

VISION: A Uganda where citizens are empowered to engage in democratic governance and the state upholds citizens' rights						
High-level Outcomes (beyond the reach of the DGF)						
No	High-level Outcome	High-level Outcome Indicator	Disaggregation	Source	Baseline	Target
1	Strengthened democratic processes that respond to citizens' rights	Proportion of population satisfied with the way democracy works in Uganda	(Male/Female, Urban/Rural, Region,	Afrobarometer (Round 7, 2017) Q36.	47% (very or fairly satisfied) (women 49%, men 44%)	According to the Afrobarometer survey Ugandans have reported fluctuating levels of satisfaction with the way Democracy works; from 47% in 2005/2006 to 51% in 2011/2012 and to 47% in 2015/2016. This satisfaction levels have been influenced by; expectations before the elections, the outcomes of the elections and constitutional amendments. In light of this, the same trend is anticipated in the next five years.
		Proportion of population who think (1) men make better political leaders than women, and should be elected rather than women, and (2) women should have the same chance of being elected to political office as men	Country level data (Male/Female, Urban/Rural, Region, Political affiliation)	Afrobarometer (Round 7, 2017) Q18.	(1) 22% (Agree very strongly or Agree), (2) 77% (Agree very strongly or Agree)	According to the Afrobarometer survey there has been a growing appreciation for Ugandan women to have the same chance of being elected to political office as men with an increase from 66% (Agree or strongly agree) in 2011/2013 to 77% in 2016, but a decline in those that believes that Men make better political leaders than women, and should be elected rather than women from 33% in 2011/2012 to 22% in 2016/2017. A similar trend is anticipated in the next five years.
2	Improved citizens inclusion and engagement in decision-making processes	Civil Society Sustainability Index	Country level data	Civil Society Sustainability Index (2015)	4.2	From 2011 to 2013 Uganda had a stable CSO sustainability index at 4.3 however; it dropped to 4.2 in 2014 and 2015. A stable trend is anticipated in the first 2 years of the program and a decline towards elections due to electioneering which usually characterized by shrinking CSO space.
		Governance Accountability Score	Country level data	Mo Ibrahim Index of African Governance Accountability score (2015)	31.1	According to the Mo Ibrahim index reports, Uganda has had a declining trend in Accountability score from 32.0 in 2011, to 31.1 In 2015. With the accountability interventions in place the score is likely to remain or improve slightly.
		Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive (SDG 16.7.2)	Country level data / Citizens' characteristics as possible and relevant (Sex, age, geographical location, migratory status)	Uganda National Standard Indicator Framework (SDG) or DGF Survey	To be determined at DGF II onset	Comment: Data for this indicator is not readily available and there is less likelihood that it will be generated in the next five years annually. Proposal: This data could be collected using the DGF survey
3	Increased protection and fulfilment of human rights and gender equality.	World Justice Project, Fundamental Rights score	Country level data	World Justice Project, Fundamental rights score (2016)	0.39	Uganda has had a decline in fundamental rights score from 0.43 in 2012 to 0.39 in 2015 and 2016. This decline is highly attributed to the slow process of law and rights of the accused, limited freedom of expression and assembly. This score may improve until the year preceding elections which is usually characterized by violations of the right to freedom of opinion, expression, assembly and association.
		Global Gender Gap Report Score	Country level data	Global Gender Gap Report Data-set (World Economic Forum) (2016)	0.704	In the last five years, the World Economic Forum reported a decline in gender gap score from 0.723 in 2012 to 0.704 in 2016. This could be attributed to low women participation in Politics and Economy. It's anticipated that the next five years this score might improve moderately as a result of the enforcement of the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG-5) and Ministry of Finance Certificate of Gender equity.
4	4. Strengthened rule of law and improved access to justice for all citizens	Access to Justice Civil Justice score	Country level data	World Justice Project	0.42	Civil justice score had a declining trend from 0.51 in 2012/2013 to 0.42 in 2016. This trend might have been influenced by delayed access to justice, unaffordable civil justice and corrupt systems. With the current judicial system innovations such as promoting small claims procedure, compulsory mediation of civil matters, the score is likely to improve
		Access to Justice Criminal Justice score	Country level data	World Justice Project	0.34	Criminal justice score declined from 0.43 in 2012/2013 to 0.34 in 2015 and 2016. Since 2016 there have been innovation in the judicial system such as plea bargain and the state brief schemes, creation of Justice Centers to expedite criminal investigations, adjudication and management of case backlog. This may lead to an improvement in the score.
		Rule of Law Score	Country level data	Mo Ibrahim Index of African Governance, Rule of Law Score (2015)	58.2	Uganda registered a decline in rule of law from 56.6 in 2011 to 53.5 in 2014. However, in 2015 the score significantly improved to 58.2. This could be attributed to improved judicial process, independence and the recruitment of new Judges if maintained, this score is likely to continue to improve unless compromised by transfer of power.

Intermediate Outcomes (to which DGF will contribute)

Sphere Ref No	Outcome	Outcome Indicator	Disaggregation	Source	Baseline	Target
1	1. Responsiveness of Government towards citizens improved	1.1 Score of local government performance in districts supported by DGF interventions	By district	Local Government Scorecard	To be determined at DGF II onset	Baseline/framing papers will determine target
		1.2 Proportion of citizens reporting satisfaction with government services.	(Gender, age, geographical location, migratory status, disability)	DGF survey	To be determined at DGF II onset	To be determined after the baseline
		1.3 Evidence of democratic institutions changing policies or practices (behaviours) as a result of DGF interventions	National and Regional level, by sector, electoral practices (Excluding budget monitoring and accountability _See indicator 2.3)	Annual DGF case study produced through a combined outcome mapping - contribution analysis approach to assess and adapt the theory of change behind the area of intervention. Participatory - involving partners and beneficiaries	0 case studies (Original theory of change within strategy paper)	5 case studies (Updated theory of change on an annual basis)
2	2. Citizen engagement on government accountability improved	2.1 Proportion of the citizens that report having engaged with government representatives.	(Gender, age, geographical location, migratory status, disability)	DGF survey	To be determined at DGF II onset	To be determined after the baseline
		2.2 Proportion of citizens who report an increase in confidence in claiming their rights	Citizens' characteristics as possible and relevant (Sex, age, geographical location, migratory status, disability)	DGF-survey	To be determined at DGF II onset	To be determined after the baseline
		2.3 Evidence of positive government response (policy and practice) to budget monitoring and other accountability initiatives supported by the DGF	National and Regional level	Annual DGF case study produced through a combined outcome mapping - contribution analysis approach to assess and adapt the theory of change behind the area of intervention. Participatory - involving partners and beneficiaries	0 case studies (Original theory of change within strategy paper)	5 case studies (Updated theory of change on an annual basis)
3	3. Human Rights of all citizens are upheld	3.1 Proportion of 2016 UPR recommendations implemented which were (a) agreed by the GoU and (b) not agreed by the GoU	Disaggregation by UPR recommendations	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners. As above - a combined outcome mapping - contribution analysis will be used to provide a more qualitative measure of progress made but to DGF interventions	To be determined at DGF II onset.	To be determined after the baseline
		3.2 Proportion of citizens that report improvement in protection of fundamental rights as a result of DGF interventions.	National and Regional levels, fundamental rights	DGF survey	To be determined at DGF II onset	To be determined after the baseline
3	4. Access to justice improved	4.1 Proportion of citizens reporting satisfaction with justice services.	Citizens' characteristics as possible and relevant (Sex, age, geographical location (Specifically DGF districts), migratory status, disability, different types; legal aid, local council courts, police, courts)	(a) DGF survey. (b) National Service Delivery survey (c) client satisfaction survey with JLOS (d) Hill Survey	To be determined at DGF II onset - baseline study	To be determined after the baseline survey
		4.2 Proportion of cases committed by security forces acted upon (i.e. reported > investigated > taken to court)	Cases reported, Investigated and acted upon By district, by DGF implementing partner, issue types	Possible sources include: UHRC reporting on cases of torture (is torture increasing or is reporting increasing or is it both?). HURINET police accountability project. Police Standards Unit	To be generated from the baseline study	To be determined after the baseline survey
3	5. Gender Equality Enhanced	5.1 Number of pro-gender laws passed and/or regulated with DGF support	Type of law/policy, National, District	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners.	To be generated from the baseline study	Baseline/framing papers will determine target
		5.2 % of annual budget allocations to gender responsive activities in Ministries, Departments, Agencies	National level	EOC reports/budget reviews (Responsiveness of Ministerial Policy Statements to Gender Equity Requirements	53% (2016/17)	To be determined after consultation with EOC

Outputs

Outputs concerning processes

No	Corresponds to Area of Interventions	Output Indicator	Disaggregation	Source	Baseline	Target
1	1.1; 1.4; 2.1; 2.2; 2.3;2.5; 3.1; 3.2; 3.3; 1.3	Number (and type) of issue-based initiatives to influence the legislative/ policy framework	political party; level of party structure; qualitative - information on the process; Electoral Legislative and policy frameworks	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	1,177
2	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2	Number of cases (examples) where inputs from citizen or CSOs are taken on board by elected representatives	Citizens' characteristics as possible and relevant (Sex, age, geographical location, migratory status, disability); level of elected representatives (parliament, local councils); qualitative - information on what the initiative was/ result	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	1,060
3	1.1; 1.2; 1.4; 2.1; 2.2, 2.3,2.5; 3.1; 3.2; 3.3; 1.3; 2.4	Number of public forums where government / state institution representatives interact with the citizens and/or CSOs to influence a legislation and/or policy framework.	Type of forum (dialogue meeting, coalition, partnership) at national level and/or local level	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	4,395
4	1.3; 2.3	Number of political parties that make information on conducting of internal nomination procedures of candidates for political posts publicly available	Political party; level of party structure; qualitative - information on the process	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	10
5	3.3; 2.4	Number of initiatives taken up by targeted duty bearers related to implementation of pro-gender equality legislative frameworks	Type of initiative; level of legislative framework (national / sub national); implementing partner	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	133
6	3.4	Number of conflict prevention, peace building and transitional justice events conducted	Type of issue (Conflict prevention, peace building or transitional Justice); Geographical Distributions (National/Sub-national),	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	1,500
Outputs concerning beneficiaires						
7	1.2; 2.3;2.4	Number of individuals participating in DGF supported events	Type of campaign; Citizens' characteristics as possible and relevant (Sex, age, geographical location, migratory status, disability)	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	8,115,000
8	1.2;2.4; 3.1	Number of Youth representatives engaged in decision making structures	Type of structure (political parties, CSOs, local government, MPs etc.), Citizens' characteristics as possible and relevant (Sex, age, geographical location, migratory status, disability)	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	10,000
9	1.2; 1.3; 2.4; 3.1	Number of women representatives engaged in decision making structures	Type of structure (political parties, CSOs, local government, MPs etc.), Citizens' characteristics as possible and relevant (Sex, age, geographical location, migratory status, disability)	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	9,100
10	All Aols	No of citizens representing marginalized groups participating in DGF funded activities and events	Characteristics of citizens (Sex, age, geographical location, migratory status, disability), Marginalization category	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	161,000
11		Number of conflict and/or torture victims assisted	Gender, Age, type of conflict and/or torture, geographical distribution	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	3,000

Other outputs

No	Corresponds to Area of Interventions	Output Indicator	Disaggregation	Source	Baseline	Target
12	1.1; 2.1; 2.2;3.1;2.4	Number of monitoring reports submitted to oversight bodies by individuals involved in DGF	Type of report; topic of report, implementing partner category; individuals involved (Sex, age, geographical location, migratory status, disability)	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	627
13	1.1; 2.2; 2.3;2.4	Number of studies carried out on issues related to governance	Carried out by whom; issue area (e.g. health, NRG, budget, etc.), dissemination and use	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	35
14	All AOs	Number of individuals participating in DGF supported learning events.	Type of training; topic of training, characteristics of trainees (Sex, age, geographical location, migratory status, disability), entity/organisation of trainee	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	25,450
15	1.1; 2.1; 2.3; 2.4;3.1	Number of meetings/ dialogues/ discussions addressing attitudes, perceptions and understanding of topics such as corruption and citizenry	Type of event, Topic of event, location of event, characteristics of citizens (Sex, age, geographical location, migratory status, disability)	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	700
16	3.2	Number of legal aid cases (a) started and (b) resolved	Location of legal aid provision (district/ national), type of legal aid provider	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	420,000
17	1.4; 2.3, 3.1	Number of By-laws and guidelines produced by civil society	Carried out by whom; issue area (e.g. Media, health, NRG, budget, etc.), dissemination and use	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	55
18	1.1; 1.4; 2.1; 2.2	Number of engagements by civil society organisations in planning and budgeting	Type of engagement; level of engagement; Implementing partner category; Citizens involved (Sex, age, geographical location,	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	5,374
19	1.2; 2.3; 3.1,2.4	Number of civic education / awareness campaigns (civic education, human rights, anti-corruption)	Type of campaign (social media, local media, mobilisation in communities etc.); topic; by whom (by government, jointly, by CSO)	DGF monitoring records, data to be reported by implementing partners	not relevant	7,803