

Abbreviations

ACP	Africa, Caribbean, Pacific
AFARD	Agency For Accelerated Rural Development
BPA	Best Practice Award
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CfP	Call for Proposals
CIVICUS	No abbreviation: World Alliance for Citizen Participation
CONOB	Coalition on Non Government Organisation's (Amendment) Bill
CSCBP	Civil Society Capacity Building Programme
CSD	Civil Society Diamond
CSP	Country Strategic Paper
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CSSC	Civil Society Steering Committee
DENIVA	Development Network for Indigenous Associations
ECCA	Empower Children and Communities Against Abuse
ECD	European Commission Delegation
ECDPM	European Centre for Development Policy Management
EDF	European Development Fund
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreement
FA	Financing Agreement
FBO	Faith Based Organisation
GoU	Government of Uganda
IDFA	Iganga District Farmers' Association
IFI	International Financial Institutes
IO	Intermediary Organisation
IP	Intermediary Person
INGO	International Non Governmental Organisation
IRDI	Integrated Rural Development Initiative
KADIFA	Kasese District Farmers Association
KAWIDA	Kamwenge Women for Integrating Dis-Abled
KADO	Kamugu Development Organisation
KIIDA	Kitgum Integrated Initiative for Development Action
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoFPED	Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development
MoIA	Ministry of Internal Affairs
MP	Member of Parliament
MTR	Mid Term Review
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory and Development Services
NAO	National Authorising Officer
NAYODEP	Nagongera Youth Development Programme
NDP	National Development Plan
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NORAD	Norwegian Assistance for Development
NSA	Non State Actor
NRM	National Resistance Movement
OCA(T)	Organisational Capacity Assessment (Tool)

OPM	Office of the Prime Minister
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PMA	Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture
PMU	Programme Management Unit
PRMT	Participatory Resource Monitoring Tool
QuAM	Quality Assurance (Certification) Mechanism
TAP	Teso Aids Programme
TERREWODE	The Association for the Re-orientation and Rehabilitation of Teso Women for Development
THETA	Traditional and Modern Health Practitioners together against AIDS and other diseases
ToT	Training of Trainers
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UPE	Universal Primary Education
VAD	Voluntary Action for Development
VEDCO	Volunteer Efforts for Development Concerns

Executive Summary

The Civil Society Capacity Building Programme (CSCBP) in Uganda has been an explorative journey through the fascinating landscape of Ugandan civil society. It succeeded to a satisfactory extent in fulfilling its purpose and accomplishing in several instances more than was stipulated under the required result areas.

The present state of affairs regarding civil society in Uganda needs to be perceived, among others, in its historical context. In the same sense the CSCBP needs to be perceived against the backdrop of a history that started more than 10 years ago. The Cotonou Agreement, confirming a partnership between countries in the ACP region, recognised the civil society role in development, which was substantiated by allowing up to a maximum of 15% of EU development assistance to be allocated to civil society initiatives. Uganda was a frontrunner in this and 3% of the EU support budget in the 9th EDF was earmarked for support to civil society organizations, which resulted in the CSCBP.

The reasons for supporting civil society to have a more pronounced role in the development process are most probably to be found in its potential for or actual contributions towards good governance and hence indirectly to economic performance.

A bit less than 50% of all the Programme's financial resources went into grants. These were allocated through a Call for Proposals. The Programme attempted to build in principles for equity; equity of access to funding, of geographic access and of access to skills applied in the formulation of proposals. The grant management process was executed with a dual objective. Firstly, it was to manage in a participatory manner the project implementations and fund flows, but secondly and equally important, to be part of the capacity building process, as it was a major component in the Programme. The grants provided for the grantee organisations, guarantee a long term strategic relationship and partnership necessary for capacity building.

A first Organisational Capacity Assessment (OCA 1) of the grantees was undertaken in May and June 2006 through the Intermediary Organizations (hereinafter, IO). Two years later, OCA 2 was executed by an external evaluator. The differences between OCA 1 and OCA 2 were analysed and the comparison provided information about the effects and impacts of the capacity building approach. The intermediary organisation as an element in the capacity building program is a model that can work, as has been demonstrated in the CSCBP.

Participation in the policy dialogue can and should take place at local (district and sub-county) level as well as at the national level. Additionally, although trying to influence the policy making process is useful, this is not the only area of legitimate action for civil society and is neither proven to be the most important, although many support programmes to civil society appear to take this as an almost automatic point of departure. Many Civil Society Organizations (hereinafter, CSOs) legitimately perform service delivery projects, sometimes complementing governmental services or operating in niches they themselves have defined. Moreover, perhaps the most lasting impact of a vigorous civil society is its enhancement of a culture of engaged citizenship, on which all other activities can subsequently be built. Unfortunately, few projects designed to "strengthen civil society" actually measure this aspect.

There are some positive indications and signals that CSOs are engaging more frequently and meaningfully with the government and donors. However, the position of the government remains ambivalent. The government appears to be reasonably prepared to provide opportunities for civil society participation and consultation in policy making and even legislative processes, but it also appears to reserve exclusivity of decision making on final policies, disregarding citizens' preferences as expressed in the consultation process. This "pseudo-democracy" results in high levels of