United Nations
Human Rights

Evaluation of the
Uganda Country Programme
2020-2022

Evaluation Report

External Consultants have prepared this report. The views expressed herein are those of the consultants and therefore do not reflect the official opinion of OHCHR.

March 2023

Dr Tonya Rosier
Dr Paul Bukuluki

Composition of the Evaluation Team

Senior Evaluator: Dr. Tonya Rosier is a senior technical leader with over 20 years of experience in research, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of programmes in the fields of human rights, gender, diversity, equity and inclusion, sexual violence, sexual reproductive health and rights. She has conducted evaluations for OHCHR, the United Nations, philanthropic, humanitarian organisations and multilateral donors. She's written organizational strategies in human rights, gender, diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) and serves on several technical advisory groups in these subjects. Dr. Rosier was formerly the Director of Gender and Women's health at the World Health Organization. She holds a Doctorate and Master of Science Degree from Harvard School of Public Health. She holds a Masters in Economics and Gender Studies from University of California, Berkeley.

Evaluator: Dr. Paul Bukuluki is an Associate Professor in the School of Social Sciences, Makerere University (Uganda). He is a social worker and medical anthropologist with more than 15 years of experience in implementation research, monitoring and evaluation of programmes in the fields of gender norms, social norms, sexual, human rights, reproductive health and rights, and violence against women and girls in development and humanitarian settings particularly in Africa. He is a member of the Global Learning Collaborative on Social Norms and the East Africa Learning Collaborative on Social Norms. Paul holds a PhD in Social/ Cultural Anthropology from the University of Vienna, Austria.

Evaluation Managers
Ms Aditi Bhola, Associate Human Rights Officer, OHCHR
Mr Sabas Monroy, Evaluation Officer, OHCHR

Reference Group
The Reference Group was chaired by PPMES, and included headquarter and Uganda-based representatives as follows:

Ihsane El Amrani	Tetsuya Hirano
Matthias Behnke	Ulrike Kahbila Mbuton
Karin Buhren	Maarit Kohonen Sheriff
Fatou Camara Houel	Sabas Monroy
Pasipau Chirwa	Monica Nascimento e Silva
Nils Clotteau	Dennis Ngoga
Sylta Georgiadis	Grace Catherine Pelly
Yusuke Hara	Jennifer Worrell

Table of Contents

Table of Acronyms

AWP	Annual Work Plan
CAT	Convention Against Torture
CA	Country Agreement
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CMI	Chieftaincy of Military Intelligence
CO	Country Office
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DAC	Development Assistance Criteria
DPP	Directorate of Public Prosecutions
EOC	Equal Opportunities Commission
ESCR	Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
FGM	Female Genital Mutilation
HCA	Host Country Agreement
HQ	Headquarters
HR	Human Rights
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
HRDs	Human Rights Defenders
HREA	Human Rights Enforcement Act
HRV	Human Rights Violations
IAAD	International Albino Awareness Day
ICC	International Criminal Court
ICCPR	Covenant on Civil & Political Rights
ICTJ	International Center for Transitional Justice
JLOS	Justice, Law and Order Sector
LRA	Lord´s Resistance Army
MATJ	Manual for Adjudication of Traditional Justice
MDA	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MGLSD	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development
NHRI	National Human Rights Organizations
MOFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MOJCA	Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAP	National Action Plan
NCD	National Council on Disability
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NHRAP	National Human Rights Action Plan
NVMTJ	National Victims' Manifesto for Traditional Justice
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
OMP	Operational Management Plan
PMS	Performance Monitoring System
PPMES	Policy, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Service
PPTA	Prevention Prohibition Torture Act

RBM	Results Based Management	UNDP	UN Development Program
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals	UNEG	UN Evaluation Group
SGBV	Sexual and Gender Based Violence	UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency	UNICEF	United Nations Children´s Fund
SRHR	Sexual Reproductive Health and Rights	UNSCDF	UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
TOT	Training of Trainers	UNW	United Nations Women
UHRC	Uganda Human Rights Commission	UPDF	Uganda People´s Defence Force
UN	United Nations	UPF	Ugandan Police Force
UNCT	United Nations Country Team	UPR	Universal Periodic Review
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework		

Executive Summary

Evaluation Background

This evaluation (2020-2022) assessed both the overall relevance of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights' (OHCHR) work in Uganda from 2018, as well as the Office's progress on the recommendations from the evaluation 2016-2018. The Terms of Reference (Annex 3) guided the evaluation of the Uganda Country Programme.

Methodology

A team of two independent consultants conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the OHCHR Uganda Programme. The evaluation began with an inception phase consisting of documentation review, fifteen interviews with OHCHR stakeholders, in Uganda and headquarters, and an inception report submitted on 25 October 2022. Between 31 October 31- 13 January 2023 sixty-three individual interviews were conducted among stakeholders in Uganda. A total of seventy-eight interviews were conducted.

The evaluation used the Development Assistance Criteria (DAC) evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact orientation and sustainability, including a seventh on gender, human rights and disability inclusion. The evaluators used a mixed-methods approach, using the following interconnected methods: (i) desk review; (ii) secondary data analysis; (iii) interviews. The analysis framework and data collection tools are in Annex 5.

Given travel restrictions due to Ebola outbreak, video interviews were conducted virtually with a wide and representative breadth of partners, government ministries, UN agencies, CSOs, donors, district, local governments, security, police and others. The interviews were geographically representative of OHCHR's work and operations. Limitations were noted and mitigated where possible.

I. Main Findings
The table below summarizes the findings based on the evaluation criteria.

RELEVANCE: *Very Satisfactory*

OHCHR is positively recognized as a convening authority, providing technical expertise and capacity building. Further, OHCHR brings legitimacy to human rights issues by working with national and sub-regional stakeholders in support of multi-stakeholder forums such as the Karamoja Regional Protection Meetings and District Mineral Watch Platform

The programme supported national institutions including Uganda Human Rights Commission (UHRC),

---

Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development (MGLSD), the Justice Law and Order Sector (JLOS) actors and security agencies to integrate human rights, gender and human rights-based approaches. The programme was noted to be responsive to contemporary issues affecting people in Uganda, notably business and human rights, land rights, workers' rights, migrant workers' rights, people with disabilities as well as albinism rights. OHCHR brought relevant human rights concerns to the forefront and engaged in constructive dialogues relating to human rights violations during the COVID-19.

COHERENCE: *Very Satisfactory*

The programme has solid partnerships with relevant government Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) such as the UHRC, Judiciary, MGLSD, Local Governments, Security agencies and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs). The Uganda Programme is aligned to the OHCHR's Management Plan (OMP 2022- 2023) and to the three principal priorities in OHCHR's core programming.

Among other UN agencies, OHCHR Uganda is well recognized as an expert agency responsible for championing human rights issues at national and sub-regional level. The CO works in partnership with other UN agencies, especially UN Women and UNFPA to coordinate and build capacity for integration of gender and human rights across the UNCT. Examples of collaboration improved and increased the reporting and registration of human rights violations and abuses committed by institutions and individuals. CSO and human rights defenders voiced the need for OHCHR to continue as a safe and honest broker.

EFFICIENCY: *Satisfactory, several areas for improvement*

OHCHR Uganda had very good and solid working relationships with relevant government agencies such as the UHRC, MGLSD, JLOS and local governments in the Karamoja and northern sub-regions. It cultivated a strong partnership with CSOs actively engaged in human rights. The programme has robust financial accountability systems. However, there were concerns voiced from CSO partners over the perceived inability of the CO to adapt its financial disbursements to ensure timely implementation and reimbursement of activities by partners.

With many competing priorities and a shrinking civic space, the CO was challenged to meet the needs with the current human and financial resources. Many respondents at national and sub-regional levels noted staff were quite stretched and juggling multiple priorities. Efficiency was decreased by spreading program resources in wide geographic regions with limited numbers of staff, particularly in the sub-regional offices in Karamoja and Northern Uganda. These areas have complex human rights issues that require sufficient human resources to achieve results and impact.

EFFECTIVENESS: *Very Satisfactory*

The programme achieved most of its planned results and at outcome and output levels. The evaluation found improved capacity across CSOs and journalists in their ability to advocate and report on human rights concerns with national authorities and international human rights protection mechanisms. The evaluation documented a strengthened capacity among law enforcement agencies and national justice institutions to integrate human rights standards on public freedoms, the right to integrity, personal liberty. In many cases, they integrated gender considerations in their policies and operations.

National Human Rights Institutions (NRHIs) and relevant actors were able to integrate and promote laws, policies and practices that comply with international obligations on equality and non-discrimination. The evaluation found an increase in monitoring, investigation, litigation, adjudication and the provision of redress for human rights violations. The UHRC and the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) were without a Chairperson and Commissioners for most of the year which made them unable to constitute their tribunals. As a result, OHCHR Uganda was unable to effectively support the institutions to effectively fulfil their accountability mandates during the reporting period.

IMPACT ORIENTATION: *Very Satisfactory*

The programme had an overall impact-oriented approach to its work. Among government entities, COSs, and the UNCT, there was an increased understanding and implementation of international treaty bodies and mechanisms such as the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Paris Principles. A direct consequence of OHCHR's presence has brought about a stronger Uganda Human Rights Commission and thereby impacting extent to which the Ugandans can understand and enjoy their rights. The engagement of civil society and other groups point to increased knowledge of human rights-based approaches and an understanding of their own human rights.

Whilst many challenges, political sensitivities, and barriers remain, positive feedback and high praise was given from UHRC, civil society, media, judiciary, police forces. Respondents noted the OHCHR training equipped CSO participants with skills and knowledge that were subsequently applied and were on-going in their work. Within the OHCHR's country programme, the evaluators assessed accountability and oversight systems had been established to measure the long-term effects and impact of the programme. The current monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system was most effective in tracking activities and outputs rather than outcomes.

SUSTAINABILITY: Very Satisfactory

The Country Programme made a significant contribution to sustainable changes regarding human rights and gender equality issues in Uganda. The CO's long-term and evolving presence, from security to development, has contributed to sustainability. Over the evaluation period, OHCHR significantly strengthened the capacity of law enforcement agencies and national justice institutions, including the Judiciary and ODPP to integrate human rights standards and gender considerations in their policies and operations. These agencies are taking on more of their own work, incorporating human rights approaches into laws, policies and internal protocols, such as law enforcement and security agencies.

Many respondents felt, however that without OHCHR's presence and programming there would be a serious void in the human rights agenda in Uganda. Among CSOs, it was cited that OHCHR provided a certain protection and legitimacy that could not be sustained without the engagement and support of OHCHR. CSOs and other respondents indicated the importance of the presence of OHCHR´s support, particularly in the issues related to human rights violations of civilians.

Within the UN system, strengthening integration and coordination of human rights within the UNCT was cited as a cornerstone of impact and sustainability. The human rights and gender working group undertook a human rights and gender capacity assessment which identified gaps in staff capacity and knowledge on HR, HRBA, and how human rights are mainstreamed across the Sustainable Development Goals (SGDs). Based on these findings, capacity building was taken on as a part of the UN capacity development plan. Further the gender and disability markers ensured accountability and sustained consideration of gender and human rights issues in the UNCT.

GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS, DISABILITY INCLUSION, INTEGRATION:

Very Satisfactory

The programme design was well targeted to vulnerable populations, particularly with respect to the protection and promotion of gender, human rights and disability inclusion. The programme targeted districts with poor human rights indicators in Karamoja and northern Uganda. The programme supported positive developments in social and gender norms, the reduction of harmful practices in relation to human rights protection.

At the national policy level, the Programme was aligned to policies and laws on gender-based violence (GBV), including the national policy on elimination of GBV, the Gender Policy, the JLOS Fourth Strategic Development Plan, the Domestic Violence Act, the amended Succession Act, and the Disability Act, among others. In promoting gender equality in addressing SGBV and sexual offences, the evaluation found many collaborative partnerships that improved gender equality. With respect to

disability inclusion, OHCHR´s work is very satisfactory. OHCHR Uganda has effectively supported key pertinent disability concerns such as albinism. The Equal Opportunity Commission's (EOC) advocacy included the commemoration of International Albinism Awareness Day and the subsequent adoption of the National Action Plan (NAP). OHCHR supported the validation of the National Action Plan and the National Symposium on Disability to raise awareness and increase access to services of albinos and disabled populations.

Within the UNCT, OHCHR demonstrated consistent and well-targeted attention to gender, HR and disability inclusion across work streams. The gender and disability scorecard were noted as a successful way to measure and ensure UN staff have capacity in HR and gender. Within the UNCT and among national stakeholders, OHCHR played an important normative role with regards to CEDAW, Universal Periodic Review (UPR), the Convention Against Torture (CAT) and other legal frameworks.

II.   Results and progress review of the 2016-2018 Evaluation

A concurrent objective of this evaluation was to review and assess the implementation status on the recommendations of the previous evaluation (2016-2018). The evaluators reviewed each recommendation and where relevant, provided recommendations for future action. A table with the detailed results of the implementation of the recommendations are found in Annex 1. Overwhelmingly OHCHR made very good progress on 12 out of 16 recommendations of the 2016-2018 evaluation. There are four areas of low and 'partial achievement' noted below.

1. The issue of mandate renewal remains a real concern. The evaluators concluded that the HCA negotiation process has not improved much since the last evaluation (2016-2018.). The chronic insecurity of the HCA limits the CO´s ability to plan and fulfil their role to the full potential.
2. Strategic communication and advocacy were partially achieved. Since the last evaluation there remains a need for OHCHR to increase strategic communication and advocacy, including the production of evidence and researched-based reports.
3. Public reporting had a low achievement score not related to OHCHR deficiencies, but rather to political sensitivity and the threat of non-renewal mandate of the CO. As of January 2023, a public OHCHR report on human rights concerns in Uganda had not been published since 2013.
4. Administrative procedures were assessed with partial achievements. To the CO´s credit, administrative procedures have been improved, however some financial and administrative challenges remain. Respondents perceived the OHCHR finance system still not "fit for purpose", given the evidence of continued delays in funding and reimbursements.

III.   Good Practices and Lessons Learned
Many good practices were identified and validated within the Uganda programme and had the potential for replication and broader application. Several lessons learned over emerged and can guide future programming.

1. Good Practice: The strong technical capacity of the CO and staff gave legitimacy to OHCHR. Their reputation for technical excellence instilled confidence among CSO partners to participate in OHCHR´s capacity building and engage in collaborative activities. This enabled CSOs to have more constructive and informed engagement with duty bearers, reporting of human rights violations and contribution to the Universal Periodic Review.
2. Good Practice: Long-term and sustainable partnerships require dedicated long-term staffing resources to provide consistency and continuously build trust and shared understanding around shared priorities and outcomes over time. OHCHR demonstrated long-term consistency and dependability through the good practices of teamwork, mutual respect and being approachable.
3. Good Practice: Within the current Host Country Agreement (HCA) the Uganda CO is mandated to work in partnership with UHRC. Despite some limitations, this working arrangement has very positively increased the capacity of the UHRC. This arrangement ensured OHCHR's coherence within Uganda's national priorities and legal frameworks.
4. Good Practice: People are OHCHR's greatest resource. The importance of staff skills, experience and orientation in the right roles with the right support is fundamental and has been demonstrated by the project.
5. Good Practice: Maximizing the value-added of partnerships, working relationships and connections at all levels has proven itself as a defining factor in OHCHR's ability to exert influence and leverage limited resources for larger results within a very diverse and complex region.
6. Lesson Learned: Undertaking technical and advisory roles and responsibilities within the UNCT can be very resource intensive. Whilst important, this work often stretched human resources within the CO. The resource requirements for UNCT activities need inclusion in staffing, work and budgetary planning from the beginning.
7. Lesson Learned: Training of security agencies, especially on international mechanisms and standards, reporting and recognizing human rights violations and abuses was deemed by respondents as highly important and impactful. With staff turnover however, capacity building could be an endless cycle for OHCHR. The CO will need to continue to expand on the Training of Trainers (ToT) model and find other measures to mitigate these challenges.
8. Lesson Learned: At present, the sub-regional offices in most-affected sub-regions remain essential for effective implementation, stakeholder engagement and capacity building at the grassroots level. However, activities are sometimes inefficiently allotted and there needs prioritization of activities, better resource allocation, and closer linkage to results,
9. Lesson Learned: What seems not to be working well is the continued challenges around the HCA renewal process itself. This dynamic often puts the CO in a precarious and unstable position regarding the country programme and staffing.
10. Lesson Learned: Paying attention to language requirements and cultural factors can be key factors in ensuring meaningful engagement with more marginalized and vulnerable stakeholders.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusion 1:

At present, the current MOU is not renewed. Since the previous evaluation in 2018, the HCA renewal process continued to be a challenge. The tenuous nature of renewal negotiations inhibited OHCHR's ability to carry out its full mandate. OHCHR continually sought to find a delicate balance between political sensitivities and the Office's ability to take a strong stance on human rights. Subsequently, the Office often led from behind the scenes through the UNCT and other CSOs.

One example is the OHCHR research and reporting role which is unfulfilled due to political considerations. The Office has not published a report since 2013. With the largest programme budget in Africa, it's unfortunate the CO is unable to provide the full breadth of OHCHR's global mandate.

Recommendation 1:

CO is recommended to strategically consider the environment and its role in Uganda in the current and long term. The question to be addressed concerns where OHCHR´s strategic value is added and what is needed to shape the future of the CO. OHCHR management is recommended to undertake an internal assessment and reflection process between the CO and HQ to clarify OHCHR Uganda's role, identifying key priority areas in the context of regionalization and comparative advantages. Given its current operating environment and OHCHR could consider (at least) three options: (a) being present with the current scope and limitations.

(b) negotiate a broader breadth and scope of work to in line with OHCHR´s mandate; and (c) consider drawing down interventions/ investment and developing a time-bound exit strategy. As this issue remains political, OHCHR management to consider a possible multi-prong approach of internal UN consultation, areas where the RCO can advocate on OHCHR's behalf, and high-level missions targeting the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and government leadership.

Conclusion 2:

The many competing and unforeseen activities amidst the shrinking civic space is a challenge. Staff are highly productive, and many activities are achieved each programme cycle. At times, the multitude and pace of activities keeps the Office engaged in some less-than-strategic level activities. Additionally, staffing resource allocation for activities is, at times, underestimated. For example, the human resources needed for activities for OHCHR´s activities within the UNCT are not always fully foreseen and accounted for. Further, there are inefficiencies in the way and some staff are spread over several technical and administrative roles, and the placement of where human resources at national and sub-regional levels. All these factors continue to further spread the CO´s limited human and financial resources.

Recommendation 2:

It is recommended OHCHR management review its work plans and prioritize the most strategic activities and plan realistic levels of human resources. When considering how human resources are best used, the Office is recommended to look beyond the outputs and activities and focus on the annual work plans aligned with result-based planning and management. The Office may look for ways to use human resources and staff time more efficiently and cost effectively. The possibility of restructuring or adapting existing human resources should be considered. In the next planning cycle, it is recommended, where possible, OHCHR reduce the activities involving direct implementation at the sub-regional or grassroots level. It is important to focus on strategic activities that cannot be done by government or CSOs.

Conclusion 3:

The CO has robust financial and accountability systems. There are, however, implementation delays due to UN bureaucracy and the reliance of OHCHR on UNDP procurement systems. Externally, on the part of partners, delays and last-minute requests further aggravate implementation. Overall, the financing, disbursement and accountability systems are not well adapted to the Uganda context. Delayed disbursements were especially problematic for CSO not often well placed financially to prepay activities with long reimbursement times.

Recommendation 3:

It is recommended management find a good balance and adapt financial management systems and procedures,
-where possible- to the Ugandan context. Lessons can be drawn from other UN agencies particularly UN Women, UNFPA and UNDP to fast-track disbursements to partners without compromising the robust financial management and accountability. It is recommended the CO management mitigate this challenge by undertaking better forward planning, anticipating activities, creating longer lead times, and beginning the procurement process well in advance of planned events. A quarterly pre-planning and budget meeting internally and with partners can systematically address upcoming and unforeseen activities. On the side of the partners, the CO is recommended to consider continuing to raise awareness among partners of OHCHR's procedures and timelines. Ensuring partners know what to expect and how OHCHR undertakes reimbursement and payment may lessen misunderstandings and false expectations on the part of the partners.

Conclusion 4:
OHCHR's strong partnerships with a wide breadth of government entities and CSOs have been the correct critical pathway to ensure human rights are sustainably and structurally embedded in the policies and frameworks of national institutions. The CO's long-term activity in capacity building has allowed partners to understand, promote and integrate human rights, gender and disability inclusion. The long-term goal of sustainability is, at some point, government entities and COSs can fully take on their respective roles to implement, sustain and advance human rights in Uganda.

Recommendation 4:
It is recommended OHCHR management consider phasing out some activities and allow CSOs partners at national and sub-regional levels to take up more implementation. In collaboration with partners, the CO should develop a 5-7-year plan to reduce implementation and capacity building allowing local entities and organizations to incrementally take up their work. Part of this plan must address the need to improve the administrative and fundraising capacities of CSOs to mobilize and secure their own resources. It is further recommended to consolidate well-working and critical relationships with government entities such as UHRC, security agencies and local governments. Where possible, the CO should expand and replicate successful models like the Karamoja protection meetings in other geographic areas.

Conclusion 5:
Over time, with well-targeted capacity building efforts, a cadre of well-trained national counterparts will be able to take on their respective roles and work. This is an opportunity for OHCHR to make concrete steps to go beyond traditional areas of capacity building and training to focus on other strategic and timely issues. It is not suggested OHCHR end, or trade capacity building for new thematic areas. Rather, it is suggested the CO strike a balance of core work and new areas and evolve over time, given the country needs.

Recommendation 5:
When assessing areas for further development, it is recommended OHCHR management consider focusing on 2-4 strategic and emerging areas of work. The Uganda would be an excellent flagship programme. The following are suggested thematic areas based on the evaluators analysis of the country's context and feedback from many respondents. They include but are not limited to human rights and environment, business and human rights, civic space, livelihoods, HR and environment, economic and social affairs. HR and climate, HR monitoring of elections and demonstrations, disability and other key areas.

Conclusion 6:

As OHCHR management considers its thematic areas of strategic focus, as proposed in recommendation 5, there are some notable successes and 'low hanging fruit' in the current programming cycle in relatively newer and emerging areas of work that can benefit from further consideration and development. One current opportunity is the National Action Plan for Business and Human Rights. In disability inclusion, another unique niche is OHCHR's engagement with the National Action Plan on Albinism.

Recommendation 6:

OHCHR Management is recommended to consider investing in advocacy efforts to facilitate translation of the National Action Plan on Business and Human Rights. In disability inclusion, it is recommended OHCHR determine its own strategic role in support of the NAP on Albinism to action. Existing opportunities such as the International Albinism Awareness Day (IAAD) and National Symposium on Disability Day can be built upon.

Conclusion 7:

Since the previous evaluation (2016-2018), the evaluators found a continued gap in communications. Investment levels in external communications in the Uganda Country Office remain insufficient. OHCHR is aware of the need for an increased focus on communication through a variety of media and forums.

Recommendation 7:

The evaluators (2020-2022) recommend OHCHR management develop a stronger advocacy and communication strategy based on OHCHR's comparative advantage and strategic messaging through partners on select issues. It is recommended OHCHR Uganda consider the OMP (2022-2023) and some of the communication tools, platforms and messages to better 'tell the OHCHR Uganda story'. Communications should be targeted to enhance visibility, advocacy, mobilization and education. Acknowledging the shrinking civic space, government relations, and political sensitivities, any public reporting should be developed with a clear understanding of risks combined with a set of mitigation strategies.

Conclusion 8:

Within the MOU, OHCHR has maximized their work to the fullest. OHCHR has excelled in technical expertise and the ability to bring various stakeholders to the table in support of gender, HR, and disability inclusion. This is unequivocally one of OHCHR's strengths and comparative advantages. Within the UNCT, OHCHR plays both technical and normative roles earning OHCHR credibility and demonstrated value added. These roles should remain and continue. Where the CO falls short is with respect to OHCHR's role in addressing current and timely thematic issues through publishing evidence and researched-based reports.

Recommendation 8:

It is recommended OHCHR management keep relevant as an agency and provide information, guidance, and a forward-looking approach to research on emerging issues in human rights. Some examples have been cited above in recommendation 6. For longer-term relevance, it is recommended OHCHR management consider research investment focusing on 2-3 areas of strategic focus with the publication of 1-2 relevant reports and papers over the next 1-3 years. To mitigate some of the OHCHR political challenges cited in Recommendation 1, the idea of developing joint publications in collaboration with UHRC, UNCT and relevant UN working group, or other collaboration with UNWomen and UNFPA should be considered.

Introduction

1.1 Program Background

The Office of the High Commission for Human Rights (OHCHR) Country Office (CO) in Uganda was established in 2005 and a Host Country Agreement (HCA) was signed with the Government of Uganda in January 2006[1]. The initial mandate focused on the human rights situation in the conflict-affected areas of Northern and North-Eastern Uganda (Karamoja). In 2009, the mandate and presence were extended to cover the entire country and all human rights issues.

In the current HCA (February 2020-February 2023), OHCHR Uganda is mandated to advise and assist the Government of Uganda on the formulation and implementation of policies, programmes and measures for the promotion and protection of human rights in the country. It further has the mandate to strengthen the capacity of human rights institutions, civil society organisations (CSOs) and other relevant actors to promote and protect human rights.

In partnership with the Uganda Human Rights Commission (UHRC), OHCHR provides advisory services and technical assistance for the implementation of international and regional human rights norms and standards, and outcomes of the corresponding human rights mechanisms. In partnership with the UHRC, the Office's mandate is to monitor the human rights situation in Uganda and regularly inform the Government of any concerns and assessments it may have, with a view to encouraging constructive dialogue on those issues and eliciting the views of the Government.

OHCHR Uganda has offices in Kampala, Gulu and Moroto. The Country Office monitors the situation of human rights and provides capacity-building and technical assistance to State institutions and civil society organisations (CSOs). OHCHR also engages in advocacy work regarding human rights, with the overall goal of enhancing the promotion and protection of human rights in the country[2].

In executing this mandate, OHCHR works closely with other national partners such as Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD), Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs (MoJCA) and the other UN agencies like UN Women, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)[3].

---

[1] https://uganda.ohchr.org/
[2] OHCHR | UN Human Rights in Uganda
[3] OHCHR| UN Human Rights in Uganda

The Swedish SIDA has been supporting the Uganda Country program since January 2017. The current programme funding support by Sweden contributes to OHCHR's implementation of the Uganda Country Office Roadmap for the years 2021-2023. At present, the total contribution by Sweden for the 2021-2023 period is SEK 31,000,000 (USD 3.7 million). As per the agreement with Sweden, OHCHR is requested to carry out an independent evaluation of the Country Programme for the period 2020-2022.

Current Country Context

Uganda remains among the poorest nations in the world and continues to face very high maternal mortality. In 2019, Uganda was ranked 131 out of 160 countries on the Gender Inequality Index. Climate and environmental challenges, such as erratic rainfall, prolonged droughts, and flooding, pose a continued threat to crop and livestock productivity.

There are several recent trends in Ugandan human rights legislation that have been enacted through various legislation and policies: Uganda enacted The Human Rights Enforcement Act, 2019, assented into law by President Museveni on 31 March 2019, which gives effect to article 50(4) of the Constitution of Uganda 1995[4]. The Act provides for a procedure of enforcing human rights by the courts of law, including by the High Court, and by magistrates' courts, through human rights suits. The Act also provides for personal liability of public officers, as well as for institutional liability, and sets out the loss of immunity from prosecution for human rights violations. The Act gives the right to apply for redress if the State is not taking adequate steps towards the progressive realization of rights and freedoms and stipulates the unconditional release of persons "unreasonably" detained.

The Persons with Disabilities (PWD) Act, 2019[5], was passed into law by President Museveni on 19 September 2019, which repealed the previous 2006 PWD Act. The Act had been adopted before Uganda's ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). The Act calls for non-discrimination in the provision of education, health, transport services and employment, and accessibility to buildings and justice services, and provides for affirmative action, and for the first time recognizes persons with albinism as PWDs.

Uganda approved the National Transitional Justice Policy (NTJP)[6] which provides a framework to guide transitional justice and address peace, justice and reconciliation needs of post-conflict Uganda. The NTJP also provides for interventions related to formal and traditional justice, foresees engagement on nation-building and reconciliation processes, reparations, and amnesty.

---

[4] Human Rights (Enforcement) Act, 2019 | Uganda Legal Information Institute (ulii.org)
[5] Uganda Persons with Disabilities Act, 2019 - Uganda Journalists' Resource Centre (ugandajournalistsresourcecentre.com)
[6] Overview of Uganda's national transitional justice policy - Uganda Journalists' Resource Centre (ugandajournalistsresourcecentre.com)

Related to Gender-based violence, the Ugandan government had its first a national policy in 2016 on the elimination of Gender Based Violence (GBV) and its National Action Plan (2016)[7]. The National Gender Policy, National Policy on Elimination of Gender Based Violence and GBV Action Plan was renewed in 2019.

Related to disability, there is a National Policy on Disability integrating sexual reproductive health and rights (SRHR), a National Action Plan on Women Peace and Security both are geared to foster inclusion, eliminate discrimination and human rights violations. Whilst Uganda has made progress, various sources have pointed to different human rights violations and abuses across an array of differing vulnerable populations and geographic contexts.

The emergency of COVID-19 necessitated the Uganda government to impose a lockdown that restricted movement of people in efforts to reduce the spread of COVID-19. While the lockdown was intended to reduce the spread of COVID-19, the second lockdown that followed the second wave in June 2021, was characterised by curfews which culminated in reported human rights violations such as extrajudicial killings, sexual violence, use of force violations, arbitrary arrests and detention, and a lack of access to justice.

On 18 and 19 November 2020, 54 people (official government count) were killed by security forces in the context of demonstrations against the arrest of two opposition presidential candidates. There were serious injuries and allegations of torture and/or ill-treatment during arrests or detention. Further, during the election process, there were violations of freedom of expression, including media freedom and the right to access to information. The internet was shut down for almost five days in January 2022.

The Karamoja sub-region has experienced insecurity that is largely related to cattle rustling and criminal activities involving small arms and light weapons. To limit the unlawful use of weapons and arms, a joint security force was instituted to disarm all people with small arms or light weapons in the Karamoja sub-region. However, this resulted in human rights violations and abuses in the region such as arbitrary arrest and detention, arbitrary killing, torture and ill-treatment, violation of the right to a fair hearing, and extortion.

In Uganda, the integration of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) [8] and human rights is integral to the work of OHCHR and other UN counterparts and is a priority for results. Globally, human rights are anchored in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the underlying SDG principle to "leave no one behind"[9]. While

---

[7] National Action Plan on Gender Based Violence (NAP-GBV) 2017-2021 | UN Women
[8] THE 17 GOALS | Sustainable Development (un.org)
[9] OHCHR and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

Uganda has made progress across the SDG's, COVID-19 has severely compromised Uganda's attainment of SDGs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10 and 16.

OHCHR is also responsible for ensuring the implementation of the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSCDF) 2021-2025 on themes related to gender equality and human rights, equitable access to and utilisation of quality basic and social protection services of vulnerable people, inclusive and accountable governance systems, peace, justice and security, and healthy environment.[10]

1.2 Evaluation Background

A previous program review of the Uganda Country Programme was undertaken in 2018 and assessed the programming period 2016-2018. As per the agreement with Sweden, OHCHR, a new evaluation (2020-2022) was undertaken to assess both the overall relevance of OHCHR's work in Uganda from 2018, as well as the Office's progress on the recommendations from the evaluation 2016-2018.

Given travel restrictions due to the Ebola outbreak and logistical considerations, seventy-eight (78) interviews were conducted virtually via video. The planned field mission in October 2022 was cancelled due to travel restrictions. Interviews were conducted among a wide and representative breadth of partners, government ministries, UN agencies, CSOs, donors, local governments, security, police and others. Within OHCHR, interviews were conducted from programme, technical and management staff from the Uganda Country Office and Geneva.

The Uganda-based evaluator worked in-person with the Uganda Country Office to evaluate the programme against the criteria of efficiency and effectiveness and to assess the programme and reporting system. Geographically, the evaluation covered OHCHR's entire programme and work conducted from the offices in Kampala, Gulu and Moroto.

The purpose of the evaluation is two-fold.
1. to assess the Country Programme and produce key findings, lessons learned, good practices, and recommendations in terms of the evaluation criteria below:
- Relevance – the extent to which the Country Programme has been and is still relevant to the situation in the country, the mandate of OHCHR, its comparative advantage, the Sustainable Development Goals and the needs of stakeholders (both duty bearers and right-holders), including partners, government and national counterpart as well as UNCT.

---

[10] Uganda-UN-Sustainable-Development-CooperationFramework-2021-2025.pdf (undg.org)

- Coherence - the compatibility of the programme with other interventions at the country/regional level, conducted by OHCHR and others.
- Efficiency – the extent to which the Country Programme has economically converted resources into results, including synergies within the organization and with the efforts of stakeholders and partners; including how OHCHR has managed to attract sufficient resources to the programme.
- Effectiveness – the degree to which the Country Programme's planned results and targets have been achieved, at outcome and output levels, including the identification of areas of intervention where results have not yet reached the expected targets.
- Impact orientation – the extent to which the strategic orientation of the Country Programme points toward making a significant contribution to broader, long-term, sustainable changes on human rights issues.
- Sustainability – the extent which the net benefits of the Country Programme continue, or likely to continue with the stakeholders in the future.
- Gender and human rights (disability inclusion) integration– the degree to which a gender and human rights perspectives and human rights-based approaches (HRBA) have been integrated in the Country Programme, and the degree to which the results obtained have contributed to gender and human rights principles of non-discrimination and equality, with emphasis on women rights and disability inclusion, as well as other vulnerable groups.

II. To assess the Uganda Programme's implementation and progress of the recommendations of the 2016-2018 evaluation. The evaluation measured progress and results on the 16 recommendations. (Annex 1)

The evaluation took both a summative and a formative approach. It verified what results have or have not been achieved, to date (summative) with a view to inform OHCHR globally as well as the future work (formative). This approach will therefore increase OHCHR's accountability and learning in line with OHCHR's Evaluation Policy, and contribute to strengthening effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability on an inclusive and equitable basis. The evaluation followed the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards[11] for Evaluation in the UN System, as well as the UNEG Handbook for Conducting Evaluations of Normative Work[12] and the UNEG Guidance "Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations".

1.3 Methodology

The evaluation began with an inception phase consisting of a documentation review, fifteen (15) interviews and an inception report submitted on 25 October 2022. Between 31 October 31- 13 January 2023 sixty-three (63) individual interviews were conducted for a total of seventy-eight interviews. The evaluation assessed all areas of

---

[11] http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914
[12] http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1484

OHCHR's mandate in Uganda. Within OHCHR, interviews were conducted from programme, technical and management staff from the Uganda Country Office and Geneva. In-person evaluation was conducted in the Country Office where the reporting and management systems were assessed.

The evaluation approach was learning-oriented and systematic and guided by the principle of credibility. The best available evidence was analysed appropriately. The findings, conclusions and recommendations are solid, and evidence based. The evaluation used the Development Assistance Criteria (DAC) evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact orientation and sustainability, including a seventh on gender, human rights and disability inclusion. The evaluators used a mixed-methods approach, using the following interconnected methods: (i) desk review; (ii) secondary data analysis; (iii) interviews conducted via virtual platforms.

Desk Review and Secondary Data Analysis:
The list of documents reviewed for this Evaluation Report is contained in Annex Three. These included project planning and reporting documents, OHCHR Management Plan (OMP). The evaluation team also conducted secondary data analysis by drawing on other published reports on thematic issues and related trends and developments in the region. This included reports from the UN, regional organizations, CSOs and research sources.

Stakeholder interviews:
A standard semi-structured interview form was used to guide interviews and gather information in a consistent format. While the core set of questions remained consistent, adjustments made considering sector, thematic issues, institutional and organizational factors. Prompting questions on gender and other inclusion considerations were included in all cases. The full listing of OHCHR (internal) and international/regional and national stakeholders (external) is set out in Annex Four. Geographically, the evaluation assessed OHCHR's work in the entire program and work conducted from the offices in Kampala, Gulu and Moroto.

The evaluation assessed the relevant and major results of OHCHR's Uganda programme from 1 January 2019 till 30 June 2022. It also focused on the strategies that led or did not lead to the achievements of the expected accomplishments, proposing possible changes to the Country Programme and organizational arrangements that will support the improvement of the Country Office's work across the programme's goals:

Goal 1: To strengthen the rule of law and accountability for human rights violations.

Goal 2: To enhance equality and countering discrimination.

Goal 3: To enhance and protect civic space and people's participation.

Goal 4: To integrate human rights into sustainable development.

Goal 5: To strengthen engagement with the human rights mechanisms.

Limitations:
Although the evaluation interviewed a wide and diverse range of stakeholders (78), were certain limitations to be highlighted below:

- The inability to conduct in-person engagement with stakeholders, internal and external, due to travel restrictions related to Ebola.
- Interviews were pre-arranged and therefore did not have the same flexibility for follow-up and informal discussions.
- Challenges in arranging interviews due to issues of connectivity and other pressing priorities of local stakeholders.
- The evaluation was unable to undertake focus group discussions.

The evaluators were cognizant of the above issues and took the following steps to mitigate the above issues ensure the evaluation's validity.

1. Remote interviews allowed the evaluators to undertake a larger number of interviews than would have been conducted in a one-week field visit. Interviews were undertaken with a wide breath of CSO's (national and sub-regional), UN agencies in the field and headquarters (HQ), government entities (national and sub-regional), networks.
2. Within government, police and security forces the evaluators ensured that interviewees were representative of all levels from the organization from leadership to junior staff.
3. The evaluators ensured geographic representation of where OHCHR has activities and operations. Interviews conducted with informants from national, district and local government.
4. The interviews cover all the technical areas and scope of work within the OHCHR mandate and work plans.

1.   Main Findings

The findings below follow the criteria set out in the evaluation Terms of Reference.

Relevance: *Very Satisfactory*
This criteria addresses the extent to which the programme is relevant to the situation in the country, the mandate of the OHCHR, its comparative advantage, and the needs of stakeholder's (both duty-bearers and right-holders).

Respondents felt OHCHR brought legitimacy to human rights issues in Uganda. OHCHR was recognized as a human rights and gender equality champion among all actors within the country. Very positive feedback from interviewees cited OHCHR as being fully inclusive in addressing the needs of marginalized groups, gender, and disability inclusion. Human rights-based approaches (HRBA) were understood and integrated across work streams.

The programme supported national institutions including the Uganda Human Rights Commission (UHRC), Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD), Judiciary, Law and Order Sectors (JLOS), and security agencies to integrate human rights, gender and human rights-based approaches. The programme was noted as being responsive to contemporary issues affecting people in Uganda. The programme was responsive to human rights issues in the ongoing disarmament process in Karamoja, especially regarding pre-trial detentions. OHCHR highlighted issues and engaged in constructive dialogues relating to human rights violations during the COVID.

The Country Office supported the Uganda Human Rights Commission (UHRC) to train and advocate with national justice institutions for the effective implementation of the Prevention and Prohibition of Torture Act, 2012 (PPTA) and the Human Rights Enforcement Act, 2019 (HREA). The Country Office, in collaboration with UHRC, worked to ensure the dissemination and awareness raising of the PPTA and HREA across the country.

The evaluation ascertained OHCHR supported the MGLSD and NCPD in joint regional consultative meetings with persons with disabilities, district councils for persons with disabilities, local government authorities and organizations of persons with disabilities in the Karamoja and Eastern regions of Uganda.

Some of its key deliverables like the National Action Plan (NAP) on business and human rights, the NAP on Albinism and the Manual for Transitional Justice mechanisms

are responsive to the emerging needs of marginalised groups or populations and to address issues considered important at the national and sub-national levels.

Table 1: Stakeholder one-word description/ comments on OHCHR's comparative advantage

the UN's "go to" agency	trusted	strong convening role – provides space for others to do their job
good facilitators - honest broker	results focused - practical and grounded, will help find solutions	make human rights easy to understand and relevant to the context
highly responsive	very good and proactive in sharing information	competent
go the extra mile to provide technical expertise	a true partner	technical experts
provide hands on support and mentoring	very good, trusted and flexible partner - open and flexible	follows through on commitments as part of collective efforts

Coherence: *Very Satisfactory*

These criteria assessed how the Country programme aligns with and supports national plans, programs and priorities of local stakeholders, partners, donors and other UN agencies, on those issues that should be considered as human rights priorities, considering OHCHR's comparative advantage. This criteria further assesses how the coordination, communication and reporting of the Country Office has been with local stakeholders, partners, donors or other UN agencies in the UNCT.

This evaluation examined OHCHR alignment with national planning frameworks and SDGs. The programme implemented by OHCHR in Uganda is in line with the Country Vision 2040, National Development Plans II and III, UN Sustainable Development Framework (UNDAF) 2020-2025 and the SDGs.

The programme had solid partnerships with relevant Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) such as the Uganda Human Rights Commission (UHRC), Judiciary, Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD), local governments, security agencies, and community service organizations (CSOs).

Within OHCHR, the Uganda Programme is aligned to the OHCHR's Management Plan (2022- 2023) and to the three principal priorities in OHCHR's core programming: 1) the promotion and protection of economic, social and cultural rights, 2) the implementation of the SDGs, and 3) the prevention of human rights crises. This implies that it is in sync with the overall planning and management frameworks of the UN Human Rights Agency.

Among UN partners, OHCHR Uganda Programme is overwhelmingly recognized as an expert agency responsible for championing human rights issues at national and sub-regional level. The OHCHR works in partnership with other UN agencies, especially UN Women and UN Population Fund (UNFPA) to coordinate and build capacity for integration of gender and human rights across the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) and work plans of government Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs). This contributed to realization of efficiencies in mainstreaming gender and human rights across some of the programmes within the National Development Plan III.

The evaluation found that joint monitoring visits increased coherence, efficiencies and impact. For example, OHCHR, in partnership with UHRC, Action Aid, International Federation of Women's Lawyers, and the Uganda and African Centre for the Treatment and Rehabilitation of Torture Victims conducted several field visits to detention facilities to investigate human rights violation and abuses.

The evaluation found an improvement in the reporting and registration of human rights violations and abuses committed by institutions and individuals. Various respondents indicated their continued apprehension to report violations and abuses directly to the appropriate authorities. Among CSO and human rights defenders interviewed, all

respondents voiced the need for OHCHR as a safe and honest broker. Several respondents felt there could be better coordination on logistics such as transportation in the case of joint visits.

Efficiency: *Satisfactory, with certain areas for improvement*

This section considers the extent to which the programme has economically converted resources (personnel, funds, expertise, time) into results.

Overall, OHCHR in Uganda has established very good and solid working relationships with the relevant government agencies such as UHRC, MGLSD, JLOS and selected local governments especially in the Karamoja and northern Uganda sub-regions. Through OHCHR's support, these organizations are better able to implement their respective mandates related to human rights as duty bearers. The CO cultivated strong partnerships with CSOs actively engaged on different aspects of human rights in Uganda.

Interviews with stakeholders highlighted OHCHR having highly competent staff in a context where needs are always greater than resources. Staff productivity was very high on the activity level. However, at times, outputs were not always tied to results. It was noted that despite limited human resources at the national and regional levels, staff produced numerous outputs linked to their various result areas. For example, the CO facilitated the process of development of a National Action Plan for Albinism, National Action Plan on Business and Human Rights, Manual for Adjudication of Traditional Justice, and to disseminate the Constitution and the Bill of Rights in some regions.

With many competing priorities and a shrinking civic space, the CO was challenged to meet the needs with the current human and financial resources. Many respondents at national and sub-regional levels noted staff were quite stretched and juggling multiple priorities. Furthermore, efficiency was perceived as affected because the limited number of technical staff were, at the same time, engaged in the administrative work giving less focus on technical aspects of the work.

A remark from one of the key informant interviews clearly pointed out this tension between technical work on human rights and the administrative workload of technical staff. "I am not sure why they operate this way like a CSO. They almost handle everything by themselves. This affects efficiency. They are so stretched because they must handle both administrative and financial management and accountability issues as well as technical aspects of their work. They should consider borrowing a leaf from other UN agencies who disburse funds to implementing partners and then establish strong/robust financial management systems to ensure there is no fraud or abuse of funds".

Efficiency was also decreased by spreading program resources to a wider geographical area with limited numbers of staff, particularly in the sub-regional offices in Karamoja and Northern Uganda. These are large geographical zones with complex human rights issues that require sufficient human resources to achieve results and impact.

In assessing the organizational arrangements put in place through OHCHR's mandate, the evaluation found the increased collaboration between OHCHR, and the Uganda Human Rights Commission brought some efficiencies especially at the national level and through joint monitoring activities at sub-national level. The strong partnership between OHCHR and UHRC was recognized as a strength.

Conversely, respondents expressed some frustration and had the view that OHCHR is "constrained" and inefficient by having to work largely "through" UHRC. Some argued that given the sensitivity of the issues especially related to civil rights. There were many concerns regarding fact that OHCHR does not directly fund CSOs or District Local Governments to implement activities. Respondents felt this would be a more effective approach.

Within OHCHR's financial systems and the reliance on UNDP, the evaluation noted systemic internal systems and procedural challenges requiring attention at a level that goes beyond this review. The programme has robust financial and accountability systems. However, delays in funding disbursements and payments were often due to OHCHR's reliance on UNDP procedures and internal bureaucracies. These funding delays were challenging and voiced as a problem by both government and CSO interviewees.

It was said the financing, disbursement, management and accountability systems were not adapted to the Uganda context. There were also concerns about the extent to which the CO was able to adapt its financing and disbursement of funds procedures to allow timely and quality deployment of resources. It was argued that human rights programming is, in many cases, emergency programming. Especially when investigations for human rights violations needed to be undertaken in a timely manner to collect the requisite evidence to hold the perpetrators accountable.

Several stakeholders rated the capacity of OHCHR to mobilize resources and fund local organizations as comparatively low. Comparisons were made to other UN organizations with greater resources and easier funding processes. It was also noted that whilst efficiency and coordination are boosted by having the sub-regional offices, staffing is perceived as insufficient, given the scope of work and geographical coverage.

Effectiveness: *Very Satisfactory*

This section addresses the degree to which OHCHR planned results and targets were achieved at outcome and output level and how activities were implemented according to the annual work plan. To assess effectiveness, the evaluators reviewed progress reports, activity reports and annual reports, and M&E data. Further, the evaluators took an in-depth review of the approaches and methods used to attain these results.

OHCHR's achievement overall was largely due to the technical competence, the CO's legitimacy in human rights, and its ability to establish, nature and maintain strong partnerships and collaboration with key stakeholders from the government, other UN agencies (particularly UNFPA and UN Women, UNCT) and relevant CSOs.

Summary of Achievements:

The CO's work with government entities and CSO actors has significantly increased their ability to monitor, investigate, litigate, adjudicate and provide redress for human rights violations. During the evaluation period (2020-2022), State institutions, national human rights institutions, CSOs, academia, and media were increasingly able to integrate international human rights standards, principles and gender considerations and Human Rights Based Approach to Data (focus on SDG framework for Uganda).

The evaluation found improved capacity across the board among CSOs and journalists in their ability to advocate and report on human rights concerns with national authorities and international human rights protection mechanisms. Among CSO's, such as the National Coalition for Human Rights Defenders, there was increased capacity in monitoring, investigation, litigation, adjudication and provision of redress for human rights violations. An example was a written report on the needs of victims of sexual and gender-based violence during the conflict between the Government and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA).

The evaluation also points to greater understanding by States and other stakeholders of the contribution of the human rights framework to achieving SDG 3, as well as key health-supporting Goals 5, 10, 11, 13 and 16. The period of review saw a strengthened capacity of law enforcement agencies and national justice institutions to integrate human rights standards and gender considerations in their policies and operations. Evidence shows that law enforcement agencies applied international standards on public freedoms, right to integrity and personal liberty during their operations.

The evaluation found the Uganda Human Rights Commission (UHRC) to be increasingly fulfilling its mandate in conformity with the Paris Principles. The evaluation also found out that Government engagement with human rights mechanisms has been strengthened using the database of human rights mechanisms as a reporting and follow-up tool.

However, the evaluation noted the UHRC, and the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) were without a Chairperson and Commissioners for most of the year which

made them unable to constitute their tribunals. As a result, OHCHR Uganda was unable to support the institutions to effectively fulfil their accountability mandates during the reporting period. However, there were improved capacities of national justice and human rights mechanisms to monitor, investigate, adjudicate and provide redress to victims of human rights violations.

Capacity building was mainly carried out by Avocats Sans Frontières (ASF), the Uganda Law Society (ULS) and UHRC to increase the capacity of criminal justice actors both at local and sub-regional (Arua, Lira, Mbale, Soroti, Masaka, Jinja, Kampala, Wakiso, Masindi, Cassese, Bundibugyo, Kabarole, Ntoroko, Gulu and Hoima) levels to apply laws while being cognizant of the human rights.

Moreover, capacity building was aimed at increasing knowledge of actors on certain acts such as the Human Rights Enforcement Act, the Torture Act and the Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) Act. To promote the understanding and implementation of this Act, capacity building was done for JLOS actors, UHRC staff, state actors (police, prison officers, probation officers) and non-state actors such as law students and human rights defenders (HRDs), paralegals, youth leaders, civil society. Within the government, trainings took place with the newly appointed Chairperson and Commissioners of the UHRC, and senior officers of the Uganda Police Force (UPF).

OHCHR offered training to government entities such as Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS), the National Planning Authority (NPA). OHCHR Uganda provided technical support in developing training manuals facilitators Guide for Lawyers on Procedural and Constitutional Rights in the Context of Pre-trial Detention. This kind of training mainly targeted lawyers and paralegals. In addition, OHCHR trained UHRC staff in monitoring and reporting on human rights concerns arising from the general elections.

OHCHR collaborated with the Uganda Law Reform Commission to develop the Manual for Adjudication of Traditional Justice (MATJ) and the National Victims' Manifesto for Traditional Justice (NVMTJ) in partnership with Advocats Sans Frontiers, International Centre for Transitional Justice (ICTJ) and the Refugee Law Project.

Below is a summary table which presents the respective level of progress at the output level. Annex One includes the table with a complete review and assessment of the results framework.

Table 1. Programme Results at Output Level

Goal 1: Strengthen rule of law and accountability for human rights violations	Score
Output 1.1 Strengthened capacity of law enforcement agencies and national justice institutions to integrate human rights standards and gender considerations in their policies and operations.	very satisfactory
Output 2.1 Improved capacity of national Justice and Human Rights Mechanisms to monitor, investigate, adjudicate and provide redress to victims of human rights violations.	very satisfactory
Goal 2: Enhancing equality and countering discrimination	
Output 1.1 Strengthened capacity of National Human Rights institutions and relevant actors to promote laws, policies, and practices that comply with international obligations on equality and non-discrimination	very satisfactory
Output 2.1 The national justice system and related institutions increasingly and proactively monitor, investigate, litigate, adjudicate and provide redress for human rights violations.	very satisfactory
Goal 3: Enhancing and protecting civic space	
Output 1.1 The Uganda Human Rights Commission (UHRC) increasingly fulfils its mandate in conformity with the Paris Principles.	very satisfactory
Output 2.1: Improved capacity of CSOs and journalists to advocate and report on human rights concerns with national authorities and International Human Rights protection mechanisms.	very satisfactory

Output 3.1 Law Enforcement agencies apply international standards on public freedoms, right to integrity and personal liberty during their operations.	very satisfactory
Goal 4: Integrating human rights into sustainable development	
Output 1.1 Increased advocacy to State and business actors to enhance the effective implementation by businesses of the UNGPs, including the digital space.	very satisfactory
Output 2.1 Greater understanding by States and other stakeholders of the contribution of the human rights framework to achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) 3, as well as key health-supporting Goals 5,10,1,13 and 16.	very satisfactory
Output 3.1 Strengthened capacity of the UNCT and UN Agencies, Programmes and Funds on international human rights norms, standards and principles.	very satisfactory
Output 4.1: Strengthened capacity of State institutions, National Human Rights Institutions, Civil Society Organizations, academia, and media to increasingly integrate international human rights standards, principles, gender considerations and Human Rights Based Approach to data (focus on SDG framework for Uganda).	very satisfactory
Goal 5: Strengthened engagement with the human rights mechanisms	
Output 1.1 Government engagement with human rights mechanisms has been strengthened using the database of human rights mechanism as a reporting and follow-up tool.	satisfactory
Output 1.2 The National Human Rights Action Plan (NHRAP) is officially approved and implemented.	satisfactory
Output 2.1 Government engagement with human rights mechanisms has been strengthened	satisfactory

IMPACT ORIENTATION: *Very Satisfactory*

This section addresses the extent to which the *impact orientation* of the programme points towards making a significant contribution to broader, long-term, and sustainable enjoyment of rights of Ugandans. The evaluation found the good foundations laid in previous and current programming cycles have reaped impactful results.

Among government entities, COSs, and the UNCT, there was an increased understanding and implementation of international treaty bodies and mechanisms such as the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Paris Principles. A direct consequence of OHCHR's presence has brought about a stronger Uganda Human Rights Commission and thereby increased the extent to which the Ugandans can understand and enjoy their rights. The engagement of civil society and other groups point to increased knowledge of human rights-based approaches and an understanding of their own human rights.

Whilst many challenges, political sensitivities, and barriers remain, the evaluation found many CSOs, and individuals committed to improving human rights in the long-term. Consistent positive feedback and high praise was given from UHRC, civil society, media, judiciary, police forces. Respondents noted the OHCHR training equipped CSO participants with skills and knowledge that were subsequently applied and were on-going in their work.

Within the OHCHR's country programme, the evaluators assessed whether accountability and oversight systems have been established to measure the long-term effects and impact of the programme. The programme's impact orientation was very satisfactory. The evaluators found the current monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system was most effective in tracking activities and outputs. The CO has been very satisfactory in tracking, responding and implementing the recommendations of the previous evaluation (2016-2018) [13], ensuring accountability and impact orientation of the Programme.

All the structures, modalities and strategies were in place to derive long-term impact. It should be noted, however that impact of the overall program can only be assessed through intervention impact research, ideally with a baseline. Whilst this is beyond the scope of this programme evaluation, it is recommended as an important undertaking for the Uganda programme.

---

[13] See table on page 25.

SUSTAINABILITY: *Very Satisfactory*

This section addresses the probability of continued benefits and work after the implementation of OHCHR programme activities. The evaluation reviewed:

1. The extent to which human rights and gender equality concerns are being systematically addressed. Whether participating organizations changed their policies and process to improve human rights and gender equality fulfilment.

2. How data gathered on issues pertaining to human rights and gender equality was used to develop real and sustainable change.

Overall, the Country Programme has made a significant contribution to sustainable changes regarding human rights and gender equality issues in Uganda. The CO has significantly demonstrated a systematic approach across all the programme goals and expected results pertaining to the concerns of human rights and gender equality. The CO's long-term and evolving presence, from security to development, has contributed to sustainability.

Regarding overall sustainability, many respondents felt that without OHCHR's presence and programming there would be a serious void in the human rights agenda in Uganda. Among CSOs, it was cited that OHCHR provided a certain protection and legitimacy that could not be sustained without the engagement and support of OHCHR. CSOs and other respondents indicated the importance of the presence of OHCHR´s support, particularly in the issues related to human rights violations of civilians.

Over the evaluation period, OHCHR significantly strengthened the capacity of law enforcement agencies and national justice institutions, including the Judiciary to integrate human rights standards and gender considerations in their policies and operations. These agencies were taking on more of their own work, incorporating human rights approaches into laws, policies and internal protocols. There was strong evidence of the increased and sustainable changes within the UCHR.

The creation and ratification of laws and policies around human rights and gender equality issues are evidenced in national policies such as the improved capacity of national justice and human rights mechanisms to monitor, investigate, adjudicate and provide redress to victims of human rights violations.

Within the UN system, strengthening integration and coordination of human rights within the UNCT was cited as a cornerstone of impact and sustainability. The human rights and gender working group undertook a human rights and gender capacity assessment which identified substantial gaps in staff capacity and knowledge on HR, HRBA, and how human rights are mainstreamed across the Sustainable Development Goals (SGDs). Based on these findings, capacity building was taken on as a part of the UN capacity development plan. Further the gender and disability markers ensured

accountability and continued consideration of gender and human rights issues in the UNCT.

Within the UN system, OHCHR was cited as playing a unique and very important technical and normative role within the UNCT. OHCHR was said to provide a harmonized approach to human rights across the UNCT. OHCHR's advisory capacity as evidenced in briefings to the UN leadership and keeping the concerns of human rights within and beyond the UN system.

Among UN agencies, OHCHR was heralded as a model of the principle of ´Delivering as One´ (DAO). This was most strongly documented in the CO's work with relevant UN agencies like UN Women and UNFPA. One example was the collaboration and joint activity with UNFPA and UN Women to orient the new officials and staff on human rights. OHCHR's role in 'Delivering as one UN' was seen by UN stakeholders as contributing to the institutionalization of the integration of human rights across all the agencies.

GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (DISABILITY INCLUSION) INTEGRATION: *Very Satisfactory.*

In this evaluation, gender, human rights and disability inclusion evidence and results have been mainstreamed and discussed across each criteria of this report (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact orientation and sustainability). This section therefore examines the extent to which a gender perspective has been incorporated into the design and processes of the programme and how the programme's achievements have contributed to the goal of gender equality and disability inclusion.

The programme design was well targeted to vulnerable populations, particularly with respect to the protection and promotion of gender, human rights and disability inclusion. The programme targeted districts with poor human rights indicators in Karamoja and northern Uganda. The programme supported positive developments in social and gender norms, the reduction of harmful practices in relation to human rights protection.

OHCHR implemented strategic activities related to the integration of gender, GBV and human rights in collaboration with UN Women and UNFPA. Programme staff and the leadership of UN Women and UNFPA spoke very highly of OHCHR as being "one of the best "UN agencies to collaborate with. A respondent noted they "would not hesitate at any moment" to partner with due its strong technical capacity on human rights and culture of partnership and collaboration as well as effective coordination of activities with other UN agencies and CSOs.

OHCHR also provided advisory and legal assistance in conducting special court sessions at sub-regional level. Further, the CO provided capacity building to increase CSO's' capacity in the monitoring and reporting of the human rights situation in the context of the electoral period 2020-2021.

At the national policy level, the Programme was aligned to policies and laws on GBV including the National Policy on Elimination of GBV, the Gender Policy, the JLOS Fourth Strategic Development Plan, the Domestic Violence Act, the amended Succession Act, and the Disability Act, among others.

In promoting gender equality in addressing SGBV and sexual offences, the evaluation found many collaborative partnerships that improved gender equality. OHCHR, in partnership with the Women's Human Rights and Gender Section, was effective in providing technical assistance through drafting sections of the amicus curiae brief for the International Criminal Court (ICC) Trial Chamber in the Dominic Ongwen case[14]. This brought to light the long-term harm caused by the conflict in Northern Uganda,

---

[14] International Criminal Court convicting Brigade Commander Dominic Ongwen for 61 counts of crimes against humanity after July 2002 in northern Uganda. Trail Chamber X sentenced Dominic Ongwen to 25 years imprisonment. 15 December 2022, the Appeals Chamber confirmed the decisions of the Trial.

particularly for survivors of conflict-related sexual violence against women and their children.

The Women's Human Rights and Gender Section of OHCHR Headquarters and UNAIDS, supported the CO with two dialogue discussions with key populations and sex workers on the HRBA and sexual reproductive health and rights. Another collaborative partnership with the Ministry of Health increased the provision of health service delivery for HIV/AIDS, sexual and reproductive health and sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV).

With respect to disability inclusion, OHCHR´s work is very satisfactory. OHCHR Uganda has effectively supported key pertinent disability concerns such as albinism. Through the Equal Opportunity Commission (EOC) advocacy on albinism included the commemoration of the International Albinism Awareness and the subsequent adoption of the National Action Plan (NAP). OHCHR supported the validation of the National Action, which contributes to the nationwide comprehensive action plan on the rights of persons with disabilities (2020-2024). OHCHR supported the National Symposium on Disability to raise awareness to increasing access to services of albinos and disabled populations.

Within the UNCT, OHCHR demonstrated consistent and well-targeted attention to gender, HR and disability inclusion across work streams. For example, a comprehensive gender scorecard assessment was undertaken, and an action plan developed with OHCHR´s collaboration. This resulted in the UNCT Uganda system-wide strategy and Action Plan on Gender Parity. The gender and disability scorecard were noted as successful ways to measure and ensure UN staff have capacity in HR and gender. Within the UNCT and among national stakeholders, OHCHR played an important normative role with regards to CEDAW, Universal Periodic Review (UPR), the Convention Against Torture (CAT) and other legal frameworks.

Similarly, at sub national level especially in the Karamoja region, OHCHR worked together with other UN agencies especially UN Women and UNFPA to identify areas to leverage and work together instead of competing. OHCHR maintained effective partnerships with other UN agencies and were perceived as reliable and cooperative. A remark from a senior staff of one of the UN agencies helps to put this in context "they are very good in terms of Delivering as one UN". "If I were to choose among the many UN agencies to partner with, I would definitely choose them as my number one partner".

Interviews with senior staff from other UN agencies reiterated the perception of OHCHR as a good partner to work. Together with other UN agencies, especially UN Women and UNFPA, OHCHR has collaborated in identifying areas that leveraged the comparative advantage of each agency. For example, OHCHR worked closely with other UN agencies to orient new commissioners and staff at UHRC. It was noted that

this approach helped to avoid duplication and to deliver together as one United Nations.

From UN partners, several areas were identified for improvement of OHCHR in its focus on human rights. For example, it was noted that OHCHR should consider re-branding themselves to be known to work beyond civil rights. Some respondents suggested that OHCHR needs to "pitch themselves such that stakeholders understand that they work holistically on rights".

It was noted by UN partners that disability inclusion offered the UNCT opportunities for joint fundraising, proposal development and resulted in leveraging each agency´s strengths in programme implementation. Respondents recommended given the sensitivity related with work on civil rights in Uganda, OHCHR expand of their scope "to go beyond civil rights brings a value added and would really be helpful in improving relationships with government and to reduce backlash".

2.   Results and Progress Review Evaluation (2016-2018)

A concurrent objective of this evaluation was to review and assess the implementation status on the recommendations of the previous evaluation (2016-2018).   The evaluators have commented on each recommendation and where relevant, have provided recommendations for future action. A detailed table is found in Annex 1. Overwhelmingly OHCHR made very good progress on 12 out of 16 of the 2016-2018 recommendations. There were four areas of low and 'partial achievement'. The evaluators have addressed each point in detail below:

1. The issue of mandate renewal remains a real concern. The evaluators conclude that the HCA negotiation process has not improved much since the last evaluation (2016-2018.). At the time of drafting of this report, the current MOU renewal was tenuous and subsequently was not renewed. The chronic insecurity of the HCA limits the CO´s ability to plan and fulfil their role to the full potential. Many respondents and the evaluators acknowledged the challenging nature of this issue. To avoid redundancy, the recommendation for this is captured in 'Recommendation 1' on page 33.

2. Strategic communication and advocacy were rated with partial achievement. Since the last evaluation there remains a need for OHCHR to increase strategic communication and advocacy, including the production of evidence and researched-based reports.   There has been progress made with the hiring of a national United Nations Volunteer (UNV) Public Information Assistant to support the Public Information Officer. This area still requires attention and dedicated effort to improve. There is opportunity for the CO to further align with the OHCHR OMP (2022-2023) for further support.

3. Public reporting was also assessed with low achievement not related to OHCHR deficiencies, but rather to political sensitivities and the threat of non-renewal mandate of the CO. As of January 2023, a public OHCHR report on human rights concerns in Uganda had not been published since 2013. This is very troubling and requires action on the part of OHCHR more broadly. Positively, a national Information book was written and approved by the MGLSD and UHRC to dispel myths against albinism, but not released publicly yet. OHCHR was active in providing guidance for this report.

4. Administrative procedures partially achieved results. To the CO´s credit, administrative procedures have been upgraded and some financial and administrative challenges have improved since the previous evaluation. The finance system is still perceived as not "fit for purpose", given the evidence of continued delays in funding and reimbursements.

5. Good Practices and Lessons Learned

Many good practices were identified and validated withing the Uganda programme. A number of practices worked well, and had the potential for replication, broader application, or adaptation according to the context.

Several lessons learned over the evaluation period (2020-2022) emerged. Lessons learned highlight things that may not have worked as well as planned, but they provide good reference points for ongoing programme implementation. Identifying areas for improvement also provide useful inputs into forward thinking for the planning for the next programme cycle of OHCHR´s work in Uganda.

1. Good Practice: The strong technical capacity of the CO and staff gave legitimacy to OHCHR. Their reputation for technical excellence instilled confidence among CSO partners to participate in OHCHR´s capacity building and engage in collaborative activities. This enabled CSOs to have more constructive and informed engagement with duty bearers, reporting of human rights violations and contribution to the Universal Periodic Review.
2. Good Practice: Long-term and sustainable partnerships require dedicated long-term staffing resources to provide consistency and continuously build trust and shared understanding around shared priorities and outcomes over time. OHCHR demonstrated long-term consistency and dependability through the good practices of teamwork, mutual respect and being approachable.
3. Good Practice: Within the current Host Country Agreement (HCA) the Uganda CO is mandated to work in partnership with UHRC. Despite some limitations, this working arrangement has very positively increased the capacity of the UHRC. This arrangement ensured OHCHR's coherence within Uganda's national priorities and legal frameworks.
4. Good Practice: People are OHCHR's greatest resource. The importance of staff skills, experience and orientation in the right roles with the right support is fundamental and has been demonstrated by the project.
5. Good Practice: Maximizing the value-added of partnerships, working relationships and connections at all levels has proven itself as a defining factor in OHCHR's ability to exert influence and leverage limited resources for larger results within a very diverse and complex region.
6. Lesson Learned: Undertaking technical and advisory roles and responsibilities within the UNCT can be very resource intensive. Whilst important, this work often stretched human resources within the CO. The resource requirements for UNCT activities need inclusion in staffing, work and budgetary planning from the beginning.
7. Lesson Learned: Training of security agencies, especially on international mechanisms and standards, reporting and recognizing human rights violations and

abuses was deemed by respondents as highly important and impactful. With staff turnover however, capacity building could be an endless cycle for OHCHR. The CO will need to continue to expand on the Training of Trainers (ToT) model and find other measures to mitigate these challenges.

8. Lesson Learned: At present, the sub-regional offices in most-affected sub-regions remain essential for effective implementation, stakeholder engagement and capacity building at the grassroots level. However, activities are sometimes inefficiently allotted and there needs prioritization of activities, better resource allocation, and closer linkage to results,

9. Lesson Learned: What seems not to be working well is the continued challenges around the HCA renewal process itself. This dynamic often puts the CO in a precarious and unstable position regarding the country programme and staffing.

10. Lesson Learned: Paying attention to language requirements and cultural factors can be key factors in ensuring meaningful engagement with more marginalized and vulnerable stakeholders.

Evaluators Perspectives January 2022

In the final drafting of this evaluation, OHCHR's mandate had not been reviewed. Whilst beyond the scope of this report, OHCHR asked the evaluators for their perspectives in the current circumstances. In the immediate term, the evaluators recommend OHCHR develop an exit strategy with several possible strategic actions:

1. Undertake an independent impact intervention research assessment to measure impact and sustainability. If the programme ends, documenting OHCHR's legacy and contribution to Human Rights in Uganda is critical. If the programme continues an impact intervention assessment is still a useful undertaking given the longevity of the Uganda programme.
2. Undertake a mapping of CSO's, which partners are doing what, areas of synergies, focusing on what kinds of capacities they have and where are the gaps and needs.
3. Consider working with the UNCT and the UN family to see what work, initiatives can be supported, mainstreamed and taken up. It would be useful to initiate dialogue with UNFPA, UNWomen and the RCO.
4. Review the possible role of the Africa Regional Office in support and oversight.

Within the scope of this evaluation, the following conclusions and recommendations are relevant in the context of OHCHR's continued operation and presence in Uganda. Drawing on the 2020-2022 findings, lessons learned, good practices, and the results of the assessment of implementation of the recommendations (2016-2018), we, as the evaluators, have made our conclusions and proposed recommendations for OHCHR's response.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations (2020-2022)

Conclusion 1:

At present, the current MOU is not renewed. Since the previous evaluation in 2018, the HCA renewal process continued to be a challenge. The tenuous nature of renewal negotiations inhibited OHCHR's ability to carry out its full mandate. OHCHR continually sought to find a delicate balance between political sensitivities and the Office's ability to take a strong stance on human rights. Subsequently, the Office often led from behind the scenes through the UNCT and other CSOs.

One example is the OHCHR research and reporting role which is unfulfilled due to political considerations. The Office has not published a report since 2013. With the largest programme budget in Africa, it's unfortunate the CO is unable to provide the full breadth of OHCHR's global mandate.

Recommendation 1:

CO is recommended to strategically consider the environment and its role in Uganda in the current and long term. The question to be addressed concerns where OHCHR´s strategic value is added and what is needed to shape the future of the CO. OHCHR management is recommended to undertake an internal assessment and reflection process between the CO and HQ to clarify OHCHR Uganda's role, identifying key priority areas in the context of regionalization and comparative advantages. Given its current operating environment and OHCHR could consider (at least) three options: (a) being present with the current scope and limitations.

(b) negotiate a broader breadth and scope of work to in line with OHCHR´s mandate; and (c) consider drawing down interventions/ investment and developing a time-bound exit strategy. As this issue remains political, OHCHR management to consider a possible multi-prong approach of internal UN consultation, areas where the RCO can advocate on OHCHR's behalf, and high-level missions targeting the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and government leadership.

Conclusion 2:

The many competing and unforeseen activities amidst the shrinking civic space is a challenge. Staff are highly productive, and many activities are achieved each programme cycle. At times, the multitude and pace of activities keeps the Office engaged in some less-than-strategic level activities. Additionally, staffing resource allocation for activities is, at times, underestimated. For example, the human resources needed for activities for OHCHR´s activities within the UNCT are not always fully foreseen and accounted for. Further, there are inefficiencies in the way and some staff are spread over several technical and administrative roles, and the placement of where human resources at national and sub-regional levels. All these factors continue to further spread the CO´s limited human and financial resources.

Recommendation 2:

It is recommended OHCHR management review its work plans and prioritize the most strategic activities and plan realistic levels of human resources. When considering how human resources are best used, the Office is recommended to look beyond the outputs and activities and focus on the annual work plans aligned with result-based planning and management. The Office may look for ways to use human resources and staff time more efficiently and cost effectively. The possibility of restructuring or adapting existing human resources should be considered. In the next planning cycle, it is recommended, where possible, OHCHR reduce the activities involving direct implementation at the sub-regional or grassroots level. It is important to focus on strategic activities that cannot be done by government or CSOs.

Conclusion 3:

The CO has robust financial and accountability systems. There are, however, implementation delays due to UN bureaucracy and the reliance of OHCHR on UNDP procurement systems. Externally, on the part of partners, delays and last-minute requests further aggravate implementation. Overall, the financing, disbursement and accountability systems are not well adapted to the Uganda context. Delayed disbursements were especially problematic for CSO not often well placed financially to prepay activities with long reimbursement times.

Recommendation 3:

It is recommended management find a good balance and adapt financial management systems and procedures,
-where possible- to the Ugandan context. Lessons can be drawn from other UN agencies particularly UN Women, UNFPA and UNDP to fast-track disbursements to partners without compromising the robust financial management and accountability. It is recommended the CO management mitigate this challenge by undertaking better forward planning, anticipating activities, creating longer lead times, and beginning the procurement process well in advance of planned events. A quarterly pre-planning and budget meeting internally and with partners can systematically address upcoming and unforeseen activities. On the side of the partners, the CO is recommended to consider continuing to raise awareness among partners of OHCHR's procedures and timelines. Ensuring partners know what to expect and how OHCHR undertakes reimbursement and payment may lessen

misunderstandings and false expectations on the part of the partners.

Conclusion 4:
OHCHR's strong partnerships with a wide breadth of government entities and CSOs have been the correct critical pathway to ensure human rights are sustainably and structurally embedded in the policies and frameworks of national institutions. The CO's long-term activity in capacity building has allowed partners to understand, promote and integrate human rights, gender and disability inclusion. The long-term goal of sustainability is, at some point, government entities and COSs can fully take on their respective roles to implement, sustain and advance human rights in Uganda.

Recommendation 4:
It is recommended OHCHR management consider phasing out some activities and allow CSOs partners at national and sub-regional levels to take up more implementation. In collaboration with partners, the CO should develop a 5-7-year plan to reduce implementation and capacity building allowing local entities and organizations to incrementally take up their work. Part of this plan must address the need to improve the administrative and fundraising capacities of CSOs to mobilize and secure their own resources. It is further recommended to consolidate well-working and critical relationships with government entities such as UHRC, security agencies and local governments. Where possible, the CO should expand and replicate successful models like the Karamoja protection meetings in other geographic areas.

Conclusion 5:
Over time, with well-targeted capacity building efforts, a cadre of well-trained national counterparts will be able to take on their respective roles and work. This is an opportunity for OHCHR to make concrete steps to go beyond traditional areas of capacity building and training to focus on other strategic and timely issues. It is not suggested OHCHR end, or trade capacity building for new thematic areas. Rather, it is suggested the CO strike a balance of core work and new areas and evolve over time, given the country needs.

Recommendation 5:
When assessing areas for further development, it is recommended OHCHR management consider focusing on 2-4 strategic and emerging areas of work. The Uganda would be an excellent flagship programme. The following are suggested thematic areas based on the evaluators analysis of the country's context and feedback from many respondents. They include but are not limited to human rights and environment, business and human rights, civic space, livelihoods, HR and environment, economic and social affairs. HR and climate, HR monitoring of elections and demonstrations, disability and other key areas.

Conclusion 6:

As OHCHR management considers its thematic areas of strategic focus, as proposed in recommendation 5, there are some notable successes and 'low hanging fruit' in the current programming cycle in relatively newer and emerging areas of work that can benefit from further consideration and development. One current opportunity is the National Action Plan for Business and Human Rights. In disability inclusion, another unique niche is OHCHR's engagement with the National Action Plan on Albinism.

Recommendation 6:

OHCHR Management is recommended to consider investing in advocacy efforts to facilitate translation of the National Action Plan on Business and Human Rights. In disability inclusion, it is recommended OHCHR determine its own strategic role in support of the NAP on Albinism to action. Existing opportunities such as the International Albinism Awareness Day (IAAD) and National Symposium on Disability Day can be built upon.

Conclusion 7:

Since the previous evaluation (2016-2018), the evaluators found a continued gap in communications. Investment levels in external communications in the Uganda Country Office remain insufficient. OHCHR is aware of the need for an increased focus on communication through a variety of media and forums.

Recommendation 7:

The evaluators (2020-2022) recommend OHCHR management develop a stronger advocacy and communication strategy based on OHCHR's comparative advantage and strategic messaging through partners on select issues. It is recommended OHCHR Uganda consider the OMP (2022-2023) and some of the communication tools, platforms and messages to better 'tell the OHCHR Uganda story'. Communications should be targeted to enhance visibility, advocacy, mobilization and education. Acknowledging the shrinking civic space, government relations, and political sensitivities, any public reporting should be developed with a clear understanding of risks combined with a set of mitigation strategies.

Conclusion 8:

Within the MOU, OHCHR has maximized their work to the fullest. OHCHR has excelled in technical expertise and the ability to bring various stakeholders to the table in support of gender, HR, and disability inclusion. This is unequivocally one of OHCHR's strengths and comparative advantages. Within the UNCT, OHCHR plays both technical and normative roles earning OHCHR credibility and demonstrated value added. These roles should remain and continue. Where the CO falls short is with respect to OHCHR´s role in addressing current and timely thematic issues through publishing evidence and researched-based reports.

Recommendation 8:

It is recommended OHCHR management keep relevant as an agency and provide information, guidance, and a forward-looking approach to research on emerging issues in human rights. Some examples have been cited above in recommendation 6. For longer-term relevance, it is recommended OHCHR management consider research investment focusing on 2-3 areas of strategic focus with the publication of 1-2 relevant reports and papers over the next 1-3 years. To mitigate some of the OHCHR political challenges cited in Recommendation 1, the idea of developing joint publications in collaboration with UHRC, UNCT and relevant UN working group, or other collaboration with UNWomen and UNFPA should be considered.

Management response
Evaluation of the Uganda Country Office Programme
Recommendation 1: CO is recommended to strategically consider the environment and its role in Uganda in the current and long term. The question to be addressed concerns where OHCHR´s strategic value is added and what is needed to shape the future of the CO. OHCHR management is recommended to undertake an internal assessment and reflection process between the CO and HQ to clarify OHCHR Uganda's role, identifying key priority areas in the context of regionalization and comparative advantages. Given its current operating environment and OHCHR could consider (at least) three options: (a) being present with the current scope and limitations. (b) negotiate a broader breadth and scope of work to in line with OHCHR´s mandate; and (c) consider drawing down interventions/ investment and developing a time-bound exit strategy. As this issue remains political, OHCHR management to consider a possible multi-prong approach of internal UN consultation, areas where the RCO can advocate on OHCHR's behalf, and high-level missions targeting the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and government leadership.
Management position on recommendation: No longer applicable **(Accepted/Partially Accepted/Not accepted)**

Management comment:		
please refer to overall comments		
Key Action	**Responsibility**	**Time-frame**

Recommendation 2:

It is recommended OHCHR management review its work plans and prioritize the most strategic activities and plan realistic levels of human resources. When considering how human resources are best used, the Office is recommended to look beyond the outputs and activities and focus on the annual work plans aligned with result-based planning and management. The Office may look for ways to use human resources and staff time more efficiently and cost effectively. The possibility of restructuring or adapting existing human resources should be considered. In the next planning cycle, it is recommended, where possible, OHCHR reduce the activities involving direct implementation at the sub-regional or grassroots level. It is important to focus on strategic activities that cannot be done by government or CSOs.

Management position on recommendation: **Partially Accepted**

Management comment:

Following the Uganda CO closure, OHCHR will develop a work plan identifying key strategic activities for the revised and future structure of OHCHR's continued work on Uganda. It will remain important that OHCHR focuses on "strategic activities that cannot be done by government and CSOs."

Key Action	**Responsibility**	**Time-frame**
1. Develop a work plan identifying 2-3 strategic priorities for OHCHR's continued coverage of Uganda.	FOTCD/AB	End of July 2023

Recommendation 3:

It is recommended management find a good balance and adapt financial management systems and procedures,
-where possible- to the Ugandan context. Lessons can be drawn from other UN agencies particularly UN Women, UNFPA and UNDP to fast-track disbursements to partners without compromising the robust financial management and accountability. It is recommended the CO management mitigate this challenge by undertaking better forward planning, anticipating activities, creating longer lead times, and beginning the procurement process well in advance of planned events. A quarterly pre-planning and budget meeting internally and with partners can systematically address upcoming and unforeseen activities. On the side of the partners, the CO is recommended to consider continuing to raise awareness among partners of OHCHR's procedures and timelines. Ensuring partners know what to expect and how OHCHR undertakes reimbursement and payment may lessen misunderstandings and false expectations on the part of the partners.

Management position on recommendation: No longer applicable

Management comment:

please refer to overall comments

Key Action	Responsibility	Time-frame

Recommendation 4:

It is recommended OHCHR management consider phasing out some activities and allow CSOs partners at national and sub-regional levels to take up more implementation. In collaboration with partners, the CO should develop a 5-7-year plan to reduce implementation and capacity building allowing local entities and organizations to incrementally take up their work. Part of this plan must address the need to improve the administrative and fundraising capacities of CSOs to mobilize and secure their own resources. It is further recommended to consolidate well-working and critical relationships with government entities such as UHRC, security agencies and local governments. Where possible, the CO should expand and replicate successful models like the Karamoja protection meetings in other geographic areas.

Management position on recommendation: Partially Accepted

Management comment:

With a proposed new remote structure, capacity building activities to "*improve the administrative and fundraising capacities of CSOs to mobilize and secure their own resources*" in addition to maintaining some implementation and capacity building activities could occur either in Uganda or outside (if resources are available). Consolidating "*well-working and critical relationships with government entities*" can be maintained following the closure of the Uganda CO; however, will largely be dependent on OHCHR's relationship with the Government of Uganda following the closure. OHCHR will continue to work with the UHRC in context of global activities through OHCHR HQ (NIRMS) and/or sub-regional or country specific activities, as relevant and possible.

Key Action	Responsibility	Time-frame
1. **Finalise proposal for OHCHR coverage of Uganda following the closure of the Uganda CO.**	FOTCD/AB	By end of July 2023
2. **OHCHR to continue working with the Uganda Human Rights Commission (UHRC) on human rights issues in the country, including possibly remotely through OHCHR's global/sub-regional presences.**	FOTCD/AB	By end of July 2023

Recommendation 5:
When assessing areas for further development, it is recommended OHCHR management consider focusing on 2-4 strategic and emerging areas of work. The Uganda would be an excellent flagship programme. The following are suggested thematic areas based on the evaluators analysis of the country's context and feedback from many respondents. They include but are not limited to human rights and environment, business and human rights, civic space, livelihoods, HR and environment, economic and social affairs. HR and climate, HR monitoring of elections and demonstrations, disability and other key areas.
Management position on recommendation: Partially Accepted
Management comment: Depending on the proposed new structure and resources (both human and financial) available for OHCHR's continued work on Uganda, some of these strategic and emerging areas of work can be considered to be included in the workplan/activities. As the new structure will certainly be reduced not all of these areas of work can be focused on.

Key Actions	Responsibility	Time-frame
1. Develop workplan, including strategic priorities and detailed activities.	FOTCD/AB	By end of July 2023

Recommendation 6:
OHCHR Management is recommended to consider investing in advocacy efforts to facilitate translation of the National Action Plan on Business and Human Rights. In disability inclusion, it is recommended OHCHR determine its own strategic role in support of the NAP on Albinism to action. Existing opportunities such as the International Albinism Awareness Day (IAAD) and National Symposium on Disability Day can be built upon.
Management position on recommendation: Partially Accepted
Management comment: OHCHR's ability to continue to work on national policy in Uganda will largely be dependent on the Office's relationship with the Government of Uganda following the closure of the Uganda CO. Nonetheless, OHCHR, either globally or through its sub-regional presence, will continue to build on these initiatives, support them and furthermore possibly make them strategic priorities following an assessment of the possibilities for engagement.

Key Actions	Responsibility	Time-frame

1. OHCHR to conduct assessment of the possibility of continued engagement with Uganda and possible inclusion of the National Action Plans on Business and Human Rights and on Albinism as strategic priorities.	FOTCD/AB	By end of July 2023.

Recommendation 7:

The evaluators (2020-2022) recommend OHCHR management develop a stronger advocacy and communication strategy based on OHCHR's comparative advantage and strategic messaging through partners on select issues. It is recommended OHCHR Uganda consider the OMP (2022-2023) and some of the communication tools, platforms and messages to better 'tell the OHCHR Uganda story'. Communications should be targeted to enhance visibility, advocacy, mobilization and education. Acknowledging the shrinking civic space, government relations, and political sensitivities, any public reporting should be developed with a clear understanding of risks combined with a set of mitigation strategies.

Management position on recommendation: Partially Accepted

Management comment:

A stronger advocacy and communication strategy to "better tell the OHCHR Uganda story" will be necessary following the closure of the Uganda CO, particularly to publicise the Uganda CO achievements, both globally and regionally.

Key Actions	Responsibility	Time-frame
1. Ensure OHCHR public information and communications strategies include the publication of Uganda successes and achievements.	FOTCD/AB and Communications Section.	End of July 2023.

Recommendation 8:

It is recommended OHCHR management keep relevant as an agency and provide information, guidance, and a forward-looking approach to research on emerging issues in human rights. Some examples have been cited above in recommendation 6. For longer-term relevance, it is recommended OHCHR management consider research investment focusing on 2-3 areas of strategic focus with the publication of 1-2 relevant reports and papers over the next 1-3 years. To mitigate some of the OHCHR political challenges cited in Recommendation 1, the idea of developing joint publications in collaboration with UHRC, UNCT and relevant UN working group, or other collaboration with UN Women and UNFPA should be considered.

Management position on recommendation: Partially Accepted

Management comment:

The envisaged new structure of OHCHR's work on Uganda will aim to remain relevant in relation

to human rights issues in the country and depending on the resources available to the new structure will focus on a number of key strategic areas of work.

Key Actions	Responsibility	Time-frame
1. Adopt key strategic areas of work, further building on work conducted by the Uganda CO, including in conjunction with the Uganda Human Rights Commission (UHRC), notably focusing on, but not limited to, capacity building for CSOs to monitor and report on the human right situation, addressing human rights violations and abuses in northern Uganda and the possibly the NAPs on business and human rights and on albinism.	FOTCD/AB	By end of July 2023.
2. Publish 1-2 relevant reports, including one public report on Human Rights in the Context of Elections following the January 2026 Presidential elections in Uganda.	FOTCD/AB	By end of 2026.