

REPORT ON THE GENDER RESPONSIVE PLANNING AND BUDGETING ADVOCACY IN LOWER LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN NEBBI DISTRICT



Prepared by:
Agency For Accelerated Regional Development (AFARD)
P.O. Box 80 Nebbi, Uganda

Submitted to:
The National Coordinator,
HURINET (U)
P.O. Box 21265, Kampala, Uganda

February 2006

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	3
2.0	Advocacy goal and objectives	3
3.0	The advocacy process and management	4
4.0	Achievements	6
5.0	Key Challenges	7
6.0	Lessons learnt	9
7.0	The LLGs 15 point commitment plans	10
8.0	Follow-up recommendations	12
9.0	Conclusion	12

**Workshop report on the Advocacy for Gender Responsive Planning
and Budgeting conducted in the Lower Local Governments of Nebbi
District
from 23rd January to 4th February 2006**

1.0 Introduction

In August 2005 AFARD, with HURINET (U) co-funding support, conducted a training in gender responsive planning and budgeting (GRPB) to mainly the women council members in all lower local governments (LLGs) in Nebbi district. The training focused on imparting knowledge and skills for undertaking a GRPB. However, from the training it was noted that the success of the training in ensuring the anchoring of GRPB in LLG is dependent in part on: (i) response tactics and maneuvers that members of the women council have in their quality interdependence with other players at the LLGs levels; and (ii) GRPB is a policy issue that calls for political action in resource allocation and utilization.

Thus, this advocacy on GRPB was organized as a way of building and consolidating alliances and positive response from the other actors (political and technical) at LLGs for the smooth implementation of and commitment towards GRPB.

A total of 35 participants were targeted for the advocacy workshop in all the LLGs. These comprised of LLG technical staff (Town Clerk/Sub-county Chief, Health Assistant/Inspector, [Assistant] Community Development Officer, Sub-Accountant/Town Treasurer and Field Extension Coordinator), Women Council (both at parish/ward and sub-county/town council), Parish Development Committees and the LLG council (all executives and representative of the councilors).

2.0 Advocacy goal and objectives

The advocacy activity, the focus of the workshops was mainly on the desired practices of the LLGs to GRPB. As a goal, it was thus, envisaged that the LLGs will develop and implement a Gender Responsive Plan and Budget (GRPB) and monitor, evaluate and be accountable for its engendered development outcomes.

Specifically, the intents of the workshop were to:

- Raise awareness on gender issues and the gender impact embedded in LLG plans and budgets.
- Enlist LLG commitments to GRPB and make them accountable for such commitments.
- Come up with an agreed monitoring and evaluation (M&E) work plan that clearly indicates responsibility centers.

Participant's expectations were closely related to the workshop objectives and content. They mainly mentioned the need to gain knowledge on strengthening relationship between women council and women councilors, gender issues and gender responsive planning and budgeting, women's rights, how to mobilize women, plan for women, and monitor council projects. Most of these expectations were met and only a few remain as issues that warrant further interventions.

3.0 The advocacy process and management

The completion of this advocacy workshop was due to a number of processes that were jointly accomplished pre-the workshop, during-the workshop, and post-the workshops. Highlighted below are some of the key milestones on the processes.

Manual development:

After the identification of the core issues for the workshop, it was pertinent that an organized approach to handling them was designed. As such, a facilitation manual was developed by a team selected from AFARD and the previous trainers (especially the district local government staff of community based services and management support services).

A number of meetings were held to design, review, and pre-test the materials produced before the final production of the manual. Consultations were also made with the district women council members and some other rights based organisations (CARITAS).

Facilitators' identification and orientation:

Following the manual development, the team of facilitators was assembled from local government, women council district executives, and AFARD. They were selected basing on their experience in the previous training as well as the need to handle 'accountability issues'.



The Facilitators (Left to Right): Gilbert, Fosca, Valentine, Julius, and Angela

Thereafter, two meetings were held to acquaint them with the workshop objectives, contents of the manual, methodological issues as well as the expected outcomes of the engagement. These meetings (also acting as a mock training session) provided a valuable critique of certain contents of the manual. It also built teamwork and common focus among the facilitators.

Mobilization of participants:

A number of strategies were used to mobilize the participants. Letters were written (timely) and delivered to all the LLG authorities. Personal telephone contacts with the Sub-county Chiefs/Town Clerks and Community Development Assistants as well as radio

announcements were conducted. This ensured that the right people attended the workshops and convenient venues were organized.

Facilitating the workshop:

A number of innovative techniques to enhance participant's understanding and enlist effective participation were used. This included gender issues-based introduction, focus group discussions, lecturantee, brainstorming, question and answers and role plays.



Internal monitoring: For purpose of quality assurance during the workshops, AFARD staff conducted internal monitoring in all the sites. This proved useful in backstopping where it was needed and building alliances with the women council members.



4.0 Achievements

- Out of the planned 19 workshops, 18 were held with a 100% turnout (as can be seen from the table below). More women attended than men because of the deliberate attempt of targeting members of the women council from both LLG and LLC II levels and all the women councilors. In Parombo LLG two attempts to have the workshop held proved futile as the Parish Chief appointed to act as the Sub county chief after the civil service reform failed to mobilize participants.
- The timing of the workshop was conducive since most LLGs were in the earlier stages of developing their plans (village consultative meetings). It is therefore being expected that the 2006/09 development plans and 2006/07 budget framework documents will integrate key principles of GRPB.
- Great improvement in the working relationship between the women council and women councilors was noted mainly as a result of the previous training. For instance, in some LLG joint planning meeting were conducted between the women council and councilors.

- Though at a small scale, some women councils are becoming functional as was witnessed in some (Akworo and Erussi) having developed their annual plans with the hope of possibly funding from the LLGs.

5.0 Key Challenges

The challenges contained here are related to the workshop objective. They are:

- ⊖ All LLGs staffs have limited capacity to properly conduct, manage, and commit to a GRPB process. This is worsened by the on-going rationalization and restructuring of local government that has created a huge man[woman]power gaps in almost all the essential departments. For instance, Atyak had no Sub-county Chief (SCC), a trained Sub-Accountant and the Assistant Community Development Officer. Paromb sub county has a Parish Chief acting as the SSC. This may have a negative consequence on the realization of the advocacy objectives as the technical staff to take on the challenge may either be lacking or the few may be overwhelmed. The few staff are also ill equipped to conduct gender analysis as no specific capacity enhancement training exists in this area. As a result:
- LLGs development plans and budgets were either gender blind or neutral. They lack the key principles of GRPB of having clearly defined and disaggregated data on benefits and impacts for each gender.
- Affirmative actions and gender (women) strategic interventions were also lacking save for Pakwach Town council and Pakwach sub-county that had some provisions on girl child education.
- ⊖ The Women Councils (at LLG and LLC) on their part also have limited capacity to properly position themselves and engage the LLGs in the planning process and the outcomes of the planning process. Their plans, where they existed, are not integrated within the overall plan and budget of the respective LLGs. This avoidance approach means they get no facilitation for their specific interventions save for the women's day celebrations.
- ⊖ Village plans (which are transmitted to higher levels) are derived in a non-inclusive nature and without clear intentions of the relevance of such plans to the village members. Thus, in a majority of cases, villages/communities plan to meet the statutory, regulatory requirements and demands of the planning process. Impliedly, villages are used as input points to the planning processes. Neither do the villages own nor do they have a voice that count in LLG plan and budget approvals.
- ⊖ It was also noted that there was limited or non-involvement of women in the planning process and thus, women are not aware of the intents and directions of the plans and budgets. In most cases women are not mobilized for the meetings. For instance, a woman in Nyapea LLG voiced that: *"we hear about these meetings (planning) and we are not invited. However, when the men have concluded the meetings, they fake our names in*

the attendance sheets and sweet talk us to sign". Interesting cases were also noted that portrayed the limited knowledge of the plan and budget intents to the women. In Nebbi sub-county, for instance, the planned *lorena* stoves training (a strategic labour saving technology meant to ease the domestic workload on women) that targeted 30 participants on equal gender representation ended with more men (26) trained than women. To the men, they dominated the training because the women were lazy in collecting the required materials (mud and grass). The women, however, advanced that men highjacked the activity because of the anticipated financial gains and monopoly of the knowledge (of constructing the stoves) which they would use to "extort money" from the households (women). It later on turned out that the trained men embarked on a constructing strategy moving from household to household in search of contracts at a cost of UGX 5,000 per stove.

- ⊖ A lot of inconsistencies were noted between the development plan (situation analysis and development strategies) and the annual budgets resulting into poor plan/budget outcomes. Whereas budget intentions are to be derived from a clear and detailed situation analysis and proper stating of development objectives from the development plans, very little link was found to exist between the two. In all the LLGs, development plans are generated as a required document and very few items are translated into the budgets. Further, intra plan and budget dissemination (in suitable and useable form) was also found to be a non-cherished and practiced planning ethics. Unsurprisingly, development plans and budgets are not disseminated beyond the key departments (the lucky ones) and political heads (the most influential ones) in the LLGs. It would thus, not be misleading to conclude that the real consumers of such plans and budgets have scanty knowledge of the plans expectations from and of the people. For instance, in Panyango a total of UGX 200,000 and UGX 500,000 was utilized in the previous financial year and planned for TBA activities respectively, however, the women were not knowledgeable about such interventions.
- ⊖ In trying to keep in line with the principles of GRPB, an audit was done in all the LLGs to ascertain the percentage of the budget allocations that go for service provision and that of administrative or supportive departments (read the cost of serving the people or doing development). On the whole, administrative costs were noted to overwhelm service provision. The case of Panyimur LLG where management support services (office of the Sub-county Chief) spent 64.4% of the total budget for 2004/05 is worth pointing. See Annex 2. Further scrutiny of the budget revealed a bleaker situation. Within the service departments, administrative costs were still (in most case) higher than what were directly benefiting the communities concerned. For example, in Nyapea LLG, 27.8% of the 2005/06 budget was allocated to technical services department, however, after analyzing the sector budget it was found that all the funds were to be utilized on administrative work such as construction of offices. Impliedly, development is being delivered or facilitated at a higher cost and very little of the LLG budget directly benefits the people whom most of the LLGs mission statement stands to "improve their wellbeing". Various reasons such as debt servicing, salaries, council expenses, remittances to LLC and HLG, management of the planning cycle, inter and intra unplanned for movements/workshops and acquisition of accountable stationeries

were advanced to explain the lion's share of the budget going to the administrative departments.

- ⊖ There still exist high levels of cultural rigidity on the side of men to uphold some of the stipulated women's rights as enshrined in the constitution. Majority of men look at women's rights as a violation (of their rights) and a tactic by the government (movement) to win elections, lessen their "God" given rights, privileges and opportunities over women, a thing they cannot easily let go. The process of bringing men on board need to be handled properly less the outcomes of the workshop may not be seen.

6.0 Lessons learnt

- The realization of GRPB requires that both the women and the leaders (mainly men) know and have the skills for undertaking gender responsive interventions. Those who have such skills are easily supportive of women's cause than those who lack the skills since they continue to appreciate development for people.
- Much of the inability of women to get a fair share of local resource allocation and utilization hinge back to their ineffective participation in the decision-making arena. Women's numerical strength is weakened by their silent voice to which leaders don't easily circum. Yet, in areas where the women leaders are vigilant and effective in the mobilization of women for LLG planning processes they have won a considerable support. Cases in point here are in Akworo where the women council have a work plan, a rotational credit scheme worth UGX 3,000,000 and have seriously embarked on a girl child education programme targeting the women.
- Where there is political (and sometimes technical) support from the LLGs to the women council, the functionality of the latter improves. In Nyapea where the Secretary of Social Services has been instrumental, training, mentoring, and financial support have been accorded to women council. Equally, in Pakwach sub-county, the ACDO has been pivotal in integrating women council in activity implementation.

Report on Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting Advocacy Workshops
In Nebbi District
February 2006

7.0 The LLGs 15 point commitment plans

Findings/Issues	Action	Target	Actors	Monitoring indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very weak women's participation in the planning and budgeting process • No facilitation (meals) during village level meetings • Planning tools (templates) are not gender specific • Poor community (especially women) mobilization for meetings • No link/ relevance in identified priorities at LLG level to the community 	Undertake a systematic gender inclusive participatory village planning meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliberately target women during planning meetings • Remit the 5% village contribution and use it for providing meals • GFPO to develop and enforce use of gender specific templates • LLG DP&B must be based (and funded) on the premise of LLC priorities that target the needs of both men and women • Facilitate villages to develop comprehensive village action plans (VAP) other than priority list; advocate for its ownership and acceptance at that level 	All women and men in the village	LC I chairperson, PDCs, WC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No of village meetings held • No and category of participants by gender • No of VAP that address specific gender needs generated and submitted • Amount of 5% village remittance used during planning meetings • No of gender specific tools developed and utilized during village planning meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is very thin relationship between LLC priorities and LLG development plan and budget (DP&B) intentions • Women council (WC) plans are not incorporated in the LLG DP&B • LLG plans lack attention to gender specific needs • Men benefit more than women in most LLG interventions • In almost all LLGs, administrative costs over weigh service delivery cost 	Develop a rights based plan/budget that Integrates LLC priorities and Women council needs in the overall LLG DP&B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WC be part of the planning team at LLG and provide and incorporate their needs at that level (also make follow-up) • Women councilors should safeguard the interest of women in DP&B generation, approval and implementation • Plan and implement affirmative action • Do thorough gender expenditure beneficiary analysis • More funds be spent on the key government priority areas that addresses the real needs of the people 	LLC and LLG executives, LLG TPC, Councilors ,NGOs, CBOs, PDCs	Chairperson, LCIII, SCC/T C, LLG Planning Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender specific priorities of LLC that are integrated in the LLG plan and budget • Amount of resources approved and expended for LLC by gender • Amount of resources approved and expended on women council activities • % of funds committed to administrative VS service delivery by gender
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development plan and budget not disseminated to key stakeholders at the LLG and LLC levels • DP&B not accessed and content not known and understood by majority • No feed back on priority status to LLC 	Communicate and disseminate DP&B intentions to key stakeholders not more than one month after approval <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make summary of DP&B and distribute to heads of LLC, councilors and dev't partners • Distribute copies of DP&B to all HOD and Executives • Make leaflets that reflect the DP&B intentions in the local language to the communities • Councilors to (must) make periodic (quarterly) consultative feedback meetings with their constituents 	HoD, WC, Councilors, Community, NGOs, CBOs, PDCs, LLC	SCC/T C, Councilors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No of disseminated summarized DP&B • No of feed back sessions/meetings and information dissemination held/conducted • No of publications of DP&B disseminated to HoD and executives • No of leaflets produced and distributed • No of meetings held by councilors and documented
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WC not functional-no meetings, lack plan of action, lack advocacy and leadership skills, low literacy levels and confidence 	Strengthen the WC institution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Train WC, women councilors and LLG authority holders on team work, confidence building and leadership skills 	WC, HoD	WC, HoD, SCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No of trainings (and attendance) organized for WC and other partners • No of joint programmes held and reported

Report on Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting Advocacy Workshops
In Nebbi District
February 2006

among some members • Poor relationship between WC and women councilors and also with the LLG	• HoD and Focal point person to involve and incorporate WC in the implementation of their planned activities while at the same time allocate funds for their planned interventions			that have included the WC • Amount of funds expended on WC plan
---	--	--	--	--

8.0 Follow-up recommendations

Following the identified challenges, the following recommendations are being made:

- ✚ Deliberately build the capacity of LLG staff. This should include training in gender analysis, planning, monitoring and evaluation. Such training should involve the politicians and technical staff as well as the existing structures within the LLG system.
- ✚ Enhance the participation of women in the planning processes through supporting the women council at the LLG and LLC as a conduit to mobilize and organize women to agitate for inclusion of their interest in the development plans.
- ✚ Various voices (from the elected and the technocrats) have been echoed on the non-involvement of women in the planning processes. All the advocated reasons, however, are institutional. This makes it unclear as to why grassroots women are shunning down their human rights. There is, therefore, the need to conduct a specific study to explore why they are in such a back seat in the decentralized development planning. This study will provide appropriate and acceptable means for enhancing their participation.
- ✚ Using evidence-based approach, increasingly continue to advocate development of GRPB in order to realize the programme outcomes. There is need to share and disseminate the advocacy reports with all the LLGs and the HLG. Equally, feedback on outcomes of the follow-ups of the commitment plans. The women council structures should be actively involved in this process so that they get to know the channels that catalyze and inhibit their operations and goals. It is in this way that an evidence-based dialogue can be conducted with the LLGs for purpose of fulfilling the intentions of the commitment plan in order to realize the goal of the GRPB
- ✚ Due to the upcoming elections, there is no guarantee that the current leadership (of the women council and councilors including other elected positions) will all bounce back in the political management of the LLGs. There is, therefore, the need to make provisions for training of the newly elected leaders on the key elements of GRPB.

9.0 Conclusion

Whereas the advocacy workshops were concluded effectively, its realization and positive outcomes are however, pegged on the commitment and a change of the mindset to the key credentials of the GRPB. Further, the attention to gender is a public policy concern and therefore, its success is much more of a political issue than technical. Impliedly, it is the prime responsibility of the political wing (as duty bearers) at all levels of governments to champion, promote, uphold and fulfill this concern-which is a fundamental human right.

Annex I: Participant's turnout by LLG

No	LLG	Male		Female		Total
		No	%	No	%	
1	Nebbi TC	17	48.6	18	51.4	35
2	Nebbi	18	51.4	17	48.6	35
3	Nyaravur	16	45.7	19	54.3	35
4	Kucwiny	13	37.1	22	62.9	35
5	Akworo	19	54.3	16	45.7	35
6	Erussi	19	54.3	16	45.7	35
7	Parombo	-	-	0	-	-
8	Wadelai	15	42.9	20	57.1	35
9	Panyango	17	48.6	18	51.4	35
10	Pakwach TC	17	48.6	18	51.4	35
11	Pakwach	25	71.4	10	28.6	35
12	Panyimur	12	34.3	23	65.7	35
13	Jangokoro	13	37.1	22	62.9	35
14	Paidha	18	51.4	17	48.6	35
15	Paidha TC	15	42.9	20	57.1	35
16	Nyapea	16	45.7	19	54.3	35
17	Atyak	10	28.6	25	71.4	35
18	Zeus	17	48.6	18	51.4	35
19	Kango	17	48.6	18	51.4	35
	TOTALS	294	46.7	336	53.3	630

Source: Workshop attendance sheet