REPORT ON COMMUNITY SCORECARD CONDUCTED

BY

ACTION FOR FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT (AFFCAD)

IN

BWAISE, KABALAGALA, KISENYI AND KATWE.

Introduction

Background

According to the World Bank, the urbanization process in Uganda "has placed an increased pressure on access to public services, particularly education and health services, and infrastructure, particularly electricity and piped water"[1]. As aforementioned, the trend of urbanization is only expected to increase and without appropriate measures to increase service delivery, a larger number of slum-dwellers will continue to face dire living conditions.

Poor service delivery, has an impact not only on the lives of slum-dwellers, but can also impact the social cohesion and peace of communities and countries. In a recent publication, the Royal United Services Institute confirms that government failure to provide basic services such as health and education allows extremist groups to meet these needs and build support as a result of this provision. More specifically the study mentions that "a governmental failure to provide basic services potentially creates a vacuum that extremist groups can fill to build support and legitimacy which might not otherwise have been forthcoming because of their violent tactics"[2]

This component of the project, therefore, will aim to strengthen the social contract between slum communities and government at national and local level through supply-side and demand-side accountability measures with the ultimate aim of increasing services for the targeted slum communities. Indeed, the literature on governance recommends that to achieve greater impact, both supply and demand-side approaches should be implemented jointly. [3]

On demand-side accountability, IOM will aim to strengthen the capacities of AFFCAD to benchmark performance of government through well-recognized methodologies such as community score-cards, social audits and governance and accountability action plans. IOM Hired Uganda Debt Network as a consultant to carry out Demand side accountability and Supply side Accountability in Kisenyi and Katwe.

The community Score Card as a Community Monitoring Tool.
A Community Score Card (CSC) is an ongoing two-way participatory tool for the assessment, planning, monitoring and evaluation of services. The CSC brings together the demand side ("service user") and the supply side ("service provider") of a particular service

---

[1] Idem, World Bank, x

[2] Allan, Harriet, Andrew Glazzard et al, *Drivers of Violent Extremism: Hypotheses and Literature Review*, (UK: Rusi, 2015) 34.

[3] Technical and Administrative Support Unit (TASU) of Uganda's Joint Budget Support Network, *Discussion Paper: Demand for Good Governance and Service Delivery in Uganda,* (Kampala: World Bank, 2014), 5

or program to jointly analyze issues underlying service delivery problems and find a common and shared way of addressing those issues. It is an exciting way to increase participation, accountability and transparency between service users, providers and decision makers. The CSC uses the "community" as its unit of analysis, and is focused on assessing and capturing opinions and perceptions of the community at the local/facility level.

Overall Objective

The overall objective of this CSC is to provide evidence to inform policy and practice changes necessary to improve the availability and utilization of service delivery in the four slums of Bwaise, Katwe, Kisenyi and Kabalagala in Kampala.

Specific Objectives

i.   To assess and report on the availability and level of access to services in the four slums.

ii. To highlight the contribution of the Community Score Card process to addressing service delivery concerns in the four slums in Kampala.

iii. To document and report on service delivery issues that call for improvements in the four slums.

Coverage of the Score Card and Participants

The CSC was applied in the four slums of Kampala (Katwe, Kabalagala, Kisenyi and Bwaise). A total of **160 (72 were female and 88 were male)** community members were assessed in the four rounds of CSC. The CSC participants included KCCA officials from the health department, education department, planning department, sanitation department, health workers from the targeted health facilities, members of Village Health Teams (VHTs), Local council one Chairpersons, religious leaders, youth leaders, Community Based Organisations and other men, youth and women in the community. All the CSC sessions were facilitated by staff of AFFCAD, with the support of community based organization representatives and youth leaders.

The Community Score Card Process Introduction

The CSC was conducted following the conventional stages, which includes, preparation; input tracking; identification of issues affecting access to and utilization of different services, scoring by the youth, women, and men; interface meeting and action plan development; implementation and progress monitoring. This process is illustrated in Figure 1 below and further elaborated in the sections that follow.

Planning and preparation: This involves identifying the sectoral and geographic scope of the initiative, assessing entitlement gaps, training CSC facilitators and securing cooperation of all participating parties. AFFCAD identified and selected 10 community based Organisations representatives and youth leaders who were invited for the planning meeting on **6th November 2018 at the AFFCAD offices in Bwaise**. Each of the selected representatives was from one of the four slums that is Bwaise, Kisenyi, Kabalagala and Katwe in Kampala. The purpose of the planning meeting was to set the date for the activities, find the venues in the four slums, and find ways on how to carry out the different activities in the four slums of Kampala that is Katwe, Kisenyi, Kabalagala and Bwaise. The activities include reflection meeting after the pilot to evaluate the process and next steps, Mobilization and Organization of the community gatherings, hold meetings to Introduce the community/service user scorecard, develop indicators, conduct the score cards with the community, consolidate the community score card, organize a service providers score card, setting up an interface meeting between the rights holders and the duty bearers, . Develop joint action plan and Undertake follow up on the implementation of agreed actions and documentation.

Photos: Youth leaders and community leaders from bwaise, kisenyi, katwe and kabalagala meeting to plan for community score cards.

Phase II: Conducting the Score Card with the community.

AFFCAD with support from the selected Community Based Organisation representatives and youth mobilised 40 community members from each of the four slums in Kampala from **8th November to 13th November 2018.** The total number of community members mobilised and those who attended the meeting were **160 (72 were female and 88 were male).** This activity involved focus group discussions (FGDs) with community members (separated into groups such as men, women, youth and others depending on the CSC's sectoral scope) to identify and prioritize issues (e.g. service access, utilization and quality provision), CSC facilitators clustered similar issues to create the Score Card indicators, communities scored each indicator and listed reasons for the score and AFFCAD and the Community Based Organisations representatives and youth leaders later on consolidated Score Cards across four communities.

AFFCAD first held a community meeting to explain the purpose and the Scorecard methodology. The community members were divided into focus group discussions (FGDs) with community members (separated into groups such as men, women, youth and others depending on the CSC's sectoral scope) to identify and prioritize issues (e.g. service access, utilization and quality provision), CSC facilitators clustered similar issues to create the Score Card indicators, communities scored each indicator and listed reasons for the score and AFFCAD and the Community Based Organisations representatives and youth leaders later on consolidated Score Cards across four communities. A two-person team of facilitators were assigned to each group. One facilitator led the exercise and the other one provided support and take notes of all discussions on issues affecting the different communities.

The following steps were used to conduct the community scorecard.

Step 1: Generating issues

After inputs were identified and tracked, groups shared ideas about service related issues to be reviewed. The groups were asked questions like "How are things going with service or programme here? What service or programme works well? What does not work well, etc?" All the issues generated by groups were noted down on flipchart paper. The different groups agreed on which issues they want to be listed. And similar issues were clustered accordingly. Fo the problems raised, the community members were asked for suggestions about how to improve the delivery of services; thereafter we discussed how to maintain the solutions.

Step 2: Prioritising issues

After generating all the issues, there were quite a number of them, and not all were relevant to the project. So the groups were asked to agree on the relevant ones that are more important and urgent to deal with first. And the group members were asked to give reasons for their choice.

Kabalagala	Issues	Priority	Reason
	High crime rate	**Community Development Office (Youth, women, disability and Elderly Funds)**	The bureaucracy of accessing the funds at KCCA is a problem faced by the youth
	Lack of a public school		Some Community Development officers are corrupt, they tend to give the money to their relatives.
	Lack of public health centres		The funds take years before interested groups access them, this is de-motivates most of the youth who

			eventually give up.
	Inaccessibility to government development funds.		
Kisenyi	**Issues**	**Priority**	**Reason**
	High crime rate	**Toilets**	Kisenyi has few toilets
	Poverty		The available toilets are for paying
	Drug abuse		The available toilets are dirty, and inaccessible because of the distance.
	Few toilets		
Katwe	**Issues**	**Priority**	**Reason**
	Sanitation	**Garbage Collection**	The rubbish collection in Katwe is a problem, so rubbish is littered and this has led to a dirty environment.
	Drug abuse		The sewage system in Katwe is poor and this had led to diseases like cholera.
	High crime rate		The sewage system is full, waste products are littered all over the place and this is a health disaster.
	Un employment		
Bwaise	**Issues**	**Priority**	**Reason**
	Un employment	**No Public school - Education**	There is no public school in Bwaise and this has led to high illiteracy rates.
	Illiteracy		Lack of a public school that would provide free education has led to high

			crime rate in Bwaise.
	High crime rate		The only public school in the area was closed down by KCCA seven years ago with the promise of opening it up which has not been done.
	Flooding		Dropout rates in Bwaise are high.

Step 3: Closing of first meeting

After prioritisation, the participants reconvened as a big community group and the Programs Director AFFCAD thanked the community for their time and inputs. She explained that the information (general issues generated by all the groups) will be taken back with you to the office to develop indicators for the high priority issues and agree on a date for the follow up visit when the issues (to be presented as indicators) will be scored.

The community members were informed that after the community collectively analyses their scores for the services, the service providers will also be rating the services and then there will be a joint meeting at the service centre where the users and providers will present and discuss their results together. The name of this joint meeting is the "interface meeting".

Photos [Left]: Programs Director AFFCAD showing one of the groups in Katwe how to develop community scorecards. **[Right]:** Some of the Community members who attended the meeting introducing and conducting community scorecards in Kabalagala.

Step 4: Developing indicators and consolidating the community scorecard

On 22nd November, AFFCAD team and the selected youth leaders met at the AFFCAD offices in Bwaise and shared the various issues generated by their respective groups. Different issues from the different groups (the men, the women, and the youth) were brought about hence the team was able to come up with common issues representing the four slums.

We identified the major issues and from those, developed indicators and listed the issues related to each indicator under it. After scoring had been done, we reconvened and came up with consolidated community scores that represent each of the four slums.

Kabalagala – Community Development Officers (Youth, Women, Disability and Elderly funds)

Indicators	Group A	Group B	Consolidation	Reasons
Bureaucracy	**Very bad (1)**	**Very Bad (1)**	**Very bad (1)**	The groups have to show minutes for the meetings which is tiresome since most community members in Kabalagala are illiterate. Each group is required to have a Constitution. The constitution drafting requires a lawyer which is expensive in the long run. The groups are required to present a budget, this is also expensive since they have to estimate the prices which fluctuate.
Politics	**Just okay (3)**	**Just okay (3)**	**Just okay (3)**	Most of the youth livelihood grants are given to groups affiliated to the ruling party and that is National Resistance Movement.
Corruption	**Very bad (1)**	**Very Bad (1)**	**Very bad (1)**	The Community Development Officers ask for bribes at each process that is selection process, desk appraisal process, and district executive committee and the ministry awarding process before a group is given a grant. There is favouritism by the CDOs that is they usually

				give grants to groups they know.
				The grants are given at intervals. This is wrong because it affects the groups work plans and affects the groups since the market prices fluctuate.
				The high taxes that are levied onto the grants, the groups.
				They ask for certificates or accreditations yet the cordial qualification is that the group has to be illiterate.
				They ask for Tenancy agreements before payment yet in actual sense you can't get one.

Katwe - Garbage Collection

Indicators	Katwe 1	Group B	Consolidation	Reasons
Politic	**Very bad (1)**	**Very Bad (1)**	**Very bad (1)**	The councillors favour areas that voted for them especially those of the ruling party i.e. National Resistance Movement. So areas as Base zone have not had their rubbish collected in years.
				Some parishes don't get information on garbage collection because of politics. Parishes that didn't vote the NRM local leaders

Indicators				Reasons
				have suffered with garbage
Corruption	**Bad (2)**	**Good (4)**	**3 (Just okay)**	In case an individual calls for a truck before or after the given date, the individual is supposed to pay for fuel. This is okay according to the community. Whenever they call the truck that collects the rubbish during the given date, it turns up and collects the rubbish.
Information	**Very bad (1)**	**Very bad (1)**	**1 (Very bad)**	Lack of information when the trucks will be collecting the rubbish. The local leaders at the lower cadre also complained of lack f information.
Access to the rubbish collection trucks	**Just okay (3)**	**Good (4)**	**Good (4)**	There is good access to the rubbish collection trucks whenever it is available although people delay to bring out garbage out of their homes.
Availability of rubbish collecting trucks	**Very bad (1)**	**Very bad (1)**	**1 (Very bad)**	There is only one truck in the two parishes. And when it gets full it does not go back to pick other rubbish.

Kisenyi – Toilets

Indicators	Kisenyi 1	Kisenyi II	Kisenyi III	Consolidation	Reasons

Accessibility	Bad (2)	Just Okay (3)	Good (4)	Just Okay (3)	The local leaders responsible don't fulfil their responsibilities. The toilets are far. There are equipments to cleans and unblock the toilets available.
Number of toilets	1 (Very Bad)	2 (Bad)	1 (Very Bad)	1 (Very Bad)	There are six public toilets in the whole of Kisenyi.
Payment	1 (Very Bad)	1 (Very Bad)	1 (Very Bad)	1 (Very Bad)	The public toilets are for paying yet the community cannot afford to pay before use.
Politics	5 (Very good)	5 (Very good)	5 (Very good)	5 (Very good)	The local leaders are not discriminative of people based on politics. No party is considered when one wants to access the toilets.
Misuse	2 (Bad)	4 (Good)	3 (Just Okay)	3 (Just Okay)	There is a person who cleans the toilets on a daily basis.

Cleanliness	2 (Bad)	2 (Bad)	1 (Very bad)	2 (Bad)	There are at times during the rainy season, the toilet pipes break and flood everywhere.

Bwaise – Education (no public school)

Indicators	Bwaise II	Bwaise III	Consolidation	Reasons
Politics	4 (Good)	2 (Bad)	3 (Just okay)	The local leaders were in opposition, so the only public school in Bwaise was closed based on the political affiliation of the local leaders.
Information	1 (Very bad)	1 (Very bad)	1 (Very bad)	The community was not given prior notice of its closure.
Conflicts	2 (Bad)	3 (Just okay)	2 (Bad)	There was a conflict between the church and the land owner. The church wanted to use the land where the school was located to expand. The church used to interrupt the school programme during teaching days
Environment	1 (Very bad)	2 (Bad)	1 (Very bad)	The school used to flood during the rainy season and this used to disturb the pupils.
Administration	4 (Good)	2 (Bad)	3 (Just okay)	Teachers used to be absent due to poor pay by the administration.

Photos: Community based organisations representatives and youth leaders developing indicators and thereafter consolidated the community scorecards from the four slums (Kabalagala, Kisenyi, Katwe and Bwaise.)

Lessons and best practices

- ❖ Empowered Communities can define and design the best ways for quality service delivery.

- ❖ While establishing community structures, opportunity should be given to the community to select the individuals they trust most rather than the KCCA selecting on their behalf.

- ❖ Community members feel appreciated when they are involved in service delivery. They were very happy being part of the district monitoring team.

Recommendations

Expanding space for dialogue: Ultimately, the project has opened up space for dialogue on issues that are generally deemed to be too sensitive to discuss publicly in the Uganda context, and shown that it is possible to make progress even in highly restrictive environments.

Improving communication: Some problems arising from lack of information sharing between providers and users or providers and district level authorities can be resolved fairly easily.

User awareness of their constitutional rights as rights bearers: Investment in raising users' awareness about their rights and entitlements scales up utilization indirectly.

Conclusion

Given the experimental nature of many community scorecard interventions, particular attention should be paid to monitoring and evaluation, particularly at the design phase. It is important to invest in developing a theory of change and identifying progress markers or performance indicators which can be tracked over the lifetime of the intervention. By building opportunities for learning about the changes stimulated by these initiatives, the pathways through which they occur and the contextual factors contributing to their success or failure, implementers are able to better understand how social accountability interventions operate and make more informed decisions regarding their scale-up and sustainability.