



**SURVEY TO ASSESS
BENEFICIARY
PARTICIPATION AND
ACCOUNTABILITY
UNDER LGDP II**



HIGHER LOCAL GOVERNMENT CHECKLIST

SECTION 1A: IDENTIFICATION PARTICULARS			
1. DISTRICT:			
2. SUB-STRATUM: (MUNICIPALITY = 1, OLD DISTRICT=2, NEW DISTRICT= 3)			

THIS SURVEY IS BEING CONDUCTED BY THE UGANDA BUREAU OF STATISTICS ON BEHALF OF THE MINISTRY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT, UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE UGANDA BUREAU OF STATISTICS ACT, 1998.

THE UGANDA BUREAU OF STATISTICS

P.O. BOX 7186,

KAMPALA,

TEL: 256 414 706000

FAX: 256 414 237553

E-mail: ubos@ubos.org

Website: www.ubos.org

Beneficiary Assessment Question Checklist

The aim of the Qualitative Assessment is to generate information that will compliment the findings from the Quantitative module. This Information will be generated through Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions as Beneficiary Assessment Tools.

The levels of Assessment in this study will include:

- *Districts*
- *Sub-counties*
- *Communities (LC 1)*
- *And some key Private Firms and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) that participated in the implementation of LGDP II.*

Higher Local Government (HLG) Checklist

The purpose of this checklist is to seek learning points from a cross-section of development partners and stakeholders. The aim is to ascertain the extent to which the LGDP II implementation and management process made progress, succeeded and created social impact to beneficiaries, and how best it can be improved in future LGDPs.

Key informant interview will be held with the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) or the HLG planner. Before commencing the interview, ascertain whether the district ever received any funds under LGDP II. If it did NOT, please do not administer the questionnaire.

Part A: LGDP II Investments

I. When did your local government first receive LGDP II funds?

2003/2004	=1
2004/2005	=2
2005/2006	=3
2006/2007	=4

II. What investments were/did the district undertaken/undertake by sub-county/Division under **LGDP II since 2004**?

[illegible]

III. If some sub-counties/Divisions have more sub-projects than others. Probe for the reasons:

a)	
b)	
c)	
d)	

IV. How was the decision to invest in these projects arrived at?

a)	
b)	
c)	
d)	

V. How are the projects managed? (**Probe:** *Is there a project management committee? how often does the committee meet?*)

	Project management committee exists 1=Yes 2=No
	No. of times: _____ 1=Weekly 2=Monthly 3=Quarterly 4=Biannually 5=Annually

VI. How do the beneficiaries (users) of the project communicate their perceptions about the project?

i)	
ii)	
iii)	

VII. Would you consider extending the management principles used in this project to other local government initiatives? 1=Yes 2=No

Probe for reasons why (irrespective of the answer given)

--

VIII. What major constraints/challenges did/does this local government/department face in executing LGDP II funded investments?

i)	
ii)	
iii)	
iv)	
v)	
vi)	
vii)	
viii)	
ix)	
X)	

IX. How often do/did the Council, District Executive Committee (DEC) and District Technical Planning Committee (DTPC) meet during implementation of LGDP II.

Committee	Estimated No. of times			Why has the number reduced/increased over time?	
	2005	2006	2007	Reasons	Code
DEC				1)	
				2)	
				3)	
DPTC				1)	
				2)	
				3)	

List issues discussed

i)	
ii)	
iii)	
iv)	

X. Are there conflicts between politicians and civil servants? 1=Yes 2=No

XI. Explain circumstances and causes of conflict between politicians and civil servants

i)	
ii)	
iii)	
iv)	
v)	

XII. How did the above conflicts affect project implementation? E.g. halting construction of the road, well etc

i)	
ii)	
iii)	
iv)	

XIII. What is your perception of the quality of goods and services from other interventions as compared to LGDP II?

TYPE OF INTERVENTION	1=Better 2=Similar 3=Worse
Other Donor-funded Projects	
Private firms	
CSOs	
CBOs	
FBOs	
Other Government initiatives (specify)_____	
Other Government initiatives (specify)_____	

Part B: Capacity Building

- I. Has this local government/ department benefited from the training sponsored by the LGDP II project (*Capacity Building Grant*)? 1=Yes 2=No

(**Probe:** *Course title, number of staff, duration of training and evaluation of the training*).

Course title	Code	Duration of training		No. of staff	Evaluation of training 1=Relevant 2=Not relevant
		Weeks	months		

- II. Did “intended” beneficiaries generally access training? 1=Yes 2=No
- III. How were the capacity gaps identified? (**Probe:** Was there any training needs assessment?)

--

- IV. How have the capacity building activities affected staff performances in their respective department (**probe:** Tasks i.e. records keeping, reporting etc.) which have improved?

Tasks	Performance 1=Better 2=No change 3=Worse

- V. What are the major challenges/ constraints in accessing and utilizing capacity building grants?

Challenge/Constraint	Code
a)	
b)	
c)	
d)	
e)	
f)	
g)	
h)	

Part C: Accountability

- I. How effective is the flow of information and funds between Program Coordination Unit/MOLG and the District? (**Probe:** Flow of funds within the District and sharing of information)

1=Good 2=Average 3=Poor

	2003/2004	2004/2005	2005/2006	2006/2007
Sharing of information				
Flow of funds				

- II. Are you satisfied with the way LGDP II funds are/were utilized? 1=Yes 2=No

III. Give reasons for your answer in II above?

IV. Are you satisfied with the resource allocation criteria? 1=Yes 2=No

V. Give reasons for your answer in IV above?

VI. Are you satisfied with the resource disbursement mechanism? 1=Yes 2=No

(Probe: Flow of Funds, criteria e.t.c)

VII. Give reasons for your answer in VI above?

VIII. How often do beneficiaries and implementers report to the district on issues concerning the projects? (Feed back from the sub county)

IX. Challenges in reporting

Challenges	Code
I.	
II.	
III.	
IV.	
V.	
VI.	

Part D: Local Government Processes

- I. How has the annual Assessment exercise and the associated incentive system affected the local government processes (*staffing, planning, financial management, resource allocation, revenue mobilization, procurements and accountability*)?

Local Government Process	Code	Effect	Code

- II. What management constraints did you face in the implementation of LGDP II investments in your local government? (Probe: Financial, Administrative, Coordination, Time, e.t.c)

Implementation Constraints	Code

III. In your view, are there factors that have significantly influenced the contribution and impact of LGDP II project at this local government level (*Probe for opportunities and challenges*)?

Opportunities	Code
a)	
b)	
c)	
d)	
e)	
Challenges	
a)	
b)	
c)	
d)	
e)	

IV. How best do you think LGDP II should have been managed at district level in terms of (planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring, supervision and reporting)?

How best	Code
a)	
b)	
c)	
d)	
e)	

V. Do you think the LGDP II investments have positively affected the community beneficiaries and beyond? (**Probe:** *issues to do with service delivery, governance, quality of life and livelihood*) one=Yes 2=No.

VI. Explain your response in V above.