

THE REPORT OF THE 21ST MEETING OF THE POLICYANALYST CADRE HELD ON FEBRUARY 13, 2020

Compiled by:

Department of Policy Development and Capacity Building
Office of the President-Cabinet Secretariat
KAMPALA

April 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOR	EWORD	.ii
1.0	INTRODUCTION	.1
2.0	BACKGROUND	.1
3.0	PROBLEM STATEMENT	.1
4.0	OVERALL OBJECTIVE/GOAL	.2
5.0	JUSTIFICATION	.2
6.0	CONTENT	.3
7.0	PARTICIPANTS	
8.0	METHODOLOGY	
9.0 9.1 9.2	PROCEEDINGS	4
	tters arising Pramework for analyzing Public Policies – A practical guide	
	Framework for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of	•
Cal	binet Decisions1	2
9.5	A guide for preparation of Policy Briefs	
9.6	Way forward and closure2	
10.0	EVENT EVALUATION	30
11.0	ACTION MATRIX	6
ANN	EX 1: AGENDA	37
ANN	EX 2: ATTENDANCE LIST	38
	EX 3: A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSING PUBLIC ICIES-A PRACTICAL GUIDE4	ļ1
EVA	EX 4: FRAMEWORK FOR MONITORING AND LUATING IMPLEMENTATION OF CABINET DECISIONS-ACTICAL GUIDE4	
ANN	EX 5: PREPARING A POLICY BRIEF5	55

FOREWORD

Policy Analyst Cadre meetings were introduced for: Information and best practice sharing; knowledge and skills exchange; peer learning and capacity building; formation of networks; and keeping abreast with contemporary public policy issues. These meetings are expected to build a community of practice of the Policy Analyst Cadre for effective public policy formulation, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and learning for transformation of lives of the citizens

This Report is a presentation of proceedings of the 21st meeting of the Policy Analyst Cadre, which brought together Policy Analysts from all Government Ministries and Departments for enhancing capacity of the members of the Policy Analyst cadre in: Analyzing Public Policies; monitoring and Evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions; and writing policy briefs. Effective monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions, reviews of public policies and writing of policy briefs had persistently failed to take off. This limited evidence based decision making and implementation, which contributed to poor service delivery to the citizens.

The meeting therefore addressed the identified inadequacies in capacities to enable effective carrying out of the identified key actions. I believe that after this meeting, the members of the Policy Analyst Cadre are fully empowered to carry out effective monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions, reviews of public policies and writing of policy briefs for improved service delivery and ultimately transformation of lives of the citizens.

Deborah Katuramu

DEPUTY HEAD OF PUBLIC SERVICE AND DEPUTY SECRETARY TO CABINET

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The 21st meeting of the Policy Analyst Cadre for the 3rd quarter Financial Year 2019/20 was held at Office of the President, Cabinet Library on 13th February, 2020. This report therefore is a presentation of the proceedings of the meeting which was in line with the Department's mandate of holding public policy for a amongst policy practitioners in the Public Service for effective and efficient service delivery for better impact on the lives of the citizens. The meeting mainly covered monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions, participatory review of public policies and writing policy briefs. A full agenda of the meeting is attached as *Annex 1*.

2.0 BACKGROUND

Policy Analyst Cadre meetings were introduced for information and best practice sharing, knowledge and skills exchange, peer learning and capacity building, formation of networks and keeping on top of contemporary public policy issues. These meetings are expected to build a community of practice of the Policy Analyst Cadre for effective public policy formulation, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and learning for transformation of lives of the citizens. In that line, monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions, participatory review of public policies and writing policy briefs were identified areas to keep the Policy Analyst Cadre up to date with contemporary public policy issues for better impact on the lives of the citizenry. The areas were selected due to the limited capacities of the Policy Analyst Cadre in those areas.

3.0 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Effective monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions, reviews of public policies and writing of policy briefs are key for effective public policy formulation and management if the overall objective of better service delivery to the citizenry is to be actualized. These functions are still lagging behind and there is need to address gaps through Policy Analyst Cadre meetings. One of the most critical reasons

for failure of these functions to take root among the Policy Analyst Cadre is inadequate capacities among the Policy Analyst Cadre in carrying out those functions. This has continued to inhibit evidence based/informed decision making and implementation, which results into poor service delivery to the citizens. Therefore, failure to address these inadequacies in capacities will continue to hamper effective monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions, reviews of public policies and writing of policy briefs to take root among the Cadre. This meeting was therefore an attempt to address the identified inadequacies in capacities to enable effective carrying out of the identified key actions.

4.0 OVERALL OBJECTIVE/GOAL

The overall objective/goal of the meeting was to attain effective and efficient service delivery to the citizenry.

4.1 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE

The specific objective of the meeting was to enhance capacity of the Policy Analyst cadre in:

- i. Analyzing Public Policies
- ii. Monitoring and Evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions and
- iii. Writing policy briefs

5.0 JUSTIFICATION

Policy analyst Cadre meetings are the established forum for peer learning and capacity building for members of the Policy Analyst Cadre. Peer learning and capacity building were required to address the inadequacies in capacities for effective monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions, reviews of public policies and writing of policy briefs that had failed to take off. In addition, it provided an avenue through which the Cadre can be empowered for effective and efficient execution of the identified tasks for improved service delivery and much desired transformation of lives of the citizens.

6.0 CONTENT

The report comprises of an Introduction, Background, Problem Statement, Objectives, Justification, Participants, Methodology, Proceedings (covering monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions, reviews of public policies and writing of policy briefs), Event Evaluation, and Conclusion.

7.0 PARTICIPANTS

The meeting was attended by 48 participants (17 females (F) and 31 males (M)) out of the expected 65 participants. This was 74% attendance. The designations of the participants are summarized in the table below:

Table 1: Desi	gnation of	Participants
---------------	------------	---------------------

Designation	Number participal	of nts	Total	Percentage
	Female	Male		
Commissioner	0	1	1	2
Assistant Commissioner	0	2	2	4
Principal Policy Analyst	3	5	8	17
Senior Policy Analyst	2	10	12	26
Policy Analyst	5	6	11	23
Others	5	9	14	28
Total	15	33	48	100

72% of the participants were members of the Policy Analyst Cadre, while 28% were non-Policy Analyst Cadre. Others were of the following designations: Assistant Lecturer (1M), Senior Economist (1F), Economists (2F, 4M), Research Assistants (2F, 1M), Information Technology Assistant (1M), Personal Secretary (1F), and Office Attendant (1M). The list of participants is attached as **Annex 2**

The meeting was chaired by Mr. Kakoole Eric, Assistant Commissioner, Policy Analysis (AC/PA), Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) and the Secretary was Mr. Mayega Yusuf, Policy Analyst, Office of the President (OP) - Cabinet Secretariat- Department of Policy Development and Capacity Building.

8.0 METHODOLOGY

The methodologies employed in the meeting were: Presentations; question and answer sessions; brain storming; discussions; and filling prepared questionnaires to capture input and feedback from the participants. This participatory approach enabled equal participation and capturing input from all participants.

9.0 PROCEEDINGS

This section presents the proceedings of the meeting.

9.1 Communication from Chairperson and reactions

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 9:15 am, followed by an opening prayer led by Mr. Abaasa Gersom, Economist Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA). The Chairperson welcomed the Members to the meeting and urged them to always keep time for subsequent meetings. He informed members that going forward, those who are absent with apology should send their communication officially through their respective Permanent Secretaries or other responsible officers. He further informed members that letters had been sent out to MDAs whose Policy Analysts had been consistently missing Policy Analyst Cadre meetings. The action was aimed at improving on members' attendance.

The Chairperson informed members that the output of the Policy Analyst Cadre meetings would be reports and not minutes as has been the case. Already, the draft report on the 20th meeting of the Policy Analyst Cadre and the report on the 3rd RBP/RIA meeting had been shared for members' input via email. The final copies would be uploaded to the Office of the President and Cabinet Secretariat websites. Members were urged to always check those websites, especially for policy documents to stay up to date with policy matters.

The Chairperson appealed to members to update their contact details for access to the Policy Analyst Cadre's email and WhatsApp groups. He concluded his communication by requesting members to ensure that they

fill the guiding questions and the event evaluation forms to inform better management of future meetings and to improve on the presented material.

9.1.1 Reactions to the Chairperson's communication

- i) The Commissioner, Policy Development and Capacity Building (C,PD&CB) welcomed all members to the meeting and informed them that the Policy Analyst Cadre was expected to be a model Cadre in the Civil Service. This is why it came up with innovations like a Model work plan, use of modern communication means and reports (which are quality assured by DHPS &DSC before publishing). Its members were expected to be exemplary in terms of work ethic.
- ii) That the letters from MDAs communicating absence with apology should be signed by the respective Permanent Secretaries.
- iii) That a member expressed concern that the agenda of the meeting made it feel like a capacity building workshop and suggested to Secretariat to identify items fit for training and those fit for meetings to improve on members' engagement. The response to that concern was that the Policy Analyst Cadre meetings were the designated forums for information sharing and capacity building of Policy Analysts and thus the presentations were relevant to the meeting.
- iv) That a member also noted that not only the new members, but also the old members, especially those who got transfers and promotions need to update their details with the Secretariat, including email and WhatsApp groups.

9.2 Review of the report on the 20th meeting of the Policy Analyst Cadre and matters arising

The draft report on the 20th meeting of the Policy Analyst Cadre Forum was reviewed and reactions made on the action matrix as follows:

Table 2: Action Matrix for the 20th Meeting of the Policy Analyst Cadre

C	Action	Status	
S N	Action	Responsi bility Centre	Status
1	Whoever arrives first for the meeting should Chair it and in case that person has Chaired the previous meeting, then the second person can Chair.	All to note	Done. Though the first four members to arrive declined.
2	The secretariat should share the presentations for the current meetings and for subsequent meetings; they should be shared in advance via email.	OP- Cabinet Secretariat	Done. All Presentations were shared via email.
3	The Dept. PD&CB should follow up with The Hunger Project to sign an MOU for collaboration in areas of policy development.	OP- Cabinet Secretariat	Pending. Dept., PD&CB still under discussion with The Hunger Project on the areas of collaboration before MOU is signed.
4	Next meeting, all members should come with their laptops/tablets/smart phones for the meeting to reduce on paper wastage. The secretariat should organize Wi-Fi internet and power extension points for the devices.	OP- Cabinet Secretariat	Done. Secretariat provided all the I.T support needed and paper wastage reduced significantly.
5	The final version of the Inventory of Policies and Laws should be shared by the Dept., PD&CB before the next meeting.	OP- Cabinet Secretariat	Pending. Inventory of Policies and Laws, Cabinet Forward Agenda and Research Agenda still with DHPS&DSC for quality assurance before publication.
6	All MDAs should track the Cabinet decisions that fall in their docket and that a session for presentation should be set aside in the subsequent meetings.	All to note	Members informed to track the Cabinet decisions in their respective MDAs.
7	Official communication would be made to the various MDAs about the update of the Model work plan.	OP- Cabinet Secretariat	Done. The updated Model work plan was officially communicated to all MDAs and to all members via email.
8	Official communication should be made to the various MDAs about members of the Policy Analysts	OP- Cabinet Secretariat	Done. Letters were sent to the various MDAs, awaiting response.

	Cadre who have consistently failed to attend the quarterly meetings.		
9	The draft Policy Analyst Client Service Charter would be aligned to the Model work plan and circulated before the next meeting.	OP- Cabinet Secretariat	Pending. The documents are still being reviewed and aligned. To be presented in the next meeting.
1 0	Two Policy Briefs would be written on: 'Ugandan Civil Servants not knowing that they were Public Servants' and 'Silo and mandate mentality' so as to create a mindset change towards effective and efficient Service to the public/citizens.	OP- Cabinet Secretariat	Done. Four draft policy briefs were prepared.
1 1	That communication should be channeled officially to Ministries and Departments about the change in the model work plan in addition to circulation via email.	OP- Cabinet Secretariat	Done. Official communication sent by Secretary Office of the President
1 2	That there should be a Capacity Building Session on how to identify and disseminate Public policies for members to share best practices.	OP- Cabinet Secretariat	Pending. For next meeting.

9.2.2 Matters arising from the report on the 20th meeting of the Policy Analyst Cadre

Members agreed with the contents and format of the report. The approved version would be shared with members via email and also uploaded to the Office of the President and Cabinet Secretariat websites.

9.3 Framework for analyzing Public Policies – A practical guide

Under this section, the framework for analysing Public Policies, good practices/ lessons for its effective application, factors/ conditions for its effective application, expected results/ outcomes from its application, performance indicators for measuring successful application of the framework, anticipated challenges in its application and practical solutions for addressing the anticipated challenges were considered. The

framework for analysing Public Policies is attached as *Annex 3* and there sponses were as follows:

9.3.1 Good practices and lessons

Under this item, members were requested to provide good practices and lessons for effective application of the framework for analysing Public Policies. The following responses were as given:

Table 3: Good practices and lessons

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Building capacity of Civil Servants to use the framework for analysis of public policies	6.6
2	Clearly defining the theory of change and the results framework for any policy	6.6
3	Engaging stakeholders and synergies in policy analysis/ formulation process should be participatory	20
4	Develop an inventory of relevant public policies for each particular MDA	6.6
5	Understanding the subject and the issue of concern	6.6
6	Conducting Regulatory Impact Assessment	6.6
7	Customization of the framework	6.6
8	Provision of clear methodology	6.6
9	Regularly review policies to understand the effects and impacts on the targeted population/ Assess the impact of the policy on vulnerable groups	13
10	Policies should be enforceable and implementable to ease their analysis	6.6
11	Use credible sources of information/ Carry out data collection on the policies	13
	Total	100

There were various good practices/ lessons for effective application of the framework for analyzing Public Policies that require consolidation.

9.3.2 Factors/ conditions for effective application

Under this section, participants were required to give factors/ conditions to enable effective application of the framework. The responses were as summarised in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Factors/ conditions for effective application

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Possession of enough knowledge and skills by the Policy Analysts	17
	to apply the framework/ Capacity strengthening to support policy	
	analysis	
2	More political will to apply structured and systematic processes to	8
	solve problems	
3	Designing clearly designed performance indicators	8
4	Having an implementation plan for public policies/ Effective	17
	planning and preparation/ Develop an action matrix	
5	Rolling back the guidelines to lower levels of Government,	25
	Departments and Agencies/ Popularization of the framework/	
	Standardised framework should be put in place and widely	
	circulated	
6	Collaboration with different players concerned in each particular	17
	MDA/ Strong liaison mechanism	
7	Problem definition	8
	Total	100

There were various factors/ conditions provided by the participants for effective application of the framework.

9.3.3 Expected results/ outcomes

Under this section, participants were required to give the expected results/ outcomes from the application of the framework for analyzing public policies. The responses are indicated in Table 5.

Table 5: Expected results/ outcomes

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Better and more effective policies adopted for addressing	36
	citizens' concerns/ Better informed policies/ Evidence based	
	policies/ Minimising policy failures/ Better service delivery	
	through formulation of policies targeted to solving problems/	
	Well-analysed policies	
2	Better acceptance of public policies among citizens/ positive	14.3
	response to government interventions by the population	
3	Improvement in tracking of implementation of public policies,	21.4
	resulting in better service delivery/ Determining state of	

	implementation of the public policies/ systematic management of	
	public services	
4	Mindset change	7
5	Policy reviews/ regular review of policy performance	7
6	New policy formulation	7
7	Findings on the impact of policies on vulnerable groups	7
	Total	100

Majority of the respondents indicated better and more effective policies adopted for addressing citizens' concerns, better acceptance of public policies among citizens and improvement in tracking of implementation of public policies, resulting in better service delivery as the major the expected results/ outcomes from the application of the framework for analyzing public policies.

9.3.4 Performance indicators for measuring success

Under this item, participants were required to suggest performance indicators that should be used in measuring the success of application of the framework. Participants gave responses as indicated in Table 6.

Table 6: Performance indicators for measuring success

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Number of policies aligned to the framework/ Number of policies	33.3
	reviewed/ Number of new policies adopted/ Number of policies	
	that are meeting the outcomes and strategic objectives for which	
	they were formulated/Number of policies analysed/ Number of	
	reviewed documents	
2	Quarterly analysis reports/ feedbacks/ Stakeholder engagements	22.2
3	Effectiveness- meeting policy goals/ Impact on targeted	22.2
	population i.e. positive change in the key indicator in the	
	population	
4	Level of implementation of the public policies	11.1
5	Percentage change in behavior and mindsets	11.1
	Total	100

Members suggested number of policies aligned to the framework, stakeholder engagements, effectiveness, level of implementation and percentage change in behavior and mindsets as indicators that should be used in measuring the success of application of the framework.

9.3.5 Challenges anticipated

Under this section, participants were required to identify challenges that may arise in the application of the framework in the Ministries and Departments. The responses generated are in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Challenges anticipated

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Insufficient capacity of the Policy Analysts to apply the framework/ Issues of human resource inadequacy	13.3
2	Insufficient political will to use the framework in policy development/ Management of politics in policy analysis/ Prioritization of public policy analysis is low	20
3	Harmonizing/ integration of the framework with the institutional Monitoring and Evaluation framework.	6.6
4	When Cabinet Decisions contradict the field views/ poor population response	13.3
5	Limited resources for carrying out the public policies analysis/ Financing the framework/ Finance resource constraints	20
6	Limited awareness about the public policies	6.6
7	Lack of data to track changes in the set targets	6.6
8	Lack of coordination among key stakeholders	6.6
9	No standard framework	6.6
	Total	100

There were several challenges suggested that may arise in the application of the framework. Addressing the anticipated challenges is pertinent to achieve effective implementation of the framework for analysing public policies.

9.3.6 Practical solutions for addressing the anticipated challenges

The following solutions were suggested by members to address the anticipated challenges in the application of the framework:

Table 8: Practical solutions for addressing the anticipated challenges

No.	Response	Percentage
1	More sensitization of all stakeholders about the framework and its	23
	advantages/ massive sensitization and awareness creation/	
2	More capacity building, especially among policy practitioners	30.7
	about the framework/ Regular trainings of Policy Analyst Cadre/	
	Strengthening the Policy Analysis Units and retooling the	
	Department/ Ensure qualified personnel to execute public policies	
3	Removal of politics as a key challenge in policy analysis	7.6
4	Provide for sufficient resources towards the analysis of public	23
	policies/ Source pooling of finances at OP to support reviews of	
	policies from MDAs/ Ensure sufficient financial flows (budget)	
5	Strengthen data information systems	7.6
6	Strengthen coordination and collaboration among key	7.6
	stakeholders	
	Total	100

The various practical solutions were suggested should be prioritized for action towards effective implementation of the framework for analysing public policies.

9.4 Framework for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions

Under this section, the framework for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions, attached hereto as *Annex 4* of the report; good practices and lessons; factors or conditions for effective monitoring and evaluation; expected results or outcomes from the application of the framework; performance indicators for measuring its successful application; the role or function the Policy Analyst Cadre should play to ensure its effective application; anticipated challenges; and practical solutions for addressing the anticipated challenges were considered. The responses were as follows:

9.4.1 Good practices/ lessons for effective application

Under this item, members were requested to provide good practices/ lessons for effective application of the framework for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions and their responses were as follows:

Table 9: Good practices and lessons

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Better structured questionnaires lead to better monitoring and evaluation results	5.55
2	The monitoring and evaluation results should be widely circulated to all stakeholders for better impact.	5.55
3	Monitoring and evaluation leads to improved performance in relation to implementation	5.55
4	Monitoring and evaluation enables corrective action	5.55
5	Monitoring and evaluation leads to improved sustainability of interventions	5.55
6	Monitoring and evaluation enables fast-tracking implementation of Cabinet Decisions and hence reduces the time taken in the implementation process.	5.55
7	Consulting the affected community in relation to certain decisions	5.55
8	Regular training of monitoring staff	5.55
9	Develop a questionnaire on the issues to look at/ Guiding questions under various parameters for monitoring Cabinet Decisions	11.11
10	Identify the Cabinet Decisions relevant to the particular MDA	5.55
11	Understanding of the subject, issue, problem and objective	5.55
12	Both intended and unintended effects are analysed for best impact measurement	5.55
13	Issues of gender and equity are considered during monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions	5.55
14	Good partnerships and synergies with key stakeholders	5.55
15	Good Communication	5.55
16	Undertake baseline surveys to have a basis for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions	5.55
17	Carry out internal consultation in the MDA	5.55
	Total	100

There were various good practices/ lessons for effective application of the framework for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions for consolidation.

9.4.2 Factors and conditions for effective application

In this section, participants were required to give factors and conditions for effective application of the framework for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions. Their responses were as summarised in Table 10 below.

Table 10: Factors and conditions for effective application

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Political support from all levels/ Leadership support for monitoring and evaluation of Cabinet Decision/ Willingness of key stakeholders to participate in the process/ Participation of various stakeholders/ Should be inclusive of all relevant	21.7
	departments and divisions	
2	Enough knowledge and skills in monitoring and evaluation by public servants/ Capacity building on how to carry out the monitoring and evaluation of Cabinet Decision	8.7
3	Clear results framework	4.3
4	A functional monitoring and evaluation framework system with clearly defined indicators of performance/SMART indicators	8.7
5	Provision of adequate funds for monitoring and evaluation/ Availability of funds for field monitoring	8.7
6	Sensitization of Permanent Secretaries on the importance of monitoring and evaluation of Cabinet Decision/ Support from the Permanent Secretaries for monitoring and evaluation of Cabinet Decision	8.7
7	Communication of policies to stakeholders/ Good communication with stakeholders	8.7
8	Effective planning and preparation	8.7
9	Timing	8.7
10	Ease of access to information within MDAs on implementation of Cabinet Decisions/ Availability of documentation/ Timely accessibility of information on the Cabinet Decision	8.7
11	Implementation process should be in line with the existing laws and regulations	4.3
	Total	100

There were various factors and conditions to enable effective application of the framework that may require consolidation.

9.4.3 Expected results/ outcomes

Under this section, participants were required to give the expected results/ outcomes from the application of the framework for analyzing public policies. The responses are indicated in Table 11.

Table 11: Expected results/ outcomes

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Improved policy impact on citizens lives/ Achievement of the objectives/ Improvement in welfare of the population or improved service delivery	29.4
2	No duplication of Cabinet Decisions	5.9
3	Continuous feedback/ Timely reports	11.7
4	Improvement in tracking of Cabinet Decisions/ Proper tracking on the status of decision implementation/ Harmonized reports on the status of implementation of Cabinet Decisions/ Evidence of Cabinet Decision implementation	23.5
5	Evidence based decision making/ Selecting the best implementation criteria, with benefits that outweigh the costs	11.7
6	Timely actions	5.9
7	Ascertaining the quality of the framework and whether there are areas for improvement	5.9
8	Consultation of key stakeholders	5.9
	Total	100

The majority, (40%) indicated Improved policy impact on citizens lives and improved service delivery as the major the expected results/ outcomes from the application of the framework for analyzing public policies. There were several other expectation as shown in the table.

9.4.4 Performance indicators for measuring the success of application

Under this item, participants were required to suggest performance indicators that should be used in measuring the success of application of the framework for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions. Participants gave responses as indicated in Table 12.

Table 12: Performance indicators for measuring the success of application

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Number of Cabinet Decisions Implemented	12.5
2	Frequency of monitoring and evaluation/ Number of consultative meeting held/ process indicators	18.7
3	Number of decisions evaluated	6.2
4	Number of MDAs that have submitted reports/ Consistency of monitoring reports from various MDAs	12.5
5	Number of policies and laws reviewed and amended	6.2
6	Number of Cabinet Decisions that resulted into laws	6.2
7	Proportion of the population affected by the implementation process	6.2
8	Percentage of objectives achieved	6.2
9	Level of understanding of the framework/ Availability of competent monitors	12.5
10	Alignment of the monitoring and evaluation questionnaire to the framework/ availability of monitoring tools	12.5
	Total	100

Members suggested the following indicators; number of Cabinet Decisions implemented, frequency of monitoring and evaluation, number of decisions evaluated, Number of MDAs that have submitted reports/ Consistency of monitoring reports from various MDAs and number of policies and laws reviewed and amended as indicators that should be used in measuring the success of application of the framework.

9.4.5 Roles of the Policy Analyst Cadre for effective application

Under this section, participants were required to suggest roles/functions which the Policy Analyst Cadre should play to ensure effective application of the framework for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions. The responses generated are in Table 13 below.

Table 13: Roles of the Policy Analyst Cadre for effective application

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Capacity building and sensitization of relevant stakeholders/ Popularization of the framework within the MDAs	21.4
2	Systematic application of the framework as required/ Utilize the framework and put it to the test	14.2
3	They should be the focal point of monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions/ Facilitating tracking or monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions/ Conduct the monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions/ spearhead the process/ follow up actions with regard to Cabinet Decisions	35.7
4	Development of performance measures of monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions/ Conduct mini survey on the Cabinet Decisions passed (analyzing effectiveness of the decisions)/ Monitor and evaluate the impact of the implementation	21.4
5	Develop monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions tools	7
	Total	100

There were several suggested roles/functions which the Policy Analyst Cadre could play to ensure effective application of the framework for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions as indicated in the table.

9.4.6 Challenges anticipated

Under this section, participants were required to identify challenges anticipated in the application of the framework for monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions. The responses generated are in Table 14 below

Table 14: Challenges anticipated

No.	Response	Percentage
1	No clear tools for monitoring	4.3
2	Need for action matrix	4.3
3	Availability of data to ensure evidence based decisions/ Getting information within the MDA in response to the guiding questions	13
4	Lack of adequate funding to do the field visits/ It is costly to monitor the implementation the decisions	21.7
5	Slow uptake as it is still relatively new/ Limited awareness and appreciation of the Cabinet Decisions/ Acceptability of the framework by different stakeholders	17.4
6	Other commitments/ tasks competing with the monitoring and evaluation process	4.3
7	Difficultly in anticipation of the impact of the policies, especially the unintended impact	4.3
8	Limited stakeholder participation in implementation	4.3
9	Coordination with other monitoring and evaluation agencies especially OPM and other M&E units in MDAs/ Coordination of multiple players involved/ Role conflicts and overlap	13
10	Linking this framework to the institutional M&E framework	4.3
11	Low buy-in and support from political leaders	4.3
12	Low capacity of Policy Analysts in implementing the framework	4.3
	Total	

There were several anticipated challenges suggested in the application of the framework. Addressing the anticipated challenges is pertinent to achieve effective implementation of the framework for monitoring and implementation of Cabinet Decisions.

9.4.7 Practical solutions for addressing the anticipated challenges

Members suggested the following solutions for addressing the anticipated challenges in the application of the framework for monitoring and implementation of Cabinet Decisions:

Table 15: Practical solutions for addressing the anticipated challenges

No.	Response	Percentage
1	More sensitization of all stakeholders to appreciate the value of	41
	monitoring and evaluation of Cabinet Decisions/ Stakeholder	
	engagement on regular basis/ Sensitization of all Permanent	
	Secretaries (PSes) in MDAs in monitoring and evaluation of	
	Cabinet Decisions/ Clarify that M&E is a step in the policy	
	process which requires critical support/ Secure the buy-in of PSes	
	in utilizing the M&E framework	
2	Continuous capacity building of all public servants involved in the	17.6
	monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet	
	Decisions/ Regular training of the Policy Analyst Cadre about	
	M&E of Cabinet Decisions	
3	Provide a budget line for the policy analysis units for monitoring	17.6
	and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions/ Provide	
	for ring-fenced funding for M&E	
4	Customization of the monitoring framework to the needs of the	5.8
	MDA	
5	Use secondary data from UBOS or any other institution	11.7
	designated to disseminate data/ strengthen information systems to	
	ensure availability of data by the stakeholders	
6	Conduct Regulatory Impact Assessment	5.8
	Total	100

Most respondents suggested more sensitization, continuous capacity building and funding for effective application of the framework. Several other practical solutions were suggested towards addressing the anticipated challenges in the application of the framework. These solutions should be prioritized for action towards effective application of the framework for monitoring and evaluation of Cabinet Decisions.

9.5 A guide for preparation of Policy Briefs

The guide for preparation of Policy Briefs, hereto attached as *Annex 5* of the report; good practices or lessons; factors/ conditions for effective preparation of Policy Briefs; current challenges; practical solutions to the current challenges; expected results/ outcomes; performance indicators for measuring the success of application of the guide; anticipated challenges; and practical solutions for addressing the

anticipated challenges in the application of the guide were considered. The responses given were as follows:

9.5.1 Good practices and lessons

Under this item, the members were requested to provide good practices/ lessons for effective preparation of Policy Briefs and their responses were as indicated below:

Table 16: Good practices and lessons

No.	Response	Percentage
1	A more participatory approach in identifying the problems, causes and sub-causes/ Make the Policy Brief process participatory by consulting concerned sector institutions/ Stakeholder consultation	22.2
2	Benchmarking with other institutions which prepare Policy Briefs/ Practical example of a Policy Brief/ Provide a template for the Policy Briefs	16.7
3	Ensure compliance with prescribed structure of Policy Briefs	5.5
4	Base the Policy Briefs on scientific or practical information/ Literature review	11.1
5	Obtaining several policy options or alternatives to an issue/ Adequate analysis of alternatives	16.7
6	Information should be shared before to enable good planning and preparation and avoid last minute work	5.5
7	Guidance on content of a Policy Brief/Regular capacity building	11.1
8	Background and rationale	5.5
9	Should always be clear whom the Policy Briefs are addressed to	5.5
	Total	100

There were various good practices/ lessons for effective preparation of Policy Briefs that may be carried forward for consolidation.

9.5.2 Challenges in preparation of Policy Briefs

Under this section, participants were required to give current challenges in preparation of Policy Briefs. The responses were as summarized in Table 10 below.

Table 17: Challenges in preparation of Policy Briefs

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Low capacity of the public servants to prepare policy briefs/	21
	Limited technical capacity to prepare the briefs/ Limited training	
2	Inadequate information or statistics available to support the	31.5
	needed research/ Limited studies to inform Policy Briefs	
3	No uniform approach/ Lack of guidelines/ Inconsistency of	15.7
	formats of Policy Briefs from various MDAs	
4	No resources for consultation/ Poor consultation of stakeholders	15.7
5	Lack of proper definition of the issue at hand or problem	5.2
	statement	
6	Appreciation of outputs or Policy Briefs by political leadership	5.2
7	Late sharing of information, not giving adequate time for Policy	5.2
	Briefs preparation	
	Total	100

There were several challenges identified in preparation of Policy Briefs that require resolution for better preparation of policy briefs.

9.5.3 Practical solutions to the challenges

Under this section, participants were required to provide practical solutions to the identified challenges in preparation of policy briefs. The responses are indicated in Table 18 below:

Table 18: Practical solutions to the challenges

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Conduct more capacity building sessions to enhance the capacity	41.6
	of public servants in preparation of Policy Briefs/ Continuous	
	capacity building	
2	Engage UBOS and other stakeholder to provide better and more	8.3
	regular data	
3	Develop a rubric/ template for universal structuring of policy	16.6
	briefs/ sticking to the guide developed for preparation of Policy	
	Briefs	
4	Technical advice from fellow members of the policy analyst cadre	8.3
	and stakeholders in partnership with Cabinet Secretariat to clearly	
	define the issue	
5	Ensure rigorous review of existing literature to justify the policy	16.6
	briefs/ strengthening documentation process by carrying out	
	research/ Commission studies to inform policy briefs	
6	Quick sharing of information	8.3
	Total	100

The majority, (41.6%) suggested more capacity building to enhance capacity in preparation of policy briefs. There were several other solutions suggested as shown in the table.

9.5.4 Factors for effective preparation of policy briefs

Under this item, participants were required to suggest factors/ conditions that can enable effective preparation of policy briefs. Participants gave responses as indicated in Table 19.

Table 19: Factors for effective preparation of policy briefs

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Sufficient facilitation for the Policy Analysts	5.8
2	Availability of enough capacity to write the briefs/ Possession of sufficient analytical skills	11.7
3	Availability of enough information or evidence to inform the decision/ Review of existing literature/ Source documents and research/ Enough information provided	29.4
4	An identified policy gap or deficit/ Problem identification	29.4
5	Policy options which decision makers can take/ Analysis of the various alternative options	11.7
6	Political support	5.8
7	Targeted audience should be known	5.8
	Total	100

Members suggested several factors as mentioned in the table above which should be prioritized for effective preparation of policy briefs.

9.5.5 Expected results / outcomes

Under this section, participants were required to state the results/ outcomes they expect from the application of the guide for preparation of policy briefs. The responses generated are in Table 20 below.

Table 20: Expected results / outcomes

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Better informed or evidence based decisions made by government	23
2	Enhanced effectiveness and efficiency to meet the needs of the citizens	7.6
3	Improvement in quality of policy briefs in terms of facts and methodology/ Better prepared policy briefs	38.5
4	Better understanding of the public problem or issue	7.6
5	Customized guidelines	7.6
6	Elaborate communication of policy matters to the target audience	7.6
7	MDAs developing more policies	7.6
	Total	100

There were several expected results or outcomes from the application of the guide for preparation of policy briefs as indicated in the table above which showed appreciation of positive impact of the guide.

9.5.6 Performance indicators for measuring success

Under this section, participants were required to provide performance indicators for measuring the success of application of the guide for preparation of policy briefs. The responses generated are in Table 21 below.

Table 21: Performance indicators for measuring success

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Number of Government policies or Cabinet Decisions taken	25
	influenced by the policy briefs/ Number of decisions reached as a	
	result of the policy briefs	
2	Number of policy briefs written in a specified period (quarterly,	25
	annually)	
3	Number of policy briefs adopted by targeted policy makers/	33.3
	Number of policy briefs accepted by Cabinet/ Level of	
	acceptability or adoption of the policy briefs	
4	Timeliness of the policy briefs	8.3
5	Quality of policy briefs prepared	8.3
	Total	100

There were several performance indicators suggested by the respondents for measuring the success of application of the guide for preparation of policy briefs as indicated in the table.

9.5.6 Challenges anticipated in application of the guide

Under this section, participants were required to identify challenges that may arise in the application of the guide for preparation of policy briefs. The responses generated are in Table 22 below.

Table 22: Challenges anticipated

No.	Response	Percentage
1	Different levels of capacity among public servants leads to uneven distribution of impact of policy briefs	16.6
2	Lack of political will to adopt unpopular policy recommendations in some instances	8.3
3	Limited resources available for dissemination of the policy briefs	16.6
4	Failure of the intended beneficiaries to understand the information if the policy brief is not clear and simple	8.3
5	Using one standard guide may limit innovation in preparation of the briefs and make the process just routine	16.6
6	Inadequacy of analytical skills among some Policy Analysts/ Inadequate training in development of policy briefs	16.6
7	Convincing the target audience that the problem is worth addressing	8.3
8	Disagreements on the structure of the guide	8.3
	Total	100

There were several challenges suggested that may arise in the application of the guide for preparation of policy briefs as indicated in the above table. These need to be addressed in order to realize better preparation and better impact of policy briefs.

9.5.7 Practical solutions for addressing the anticipated challenges

Members suggested the following solutions for addressing the anticipated challenges in the application of the guide for preparation of policy briefs:

Table 23: Practical solutions for addressing the anticipated challenges

No.	Response	Percentage
1	More sensitization and awareness creation about the importance of policy briefs/ Sustained training and capacity building for intended users of the guide/ Campaign to change th mindset of the readers	37.5
2	More capacity building among public servants in policy briefs	25
3	Ensure the policy briefs are clear and easy to understand	12.5
4	Integrate it into the Policy Analysis Units work plans of different MDAs	12.5
5	Regular review of the guide itself to improve it	12.5
	Total	100

Several practical solutions were suggested towards addressing the anticipated challenges in the application of the guide for preparation of policy briefs. These should be prioritized for action towards effective application of the guide.

9.5.8 Reactions to the presentations, questions and answers

The following reactions to the presentations were noted from the members:

- i) There was need for a PowerPoint presentation with practical examples.
- ii) Need for an expanded scope for the framework for analyzing public policies. It should include legal implications and relevance to National and International commitments such as the ruling Party Manifesto, National Development Plan (NDP III) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
- iii) The framework for analyzing public policies should highlight effects of the public policy; the outputs, outcomes, impact and how it has affected the overall performance of the economy.
- iv) The framework for analyzing public policies should have a section highlighting the expertise of the Policy Analysts, since Policy

- Analysts play the role of experts in this area of analysis of public policies.
- v) The C,PD&CB was commended for building the capacity of the members of Policy Analyst Cadre.
- vi) Inclusion of methodology and tools of analysis in the framework for analyzing public policies with an analysis matrix.
- vii) The framework for analyzing public policies should be applied to at least 6 policies from one Ministry as an experiment and the results shared with members to inform improvement of the framework.
- viii) Developing a standard criteria for selecting the cabinet decisions for analysis to be included in the framework for monitoring and evaluation of Cabinet Decisions for presentation in the next Policy Analyst Cadre meeting.
- ix) A clear distinction between monitoring and evaluation of Cabinet Decisions and Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA). RIA is the structured and systematic process of choosing the best option to address a problem, while monitoring and evaluation of Cabinet Decisions is the process of establishing the relevance, effectiveness and impact of a Cabinet Decision to inform Cabinet whether it should be scaled up, modified or halted for improvement of citizens' welfare.
- x) Clarification was sought on how the current framework fits into the National Integrates Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) under Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) and into the mandate of OPM. The response was that we are moving away from mandate mentality and every institution of Government contributes to the overall monitoring and evaluation framework. Monitoring and evaluation is done at different levels and the scope varies from institution to institution.
- xi) Challenges faced in implementation of the framework for monitoring and evaluation of Cabinet Decisions and best practices should be included in the presentation for better impact.

- xii) Cabinet Decisions should be rooted to Policy Analysts in Ministries and Departments more efficiently rather than the chain of communication stopping at the Permanent Secretary and the implementing unit.
- xiii) A presentation on Cabinet Decisions should be made in the next meeting.
- xiv) When writing a policy brief, it is important to know your target audience, what you intend to communicate to them and the desired actions from them in order to achieve the desired impact from the policy brief.
- xv) The policy brief should be as concise as possible tailored to capture the mind of the reader.
- xvi) The title of the policy brief should be particular about the intended Government intervention.
- xvii) The methodology used in coming up with the problem, its manifestations and the recommended policy interventions must be indicated clearly in the policy brief, thus it should be evidence based.
- xviii) That one should avoid putting many policy recommendations in the policy brief. 2-3 recommendations are sufficient. The recommendations must be in line with the subject of the policy brief and clearly show the relevant authority to handle them.
- xix) The subsequent meeting should cover more details of the policy brief and practical examples.
- xx) A member asked a question about the sources of a policy brief. The response was that policy briefs are informed by research like research reports, literature review and field studies thus should be evidence based.
- xxi) When preparing a policy brief, the problem statement must capture the problem and options on how to deal with it.
- xxii) Members were reminded that they ought to prepare briefing notes for policy analysis for every Cabinet submission that comes from their MDAs, which are different from policy briefs.
- xxiii) Members were also reminded that policy briefs are key outputs in the updated model work plan of the Policy Analyst Cadre.
- xxiv) That a training workshop had been organized to train a core team of members on policy briefs, who will in turn train others on the

- same to further build the capacity of the cadre in developing policy briefs.
- xxv) Members were urged to see this as an opportunity to leave a legacy in the Cadre by being pioneers in developing the policy briefs and briefing notes, just like they did with the model work plan and clients charter.

9.6 Way forward and closure

9.6.1 Way forward

The way forward was summarized as follows:

- a. A member from Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) briefed members about the current status of response to the locusts which had invaded the country and informed members that Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) was leading the response efforts. About the Corona virus which was spreading all over the world, he informed members that Uganda was yet to get a case, but would be able to respond to the threat.
- b. Members were invited to Uganda Management Institute (UMI) for a policy dialogue on management of water, sewerage and sanitation scheduled for 12th March, 2020.
- c. Members were informed that training on policy briefs was scheduled for 19th February, 2020 and invitations had been sent to the selected participants. That this first group of participants would work on the draft policy briefs and the desired format of the brief before sharing with others.
- d. A member from Ministry of Information and Communication Technology and National Guidance (MoICT &NG) appreciated the Department of Policy Development and Capacity Building in Office of the President for their support in developing the Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) on Bio-Economy and the draft policy documents.

- e. Members were also reminded to attend the 4th Annual Joint Review of institutionalization of RBP/RIA which was scheduled for 27th February 2020.
- f. Some members expressed concern that the Policy Analysts were not recognized in their Ministries and were being made to do planning work. The C,PD&CB gave a reaction to this concern thus:
 - i. Policy Analysts do not belong to the Planning Unit.
 - ii. Policy Analysis Units ought to prepare and submit their work plans and performance reports through their respective Permanent Secretaries in order to justify and back up their activities, basing on the Policy Analyst Cadre model work plan.
 - iii. On the issue of lack of facilitation, he gave his own example of how he overcame that challenge and urged the Policy analysts to be professionally assertive, communicate their activities as required and seek for his help where their efforts have failed.

9.6.2 Closure

The following closing remarks were made:

- a. Members were appreciated for turning up in large number and for the valuable information they had shared.
- b. Members were urged to be assertive in order to be able to perform as expected in the model work plan.
- c. Members were urged to share experiences on how to overcome challenges in the service and to always look for the opportunity in all situations.
- d. The C,PD&CB was requested to build the capacity of members in negotiation and assertiveness in order for the cadre to be more successful in meeting its objectives.

Thereafter, the meeting was closed at 11:45 am

10.0 EVENT EVALUATION

This section provides the participants' assessment of the 21st meeting of the Policy Analyst Cadre. The event had 48 participants(15F, 33M).40% of the participants assessed the 21st meeting of the Policy Analyst Cadre. The responses were as follows:

10.1 Reason(s) for attending the meeting

Each participant was required to indicate reasons for his/ her attendance of the meeting. The responses were summarized as follows:

S/n	Major reason(s) for attending the event	Percentage
1.	Information sharing	37%
2.	Personal growth and development	63%
3.	Content	53%
4.	Networking	32%
5.	Work requirement	26%
6.	Other (Specify)	

Most of the respondents mentioned personal growth and development, content and information sharing as major reasons for attending the event. Few cited networking and work requirement. All the respondents gave multiple answers for attending the event.

10.2 Assessment of the event by the participants

The participants were required to give their honest overall assessment of the meeting. The responses provided were:

S/n	Overall assessment of the event	Percentage
1.	Excellent	5.2%
2.	Very good	47.4%
3.	Good	47.4%
4.	Fair	0
5.	Poor	0
	Total	100%

47.4% of the respondent rated the event very good, while 47.4% rate the event good. This was an indication of a very successful meeting.

10.3 Assessment of materials delivered

The participants were required to assess the quality of materials that were used during the meeting. The responses revealed the following:

S/n	Assessment of materials delivered	Percentage
1.	Excellent	5%
2.	Very useful	42%
3.	Useful	53%
4.	Fairly Useful	0
5.	Poor	0
6.	Other	0
	Total	100%

42% of the respondents indicated that the materials were very useful, while 53% indicated that the materials were useful. Majority of the respondents appreciated the materials delivered.

10.4 Lessons learnt

Each participant was required to present one key thing learned from the 21st meeting of the Policy Analyst Cadre. The responses provided were:

S/n	Key thing/ issue learnt	Percentage
1.	Monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet	5.2%
	Decisions is very important for improvement of the citizens' welfare	
2.	Critical elements of monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions/ Best practices of monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet	
	Decisions	37%
3.	Policy analysis framework and development	5.2%
4.	Preparation of policy briefs	37%
5.	Critical thinking and creativity since the meetings are participatory	5.2%
6.	Innovation for easing our work is necessary	5.2%
7.	None/ no response	5.2%
	Total	100%

There were several lessons learnt by the respondents out of the meeting, which was an indication that the meeting was beneficial to most of the respondents.

10.5 Things to be done differently

The respondents were requested to present what they would do differently after attending the 21st meeting of the Cadre. The responses provided were:

S/n	What participants would do differently	Percentage
1.	Align output, especially policy briefs to recommended	26%
	structure/ Apply the frameworks presented	
2.	Prepare clear policy briefs and briefing notes	21%
3.	Better research	5.2%
4.	Attention for detail in the monitoring and evaluation of	16%
	implementation of Cabinet Decisions/ Planning for	
	monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet	
	Decisions	
5.	Share information on policies in my Ministry/ Improved	16%
	communication on policy analysis/ Better understanding on	
	review of public policies	
6.	Address the lack of a budget line for monitoring and	5.2%
	evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions	
7.	Review the report on the meeting on monitoring and	5.2%
	evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions held on	
	26 th March, 2019	
8.	None/ no response	5.2%
	Total	100%

The respondents identified various actions that would be done differently out of the engagement, which indicated the various exposures that were achieved out of the meeting by the respondents.

10.6 What should have been done better

The respondents were asked to state what should have been done better during the 20th meeting and the responses provided were:

S/n	What should have been done better during the event	Percentage
1.	More time allocated for better absorption of the materials/	16%
	The event should have been organized in form of a training	
	workshop for better understanding of some key issues	
2.	Reduce meeting content	11%
3.	Relate the theory of change and results matrix in policy	5%
	evaluation	
4.	PowerPoint presentations should have been used	20%
5.	Provide for practical cases in the presentations/ Use practical	11%
	examples	

6.	Air conditioning should be improved	5%
7.	More involvement and consideration for the new Cadre	5%
	members so we can move at the same pace	
8.	Presentations should have been circulated before in order to	11%
	capture better comments	
9.	None/ no response	16%
	Total	100%

The major areas identified that should have been done better were: More time allocated to the event, use of PowerPoint presentations, more practical examples and early sharing of materials for the meeting. These should be addressed in subsequent meetings.

10.7 Suggested areas/topics

The respondents were required to suggest topics/areas for consideration during the next meetings of the Cadre. The suggested areas/ topics were:

S/n	Areas/topics	Percentage
1.	Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA)/ Refresher on RIA preparation	21%
2.	Financing for Policy Analyst Cadre to undertake monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions	5.2%
3.	Developing Policy Briefs	5.2%
4.	Policy evaluation, theory of change and results matrix	5.2%
5.	Sample of Cabinet Decisions	5.2%
6.	Cabinet Submission guidelines	5.2%
7.	Aligning monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions to National and International commitments	5.2%
8.	Format for writing a briefing note/ Preparation of Cabinet Briefs	11%
9.	Research/ How to conduct institutional research or intelligent research	11%
10.	None/ no response	26%
		100%

A number of areas/topics were suggested for consideration for subsequent meetings that require prioritization and handling in a phased manner.

10.8 Expectation(s) that were met

Under this item, the participants provided the following expectations that were met during the meeting:

S/n	Expectation(s) that were met	Percentage
1.	Got new ideas/ new emerging issues	16%
2.	Content, checklists/ More knowledge	11%
3.	How to write a policy brief/ Deeper understanding of policy brief preparation	11%
4.	Time management	5%
5.	Improved guidance on monitoring and evaluation of implementation of Cabinet Decisions	11%
6.	The agenda was adhered to	5%
7.	Relation of public policy decisions and implementation results	5%
8.	All were met	16%
9.	None/ no response	20%
	Total	100%

The respondents' expectations that were met were mostly in terms of knowledge and experience sharing and coverage. This was an indication of a well-handled meeting.

10.9 Expectation(s) that were not met

Under this item, the respondents provided the following unmet expectations:

S/n	Expectation(s) that were not met	Percentage
1.	Developing policy briefs	5%
2.	The presenters were not very conversant with the topics	5%
3.	Practical cases were lacking/ Case studies of the 3 presentations	11%
4.	None/ no response	79%
	Total	100%

79% of the respondents indicated none or had no response that was unmet, an indication that all their expectations were met. This reaffirms the fact that the meeting was a success.

10.10 Improvement of subsequent meetings

Under this item, members provided suggestions for improvement of subsequent meetings as follows:

S/n	Information to improve on similar subsequent meetings	Percentage
1.	Focus on scientific data to inform preparation of policy briefs	5.2%
2.	Send presentations before the meeting	5.2%
3.	Commend the secretariat for sharing the presentations early for preparation	5.2%
4.	Increase the number of participants from each MDA to have a sufficient number of officers whose capacity has been developed	5.2%
5.	Come up with a team to improve on the presentations	16%
6.	Change the meeting venue. This one is too noisy	5.2%
7.	Extend the meeting beyond half day	5.2%
8	Communication should be sent on email and WhatsApp as the hard copies are also being sent	5.2%
9	Agenda items were better suited in a training, not a meeting	5.2%
10	Use of Google forms to improve on the speed and accuracy of	5.2%
	event evaluation and other guiding questions	
11	None/ no response	37%
	Total	100%

Some participants suggested better presentations and several other suggestions for which should be considered for improvement of future meetings.

10.11 Follow up actions

Under this item, the respondents provided action points for follow up out of the meeting as indicated below:

S/n	Action points of the event for follow up	Percentage
1.	Send all presentations to members via email for further reading	5%
2.	Better mobilization of members	5%
3.	Workshop for better concentration/ Have such important topics in	16%
	training workshops	
4.	Refreshers for new Policy Analysts	5%
5.	Presentation on Cabinet Decisions	5%
6.	Engage key persons to develop guiding material	5%
7.	Cabinet submission guidelines	5%
8.	Enrichment of the guides in line with the discussions that followed	5%
	the presentation	
9.	Proper planning of the event	5%
10.	Ask for feedback/ seek for more comments from members	11%
11.	Format for writing a briefing note	5%
12.	Policy Analysts should be asked to write policy briefs quarterly or	5%
	solicit from partners who have conducted empirical research	
13.	None/ no response	47%
	Total	124%

A number of suggestions were presented for follow up that required prioritization for appropriate action. Most participants had multiple responses to this section.

11.0 ACTION MATRIX

SN	Action	Responsibility Centre	Status
1	All members, especially the new ones and those who got transfers and promotions to update their details with the Secretariat.	All to note	
2	Pending from previous report. Dept., PD&CB still under discussion with The Hunger Project on the areas of collaboration before MOU is signed.	OP-Cabinet Secretariat	
3	Pending from previous report. Inventory of Policies and Laws, Cabinet Forward Agenda and Research Agenda still with DHPS&DSC for quality assurance before publication.	OP-Cabinet Secretariat	
4	Pending from previous meeting. To allocate time in the next meeting for a Capacity Building Session on how to identify and disseminate Public policies where members who had handled the activity before would share best practices.	OP-Cabinet Secretariat	
5	Upload the report on the 20 th meeting of the Policy Analyst Cadre to the Office of the President and Cabinet Secretariat websites.	OP-Cabinet Secretariat	
6	Expand the scope of the framework for analysing public policies to include legal implications and relevance to National and International commitments for example the ruling party Manifesto, National Development Plan (NDP III), Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and other Regional and International commitments.	OP-Cabinet Secretariat	
7	Apply the framework for analysing public policies to at least 6 policies from one Ministry as an experiment and share the results with members to inform improvement of the framework.	OP-Cabinet Secretariat	
8	Develop a standard criteria for selecting the cabinet decisions to be analysed and if possible, that criteria should be included in the framework. This would be presented in the next meeting.	OP-Cabinet Secretariat	

9	Include challenges faced in implementation of the framework for monitoring and evaluation of Cabinet Decisions and best practices in the presentation.	OP-Cabinet Secretariat
10	Make a presentation on Cabinet Decisions and how	OP-Cabinet
	the Policy Analysts can get the Cabinet Decisions to be communicated more efficiently in the next meeting.	Secretariat
11	Members who attended the training on Policy briefs held from 19 th to 21 st February, 2020 ought to build the capacity in developing policy briefs of those who didn't attend the training.	All to note
12	C,PD&CB to build the capacity of members in negotiation and assertiveness in order for the cadre to be more successful in meeting its objectives	C, PD&CB

ANNEX 1: AGENDA

AGENDA FOR THE POLICY ANALYST CADRE MEETING 13TH FEBRUARY, 2020

- 1. Opening Prayer;
- 2. Communication from the Chairperson and matters arising;
- 3. Presentation of a Framework for Monitoring and Evaluating Implementation of Cabinet Decisions- A Practical Guide;
- 4. Presentation of a framework for analysing Public Policies A practical guide;
- 5. Presentation of a guide for preparation of Policy Briefs.
- 6. Way forward and closure.

ANNEX 2: ATTENDANCE LIST

ATTENDANCE LIST FOR POLICY ANALYST CADRE MEETING QUARTER TWO FY 2019/20

S/N	NAME	DESIGNATI ON	MDA	TEL	E-MAIL
1.	Dr. Abubakar. M. Moki	Commissione	OP	0772844195	abumoki@op.g o.ug
2.	Mwenyi Davis	AC/PA	OP	0772415915	dmwenyi@yah oo.co.uk
3.	Eric Kakoole	AC/PA	MAAIF	0782544185	kakoole@hotm ail.com
4.	Babito Samuel A	PPA	MoLG	0776938311	babitosamuelaki ki@yahoo.com
5.	Kivunike Godfrey	PPA	MOICT & NG	0752830038	godfreykivunik e@yahoo.com
6.	Margret Luzige	PPA	MTIC	0782454923	luzigemarg@g mail.com
7.	Julius Kabusere	PPA	МОН	0779109426	serejulius@yah oo.com
8.	Bindeeba Barbara Cynthia	PPA	MOWT	0772653369	cynthiabindeeba @gmail.com
9.	Odeny Wilfred	PPA	MoIA	0782431374	freodeny200@g mail.com
10.	Odongtho Irene Freda	PPA	MAAIF	0772868225	fiodongtho@g mail.com
11.	Zebosi Nicholas	PPA	MoSTI	0782725529	zebosinicholas @gmail.com
12.	Kasuku Ben	SPA	OP	0753025132	kasukuben@ya hoo.com
13.	Namirembe Hafsa	SPA	OP	0704136510	hafsamirembe @yahoo.com
14.	Twinomujuni Collins	SPA	MTIC	0703035453	twinomujunicol lins@gmail.co m
15.	Joseph Lule	SPA	MoPS	0773313107	josephlule2@g mail.com
16.	Amos Mubangizi	SPA	MOES	0782891979	amubangizi@g mail.com
17.	Kagoro Julius Caesar	SPA	ODPP	0772569564	czrkgz2010@g mailcom

18.	Okello Joseph	SPA	MOFA	0772939482	jokelloc@yaho
10	G. El I	GD 4	OD DOEL ID	0500105506	o.com
19.	Steven Ekadu	SPA	OP/DSEMR	0782137536	eonyu.steven@
20.	Paul Basudde	SPA	MEMD	0772863209	gmail.com pbasudde@yah
20.	Faul Basudde	SFA	MENID	0772803209	oo.com
21.	Atuhaire	SPA	OPM	0776556469	atuphiona@gm
21.	Phiona	Sizi	OTIVI	0110330407	ail.com
22.	Tamale	SPA	ESC	0785510210	andrew tamale
	Andrew	5111	250	0700010210	@yahoo.com
23.	Patrick	SPA	DEI	0782554292	pserwadda@gm
	Serwadda				ail.com
24.	Areke James	Senior Econ	HSC	0782093119	arekejs@gmail.
	Stephen				com
25.	Mayega Yusuf	PA	OP	0776967423	ymayega@gmai
					1.com
26.	FauzaKisu	PA	OP	0771909872	fkisu.fk@gmail.
	Mugobya				com
27.	Zzaake Joseph	PA	OP	0787580717	jzzaake@cabine
	Muleme				tsecretariat.go.u
20	O 1.' D '	DA	MEMD	0704220611	g 0 1 12.0
28.	Owechi Penina	PA	MEMD	0784230611	Owechip12@g mail.com
29.	Kasemire	PA	MOES	0774293451	pkasemire@gm
29.	Proscovia	I A	WIOLS	0774293431	ail.com
30.	Orishaba	PA	MoES	0781424360	orishjudi@gmai
	Judith		1,1025	0,01.2.000	1.com
31.	Edgar James	PA	MOJCA	0753834311	princenadiope
	Nadiope				@gmail.com
32.	Emoje Fiona	PA	Judiciary	079253556	femoje@judicat
					ure.go.ug
33.	Nassali	PA	OPM	0701625185	aminahnassali
	Aminah			.=	@gmail.com
34.	Zzinga James	PA	MLHUD	0705039755	jameszzinga@g
25	Nivo col-	DA	MOEC	0702727624	mail.com
35.	Niwagaba Emmy	PA	MOES	0703727634	emmyniwags@ gmail.com
36.	Stella Nkinzi	Economist	MODVA	0774225430	skizie18@yaho
50.	Kasibante	Economist	MIODVA	0114223430	o.com
37.	Kyohiirwe	Economist	MoICT&NG	0787909007	brigy023@gmai
57.	Bridget	Deonomist	1.10101010110	0,0,70,007	1.com
38.	Tonny Bbale	Economist	MoFPED	0776105266	tbbale@gmail.c
	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2			.,0102200	om
39.	Julius Akiiki	Economist	MoFPED	0772987796	ejedidiah@gma
	Tumusiime				il.com
	Tumusiime				il.com

	I			1	1
40.	Jackson	Economist	MoICT&NG	0779148781	Jackson.asiimw
	Asiimwe				e@ict.go.ug
41.	Collins	Economist	MoFA	0782459188	collinsturinawe
	Turinawe				@mofa.go.ug
42.	Nalukenge	RA	MoFPED	0775512240	shakiranalukeng
	Shakira				e@gmail.com
43.	Isabel Odongo	RA/CPA	MOFPED	0793694181	isabelodongo1
	Nabaasa				@gmail.com
44.	Namwanje	RA	Judiciary	0777716614	naasumpta@gm
	Assumpta				ail.com
45.	Edward	Ass.Lecturer	MUK	0773630795	edwardkabongo
	Kabongoya				ya@gmail.com
46.	Ikabat Francis	SA	OP	0706062665	ikabatfranc@g
					mail.com
47.	Nansiri Cissy	PS	OP	0774319558	cnansiri@gmail
					.com
48.	Ocwiyo James	OA	OP	0776144999	ocwiyojames1
					@gmail.com

ANNEX 3: A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSING PUBLIC POLICIES-A PRACTICAL GUIDE



The Republic of Uganda

A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSING PUBLIC POLICIES-A PRACTICAL GUIDE

Theme: analysis evidence to better serve citizens' interests

1. Introduction

This document outlines what is expected of analysing public policies. It is a guide to stakeholders involved in analysing public policies to ensure ownership, result-based orientation, cost-effectiveness and quality public policies. Analysing public policies involves systematic and objective assessment of public policies' design, management, and performance. It provides assessment that is credible, useful with practical and constructive recommendations, in order to enhance public policies. In addition, it provides accountability to stakeholders with whom the final public policy analysis reports are shared.

2. Purpose

The purpose of the framework is to provide a standard of analysing policies and reporting of analysis results.

3. Scope

Analysing public policies is done at both desk and field analysis levels. Each analysis covers the duration agreed with the stakeholders. Analysing public policies is at three thematic areas, namely effects, implementation and cross cutting issues. Effects cover analysis of impact, effectiveness, relevance, unintended effects and Equity (including Gender and Human Rights). Implementation analysis covers specific characteristics of public policies, processes, cost and efficiency, feasibility and adaptability. Cross cutting issues covers sustainability/durability, partnerships and synergies.

4. Guiding Questions

Analysing public policies is guided by the following questions:

i. Effects

Impact

- What has happened as a result of the policy? (This may include any general intended and unintended positive and negative effects).
- What difference does the public policy make?
- Which public policy design is more effective for one or more specific quantifiable outcomes?
- How do public policy outcomes differ among different populations and what factors condition those outcomes?

Effectiveness (Policy's effectiveness as a means of affecting the targeted problem)–Not to forget neutral or negative effects.

- What are the effects or changes of the public policy on the targeted problem? (Positive, neutral, negative).
- To what extent has the public policy achieved its intended objectives? What are the supportive factors and obstacles encountered during the achievement?
- How has the public policy achieved its intended outcomes? What are the supportive factors and obstacles encountered during the achievement?
- What evidence is there on the stakeholders'/beneficiaries' knowledge, understanding and capacity to carry out actions of the public policy and whether it has been improved?
- How effective is the public policy in terms of its intermediate effects?
- Is the intervention logic of the public policy plausible/credible?
- How does the implementation context influence the public policy effectiveness?
- How much time is needed before effects can be observed? Do the effects persist over time?
- Have the activities achieved or are likely to achieve the planned objectives and out comes as enunciated in the public policy document?

- To what extent are public policy stakeholders/beneficiaries satisfied with the activities of the public policy and the quality of the outputs?
- How have the different activities complemented each other in the empowerment of stakeholders/beneficiaries targeted by the public policy?
- What are the lessons learned or best practices for similar future public policies?

Relevance

- How does the choice of the public policy activities and deliverables properly reflect and address the primary problems/needs/issues, taking into account mandates of the stakeholders involved?
- How do the objectives and goals match the problems or needs or issues that are being addressed?
- How are the actual activities and out puts of the public policy consistent with the overall goals and intended out comes?
- What is the comparative advantage of each stakeholder involved in the public policy and to what extent did or does the public policy maximise it?
- How does the public policy fit into the current constitutional/ sectoral/national/international reference and frameworks?

Unintended Effects

- What are the unintended effects of the Cabinet decision/does the Cabinet decision produce unintended effects, whether positive or negative?
- How can the negative unintended effects be mitigated?

Equity (including Gender and Human Rights)

- What are the effects (intended or unintended of the public policy on different groups?
- What are the gender ratios of the targeted group with the public policy?
- Does the public policy create, reinforce or correct social inequalities?
 - How do public policy outcomes differ among different

- stakeholders and what factors condition those outcomes?
- What are the various stakeholders/beneficiaries' levels of satisfaction with the public policy and its outcomes?
- To what extent has the design and implementation of the public policy in corporate gender and human rights main streaming considerations, and can evidence be identified in this regard?
- How have the stakeholders/ beneficiaries been sensitised on the gender and human dimension of public policy? On accountability and sustainability of the public policy? On their impact on gender and human rights equality?
- To what extent does the public policy advance effort to promote job creation, wealth creation and inclusive sustainable growth and development?

ii. Implementation

Specific Characteristics of Public Policies

- Scope of implementation
- Amount of resources necessary
- Decision maker: a public authority
 - -Is accountable
 - -Is subject to various forms of pressure

Process

- What is the evidence of receipt of the public policy by the implementing key stakeholders? (letter of submission, circular, media, briefing, email-official or unofficial, social media, telephone call, others-specify)
- What activities/events were carried out due to the public policy?(evidence of implementation of the public policy -items delivered, knowledge of materials, record of events, schedule of events/actions undertaken, visible features
- What geographical areas are covered by the public policy implementation?

Costs and Efficiency

• What is the financial cost and gains of the public policy (for the government, other actors-industry, community organisations, consumers, taxpayers, etc.)?

- How are the costs distributed over time? Is the public policy delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner?
- What cost is/was involved in the implementation of the public policy? and how does it deviate from original plan/ budget?
- To what extent are the costs apparent?
- How do the costs of the public policy compare with those of other potential public policy, including that of inaction?
- What is the cost-effectiveness of the public policy for the government, for society?
- Have public policy implementation modalities, and internal monitoring and control been adequate in ensuring the achievement of the expected outcomes in a timely and cost-effective manner?
- Has the public policy timeline been affected by possible constraints/problems? If so, how have these affected the objectives and have they been addressed in an appropriate manner?
- Have public policy implementation modalities, and internal monitoring and control been adequate in ensuring the achievement of the expected outcomes in a timely and cost-effective manner?
- Has the public policy leveraged in-house expertise, previous research and technical l cooperation out comes, existing data bases, and other public internal resources and/ or external collaboration from international development partners and mechanisms?
- Is the policy delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner?

Feasibility

- Is the public policy technically feasible?
- Are the required human, material, and technological resources available?
- Does the public policy fall under the legal jurisdiction of the institution? Is it in conformity with existing legislation?
- Is the public policy a follow-up to a pilot program?
- Can the public policy be administered by pre-existing mechanisms?
- Is the institution promoting the public policy also the one that implements it? If not, how many different actors are involved in implementing this policy? Are they effectively guided by the policy's promoters? Do they cooperate well?

- Do the opponents of the public policy have the ability to interfere with its adoption, its implementation?
- What are the levels of quality of the activities/ events/ outputs/ outcomes offered by the public policy?

Acceptability

- Do the relevant stakeholders view the public policy as acceptable?
- Which actors are or would be affected by the public policy?
- Is the problem targeted by the public policy considered a social issue that requires intervention? What are stakeholders' reactions to the idea of intervening to address this problem?
- How do stakeholders think the issue should be addressed?
- What do stakeholders think of the proposed public policy? Of its
 effectiveness, its unintended effects, its equitability, its cost, and its
 feasibility? Of the degree of coercion it involves?
- What do stakeholders think of the conditions surrounding adoption and implementation of this policy?
- Can the public policy acceptability evolve during the period in which it is being implemented?

iii. Cross Cutting Issues

Sustainability/Durability

- Is there capacity to be sustained over time (meaning documented capacity of the decision to remain in effect and to continue producing effects over time)?
- Is there evidence that the various stakeholders/ beneficiaries are committed to continue working towards the public policy objectives?
- To what extent have public policy beneficiaries/ stakeholders capacities been enhanced?
- Is there awareness of bottle necks or further actions for improved capacities?
- Havetheactivities and outputs been designed and implemented in such awa
 ytoen sure maximum sustainability of the public policy impact? For
 instance, to what extent did the stakeholders/beneficiaries have a
 sense of ownership?
- Have efforts been made to sustain the knowledge and capacity

- gained in the public policy for future similar public policy?
- Are there lasting benefits after the public policy intervention is completed?
- What has MDA/Local Government/or any other stakeholder done to ensure continuity of public policy results?
- Is there evidence that the various stakeholders/ beneficiaries are committed to continue working towards the public policy objectives? To what extent have public policy beneficiaries/ stakeholders capacities been enhanced? Is there awareness of bottlenecks or further actions for improved capacities?
- Have the activities and outputs been designed and implemented in such away to ensure maximum sustainability of the public policy impact? For instance, to what extent did the stakeholders/beneficiaries have a sense of ownership?
- Have efforts been made to sustain the knowledge and capacity gained in the public policy for future similar public policies?
- Are there lasting benefits after the policy intervention is completed?

Partnerships and Synergies

- How has the public policy advanced partnerships with various stakeholders (for example, national and local governments and regional counter parts, the civil society and/ or the private sector)?
- How have the different activities complemented each other in the empowerment of stakeholders/ beneficiaries targeted by the public policy?
- How has the public policy advanced partnerships with various stakeholders (for example, national and regional counter parts, the civil society and/ or the private sector)?

ANNEX 4: FRAMEWORK FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATING IMPLEMENTATION OF CABINET DECISIONS- A PRACTICAL GUIDE



The Republic of Uganda

FRAMEWORK FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATING IMPLEMENTATION OF CABINET DECISIONS- A PRACTICAL GUIDE

Theme: monitoring and evaluation evidence for better impact

1. Introduction

Cabinet is the highest policy making organ of Government and is responsible for determining, formulating, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the policy of Government. Cabinet Secretariat supports Cabinet to carry out her responsibilities. The Office of the President supports provision of comprehensive and quality public services to the citizens through provision of strategic leadership in policy development, management and good governance. This framework helps in monitoring and evaluating implementation of Cabinet decisions for better impact.

2. Problem Statement

There are persistent citizens out cry of poor service delivery and unmet public interests despite several public policies and Cabinet decisions in place aimed at changing the situation. This creates uncertainty as to whether Government is on course to best serve the public interest. This is attributed to among others, absence of a structured framework for monitoring and evaluating implementation of Cabinet decisions for generation of evidence for better impact.

3. Purpose

The framework constitutes a tool that is both structured and flexible intended to guide all those who are called upon to monitor, evaluate and represent Cabinet decisions perspective to policy makers. It can be adapted according to the information needs of each decision-making context and according to the resources available for carrying out monitoring and evaluation analysis.

4. Scope

The framework can be applied-(i) before adoption of a Cabinet decision to inform relevance of adopting the decision; clarify, justify and advocate for adoption; comparing different options; (ii) to analyse a Cabinet decision already being implemented to determine whether it should be terminated or prolonged or identify areas of improvements; and (iii) post implementation analysis of Cabinet Decision to establish whether it can be reactivated or scaled up to other areas.

5. Dimensions of Analysis

The following dimensions of analysis are used: (i) effects (effectiveness, relevance, unintended effects, equity); (ii) implementation (processes, cost and efficiency, feasibility, acceptability); and (iii) cross cutting issues (sustainability/durability, and partnerships and synergies).

6. Data Collection Method

The following can be applied: (i) individual reflection- answering the guiding questions, (ii) group brainstorming-answering the guiding questions(iii) consultation with experts-using the guiding questions as an interview guide or as a grid to fill out; (iv) deliberative process- bring together representatives of the relevant stakeholders and the facilitator stimulates discussion among participants by referring to the guiding questions. After the meeting, the statements gathered are classified under the various dimensions of the analytical framework; and (v) Literature review- guiding questions are answered by referring to published data.

7. Presentation of Results

The results are presented in narrative form: the quantitative and qualitative data collected on each dimension are synthesized in a text. It should be noted that the boundaries between analytical dimensions are not rigid: if certain information skirts the border between two

dimensions, it can be associated with one or the other, as one sees fit. The aim is simply to organize the data collected into coherent groups. The exception to this principle of flexibility is the "Acceptability" dimension, which requires careful processing of the related data. When comparing several options, and in particular when choosing a Cabinet decision to prioritise over others, a better overview can be obtained by summarising the information gathered on each dimension in the form of a scorecard.

8. Guiding Questions

iv. Effects

Effectiveness

- What are the effects or changes of the Cabinet decision (positive, neutral, negative) on the targeted problem?
- To what extent has the Cabinet decision achieved its intended objectives? What are the supportive factors and obstacles encountered during the achievement?
- How has the Cabinet decision achieved its intended outcomes? What are the supportive factors and obstacles encountered during the achievement?
- What evidence is there on the stakeholders'/beneficiaries' knowledge, understanding and capacity to carry out actions of the Cabinet decision?
- How effective is the Cabinet decision in terms of its intermediate effects?
- Is the intervention logic of the Cabinet decision plausible?
- How does the implementation context influence the cabinet decisions effectiveness?
- How much time is needed before effects can be observed? Do the effects persist over time?

Relevance

• Did the Cabinet decision choice of activities and deliverables properly reflect and address the primary problems /needs/ issues, taking into account mandates of the stakeholders involved?

- Do the objectives and goals match the problems or needs that are being addressed?
- Were the actual activities and outputs of the Cabinet decision consistent with the overall goals and intended outcomes?
- What is the comparative advantage of each stakeholder involved in the Cabinet decision and to what extent did the public policy maximize it?
- Does the Cabinet Decision fit into the current constitutional/ sectoral/ national/ international reference and frameworks?

Unintended Effects

- What are the unintended effects of the Cabinet decision/does the Cabinet decision produce unintended effects, whether positive or negative?
- How can the negative unintended effects be mitigated?

Equity (including Gender and Human Rights)

- What are the effects (intended or unintended of the Cabinet decision on different groups?
- What are the gender ratios of the targeted group with the Cabinet decision?
- Does the Cabinet decision create, reinforce or correct social inequalities?
- How do Cabinet decision outcomes differ among different stakeholders and what factors condition those outcomes?
- What are the various stakeholders/ beneficiaries' levels of satisfaction with the Cabinet decision and its outcomes?
- To what extent has the design and implementation of the Cabinet decision in corporate gender and human rights mainstreaming considerations, and can evidence be identified in this regard?
- How have the stakeholders/ beneficiaries been sensitised on the gender and human dimension of Cabinet decisions? On accountability and sustainability of the Cabinet decision? On their impact on gender and human rights equality?
- To what extent does the Cabinet decision advance effort to promote job creation, wealth creation and inclusive sustainable growth and development?

v. Implementation

Process

- What is the evidence of receipt of the Cabinet decision? (letter of submission, circular, media, briefing, email-official or unofficial, social media, telephone call, others-specify)
- What activities/events were carried out due to the Cabinet decision?(evidence of implementation of the Cabinet decision-items delivered, knowledge of materials, record of events, schedule of events/actions undertaken, visible features
- What geographical areas are covered by the Cabinet decision implementation?

Costs and Efficiency

- What is the financial cost and gains of the Cabinet decision (for the government, other actors-industry, community organisations, consumers, taxpayers, etc.)?
- How are the costs distributed over time?
- To what extent are the costs apparent?
- How do the costs of the Cabinet decision compare with those of other potential Cabinet decisions, including that of inaction?
- What is the cost-effectiveness of the Cabinet decision for the government, for society?
- Have Cabinet decision implementation modalities, and internal monitoring and control been adequate in ensuring the achievement of the expected outcomes in a timely and cost-effective manner?
- Has the Cabinet decision time line been affected by possible constraints/ problems? If so, how have these affected the objectives and have they been addressed in an appropriate manner?
- Is the Cabinet decision delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner?
- What cost is/was involved in the implementation of the Cabinet decision (s)? and how does it deviate from original plan/budget?

Feasibility

• Is the Cabinet decision technically feasible?

- Are the required human, material, and technological resources available?
- Does the Cabinet decision fall under the legal jurisdiction of the institution? Is it in conformity with existing legislation?
- Is the Cabinet decision a follow-up to a pilot program?
- Can the cabinet decision be administered by pre-existing mechanisms?
- Is the institution promoting the Cabinet decision also the one that implements it?
- If not, how many different actors are involved in implementing this policy? Are they effectively guided by the policy's promoters? Do they cooperate well?
- Do the opponents of the Cabinet decision have the ability to interfere with its adoption, its implementation?
- What are the levels of quality of the activities/ events/ outputs/ outcomes offered by the Cabinet decision?

Acceptability

- Do the relevant stakeholders view the Cabinet decision as acceptable?
- Which actors are or would be affected by the Cabinet decision?
- Is the problem targeted by the Cabinet decision considered a social issue that requires intervention? What are stakeholders' reactions to the idea of intervening to address this problem?
- How do stakeholders think the issue should be addressed?
- What do stakeholders think of the proposed Cabinet decision? Of its effectiveness, its unintended effects, its equitability, its cost, and its feasibility? Of the degree of coercion it involves?
- What do stakeholders think of the conditions surrounding adoption and implementation of this policy?
- Can the Cabinet decision's acceptability evolve during the period in which it is being implemented?

vi. Cross Cutting Issues

Sustainability/Durability

- Is there capacity to be sustained over time (meaning documented capacity of the decision to remain in effect and to continue producing effects over time)?
- Is there evidence that the various stakeholders/ beneficiaries are committed to continue working towards the Cabinet decision objectives?
- To what extent have Cabinet decision beneficiaries/stakeholders capacities been enhanced?
- Is there awareness of bottlenecks or further actions for improved capacities?
- Have the activities and outputs been designed and implemented in such away to ensure maximum sustainability of the Cabinet decision impact? For instance, to what extent did the stakeholders/beneficiaries have a sense of ownership?
- Have efforts been made to sustain the knowledge and capacity gained in the Cabinet decision for future similar Cabinet decisions?
- Are there lasting benefits after the Cabinet decision intervention is completed?
- What has MDA/Local Government/or any other stakeholder done to ensure continuity of Cabinet decision's results?

Partnerships and Synergies

- How has the Cabinet decision advanced partnerships with various stakeholders (for example, national and local governments and regional counter parts, the civil society and/ or the private sector)?
- How have the different activities complemented each other in the empowerment of stakeholders/ beneficiaries targeted by the Cabinet decision?

9. Conclusion

This framework when effectively applied will enable use of monitoring and evaluation evidence for better impact of Cabinet decisions in transformation of the lives of citizens. It is hoped that the various stakeholders being focused on citizens will require the evidence to be degenerated.

ANNEX 5: PREPARING A POLICY BRIEF



The Republic of Uganda

PREPARING A POLICY BRIEF

A policy brief constitutes a central tool for achieving policy impact. It is a concise summary of a particular issue, the policy options to deal with it, and some recommendations on the best option.

A policy brief is aimed at government policy makers and others who are interested in formulating or influencing policy. It is issued in hard and electronic versions.

A policy brief should:

- ✓ Provide enough background for the reader to understand the problem.
- ✓ Convince the reader that the problem is worth addressing and must bead dressed urgently.
- ✓ Provide information about alternatives (in an objective brief).
- ✓ Provide evidence to support one alternative (in an advocacy brief).
- ✓ Stimulate the reader to make a decision.

There are many ways of structuring a policy brief, but all Policy Briefs should not belonger than 4 pages and structured to include the following (where applicable):

- ✓ Title of Brief;
- ✓ Background;
- ✓ Problem Statement;
- ✓ Context and importance of the problem being addressed;
- ✓ Policy issues a rising and attempts to deal with them;

- ✓ Alternative approaches for achieving better policy out comes and impact;
- ✓ Recommendations for Action

Policy briefs may also contain the following at the discretion of the author(s):

- ✓ Tables
- ✓ Boxes and side bars
- ✓ Cases
- ✓ Photographs
- ✓ Graphics

Title of the paper

The title should catch the attention of the reader and compel him/ her to read on and so needs to be descriptive, punchy and relevant.

Introduction

This introduces the brief by providing and exciting summary.

Background

The background should convince the reader that the brief is worth paying attention. It should enable the reader to clearly see there levance and importance of the brief. As such, a1 to 2 paragraph executive summary commonly includes:

- ✓ A description of the problem being addressed;
- ✓ A statement on why the current approach/ policy option needs to be changed;
- ✓ Recommendations for action.

Context and importance of the problem

The brief should convince the reader that the problem exists, is current, urgent and requires action to be taken. The context and importance of the problem is both the introductory and first building block of the brief. As such, it usually includes the following:

- ✓ A clear statement of the problem or issue in focus;
- ✓ A short over view of the root causes of the problem; and

✓ A clear statement of the policy implications of the problem which clearly establishes the current importance and policy relevance of the issue.

The length of the problem description may vary considerably from brief to brief depending on the stage on the policy process in focus. E.g. There may be a need to have a much more extensive problem description for policy at the evaluation stage than for one at the option choosing stage.

Policy implications/ Critique of policy option(s)

The aim of this element is to detail short comings of the current approach or options being implemented and therefore, illustrate both the need for change and focus of where change needs to occur. In doing so, the critique of policy options usually includes the following:

- ✓ A short overview of the policy option(s) in focus;
- ✓ An argument illustrating why and how the current or proposed approach is failing.

It is important for the sake of credibility to recognise all opinions in the debate of the issue.

Policy recommendations

The policy recommendations should provide convincing proposals of how the failings of the current policy approach need to be changed. As such this is achieved by including;

- ✓ A breakdown of the specific practical steps or measures that need to be implemented;
- ✓ Expected results or outputs or outcomes to be seen when action is taken and how it is linked to addressing the problem at hand; and
- ✓ Sometimes also includes a closing paragraphre-emphasising the importance of action.