

**UGANDA PROGRAM FOR HUMAN AND HOLISTIC DEVELOPMENT**

# **UPHOLD**

## **MAPPING OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS IN UGANDA**

**PHASE ONE STUDY REPORT  
(REVISED)**

**Prepared by**

**Denis Muhangi  
Dept. of Social Work & Social Administration,  
Makerere University**

**January 2004**

**Subcontractor Name:** Denis Muhangi  
**Project Name:** UPHOLD  
**Project Number:** 55020  
**Prime Agreement:** 617-A-00-02-00012-00  
**Subcontract No:** 55020-DM-01

## Abbreviations

|         |   |  |
|---------|---|--|
| AIM     | - | AIDS/HIV Integrated Model District Programme             |
| CAO     | - | Chief Administrative Officer                             |
| CBO     | - | Community Based Organization                             |
| CDRN    | - | Community Development Resource Network                   |
| CHAI    | - | Community HIV/AIDS Initiative                            |
| CSO     | - | Civil Society Organization                               |
| DDHS    | - | District Directorate of Health Services                  |
| DDP     | - | District Development Plan                                |
| DENIVA  | - | Development Network of Indigenous Voluntary Associations |
| FBO     | - | Faith Based Organization                                 |
| HURINET | - | Human Rights Network                                     |
| INGO    | - | International NGO  |
| MIA     | - | Ministry of Internal Affairs                             |
| MOES    | - | Ministry of Education and Sports                         |
| MOFPED  | - | Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development   |
| MOGLSD  | - | Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development        |
| MOH     | - | Ministry of Health                                       |
| MOLG    | - | Ministry of Local Government                             |
| NACWOLA | - | National Community of Women Living with HIV/AIDS         |
| NGO     | - | Non-Governmental Organization                            |
| NUDIPU  | - | National Union of Disabled Persons in Uganda             |
| RDC     | - | Resident District Commissioner                           |
| TTP     | - | Tripartite Training Programme                            |
| UAC     | - | Uganda AIDS Commission                                   |
| UACP    | - | Uganda AIDS Control Programme                            |
| UCRNN   | - | Uganda Child Rights NGO Network                          |
| UDN     | - | Uganda Debt Network                                      |
| UPHOLD  | - | Uganda Programme for Human and Holistic Development      |
| UNASO   | - | Uganda Network of AIDS Service Organizations             |
| USAID   | - | United States Agency for International Development       |
| UWONET  | - | Uganda Women's Network                                   |
| VCT     | - | Voluntary Counseling and Testing                         |

## Table of Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Abbreviations.....  | ii        |
| Table of Contents.....  | iii       |
| List of Tables.....   | iv        |
| Executive Summary.....  | v         |
| <b>1 Introduction.....</b>  | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 Background.....   | 1         |
| 1.2 Purpose of the Study.....   | 1         |
| 1.3 Specific Tasks.....   | 2         |
| 1.4 Study Process and Methodology.....                                    | 2         |
| 1.4.1 Overall Approach and Design.....                                    | 2         |
| 1.5 Scope and Limitations of the Phase 1 Study.....                       | 4         |
| 1.6 Organization of this Report.....                                      | 5         |
| <b>2 Civil Society Organizations: An Overview.....</b>                    | <b>6</b>  |
| 2.1 Introduction.....   | 6         |
| 2.2 Conceptual and Definitional Issues.....                               | 6         |
| 2.3 The Increasing Interest in Civil Society Organizations.....           | 7         |
| 2.4 Evolution of NGOs and CBOs in Uganda.....                             | 8         |
| <b>3 Phase One Study Results.....</b>                                     | <b>10</b> |
| 3.1 Introduction.....   | 10        |
| 3.2 Overview of Existing Documentation of CSOs at National Level.....     | 10        |
| 3.3 Existing Documentation of CSOs at District Level.....                 | 11        |
| 3.4 Types of Civil Society Organizations in the 20 Districts.....         | 14        |
| 3.5 Sector Composition and Activities of CSOs.....                        | 15        |
| 3.6 Registration and Regulation of CSOs in Uganda.....                    | 17        |
| 3.7 Funding of CSO Activities.....  | 19        |
| 3.8 Relations between Civil Society and Government at National Level..... | 19        |
| 3.9 Relations between Civil Society and Government at District Level..... | 21        |
| 3.10 CSO-CSO Relations.....   | 22        |
| <b>4 Emerging Issues, Gaps and Preliminary Recommendations.....</b>       | <b>23</b> |
| 4.1 Introduction.....   | 23        |
| 4.2 Emerging Issues about CSOs.....                                       | 23        |
| 4.3 Preliminary Recommendations.....                                      | 24        |
| 4.4 Information Gaps from Phase I.....                                    | 25        |
| 4.5 Proposals For Phase II.....   | 28        |
| References.....   | 30        |
| List of National Level Key Informants Met.....                            | 32        |
| Appendices.....   | 33        |

**List of Tables**

Table 1: Number of CSOs in the 20 Districts by Type..... 14  
Table 2: Number of CSOs by Sector and by District ..... 16  
Table 3: Available and Missing Information from the Secondary Data Review ..... 26

## **Executive Summary**

This report discusses the results of the Phase I study to map Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in the 20 districts of Uganda, where UPHOLD is operating. Phase I was based on a review of secondary data both at national and district levels, as well as interviews with selected key informants at national level.

The study focused on CSOs involved in the UPHOLD target sectors of Health, education, and HIV/AIDS, as well as the cross-cutting areas of gender, advocacy, capacity building, management, and communication.

At national level, documentation of CSOs exists in form of directories and inventories compiled by different organizations. Most such compilations have been made by NGO network organizations including DENIVA, the National NGO Forum, HURRINET, and UNASO. Some NGOs and government programmes have also compiled directories to serve their needs. The NGO Registration Board in the Ministry of Internal Affairs has a listing of all organizations registered with it.

The level and quality of documentation of CSOs at district level varies across districts. Some districts such as Pallisa and Gulu, through their Community Development Department or the District NGO Forum have directories of CSOs. Others (Lira, Bushenyi, Bundibugyo, Mbarara and Rukungiri) are in the process of recording CSOs. Yet others do not have any systematic or comprehensive record of their CSOs.

The study results indicate that a very big number of CSOs exists in the districts, a listing by this study revealing 3,400 CSOs in the 20 districts. Yet this figure does not represent the actual number of CSOs that exist, but rather, only those captured in the documents that were accessed. The South-Western district of Bushenyi, Rukungiri and Mbarara revealed the biggest number of CSOs, while the Northern and North Eastern districts had the least number. Bushenyi had 1,160 CSOs, being the district with the biggest number of CSOs recorded. Districts that have been registering CBOs through their Community Development Departments reveal a very big number of CBOs.

In almost all districts, CBOs were the most dominant type of CSOs that exists. International NGOs were mainly found in districts that have a history of civil war and other forms of conflict (Gulu, Kitgum, Nakapiripirit, Bundibugyo, Luwero), and those with a history of other calamities such as HIV/AIDS (Rakai). Several of the CSOs could not be classified in terms of their type, due to unavailability of such information.

A total of over 200 CSOs were recorded to be engaged in the education sector in the 20 districts, while over 300 were engaged in the sectors of health and HIV/AIDS. Patterns in some districts indicated that most CSOs involved in HIV/AIDS were formed or

registered in the last one to three years, possibly indicating the community response to participate in the implementation of HIV/AIDS programmes with resources channeled through the districts. A number of CSOs in the districts that have been characterized by civil war and conflict in the past were recorded to be engaged in activities related to emergency response, conflict resolution and peace building, advocacy, and psycho-social support.

Much of the available information on CSOs relates to the type of CSO, year of foundation/registration, contact address and activities undertaken. Glaring gaps in information remain, with respect to capacities, strategies, affiliation, size and nature of population targeted, and financial resources of CSOs. Gaps also exist with respect to the nature and quality of relationships between districts and CSOs, as well as their attitudes towards each other.

While the documents review revealed some information about the government-CSO relations at national level, little was found with regard to relations at district level. At national level, CSOs have over the recent years been actively involved in government policy and planning processes, mainly under the UPPAP process, the PEAP/PRSP reformulation processes and the budget policy framework. However, CSOs are still struggling to get a favourable NGO law, to replace the *Non-Governmental Organizations registration Statute, 1989*, which is seen to be more of a control mechanism rather than an enabling one.

There is need to recast the tasks under phase II of this study, as well as the methodology in light of the results from phase I. The key issues from phase I which have a bearing on the planning for phase II include the following:

1. Some of the districts have very big numbers of CSOs and therefore, the mapping initially planned will need a lot of time and resources and may be impractical to execute
2. For practical purposes in relation to UPHOLD's work, mapping hundreds of CSOs may not be very useful. UPHOLD does not need to end up with 'another' inventory of 'all' CSOs. Moreover the numbers on ground keep changing over time, as well as their nature.
3. Districts have already started some efforts to document CSOs, while District NGO Networks have also already started some work in coordinating CSOs. There is already some potential for partnerships and UPHOLD is not starting from nothing.

In light of the above, the following proposals are made for phase II:

- a) Whereas the task of mapping (through primary data collection) should be pursued further in phase II, this should be done at a smaller, manageable scale. The idea

should therefore be to follow up and map a sample of CSOs selected on the basis of some agreed criteria that reflects the practical needs of UPHOLD, rather than a census of all CSOs. The results of phase I already provide a sampling frame to sample from. The selection criteria should among others, include the extent to which a given CSO is active or functional.

- b) Phase II should also be used to initiate and/or facilitate a process of dialogue and action between UPHOLD, the local governments and the CSOs, as a strategy towards meeting the long-term intentions of the programme. This process should build on the already on-going efforts towards collaboration between districts and CSOs. The dialogue process requires engaging representatives from these sets of actors into discussion of phase I results and involving them in planning and executing Phase II, and subsequently sharing the results of phase II.
- c) Critical gaps that remain from phase I should be filled, and investigation of the critical issues regarding district-CSO collaboration and attitudes should be pursued.

# **1 INTRODUCTION**

## **1.1 Background**

The Uganda Program for Human and Holistic Development (UPHOLD) is an integrated social services program funded by USAID, designed to support the Government of Uganda's social sector, with focus on three integrated sectors: health, education and HIV/AIDS. The program seeks to increase the quality, access, utilization, support and sustainability of services in these sectors. UPHOLD's key strategy is to work with and through partners, tapping their existing knowledge and experience, while at the same time strengthening their capacities. Partnerships, especially those between public and private actors are considered to be central to current efforts aimed at advancing service delivery through the decentralization framework. This is in line with the Government of Uganda strategy to actively involve the private sector in the development process. UPHOLD is operating in 20 districts of Uganda, clustered in six regions across the country.

One set of actors in the envisaged partnership is that referred to as Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). As will be discussed further in this report, a concise definition of what constitutes CSOs remains elusive. For purposes of this study, however, CSOs can be understood to include a range of non-government, non-profit oriented organizations that seek to achieve specified goals to benefit a cross-section of the population. These may be those specifically known as NGOs, Community Based Organizations (CBOs), Faith-Based Organizations (FBOs), cultural associations and other institutions of a voluntary nature that are involved in development work. There are also other organizations (such as some micro-credit schemes), which, though having an element of profit-making, have social objectives as well. While there are other types of CSOs such as the media and trade unions, these were not a subject of this study.

## **1.2 Purpose of the Study**

Whereas CSOs exist in big numbers, UPHOLD and its other partners do not have accurate information on the numbers, nature and operations of CSOs. There is also concern that CSOs are not sufficiently involved in local government programs.

The purpose of the study was to map the nature, operations and scope of CSOs in the 20 districts and thereby provide information that would enable UPHOLD and districts to maximize the benefits of partnerships with CSOs and communities. The results of the study were also expected to feed into the Partnership Development Strategy. The results of the study should further be used by UPHOLD, Ministries and other stakeholders to design support mechanisms for CSOs to enable them play a more effective role in development.

### **1.3 Specific Tasks**

The specific tasks in this study as derived from the Scope of Work (SOW) included the following:

1. Listing CSOs in the 20 UPHOLD supported districts by key characteristics including type, district of operation, whether it is known to the district, sources of support, and affiliation.
2. Determining the geographical coverage of each CSO in terms of sub-counties, parishes and villages covered
3. Documenting the population groups (age-groups, children, women, adolescents, orphans, IDPs, disabled etc) and total number of people targeted by the respective CSOs
4. Determining the sectors, technical areas and actual activities in which CSOs are involved, with specific focus on the sectors of health, education and HIV/AIDS, but also considering cross-cutting areas such as gender mainstreaming, advocacy, capacity building, management, behaviour change communication and counseling.
5. Documenting the strategies used by CSOs and how they interact with the communities
6. Assessing the human, material, financial and technical capacities of CSOs
7. Assessing the existence, nature and quality of relationships between CSOs and the district and sub-county local governments as well as other organizations
8. Collecting information on CSO involvement in district programs, including attitudes, constraints, and requirements related thereto.

### **1.4 Study Process and Methodology**

#### **1.4.1 Overall Approach and Design**

The mapping study was envisaged to be undertaken in two phases; the first one drawing information from secondary sources at national and district levels, and the second, involving primary data collection from districts and CSOs depending on need as determined from the results of the first phase.

The approach to the first phase of this study was designed to be participatory, involving the key stakeholders, especially the districts, the CSOs, the UPHOLD field and head office staff, and the relevant government ministries and agencies. These include the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MOGLSD), the Ministry of Health (MOH), the Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES), Ministry of Local Government (MOLG), Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MOFPED), and the Uganda AIDS Commission (UAC). As such, these actors were not simply to serve as informants, but to play key roles in shaping the study, executing it, and discussing its results. UPHOLD Operations staff (Community Participation

Coordinators) were also part of the study team. The UPHOLD head office team and regional officers provided supervision, monitoring and back-up support where it was necessary.

This study targeted CSOs engaged in the target sectors (education, health, HIV/AIDS) as well as the cross-cutting technical areas (gender, advocacy, capacity building, management, behaviour change communication, counseling) in the 20 UPHOLD programme districts.

This report constitutes the output for phase 1 which was based on secondary data review at national and district levels, and key informant interviews at national level. The following tasks were undertaken during this phase of the study:

- Preparation of the concept paper which was discussed with UPHOLD to agree on the study methodology, time frame and other study details.
- Preparation of guidelines for identification and review of documents on CSOs and a tool for national level key informants.
- Recruitment and training of the Study Team.
- Interviews with national level key informants - Key informants at national level included individuals and organizations that work with or possess information about CSOs. Key informants were drawn from NGO network organizations, Ministries, and the Uganda AIDS Commission. The list of key informants met is attached in appendix.
- Identification, collection and review of secondary data materials at national level. The sources of this data at national level included the following:
  - UPHOLD
  - AIM
  - Development Network of Indigenous Voluntary Associations (DENIVA)
  - NGO Forum
  - NGO Registration Board
  - Uganda AIDS Commission (UAC)
  - Action Aid Uganda
  - AMREF
  - Uganda Network of AIDS Service Organizations (UNASO)
  - Uganda Debt Network (UDN)
  - Human Rights Network (HURINET)
  - Community Development Resource Network (CDRN/UPDNET)
  - Makerere Institute of Social Research (MISR)
  - Tripartite Training Programme

- Network of Ugandan Researchers and Research Users (NURRU)
  - Centre for Basic Research (CBR)
  - Inter-religious Council of Uganda (IRCU)
- Collection and review of district-based secondary data materials - District visits were undertaken to review any existing documentation on CSOs. Sources of secondary data on CSOs at district level will include:
- District Development Plans
  - Sub-county Development Plans
  - NGO reports submitted to districts
  - Documents from the Directorate of Gender and Community based Services
  - Documents from the District Planning Unit

These district visits were also used for contact building with the districts, and preparing for the second phase of the study. They also provided the opportunity for the initiating or continuing of UPHOLD's engagement process with the districts. The study team briefed the district leaders about the purpose of the study, and the expected involvement of the district. Community Development staff who could join the team as Data Collectors in phase II were also identified.

- Production of a preliminary report based on secondary data and key informant interviews.

### **1.5 Scope and Limitations of the Phase 1 Study**

While the scope of this study was fairly well-defined in terms of the target sectors of health, education and HIV/AIDS, the consideration of CSOs involved in the cross-cutting themes opened up the study to a much wider scope, which as will be shown later, resulted into a very big number of CSOs per district. The study also faced specific limitations in terms of the following:

- Most districts did not have organized or comprehensive information about CSOs. Most had different lists located in different places, having been compiled for different purposes.
- Most CSOs register at district level as fulfillment of a requirement to access support. As such, many of the CSOs recorded may actually not exist on ground – depending on the purpose for which they were registered, and whether they accessed any funding after that.

- Much of the existing information about CSOs, both at national and district levels was nothing more than the name, contact address and location of the CSOs. As such the full range of information sought by the study could not be found in the documents.
- Both, accessing documents and obtaining interviews at national level was in some cases complicated by the bureaucracy of the organizations in question, together with the busy schedules of the relevant officials.
- There was limited time allowed for national-level research. Most informants and providers of documents required prior contact and appointment.

## **1.6 Organization of this Report**

This report is organized into 4 Sections of text and discussion and 20 Appendices. The text in section 2 discusses definitional, conceptual and historical aspects of CSOs, while section 3 presents the results of the study. Section four summarizes the emerging issues and gaps, and makes some preliminary recommendations. Much of the data on CSOs is presented in appendices which have been compiled separately for each district.

## 2 CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS: AN OVERVIEW

### 2.1 Introduction

This section of the report briefly highlights the conceptual issues of CSOs and their evolution in Uganda. Both of these aspects are important to the understanding of CSOs in Uganda today.

### 2.2 Conceptual and Definitional Issues

The term civil society has been variously used to the extent that no single definition apparently appears to satisfy all interests. Most writers however seem to converge on the point that civil society organizations are those that function outside the market and the state. White (1994) defined civil society as;

*...an intermediate realm of formal associations situated between the state and the household, populated by organizations which are separate from the state, enjoy some autonomy in relation with the state, and are formed voluntarily by members of society to protect or extend their interests or values.*

CSOs constitute what has also been termed as the “third sector” – third in a sense of government being the first and the business sector being the second. Salamon and Anheier (1999) outline five key characteristics of “third sector” organizations;

- (i) Formal or organized (have institutionalized structure with regular meetings),
- (ii) Private (separate from government even though they may receive some government support),
- (iii) Non-profit (financial surpluses do not accrue to owners but are ploughed back into the organization),
- (iv) Self governing (able to control and manage their own affairs), and
- (v) Voluntary (voluntary participation in the organization).

Examples of civil society have been noted to include a wide range of groupings such as NGOs<sup>1</sup>, CBOs, the media, trade unions, cooperative societies, and professional

---

<sup>1</sup> NGOs are distinguished from CBOs in a sense that they employ paid staff, and they seek to serve the needs of a section of the population consisting not necessarily of the founders or members. On the other hand, CBOs are membership organizations that rely on voluntary service from members and seek to serve the needs of the members themselves. FBOs are otherwise known as religious-based organizations, their foundation having roots in some religious faith. They are thus often affiliated to religious denominations and their agencies such as churches and mosques.

associations (Bazaara, 2000). The types of CSOs which are of relevance to this study can be distinguished as follows:

1. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) – these are non-government, non-profit organizations usually formed to promote or pursue objectives of common interest, often in the benefit of poor sections of society. NGOs can further be distinguished into:
  - a) International NGOs (INGOs) – these have been formed in one country where they have their head-office, but they may have subsidiary offices and operations in several countries. The common INGOs have their headquarters in Europe, America, of Scandinavian countries.
  - b) National NGOs (NANGOs) – these have been locally formed within a given country. They have operations in either all or most regions/districts of a country
  - c) Local/District Based NGOs – these have been locally formed in particular regions/districts and their operations are restricted to a single or a few districts.
2. NGO Networks/Umbrella Organizations - These are organizations that have been formed as alliances to bring together various organizations with similar concerns or those operating in a particular sector. NGO networks may be formed at national, sub-national or even international levels.
3. Community Based Organizations (CBOs) – CBOs are membership organizations formed voluntarily by a group of people to serve their common interests. CBOs rely on the voluntary service of their members and do not employ paid staff. This attribute is one of the key features distinguishing CBOs from NGOs.
4. Faith Based Organizations – These are organizations that have been formed based on a belief in some super-natural power related to religious belief. They are often associated with religious institutions such as churches, mosques, or are otherwise founded by members or leaders of a given religious affiliation. FBOs may at the same time be classified either as CBOs or NGOs.

### **2.3 The Increasing Interest in Civil Society Organizations**

In much of the world, interest in CSOs increased rapidly during the 1980s. It has been argued that this increasing interest was largely associated with the resurgence of neo-liberal, free market ideology, which sought to reduce the role and influence of the state. Civil society was closely linked with democratization, and it came to be seen as a solution to the problems of development policy implementation, bypassing the corrupt

and inefficient organs of the state (Clarke, 2003). CSOs, particularly NGOs have increasingly been seen as effective channels for development assistance. Their perceived strengths include being closer to the poor, being administratively flexible, innovativeness, and cost-effectiveness (Lewis, 2003).

## 2.4 Evolution of NGOs and CBOs in Uganda

NGOs and CBOs are by far, the most common types of CSOs in Uganda. NGO work in Uganda dates as far back as the 1960s. The pattern of NGO activity in Uganda as in much of the developing world has followed three phases;

The first phase, which characterized the 1950s and 1960s, was that of relief and emergency response. NGOs were very few at the time and their main activities during this period were in the sectors of health, education and emergency relief. Their work in health and education was also more charity-oriented, rather than developmental. Government perceived the work of NGOs as temporally and transitional, pending government take over when resources allowed. Their role was also seen mainly in terms of filling gaps – providing services where government could not reach.

The second phase which covered the 1970s and 1980s was a development phase, whereby NGOs became more concerned with issues of supporting self-help development, involving communities, and delivering development oriented services. During the 1970s, CSOs in Uganda suffered restriction from the state, as any attempts at self-organization were perceived as anti-government. The fall of the Idi Amin regime at the end of the 1970s brought with it a new era for CSOs. The number of NGOs is reported to have increased from as few as less than 20 to more than 100 during the early 1980s, as voluntary efforts came in to fill the vacuum created by the collapse of government structures and services. During the early and mid 1980s, CSOs enjoyed much more freedom from the state, although at the same time, they had no fruitful collaboration or support from the state. Some writers have characterized the NGO-government relationship during this time as one of a *laissez-faire* nature. This freedom from state restriction, the collapse of state services in the preceding period, and the availability of donor support, all combined to contribute to a rapid increase in the number of NGOs and CBOs in the country during this period.

The third phase, which cuts through the later part of the 80s, the 1990s and 2000s is associated with the biggest increase in the number of CSOs. DENIVA, the network of local NGOs had registered over 400 organizations (NGOs and CBOs) by 1996 (Ridell et al, 1998). A database generated by the Ministry of Planning and Economic Development in 1998 listed 2,728 NGOs and 743 CBOs in the country. The increase in the number of CSOs has been attributed to both internal factors – such as the increased

freedom of association and organization – and external factors, such as the global trend towards a reduced role for the state and an increasing role for non-state actors. It is argued that CBOs and NGOs in Uganda have also been formed for additional reasons including as a form of employment and a means of survival, as a channel for tapping donor assistance (Bazaara, 2000), and more recently for tapping funds channeled through government programmes at district level. This phase of CSO development is also associated with a growing focus by NGOs on higher goals of advocacy, human rights, gender and development, policy influence and good governance. There is also greater attention to issues of CSO-Government collaboration and partnerships.

## **3 PHASE ONE STUDY RESULTS**

### **3.1 Introduction**

This section presents a summary of the study results, the details being attached as appendices. The section begins with an overview of the existing documentation on CSOs at national level and then at district level.

### **3.2 Overview of Existing Documentation of CSOs at National Level**

A review of documents from government and non-government sources at national level was carried out. There have been several attempts by different agencies to develop inventories or directories of existing CSOs to serve different interests.

On the part of government, the official sources of information on CSOs include the NGO Registration Board in the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The Board is responsible for registering all NGOs before they can operate in the country. The Board has a listing of all registered NGOs since 1989. The listing contains 3,650 organizations. This listing, however, only shows the name of the organization, file number, overseer, and postal address.

Other sources of information on CSOs include the following:

The network of Ugandan NGOs and CBOs, DENIVA, compiled a directory of member organizations in 1997, which lists 300 member organizations.

The National NGO Forum also has a listing of its registered member NGOs, both local and international.

The Uganda AIDS Commission in collaboration with AMREF also compiled a directory of CSOs involved in HIV/AIDS in 2001, which revealed 730 active CSOs in the field of HIV/AIDS countrywide.

HURINET (U) has compiled a directory of human rights and development organization in Uganda. This directory lists over 200 organizations. The directory provides information on the name of the organization, abbreviation, programmes undertaken, area of focus, area of operation, organization structure and contact details. The directory groups the organizations into some form of thematic categorization including; children's rights, health, development, special interest groups, refugees, food, environmental protection, professional associations, human rights, and women. About 29 organizations are listed under the theme of health.

Action for Development (ACFODE), a women's NGO produced a book that gives brief profiles of 47 NGOs involved in gender and women emancipation work. The book is entitled *Visible at Last: NGO contribution to women's Recognition in Uganda*.

The Uganda Network of AIDS Service Organizations (UNASO) has a directory of its member organizations. The member organizations include organizations involved in HIV/AIDS work.

The Parliament of Uganda with support from USAID published a directory on CSOs and public policy experts in Uganda. This is dated 2001. The directory lists the name of the organization, contact address, objectives, activities, status (either local or international), area of operation and field of expertise. The CSOs are categorized under some thematic areas including agriculture, capacity building, community development and income generation, democracy and governance, education and literacy, environment, financial institutions, health, information and communication, legal and human rights, religious organizations, research and consultancy, special interest groups and training.

The Tripartite Training Programme (TTP) implemented by DENIVA, ACFODE and URDT has a collection of profiles from the organizations that have participated in its trainings.

The IMCI/RBM NGO Secretariat is compiling an inventory of CSOs involved in malaria control countrywide. This is a secretariat of NGOs involved in Integrated Management of Childhood Illnesses and Malaria control.

Given these different listings, it may be difficult to accurately tell the number of NGOs in the country. The listing by the NGO registration Board could be the near-to-comprehensive listing, although it also has problems of classification. For instance some of the organizations registered as NGOs are in actual sense membership organizations that could be categorized as CBOs.

Another issue emerging from this review is that UPHOLD does not need to simply end up with 'another' directory or inventory. UPHOLD has the opportunity to go beyond this level and initiate at an early stage, a process of dialogue, interaction and action between itself, CSOs, and governments at local and national levels.

### **3.3 Existing Documentation of CSOs at District Level**

The availability and quality of documentation on CSOs at district level varies widely across districts. Some districts have compiled inventories and directories of CSOs operating in their jurisdictions. A good example of such a district is Pallisa.

Pallisa district has compiled an inventory of NGOs and CBOs in the district for the year 2001/2002. These are grouped by sub-county. The inventory lists the name of the organization, date of registration, location and address, date of renewal, composition of membership, sources of funding, aims and objectives, scope and nature of business, activities undertaken, achievements and constraints. The inventory lists 323 CSOs in 22 sub-counties. The directory, however, does not distinguish between NGOs and CBOs. The compiling of the directory was spearheaded by the Department of Community Development.

Other districts also have directories or inventories of CSOs compiled by the District NGO Forum. A good example in this case is Gulu District. The District NGO Forum in Gulu with support from DENIVA produced a directory of CSOs in the district in 2003. The directory gives the profiles of 255 CSOs in terms of name, year of establishment and registration number, contact person, sectors, offices and contact details, and activities. These profiles are listed according to the alphabetical order of the CSO names. The directory also provides an index by sector and by type of organization.

Some districts are still in the process of compiling directories or inventories, either by the District NGO Forum, or the Directorate of Gender and Community Based services, and have already lists of CSOs that are being expanded and updated. These include Lira, Bundibugyo, Rukungiri, Mbarara and Bushenyi. Lira district has compiled the profiles of 178 NGOs and CBOs. Out of the 178 organizations, only 5 are categorized as NGOs. The listing includes the name of organization, type, district registration number, objectives, activities, target group, geographical coverage, date of registration and date of expiry of registration.

In districts such as Kamuli, Mayuge, and Kitgum, the District NGO Forum have some lists of CSOs, not comprehensive though.

In most other districts, registration of CSOs, especially CBOs takes place in the Directorate of Gender and Community Based Services, and some lists of registered CBOs exist. In Mbarara district, the district Directorate of Gender and Community Based Services has been registering local organizations and it keeps files for each registered organizations. The files contain the constitutions of the organizations, and these specify their intended objectives, areas of operation and activities to be undertaken. The information captured therefore refers to the organizations at the time of registration with the district. No verification of the submitted information appears to

have been done. The district relies on the recommendation letters given by Local Council (LC) Chairpersons and sub-counties to register CBOs. In Bushenyi where the Department of Community Development has been registering CBOs, a listing of over 1000 CBOs exists.

In the rest of the districts, the information on CSOs that exists is not comprehensive, is in form of small different lists found in different locations, and was compiled for specific uses. For instance in Kyenjojo district, the DDHS carried out an appraisal of CSOs for the CHAI project and listed 23 CSOs, mainly community groups.

In a way, the availability and quality of data on CSOs in a particular district also tells, the extent to which the district has been interested in working with CSOs, or monitoring their work. Where District NGO networks have compiled data on CSOs, it also reflects the strength of CSO organization and coordination in those particular districts. For instance in some districts such as Yumbe, the District NGO Forum is still in its establishment stage.

Paradoxically, districts which have records of only a few CSOs were more likely to have those that are active. On the other hand, districts that had recorded hundreds of CSOs could not tell which ones were functional. The latter group of districts are mainly those that register CSOs through the District Directorate of Gender and Community Based Services, as well as those that made it a requirement for CSOs to register in order to access resources from the district.

### 3.4 Types of Civil Society Organizations in the 20 Districts

The biggest number of CSOs found in the districts in that of CBOs.

The table below shows the number of CSOs in the sectors of interest revealed in each district. It must be noted that these numbers may not represent the actual number of CSOs in the districts, since they are based on what was available in the documents that were accessed. However, the numbers give a picture of the numerical magnitude of CSOs in the respective districts.

**Table 1: Number of CSOs in the 20 Districts by Type**

*NB: Only those in the target sectors and crosscutting themes are included, although for some districts, this distinction could not be made*

| District      | NGO Networks | INGOs     | NANGOs    | Local/<br>District<br>NGOs | CBOs        | FBOs      | Others/<br>Unspecified | Total       |
|---------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------------------|-------------|
| Wakiso        | 0            | 9         | 19        | 11                         | 33          | 11        | 50                     | 133         |
| Luwero        | 1            | 6         | 9         | 6                          | 3           | 6         | 16                     | 47          |
| Mubende       | 2            | 4         | 3         | 1                          | 22          | 6         | 46                     | 84          |
| Rakai         | 1            | 7         | 3         | 3                          | 34          | 1         | 9                      | 58          |
| Mbarara       | 1            | 1         | 5         | 1                          | 332         | 1         | 9                      | 350         |
| Rukungiri     | 1            | 2         | 3         | 1                          | 231         | 2         | 3                      | 243         |
| Bushenyi      | 0            | 0         | 1         | 2                          | 1,153       | 1         | 3                      | 1,160       |
| Kyenjojo      | 0            | 0         | 0         | 0                          | 35          | 0         | 23                     | 58          |
| Bundibugyo    | 0            | 7         | 2         | 1                          | 35          | 2         | 63                     | 110         |
| Arua          | 1            | 4         | 0         | 15                         | 18          | 0         | 3                      | 41          |
| Yumbe         | 0            | 2         | 0         | 1                          | 12          | 0         | 4                      | 19          |
| Gulu          | 1            | 11        | 3         | 29                         | 135         | 8         | 68                     | 255         |
| Kitgum        | 1            | 5         | 1         | 0                          | 22          | 0         | 11                     | 40          |
| Lira          | 0            | 2         | 0         | 3                          | 173         | 0         | 0                      | 178         |
| Katakwi       | 0            | 3         | 3         | 1                          | 0           | 1         | 3                      | 11          |
| Nakapiripirit | 0            | 8         | 0         | 1                          | 2           | 5         | 6                      | 22          |
| Pallisa       | 1            | 1         | 1         | -                          | -           | -         | 345                    | 348         |
| Mayuge        | 1            | 2         | 3         | 14                         | 121         | 2         | 1                      | 144         |
| Bugiri        | 1            | 0         | 2         | 9                          | 20          | 1         | 1                      | 34          |
| Kamuli        | 3            | 3         | 6         | 3                          | 10          | 5         | 36                     | 66          |
| <b>Totals</b> | <b>13</b>    | <b>76</b> | <b>63</b> | <b>102</b>                 | <b>2391</b> | <b>52</b> | <b>355</b>             | <b>3401</b> |

It can be observed from the above table that 9 districts revealed more than 100 CSOs in each of them. The biggest numbers of CSOs were in the South-Western districts of Bushenyi, Mbarara and Rukungiri, and the Northern district of Gulu. The least numbers were in the districts of Katakwi, Yumbe, Nakapiripirit, Kitgum, Bugiri and Arua. These districts are mainly from the North-Eastern and Northern regions. Thus, it would appear that the distribution of CSOs tends to have some geographical pattern, with the

South-West having the biggest numbers, and the Northern and North-Eastern having the least. Caution, however, must be taken in taking this conclusion since these figures do not accurately reflect the actual number of CSOs on ground, rather they could be a function of the level of documentation done on CSOs in the different districts. Thus districts that have more organized documentation (Gulu, Pallisa, Lira, Bushenyi), also tend to reveal a big number of CSOs.

The table also reveals that CBOs are most dominant type of CSOs. In some districts such as Kyenjojo, almost all the CSOs identified fall in the category of CBOs. A big number of CSOs in most districts remain unclassified (in the category “other”) due to lack of information. International NGOs were more in number in districts that have been experiencing civil strife and insurgency (Gulu, Bundibugyo, Nakapiripirit, Kitgum), and those that have a history of other calamities such as war or HIV/AIDS (Luwero and Rakai).

The NGO networks found in the districts were mainly in form of the District NGO Forum that have been established in most districts. Some national level networks such as DENIVA were also found to be recorded in some districts as part of the CSOs operating there. There were also a few districts with networks for people living with HIV/AIDS.

### **3.5 Sector Composition and Activities of CSOs**

CSOs are involved in diverse activities. The analysis of CSOs by sectors and activities reveals important patterns.

Districts that have a history of civil strife were found to have some NGOs involved in emergency response work, conflict resolution, advocacy, and psychosocial support. These districts include Kitgum, Lira, Nakapiripirit, Bundibugyo, and Gulu.

Involvement in HIV/AIDS tends to be related to the age of the CSO, with most of the CSOs founded/registered in the last 3 years involved in this sector. This could be related to the developments in the last few years by which CSOs became involved in implementing HIV/AIDS programmes on behalf of government programmes, with funds channeled through districts. Registration with districts was often a requirement for CSOs to be eligible to access such resources. Such a scenario is evident in Mbarara district, where almost all CSOs formed/registered between 2000 and 2003 indicate HIV/AIDS as one of their sectors. This may have a number of implications. First, it could confirm that the formation of CSOs is largely supply-driven, induced by the availability or expectation of resources. Actually in Mbarara, even the few CSOs that had been in existence since the mid 1990s got registered in 2003. Second, it could mean that CSOs that were formed in this manner may not be functional if they did not

receive the support that was anticipated at the time of formation/registration. Thirdly, such CSOs may not have developed capacities or the experience, if they have not been active.

The case of Mbarara also reveals that CSOs that were formed/registered before 2003 are involved in diversified activities and are distinct from those formed/registered in 2003. For districts such as Mbarara the date of registration might be an important criterion in considering which CSOs to work with.

The table below shows the number of CSOs in the 20 districts by sector.

**Table 2: Number of CSOs by Sector and by District**

| District      | Education | Health | HIV/<br>AIDS | Gender | Capacity<br>Building | Advo-<br>cacy | Agriculture<br>/Livestock | IGAs | Peace<br>&<br>Conflict<br>Resolution | Others |
|---------------|-----------|--------|--------------|--------|----------------------|---------------|---------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|--------|
| Wakiso        | 56        | 39     | 33           | 2      | 4                    | 2             | 21                        | 9    | -                                    | 30     |
| Luwero        | 13        | 12     | 5            | 1      | 4                    | 3             | 5                         | 5    | -                                    | 15     |
| Mubende       | 8         | 8      | 25           | 5      | 4                    | 2             | 10                        | 3    | -                                    | 9      |
| Rakai         | 24        | 22     | 26           | 1      | 3                    | -             | 8                         | 1    | -                                    | 9      |
| Mbarara       | 68        | 161    | 210          | 18     | 36                   | 3             | 52                        | 76   | -                                    | 180    |
| Rukungiri     | 4         | 4      | 20           | 1      | 4                    | -             | 70                        | 10   | -                                    | 77     |
| Bushenyi      | 198       | 498    | 388          | 26     | 7                    | -             | 112                       | 341  | -                                    | 843    |
| Kyenjojo      | 14        | 5      | 13           | -      | 2                    | -             | 18                        | 3    | -                                    | 21     |
| Bundibugyo    | 30        | 33     | 30           | 14     | 8                    | 4             | 27                        | 22   | -                                    | 34     |
| Arua          | 20        | 14     | 12           | -      | -                    | -             | 12                        | -    | -                                    | 1      |
| Yumbe         | 3         | 10     | 4            | -      | -                    | -             | 2                         | 3    | -                                    | 6      |
| Gulu          | 23        | 66     | -            | -      | 34                   | 38            | 163                       | -    | -                                    | 142    |
| Kitgum        | 3         | 7      | 15           | 1      | 4                    | 2             | 4                         | 5    | 3                                    | 15     |
| Lira          | 26        | 14     | 57           | 2      | 8                    | 2             | 18                        | 9    | 2                                    | 15     |
| Katakwi       | 1         | 4      | 9            | -      | -                    | -             | -                         | -    | -                                    | 2      |
| Nakapiripirit | 3         | 4      | 2            | 1      | 1                    | -             | 6                         | -    | 5                                    | 3      |
| Pallisa       | 18        | 44     | 5            | 1      | 9                    | -             | 297                       | 72   | -                                    | 89     |
| Mayuge        | 7         | 11     | 17           | -      | 1                    | -             | 27                        | 19   | -                                    | 23     |
| Bugiri        | 4         | 14     | 13           | -      | -                    | -             | 7                         | 2    | -                                    | 8      |
| Kamuli        | 6         | 7      | 18           | -      | 3                    | 8             | 11                        | 2    | -                                    | 18     |
| Totals        | 262       | 318    | 304          | 29     | 89                   | 61            | 706                       | 165  | 10                                   | 517    |

\*\* Figures may add up to more than the total number of CSOs since most CSOs are involved in more than one sector

\*\* "Others" includes: trade, financial services, savings and credit, infrastructure development, psychosocial support, water and sanitation, emergency relief services,

\*\* For Gulu, HIV/AIDS is included together with Health, while conflict resolution is included together with advocacy.

### **3.6 Registration and Regulation of CSOs in Uganda**

The need to regulate CSOs in Uganda gained importance in the second half of the 1980s following the rapid proliferation of NGOs in the country. There was concern about the big and increasing number of local and international organizations calling themselves “NGOs”, whose activities were not clearly known or accounted for. Government therefore put in place the *Non-Governmental Organizations Registration Statute (No.5 of 1989)*, and the accompanying Statutory Instrument, *The Non-Governmental Organizations Regulations, 1990 (No.9 of 1990)*, the main aim being to provide for the registration of NGOs and to establish a Board for NGO registration and matters connected therewith<sup>2</sup>. The NGO Registration Board was established with a Secretariat in the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

The Board was composed of two members from the public, and one member from the Ministries of Internal Affairs; Relief and Social Rehabilitation; Justice; Lands and Survey; Planning and Economic Development; Finance; Foreign Affairs; Local Government; Women in Development; and representatives from Office of the Prime Minister, Internal Security Organization, and External Security Organization.

The Board is empowered to consider NGO applications for registration, to approve or reject such applications, to keep a register of registered organizations, and to grant or revoke certificates of registration. It is also charged with the duty of guiding and monitoring the work of NGOs. The Board has never played the latter role, due to under-facilitation.

As can be seen from its composition – consisting of representatives from key security organizations – together with its secretariat being housed in the Ministry of Internal Affairs (the ministry responsible for security, law and order), the Board and the statute in general seems to have been established more as measures to control, rather than enable the work of NGOs.

The process of NGO registration itself as provided for by the statute has been described as highly centralized (Ridell, 1998), since the NGO registration Board and secretariat have no structures at local government level.

---

<sup>2</sup> Before the NGO Registration Statute came into force, NGOs were variously registered under The Companies Act, The Uganda Registration Services Bureau Act 1998, or simply as associations and trusteeships. Today, NGOs which register with the Registration Board also have to register under the Companies Act to acquire legal status because the former does not confer legal status.

Civil society groups in Uganda themselves have openly argued against the existing regulatory mechanisms of government vis a vis CSOs. The NGO Registration Statute has been under revision, but apparently not for the better of CSOs. In reference to the NGO Registration (Amendment) Bill, Asiimwe-Mwesigye (2003, P.10) from the Uganda Women's Network (UWONET) argues that:

*The present bill treats NGOs as a security threat, provides for an excessive degree of state control and interference in the activities of NGOs and makes registration and revocation or registration of an NGO dependant on government policy, plan or in public interest. The bill makes no attempt to lay the ground for constructive relationship between NGOs and Government, for example by institutionalizing channels of communication and cooperation.*

CSOs feel that whereas the NGO law is being revised, it still contains clauses that will make their work very difficult. In 2001, a coalition of CSOs made consultations to agree on a common position in response to the NGO Amendment Bill. The CSOs proposed that the NGO Board should be placed in a more development-oriented ministry such Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, or Ministry of Finance, rather than the Ministry of Internal Affairs. They also called for greater representation of CSOs on the Board, and they rejected the proposed introduction of annual permits (Action Aid 2001).

Some CSOs have argued that the best way to regulate CSOs is for them to regulate themselves through for instance formation of their own Board. Precedents to this include the work of professional associations such as the Uganda Medical Association, which regulates the conduct of medical practitioners. There are no efforts towards this though.

Another government office with responsibility for NGO regulation and coordination is the Office of the Prime Minister, which has an Aid Coordination Secretariat. The secretariat among others is responsible for coordinating and monitoring NGO activities. In the past, this office used to convene monthly meetings for NGOs, which were abandoned with time.

Whereas registration of NGOs with government is done at national level as discussed above, that for CBOs and other district-based associations is undertaken at district level, although there seems not to be any specific law regarding this. In most districts, the Directorate of Gender and Community Based Services is the office registering CBOs. At district level, Resident District Commissioners have also occasionally taken interest in regulating the work of CSOs, again from the security perspective.

Apart from registration with government, CSOs also register, voluntarily though, with the umbrella organizations in which they may fall, such as the NGO Forum at national and district levels, DENIVA, and the sector-specific NGO network organizations. Districts with functional NGO networks include Gulu, Lira, Arua, Kitgum, Mbarara, Mayuge and Kamuli. It was found that membership to District NGO Networks is still hampered by, among other things, the high membership fees charged (ranging between U.shs. 20,000 –50,000 in most districts). For instance in Mbarara district, only 54 out of 350 CSOs were found to be members of the District NGO Forum recently formed.

It can be seen from the above that regulation of CSOs has been a matter bound to raise controversy. Both the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda (1995) and the Local Governments Act (1997) recognize that NGOs have a role to play in the development process nationally and locally, and assign ministries and local governments the responsibility of co-coordinating and monitoring NGO activities. The two laws however, do not specify the modalities of how NGOs would work with the different government levels.

### **3.7 Funding of CSO Activities**

International and local NGOs, as well as the umbrella organizations are largely dependent on external donor support. Some CBOs also get external support although majority operate with local resources generated from their members. CSOs have not received much financial support from government or the local private business sector. Most documents available at the districts do not contain information on the finances brought in by CSOs.

### **3.8 Relations between Civil Society and Government at National Level**

At national level, relations between civil society organizations and the central government organs tends to vary depending on the type and nature of CSO in question, as well as the extent it has sought to work in relationship with government. Some advocacy NGOs such as the Uganda Debt Network boast of a very positive relationship with government Ministries (Ridell et al, 1998), despite their frequent attack on government policies and practices.

*We do not have a problem in working with government. We are respected for being independent. We support government where it is right, we oppose it where it is wrong (Informant, Uganda Debt Network).*

CSOs were involved in the drafting of the first Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) which was completed in 1997. When the PEAP was being revised in 1999-2000, together with the formulation of the Poverty Reduction Strategy paper, CSOs were

represented on the Task Force that led the consultative process. CSOs on this Task Force included Oxfam (UK), Action Aid (UK), VECO Uganda (Belgium), SNV (Netherlands), MS Uganda (Denmark), Action for Development (ACFODE), the Uganda Women's Network (UWONET), Forum for Women Educationalists (FAWE), World Vision, Uganda Catholic Medical Bureau (UCMB), and the Uganda Debt Network (UDN). It has been pointed out that CSOs were not simply represented on the Task Force but their input was incorporated in the PEAP/PRSP. However, it has been argued that it was a requirement from the World Bank and the IMF that PRSPs are formulated with as wide participation of stakeholders as possible, including CSOs. It is argued that CSO participation in the PRSP formulation represented the first explicit effort on part of government to deliberately involve CSOs in policy design, planning, and implementation (Gariyo 2002).

The Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) also strongly recognizes the important role that civil society organizations are expected to play and seeks to integrate them in the planning process.

CSOs and their network organizations have been actively involved in the Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment process (UPPAP) spearheaded by the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MOFPED). These included Oxfam, DENIVA, the National NGO Forum, UWONET and UDN.

Others such as the UDN and the National NGO Forum have been involved in empowering communities to monitor the Poverty Action Fund (PAF) programmes. These have also been involved in the budget policy framework. Some CSOs have also been involved in the Sector Working Groups (SWGs) that discuss sectoral plans and programmes.

The new developments of the Sector-Wide-Approach are not fully welcomed by the CSOs. Particularly, the requirement that CSO budgets should be part of government budgets and the requirement that CSOs get their funds through government channels is seen as dangerous for the independence of CSOs.

The Uganda AIDS Commission, which is the government body responsible for co-ordination of HIV/AIDS work in the country, has initiated a partnership mechanism in which CSOs participate. The partnership consists of 11 self coordinating entities that include faith based organization, international NGOs, the private business sector, PWAs, and research and academic institutions among others. These entities are supposed to hold monthly meetings, and to send a representative to meetings with UAC.

### **3.9 Relations between Civil Society and Government at District Level**

Decentralization of functions and services to local governments is expected to have opened opportunities for increased collaboration between government and non-government actors. NGOs are expected to be part of the district planning process.

Different districts have put in place different mechanisms to coordinate CSO activities. Some have set up committees for this purpose; others have designated particular offices (Deputy CAO, Planning Unit, Directorate of Gender, RDC) to be responsible for coordinating CSO activities. In most districts, NGOs have initiated their own district fora, the District NGO Forum, in which they come together to coordinate themselves and pursue common interests.

CSOs are supposed to have a representative on the District AIDS Committees (DACs). CSOs in districts have implemented government programmes, such as the Community HIV/AIDS Initiative (CHAI).

In Rakai district, the three-year District Development Plan includes a list of NGOs/CBOs operational in the district as well as an NGO investment profile, which summarises the planned investments of about 6 NGOs. However all this information is attached in the appendix of the document, lacking integration with the sectoral plans of the district. This could imply that although some effort has been made to know what NGOs are doing and include them in the district planning process, the district and the CSOs still run separate plans.

In Luwero, the District budget 2003/2004 includes in its appendix the work-plans and budgets of two CSOs, namely Association Francois Xavier Bagnoud (AFXB) programme and the Uganda Society for disabled children.

Documents accessed in Mbarara from the district offices showed evidence that the district has been working together with CSOs, especially in HIV/AIDS work under the HIV/AIDS Control Project. Such documents included invitations to planning meetings and workshops written by the CAO to CSOs, lists of CSOs to be invited, invitations of proposals from different organizations including CSOs, guidelines in evaluating proposals from CSOs, budgets showing different CSOs as the implementers, minutes of planning meetings with lists of attendance showing that representatives of CSOs were present.

In Kitgum, NGOs together with the district leadership have what is called the Joint Forum for Peace (JFP), in which the two sets of actors work together. The major NGO actors in this forum are ACORD, AVSI, and IRC. In one of its quarterly reports, ACORD states that the district leadership has trust in ACORD. ACORD was one of the NGOs that accessed the Uganda AIDS Control Programme (UACP) funds through the

district to implement HIV/AIDS activities. It was also selected with three other CSOs to implement the CHAI programme funded by UACP. ACORD acknowledges that these relationships strengthened its partnership with the district. IRC worked with the DDHS office to distribute condoms to the IDP camps. The documents also revealed that IRC sends monthly reports to the LC5 Chairperson, the RDC, the CAO, the Mayor, the Secretary for Health, the CDO, the DWO, the DDHS, and the Kitgum District NGO Forum. Kitgum district also has a District Integrated HIV/AIDS work plan for 2003/2004, which integrates activities of all key actors in HIV/AIDS.

Action Aid Uganda reports that it has worked with and influenced local governments in Pallisa, Katakwi and other districts where it operates to engage in participatory planning processes, promote human rights, improve service delivery, and respond to community demands (Action Aid 2002).

### **3.10 CSO-CSO Relations**

One way in which CSOs relate with other CSOs is through their networks or alliances.

UNASO has District Focal Point Organizations in most of the districts. These have the responsibility for distributing information to other organizations, mobilization, liaison, and district coordination of HIV/AIDS service organizations.

Another way is where the bigger CSOs, such as international NGOs, support the smaller ones. Action Aid for instance has been supporting local NGOs and CBOs, building their capacities to do their work better. By 2001, Action Aid Uganda had established relations with almost 200 organizations in the country (Action Aid 2001). In the same year, 48% of Action Aid Uganda's total programme spending was channeled through other organizations, majority of this to those working at district and lower levels.

## **4 EMERGING ISSUES, GAPS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **4.1 Introduction**

The foregoing sections of this report have discussed the key results of the study. This section attempts to sieve out some of the key emerging issues, gaps and also to make some tentative recommendations.

### **4.2 Emerging Issues about CSOs**

The first conclusion is that there are so many CSOs in the districts, especially those of the CBO type. This could be both an opportunity but also a challenge. An opportunity to tap that big potential and to reach many communities through structures that already exist, and that are based largely on voluntarism – with cost-saving implications. It could be a challenge, because many problems and exaggerations could be hiding behind the big numbers. Efforts to work with CSOs must in this case be based on further screening and appraisal to understand them better.

An assessment of the character of CSOs in Uganda reveals more CBOs in numerical terms compared to NGOs. Of course the NGOs have better capacities and are more visible on ground. Despite this, the CBOs are more representative of the people and should therefore be actively involved in development processes.

Secondly, it can be noted that districts are at different stages in terms of working with CSOs and knowing what they are doing. This is reflected in the extent of integration observed from the district development plans and budgets, as well as the availability and quality of information on CSOs at district level. The availability and quality of data on CSOs in a particular district seems to tell the extent to which the district has been interested in working with CSOs, or monitoring their work.

Where District NGO networks have compiled data on CSOs, it also reflects the strength of CSO organization and coordination in those particular districts. This could point to the level of potential to work with CSOs in a particular district in a fairly organized manner. It could be envisaged that districts with viable NGO networks could find it much easier to realize partnerships between CSOs and local governments than those where there are no such networks or where they are weak. However, CSO networks themselves need to be carefully studied to understand the forces behind their formation and the extent to which they are truly representative of their members.

One fear expressed by writers on civil society is that CSOs that are sub-contracted by government to implement programmes on its behalf are likely to become agents of

government, lose their independence of action, and become an extension of government (Bazaara, 2000, P.35). One of the questions in the relationship between CSOs and governments at various levels, therefore, is how can CSOs closely work with government without losing their values, their identity and their autonomy? Conversely, where, when and why do some governments, central or local, work with CSOs or not?

There is also an issue of trust building between CSOs and government at different levels. Trust is essential for all other forms of collaboration to grow. CSOs and government cannot share information, plan together, integrate budgets and so on, if they are suspicious of the intentions or feelings of each other, or if they think they are in competition with each other. The key question in this respect therefore is how can openness and trust be built? How can the culture of competition be replaced with a culture of collaboration? These questions should be pursued further in phase II of this study.

Another key question related to the desired degree of formality of the working relationship between a given CSO and a local government. Is there need for instance for CSOs to sign an agreement or a memorandum of understanding with the district in when the two are going to work together? When is such an understanding necessary? What would it help? Is it a solution to some of the problems currently experienced?

An analysis of the date of formation/registration of CSOs in some districts reveals that most CSOs were formed and/or registered in recent years (one to three years ago). In such cases, the CSOs also tend to be concentrated in specific sectors. This seems to point to a supply-side factor that attracted the formation of CSOs at this particular time. If this is a valid conclusion, then there is need for verification to ascertain which CSOs actually exist, and what are they actually doing.

### **4.3 Preliminary Recommendations**

There are different possible options for UPHOLD's engagement with CSOs.

One option is to go through higher-level CSOs in the CSO axis to reach the lower level ones. For instance, going through INGOs and NGOs to reach CBOs. In this respect, it is possible that CBOs may not relate at par with districts. What is possible is for NGOs to enter into partnership agreements with districts, but with a requirement for the NGOs to work with and through CBOs in those districts. This is given further credence by the fact that CBOs are more likely to relate better with NGOs than with districts.

A second option is for UPHOLD to work directly with CSOs, even those at the lowest level, such as CBOs. This is made possible by the fact that UPHOLD has regional offices and staff who can work with such grassroots organizations.

CSOs and development support agencies and partners need to get well versed with and appreciate the procedures that govern the operations of local governments if they are to relate effectively with them. One of the important first steps in building government-CSO relations, will therefore be to orient CSOs in established government procedures.

One way in which CSOs can influence what happens in local governments is through lobbying and advocacy. But effective advocacy requires that CSOs have accurate and up-to-date information about the issues they are advocating for. Information sharing between the bigger CSOs and the smaller ones will be an important mechanism for strengthening this aspect.

#### **4.4 Information Gaps from Phase I**

The following two tables summarize the available information as revealed by this report and the gaps that remain. Table 3 gives the details of the available and missing information, while Table 4 summarizes the emerging picture as per the requirements listed in the scope of work for this study.

**Table 3: Available and Missing Information from the Secondary Data Review**

| <b>District</b> | <b>Available Information</b>  | <b>Missing Information</b>   |
|-----------------|---|--|
| Wakiso          | Name of CSO, type, districts of operation, year of foundation, where and when registered, sub-counties of operation, target groups, sectors, activities, collaborating organizations, sources & type of support | Affiliation, facilities, known to the district, size of population served, capacities, human resources, management structures, community involvement, relations with district  |
| Luwero          | Name of CSO, type, location & contact address, activities, area of operation  | Affiliation, districts of operation, year of foundation/registration, target groups, size of population served facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, management structures, community involvement, relations with district  |
| Mubende         | Name of CSO, type, location, contact person & address, activities   | Affiliation, districts of operation, year of foundation/registration, areas of operation, target groups, size of population served facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, management structures, community involvement, relations with district                              |
| Rakai           | Name of CSO, type, districts of operation, location, year started, where registered, known to the district, sub-counties & parishes of operation, target groups, sectors, activities, management structures     | Affiliation, size of population served partners, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, budget, membership, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes  |
| Mbarara         | Name of CSO, type, office location, sectors, year registered, year started, objectives/activities   | Districts of operation, affiliation, areas of operation, target groups, size of population served sectors, activities, partners, budget, membership, facilities, capacities, management structures, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes |
| Rukungiri       | Name of CSO, type, sub-counties & parishes of operation, activities, contact address  | Districts of operation, affiliation, year of foundation/registration, target groups, size of population served sectors, partners, budget, membership, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes                       |
| Bushenyi        | Name of CSO, location, area of operation, address, activities/objectives  | Type, districts of operation, affiliation, year of foundation/registration, target groups, size of population served sectors, partners, budget, membership, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes                 |
| Kyenjojo        | Name of CSO, type, sectors, activities, location  | Districts of operation, affiliation, year of foundation/registration, areas of operation, target groups, size of population served partners, budget, membership, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes            |
| Bundibugyo      | Name of CSO, type, year of registration, sectors, activities, location & address, contact person  | Type (for some), districts of operation, affiliation, districts of operation, areas of operation, target groups, size of population served partners, budget, membership, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes    |
| Arua            | Name of CSO, type, districts and sub-counties of operation, where registered, sectors   | Affiliation, year of foundation/registration, target groups, size of population served, activities, partners, budget, membership, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes   |
| Yumbe           | Name of CSO, type, districts of   | Affiliation, size of population served, partners, budget,  |

| District      | Available Information  | Missing Information  |
|---------------|--|--|
|               | operation, year of foundation, year started operations, distance to district headquarters, location of operations, where and when registered, known to the district, sub-counties, parishes and villages of operation, target groups, sectors and activities | membership, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes   |
| Gulu          | Name of CSO, type, year of foundation, contact person, address, physical location, nearest town, activities  | Districts of operation, affiliation, areas of operation, target groups, size of population served sectors, partners, sources of funding, budget, membership, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes              |
| Kitgum        | Name of CSO, type, area of operation, location of office, date of foundation, sectors, activities, source of funding   | Districts of operation, affiliation, areas of operation, target groups, size of population served, partners, budget, membership, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes  |
| Lira          | Name of CSO, type, where registered, activities, target groups, coverage, date of registration   | Districts of operation, affiliation, size of population served sectors, partners, budget, membership, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes   |
| Katakwi       | Name of CSO, type, districts of operation, office location, distance to district headquarters, sub-counties of operation, sectors and activities   | Type, districts of operation, affiliation, year of foundation/registration, target groups, size of population served, partners, budget, membership, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes                       |
| Nakapiripirit | Name of CSO, type, sectors, activities, budget, year of foundation   | Districts of operation, affiliation, areas of operation, target groups, size of population served, partners, membership, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes  |
| Pallisa       | Name of CSO, date of registration, location & address, membership composition, sources of funding, aims and objectives, scope & nature of business, activities, achievements and constraints   | Type, districts of operation, affiliation, areas of operation, target groups, size of population served, partners, budget, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes  |
| Mayuge        | Name of CSO, type, where registered, source of funding, areas of operation, location of office, contact address, objectives, activities  | Districts of operation, affiliation, year of foundation/registration, areas of operation, target groups, size of population served sectors, partners, budget, membership, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes |
| Bugiri        | Name of CSO, type, districts of operation, location of operations, year of foundation, year started operations, where and when registered, known to the district, facilities, coverage, target groups, sectors, activities, partners, management structures  | Districts of operation, affiliation, size of population served, budget, membership, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes   |
| Kamuli        | Name of CSO, type, area of operation, activities, date of foundation, remarks  | Districts of operation, affiliation, target groups, size of population served sectors, partners, budget, membership, facilities, capacities, strategies, human resources, community involvement, relations with district, attitudes  |

From the above table, it can be noticed that glaring gaps in information remain, with respect to capacities, strategies, affiliation, size and nature of population targeted, and financial resources of CSOs. Gaps also exist with respect to the nature and quality of relationships between districts and CSOs, as well as their attitudes towards each other.

## **4.5 Proposals For Phase II**

This report and the accompanying appendices provide useful information for work with CSOs. However, a number of gaps and shortcomings remain, as pointed out in the foregoing sections of this report. Given the outcomes of the phase I study, it is necessary that the study be continued into the second phase to fill the gaps and ensure that the scope of work is fully addressed.

However, there is need to recast the tasks under phase II, as well as the methodology in light of the results from phase I. The key issues from phase I which have a bearing on the planning for phase II include the following:

- i. Some of the districts have very big numbers of CSOs and therefore, the mapping initially planned will need a lot of time and resources and may be impractical to execute
- ii. For practical purposes in relation to UPHOLD's work, mapping hundreds of CSOs may not be very useful. UPHOLD does not need to end up with 'another' inventory of 'all' CSOs. Moreover the numbers on ground keep changing over time, as well as their nature.
- iii. Districts have already started some efforts to document CSOs, while District NGO Networks have also already started some work in coordinating CSOs. There is already some potential for partnerships and UPHOLD is not starting from nothing.

In light of the above, the following proposals are made:

- Whereas the task of mapping (through primary data collection) should be pursued further in phase II, this should be done at a smaller, manageable scale. The idea should therefore be to follow up and map a sample of CSOs selected on the basis of some agreed criteria that reflects the practical needs of UPHOLD, rather than a census of all CSOs. The results of phase I already provide a sampling frame to sample from. The selection criteria should among others, include the extent to which a given CSO is active or functional.
- Phase II should also be used to initiate and/or facilitate a process of dialogue and action between UPHOLD, the local governments and the CSOs, as a

strategy towards meeting the long-term intentions of the programme. This process should build on the already on-going efforts towards collaboration between districts and CSOs. The dialogue process requires engaging representatives from these sets of actors into discussion of phase I results and involving them in planning and executing Phase II, and subsequently sharing with them the results of Phase II.

- Critical gaps that remain from phase I should be filled, and investigation of the critical issues regarding district-CSO collaboration and attitudes should be pursued.

## References

Action Aid Uganda (2001): Annual Report, 2001

Action Aid Uganda (2002): Annual Report, 2002; Fighting Poverty Together.

Arua District Indigenous Non-Governmental Organisation Network (ADINGON) (2003): Registration book for Indigenous CSOs.

Arua District Local Government (2003): Arua District Development Plan (2003/04 – 2005/06) Strategic Frame work, Arua District planning Unit.

Arua District Local Government (2003): Five Year Health Strategic Plan, 2003-2006.

Asiimwe-Mwesigye, J. (2003): The Situation of Human Rights and Governance in Uganda Today: A Civil Society Perspective. In, *'Voices for the Public Good': Civil Society input into the 2003 Consultative Group Meeting*. Uganda National NGO Forum, Kampala.

Bazaara Nyangabyaki (2000): Contemporary Civil Society and the Democratization Process in Uganda: A Preliminary Exploration. CBR Working Paper No.54, Kampala Uganda.

Clarke Ron (2003): Civil Society and its role in development. In Colin Kirkpatrick, Ron Clarke, and Charles Polidano (Eds), *Handbook on Development Policy and Management*. Edward Elgar, 2003.

DENIVA (1997): Directory of Member Organizations

Gariyo Z (2002): Participatory Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers: The PRSP Process in Uganda. Uganda Debt Network Discussion Paper No.5, 2002.

Lewis David (2003): The rise of non-governmental organizations: issues in development management. In Colin Kirkpatrick, Ron Clarke, and Charles Polidano (Eds), *Handbook on Development Policy and Management*, Edward Elgar, 2003.

Ministry of Internal Affairs (2002): Complete List NGOs Report. NGO Registration Board, July 2002.

Republic of Uganda (1989): Non-Governmental Organizations Registration Statute, 1989. Statute 5.

Ridell, R., Gariyo, Z. and Mwesigye, H. (1998): Review of National Policy on Non-Governmental Organizations for Uganda. Kampala August 1998.

Salamon, L. and H. Anheier (1999): 'The Third Sector in the Third World', In D.Lewis (Ed.), *International Perspectives on Voluntary Action: Reshaping the Third Sector*, London: EarthScan.

White, G. (1994): Civil Society, Democratization and Development (1): Clearing the Analytical Ground, In *Democratization*, Autumn

Yumbe District Local Government (2003): Three-Year Development Plan 2003/06, District Planning Unit, Yumbe

Yumbe District Local Government (2003): District Budget/ Financial Estimates 2003/04, District Planning Unit, Yumbe

### **List of National Level Key Informants Met**

1. Joyce Kadowe – Social Scientist, Uganda AIDS Commission
2. Basil Kandyomunda – Deputy Executive Director, Uganda Debt Network
3. Christopher Ssendendo – Coordinator/Executive Director, Uganda Community Based Health Care Association
4. Rugambwa Justus - Coordinator, CSOs Operating Environment – DENIVA
5. Kenneth Atim – Policy Analyst, NGO Coordination Unit, Office of the Prime Minister
6. Susan Kasule - Secretary, NGO Registration Board
7. Dr.Nelson Musoba - Health Planner, Public–Private Partnership Secretariat, Ministry of Health

## **Appendices**

(Included under separate file)

### **Guide to the Appendices**

Tabulations/matrices of CSOs in each district have been compiled as appendices to this report, but given their volume, they are saved under a different file, and bound separately. The districts of Pallisa and Gulu are not included in the appendices because the two have compiled inventories/directories and it was deemed unnecessary to reproduce them here.

Some of the district appendices are produced in the same format as the tool which was used to collect the data. This is a long matrix that spreads to several pages. This was done where much information was found for CSOs in a particular district. For districts where information on CSOs covered only a few variables, this has been summarized in a simple matrix/table form.