

External evaluation of LO-Norway's co-operation with National Organisation of Trade Unions (NOTU), Uganda

Øyvind Eggen and Hassan Raha

Norsk Utenrikspolitisk Institutt
Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

NUPI Report



External evaluation of LO- Norway's cooperation with National Organisation of Trade Unions (NOTU), Uganda

Øyvind Eggen and Hassan Raha

September 2012

This evaluation was commissioned by:

The Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions (LO), Norway (www.lo.no).

Contact: Kirsten S. Natvig, kirsten.natvig@lo.no

Africa contact point for LO Norway: Robinson Sikazwe, robhesi@zamnet.zm

Implementing organisation under evaluation:

National Organisation of Trade Unions (NOTU), Uganda (www.notu.or.ug).

Contact: notu@infocom.co.ug

Authors:

Øyvind Eggen, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, Oslo (www.nupi.no).

Contact: oyvind.eggen@nupi.no

Hassan Raha, independent consultant, Dar es Salaam

Contact: hassanraham@yahoo.com

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	I
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	II
SUMMARY	III
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 METHODOLOGY	1
1.1.1 <i>Limitations</i>	2
1.2 BACKGROUND.....	3
1.2.1 <i>Economic, political and legislative context</i>	3
2 THE ORGANISATION	5
2.1 THE ROLE OF NOTU IN DEFENDING WORKERS AND WORKERS' RIGHTS	5
2.2 'POLITICS' - THE EXPLOITATION OF UNION MANDATE FOR INDIVIDUAL GAINS.....	7
2.3 INTERNAL DEMOCRACY, OWNERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY.....	9
2.4 SUSTAINABILITY.....	11
2.5 EFFICIENCY	12
2.6 THE ROLE OF NOTU IN SECURING UNITY BETWEEN AND WITHIN UNIONS	13
2.7 STRENGTH AND WEAKNESSES OF NOTU	14
3 RESULTS OF THE COLLABORATION.....	15
3.1.1 <i>Weak framework for reporting</i>	15
3.2 OUTCOMES FROM THE COLLABORATION.....	16
3.2.1 <i>The 2006-2009 period</i>	17
3.2.2 <i>Status for the 2010-2014 period</i>	18
3.3 POSSIBLE IMPACT	19
4 THE LO NORWAY-NOTU COLLABORATION	22
4.1.1 <i>Relevance</i>	22
4.1.2 <i>Managerial issues</i>	23
5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	25
5.1 GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	25
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	26
5.2.1 <i>Recommendations to NOTU</i>	26
5.2.2 <i>Recommendations to LO Norway</i>	27
6 ANNEXES	I
6.1 ANNEX I: TERMS OF REFERENCE	I
6.2 ANNEX II: ITINERARY	IV
6.3 ANNEX III: STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED	V
6.4 ANNEX IV: RESULTS OF THE AGREEMENT PERIOD 2006-2009	VIII
6.5 ANNEX V: RESULTS OF THE AGREEMENT PERIOD 2006-2009	XI
6.6 ANNEX VI: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR NOTU AFFILIATED UNIONS	XIV

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADC	Annual Delegates Conference
ATGWU	Amalgamated Transport and General Workers Union
CBA	Collective Bargaining Agreement
CGC	Central Governing Council
COFTU	Central Organisation of Free Trade Unions
DC	Delegates Conference
EAC	East African Community
EPZ	Economic Processing Zones
FUE	Federation of Uganda Employers
HIV/AIDS	Human Immuno Deficiency Virus/ Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ITUC	International Trade Union Confederation
LO/FTF Council	Danish Trade Union Council for International Development co-operation
LO-Norway	Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions
MGLSD	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development
NOTU	National Organisation of Trade Unions
NRM	National Resistance Movement
NUCCPTE	National Union of Clerical, Commercial, Professional and Technical Employees
NUCMW	National Union of Cooperative Movement Workers
NUEI	National Union of Educational Institutions
NUPAWU	National Union of Plantation and Agricultural Workers of Uganda
NSSF	National Social Security Fund
NUTE ACCAW	National Union of Theatrical, Entertainment , Art , Culture , Craft Manufacturers and Allied Workers
RBM	Results-based management
QDC	Quinquennial Delegates Conference
SECRETARIAT	The secretariat is composed of: Chairman General, Vice-Chairman General, Secretary General, Deputy Secretary General, Treasurer General, Deputy Treasurer General and Heads of Departments (Ex-Officio)
SLAREA	Strengthening of Labour Relations in East Africa
UBTAWU	Uganda Beverages, Tobacco and Allied Workers Union
UBCCCAWU	Uganda Building, Construction, Civil Engineering, Cement and Allied Workers Union
UCEU	Uganda Communication Employees Union
UEAWU	Uganda Electricity and Allied Workers Union
UFAWU	Uganda Fisheries and Allied Workers Union
UGAWU	Uganda Government and Allied Workers Union
UHAWU	Uganda Horticultural and Allied Workers Union
UHLAWU	Uganda Hospitality Leisure and Allied Workers Union
UMU	Uganda Media Union
UMMOGAWU	Uganda Mines, Metal, Oil, Gas and Allied Workers Union
UNATU	Uganda National Teachers Union
UNMU	Uganda Nurses and Midwives Union
UPEU	Uganda Public Employees Union
URWU	Uganda Railways Workers Union

Summary

The report presents the results of an evaluation of LO Norway's cooperation with the National Organisation of Trade Unions (NOTU) for the period 2006 to date. Since the support provided by LO Norway covers general budget support and is used to finance most of NOTU's core activities, the evaluation team has assessed NOTU's performance and development in general, with specific interest in how LO Norway has contributed both financially and in other ways.

During some of the period under evaluation, especially around 2008, the organisation suffered from serious organisational challenges and was at times almost dysfunctional. These challenges has not been assessed in detail in this report because LO Norway already knows the process well. LO Norway played a constructive role in assisting NOTU to overcome the problems in 2008 and 2009. Nonetheless, the team indicates the hypothetical possibility – not supported by evidence – that core budget support from LO Norway prior to the crisis may have enabled the negative development to proceed over a longer period than what might have been the case if NOTU had relied less on external funding.

The evaluation team finds that since 2009, NOTU has utilised external funding reasonably well in implementing activities according to both the agreement with LO Norway, and NOTU's constitutional mandate. It carries out a range of different roles towards the affiliate unions and society in general, the combination of which seems justifiable in its context. Efficiency and effectiveness are satisfactory, and the cooperation seems to produce a range of outputs and outcomes that, although not fully according to plans, nonetheless represent good value for money. The work of NOTU and the support from LO Norway are relevant, although the evaluation team suggest reconsideration of the balance between different activities. The activities are likely to produce positive impacts both internally among trade unions and for workers' rights in Uganda in general. There are several potentials for improvement, including more long-term strategic planning to enable more optimal use of resources for long-term goals rather than merely responding to urgent issues both internally and externally. There are challenges in terms of internal democracy and accountability, but a recent constitutional amendment is a great step in the right direction.

Two major challenges to NOTU, as to trade unions elsewhere, are internal divisions between and within unions, and a 'patronage system' allowing individuals to use their union mandate for individual gains even if at the cost of the constituencies. NOTU has not been able to overcome these problems, which are among the greatest and most difficult challenges ahead. NOTU is not to blame for current divisions between trade unions in Uganda, but it has not played an effective role in responding to the situation and supporting unity.

LO Norway has, by its commitment to funding, by providing highly qualified technical assistance, and by maintaining a good relation with NOTU even in times of trouble, served its purpose as a donor well, with one important exception. The agreements that form the basis for the collaboration are confusing and inconsistent and do not provide a good framework for planning and implementation, nor for evaluation. The evaluation team acknowledges that the partners have chosen to invest in other components of the collaboration – technical expertise and long-term, trust based relations – than the formalities, but the team points at some risks involved in such strategy.

Following recent constitutional amendments that will enable effective collection of union member fees there is the potential that in future, most of NOTU's core activities may be financed without external funding. Still, Nonetheless, in foreseeable future it will need – and it has the capacity to utilise – external funding for a whole range of services to members.

Conclusions and recommendations both to NOTU and to LO Norway are presented in chapter 5.

1 Introduction

The Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions (LO-Norway) collaborates with the National Organisation of Trade Unions in Uganda (NOTU) to strengthen the trade union movement in Uganda in general and the capacity of NOTU in particular. This evaluation covers the period since 2006. The main objectives are, according to the Terms of Reference (Annex I),

- To assess the results of the support provided to NOTU and the affiliated national unions by LO to strengthen the capacity of the NOTU.
- To assess the modality of cooperation with the NOTU and provide recommendations on areas for improvement, with special emphasis on:
 - Internal democracy, ownership and accountability
 - The role and strength of the NOTU in terms of defending workers and workers' rights
 - How Ugandan labour laws and legislation in general affect trade union activities
 - NOTU's value added in terms of securing unity between and within unions

In addition, the ToR asks for an assessment of a range of other aspects including relevance, efficiency, sustainability, and external impact. These issues, not part of the main objectives, are discussed in the report even though the scope of the evaluation does not allow for in-depth, evidence-based, conclusive assessments on all the issues.

The period under evaluation is covered by two agreements: one from 2006-2009 and one from 2010-2014. For reasons explained later (see chapter 1.2, page 3), the evaluation mainly responds to the first objective (assessing results) when discussing the first contract period. The other evaluation objectives beyond assessing results are responded to primarily with reference to the period 2009-2012.

The evaluation team consisted of Øyvind Eggen (team leader) from the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) and the independent consultant Hassan Raha from Dar es Salaam. LO's consultant for African partnerships, Robinson Sikazwe, took part in the data collection phase (the Uganda visit). Since Mr Sikazwe is contracted by LO Norway on long-term basis to follow up the cooperation with African partners including NOTU, some of his work is also under evaluation. His joining the team enhanced data gathering significantly and also improved learning outcomes for LO. He took part in most interviews, but left the venue every time the cooperation with LO Norway was discussed. After conclusion of the data collection phase, Mr Sikazwe did not take any part in the analysis and report writing except for a written comment to the draft report. The other two team members have no conflict of interest.¹

1.1 Methodology

The evaluation is based on qualitative methods, primarily involving document reviews, semi-structured interviews with key informants, direct observation of interactions within and between different levels of the organisation, focus group discussions, and a survey among the affiliated unions of NOTU. Interviews and discussions were held in Uganda during 18-26 June, 2012.

Documents were acquired from LO Norway, NOTU and all stakeholders met. A questionnaire (Annex VI) was sent about two weeks prior to interviews to all the 20 affiliates plus the Uganda National Teachers Union

¹The team leader is a personal friend of a previous employee of LO Norway who used to have responsibility for the cooperation with NOTU.

(disengaged from NOTU at the time). The aim was to compile a preliminary understanding of issues and to prepare interviews, and also to establish a direct relation and a channel for communication that did not go via the NOTU secretariat. 16 of the unions (76 %) responded. Some unions also responded to the explicit invitation in the survey to make direct contact with the evaluation team for further feedback. The responses have been used for preparation of interviews, for triangulation and as a basis for the qualitative analysis of key issues.

Stakeholders for interviews and group discussions were selected upon a combination of the evaluation team's requests and NOTU's suggestions. Since most of the issues in the ToR related to internal dynamics within NOTU, the affiliated unions of NOTU were seen as the most important stakeholders, but external stakeholders were also consulted. To enable both a non-biased selection – for instance, towards those most sympathetic to NOTU – and some degree of diversity, the team asked to meet the following unions: The two biggest, the one smallest, the most recently affiliated union, plus 1-2 suggested by NOTU. In practice, there was overlap between several of these. The team also met some unions whose leadership asked for separate meetings in response to the invitation in the survey questionnaire. In addition, representatives of almost all the other affiliates took part during different group discussions with the team, including discussions with the Central Governing Council. Stakeholders not associated to NOTU were selected by the team, in most cases upon suggestion by NOTU or LO Norway. See Annex III for a list of stakeholders consulted.

All the semi-structured interviews with unions involved the leadership (general secretary and/or the chair). Since the main focus was on the relationship between the unions and NOTU and not the internal dynamics in the respective unions, the team found this acceptable even though the presence of the leadership can be expected to influence on other union representatives. More informal talks were held with non-leaders in several of the unions, including women and youth, without the presence – in some cases also without the knowledge – of their leaders, in an attempt to identify diverging views. No significant divergence was found here except that non-leaders seemed to express slightly more critical views on both the unions and on NOTU, which is not surprising.

Within the NOTU structure, all levels of the organisation including all categories of staff and elected representatives were consulted without the presence of leadership. Focus group discussions were held with different categories of stakeholders such as youth, women, and staff members.

When analysing the data, most of the objectives and issues in the Terms of Reference were subject to a qualitative assessment based on the combination of respondents' inputs and the evaluators' own assessment based on their expertise and experience, supported by academic literature. Data were triangulated to the extent possible within the scope of the evaluation methodology.

1.1.1 Limitations

There are certain limitations to any evaluation of this category. The relatively short time available for data collection constitutes a limitation to how much data that is made available to the team. The methodology, designed for effective and efficient data collection, ensures a high degree of confidence that data actually collected and presented is correct. The limitation is on data not collected: Within the short time frame there is no guarantee against the risk of missing out important other data, which might have led to other conclusions if known to the team. Since a majority of the stakeholders consulted have a direct interest in a positive assessment, the team risks learning more about the positive than the negative aspects of the organisations under evaluation. The same is the case for most written documentation produced by the organisation, which typically has a bias towards the more positive views. Consulting with external

stakeholders and all different parties with conflicting interest compensate for this to some degree and the team therefore had particular attention to possible critical views.

The above are general limitations to any evaluation of this kind and do not reflect any suspicion of a particular bias in this particular evaluation. A specific challenge in this evaluation was that NOTU reporting of results were weak, something which partly reflects design flaws in the original agreements (see section 3.1.1), something which makes it difficult to know which results were planned at initial stages and hence what results it would be reasonable to expect. Moreover, some of the issues mentioned in the ToR, such as external impact, are impossible to respond to within the limited scope and methodology of the evaluation: Such issues are nonetheless discussed in this report even though it has not been possible to produce concluding evidence.

1.2 Background

The report is written on the assumption that the reader already has a general understanding of the context, including the challenges of trade unions in Africa and the general political situation in Uganda. This section only provides brief information on relatively recent developments in the economic, political and legislative context of specific relevance to workers and trade unions in Uganda, as well as a brief presentation of the structure of unions. For more information, the baseline study of 2010 (available from LO Norway) is recommended.

1.2.1 Economic, political and legislative context

Regionally, an important development with regard to trade unions is the revival of the East African Community (EAC) in 2000 by the three countries Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania and later (2007) joined by Burundi and Rwanda, with a combined population of 133 million people. The EAC has been engaged in economic, political and social reforms aiming at creating an enabling environment for the private sector, including liberalisation. These developments added to challenges posed by developments seen since the 1980s from a planned economy to a market economy with shift from public ownership to the private sector.

To market the region as an investment destination, the countries created Investment Centers and Economic Processing Zones (EPZ), and offered tax holidays, exemptions and free utility services. Public owned companies were sold to new investors on the expectation that foreign direct investments (FDI) would flow in. All kinds of companies with different management models and attitudes, spanning from serious investors to what can better be seen as plunderers, came in from all over the globe. The majority of them portrayed anti-union attitudes, and even direct hostility against unions are common among many employers – this is emphasised among the biggest problem for unions by many NOTU affiliated unions responding to the member survey for this evaluation.

The East African region was ill prepared, with archaic and obsolete labour laws in operation. The laws regulating employment standards were too many and old, some dated back to the colonial era. Other laws had undergone many amendments to the extent of being extremely difficult to comprehend. Dispute resolution procedures were lengthy and complex. Moreover, it was not appealing in a market economy for labour disputes to be resolved at a political level. The legislation did not permit free collective bargaining.

Since around 2000-2001, EAC engaged in a process of reviewing and reforming labour legislation and develop labour market policies compatible with the new investment environment. Harmonizing of social and labour policies and legislation was an important objective with a view of establishing a common market and allowing labour mobility within the member states. Areas of reform included employment law; labour relations law;

dispute prevention and settlement machinery; the legal structures and regulatory framework; occupational health and safety; and employment promotion. The reforms have opened, at least in legal terms, a new era in the industrial relations system. The government now has the responsibility of balancing the interests of both employers and workers. In order to do that the reforms sought to put in place policies and laws and regulatory structures meant to promote good governance, reduce poverty, create sound labour relations, increase labour productivity and create more jobs as well as securing rights for workers derived from the 8 ILO Core Conventions.

The labour law reforms benefitted a great deal from the ILO instruments and also ILO's legal support and expertise. Reforms coincided with the establishment of the project on Strengthening of Labour Relations in East Africa (SLAREA) that covered Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. Up to date, the labour law and policy reforms in Uganda include the following enacted Labour Laws and adopted policies:

- Workers' compensation Act of 2000
- The Employment Act No.6 of 2006
- Labour Unions Act No.7 of 2006
- The Labour Disputes (Settlement and Arbitration Machinery) Act No.8 of 2006
- The Occupational Safety and Health Act No.9 of 2006
- The Public Service (Negotiating and Consultation Machinery) Act of 2008
- The National Social Security Fund Act Cap 222
- The Equal Opportunity Commission Act of 2007
- The National Employment Policy of 2011

Uganda has ratified 30 ILO Conventions inclusive the eight (8) ILO Core or Fundamental Human Rights Conventions, as well as four out of six conventions that promote Tripartism and Social Dialogue, namely Conventions 87, 98, 144 and 154.

The Uganda Industrial Court has been formally revived and is expected in the very near future to be functional. The Court's main function is to settle all industrial disputes between Employers and Trade Unions that have failed to be resolved through arbitration and conciliation. A National Labour Advisory Board, established in the early 1960's to advise government on issues related to labour, employment, legislation and policy, is planned to be reactivated soon.

In conclusion, Uganda faces a lot of challenges for workers and unions as a consequence of economic restructuring and liberalisation, but after recent reforms Uganda has relatively good labour laws and policies. The challenge is in the effective implementation, which in most cases is still low. Enforcement authority and mechanisms are lacking and the government of Uganda is soft hearted towards foreign investors, to the detriment of Trade Unions and workers. A major obstacle is the absence of a strong and adequately funded Ministry of Labour. Labour issues are dealt with only by a Labour Office under the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, which is understaffed.

The labour unions in Uganda are, in general terms, relatively weak both when compared with earlier phases in Ugandan history and when compared with several other African countries today. This is partly explained by the liberalisation and a general weakening in both the number of formally employed (in particular in public sector), but it also reflects internal dynamics in the unions such as poor governance and poor leadership, some leaders' engagement in partisan politics against the interest of the unions, periods of poor management, and internal factions. One area where the union has a particular privilege compared to other countries is in appointing members of Parliament: Five specific seats are made available in Parliament for workers' representatives. Three (3) of the five MPs are appointed by NOTU, one by COFTU and one independent (female) by both.

2 The organisation

The National Organisation of Trade Unions (NOTU) was established by decree no. 29 of 1973 and its status is confirmed by later laws and regulations, currently the Labour Unions Act of 2006. It has 20 affiliate unions representing roughly 200,000 members². It is one of two national centres in Uganda, the other one is Central Organisation of Free Trade Unions (COFTU), formed in 2003 by splinter groups that broke away from NOTU in the same year. Although the two centres currently have the same legal status NOTU enjoys the legitimacy of being the oldest and most probably the most representative of the two³.

During the years 2006-2008, NOTU experienced major organisational challenges, including the illness of the secretary general and one director, internal conflict in the secretariat, and very poor management and performance in general. A process was initiated in 2008 and 2009 to address the challenges, coinciding with the election of new leadership by the congress in December 2008 and followed by recruitment of new staff members. As a result of these developments, the organisation has since 2009 been radically different from what it was before. The team believes that the contributions by LO Norway was an important and perhaps decisive factor behind the successful improvement and therefore that the mere existence of a relatively well functioning organisation may be seen as partly a result of LO Norway support (see section 3.1.1). This is, however, methodologically difficult to substantiate within the scope of the evaluation, partly because it is difficult to establish counterfactual scenarios.

The status before 2009 and the process towards improvement are well known to LO Norway, both due to its direct involvement in the process and through a forensic review that has produced extensive documentation. The evaluation team therefore found little rationale in studying the period prior to the organisational restructuring with reference to other objectives than to assess results of the period (section 3.2.1). In this evaluation's assessment of the organisation, main emphasis is therefore on the period since 2009. This is a short period and for most of the issues it is difficult to assess changes in the period. Instead, the team presents a general assessment of status of the organisation as of today, indicating recent developments identified and highlighting challenges to be addressed in the collaboration between NOTU and LO Norway.

2.1 The role of NOTU in defending workers and workers' rights

NOTU like all other national centres has a host of roles in defending workers and workers' rights, and each national centre balance the roles differently. The different roles of NOTU in Uganda can be systematised along different dimensions. In the following manner, different roles of NOTU are mentioned without an assessment of the effectiveness of these different roles⁴, followed by further discussion of some of the roles in later sections.

Political decision making: NOTU influences political decision-making on behalf of its members. A potentially important channel for implementing this role could be via the five workers MPs who are in parliament. The

² 200,125 according to the Financial Report 2011: however, the team does not believe that the figure is accurate as reliable membership data is not available from all affiliated unions.

³ None of the two centres are able to present accurate, verifiable aggregated figures of members. The other centre, the Central Organisation of Free Trade Unions, claim a much higher number of 540,000, but this is not substantiated and is not verifiable. Two thirds are said to be in informal sector, where it is very difficult to organise and verify membership. For the NOTU figure of 200,125 at least the main bulk is drawn from well-established, large unions where the figures can be seen as reliable at least as approximates.

⁴ The effectiveness is methodologically difficult to measure, most of all because comparison is difficult: A counterfactual scenario (with different or no role of NOTU) cannot be established and for several of the different roles comparison with other countries is not necessarily fair due to the specific political context of Uganda.

MPs, however, are not directly accountable to NOTU and to some degree they operate as autonomous even though they promote workers' rights. Instead, NOTU carries out its political role via several other channels, such as direct dialogue with government agencies – in particular the labour office of the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD), and via media.

Social dialogue: NOTU executes this role through participation in relevant forums both internationally and in Uganda. Generally, there is a good relationship between NOTU, the Federation of Uganda Employers (FUE) and the government; indeed, NOTU seems to have a better relationship with those other parties than with the other centre, COFTU. One of the main obstacles to improved social dialogue in Uganda is that the government is hampered by capacity constraints, in particular in the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD). The department handling Labour matters is understaffed and underfinanced and unable to cope with the volume of work, problems and challenges related to labour and employment issues, and the Labour Advisory Board is dormant.

Norm setting and regulations: NOTU has a role in influencing norms and standards in relation to issues like job security, minimum wages and occupational safety and health at the workplace. This is carried out by different forms of involvement with the government, including encouraging its role in the Uganda government to ratify adopted International (ILO) conventions and co-opt them into the national laws, via media and by direct and indirect engagement with employers and employers' representatives. On relatively recent example is the agreement on minimum wages in the horticulture sector.

Public opinion and wider society: NOTU works to strengthen the awareness and understanding of workers' and union issues, thereby the legitimacy of the unions and the future political influence of unions. This is done by direct engagement in the public debate and other communication strategies, making NOTU visible and relatively well known in the public. NOTU leaders feature regularly on community radio and television stations as well as commenting to national printed media. Here, they challenge anti-union pronouncements by government agencies and political parties, or comment on specific and general issues of national relevance to workers' rights such as legislation and policies, the state budget or other matters. Typically, they do this via radio and television statements including radio programs dedicated to workers' issues, and via press releases, press conferences or by direct contact with journalists. NOTU normally applies a critical approach with very clear statements regarding workers' or NOTU interests. With a few exceptions, NOTU has not taken on a particularly confrontational approach towards the government as such, but do not hesitate to target named or unnamed individuals in government bodies. In cases of clearly expressed conflicts such as strikes, NOTU normally applies a more dialogue-oriented approach. The team believes that in most cases this is a good strategy.

It is noteworthy that NOTU's engagement in the public is strictly limited to issues of workers' rights or organisational issues. NOTU does not voice a general political agenda as we have seen among trade unions in many other countries (including African countries), for instance in the form of criticism of or opposition to the government of the day. There are understandable reasons why NOTU has chosen non-engagement in such issues, but it also means a lost opportunity to influence on the general political development of Uganda in a critical phase.

Employment relationship and economic aspects: The affiliated unions of NOTU are the primary actors here, but NOTU has an important role in carrying out relevant capacities at leadership and workplace or enterprise level(s) of the affiliate unions by training trade union leaders on collective bargaining and negotiation skills.

Capacity building in unions: Helping the affiliates to develop and utilise their potentials for improved performance and productivity. This includes imparting of skills like recruitment and organizing, leadership,

economic literacy, research, collective bargaining, labour standards, income generation activities, HIV/AIDS and so on. NOTU also has a role in promoting gender and youth issues in the unions.

Democratisation: In addition to its constitutional function of being the democratic structure for unions at the national level, NOTU also supports democratic structures and functioning within the unions and, indirectly, at the work place. This is done both in strengthening the capacity of the unions on these matters and probably also by serving as a role model for the affiliate unions to emulate on matters of democracy.

Unification: As the national centre, NOTU can encourage the affiliate unions to forget about their past differences, work together and forge a strong unity in the labour movement, so as to enable them to have a common stand and louder voice on all issues related to workers and workers' rights. The actual role of NOTU is discussed in section 2.6.

2.2 'Politics' - the exploitation of union mandate for individual gains

Many types of institutions, especially in Africa, are affected by what is known by several names such as 'patronage system', 'big man syndrome', 'power politics', 'partisan politics' or simply 'politics'. It is sometimes also called 'political corruption' – as it may, but does not necessarily involve corruption in legal terms. It is known among presidents, government officials, parliamentarians and in NGOs, and trade unions are no exception. It cannot be identified by a clear-cut definition, but involves a whole range of strategies and mechanisms, which have in common the use of positions – often in non-constitutional and occasionally even illegal ways – to secure and strengthen one's own power position and/or to serve individual economic benefits. The strategies range from pure corruption according to legal definitions, to different types of manipulation where the 'big man' (or 'big woman') strategically invests in a cadre of loyal supporters who will support him (or, less often, her) during elections or appointments, expecting some individual benefits in return. Frequently, one can also see abuse of power in the form of harassments and threats to those who oppose or threaten the 'big man', or weakening the position of competitors by spreading rumours about them. While spreading rumours and manipulating information is not at all exclusive to 'big men', by their power positions and economic strength they can more effectively make their views widespread: For instance, small amounts of cash (sometimes termed 'fuel money') can be shared with key contacts when one meets to disseminate certain information, thereby 'fuelling' the spread of certain messages.

Common for all the strategies is that they happen at the cost of serving the constituencies – the same people who originally delegated power to the 'big man'. Even though it is highly unpopular, it is often effective, partly because the individual gains for all people involved (patron and client) are higher by participating than by avoiding taking part in the game. A problem is that it is often not easy to identify the strategies in an early phase – and when the system is first established, it is very difficult to get rid of it.

This is one of the most destructive elements in trade unions, as it hinders internal democracy, reduces the effectiveness of the unions in securing workers' rights, and very often leads to division. NOTU and the trade unions in Uganda has had their share of the problems, and many informants have told the evaluation team that the problem has increased over the last one or two decades – and a majority of the member survey respondents highlight this among the biggest challenge for unions in Uganda. The problem is aggravated by the political structure with specific seats in parliament allocated to MPs representing the unions. Ironically, some observers seem to be of the opinion that the allocation of seats to workers' MPs has increased the

internal challenges in unions and even lead to less influence for the trade unions in general⁵. The possibility of a seat in parliament – with corresponding political power and economic benefits – probably constitutes a temptation for union representatives who are more interested in their own individual gains than in serving the unions, and when people are in position, much of their strategies seem aiming at remaining in power rather than serving members.

One implication of the system in Uganda is that trade unions are linked to state power in very unfortunate ways, in particular if the MPs associate themselves (explicitly or not) to the ruling party. A trade union depends on autonomy from the state to maintain integrity and credibility and thus to be able to function well. But when some of the most trusted union representatives become part of the state power apparatus, they have a double role that undermines their autonomy from the state, creates confusion as to whether one represent the union or the state power, creates the possibility that those representatives can misuse state power and state resources (financial or non-financial) to further strengthen his position, and even use the position to harass or even threat opponents. Hence, the close association of union representatives to the state and state powers serves to strengthen the possibility of misusing power, rather than to give unions power and may undermine the unions by reducing their credibility as autonomous from the state.

The evaluation team notices that NOTU still suffers from this problem, but that this depends much on individuals. Overcoming the problem is the most important challenge for NOTU and unions and should be given the highest priority.

The team has no specific suggestions on how to avoid it, but it is clear that it involves several elements:

- During elections, it is important to elect candidates who demonstrate commitment to serving their members rather than those most actively involved in 'politics'. This is challenging as many will be tempted by the potential for individual gain from showing support to candidates against expectations to 'harvest' from his position if he is elected.
- During all decision making processes, the governing bodies must hold their leaders accountable, insisting that they always stick to their constitutions and always respond to their constituencies demand. Tendencies of leaders to give priority to their own personal interests must be stopped as early as possible.
- A culture of openness on the strategies and mechanisms involved may be crucial. After a leader has established himself as a 'big man', almost everybody will already know. Rather, it is important to be open in an early process, before things have settled. That would enable people to identify 'early warning signs' of this syndrome at a time when it is still possible to stop it. There is no easy way to achieve this, partly because communication about these issues would almost necessarily involve implicit or explicit criticism of powerful individuals. Moreover, for the individual – ordinary members or people aspiring towards leading positions – it may pay most to establish good relations with a 'big man' and thereby being part of the system rather than confronting it. A transformation towards a 'culture of openness' will therefore be difficult and will take time, and there is no easy recipe available. However, responsible leaders, co-leaders or brave individuals can probably accelerate the process by talking more explicitly about the challenges.

⁵John-Jean Barya, «Trade unions, liberalisation and politics in Uganda», i *Trade Unions and Party Politics: Labour movements in Africa*, red. Björn Beckman, Sakhela Buhlungu, og Lloyd Sachikonye (Cape Town: HSRC Press, 2010), <http://www.scribd.com/doc/26813858/Trade-Unions-and-Party-Politics-Labour-movements-in-Africa>.

2.3 Internal democracy, ownership and accountability

Internal democracy can be assessed along several different criteria. When looking at the formal democratic structures NOTU has followed all the procedures laid out by the constitution and its leadership is democratically elected by the congress. The secretariat and the Central Governing Council (CGC) meetings have been held according to the constitution. Two standing committees, The Finance, Administration and General Purpose Committee and the Disciplinary Committee have been dormant for no justifiable reason(s).

Generally speaking, a similar note can be said for most of the NOTU affiliates. All are reported to have held congresses as required by their constitutions during the last couple of years. This is a great achievement as compared to previous years: Some affiliates were reported not to have had their QDCs for about a decade until recently, allowing leaders to disregard their constitutions and prolong their mandates. Other aspects of the internal democracy of the affiliate unions have not been assessed systematically, but visits to some unions and consultations with stakeholders suggest that the formal democratic structures are generally functional in most unions, at least the bigger ones. NOTU and several affiliates have even gone some important steps beyond what is required by their constitutions, for instance in the issue of women and youth positions: Women and Youth committees have been established and backed by CGC resolutions.

When looking at the effective response to members' concerns, NOTU's performance is more variable. One example is the constitutional amendment. The major challenge for a long time was not that the constitution was not followed, but that it was outdated. Proposals to amend the constitution to cater for women representation were heard long ago, but the amendments were pending for about a decade even though NOTU has held regular meetings in all relevant forums and levels, which would have made it possible to discuss the issues long ago. Later, other issues have been presented, including youth representation and the issue of proportional representation of unions (depending on membership). However, in spite of agreement, in principle, on some amendments (such as women representation) and the urgent need for clarification of other matters (such as proportional representation) the matter was not taken forward to an extraordinary delegates conference until July, 2012. The slow process towards amendment hampered the organisation for a long time, and led to the Uganda National Teachers Union (UNATU) suspending its membership in NOTU in 2010. More recently, four other unions threatened to temporarily suspend their activities and payment of membership fees awaiting a constitutional amendment.⁶ The July conference approved the proposed challenges and the constitution can now be seen as up-to-date. The matter with UNATU and the other unions seems solved, presumably bringing NOTU back on track and able to focus on other issues. But the lesson remains that, although NOTU was made aware of members' concerns long time ago, it was unnecessarily late in responding to key organisational issues, under several different leaders (including the current). This casts doubt over the ability of NOTU to respond adequately to members' interests and to respond effectively to key democratic challenges.

The NOTU leadership has done its best to be transparent to the affiliate unions, in sharing reports on projects, audited accounts, financial statements together with oral sharing of valuable information with its affiliates, in particular through the central governing council. But NOTU's good will gesture is not being reciprocated by many of the unions under it. Many have virtually closed all possible avenues to ensure transparency. As a result of that attitude, financial report, the union(s) membership data and total revenue collection through union dues cannot be relied upon. It goes without saying that these unions' reluctance to transparency is a major obstacle and hinders a good, democratic, transparent relationship. The lack of transparency – not on behalf of NOTU but in many of its affiliated unions, is a serious problem haunting the affiliates of NOTU to date.

⁶ National Union of Plantation and Agriculture, Uganda Electricity and Allied Workers' Union, Uganda Public Employees' Union, and Uganda Mines, Metal, Oil, Gass and Allied Workers' Union.

The affiliate unions have demonstrated ownership through active participation in NOTU meetings, seminars and activities, and many demonstrate a genuine interest in NOTU's development. In the recent past, payment of subscriptions from the unions to the national centre has slightly improved; and this is seen as an indicator of ownership. The fact that there is openly expressed discomfort and discontent on issues of governance, like constitutional amendment and other reforms, is an indication that unions look at NOTU as 'their' structure and do not mainly relate to NOTU as a service provider. Responses to the member survey confirmed that practically all unions show strong interest in the further development of NOTU. They also express their interest in a more active role of NOTU in support the respective member unions both by providing training and services, and by taking an active role when the respective unions are involved in conflicts with employers. The suspension of membership by some unions does not change this: both UNATU and the four unions who recently temporarily suspended their membership strongly expressed their interest in a solution and insisted that their decision to suspend membership should not be seen as disengagement, but rather as a strong message of interest in change.

In terms of accountability, the NOTU leadership and secretariat is formally accountable to its affiliate unions. This is ensured via constitutional meetings especially in the Quinquennial Delegates Conference (QDC), Annual Delegates Conference (ADC) and Extra Ordinary Delegates Conferences, as well as the CGC meetings. The CGC meets many more times than the rest of the constitutional organs of NOTU and is therefore the most important forum for accountability in the day-to-day operations.

For representatives other than the leadership and secretariat, such as the Members of Parliament and representatives in some important boards and committees, there are few effective forums or constitutional guidelines to ensure accountability. They are elected by extra ordinary delegates' conferences of NOTU (and similarly, for COFTU) under the relevant articles of the constitutions of the respective national centres and thereby given the mandate to represent unions and workers in some of the most important and powerful positions in Uganda. But after being elected, these officials are then left loose to do what pleases them until the next elections, at least formally. Up until recently there were no clear-cut formal requirements that the MPs should consult with and report back with their constituency during their tenure of office. This was arranged for with the recent constitutional amendment and its implementation requires immediate attention.

The actual response and accountability of leaders and other representatives vary. Historically, the leadership has been slow in responding effectively to issues raised by members, such as the constitutional amendments, which has now been solved. Another and more serious issue is that some leaders and representatives can act in ways that seem more to reflect personal agendas than actions on behalf of unions. Key individuals seem not obliged to listen and consult with the affiliates before taking initiatives. They do not show respect for all constitutional requirements and the formal decision making mechanisms but are not held effectively accountable for what they are doing (or not doing) in the name of unions and workers. The MPs, in particular, are seldom taken to task to account for their service and performance in Parliament. One recent example is the Magazine "Workers' Voice – the Heartbeat of the Working People". The title suggests that this is a trade union publication and one could expect that it brought forward the voices of workers. In fact, it is not. The magazine is an individual initiative by two key persons supposed to be representatives of trade unions, but the magazine in general is more to be seen as a private business (as many advertisements probably provide a fairly good income) and has little or nothing to do with unions and workers. In fact, it shows great disrespect to the unions and to workers, simply by almost ignoring them in a magazine with that title.

The evaluation team is unable to comment or ascertain internal democracy and accountability within the affiliated unions due to the fact that the time given was not adequate enough to accomplish such a task.

2.4 Sustainability

Sustainability here refers to whether NOTU will be able to continue its work in the event of the withdrawal of project support from LO-Norway and in the absence of comparable amounts of funding from other cooperating partners abroad. The existence of NOTU is secured and not an issue here; sustainability here refers to a minimum degree of effective representation of its members at national level and some service delivery to members is not to be taken for granted.

It is clear that with the current financial status and financial flows, NOTU is not sustainable at anything close to its current level of functioning if donor funds are withdrawn. Financial backing from LO-Norway is therefore important. This is a point that is made quite emphatically in the audited financial report. NOTU depends on LO Norway for more than 50 per cent of its turnover (amounting to Ushs 713 mill in 2011) and about 35 per cent from other donors and has incurred a significant debt with total liabilities well exceeding total assets⁷. Subscription fees from affiliated unions in the last two financial years have been around 8 per cent. In spite of improvement in grant and non-grant income in recent years, the organisation is still accumulating debt and NOTU would definitely be unable to meet its financial obligations for some time to come. Theoretically, NOTU could have maintained some basic operations with a reduced staff without the support of LO Norway, but would not be able to provide much services to members and would probably not manage its debt. Hence, based on the *current* financial status and flows, prospects for financial sustainability are poor.

There are, however, potentials for improvement within short time for the following reasons. The labour union check-off regulation passed in 2011 provides a legal framework for deducting union dues at source. It states that where payments are made to a labour union, 10% of the total amount received should be paid to the national centre (NOTU or COFTU) by the 10th day of the next month. Many unions already practice check-off for their own members, but without direct transfer to NOTU, and up until the constitutional amendments in July 2012 the constitution did not provide for this. According to the audit report 2011, check-off 'at source' would enable NOTU to collect an estimated 208 million UGS per year or about 28 per cent of current expenditures (excluding the Uganda National Teachers Union). A more optimistic estimate (including UNATU) from the secretariat suggest about three times this amount. The team believes that the latter estimate is too optimistic (after all, NOTU does not even have reliable data on membership) but they indicate a potential income via the check-off system that makes it possible to cover most of current expenditures and finance not only basic costs but a reasonable degree of activities serving the members, and even while serving debt. Hence, when the system for check-off 'at source' is in place, it is justified to state that there is the potential for financial sustainability. There are also plans for a commercial radio station to contribute monthly revenue of 5 million Ushs.

In terms of international networks, NOTU is well positioned. It is affiliated to the following international organisations: East African Trade Union Confederation (EATUC), ITUC Africa, ITUC Brussels, Organisation of African Trade Union Unity (OATUU), African Labour Research Network, and Trade Unions Federation of Eastern Africa (TUFEA). In addition, NOTU cooperates with a number of development partners, such as TUC London, ILO through IPEC-Child Labour project and ILO conferences, FES, ACILS-Solidarity center, LO-FTF Danish Council and ITUC-Africa. NOTU has also maintained bilateral relations with All China Federation of Trade Unions (ACFTU), and has received equipment support from their counter parts in China. It is not likely that any of these partners are ready to take over the role of LO Norway in providing substantial amounts of core budget funding. But as noted in section 3.2.2, support from LO Norway has likely led to improved

⁷ Total liabilities exceed assets by Ush 422 mill or about 56 per cent of annual turnover, according to financial report 2011.

capacity of NOTU to manage funds from other donors, thus, the capacity to utilise funds from donors have improved, something that supports sustainability provided such funds are made available in future.

In conclusion, sustainability of NOTUs activities when support from LO Norway ends depends fully on the establishment of an effective system for check-off at source with 10 per cent directly transferred to NOTU. If this is not in place, sustainability is doubtful.

2.5 Efficiency

Efficiency here means to what extent the least costly resources possible have been used in order to achieve the desired results.⁸ Efficiency has several dimensions including the internal management in the organisation, whether the strategic approaches are good, and the mode of cooperation between NOTU and its donors. Efficiency can be considered at different levels. The team finds it useful to distinguish between management in NOTU, and governance of NOTU.

Since 2009, NOTU as an organisation has been efficient in its general management, administration and finance. The immediate results obtained have justified the costs incurred and resources used both in terms of human, financial and material resources. The general cost structure is justified, and according to consultation with independent stakeholders the costs are generally not above market costs or the costs in comparable sectors (such as NGOs). The same can be said for the use of per diem - the most common is what is termed 'transport refund' at UGS 20,000, which is in the upper range of normal actual costs for transport, but beyond normal per diems in comparable sectors. In spite of strict guidelines, reportedly, semi-formal tenders have been applied for larger procurements. Staff qualifications and productivity has not been systematically assessed for this evaluation, but the evaluation team is of the impression that staff is well qualified, work hard and produce well. Recent years' developments towards a clearer division of labour between the employed technical staff and the democratically elected union representatives (primarily the secretariat) are also expected to improve staff productivity. NOTU has established and maintained effective working internal and organisational systems through the secretariat and CGC. In other words, there is reason to state that the support to NOTU represents value for money, when measuring actual resource inputs versus outputs.

The evaluation team is, however, not convinced that *governance* allows the optimal utilisation of resources with regard to long-term production of results. This would require long-term strategic planning so that resources are used to produce those outputs that most effectively serve for desired outcomes over time. Most of NOTU's work has not been subject to long-term, strategic consideration of which objectives to pursue at what time, and how to find the most efficient pathways to achieve those objectives, followed by consistent efforts to actually succeed. The leadership seems to have taken on tasks based on external or internal pressures as they arise instead of making priorities based on long-term strategic considerations.

A comprehensive strategy was developed as late as in 2011, but this does not seem to have changed this problem. One can suspect that the strategy is more of a paper exercise than really a tool for strategic government: it was not referred to by any stakeholders unless first mentioned by the evaluation team, and even key informants did not have it ready by hand. Moreover, the strategy is very wide in its scope, something that makes it less suitable for prioritising. It can easier be understood as a wish list than actual priorities. In any case, there is an urgent need to address the issue of harmonising the agreement with LO Norway and the strategy, because LO Norway's funds so much of the core activities of NOTU.

⁸ Cf. OECD DAC Criteria for evaluating development assistance.

2.6 The role of NOTU in securing unity between and within unions

Trade unions in Uganda have been severely disturbed by internal divisions for almost a decade, and the lack of unity and internal disagreements among leaders in the Uganda labour movement remains a major concern to NOTU and its sympathizers both at home and abroad. The most dramatic development in this regard is the establishment of the competing national centre, COFTU, a major hindrance to unity between and even within unions. Much of the later challenges at sector and work place level can also be traced back to this event (but this is not to say that there would not have been internal factions and partisan politics without COFTU). Splinters are likely to further complicate internal governance within the affiliated unions and at the national center.

The developments started before the period under evaluation and the first years will not be analysed here except that the evaluation team has noted that all evidence point towards the conclusion that this division cannot be blamed on NOTU but on individuals who left NOTU to form COFTU. The move can hardly be understood in other ways than as an attempt by individuals to serve their own political interests. It is worth noting that COFTU and NOTU do not have significantly different objectives or approaches to improving workers' rights, for instance in terms of which attitudes they have taken towards to the government (including the balance between a more 'confrontational' and a more 'collaborative' approach), their priority to different sectors, or other issues.

In its communication, NOTU has generally emphasised unity at all levels by encouraging the affiliate unions to forget about their past differences, work together and forge a strong unity in the labour movement, to enable them to have a common stand and louder voice on all issues related to workers and workers' rights. The current NOTU leadership has tried keeping the unions together. But its role in this area seems less successful than many other roles, something which is also confirmed by the member survey: this is one of the areas where the members are least satisfied with NOTU.

In terms of collaboration with COFTU, NOTU has not been particularly active in creating a better working relationship. There is indeed coordination and collaboration, but not very extensive. Attempts to form duplicate unions at the workplace have been met by strong resistance from NOTU. It is worth noting that the only true attempt to establish a permanent platform for good collaboration came from abroad, and not from NOTU or COFTU: On the initiative of ILO and COTU-Kenya an initiative was taken to develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the two parties. After a period of negotiation and preliminary agreement, the NOTU chairman did not sign the MoU. Evidence indicates that this was not necessarily due to lack of willingness of NOTU to enter into a good collaboration and to sign the MoU, but due to a combination of some parts of the MoU (including the establishment of a confederation) and poor governance within NOTU regarding the whole process.

It demonstrates that even though NOTU is not to blame for the fact that there are two centres, NOTU has not been in the forefront in dealing with the situation; rather the opposite, it has been a bit reluctant. Given the history, it is easy to understand that there is still reluctance in NOTU to accept the claim by COFTU to be accepted as an alternative national centre with equal status. But even if understandable, it is not a good approach. There is little doubt that COFTU has come to stay and will remain an alternative national centre for the foreseeable future. COFTU's existence is secured by the Labour Unions Act of 2006, which gives the two centres equal legal status.

Within the NOTU affiliated unions, the agreement with LO Norway has stated merger of unions as one indicator and some unions have indicated interest in merger, but to date the merger process has remained stagnant. The evaluation team agrees that there is the potential to merge some unions and that it would

have been beneficial. Still, the team believes that the possibilities of mergers are remote, as long as not both or all the unions to be merged really want such development, and even if all parties agree it may be very demanding and will have high organisational costs both in the affiliated unions and for NOTU. As mentioned by a stakeholder during interview: “This process cannot be rushed, since mergers are not meant to unify papers but people”.

On the other hand, there are reasons to believe (confirmed by several stakeholders) that sooner or later circumstances in Uganda will dictate that several existing unions will have to merge or perish. It should also be noted that much of the reluctance to merge is associated with the leadership’s individual interests and fear of the unknown future, obstacles that are not necessarily legitimate. Nonetheless, for the moment there are so many other important tasks ahead for the organisation that the costs of such mergers are not justified. The objective should therefore be re-considered. Instead, NOTU should be ready to support in processes of merger if requested by both or all unions to merge, and otherwise does not need to push merger.

A more urgent issue is, however, to ensure that NOTU does not encourage small unions. There is no effective strategic thinking about allocation of NOTU services to affiliates (such as training) based on their membership. In several cases it is observed that key positions in NOTU or in various boards have been given to representatives of smaller unions. This practice constitutes direct and quite effective incentives for the unions to remain small, due to the simple logic that it pays to be small: The members of a small union may have access to NOTU services and there may be more opportunities to be appointed in important positions in a small union than in a bigger one. Here, NOTU has a counterproductive role that directly undermines the objective of facilitating mergers.

2.7 Strength and weaknesses of NOTU

To supplement the findings above, the evaluation team also undertook a strength and weaknesses analysis as summarized below.

Strengths:

- Good management
- Good service delivery to members
- Skilled and responsive secretary general
- Trained and devoted staff in a relatively good (and improving) internal division of labour and responsibilities
- Many components of the internal democracy are good
- Good public image
- Good relations with the government and employers, with the capacity to engage in social dialogue
- Good gender and youth policies and many instances of corresponding good practices

Weaknesses:

- Weakness in governance: late response to important issues, some key individuals’ limited accountability towards members
- Low numerical strength in terms of membership
- Low financial income from members – highly donor dependent
- Factions amongst affiliate unions
- Two national centres, and NOTU has not responded constructively to the situation
- Lack of transparency on behalf of the affiliated unions towards NOTU.
- MPs are not held accountable and their positions not utilised strategically by NOTU

3 Results of the collaboration

This section presents and discusses results in terms of the more easily identifiable, tangible (if not always measurable) outcomes and possible impacts of the activities under the collaboration between NOTU and LO Norway. Since the main objectives for the collaboration is institutional development and LO Norway provides most of the funding to NOTU (53 % of all costs and 74 % of staff and administration expenses in 2011), most of the results of the organisation's work (except those financed through earmarked contributions by other donors) can be linked to the collaboration. In line with common norms for evaluations, results are hereby discussed with primary reference to the objectives stated in the agreements, meaning that emphasis is on the planned results, except for the final discussion on impact, which by definition includes both planned and unplanned effects.

Outputs (immediate results) of the collaboration are relatively easy to identify as they are in most cases reported (or at least they should have been reported), and these are not discussed here. Due to the combination of little time available and a ToR very wide in scope, the team decided in consultation with LO Norway, not to give priority to verifying the accuracy of NOTU reporting on results.⁹ Outcomes (likely short and medium term effects) have been identified during document review and stakeholder interviews. In most cases it is methodologically difficult to conclude on attribution (whether the observed outcomes actually is a result of NOTU and LO Norway inputs) but for most of the outcomes it is reasonable to assume that the outcomes are partly – but seldom fully – the result of the collaboration. In terms of impact (planned and unplanned, positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects), it is not possible to conclude on attribution within the scope and methodology of this evaluation, because most of the observed changes can be explained by many different external factors in addition to NOTUs work¹⁰. The team nonetheless discusses some possible impacts and NOTU's contributions, but without conclusive statements.

The distinction between outcomes and impact is not always clear-cut and partly depends on definition. The agreements between NOTU and LO Norway do not reflect any clear understanding of the difference and this report is therefore not organised according to the agreements but to the evaluation team's own definitions of outcomes versus impact. Generally speaking, organisational developments are most often considered as outcomes, while changes that affect long term improvements of workers' rights in Uganda in general are seen as impact.

3.1.1 Weak framework for reporting

For the purpose of an evaluation, a major weakness in the collaboration is that NOTUs reporting on result at higher (outcome and impact level) is very weak. The annual reports list a number of outputs at a level of detail that is not necessary, with correspondingly less emphasis on outcomes, which are more sporadically reported and often not along the agreed indicators. This is not to say that outcomes and impact are not achieved, but the reporting from NOTU makes it very difficult – and expensive – to assess results in an evaluation.

The weakness in reporting reflects a problem with the overall planning, monitoring and evaluation framework that can be traced back to the framework provided by LO Norway. The agreements consist of three parts: a general contract, a presentation of goal and objectives according to a logical framework, and a

⁹ This is partly justified by the fact that the main direct beneficiaries of most of NOTU's activities are the affiliated unions, who have been extensively consulted during the evaluation. The evaluation team believes that they would have been informed if there had been reasons to suspect misreporting.

¹⁰ An impact evaluation would require much more resources and a radically different approach, and even if so there is probably no methodology available to produce conclusive statements on impact.

separate document called 'needs and priorities'. The three parts seem to have been developed independently of each other. The latter two parts both involve some specification of objectives and in practice they constitute a double set of objectives and indicators that are overlapping, but not always internally consistent.¹¹ Combined, the two sections seem to constitute a broader range of objectives and results instead of what is manageable within sound management for a small organisation like NOTU. In other words, even if NOTU had managed the collaboration optimally, it would probably not have been able to satisfy all the expectations. On top of all this comes the Norad reporting format, a format that does not correspond well with the agreements with LO Norway but has been used in some reports.

There are also some aspects of the basic logic behind the agreements that makes it difficult to make NOTU accountable for results. Where the 2006-2009 agreement aims at improvements in NOTU, the 2010-2014 agreement states as its main goal a number of changes expected to occur in the affiliated unions ('the unions are strong, united, democratic, financially viable, with skilled shop stewards capable of representing their members'). Also at outcome and output level there are several references to changes in internal affairs of the unions. But NOTU has very little influence over most aspects of the internal affairs of the unions, and most unions would probably see it as outside of NOTU's mandate to interfere in those aspects of the union. The constitution only allows NOTU a limited role: 'to assist such unions to find practical solutions to problems of organisation and administration'. NOTU does indeed contribute in the form of training and some other services to members, but improvements in the unions depend on much more than training. Hence, NOTU is not in a position – neither in terms of its constitution, its capacity nor its mandate as viewed by the affiliate unions – to influence on internal affairs of the unions beyond some limited training and services. NOTU does not even have access to basic data on financial management and organisational issues, and this is not likely to change within the period. Hence, the current agreement with LO Norway asks for results within a sphere that is outside NOTU's constitutional mandate, and it is only possible to achieve if NOTU takes on a role that we may expect is not natural and perhaps not wanted by most affiliate members.

Moreover, the current agreement only to a limited degree mentions NOTU's working for improvement of human and workers' rights in general, which is the most important function of NOTU, and something which would have been natural for a donor that supports the core budget.

In effect, the current framework makes it almost impossible for NOTU to actually report success according to the agreed objectives, even if NOTU would have performed optimally according to its own mandate. This is a responsibility of LO Norway, which presumably was most influential in developing the agreement. Surely, there is substantial improvement both in the most recent agreement and in recent years' reporting in general. Still, there is ample room for improvement, and the evaluation team believes that due to the type of organisation and the mandate of NOTU it is quite easy to actually satisfy common standards in development cooperation with regard to results based management (RBM), if this is given priority.

3.2 Outcomes from the collaboration

This discussion on outcomes puts primary emphasis on planned results, e.g. those that are already agreed in the agreements with LO Norway. NOTU has indeed carried out activities and has seen achievements that were not planned and prior agreed with LO Norway. Some are reported in the annual reports, but there are

¹¹ In the 2010-2014 contract there are two formulations of the overall goal (impact) with potentially important differences in substantial meaning - one referring the trade union movements, in which NOTU is naturally the key actor, and one to 'the unions', over which NOTU has limited influence. There is also a double set of indicators, one in the narrative text just below the goal statement, one in the corresponding logframe. Similar inconsistencies are found on lower levels of objectives throughout the two agreements.

likely other results that are not reported. Even if those unplanned results may be substantial and positive, they are in most cases not taken into account in this evaluation, as common norms for evaluations suggest that the evaluation only considers the planned and prior agreed results at this level¹².

3.2.1 *The 2006-2009 period*

The assessment of outcomes for this period is based on the indicators in section 9 “indicators for evaluation” in the 2006-2009 agreement although those indicators are not fully consistent with other parts of the agreement. Only those indicators in section 9 that are regarded as outcomes (primarily within organisational development) are mentioned in this section; impacts are discussed separately.

A systematic overview is found in Annex IV. It shows that the main goal for the period – a financially viable, effective, democratic and influential trade union organisation – was not achieved. This is mainly due to internal disturbances in the organisation in the period 2006-2008, including weak leadership and poor management. Since LO Norway was informed about the situation in 2008, they engaged in different ways, including a forensic investigation carried out by Ernst and Young, and direct involvement by LO Norway including training in leadership and management. The response from LO Norway after being informed is considered appropriate and effective by key stakeholders both within and outside NOTU. The evaluation team believes that this is one key factor behind the fact that NOTU managed to get on a better track – but only in combination with the most important event, namely the election of new leadership in late 2008, as well as the recruitment of new staff members and lots of efforts by the secretary general and the staff to improve management. In the latter part of the agreement period, therefore, the organisation was on a very good track.

On the objective of increased membership the available figures indicate about 14 per cent increase between 2005 and 2009 (from 146,427 to 167,409) against a target of 40 per cent.¹³ However, the accuracy of the figures is doubtful: It is not always clear how membership has been calculated in unions (the frequent use of very round figures suggests they are just estimates), and different estimates of membership are internally consistent. Annual reporting typically account only for new recruited members, not changes in total membership. There is probably no way to reconstruct reliable and comparable data from 2005-2009. The evaluators can therefore not conclude on results in terms of increased membership.

Similarly, for the indicators ‘effective structures at all levels’, ‘improved capacity all-round’, and ‘increase in women members as well as greater participation of women at all levels’, there is no available data to assess results. In particular, baseline data is missing. For all these objectives, the evaluation team believes that there have been some substantial improvements, even though far from satisfactory, and the team notes in particular that there were clear positive trends at the end of the period. But there is no way to verify the overall achievement of these results during the period.

The indicator ‘increased income from members/affiliate’ dues’ have been achieved if one compares the first and the last year of the agreement – but not if looking at the years in between, where income was poor. On the objective of ‘manageable debt’ the results are negative as debt was accumulated during the period. In terms of financial management in general, there is little doubt that there was an improvement, in particular the last year.

¹² If NOTU and LO Norway want to assess outcomes that are not planned and not reported, this is more efficiently done by the partner organisation itself than an external evaluation team.

¹³ Based on Annual Reports.

In conclusion, available data does not enable the team to give a clear conclusion on results for the period 2006-2009. However, all available evidence point towards a situation in 2009 that was substantially better than what one could expect only a year or two earlier, and for several indicators it was probably better than in 2006. On that background, the team can conclude that the overall outcomes for the period as a whole range from weak to moderately positive, while the achievements during the last two years of the period seem quite impressive.

3.2.2 *Status for the 2010-2014 period*

Less than half way in the current agreement period it is too early to give any conclusive assessment of results. A preliminary overview is presented in Annex V. For all the planned outcomes, the prospects are generally positive at a general level, but not at indicator level. For instance, on the planned outcome of 'strong, united, democratic, financially viable unions with skilled shop stewards capable of representing the members' there are many positive developments, but on the first indicator – merging of affiliated unions leaving a total of 17 unions – the results are negative, since now there are 21 unions. A similar note can be made for many of the planned outputs: a generally positive development, but poor achievement of results.

This can be explained by at least two factors. First, there are design flaws in the original formulation of objectives and indicators. The number of affiliate unions is a good example: Organising more sectors – a positive development – would naturally lead to more affiliated unions, translating to negative results according to indicators. Second, NOTU has generally ignored the indicators in its planning, implementation and reporting. Indeed, it generally does not even report along all the agreed indicators, but report instead a range of other outputs and outcomes within each objective¹⁴. The indicators have, thus, already lost their function in guiding day-to-day operations. Neither are they suitable for an evaluation.

The evaluation team has nonetheless seen evidence of general improvements along several objectives and some of the indicators. This includes organising and recruitment (in existing and new workplaces), women's representation, more democratic unions, and capacities developed at leadership and enterprise/workplace level. At this moment in time – half way in the period – this is quite satisfactory. The fact that all unions have held their congresses according to constitutional requirement – something that some of the unions hadn't had for about a decade – is a good indication of improvements at union level.

There is evidence that support from LO Norway has significantly improved the capacity of NOTU to manage its operation and finances since 2009. At the union level, support from LO Norway has been used to offer training and other services to unions in areas such as governance, leadership, recruitment (and hence better financial income) and income generation for members (such as savings and credit), all of which is suited to improve the prospects for sustainability of the unions. Another more indirect contribution is that by lifting union and trade issues in the public and demonstrating some improvements in workers' rights NOTU has demonstrated the value of unions, which can make it easier for the unions to recruit and hence to increase future income. But the actual effects are less clear and difficult to measure.

NOTU has also maintained and probably improved its relation to its affiliated unions during the period, especially with the constitutional amendments paving the way for the re-activation of membership for Uganda National Teachers' Union. All unions consulted acknowledged that under the present leadership, service delivery is commendable and that it has improved, and the member survey confirmed that almost all are satisfied with NOTU services, and there seems to be much demand for more services. The national centre

¹⁴ The 2010 report is based on an adaptation of the Norad format, while the 2011 report is based on the logic of the agreement with LO Norway, but with only some indicators used for reporting.

has been able to service the needs of its affiliates even in a period of economic constraints and where the organisation was burdened with heavy organisational and managerial challenges.

Other indications of organisational improvement are the inclusion of women and youth in NOTU structures and organs, and the reported (not verified) increased capacity of organizers, negotiators, researchers, paralegal support cadre, women and youth leaders, and trade union leaders in general. It is reasonable to attribute significant components of this capacity improvement to services by NOTU in the form of capacity building, recruitment and organizing, education and training, but there is still a long way to go. The member survey revealed that only about half of the affiliated unions had gender policies (and several of the policies had been developed before the period under evaluation) and a majority claimed having an active approach to women representation¹⁵. Less than one third had youth policy in place.

Although not emphasised in the agreement, the evaluators also note good performance in terms of NOTUs external relations during the period. NOTU has maintained good relations with the government and has retained its representation in important organs including the Parliament, the Immigration Board, the National Social Security Fund and the Vocational Institutions Board. NOTU has also appointed representatives to the Labour Advisory board and the Industrial Court that is due to operate soon. NOTU, its affiliates and other partners seem to have improved their image, attitude and performance towards the government, employer's organisation and the public at large.

In conclusion, NOTU has performed well in the period. But due to the design of the cooperation, it will not be able to report satisfactorily on all of the indicators of the 2010-2014 agreement level unless the agreement is revised and reporting improved. One response to this problem could be to disregard indicators whatsoever, trusting that NOTU will anyway make good use of the funding towards the general objectives of the agreement. This is, however, not likely to be accepted by the back donor, NORAD. The other response is to revise the indicators so that they truly reflect achievement of objectives and are also measurable. In respect for the democracy of NOTU, this should be based on the Strategic Plan for 2011-2015.

3.3 Possible impact

Due to the natural time lag between an input and the impact, it is not natural to distinguish between the two agreement periods in a discussion of impact. Both periods are discussed here. A baseline study was made in 2010, establishing some data that can be used in measuring outcome and impact of the 2010-2014 agreement at a later stage. At this moment it is too early to see significant changes as a result of the cooperation and the report is therefore not used as a direct reference. The scope and methodology of this evaluation does not allow for a substantial engagement with the question of attribution: whether the changes in the period can be attributed to the work of NOTU. Instead, the report only refers to changes observed and mentions NOTU's contribution to each impact area without any assessment as to which extent NOTU actually was a key factor behind the 'cause' of the changes.

It is worthwhile to mention that the overall long-term goal (anticipated impact) is quite different and inconsistent in the two agreements: the 2006-2009 agreement refers to changes in NOTU while the 2010-2014 agreement refers to changes in the affiliated unions. None refers to changes in actual labour relations

¹⁵ The reason for giving very approximate indications instead of accurate statistics is that some respondents are unclear or there is a matter of definition of gender policy, hence accurate figures would be misleading. The baseline report indicates gender composition in leadership and key positions of NOTU as well as in affiliate unions. This is a good indicator, but it is too early to assess change since the baseline of 2010 as in most cases elections have not been held since then.

and workers' rights, which would be most natural given the tradition to state a general development objective (rather than organisation specific objectives) as anticipated impact, to justify donor (Norad) support to NOTU. To be sure, the 2006-2009 agreement in particular, and to less extent the 2010-2014 agreement¹⁶ have some objectives and indicators regarding improved workers' rights, but mostly at a subordinate level. The evaluation team takes as granted that the ultimate goal is to improve workers' rights and workers' interests, not to build unions, and therefore discusses impact with primary emphasis on developments that point towards improvement of workers' rights and improvements at the work place in Uganda.

With regard to organisational development, it is already mentioned (section 2 and above) that there is a possibility that the mere existence of NOTU as we know, it can be seen as an impact of the NOTU/LO Norway collaboration. This is a plausible hypothesis given the organisational challenges of NOTU during the early years of the period, which might have led to disastrous effects on the organisation if LO Norway had not continued to provide core grants and also engaged heavily in organisational improvements.¹⁷ However, to illustrate the complexity of an impact assessment: another justifiable hypothesis is that core grants from LO Norway prior to that time might have allowed the institution to enter into weak governance and poor management for a longer period of time than it would if it had depended on funding from its own affiliated members. If so, support from LO Norway may also be a negative factor behind the problems developing, and that LO Norway later contributed to solving them. Such considerations are well outside the scope of the methodology and time allocated for this evaluation.

Among the changes of relevance outside the organisation within the period under evaluation, are the following. In terms of political developments, the probably most important achievements in recent years are the new labour laws since 2006, at the start of the period under evaluation. As already mentioned, this achievement is primarily due to regional developments, in which NOTU has been marginal (but where trade unions in other countries and internationally have perhaps played a role). In the period under evaluation, the challenge has been the implementation of the laws. This process is slow, but improvements are seen. Among the most important is the Industrial Court, where a lot of progress has been made and only some formalities remain before its establishment. NOTU has been pushing for change in this area and has probably contributed together with many other stakeholders.

More specific areas where NOTU has been engaged, where positive developments have been seen and where it is reasonable to believe that NOTU contributions, together with many other factors, have played a positive role, include:

- Rise in the threshold from Ush. 130,000 to Ush. 235,000 for workers' Pay As You Earn (PAYE) tax; making large number of lower paid workers exempt from tax.
- Retention of five workers' representatives in the board (of nine members) of the National social security fund (NSSF) against a government proposal to reduce the number to two.
- Reviews and development of policies, such as the National Employment Policy
- Recognition Agreement establishing negotiating machinery for public employees.

Among the issues where there is little or no progress are the fight for a fully-fledged Ministry of Labour (instead of only a Labour department at the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development), and the re-activation of the Labour Advisory Board, which is dormant due to financial difficulties facing the Labour Department. On the issue of minimum wage(s) there is little progress, but in the horticulture sector minimum wages have been agreed upon with the employers, with the very active contributions by the Uganda Horticultural and Allied Workers Union supported by NOTU.

¹⁶ Except for some indicators, such as the number of collective bargaining agreements.

¹⁷ The existence of NOTU is secured by law, so a formal closure would not be likely.

In terms of employment relationship, there are many new recognition agreements – the most important being the one for public employees – and some new collective bargaining agreements: Starting with a baseline of 133, there are five new agreements and 20 have been amended (several of them cover a large number of employees). There are also other indications of general improvements in employment relationships, as well as some set-backs and many instances of very stubborn employers. These are developments, where it is reasonable to assume that NOTU's efforts in developing relevant capacities at leadership and workplace or enterprise level(s) of the affiliate unions have contributed, perhaps especially amongst the newly affiliated unions.

On all the above developments, NOTU has been advocating for improvement and the evaluation team finds it reasonable to assume that NOTU has been one of the key factors behind progress in several of the processes. The changes recorded will definitely outlive the projects lifespan.

4 The LO Norway-NOTU collaboration

LO-Norway and NOTU have both time and again, shown their desire and commitment, to ensure that the project does not fail. Both partners seem to consider each other as equals and treat each other with respect. In addition, LO-Norway financial support to the trade unions in Uganda is indeed generous. Funds have been transferred in time from Norway throughout the project phase(s). Moreover, LO-Norway provides professional advice and technical support on the project. Both parties continue to respect the main objectives (not the indicators) of the agreement(s) and the terms of collaboration. So far the collaboration has been smooth and beneficial. Still, there is always room for improvement.

4.1.1 *Relevance*

At a general level, the support by LO-Norway has certainly been relevant to the needs of the trade unions in Uganda, as it both involves strengthening of the most appropriate national centre via core support to NOTU – the preferred option for organisational support provided a minimum of managerial and organisational requirements, and by strengthening the unions through services aiming at improving their capacity. Although the current agreement highlights supporting the unions, in practice most of the support (the core funding) has been supporting the central (NOTU) level since far most of the funding has been channelled to that level. Both the two approaches are relevant, and the priority to supporting the central level rather than the individual unions seems appropriate in the current context.

The response of LO Norway after being informed about management issues in 2008 confirms the ability to adapt to urgent needs, even if it means deviating from plans in responding to an urgent issue and managed to combine a strict approach to suspicion of mismanagement with offering support to improvement at the same time. Many donors would not be able to respond so swiftly to a changing situation, but might instead just stick to agreed plans up until a point where the situation had come so far that they would just terminate funding instead of adapting.

At a more specific level, however, there is reason to reconsider whether the different activities are the most relevant to the needs of the unions and of NOTU. Most of the main challenges in NOTU and several unions in recent years can be explained by limited understanding of both leadership and basic features of trade unions, both among leaders and members. The problems involve both issues of ‘big man syndrome’ and ‘politics’, the divisions, many instances of poor governance, and so on. Addressing such challenges demand a broad knowledge basis among the members, not only leaders and other representatives. Nonetheless, only smaller components of LO Norway support goes to improve the more general education in unionism, good governance and leadership. In hindsight, for LO Norway’ support to be more relevant, a larger share should perhaps go towards that end.

As discussed previously, there is the possibility (see 2.6) that LO Norway support may even have been directly counterproductive in some ways: if funding is used to provide training and other services to members regardless of their size, an incentive is created for unions to remain small rather than to merge. Moreover (see 3.3), it is not clear that the choice of providing core budget support to NOTU has been relevant at all times. Core budget is relevant and appropriate when the partner organisation is well governed and well managed, but it has a lot of risks if not. If the main problem is responsiveness and accountability of the centre towards its affiliated unions, core budget support may be directly counterproductive as it may reduce as such. One is that members may allow governance and management to worsen for a longer period of time, as long as it is not their own money that is at risk. There is also a range of other risks involved, including the distraction of leadership’s attention to its own members, as core support removes incentives for leaders to enter into a good, mutually committing relationship with affiliates, which would have been necessary if NOTU

depended financially on the unions. These risks are much higher in a context of poor governance and management.

Thus, under the current situation of relatively good management core budget support may be relevant, at least for a limited period of time. But during earlier years of (and prior to) the period under evaluation it is doubtful that this was the most relevant modality of support to NOTU, and it might have been directly harmful. This is difficult to substantiate as it is not possible to know the counterfactual, what would have happened without core budget support from LO Norway. But in general terms there is reason to suspect that budget support did not help, and might perhaps even have worsened the problem of poor governance and management during the earlier years.

4.1.2 Managerial issues

The management modality chosen for the collaboration between LO Norway and partners is one that puts less emphasis on formal, bureaucratic procedures and more on the personal relations and in-depth knowledge of the trade unions in Africa, combined with emphasis on the fact that trade unions are democratic structures and that the donor should therefore limit its role beyond ensuring that funds are managed well. The use of an experienced consultant with long experience from other comparable African contexts represents sound management and is one of the factors that make this possible. The consultant has done a tremendous job, not least in his engagement with the more challenging parts such as the organisational and managerial weaknesses.

Whether this mode of working is the best mode of collaboration depends on several factors. In terms of efficiency, the question is whether the least costly model has been applied that nonetheless constitutes sufficient degree and quality of follow-up. The team has not consulted all relevant data (including the cost at LO Norway and the consultant for follow-up), but the general modus of operation seems efficient. The use of a consultant who is both very competent and based in the region makes it possible to deliver high quality support both to the partner and to LO Norway at a reasonable cost. The consultant has made periodical visits to Uganda to monitor the on-going progress and to offer technical support throughout the period. The technical support offered seems timely and relevant, and the consultant has demonstrated flexibility and adaptability in increasing his availability and support to NOTU in the period when particular attention was needed.

One may discuss whether the follow-up from LO Norway is frequent enough, given that LO Norway and the consultant only occasionally visits Uganda. One issue is whether mismanagement would have been discovered earlier if LO Norway had a representative in the country or visited more frequent. This is relevant as there is a trade-off between efficiency and close follow-up.

Reporting and other formal requirements are at a minimum level. In practice, the formal instruments on which the collaboration is based are very weak according to most standards in development collaboration. As mentioned before, the design of the agreement is confusing, inconsistent and not well suited for management nor reporting. The reports have been poor (but have improved in the last couple of years). For practical reasons, neither the agreement nor the reporting provides a sufficient presentation of what is actually done under the collaboration. As such, the formal documents do not have the intended function.

The evaluation team sees well the priorities of investing in other parts of the collaboration rather than the formalities, and choosing other modalities of collaboration than the formal bureaucratic procedures may be justified. The nature of unions work and internal democratic structures is an argument against having strict,

logic adopted from the development industry. But the team would nonetheless like to point at some inherent challenges and some risks for the partners to consider.

As an initial problem, it is difficult to read from the agreement what is actually agreed, since the contracts are confusing at almost all levels ranging from the overall goal and priorities to the specific indicators, and generally the logic is difficult to understand. This makes it very difficult to evaluate whether the partners have delivered – as indicated in this report, it is simply not possible to conclude on key issues. Importantly, this does not mean that it has not delivered, but it makes it difficult to verify both success and failure, causing problems for both partners. The baseline study of 2010 makes it easier to evaluate the current agreement than the previous one, but still there is a way to go before the formal modalities can work in actual improving management and reporting instead of primarily being a burden.

The risks involved are at least three. First, in case of the loss of key personnel (such as the LO Norway consultant) it is not possible to learn from the existing documents what has been agreed, planned, discussed or implemented. The transfer of knowledge will therefore be difficult and much knowledge will be lost. Second, in case of disagreement between the partners it is difficult to use the agreement as a basis, simply because it is difficult to know what was originally agreed and there seems to be established practice that the agreement is not binding at the level of specific objectives and indicators. Third, if quality of the formal procedures is too poor the back donor may not accept it.

The team reiterates that there are good reasons to invest in other aspects of the collaboration than the formal documents – and indeed, the evaluators' needs and views should be balanced against other more important stakeholders' interests. But nonetheless, it is useful to consider the problems and risks involved mentioned above. The team would also like to state that there is nothing in the nature of trade union's work that goes against a much stricter use of formal mechanisms, including the full application of LFA/RBM approaches and rigid M&E, except that it involves some costs in establishing the system and to actually do the monitoring and reporting. On the last point, competence is widely available in Uganda and the human resources needed could be justifiable. In any case, regardless of the formal modalities chosen, in respect for the democracy of the unions it would be necessary to adjust and adapt the agreements to democratic decisions in NOTU and, when are relevant to the unions. Currently, it is urgent to consider whether the LO Norway agreement and the recently developed strategic plan are consistent and to consider its implications.

5 Conclusions and recommendations

5.1 General conclusions

The team concludes that NOTU has, since 2009, performed well under the collaboration with LO Norway. It has utilised funds in an efficient manner in ways that have most likely served substantially to strengthen the capacity of both NOTU and affiliated unions. For the first (2006-2009) agreement period under evaluation, the expected outcomes have only partly been achieved, primarily due to poor performance in the first part of the period, but in 2009 the organisation was on good track. For the current (2010-2014) agreement, it is too early to conclude on outcomes. In general terms, there is good progress on several objectives, but not along the indicators specified in the agreement. This does not mean poor performance, but reflects that indicators are not well suited for management nor the reporting of results. The combination of the design of the agreement and the lack of coherent monitoring and reporting according to the agreement suggest that it will not be possible to report results sufficiently at the end of the period unless the agreement and reporting modality is revised.

Within the scope and methodology of this evaluation it is not possible to conclude on impact, but the team finds it reasonable to assume that training and other services is a contributing factor to improved internal democracy in unions and the good achievements seen by several unions in terms of improved workers' rights in the respective sectors, and that the work of NOTU at the national level is one of several contributing factors to achievements seen of relevance to workers' rights in Uganda in general.

NOTUs organisational development has been promising since 2009. It has improved management, adhered to the constitutional requirements for democratic processes and have – in particular after the issue with the Uganda National Teachers Union has been resolved – maintained a fairly good relation with its unions. Among the unions there is a strong feeling of ownership and in general the internal democracy of NOTU vis-a-vis members functions well. NOTU secretariat is transparent, but many unions are not transparent vis-a-vis NOTU. Among the organisational challenges there has been the poor response to the call for constitutional amendments, which is now finally solved. The major problem in trade unions remains, however: some individuals are not accountable to the members and instead seem to use the unions as a platform for individual gains by engaging in 'politics'.

NOTU has also maintained and probably improved its relations with external partners. Generally speaking, NOTU has chosen a sound role in defending workers and workers' rights in Uganda. The weakest point with regard to external partners is the collaboration with COFTU, where little progress has been made towards a good working relationship and where NOTU has not been proactive finding in solutions.

There is no structure in place to hold the workers' MPs accountable and link them more directly to the unions. As a result, the MPs do not necessarily really represent workers' voice.

NOTU is not sustainable with the current financial inflows, but as soon as a system for check-off collection at the source is in place, according to the new regulations of 2011, NOTU may be able to finance all its core activities without external funding. Nonetheless, in foreseeable future it will need – and it has the capacity to utilise – external funding for a whole range of services to members.

LO Norway's support is found to be relevant and efficient at a general level, with some questions regarding whether more funding should be allocated to more basic education in unionism, good governance and leadership. The team has some doubts regarding core budget support in previous periods affected by poor governance and poor management, but it believes that this is currently a good approach. There are

weaknesses in the design of the agreements, which therefore constitute a very poor framework for reporting results. This is the responsibility of LO Norway and not NOTU.

5.2 Recommendations

5.2.1 *Recommendations to NOTU*

Governance should be more effective and mainstreamed into faster response to members' concern and more consistent, long-term efforts based on strategic considerations rather than a case-to-case response to urgent concerns. The strategic plan will help towards this objective, but only if it is actually used to guide the organisation and frequently revised (at least annually) to ensure that it reflects the members' interests.

All leaders and representatives must be made accountable. Among the measures are improved education to members at all levels; and early addressing of tendencies by individuals when they seem to lose focus on their democratic constituencies and rather engage in 'politics'. Recent constitutional amendments towards proportional representation and voting rights only for paid-up membership will also help. NOTU should revive two standing committees, The Finance, Administration and General Purpose Committee and the Disciplinary Committee, which are now dormant.

To address a range of challenges in governance of both NOTU and the affiliated unions, more resources should be invested in the Training of Trainers (TOT) from the affiliate unions, who in turn will train their own members at enterprise and the workplace(s) on matters related to unionism, good governance and democracy in general. The issue of lack of transparency from the affiliate unions towards NOTU should be addressed, but with some caution for two reasons. Although the concern is legitimate – and indeed, general transparency towards all stakeholders should be expected from any democratic organisation – strong insistence by NOTU on access to information may be interpreted as an attempt to control and oversee the affiliate unions. This is not within NOTUs mandate and may threaten to undermine the otherwise good relation between NOTU and its members. Moreover, the new requirements for check-off of membership fees to NOTU 'at source' will lead to substantial improvements in terms of transparency in giving NOTU access to information on membership and income from membership dues. The issue should be discussed in the central governing council, but should not be pushed too hard.

A good working relation with COFTU should be sought to enhance the effectiveness of the efforts of both centres towards common goals. Since NOTU withdrew from signing the MoU with COFTU, it is natural that NOTU will be proactive in finding other forms of good collaboration.

Measures should be taken to improve the MP's accountability to the unions and for NOTU to enjoy more benefits from their positions. To some degree, accountability will be enhanced by the formal mechanisms for accountability arranged for in the recently amended constitution: the new clause 14 requires the MPs to consult with and report back to their constituency. NOTU should use that clause actively and not allowing it to be a formal requirement only. NOTU should also consider arrangements to make a much larger share of the MPs' economic benefits go directly to NOTU. After all, NOTU represents the constituency and is the one that has given the MPs the 'ticket' to Parliament. Such a measure will serve several purposes: It will help in financing NOTU; reduce the destructive aspects of individual aspirations to become an MP; and make the MPs more accountable to NOTU because they will depend more on the National center for re-election when having less economic resources available to secure their positions and future re-election by investing in clientelist relations.

NOTU and LO Norway should reconsider its position on the promotion of mergers between unions. This is not because mergers are not a good idea, but because the organisational costs time and energy spent on the issue by leaders and key forums will be high as long as mergers are not appealing to both sides. Instead, NOTU should encourage mergers and be ready to facilitate and assist when the opportunity arises. As a start, NOTU should ensure that services are distributed to unions depending on the size of unions, perhaps with some additional criteria such as priority to new unions, to ensure that it does not pay for a union to be small.

NOTU should work jointly with other stakeholders, and continue to exert pressure on the government to ensure that a separate Ministry of Labour is created, the Industrial Court is functional and the enacted laws are enforced for the benefit of the workers and society at large.

5.2.2 Recommendations to LO Norway

The agreement between NOTU and LO Norway must be revised if NOTU shall be able to report satisfactorily on results at end of the agreement period. New formulations of objectives and indicators should be based on the Strategic Plan developed in 2011, to make sure that the agreement does not undermine democracy, as it might if it deviates from the Strategic Plan.

When a check-off system is in place, NOTU will be able to cover most of its core costs itself. This is an opportunity to revise LO Norway support. There is still a great need for funding and NOTU has the capacity to use funding efficiently with presumably good results, so the overall volume of support should be the same or preferably higher, but it can be allocated differently.

LO Norway should have a more proactive and cautious role to the fact that core funding from abroad can serve to strengthen or at least to hinder early response to some of the biggest challenges in African trade unions, namely internal factions and the problem of centres or key leaders and representatives not being sufficiently responsive and accountable to members problems. The same may be aggravated when the centres don't solely depend on members' fees or when access to funding from abroad increases tensions and competition for positions. This is a well-known problem in other forms of development cooperation and LO Norway should learn from experiences in other sectors and apply a 'do no harm' approach. As a start, LO Norway should explicitly acknowledge that the fact that trade unions have good formal democratic structures does not make them immune against the challenges seen with development cooperation in other sectors, such as NGOs. Instead of seeing trade unions as a special case requiring specific approaches, LO Norway should acknowledge that because the organisation has relatively narrow and limited experience with development assistance it should strive to learn from challenges and experiences in other sectors of development cooperation, to maximise the benefit and avoid harmful effects.

LO Norway should reconsider its working relationship with partners with regard to the formal bureaucratic instruments, such as more investment in agreements and an LFA/RBM logic. This should be balanced against costs and should not happen at the cost of flexibility and adaptation to democratic processes in the unions and hence it must be regularly reviewed and revised.

LO-Norway should explore the possibility of setting aside a certain percentage or quota of the funds for the Youth Committee activities, similar to what has currently been agreed upon for the Women Committee. At present the Youth Committee rely on the good will and sympathy of the Secretary General of NOTU. In case of leadership changes the Youth activities would suffer.

6 Annexes

6.1 Annex I: Terms of Reference

Background

The Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions (LO-Norway) has since 1993 supported the National Organisation of Trade Unions in Uganda's (NOTU) work to strengthen the trade union movement in Uganda in general and the capacity of the NOTU in particular.

Through negotiating, organising, training and education the NOTU and its affiliated unions should be able to develop strategies on how to improve labour rights through negotiating collective agreements benefiting its members as well as strengthening the total capacity of the trade union movement in Uganda. Thus the influence of the trade unions in Uganda may be enhanced.

A new Cooperation agreement was signed between LO Norway and the NOTU in 2011, covering the period 2010-2014. The overall objective of the cooperation is to: *"Build a financially viable, effective, democratic and influential trade union movement in Uganda"* with the following five planned programme results:

1. Plans for organising and recruitment have been formulated and implemented
2. Increased Women's representation and gender equality within the trade unions.
3. Unions have good constitutions that are democratic and are respected and adhered to.
4. Unions have effective systems for membership management, dues collection and internal and external accountability.
5. Relevant capacities developed at leadership and enterprise/workplace level; skilled shop stewards capable of representing their members.

The five year agreement between NOTU and LO-Norway further outlines the objectives, expected results and indicators as reference for the evaluation.

The last evaluation of the cooperation between NOTU and LO was carried out in 2005. It concluded that the cooperation should be continued, but with stronger emphasis on accounting procedures, recruitment and organizing among other things.

LO Norway wants to evaluate the programme co-operation with NOTU to assess whether the cooperation after the last evaluation has brought about the planned results, and the probability of achieving the planned results. The evaluation should provide recommendations for both LO and NOTU on how to enhance this probability.

The co-operation and dialogue between LO-Norway and its Ugandan partners is built on mutual respect for the organisations' right to develop their own policies, accountability and full transparency.

Objective of evaluation

- To assess the results of the support provided to NOTU and the affiliated national unions by LO to strengthen the capacity of the NOTU.
- To assess the modality of cooperation with the NOTU and provide recommendations on areas for improvement. Special emphasis should be put on:
 - Internal democracy, ownership and accountability between NOTU leadership and secretariat and affiliated unions

- The role and strength of the NOTU in terms of defending workers and workers' rights
- How Ugandan labour laws and legislation in general affect trade union activities
- The NOTU's value added in terms of securing unity between and within unions

Scope of work:

The evaluation should include, but not necessarily be limited to, an assessment of the following issues;

1. Has LO's support been relevant i.e. has the project targeted the needs of the organisation and its affiliates, and if the project has been changed during its implementation, has it been modified in accordance with any changing needs of the partners
2. The efficiency in implementation of the project. The principal parties involved in the project are LO-Norway, NOTU and its affiliated trade union organisations. How efficient have these organisations been in the implementation of the project i.e. has the work been carried out, and the financial and human resources been used in an appropriate and cost-efficient manner?
3. What are the results of the project so far? Is it likely that the objectives will be met, and that all the expected results of the project will be produced by the end of 2014? If not, - why i.e. have the objectives been unclear and/or unrealistic or is it due to other internal and/or external factors? Have recommendations of the member organisations, LO-Norway and internal reviews been followed up in an appropriate manner?
4. Sustainability. Are NOTU and the participating organisations able to continue the project activities when LO-Norway support ends? Has the capacity of the organisations been permanently improved? If so, what are the indicators of this?
5. External impact. Has NOTU and the participating partners been able to improve their performance towards the governments, employers and the general public of their countries as a result of the project? Has there been an impact of political influence in the society, improved trade union rights, better labour legislation, etc, that may be directly or indirectly linked to the project?
6. Other findings. In addition to the above the evaluation team may include what it considers relevant, including assessment of gender issues and to what extent they have been adequately addressed in the project.

The Consultants should review any strengths or weaknesses of the programme and their partners, and make recommendations on how to enhance the achievement of the planned results.

Implementation

Two external consultants will be contracted to do the evaluation of the NOTU Organisational Development Programme. The evaluation will take place in June 2012. The cost of the evaluation will be covered by the LO-Norway's global evaluation project, 2012NDWEVA.

A field visit will be done to Uganda visiting the NOTU Headquarter as well as affiliated national unions. Interviews with the elected leaders and staff of NOTU and the affiliated national unions, hereunder the Teachers' Union UNATU, will be of great importance. Further information should be sought through written material and interviews with shop stewards and rank and file members of the NOTU and affiliated unions. Also, it might be worthwhile talking with the other national centre, COFTU. Other relevant research institutions, employers' organisations, government authorities, the Norwegian Embassy and the auditor of the project may be interviewed as found necessary.

The evaluation report should be limited to approximately 20 pages in addition to an executive summary.

In total 37 working days are calculated for this consultancy, 22 for the team leader and 15 for the team assistant. This includes a visit to NOTU for both consultants together, review of documentation as well as preparations and reporting to LO. The Consultants should complete a draft report in English to LO by September 1st 2012. Based on comments to the draft report the Consultants will submit a final report by October 1st 2012.

Oslo, XXXX
LO Norway – International Department

Diis Bøhn
Interim Head of Division for International Trade Union Solidarity

6.2 Annex II: Itinerary

DATE	ACTIVITY	VENUE/REMARKS
Monday, 18th June	Arrival of team Meeting with secretary general	Imperial Royal Hotel
Tuesday 19th	Members of Secretariat	NOTU Offices
	Central Governing Council	NOTU Offices
Wednesday 20th	Federation of Uganda Employers	FUE Offices
	COFTU	COFTU Offices
	Ernst and Young	Ernst and Young Offices
	Teachers Union	Teachers Union Offices
Thursday 21st	Horticultural Union (Union + two work place visit)	Horticultural Union Offices + work places
	Women Committee	NOTU Offices
	Workers` MPs	Hon. Bakkabulindi`s Office
	Leadership in four unions	Imperial Royal Hotel
Friday 22nd	Media Union	Media Union Offices
	NOTU Youth Committee	NOTU Offices
	Government Officials in Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Affairs	The Ministry offices
	Clerical Union	Clerical Union Offices
Saturday 23 rd	Excursion & discussion with SG of NOTU and SG of Horticultural Union	Entebbe
Sunday 24 th	Meeting with SG of NOTU Concluding discussion in team	Imperial Royal Hotel
Monday 25th	NOTU Heads of Departments	NOTU Offices
	Organising Committee	NOTU premises
	Presentation and discussion with NOTU Secretariat and Central Governing Council	Casa Miltu Hotel

Some meetings were held as parallel meetings where the team split in two.

Discussion in teams was held during lunch break, every evening and during the weekend.

6.3 Annex III: Stakeholders consulted

Names with contact details for all stakeholders consulted have been stored and are available on request.

NOTU

Leadership

Owere Usher Wilson, Chairman General

Peter Werikhe Christopher, Secretary General

NOTU secretariat

Adoch Bernadette, Director, Women and Youth

Baligasima Yazidi, Assistant Project Director

Kaggwa Stanley, Deputy Vice Chairman General

Mary Immaculate Mayende, Dep. Treasurer General

Nabulya Katende Sarah, Treasurer General

Oloka Mesilamu, Deputy Secretary General

Owere Usher Wilson, Chairman General

Peter Werikhe Christopher, Secretary General

NOTU Central Governing Council

Adoch Bernadette, Director (NOTU)

Baingana Emmanuel, Communication Union Representative

Buhigiro Samuel, General Secretary Beverages Union

Byaruhanga Rogers, NUTIDOW

Byomaro Victor, General Secretary Railways Union

Hon. Bakkabulindi C, Workers Representative (MP)

John Oprong, General Secretary Media

Kafeero Simon, Organizing Sec. Co-operative Union

Kamulegeya Elijah, Communication Union

Kanyana Ezra, NUTDOW

Katende Patrick, Youth Chairman (NOTU)

Kibaya Mukajanga, Treasurer Railways Union

Kiirya Azizi, Transport Union General Secretary

Kinene M.S Mitawa, UFAWU

Mary Immaculate Mayende, Deputy Treasure General (NOTU)

Mugyama Frank, Gen. Secretary Hospitality Union

Mukasa Henry, General Secretary Fisheries Union

Musa Okello, NUEI

Musoke Joseph, Secretary Education Union

Nabulya K. Sarah, Treasurer General (NOTU)

Nakalembe Margaret, Youth Committee

Nalugya Amihah, Org/Sec Hospitality Union

Nansubuga Christine, Treasurer Co-operative Union

Owere Usher Wilson, Chairman General (NOTU)

Peter Werikhe, Secretary General (NOTU)

NOTU women's committee

Agnes Kim Atwoki, Chairperson

Mercy Matende, Vice Chairperson
Victoria Kakooza Nanteza, Secretary
Alice Druto, Publicity Secretary
Agnes Kunihiro, Treasurer
Immaculate Auma, Committee member
Claire Akonya, Committee member
Lucy Kabengano, Committee member
Rhoda Atim, Committee member

NOTU youth committee

Areo Harriet, Vice Chairperson
Adoch Bernadette, Director Women and Youth
Birungi Annet, Committee Member (NOTU)
Katende Patrick, Chairman NOTU Youth Committee

NOTU organising committee

Baligasima Yazidi, Secretary Organizing Committee
Buhigiro Samuel, Org/Education Secretary
Mugeni Owuman, Organizing Secretary
Mukasa Henry, Chairman Organizing Committee
Okumu Ochwo, Org/Education Secretary

Staff

Adoch Bernadette, Director Women and Youth
Baligasima Yazidi, Assistant Project Director
Turyahebwa Anthony, Director Research
Violet Kyakyo, Accounts Assistant

Unions representatives

National Union of Clerical, Commercial, Professional and Technical Employees

Mudirika Katikajira Mukasa, General Secretary

National Union of Plantation and Agricultural Workers of Uganda

Pajobo Joram Bruno, General Secretary
Kutosi, Chairman
Treasurer General

Uganda Electricity and Allied Workers Union

Amit Tom, General Secretary
Mavunwa Edison Han, Deputy Education and Organising Secretary

Uganda Horticultural and Allied Workers' union

Stephen W. Barasa, General Secretary

Uganda Media Union

John Oprong, General Secretary
Ikebesi Omoding, National Chairman

Uganda Mines, Metal, Oil, Gas and Allied Workers Union

Mugambwa Harriet, Education and Organizing Secretary
Sewanyana Florence, National Treasurer

Uganda National Teachers' Union

Teopista Birungi Mayanja, General Secretary
Margret Rwalouskaija, National Chair
Stephen Legesi, National Treasurer
James Tweheyo, Vice National Chair (and permanent repr. to NOTU)

Uganda Public Employees Union

Jolly Aripa Kirabo, General secretary

Members (both leaders and members not in leadership) from several other unions have been consulted on informal basis.

Other stakeholders

Parliament

Hon. Bakkabulindi Charles, Member of Parliament
Hon. Mary Tuunde, Member of Parliament

Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development

Kamya Magulu, Labour Commissioner
Nabwiro Rebecca, Senior Labour Officer

Federation of Uganda Employers

Rosemary N. Ssenabulya, Executive Director

Central Organization of Free Trade Unions (COFTU)

Robert Matukhu, Vice Secretary General
24 members of the Central Governing Council

Ernst & Young

Stephen Hamya, assurance
Francis Louis Kibuuka, assurance

Royal Norwegian Embassy

Samuel Kajoba, Senior Programme Officer

Uganda Rose Flowers Ltd

Sam Kumobwa, worker and union member
Brano Muzamil, worker and union member
Omura Richard, Human Resource Manager

Rosebud Ltd

Ravi Kumar, General Manager
Dimple Mehta, Administration Manager

6.4 Annex IV: Results of the agreement period 2006-2009

This table was developed as an analytical tool for the team and should not be seen as conclusive statements for each results area. The indicators are identical to the indicators in section 9 “indicators for Evaluation” in the agreement, but they are organized differently: As the original agreement did not reflect a standard logic according to a logical framework approach, the indicators here are re-organized to reflect the evaluation team’s reconstruction of a logical framework approach.

The organization in outcomes and impact is done by the evaluation team. For outcomes, results have been assessed with regard to status at end of agreement period (2009). For possible impact, due to the natural time lag possible results are assessed as of 2012. The assessment of outcomes is based on evidence, while it is outside the scope of the methodology of this evaluation to provide an evidence based assessment of impact.

Outcomes (status 2009)

Results	Status (2009)	Comment
Impact (main goal for the period): NOTU-Uganda becomes financially viable, effective, democratic and influential trade union organization	NOT ACHIEVED	Internal disturbances in the organization including proliferation of splinter unions and general rivalry and disunity in the labour movement did hamper progress in this area during the period 2006-2009.
Outcomes		
Increase in membership by at least 40 percent above 2005 figure	NOT ACHIEVED	NOTU’s annual reports indicate that the total membership figures were as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Year 2005: 146,427 members – Year 2009: 167,409 members – An increase of mere 20,982 members. Membership data is generally unreliable and the team doubts the accuracy of these figures.
Effective structures at all levels (emphasis on local level)	PARTLY ACHIEVED	Local level structures are intact and functional. No systematised, reliable data for the affiliated unions except for their adherence to formal (constitutional) procedures. Observations nonetheless suggest that there have been improvements in most unions.
At least 20 percent annual increase in income (members/affiliates’ dues)	PARTLY ACHIEVED	The 2009 figures are 6 percent above target (43,7 mill UGS vs target 41,2), but due to significant drop of the income from members in 2007-2008 the total income over the whole period is well below.
Improved capacity all-round	PARTLY ACHIEVED	No data available that makes it possible to compare capacity in unions pre and post the period. The team believes that the capacity of unions has improved, especially the new ones in understanding and handling of legal matters. For NOTU, substantial increase in capacity was achieved in 2009 after a period of poor performance.
Greater internal democracy	PARTLY ACHIEVED	A lot of challenges in the period, therefore difficult to assess. All 20 unions completed their QDC’s. Women and youth committees were facilitated to hold all their meetings and carry out some few activities.

Increased involvement in the fight against HIV/AIDS (especially among workers/members)	PROBABLY ACHIEVED	A range of measures relating to HIV/AIDS are likely to have increased involvement in the fight against HIV/AIDS among workers/members. There is no data available to verify this.
Increase in women members by at least 25 percent above the 2005 figure as well as greater participation of women at all levels.	DATA NOT AVAILABLE	Little or no available and reliable data on members in affiliates. One source (ILO according to the baseline report 2010) indicates that already in 2002, there were 36 per cent women members. Those parts of the membership data where gender disaggregation was possible suggested 23 percent women members in 2010. However, due to unreliable data the evaluation team does not believe that the comparison is justified. The team finds it reasonable to assume that there has been an improvement in the period due to more attention to the issue and several measures taken.
Manageable debt and improved fiscal management	DEBT: NOT ACHIEVED. FISCAL MGT: ACHIEVED.	Financial management greatly improved in 2009 and onwards. Deficit in all but one of the years, leading to great increase in accumulated deficit.
Ability by NOTU-Uganda to finance most of its core functions	NOT ACHIEVED	No substantial improvement during the period. Grant share of total costs indeed increased (from 83 to 87 %) during the period.

Possible impact (status 2012)

Objective	Status (2012)	Actual developments in the period	How NOTU has contributed to change
<i>Overall goal</i>			
Respect for human and trade union rights	Some improvements, some setbacks	Several concrete steps are taken towards protecting workers and trade union rights. Liberalization threatens workers' interests. Human rights in general are under threat in the current political context.	NOTU has been among the active agents behind many achievements regarding workers' and trade union rights, but has done none or few efforts to influence on the general trends such as liberalization and threats to human rights in general.
<i>Objectives/outcomes</i>			
Optimum number of full time employees [and reduction in short term contracts and casual labor ¹⁸].	Not achieved	Liberalization is one main threat. Few achievements in terms of general measures (law, policy, agreement) to protect workers' rights with	NOTU emphasizes the problem of short terms contracts and casualization and there has been success in individual cases. But little active efforts are seen by NOTU to

¹⁸ Reformulated by the evaluation team.

		this regard, but several instances of individual cases where workers have been granted compensation.	influence on liberalization and other general trends. That would require that NOTU takes a wider role than today (influencing general political and economic development)
All unions covered by up to date Collective Agreements	Partly achieved	The objective of covering all unions has not been met, but there has been substantial progress in this area	This has been a priority in NOTU. The most important direct contribution is to strengthen the capacity of the unions to negotiate.
New and favourable labour laws	Some achievement	The most important laws were already in place at start of agreement period (2006). A number of favorable policies and regulations have been developed in the period. For most, operationalization and enforcement remains.	NOTU has been pushing for most of the changes seen. The actual efforts and the effectiveness have not been assessed.
Greater involvement in matters of national, regional, and international importance, especially those affecting workers	Partly achieved	Some improvements in, for instance, social dialogue.	NOTU has been supportive and has taken part in bipartite and tripartite dialogue, and has managed to establish good working relationships with the different partners.
Significant reduction in child labour		Statistics have not been consulted for the evaluation, but there has likely been a reduction in child labor due to more national and international focus.	NOTU has worked on the issue, but is only one out of very many other actors and the actual effect is difficult to measure.

6.5 Annex V: Results of the agreement period 2006-2009

Status as of June 2012 or latest data available, organized according to indicators in original agreement.

Programme Goal:	Indicators (target for periode):	Baseline data (2010)	Status June 2012, and comments	Likelihood of achieving objectives by 2014
The unions are strong, united, democratic, financial viable, with skilled shop stewards capable of representing their members.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 6 affiliated unions merged: leaving a total of 17 unions 2. Leadership on all levels adhere to union constitution (i.e. constitutional meetings held, congress held, decision making processes adhered to) 3. Increased women in central leadership (General secretaries, deputy GS, chairpersons) at confederation, union and workplace levels 4. Leaders and shop stewards negotiate on behalf of members in bi-partite and tri-partite structures 5. 50 new collective agreements signed and all 133 agreements are renewed annually 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 20 union affiliated 2. No data 3. Women leadership is 33.3%, only 3 GS of 20 NOTU: 1/3 are women 4. There are active negotiations 5. There are concluded CBAs: A total of 133 registered 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No unions merged, a total of 20 unions 2. Most unions adhere to constitution in terms of formal meetings and procedures (exact number is a matter of definition) 3. No aggregated data collected for the evaluation 4. Active negotiations, in particular bi-partite, likely increase in the period (substantial number of new recognition and collective bargaining agreements): 5. 5 new agreements and 20 have been amended. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not likely unless much more proactive efforts (at large organisational costs) 2. With a possible exception for a small number of particularly weak unions, this is likely. 3. Given the current focus and efforts, in general terms an increase in women leaders is very likely (but not necessarily to a satisfactory degree). 4. Likely (but not necessarily to a satisfactory degree). 5. Fully possible given the current developments.
Planned results (outputs)	Indicators:			
1. Plans for organising and recruitment have been formulated and implemented	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 50 membership growth, (288 560 members as of end 2014) 2. Increased women membership: 40 % of new members should be women (38 500 new women members) 3. New workplaces and enterprises are 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.192 373 members 2. 26 073 women members, out of 114 311: 23 % (UNATU has no gender data) 3&4 No data 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No data (data only on new members, not total membership) 2. 43 % of new members are female 3. Several new 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There will not be sufficient data to conclude exactly on growth (change), as baseline data is poor due to unreliability of reporting from some unions. 2. Possible, but demanding

	<p>organised.</p> <p>4. New sectors are organised</p> <p>5. Accurate membership records/data established.</p>	<p>5 Not all have gender or youth aggregated or accurate membership data.</p>	<p>workplaces and enterprises, including in Western Uganda</p> <p>4.</p> <p>5. No achievement</p>	<p>3. Likely</p> <p>4. Possible</p> <p>5. Fully possible if given priority and if unions cooperate. Facilitated by checkoff system</p>
<p>2. Increased Women's representation and gender equality within NOTU-Uganda and the trade unions</p>	<p>1. Gender policies adopted in NOTU (by 2011) and all member-unions/affiliates (by end 2014)</p> <p>2. At least 30 % women participation in all activities (reflected in course reports)</p> <p>3. All negotiation committee at tripartite and bipartite level should include two women</p>	<p>1. There are no gender policy, but deliberate measures to mainstream gender</p> <p>2. Women's participation in trade union activities was still below the average (30%) (data 1999)</p> <p>3. No baseline data on women in negotiations</p>	<p>1. Many measures are taken both at NOTU and union level, according to reports</p> <p>2. Data has not been aggregated generally. Using LO Norway funded activities in 2011 as a case, target is achieved.</p> <p>3. Not reported</p>	<p>In general terms, an increase is fully possible and much has already been achieved, but probably not to a satisfactory degree (equal representation). More systematically aggregated data is necessary.</p>
<p>3. Unions have good constitutions that are democratic and are respected and adhered to.</p>	<p>1. Members participate actively in decision making process: formulation of policies and programmes of activities in NOTU.</p> <p>2. Free, transparent and democratic election processes for union leaders</p> <p>3. NOTU will work actively to assist all affiliates to ensure their constitutions suit international standards</p> <p>4. Constitutions stipulate specific women's representation, either in the form of specific bodies or as a specific share of representatives in various constitutional and decision making structures</p>	<p>No baseline data. Needs qualitative assessment in annual reports,</p>	<p>1-2: Most (not all) union have a minimum of democratic decision making processes in place and functioning.</p> <p>3: NOTU has little or no role in influencing/supporting unions with this regard.</p> <p>5. Amendments are underway in several unions: many have policies already even if constitution is not changed.</p>	<p>This is likely to be achieved for most unions; however, unless the relationship between NOTU and unions change much, NOTU will not have a major role in this beyond some awareness raising and training.</p>
<p>4. Financial management: Unions have effective</p>	<p>1. Updated and reliable membership</p>	<p>1. The membership</p>	<p>1-2: Data is not made available (all unions will</p>	<p>The large unions as well as NOTU are likely to achieve this</p>

<p>systems for membership management, dues collection and internal and external accountability.</p>	<p>data segregated by gender and age for all NOTU affiliates.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Members pay subscription dues in accordance to the constitution 3. Audited accounts are on time – by 15 March the following year 4. Management letters are free of qualifications. 5. National centres share relevant information on a timely and regular basis with affiliates (i.e. information on financial situation, financial management systems, on budget priorities, accounts) 6. Accounting systems and controls are in place with accurate financial records 	<p>data is not updated and segregated by gender and age by all affiliates,</p> <p>2. Dues income 2010: 52 014 002</p> <p>5/6 The accounting manual stipulates all financial controls and budget adherence, spot check by the Treasurer General twice a week</p> <p>5/6 There is a financial manual</p>	<p>not necessarily share data with NOTU).</p> <p>3.-4: On time, some qualifications (not new)</p> <p>5. NOTU share relevant information.</p> <p>6. Accounting system (incl new manual) is in place.</p>	<p>objective.</p>
<p>5. Relevant capacities developed at leadership and enterprise/workplace level</p>	<p>Annual trainings will lead to a constant number of trained and available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 negotiators, • 20 organisers • 25 trainers, • 20 women leaders, • 20 youth, • 20 OSHE representatives, • 200 shop stewards, • 4 support staff (incl. accounting) etc. <p>Types of skills depend on role.</p>	<p>There is a poll of trainers, but baseline says nothing of numbers or needs.</p>	<p>No overview of the overall number of trained people available, nor of the needs.</p>	<p>Better planning and measuring (of overall number of people trained and available, not only persons trained per year) is needed to measure this.</p>

6.6 Annex VI: Questionnaire for NOTU affiliated unions

(typographically compressed)

Dear representative of a NOTU affiliated union,

LO Norway has commissioned an evaluation of the cooperation agreement between LO and NOTU. The evaluation team consists of Dr Øyvind Eggen from Norway and Mr Raha Hassan from Tanzania, supported by Mr Robinson Sikazwe.

The evaluation will cover different aspects of the cooperation agreement, including the role of NOTU in defending workers and workers' rights in Uganda; and the role of NOTU leadership and secretariat vis-à-vis NOTU affiliated unions.

For that purpose, the team would highly appreciate your inputs to the evaluation by filling this form. Some unions will also be invited to interviews or group discussions during the team's visit to Uganda during 17-26 June, 2012.

We kindly ask you to respond to the questions below and return it either by email to Øyvind Eggen (oyvind.eggen@nupi.no) or by printing the form and submit it in a *closed* envelop to NOTU secretariat **before June 16, 2012**. The closed enveloped will be given to the evaluation team. We assure you that your response will be read only by the evaluation team and will *not* be shared with NOTU leadership and secretariat. Individual statements may be quoted anonymously in the evaluation report. If you need more space, use separate sheets of paper and refer to the number for each question.

1. Introduction

- a. Your organisation (union):
- b. Your position in the union:
- c. For how long have you had this position?

2. The Union

- a. What is the annual budget for your union, and what are the main sources of financing? *Approximate figures/percentage is sufficient.*
- b. How much to members pay? What is the method of collection?
- c. Is your union up-to-date with dues payments to NOTU? If not, why not?
- d. Does the union have a gender policy/strategy? If yes, indicate its title and the year it was adopted.
- e. What is the status of implementation of the gender policy/strategy? If the union has no gender policy/strategy, please indicate other measures taken with regard to gender.
- f. Does the union have a policy/strategy for young workers' participation? If yes, indicate its title and the year it was adopted.
- g. What is the status of implementation of the policy/strategy for young workers' participation? If the union has no such policy/strategy, please indicate other measures taken with regard to young workers' participation.

3. Context and situation assessment

- a. What are, in your view, the main challenges to workers in your sector in Uganda today?
- b. What are the main obstacles to improving workers' rights in your sector?
- c. What are the main challenges to union activities at the work place?
- d. What are the main challenges facing your union?

- e. What do you think are the main challenges to unions in Uganda in general?
- f. Trade unions are, in Uganda as elsewhere, threatened by internal division and loss of unity. What do you think are the main factors to explain this?

4. Assessment of NOTU

- a. How would you assess the role of NOTU in general?
- b. In which ways do you think that NOTU contributes to improvement of workers' rights in Uganda in general?
- c. In which ways does NOTU strengthen your union?
- d. In which areas do you feel that NOTU does too little in support of your union and/or workers rights?
- e. What is your assessment of the role of NOTU in response to division between and within unions in Uganda?

5. Areas for improvement

- a. How do you think NOTU should improve its role in strengthening workers' rights in Uganda in general?
- b. How do you think NOTU should improve its role in strengthening your union?
- c. How do you think NOTU could improve its response to division between and within unions in Uganda?
- d. How do you think NOTU can improve its financial situation?

6. Any other inputs

Please provide any other inputs you may have to the evaluation.

