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This map is part of a series of maps on the evidence-informed decision-making (EIDM) landscapes in different countries in Africa. The series comprises 25 maps and is available from the Africa Evidence Network. This is map 8 in the series. Maps were produced as part of the bursary conditions for attendance at Evidence 2016 (http://evidenceconference.org.za/). Bursaries were provided as part of the UJ-BCURE programme, funded by the UK’s Department for International Development (DFID).

OVERVIEW OF THE EVIDENCE MAP

• The key players in the Evidence Informed Decision Making include Cabinet, Parliament, State House, Office of the Prime Minister, Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development, National Planning Authority, Development Partners and Office of the Auditor General.
  o Ministries Departments and Agencies (MDAs) in this case are the sector Ministries Departments and Agencies that are responsible for implementation of Government programmes. Other players are Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Uganda Evaluation Association, Think Tanks, Academia and Civil Society.
  o All these institutions have members to committees and technical working groups under the Government Evaluation Facility coordinated by the Department of Monitoring and Evaluation in the Office of the Prime Minister.
• The existing gaps include:
  o inadequate funding amidst increasing demand for generation of evidence through studies and rigorous evaluations
  o the role of academia in engaging the public sector in provision of evidence is still weak. Most academic research work has not been used due to inadequate coordination with the public sector existing platform.
  o Some decision makers still do not appreciate the need for evidence.
• The bottlenecks are brought by some overlaps institutional mandates and coordination challenges that require intervention of top decision makers. Whereas the newly passed M&E Policy and Coordination Policy address the key issues, implementation of some components of the policies is still lacking.
• Best characteristics:
  o Good representation (seniority) of the key players to the national evaluation platforms (working groups, subcommittees e.t.c).
  o Annual forums that brings all stakeholders together: Uganda Evaluation Weeks, Government Annual and Half-Annual Performance Retreats, Uganda Community of Practice.
  o Strong feedback mechanisms
  o Functional Community of Practice
  o Donor Support
  o Stakeholder commitment
CONCLUSION:

- Intervention/support that the system would most benefit from:
  - Increase in development partners support
  - Awareness and capacity development for policy makers in designing and commissioning evaluations.
  - Stronger partnership between academia and practitioners (designing and carrying out rigorous evaluations on government programmes).
  - Building a pool of evaluators across the academia, policy practitioners, civil society and the private sector.

- The map above highlights a multi-sectoral and discipline relationship and engagement of evidence producers through institutionalised framework to produce evidence. It is also a learning framework for stakeholders who are aimed at generating evidence on what works and what does not to enable proper decision making in Uganda. This map therefore provides lessons in the context of Uganda specifically how the Government Evaluation Facility coordinated by the Department of Monitoring and Evaluation in the Office of the Prime Minister supports generation, translation and use of evidence to create impact in service delivery in the public sector in Uganda.

- Upscaling:
  - The capacity building can be scaled up to cover lower local governments.
  - The national awareness and evidence dissemination events can also be scaled to regional level to specifically touch the regional context.

- The creative metaphor: “evidence to policy path”
Appendix: Additional information on the detailed M&E System and Government Evaluation Facility composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>Evaluation Capacity Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>Evaluation Sub-Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoFPED</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDA</td>
<td>Ministries, Departments and Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/M&amp;ETWG</td>
<td>National Monitoring and Evaluation Technical Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>National Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPA</td>
<td>National Planning Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAG</td>
<td>Office of the Auditor General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OoP</td>
<td>Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPM</td>
<td>Office of the Prime Minister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>