1 - Structure and outcomes of the digital workshop

Topic 1: Programme design and theory of change

1.1. Theory of Change and assumptions:

Assumptions:

- The different trajectories of the Uganda PfR programme are separate but overall complementary. The use of a Theory of Change is helpful for the programme to ensure coherence and work towards a common objective.
- The practice trajectory helps generate evidence for the policy trajectories at local and national level to make lobby and advocacy activities more effective.
- Engaging in IRM dialogue with relevant government offices at the policy level will result in adaptation and replication of best practices and improved budget allocations for IRM.

Questions for reflection:

- How did these assumptions play out in reality? What are some of the lessons learnt around the assumptions?
- What are your experiences with using the Theory of Change to guide planning and maintain coherence across the programme? Has there been sufficient support in developing and using the ToC?
- In PfR III, what are some of the lessons learnt and best practices on how to synergise across trajectories? what could be done better?
- Have the practice and the policy lobby and advocacy gone sufficiently hand in hand? How did this work in practice, and were there sufficient resources for this?

- **What is your impression of the complementarity of different trajectories?**

PfR Uganda response:

The policy trajectories are quite complementary. In terms of a general approach, it was complementary, for example, if the climate change trajectory made more headway in comparison to wetlands. We were then able to learn more from the climate change policy, eg how they have engaged with ministers and members of parliament. So trajectories complement each other in approach. But there is difficulty in complementarity due to technocrats within different ministries. For example, climate change technocrats may not join hands with technocrats from other departments. This may be due to budgeting, or specific programme needs or agendas. If it's for wetlands issues, for example, you are very specific on who you target.

Within policy, there are issues that create a lack of complementarity. Institutional mandates might clash. We found this in developing the wetlands policy. MENA is a stand-alone authority, when engaging them about wetlands policy, there is a lack of complementarity.

- **This echoes much with the situation in Indonesia. Very tightly defined mandates and institutional barriers, which hinder ministry collaboration/complementarity. Was this more at local government level in Uganda?**

PfR Uganda Response:

At the district level, there are district officers who coordinate together and there is greater complementary and collaboration than at the national level. However, at the district level there are institutional clashes between local government and municipal. The Municipality might have an

environment officer, similar to district level, with similar budgets and programmes, which might create clashes.

It has been easier to influence districts, especially when creating by-laws. The District departments easily coordinate, and it is easier to work with them as communities are closer to them, and easier for these communities to knock on district governance doors to push for their agendas. The district level responds to community voices faster than at national level. Districts are also at the forefront. They are faced with droughts, floods etc. so when you introduce an approach, they feel like the best government level to solve a problem and come up with solutions.

- **Regarding coherence between trajectories. In the ToC design there seems to be a feedback loop between practice and policy level. In hindsight what are your experiences to the extent that this process flows in a smooth way and has played out in reality?**

PfR Uganda response:

Pushing the agenda from local to national level has made it easier for us. Policy makers visit the areas where we work. We bring local voices from communities to attend parliamentary sessions to give input. These processes have played out well. Members of parliament also want to see evidence. You need to show practice. We have laid very good ground for bridging between local level and policy makers.

- **You spoke about the need of showing evidence to decision makers. What type of evidence really works best? Is it oral evidence, is it on paper eg a KM product? Is it via a meeting and presentation, or is it bringing stakeholders together in the field?**

PfR Uganda response:

In recent experience with the Wetlands Policy Bill, the emphasis was on hard evidence around policy issues and legislation. Using impact assessment as the first step. You need hard evidence to get the legal process to move. Policy makers respond to hard evidence.

1.2. On policy engagement

Organisational politics: There has been sufficient access for CSOs to national and local decision-making institutions and programmes that have the mandate and the capacity to mainstream the IRM principles at national and local level. The adoption of the new NGO law has had a positive effect in this regard.

Timing of policy processes: Major decisions often take time and are also stalled due to political dynamics or other emerging priorities. As a result, a long time is needed – perhaps even longer than the duration of the programme – to reach tangible outcomes by way of policy change, behavioural change, ... to be realised.

Contributions vs. attribution of outcomes: In general, in policy influencing, one could have contributed to a significant outcome but there are so many other variables and actors contributing towards the same results that it is very difficult to derive attribution. Therefore, the reflection on outcomes by the PfR should also be contextualised in terms of this reality.

Questions for reflection:

What were your starting expectations vs. reality of the ease of and effectiveness of working with national and local government to influence policies? Did you anticipate internal organisational politics, potential inaccessibility, impact of bureaucracy and slow pace of decision-making?

- **Regarding the issue of access. The impact of the new NGO (CSO) law at national level. Has this been a positive experience in terms of accessing officers in government and pushing for change since the new law has been in place?**

PfR Uganda response:

Our issues are not very political, and everyone is worried about climate change issues. So we are looking at topics that interest everyone, and thus also in the interest of policymakers. When it comes to human rights issues that come into contention with politicians or governments officials, this is not easy to engage with. So it is a lot easier to engage the government about PfR and climate issues. We engage politicians, technocrats, in identifying the problem and how we can work together. This has been a plus for PfR and why it has been easier to push for an IRM agenda.

With the new CSO law established, there has been greater recognition of CSOs by the government now. It is therefore not easier to operate with the government. Civil society has built up a lot of credibility, and this new law has provided them with legitimacy to be taken seriously. Now you can raise issues, but as long as they are not political.

With nuances in regard to CSO law, PfR came at the right time. Climate change is an international topic, many people affected by this. The Ugandan government had made commitments to tackle climate change already. So PfR was very much aligned to national and international approaches. PfR is packaged with organisations that have a lot of expertise. With or without the CSO law, the PfR would have still had accepted presence in Uganda.

Topic 2: Capacity strengthening and knowledge management

Capacity strengthening: A key element of the programme design is that capacity strengthening will help local partners to become more effective in taking forward their lobby and advocacy activities to promote IRM. Local CSOs, companies, government departments and other stakeholders have benefited from a range of capacity strengthening activities, mostly in the form of sensitisation, awareness-raising (e.g. on benefits of sustainable wetlands management) and technical training on IRM concept, principles and practice (e.g. practice of climate-smart agriculture, water harvesting, preparedness for bush burning or mudslides). To some extent, training has also covered more generic skills for local CSOs e.g. in terms of lobby and advocacy, knowledge management, process facilitation, external communication, but this was more limited.

Dialogue Capacity Frameworks: The Dialogue Capacity Framework has provided a tool to help identify capacity gaps and needs among local partners, but its usefulness to help guide capacity strengthening planning has been limited. Many capacity strengthening activities for local partners also address project management-related topics (e.g. finance, administration) for them to comply with the management standards of the programme. This partially diverted attention away from building the skills needed in terms of programme implementation.

Knowledge management: Knowledge management comes in many forms and shapes throughout the programme and is used for different purposes. These notably are documentation and sharing of

knowledge and information from the practice level to help inform policy processes (e.g. policy brief on understanding climate change impact in selected vulnerable hotspots in Uganda), research to help build an evidence base (e.g. EMLI study on climate adaptation finance) to inform advocacy, and learning workshops and study visits for PfR partners to improve programme implementation through lessons-sharing.

Questions for reflection:

- Has capacity strengthening been sufficiently based on a proper diagnostic of partners' and stakeholder needs? Beyond more technical training in IRM, has the capacity strengthening in terms of building skills (lobby and advocacy, facilitation, communication...) been sufficient and appropriate to local partners' needs?
- Does the observation sufficiently capture the use of knowledge management within the programme? How have knowledge management activities helped to perform better in terms of lobby and advocacy? What could be improved in the approach to KM?
- **A lot of activities in Uganda focus on sensitization, awareness, and training on IRM. e.g. strengthening CSOs to lobby and advocate. But mostly on technical IRM training, and less so on generic skills. Is this the case? Secondly, how do you design and plan for capacity strengthening activities? The dialogue capacity framework - has that been useful to identify gaps and address needs of local partners?**

PfR Uganda response:

Generally agree that to a large extent, quite a bit of capacity strengthening has been on understanding IRM as an approach, upscaling it from the partners to all other stakeholders. But in reflection on the investment trajectory, Wetlands International has worked quite a bit with CARE on this trajectory. The capacity strengthening allowed us to engage with small and medium enterprises. But lacking in some ways in terms of building partnerships to engage with big multinational investors.

In the design for Capacity strengthening, it is not only on IRM. We also looked at which tools partners use to push for the agenda. As an alliance, we had to redesign to know how to engage with a new form of SME investors who disregard government regulations and get away with it.

We have been successful in capacity strengthening in IRM and empowering local partners to be able to engage, and working with communities to make sure they were able to engage. In communities and local governments where we worked on investments, they have been able to push for investments at the local level. Small companies that were polluting the rivers - Communities were able to put a stop to that with this work on investments.

- **In regard to the Dialogue Capacity Framework tool, have you found this a useful tool to plan capacity strengthening activities?**

PfR Uganda response:

We have engaged with it at every workshop at country level. It is very detailed and has been very helpful. Entails all capacities we need to implement PfR, although some capacity elements may not apply to us. But it makes us reflect on whether a capacity has been applied, and allows us to plan for it. In our annual reports, you'll find that this framework is very related to where we report on capacity strengthening.

- **An issue came up on how much capacity strengthening was considered the hub of the PfR programme. The experience in Indonesia was that members have directly engaged with the government, rather than engaging in capacity strengthening to do this. Is this similar in the Ugandan context? How have you positioned CS in the programme?**

PfR Uganda response:

It depends on how someone defines capacity strengthening. Have had incidents where we have taught organisations about the approaches and issues we want them to adopt to engage decision makers. But also had scenarios where PfR has been a mixture of capacity strengthening and lobbying and advocacy at the same time. There have also been times where even if the agenda for PfR was to put capacity strengthening of CSOs at the forefront, we have found that the PfR partnership is best placed to engage directly with facilitators for multiple different reasons. So we did not put capacity strengthening as the key method of PfR, it's been a blend of approaches. We should do a small evaluation amongst ourselves to see to what extent we built up the capacities of local partners.

Once you enter that space in government, it's easier to carry people along as you go. For example, for the Climate Change Bill, we had a partner at the parliamentary level. Easier for them to have a foot in parliament, so easier for them to lobby on IRM and to ensure that members of parliament understand what is being pushed for. Complementing each other on different spaces so it is easier to engage. Building and supporting local partners, but also taking advantage of every space available.

Remark from evaluation team: This suggests a nuanced approach on how capacity strengthening is intertwined with lobbying and advocacy work. Important lesson that comes from country cases.

- **What could be improved in regard to capacity strengthening?**

PfR Uganda response:

Capacity strengthening is a continuous activity. Need to have, maybe in PfR III, a reflection process and identify serious gaps where capacity strengthening is further needed. Also technical training for partners to do certain things and move agenda quickly. We are not having enough training currently. Need to prioritise this in the next phase of the programme.

Topic 3: Cross-cutting issues

3.1 On inclusion and gender sensitivity

Inclusion is at the centre of what PfR does, especially addressing specific needs of marginalised and vulnerable groups, including women. In Uganda, this mostly manifests itself in focusing practice engagement on regions that are marginalised or vulnerable to droughts, landslides... e.g. Otuke, Karamoja, and by facilitating processes to make sure that voices of disadvantaged communities are consulted in national policy processes.

Building largely on the expertise of CARE and its gender marker, awareness and capacities on gender mainstreaming of all partners have been improved in the course of the programme. Yet there is scope to further strengthen understanding of how gender issues can be tackled when promoting IRM at the practice/local level.

Questions for reflection:

How successful have the PfR team's efforts been in promoting inclusion and making sure that voices of marginalised and vulnerable groups are picked up at the national level? To what extent has improved awareness on gender issues also been picked up in the design of programme activities? What other means could be used to mainstream inclusion and gender sensitivity at the national and local/practical level?

3.2 On Sustainability

The main 'theory of change' strategy of the programme to ensure sustainable impact of its efforts is indeed by focusing on influencing policies, which if made IRM-smart, will have a positive impact well beyond the lifetime of the programme. While this is one approach, the nature of the Uganda programme, as one that works directly with policy stakeholders means that it should think about its sustainability strategy and exit plan differently from the PfR country programmes. It may not be time yet to think about an exit plan, however, looking ahead in the future, how should PfR III be built in a way that builds on results from PfR II and cements the impact of the Alliance for a longer term?

Questions for reflection:

How does the programme ensure that the local stakeholders it targets will continue to adopt IRM in their policies, and practices even after the life of the PfR Uganda programme? How will this play out, particularly noting the fact that the target areas are influenced by political interests and incentives that continuously evolve?

- **Could you tell us a bit more about inclusion and gender sensitivity in the programme? Also the issue of sustainability, how do you ensure that the impact of PfR will remain beyond the lifetime of the programme and ensure its legacy will continue?**

PfR Uganda response:

Regarding sustainability: with civil society, the partners that we have, and networks that we feed into, some of the partners we have are also members of other networks. We do training on IRM and then find out many organisations do one or two and then integrating IRM has been easier in their strategic plans.

Uganda Red Cross society has now revised their mandate to do development and has integrated IRM. So IRM will remain because it is becoming part of organisations. At the district level, some districts have a chapter on IRM in their district plans on what brings DRR and ecosystem management and climate change adaptation together. They have found ways of putting this in their budgets and now ingrained within their plans. Multi stakeholder platforms push for IRM at regional level within the country. Even when PfR finishes, appreciation for IRM and tools, this will carry on for sustainability.

Regarding marginalised groups: These have been involved in consultations at regional and national level. Given a chance to speak their views. You have a gender focal person, and a person representing indigenous communities.

- **In the Uganda context, to what extent have you pushed the concept of IRM? Or have you rather focussed on the substance behind IRM? Has it been useful to use the label, or not so much?**

PfR Uganda response:

In our experience, it is always best to break down IRM for partners, for them to realise that working on the three components is what IRM essentially is. So for example, in training that we have been doing, breaking down IRM, explaining the three components, and how they influence each other and interact with each other.

It is very difficult sometimes to bring in new jargon or a complicated concept. But in processes like the national development plan, we broke down the 3 different components of IRM. Different components were integrated into this plan.

- **You have benefitted from CARE in mainstreaming gender throughout the programme, and building awareness on gender sensitivities. Do you think there is scope to strengthen gender sensitivity?**

PfR Uganda response:

In the practice trajectory we have included gender, and this has been going well. But what is lacking is gender equity. It is unlikely that we have rocked the boat in any significant way. We have made strides in ensuring women are included in planning and that their voices are heard. Bringing them to the forefront of actions has been key. Also need to make sure that the women are pushing for the agenda for women. So not always about numbers, but making sure that what they are saying is key. Need to work more to sufficiently have women represented and have their voices heard. During review of the draft wetland policy, CARE advocated for gender issues to be explicitly mentioned and addressed. This was done. Additionally, CARE, URCS and PFCC advocated for gender to be integrated in the principles for the NDPM bill and this was adopted.

In terms of gender, over time we have improved on gender in our design of the proposals. But a lot is still to be done to improve. In PfR III we need to consider issues of gender, which will require additional capacity strengthening in policy work.

- **If PfR III is going to be funded, it concerns the future of PfR. If it is realised, then the question is on governance. What changes might be needed in the governance of the entire PfR programme? Or should they continue as they are? Where can things be improved?**

PfR Uganda response:

In the new power of voices, there is more southern leadership, which will produce changes. There will be more authority given to the southern partners. But what does this mean for Uganda? Will more local partners be in the lead? Don't think we have managed to work enough on strengthening local partners to fulfil this role.

The current management structure has been good. It is not a blueprint, but there is a structure. More of a loose framework. Makes it flexible, easier to manoeuvre through.

Already we can see a significant shift in terms of decision making over the years. When it comes to the power of voices, that phase on southern leadership, we can see that organisations in the north have engaged us more in developing and contextualizing the design of the Power of Voices proposal through consultations, writing proposals etc. Capacity strengthening was conducted by CARE and PfR members were consulted. The output was the Kampala recommendations which were also used in the PoV design. Moving forward, we need to move towards more discussions between north and south. Will we be more involved in discussing the real issues, because we understand more the local dynamics, things happening in the country etc.

- **If there is a choice taken in widespread engagement in real processes e.g. budget discussions, would you be able to take this on with the existing resources you have? To contribute to extra tasks and discussions on top of your responsibilities already?**

PfR Uganda response:

With the resources that we have, the way that the partnership is designed, we have a good grasp already of the issues happening on the ground. We have local partners from regional, national and district. We have a good knowledge base and understanding of issues. It's hard to say if the resources are enough, because you never know if you need more or personnel. What we have now is sufficient, but we need to leave some room due to dynamic country context. Need to have flexibility in this way.

We would need more funds to engage in these processes. It would be good to have budget discussions, after developing the ToC each year, because then you would know where you would need the resources allocate

Topic 4: Partnership, Complementarity and Coordination

Complementarity: The partnership is based on the strategic value in terms of technical expertise and/or access to policy spaces each organisation brings. Partners bring complementary expertise across the three main dimensions of IRM, as well as access to different policy levels and stakeholders at national and/or local level, and across different regions within the country.

Wetlands International comes with extensive experience in wetland management and restoration of ecosystems and has MoU with the Ministry of Water and Environment. Cordaid has expertise on resilient livelihoods and the interface between DRR and climate change adaptation, whereas CARE has expertise on DRR/CCA/EMR, partnerships, standing MOUs with MAAIF, MoWE, UNMA, OPM, NGO forum, policy and practice on natural resources governance, established communication with district authorities (e.g. in Otuke) and knowledge of applying a gender lens. The Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre works with the other alliance members especially with support to tools and capacity strengthening on climate change adaptation and joint implementation on advocacy. URCS has expertise on DRR, a good working relationship with the DRM directorate and a wide network of local branches. The country team has also responded effectively to the transition from PfR I to PfR II by integrating new organisations with L&A experience, research, and capacities at the national level, such as PFCC, EMLI, and PELUM.

Collaboration: There is a division of tasks, different partners take the lead over different trajectories within the overall setup of the country programme, and partners plan their own strands of activities and policy engagement in each trajectory. Yet there is also shared ownership over the programme as a whole, which translates in a good practice of interaction between partners, consultation in policy processes, joint action or support in the form of thematic expertise (e.g. PELUM and CARE providing input from a climate change lens into a wetlands position paper), advice on processes and approaches and co-financing activities. Social media such as Facebook, WhatsApp... also help facilitate information-sharing and coordination through more informal channels.

Relation between international and local partners: The relation between international and local partners has evolved in the course of the programme beyond a donor-recipient relation. Whereas project processes (e.g. PME) and decision-making were initially not sufficiently adapted to local realities and challenges, local partners have increasingly been involved in project processes and decision-making in a spirit of co-ownership. Local partners value the PfR not just as a provider of resources, but also as a platform to pitch ideas, share views,...

Questions for reflection:

- Do you agree that the setup of the partnership has been overall complementary? In the course of the programme, have you encountered certain issues with availability of expertise or access to political fora? How did you deal with them?
- Do you agree with the assessment that collaboration and coordination between partners has been positive and effective? In the future, are there any issues that you would like to improve?
- What has triggered the evolution in the relation between international and local partners?

Note: Due to time constraints and technical difficulties, questions relating to topic 4 could not be asked or responded to.

Part 2 - outcome harvesting matrix

Based on document analysis and interviews. Any text highlighted in red signifies text added by PfR Uganda participants.

| <u>Trajectories</u> | <u>Outcomes</u> in relation to each trajectory | <u>Significance</u> of each change | <u>Contribution</u> of PfR to each change |
|--|--|--|---|
| <u>Trajectory 1:</u> Uganda Climate Change Bill | <p>Policy-makers and government officials working on climate change and beyond are more aware of IRM ; Increased consensus on importance of integrating IRM principles in draft bill.</p> <p>MoWE /CCD started to acknowledge work of PfR in their reports to UNFCCC (eg. TAF study used to prepare government report to COP25) and Government also used PfR study to report to NDC Partnership. NDC Partnership used it to publish article in their website.</p> <p>Government also developed Programme Based Budgeting System (PBS) which is used to track climate change actions across all sectors of government. This signifies kick off by government in planning and budgeting for climate change and risk management in sectors.</p> | <p><i>This is significant because:</i></p> <p>IRM approaches are now also more widely applied across the board, e.g. through the integration of methodologies on DRR and climate change adaptation at the government official level.</p> <p>Members of parliament are now better equipped to be champions on climate change and IRM in their own constituencies, e.g. to popularise tree planting, sensitising rice cultivators on use of and property rights over wetlands, promote restoration of drained wetlands.</p> <p>The existing gender sensitive climate change indicators or frameworks and guides provides fertile ground for NCC Bill to be implemented once approved.</p> <p>TAF study empowered government with knowledge on financial gaps from commitments by foreign donors which will now be followed. Ministry of Finance and CCD are already discussing the need to establish a finance department for adaptation.</p> | <p><i>PfR has contributed to this outcome by:</i></p> <p>... working through PFCC to provides expertise, training, research and updated information to members of parliament, which helps them create a better awareness and become champions on climate change and IRM in their legislative and control work, as well as in their constituency outreach.</p> <p>... producing a study on tracking adaptation finance through EMLI and engaging other CSOs to assess the financial inflows related to Climate Change Adaptation and gender responsiveness.</p> <p>... building capacity of the Members of Parliament, CSOs, and district officials on the IRM concept and principles to inform their policy formulation debates, planning, budgeting, and dialogue with other stakeholders.</p> <p>...conducted research and produced simplified policy briefs and other materials such as the IRM Gap analysis and the Policy recommendations on the vulnerable hot spots of Uganda.</p> <p>...Brought forward publications of PfR I on</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>'Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development in Uganda: District CCA Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators' to continuously demand MoWE /CCD to foster their integration in governments performance tool and start measuring adaptation work in development programmes.</p> <p>Secondly, facilitated development of the 'Standard National Climate Change Indicators and Reference sheets as part requirement by UNFCCC for addressing national commitments to UNFCCC like allocation of funding towards making climate change policies functional.</p> |
| | <p>Rebuilding/keeping momentum of legislative process of Climate change bill.</p> <p>Promoting implementation of the NCC policy and frame works like National Climate Smart Agriculture to demonstrate benefits from CSA and the need to fasten approval of the NCC Bill so that there is legal instrument to compel allocation of more funds for IRM.</p> | <p>The climate change bill process had long been stalled but now has received new attention again, despite continued challenges to keep attention high (e.g. because of prioritisation of environmental policy and act). The legislative process itself also helps sensitising people at the community level more about the importance of climate change (adaptation) and how to pursue it.</p> | <p>... working through PFCC members to put pressure on MoWE/climate change department to define principles of climate change bill, informally share with line ministers put legislative process back on the rails, sustain the momentum at which MPs demand for the Bill.</p> <p>Making use of other networks outside PfR e.g CARE has made use of ACCRA and INGO Africa Climate Smart Agriculture (ACSA) Alliance to advocate for passing the bill.</p> |
| | <p>Creation of Parliamentary standing Committee on Climate Change <i>[more an unintended positive outcome]</i>.</p> | <p>The creation of a standing climate change committee eases discussion on climate change issues within the parliament, while the PFCC (of which all committee members are also members) provides a link with the wider society.</p> | <p>PfR contribution to PFCC Helped enlighten members of Parliament on the need to establish a standing committee that would compel parliament to deliberate climate change on the floor of Parliament. This is evidenced by the appointment of the chair PFCC as the Chair of the standing committee. The Forum led to the birth of the Committee.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | | | PfR supported the second phase of orienting the Committee. |
| | Recommendations of PfR on Climate Change Bill adopted (some 40% of all recommendations formulated). | Civil society and community voices included in Climate Change Bill. | <p>... facilitating and financing civil society consultation process on the bill and using political networks via PFCC to put pressure on drafting team to adopt CSO recommendations, including on IRM.</p> <p>... conducting a gap analysis of the draft bill in close cooperation with the bill drafting process. These recommendations were shared widely for CSOs to re-echo them during the Bill consultations at all levels....facilitated the two meetings by the First Parliamentary Counsel and the Technical Working Group during the drafting of the Uganda Climate Change Bill through PELUM Uganda, CARE and RCCC.</p> |
| | Popularisation of climate change bill. | Reasonable number of people in Uganda are aware of the CC Bill in the offing. They are preparing for their responses to some of the salient features of the Bill with their respective MPs. | <p>... using media appearances (e.g. in Climate people's parliament) to sensitise wider audience on climate change bill and importance for different regions/communities.</p> <p>-Cordaid financed at least 4 people who formed part of the national Consultation Team in all regions of Uganda and held other consultations with the special interest groups and representatives from Hotspots like the Elgon.</p> <p>... producing policy brief on understanding climate change impacts in selected climate vulnerable hotspots in Uganda by PELUM, CARE.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | Various IRM recommendations adopted in the NAP-Ag (National Adaptation Plan for Agriculture). | NAP-Ag contributes to the domestication process of international frameworks on climate change, esp. the UNFCCC. | ... participating in the CSO technical committee of the NAP-Ag (via PELUM) and promoting IRM principles in process. |
| Trajectory 2: Uganda Wetlands Policy/Bill | Wetlands policy and Bill review process revived. | <p><i>This is significant because:</i></p> <p>The draft Wetlands Bill already exists since 2009 but had been stalled because of jurisdiction issues due to lack of a clear policy direction on governance and failure by the old Environment Law to provide for clear institutional mandates.</p> | <p><i>PfR has contributed to this outcome by:</i></p> <p><i>...CARE, Wetlands International and ECO</i> supporting the Ministry of Water and Environment/Wetlands Management Department to revamp the process of reviewing the existing national wetlands policy and the draft Bill 2009 through regional, national level and high level consultations. This included review of the Regulatory Impact Assessment as required by the standing orders from the Cabinet Secretariat.</p> |
| | <p>MoWE, CSOs and local authorities (especially the sub national governments) are more aware on importance of IRM in Wetlands management policy and practice</p> <p>The voice of community stakeholders, private sector and civil society recommendations are captured and reflected in the revised policy and Bill</p> <p>IRM principles are taken into account during review processes of Wetlands policy and Bill; draft policy mentions IRM-informed risk management measures.</p> | <p>The organisation of consultation processes helps in making the process more inclusive, participatory and easily accepted by all stakeholders - and more especially by the communities (their voices) who are impacted by the policy and Bill. The creation of a technical team of government officials, experts and CSOs helps to ensure uptake of consultation outcomes in the review process.</p> | <p>.... being a facilitator in the broader policy process. PfR has provided technical input, both through advocacy and financial support e.g. to organise regional consultations of communities and CSOs, which made the process more inclusive. PfR tried to bring communities, special interest groups and traditional institutions on board in the review processes. PfR partners also work to ensure uptake of consultation outcomes in the drafting process. Although it remains a government-led process, CSOs are now more taken on board than before and are influencing the outcome and shape of the policy and Bill.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | <p>District authorities are more able to translate national wetlands policy at the community level, e.g. in Otuke new district ordinance on natural resources management.</p> <p>Otuke district local government coordinated peers in the land scape and have inter-district coordination to manage emerging issues eg seasonal migration of pastoralists from Karamoja to Lango subregion in dry seasons.</p> | <p>This is significant because implementation of the policy and law are mostly done at the community level. It is therefore important for clarity at this level to be provided here for ease of implementation of the policy and law.</p> | <p>... PfR partners have provided technical support to Otuke district officials in the drafting of the new ordinance on natural resources management, including by setting up meetings and discussions.</p> |
| <p><u>Trajectory 3:</u> National Disaster Preparedness and Management Policy /Bill</p> | <p>Office of the Prime Minister committed to fast tracking the National Disaster Preparedness and Management Policy/Bill making Process</p> | <p><i>This is significant because:</i></p> <p>The impact of disasters in Uganda has been felt for a long time. The OPM requested support from PfR for DRR law legislation processes but have been stuck with the internal dynamics between the Ministry of Finance (hosting the Disaster Fund). OPM hopes that PfR will bring onboard good practice and comprehensive climate laws.</p> | <p><i>PfR has contributed to this outcome by:</i></p> <p>... providing training on DRR advocacy to other PfR partners as well as partners in the field</p> <p>...Strengthening local DRR platforms of Teso to ably engage in related DRR Legal frameworks.</p> <p>... creating awareness, fast-track meetings and pushing for urgent need for climate smart policies and legislation in Uganda working with Parliamentary Forum for Disaster Risk Reduction.</p> <p>...Reviewing the principles of the Bill together with the Drafting Team. Formulating IRM messages included in the Bill draft.</p> <p>... pioneered and engaged a Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre Youth in Adaptation Tool Kit (Y-adapt) to create online and offline</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>advocacy for Disaster Legislation in Uganda.</p> <p>... working with the OPM on the DRM policy and bill through the Parliamentary Forum on DRR to push for DRR bill and providing technical input in risk assessment and regional consultation of draft bill to ensure uptake of civil society interests in the bill.</p> |
| | Civil society and community voices consulted during the consultation process on policy and bill. | <p>Civil societies provide alternative forms of much needed advocacy.</p> <p>This consultation enables the process to be more inclusive with specific area needs included or adopted to the policy/bill.</p> | ... facilitating community participation in production of NDPM bill and policy processes through regional/local consultations. |
| | More awareness on NDPM bill among local disaster management committees. | There is urgent need to implement the existing Disaster Management Policy. | ... supporting local governments and disaster committees in terms of training and sensitization, e.g. on disaster contingency planning. |
| <u>Trajectory 4:</u> Investment | Views on IRM and climate change integrated into the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment. | <p><i>This is significant because:</i></p> <p>This is significant because integrating IRM into ESIA presents the cheapest and easier way of ensuring that the private sector and any stakeholder involved in development projects integrates the IRM principles and practices in their operations and can be held responsible for non-compliance.</p> | <p><i>PFR has contributed to this outcome by:</i></p> <p>Providing technical support, mobilizing stakeholders, writing technical briefs and lobbying policy makers to address climate change, DRR and EMR into the revised ESIA regulations. This was done at the national level and involved mobilizing CSOs and writing a technical brief to NEMA.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | Wetlands stakeholders have enhanced awareness of IRM approach to resolve wetland issues and integrate IRM principles in the planning process as part of the chain to develop wetlands management plans. | This is significant because once IRM is integrated into wetlands management plans, then resilience of both ecosystems and the stakeholders or wetlands dependent communities will be enhanced and generate multiple benefits for all. | Providing support via engaging stakeholders and building their capacity to integrate IRM into wetland management plans. |
| | SMEs can better access climate and weather information in target districts. | This is significant because by SMEs accessing climate and weather information, they can better plan for risk mitigation and climate proof their investments hence becoming more resilient in the long term. | PfR facilitated this through providing training on IRM, importance of weather and climate information for businesses. |
| | Making local investments at district level IRM sensitive. | This is important because it increases protection of the eco-system. | PfR facilitated this through training of SMEs and District Local Governments in Otuke. |
| <u>Trajectory 5:</u> Practice | More awareness of IRM in local government plans, and among practitioners and schools. | <p><i>This is significant because:</i></p> <p>Inclusion of IRM in local government plans is vital for increased budget allocation in district local governments for IRM related plans and activities.</p> <p>Increased awareness of IRM is important for adoption and scale up of IRM practices by community members.</p> | <p><i>PfR has contributed to this outcome by:</i></p> <p>... sensitising and training community structures on the importance of IRM and how to apply it in practice (e.g. how to interpret climate data, observe mudslide risks, build community warning systems, IRM-sensitive saving and lending) and how to document past experiences.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | Access, use and reporting of weather forecast by end users (farmers, district authorities) scaled up in various districts. | Farmers before only had access to more generic weather information at the national level which they received via the radio. Now they have access to more specific information focused on their specific areas, which allows them to plan better. Also the Uganda National Meteorological Authority appreciates being able (e.g. through DRR platforms) to better reach farmers. UNMA only has channels of mass media through radio and reports, but access to local level is difficult. District authorities appreciate weather information flow and climate mainstreaming and integrating IRM in their planning and budgets. | ... PfR partners have worked with district authorities in Otuke, Teso and Karamoja region (political leaders, environment department, production department, natural resources department...) to promote better dissemination of weather forecast information to farmers. They also helped setup and/or facilitate structures at community level (e.g. DRR Platform for Teso, Riam Riam in Karamoja and Otuke Multi-stakeholder platform) which serve as platforms to disseminate information. |
| | Districts and communities (political leaders, officials, farmers...) have adopted and scaled up practice of climate-smart agriculture. | Climate-smart agriculture applies an IRM approach in that it contributes to climate change adaptation, DRR and resilience, as it is about preparing for adverse natural events as well as having a longer-term impact on the climate. It therefore provides practical showcases on IRM in practice. | ... PfR partners have provided information and training, practice-sharing to district authorities, communities, businesses and farmers on climate-smart agriculture. |
| | Communities are more aware and empowered to take responsibility of natural resources management. In Otuke, community environment committees are set up to handle environmental issues and manage wetlands in Otuke district. These structures have all signed a natural resources asset management framework, providing guidance on the sustainable use of natural resources and wetlands, | The setup of community structures not only to better perform on environmental issues within their communities (e.g. more awareness of natural resources management issues and value of wetlands, demarcation of buffer zones, more use of water harvesting reduced cutting of shea nut tree and better preparedness for bush burning), but through participation in bigger events also were able to promote their IRM approaches in other districts. In Katakwi, | ... PfR contributed to the creation of community environment committees through training and assistance (already since PfR I) and also provided training on IRM practice e.g. water harvesting. PfR also contributed to the formation or training of existing VSLAs and supported them to register as SACCOs. These have been linked to district commercial officers who continue to support them in |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>integrating local norms and practices. Community response teams are set up that reflect the IRM approach combining members with different backgrounds. Also in Katakwi, farmers have organised themselves in community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction committees.</p> | <p>training with the district Commercial Officer also covered how farmers can better organise their businesses.</p> <p>An unintended outcome has also been that community environment committees also function as structures to manage conflict over natural resources and reduce competition for grazing ground.</p> | <p>organisational development and supported them access government programs.</p> |
| | <p>The creation of community structures also contributed to financial inclusion of farmers: In Otuke, the community environment committee saw a quick growth in membership since 2017 (from 20 to 200) so they were able to form a VSLA. In Katakwi, district authorities supported VSLAs to grow into SACCOs and become bankable. In Katakwi VSLAs have registered SACCOs.</p> <p>In Nabilatuk District, supported groups benefited from Uganda Women Empowerment Programs, Youth Livelihoods Programs and Regional Pastoralist Livelihoods' Resilience Project.</p> | <p>Upgrade to SACCOs increases access to formal financial services (loans) to members.</p> <p>This increases communities access to government programs which increases their resilience.</p> | <p>PfR trained groups and also facilitated linkages with District commercial officers who further linked them to other micro finance institutions.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | <p>Communities are better organised to address DRM. Interaction between local authorities and CSOs from different districts in Teso sub-region is strengthened through creation of DRR platform, in Karamoja Riam Riam and Otuke Multi-stakeholder platform which also includes the Uganda National Meteorological Authority. Also in Soroti, The Disaster Risk Reduction Platform for Teso that brings together multiple CSOs from Teso together has been established and it engages in continuous planning for DRM, facilitates dissemination of climate information received from UNMA, and facilitates the exchange of good practices e.g. new technology for flood-resistant huts, water harvesting, tree planting.</p> | <p>The platform engages in exchange meetings, learning meetings, participates in international DRR days and other national events. It also provides input into district work plans, documentation of early warning information. It also contributes to increased appreciation and adoption of IRM practice at the individual level e.g. in climate-smart agriculture development.</p> <p>Communities get adequate information on weather forecast to manage DRM through Interaction between district authorities and RiamRiam CSN members.</p> | <p>PfR formed or facilitated organisational development of platforms. Conducted trainings, exposure and exchange visits.</p> |
| | <p>IRM approach adopted local DRR committees. In Mbale, the Manafa village DRR group, which originally started as a farmers group, has been transformed into the Manafa IRM club.</p> | <p>The reformed Manafa IRM club also engages in climate change adaptation, disaster observing using modern technologies, savings and lending activities. They also are better organised to communicate with district authorities when disaster strikes and support with information and documentation.</p> | <p>PfR supported in re-vitalising District Disaster Management Committees, training and facilitating their functionality.</p> |

Annex B - List of interviewees

- Rachel Kyoziira, Cordaid Uganda/PfR Uganda county lead
- Lorna Kobusingye, Wetlands International
- Anthony Wolimbwa, ECO
- Stephen Olupot, Uganda Red Cross Society
- Brian Kanaahe, Uganda Red Cross Society
- Monica Anguparu, CARE International
- Christine Kaaya, Parliamentary Forum on Climate Change
- Christine Lyura, Parliamentary Forum on Climate Change
- Nicholas Businge, Parliamentary Forum on Climate Change
- Gertrude Anirwoth, Parliamentary Forum on Climate Change
- Pelgia Tumuranye, Parliamentary Forum on Disaster Risk Reduction
- Lawrence Kanakulya, PELUM
- Josephine Akia Luyimbazi, PELUM
- Lucy, Ministry of Water and Environment/assistant commissioner for wetlands policy
- Akurut Violet Adome (Hon), MP and member PFCC
- Charles Hukor, MP and member PFCC
- Agnes Kumibira, MP and member PFCC
- Alex Beyarigaba, MP and member PFCC
- Elizabeth Carabine, Netherlands Embassy to Uganda/ Regional Senior Expert Climate Change
- Robert Bakiika, EMLI/Deputy Executive Director
- Ogwang David Omega, CARE International