



Uganda

Infrastructure Transparency Index

2021 Report



The Infrastructure Transparency Index (ITI) is an instrument of CoST - the Infrastructure Transparency Initiative (CoST) that measures transparency and the quality of processes related to public infrastructure at both national and sub-national levels. Collaboratively designed and based on international good practice and lessons learned, its objective is to provide stakeholders with quality information that promotes transparency and improves public infrastructure management.

Research team:

Michael Cengkuru. Evaluation Coordinator. CoST Uganda

Joshua Allan Okuja. Information Technology Consultant CoST Uganda

Derrick Muzoora Evaluator. CoST Uganda

Samuel Mutongole. Evaluator. CoST Uganda

National coordination:

Olive Kabatwairwe. Country Manager. CoST Uganda

International coordination:

David Zamora. International Consultant. CoST International

Evelyn Hernandez. Head of Members and Affiliate Programmes. CoST International

Gilbert Sendugwa. Senior Regional Manager, Africa. CoST International

Disclaimer

This report presents the results of an evaluation of transparency in the infrastructure sector to provide inputs for strengthening public institutions. Like other evaluation instruments, its impact depends on the use to which it is put. This is not an instrument to evaluate corruption, not an agent of organisational audit, and not an instrument of perception. It does not assess public officials or measure the general quality of procuring entities' websites. The results in this document do not represent the opinion of CoST regarding the administrative work of governments or procuring entities.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

December 2021

Table of contents

Chapter 1 Infrastructure Transparency Index	10
1.1 Concept of the ITI	10
1.2 Objectives of the Index	11
1.3 Principles of the Index	11
1.4 Structure of the ITI	12
Chapter 2 Methodology	15
2.1 Evaluation process	15
2.2 Data collection	16
2.3 Procuring entities sample	19
2.4 Infrastructure project sample	22
2.5 Interaction with Procuring and Disposal Entities	26
2.6 Challenges and limitations and recommendations on the methodology	29
Chapter 3 Main results	30
3.1 National ITI score	30
3.1.1 Enabling environment	31
3.1.2 Capacities and processes	33
3.1.4 Information disclosure	38
3.2 Procuring entities ITI score	41
3.2.2 Results by procuring entities type	49
3.2.3 Results by procuring entities sector	50
3.2.4 Sub-rankings	52
3.3 Infrastructure projects scores	59
Conclusions	66
Recommendations	68
Annex 1 Evaluation instrument	69
Annex 2: List of websites and platforms consulted:	69
Annex 3 Procuring entities survey	69
Annex 4 The Procuring entities' interaction checklist	69
Annex 5: National ITI scores in detail	69
Annex 6 Procuring entities scorecards	69
Annex 7: Statement from the launch of ITI results, 3rd December 2021	69

List of figures

Figure 1 ITI hierarchy example.....	12
Figure 2 Shows officers across the entities engaged during the index	16
Figure 3 Data collection period.....	17
Figure 4 Entities attempted to fill in the survey	18
Figure 5 National Infrastructure Transparency Index Score for Uganda in the year 2021	30
Figure 6 National Score for Enabling Environment.....	31
Figure 7 Capacities and processes analysis.....	33
Figure 8 Institutional capacities variable and sub variable.....	33
Figure 9 Institutional processes variable and sub variable	34
Figure 10 National Score for Citizen Participation.....	36
Figure 11 National Score for Information Disclosure	39
Figure 12 Best performing entities in the 1st Index.....	43
Figure 13 Graph dividing the PEs with their average score	44
Figure 14 Procuring and Disposal Entities grouped by budget size.....	45
Figure 15 Entities in Quartile 1 grouped by budget size	46
Figure 16 Entities in Quartile 2 ranked and grouped by budget size.....	47
Figure 17 Entities in Quartile 3 and Quartile 4 grouped by budget size.....	48
Figure 18 Entities ranked and grouped by type showing average score of each	49
Figure 19 Entities ranked and grouped by sector showing average score for each	50
Figure 20 Entities ranked and grouped by sector showing average score for each	51
Figure 21 Infrastructure Projects by quartile with the average project score for each	65

List of tables

Table 1 Evaluation subjects and data collection methods for each dimension	14
Table 2 Selected Procuring Entities.....	21
Table 3 Entities and their respective projects under the first Index.....	25
Table 4 Entities and evaluators interaction protocol.....	28
Table 5 Dimension 1 Enabling Environment: Indicators with the lowest scores.....	32
Table 6 Dimension 2 Capacities and Processes: Indicators with the highest scores.....	34
Table 7 Dimension 2 Capacities and Processes: Indicators with the lowest scores.....	35
Table 8 Highest performing indicators under Citizen Participation	37
Table 9 Lowest performing indicators under Citizen Participation	38
Table 10 Highest performing indicators under Information Disclosure	39
Table 11 Lowest performing indicators under Information Disclosure	40
Table 12 Procuring Entities ranked by ITI Score.....	42
Table 13 Central Government Entities Sub Ranked according to their performance.....	52
Table 14 Government Agencies sub ranked according to their performance	53
Table 15 Sub ranked Procuring and Disposal Entities of type Government Company	53
Table 16 Local Government entities sub ranked as per performance	54
Table 17 Entities ranked by score in Citizen Participation Dimension	56
Table 18 Entities ranked by score in by Capacities and Processes Dimension.....	57
Table 19 Entities ranked by score in by Information Disclosure Dimension	59
Table 20 Selected Infrastructure projects ranked according to project scores	64

Acknowledgements

Developing our inaugural Infrastructure Transparency Index (ITI) in Uganda amidst a pandemic has been a learning and team experience. We are indebted to the Government of Uganda through the Ministry of Works and Transport for providing an enabling environment for the CoST initiative to engage and contribute to the National Development Plan by informing delivery of “quality infrastructure, a stronger economy and better lives”. Uganda is a beloved country selected to pilot this critical tool among the 19 governments implementing CoST globally.

We would like to thank the thirty (30) pilot Procuring and Disclosing Entities (PDEs) whose sixty (60) projects were evaluated in the first Index. Special thanks go to the public officials engaged during the Index for their kind cooperation in providing information and embracing the Index as a tool to improve systems, processes and procedures in which infrastructure projects are planned and delivered.

It is noteworthy to mention that the Index would never have been a success without the technical support of the CoST International Secretariat with the financial backing from the United Kingdom’s Foreign Commonwealth Development Office (FCDO). We acknowledge the help of the CoST International Secretariat including; Evelyn Hernández – Head of Member and Affiliate Programmes, Gilbert Sendugwa – Senior Regional Manager for Africa and David Zamora, the CoST ITI expert.

We extend special gratitude to the Uganda inaugural ITI team led by the CoST Uganda Manager - Olive Kabatwairwe, coordinated by Michael Cengkuru - Open Data Specialist at the Africa Freedom of Information Centre (AFIC). The assessment team comprised two evaluators, Derrick Muzoora and Samuel Mutongole, and an information technology specialist Allan Okuja. This team has been consistent and very supportive despite the challenges brought about by the pandemic and delays in data retrieval but worked tirelessly to deliver the first Index.

A word from the Champion

On 10th February 2021, at the launch of the 4th Assurance Report, I announced and commissioned the first Infrastructure Transparency Index and invited Government entities to provide maximum support to CoST Uganda for its effective completion.

I am pleased to learn that 60 projects from 30 entities have been evaluated in this Index. I congratulate the 30 entities and CoST Uganda on this significant milestone. The inaugural results speak to four critical dimensions: enabling environment, capacities and processes, citizen participation, and information disclosure. However, the performance is not to our required standard; this means that these areas will have to score up to 100% in subsequent indices to realize full transparency.

The Uganda national ITI score in the year 2021 stands at 20.8%. Uganda's performance in the enabling environment dimension is at 41.4%, information disclosure at 18.4%, citizen participation at 13.8% and capacities and processes at 13.5%. Looking at the performance in the different dimensions, we will need concerted efforts to achieve full transparency in the sector. I am much more concerned that Local Governments performance in the Index was woefully bad, especially on disclosure, with nearly all the thirteen local governments scoring less than 15%. , Local governments are the stewards of a sustainable budget for the sector, and as such, contract terms should have transparency and accountability provisions, central government entities all-encompassing.

My Ministry provides stewardship to the CoST Uganda programme. In my capacity as the Champion, I congratulate the inaugural winners, including Kampala Capital City Authority, who scored 62%, Uganda National Roads Authority with 58% and the Office of the Prime Minister with 48%. As we celebrate your good performance, we challenge you to maintain this position in subsequent indices and; Uganda other entities to take you over. Through the ITI, several areas of strength were identified; Uganda has the requisite enabling environment at 41.1%, but there is a need to strengthen compliance and implement sanctions and incentives to improve transparency, accountability and performance of infrastructure projects.

With the low levels of transparency revealed through this index, I call upon respective Government entities, oversight bodies, state and non-state actors to note these areas of improvement and recommendations to inform positive change.

On behalf of the Government, I extend thanks to CoST International for providing this tool and the financial support to apply it across government institutions. I invite CoST International to consider running this Index as an annual process alongside the Assurance process to facilitate improvements. My Ministry will work with the respective entities and stakeholders to address the issues and recommendations raised in the first Index.

GEN. EDWARD KATUMBA WAMALA

Minister of Works and Transport
CoST Uganda Champion

Executive Summary

This report presents results of the inaugural Infrastructure Transparency Index (ITI) undertaken by CoST Uganda in 2021. The index ran across 30 entities assessing 60 selected infrastructure projects and evaluating critical aspects of the national conditions for delivering public infrastructure projects.

The ITI's mission is to review the transparency and accountability of public infrastructure continuously. The ITI's objectives are as follows: *to assess the state of infrastructure transparency and the capacity of procuring entities to improve transparency in the country; to track and encourage progress and facilitate peer learning, all while assisting in holding procuring entities accountable; and to raise awareness of transparency while building on existing data standards such as the CoST IDS and the OC4IDS.*

The index was guided by a methodology designed in the CoST International ITI Manual, which provides four dimensions: enabling environment, capacities and processes, citizen participation, and information disclosure. Each dimension is assessed against a list of standard indicators and sub-indicators under which each entity, project and dimension are measured and interpreted. In the first Index, the data collection process took a total of 88 days with the whole Index taking seven months, indicating the need to strengthen the appreciation of transparency in the sector. The major limitations the Index encountered was the COVID-19 pandemic and its associated challenges, the low levels of disclosure of infrastructure data and slow uptake of the index by public officials.

The index results reveal that the national ITI score in 2021 stands at 20.8%, representing the national enabling conditions and 60 projects and 30 entities across various sectors. Uganda's performance in the enabling environment dimension is at 41.4%, information disclosure at 18.4%, citizen participation at 13.8% and capacities and processes at 13.5%. Local Governments performed least in the first Index with nearly all the thirteen assessed scoring less than 15%.

Three entities, including Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA), Uganda National Roads Authority (UNRA) and Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), emerged the best performing across the various dimensions in the first Index with scores 62%, 58%, and 48%, respectively. There are notable inconsistencies with data published across the official public access to information platforms such as the Government Procurement Portal (GPP) and respective entity websites. Only one out of every five entities discloses infrastructure data proactively. Public officials lack capacity to disclose data, but also, lack capacity on the legal and policy framework in relation to transparency and accountability.

The index presents a framework for improving the enabling conditions for delivering infrastructure projects, calling on Government through its respective line entities to demonstrate a stronger political commitment to enhance infrastructure transparency, revealing itself in bold actions and implementing sanctions and incentives for non-compliance with the legal and policy framework across the entities. Strengthen citizen engagement (barazas) and make them mandatory across all projects, train public officials on disclosure and the legal framework, enhance institutional capacity and human resources across Local Governments, standardize disclosure and recognize the Index as an annual national performance indicator in the sector.

Chapter 1 | Infrastructure Transparency Index

1.1 Concept of the ITI

CoST – the Infrastructure Transparency Initiative is one of the leading global initiatives improving transparency and accountability in public infrastructure. CoST works with government, private sector and civil society to promote the disclosure, validation and interpretation of data from infrastructure projects. This helps to inform and empower citizens and enables them to hold decision-makers to account. Our experience indicates that informed citizens and responsive public institutions help drive reforms that reduce mismanagement, inefficiency, corruption and the risks posed to the public from poor quality infrastructure. Applying this approach results in cost savings, effective utilization of resources and trust helping close the infrastructure financing gap and delivery of better quality infrastructure for all.

The ITI is a national or sub-national evaluation instrument to measure levels of infrastructure transparency and the quality of the associated processes that improve participation and accountability. It aims to help stakeholders from government, the private sector and civil society understand the relative strengths and weaknesses of transparency, participation and accountability within the sector. The Index has been developed in collaborative manner and it is based on international good practice and lessons learned.

In its design, the ITI interprets transparency in broad and practice not only by looking at it through the traditional lens of access to information but also by considering associated enablers and capacities. These include citizen participation that leads to the creation of public value through access to information. The final ITI score for each procuring entity is obtained from the weighted sums of four constituent dimensions, namely; enabling environment, capacities and processes, citizen participation and information disclosure. Although the ITI was designed for CoST members to evaluate and strengthen their national or sub-national programmes, other interested parties can also use it as a tool to strengthen their institutions.

The tool calculates a transparency score on a scale of zero to one (0-1) for a country's national or subnational public infrastructure, as well as for each of its procuring entities. The scores are based on a large number of unique indicators. These are independently evaluated to assess procuring entity practices and the national or sub-national conditions that give rise to transparency and accountability in the local infrastructure sector. The score is published in the form of an index that ranks procuring entities and provides a national or sub-national assessment. By identifying shortcomings in existing practice, an agenda can be developed to raise transparency and accountability standards within the country or sector and improve ongoing infrastructure management practices. The ITI results provide information that can guide public leaders and others with an interest in strengthening transparency and accountability at the national or sub-national level, as well as in procuring entities.

1.2 Objectives of the Index

The aim of the ITI is to assess the level of transparency and accountability in public infrastructure over time. The objectives are as follows:

1. Assess the state of infrastructure transparency and the capacity to improve transparency
2. Track and encourage progress and facilitate peer learning and promoting accountability.
3. Raise awareness of transparency at the national or local levels building on existing data standards such as the CoST IDS and the OC4IDS.

1.3 Principles of the Index

The ITI is based on the following principles.

- **Relevance:** offers information about the state of the legal framework, the institutional capacities and the disclosure of information to improve infrastructure project administration and implementation.
- **Comprehensiveness:** uses a comprehensive set of indices that allows for a broad assessment of the sector and in-depth evaluation of a procuring entity.
- **Simplicity and trustworthiness:** the methods for collecting and processing data are simple, so the results are easily understood and can be made use of by different stakeholders.
- **Replicability and objectivity:** any person replicating the ITI methodology will be able to obtain the same results as presented in formal reports.

Further characteristics of the ITI are as follows.

- **Impartial:** the coordination of the ITI methodology and its implementation is undertaken through an independent third party with relevant expertise.
- **Periodic:** the evaluation is typically performed annually to offer time between evaluations to improve transparency, accountability and management of infrastructure delivery.
- **Accurate:** the indicators are determined using primary sources of information stemming from national websites or portals and surveys of key public officials.
- **Specific:** the score for each indicator is determined against a single piece of information. This piece of information is not re-used to determine the score of other indicators.
- **Informative:** the results offer a snapshot of assessed procuring entities, which shed light more broadly on the national or subnational situation.
- **Evolving:** the number of procuring entities assessed will grow in time to offer a more complete representation of the national or sub-national context. In addition, the ITI is expected to be reviewed and updated after some years to ensure it continues to offer relevant guidance for transparency in public infrastructure.
- **Constructive:** the ITI can help stakeholders compare the level of transparency of procuring entities and monitor how this changes over time. At this stage, the ITI is not intended to compare countries as the methodology does not take into account the contextual factors and it allows for some decisions that may lead to a slightly different approach being taken. Nevertheless, CoST plans to use the lessons from the initial application of the ITI to allow for country comparisons at a later stage of development. As with other measuring

instruments, the impact of an ITI evaluation depends on the extent to which its results are used by those responsible for decision making.

1.4 Structure of the ITI

The Infrastructure Transparency Index (ITI) is made up of four building blocks known as dimensions, namely: enabling environment, capacities and processes, citizen participation and information disclosure

The first dimension evaluates the national or sub-national context with its legal framework. The other three evaluate the capacities and transparency outcomes at the procuring entities level. Together, the four dimensions align with empirical studies that describe how the quality of procurement outcomes depends on a combination of the regulatory framework and institutional capacities.

Each of the four dimensions is divided into a series of components to allow for their comprehensive evaluation. The result is a four-level hierarchy: the dimensions are formed by variables, which in turn are made up of sub-variables, which in turn are composed of indicators (see figure 1).




Figure 1 ITI hierarchy example

All the indicators are individually evaluated and scored. A set of weighted indicator scores then gives a sub-variable score; a set of weighted sub-variable scores gives a variable score; and a set of weighted variable scores gives a dimension score. A national or subnational ITI score is finally obtained from the weighted sum of the four dimension scores.

Dimensions

Dimension 1: enabling environment

Dimension 1 assessed national or sub-national conditions enabling transparency for the infrastructure sector considering the regulatory framework and centralized digital tools. It has one variable, three sub-variables and 12 indicators. The complete list of indicators is provided in [Annex 1](#). The variables and sub-variables of the dimension are: Legal framework and digital tools which evaluated the access to public information regulatory framework, transparency standards in the public infrastructure sector and the national digital information tools. All indicators of this dimension are national or sub-national and are measured once at the country or local level, irrespective of the number of procuring entities selected for evaluation. Its results offer feedback to strengthen the national or subnational environment, not processes within institutions. The score for the dimension is obtained through the weighted sum of the underlying indicators.

The indicators in this dimension were evaluated using information that is typically available from online sources such as websites containing national regulatory frameworks and information linked to the sector, such as those focused on transparency, public procurement, public infrastructure and public finances.

Dimension 2: capacities and processes

Dimension 2 assessed the soundness of procuring entities' procedures and capacities to disclose data and information. It has two variables, five sub-variables and 25 indicators. The complete list of indicators is provided in [Annex 1](#). The variables and sub-variables of the dimension are: Institutional capacities including, basic knowledge and digital capacities, and; Institutional processes which included, procedures to disclose information, enablers and barriers to disclose information and control over infrastructure projects disclosure.

All the indicators of this dimension evaluated procuring entities, not national or subnational conditions. The indicators were evaluated once in each of "n_e" selected procuring entities. The dimension results offered feedback to strengthen capacities and processes at the procuring entity level. The score of the dimension was obtained through the weighted sums of the underlying indicators for each procuring entity. The data required to evaluate the indicators from this dimension were captured by a survey that was undertaken by a selected government officer from each procuring entity through either self-assessment.

Dimension 3: citizen participation

Dimension 3 evaluated the opportunities provided by procuring entities for citizen participation and how citizens can use the disclosed public information. It had one variable, two sub-variables and 12 indicators. The complete list of indicators is provided in Annex 1. The variables and sub-variables of the dimension included; Participation practices with focus on participation opportunities and use of information by citizens.

All the indicators of this dimension evaluated procuring entities. The indicators were evaluated once for each of "n_e" selected procuring entities. The results from this dimension offered feedback to strengthen a procuring entity's citizen's participation practices. The score for this dimension was obtained through the weighted sums of the underlying indicators for each procuring entity. The data required to evaluate indicators from this dimension were captured by a survey (the same as for dimension 2) that was undertaken by a selected government officer at each procuring entity through either self-assessment.

Dimension 4: information disclosure

Dimension 4 assessed the amount of project data and information disclosed by the procuring entities according to the CoST Infrastructure Data Standard or the Open Contracting for Infrastructure Data Standard. It had one variable, six sub-variables and 44 indicators. The complete list of indicators is provided in [Annex 1](#). The variable and sub-variables of the dimension included; Disclosure practices with sub variables as project identification, project preparation, execution or construction contract procurement, supervision or project management contract procurement, execution of construction contract implementation and supervision or project management contract implementation.

All indicators of this dimension evaluated “ n_p ” infrastructure projects developed by each of “ n_e ” procuring entities. The dimension results offered feedback to the selected procuring entities to strengthen their information disclosure. The overall score of the dimension was obtained through averaging the weighted sum of the underlying indicators for each of “ n_p ” projects.

The indices in this dimension were evaluated using information that was typically available from online sources such as websites containing information on public infrastructure projects and public procurement and other websites showing information linked to these subjects.

Table 1 below presents a summary of the evaluation subjects and data collection methods for each of the four dimensions.

	DIMENSION 1: enabling environment	DIMENSION 2: capacities and processes	DIMENSION 3: citizens participation	DIMENSION 4: information disclosure
Evaluation subject	National or sub-national conditions	Procuring entities	Procuring entities	Procuring entities' projects
Data collection method	Desktop research	Self-assessment or interview	Self-assessment or interview	Desktop research

Table 1 Evaluation subjects and data collection methods for each dimension

Chapter 2 | Methodology

2.1 Evaluation process

Each of the four ITI dimensions had their own evaluation process, as follows.

Dimension 1: enabling environment

Dimension 1 assessed the national conditions enabling transparency for the infrastructure sector and its indicators were determined through desktop research. Each indicator required inputs from at least two evaluators, who made an initial evaluation independently of each other to avoid any bias.

In instances where the results from both evaluators for each indicator were the same, the results were considered final. If there was a difference between them, then a third evaluator resolved the difference. This third evaluation coincided with one of the first two and to consider a score as final. The quality of the collected data in dimension 1 was achieved through this approach, which ensured that the same observation was always independently obtained by two different evaluators.

Dimension 2: capacities and processes

Dimension 2 assessed the soundness of a procuring entity's procedures and capacities to disclose data and information. Its indicators were evaluated through a survey that was completed once by an officer at the procuring entity. The ITI sought for a person that was familiarized with the principles of transparency, accountability, open data, citizen participation, collaboration and innovation.

The quality of data collected by the survey was verified by triangulating the results with other sources of information. These include the following.

- Endorsement. The officer that completed the survey at the PE endorsed the responses that he/she provided. Through the exchange of formal communications, this officer was also officially named by the PE to provide the information required by the ITI.
- Evidence that validated the assigned scores. Along with the survey responses, the officer also provided evidence (such as explanations, documents, websites, notice boards and newspapers) to validate his/her response to each question of the survey. This information was reviewed by the evaluation team. If the information did not match with the score assigned by the officer, the evaluation team either went back to the officer to ask for more information and/or adjusted the score based on the evidence that was provided.

Dimension 3: citizen participation

Dimension 3 assessed the opportunities provided by procuring entities for citizen participation and how citizens used the disclosed public information. Its indicators were evaluated through the same survey that was completed by the information officer of each procuring entity. The quality of data collected by the survey was verified by the same evidence and endorsement control method as used with the other dimension.

Dimension 4: information disclosure

Dimension 4 assessed the amount of data and information disclosed by the procuring entities according to the CoST Infrastructure Data Standard or the OC4IDS; and its indicators were measured through desktop research. These indicators required two or three evaluators, as in dimension 1. The quality of the collected data came from the same method, where a single observation was always obtained through independent evaluation by two different people.

2.2 Data collection

Desktop research

The results were established through a desktop study on various PE websites done by both Evaluator(s) 1 and 2 independently and final results were confirmed by Evaluator 3. The evaluation team consulted a series of official published government websites belonging to the 30 entities and the legal and policy websites to complete an assessment for Dimension 1 and 4. A list of websites and platforms accessed is presented in [Annex 2](#).

Procuring entity survey

The Procuring Entity survey was undertaken using innovative means in the interest of the prevailing conditions within the country. With the announcement of a countrywide lockdown during the initial stages of the Index, the virtual engagements with stakeholders and public officials became the most effective means to communicate and influence performance. To this end, an online self-assessment was designed and communicated across all the 30 entities' respective officials undertaking the Index. Entities that had not communicated their respective officials were engaged to ensure this was done. The online self-assessment can be accessed via [Annex 3](#).

Deployment of the online survey encountered challenges, such as slow to no response across pilot entities, despite the various engagements and reminders to the public officials as indicated in [Annex 4](#), the Procuring entities' interaction checklist. Overall across the 30 entities, the highest number of officers engaged were information officers whereas commissioners were the least. Two permanent secretaries were engaged through the survey. The difference in number and nature of officials engaged in the Index varies on who the Accounting Officers recommended to provide information during the study, in some entities, especially those that did not provide information, interactions were limited to the Accounting Officials and non-other.




Figure 2 Shows officers across the entities engaged during the index

Data collection period

The data collection process took a total of 88 days, with the self-assessment tool taking up to 34 days. The desk research undertaken by the evaluation team took a period of one month and twenty one days.




Figure 3 Data collection period




Figure 4 Entities attempted to fill in the survey

Across the 30 entities, we observed that all procuring and disclosing entities had low scores. They had their projects on the National Digital Information tool (GPP) which allowed evaluators to gather data about their projects, although the data accessed in most instances was incomplete, inconsistent, uncategorized and complex to comprehend. Only one out of every five procuring entities who received the survey completed it. The vast majority (20) did not attempt the survey, with four entities failing to complete it. When officials were asked why they did not conduct the survey, some cited time constraints, while others stated that they saw no real benefit in doing so. The response rate for procuring and disclosing entities in the first ITI was significantly lower than expected. The low performance was majorly attributed to limitations caused by COVID-19, lack of access to offices during the lockdown where most equipment and project documents were archived, lack of appreciation and understanding of the index, attitude of public officials towards the assessment. The response rate exhibited by entities reveals a lack of appreciation and preparedness on the need for transparency, accountability, access to information and citizen participation

2.3 Procuring entities sample

The ITI commenced with the identification of Procuring and Disclosing Entities to participate in the first ITI. A list of entities undertaking projects disclosed on the Government Procurement Portal (GPP) was retrieved from the GPP, this was followed by a mapping of 30 entities to engage in the index process. The 30 entities were identified considering entities from the various levels of Government, the budget they hold and availability of projects within the financial years under consideration. Entities were retrieved from the GPP randomly to provide a wide list of entities from which the 30 entities that met the criteria would be identified. This provided a wide coverage of the entities from which the selection would be made. The budget size indicated in the table is as disclosed in the Government Procurement Portal.

Table below shows the Procuring and Disposal Entities that were selected for the ITI exercise for 2021.

No	PE Name	Type	Sector	Budget Size(Contract Value)
1	Office of the Prime Minister	Central Government	Public Sector Management	443,300,000
2	Office of the President	Central Government	Public Sector Management	1,300,000,000
3	Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development	Central Government	Public Sector Management	6,776,792,977
4	Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Sports	Central Government	Education	24,224,910,546
5	Ministry of Water and Environment	Central Government	Water and Environment	66,076,230,252
6	Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development	Central Government	Lands, Housing & Urban Development	66,198,500
7	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	Central Government	Gender, Labour and Social Development	280,201,853
8	Makerere University	Central Government	Education	197,500,000
9	Parliament of Uganda	Central Government	Public Sector Management	73,812,671

10	Law Development Centre	Central Government	Education	26,762,400
11	National Social Security Fund	Government Agency	Gender, Labour and Social Development	5,385,216,563
12	National Water And Sewerage Corporation	Government Company	Water and Environment	616,459,848
13	Uganda Revenue Authority	Government Agency	Public Sector Management	125,000,000.00
14	Uganda Property Holdings	Government Company	Public Sector Management	601,920,000
15	Uganda National Roads Authority	Government Agency	Works and Transport	141,479,874,995
16	Uganda Electricity Distribution Company	Government Agency	Oil, Gas and Energy	25,910,053,120
17	Uganda Communications Commission	Government Agency	Information, Communication and Technology	524,884,452
18	Entebbe Municipal Council	Local Government	Local Economic Development	13,596,445,586
19	Kampala Capital City Authority	Local Government	Local Economic Development	5,141,254,818
20	Kayunga District Local Government	Local Government	Local Economic Development	20,000,000
21	Nebbi District Local Government	Local Government	Local Economic Development	133,777,200
22	Masaka District Local Government	Local Government	Local Economic Development	163,050,000
23	Mbale District Local Government	Local Government	Local Economic Development	23,610,123,000
24	Lira District Local Government	Local Government	Local Economic Development	76,000,000

25	Tororo District Local Government	Local Government	Local Economic Development	480,000,000
26	Mityana District Local Government	Local Government	Local Economic Development	232,919,626
27	Jinja District Local Government	Local Government	Local Economic Development	232,342,000
28	Arua District Local Government	Local Government	Local Economic Development	1,010,000,000
29	Kiboga District Local Government	Local Government	Local Economic Development	48,000,000
30	Bukedea District Local Government	Local Government	Local Economic Development	138,000,000

Table 2 Selected Procuring Entities

2.4 Infrastructure project sample

The ITI was undertaken during the third wave of the COVID19 pandemic. It was critical to assess the readiness, policy, structures, and institutional frameworks of various government institutions for pandemic management. With this context in mind, we looked at projects that were planned, procured and most probably completed during the fiscal year **2017-2021**. From the analysis we noted that, there were limited entities that had projects disclosed under implementation or completed during the past three financial years, closer to the period of the index, therefore, the methodology had to be stretched further backwards for a period of five years.

Following the identification of 30 entities, a sample of projects from which a selection would be made was retrieved from the Government Procurement Portal using excel, providing basic project data. This was followed by the mapping of 60 projects, with two projects assigned to each entity. The criteria were to choose one project with the highest value and one at random.

A matrix of entities, projects, identification methods, and basic information such as procurement method, reference number, and budget, among other things, was created. The projects were identified with regional balance and sector recognition in mind; implemented across the country and from various sectors of infrastructure development as indicated in the Table below.

No	PDEs	Projects Name
1	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	Project 1: Procurement of Civil Works for the Construction of a Pit Latrine and Kitchen at Kampiringisa Songhai Model Centre
		Project 2: Procurement of Civil works for Construction of a suspended Ceiling at UGIP-Songhai Administration Block
2	Ministry of Water and Environment	Project 1: Construction of Busia water supply and sanitation project
		Project 2: Construction of Nakasongola Water Supply and Sanitation system phase 1
3	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development	Project one: Construction of regional offices for the offices of OAG in Moroto
		Project 2: Construction of regional premises for the office of OAG in Hoima
4	National Water & Sewerage Corporation	Project 1: Earth rocketing and road reinstatement at Jinja - Iganga Road and railway crossing works for the 4th new pumping main Masese to Rubaga 1 and 2 under reservation scheme.
		Project 2: Construction and commissioning of two 162m3 steel reservoir tanks in Nyungwe - Mubende and Kiwamirembe in Kajjansi town council under Lot 1 & 2
5	Kampala Capital City Authority	Project 1: Procurement for the renovation of a three classroom block at Nakivubo primary school

		Project 2: Construction of KCCA Philip Omondi Stadium
6	National Social Security Fund	Project 1: Variation No.2 of contract for Execution of General Infrastructure Works at Lubowa Housing Project – Phase 1 – Lot 4
		Project 2: Provision of Consultancy Services for Detailed Design and Construction Supervision of the Lubowa Housing Project
7	Uganda Electricity Distribution Company	Project 1: Evacuation line, substation and capacitor banks for power generated from ACWA 11
		Project 2: 33kv Power line extension and transformer installation for system improvement at Lugusulu TC Mawokota Sembabule District.
8	Office of the Prime Minister	Project 1: Construct roof water harvesting scheme and boreholes in primary schools (under dry lands project)
		Project 2: Construction of community grain warehouses (under dry lands project)
9	Uganda National Roads Authority	Project 1: Periodic maintenance of Kibuye –Entebbe Road (22kms)
		Project 2: Construction of 40m span Bridge and Multiple Cell Box culverts on Lugogo Swamp crossing along Kyamukonda-Kasozi-Ngoma Road
10	Uganda Property Holdings	Project 1: Renovation works at Plot 9695/12 Changamwe Mombasa Kenya
		Project 2: Renovation of warehouses at Plot 1/240,1/238,1/293,and 1/357 Shimanzi Mombasa
11	Office of the President	Project 1: Construction of the Proposed Office Building for Resident District Commissioner Nakapiripirit
		Project 2: Construction of the Proposed Renovation of Government Property at Plot 4,Mackinzie Valley Kololo
12	Uganda Revenue Authority	Project 1: Renovation of Truck Yard and Verification Bay at Malaba OSBP under Lot 2
		Project 2: Renovation of Packwach Office
13	Law Development Centre	Project 1: Repair of Leaking Roof
		Project 2:Repair of Toilets
14		Project 1: Upgrade of SLAAC Data processing centre room at the department of survey and mapping, Entebbe.

	Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development	Project 2: Procurement of civil works and repairs at Luwero zonal office under Z&A
15	Parliament of Uganda	Project 1: Repair works on the stone pitching around Multi-level car park
		Project 2: Civil maintenance works (partitioning offices, painting offices, tiling floors)
16	Makerere University	Project 1: Office partitioning at existing commerce building for department of development studies
		Project 2: Partitioning works at former commerce building
17	Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Sports	Project 1: External facelift and repair of entrance to Ministry of Education and Sports at Embassy House
		Project 2: Construction of facilities in selected institutions in Uganda in 5 lots
18	Uganda Communications Commission	Project 1: Provision of works for construction of fences at seven digital terrestrial television broadcasting sites (dttb)
		Project 2: Provision of works for construction of fences at three digital television broadcasting site (dttb) -lot 3
19	Masaka District Local Government	Project 1: Construction of 50,000 Litres Mansory rain water harvesting tanks
		Project 2: Construction of a two classroom block with an office, store and supply of 36 three seater desks and installation of a 10,000litre tank at Gayaza Muliira P/S and Zzimwe Cope P/S
20	Bukedea District Local Government	Project 1: Rehabilitation of 10 boreholes
		Project 2: Construction of maternity in malera h/c iii
21	Entebbe Municipal Council	Project 1: Construction of a 2 classroom block at Kigungu p/s
		Project 2: Busambaga road drainage construction 1.0km
22	Mbale District Local Government	Project 1: Construction of Manafwa Rd, Market Place, Central Rd, North Rd, Pallisa Rd - Bishop wasikye & Nkokonjeru Terrace
		Project 2: construction of classroom blocks, OPDs and Staff Houses in various schools and Health Centres in the District
23	Kiboga District Local Government	Project 1: Borehole casting & installation of 05 boreholes
		Project 2: 5stance lined pit latrine at Lwamata hciv

24	Jinja District Government	Local	Project 1: Construction of a 4 in one teachers house and four bricklined stance VIP pit latrine at Kagogwa primary schools
			Project 2: Construction of a 4 in one teachers house and four bricklined stance VIP pit latrine at Butangala primary schools
25	Tororo District Government	Local	Project 1: Renovation of a seven classroom block at Pajangango Primary School under DDEG
			Project 2: Upgrading of Malaba HC3 to HC4 Malaba town council under Transitional development grant
26	Arua District Government	Local	Project 1: Construction of in patients department (ipd) and three units of staff houses at Siripi hc
			Project 2: Construction of classroom block at Imvepi ps
27	Lira District Government	Local	Project 1: Fencing of Aswa livestock holding ground and renovation of production dept. office
			Project 2: Rehabilitation of 4 classrooms at Ayel p/s
28	Mityana District Government	Local	Project 1: Construction of production office block phase iii
			Project 2: Bore hole sitting and drilling supervision of four boreholes at; Buwalulanamungo s/c, Jjinjamaanyi s/c, Nakyewa & Nabumbungu in Bulera s/c.
29	Nebbi District Government	Local	Project 1: Construction of two classroom blocks a with offices at Otwago nfe
			Project 2: Construction of a Classroom Block
30	Kayunga District Government	Local	Project 1: Rehabilitation of an abattoir in Bbaale sub county
			Project 2: Supply and installation of window glasses to the district council hall

Table 3 Entities and their respective projects under the first Index.

2.5 Interaction with Procuring and Disposal Entities

Figure showing the general steps taken during the interaction with Procuring and Disposal Entities. A detailed interaction between the Evaluators and Information officers across the procuring entities that were selected to take part in the ITI exercise is detailed in [Annex 4](#), the Procuring entities' interaction checklist.

1 Presentation of ITI to stakeholders

The ITI was presented to the PEs' information officers, chief administrative officers, permanent secretaries, and procurement officers via an online meeting. The event also drew media, oversight bodies, and civil society organizations (CSOs), among others.

2 Selection of assessment methodology

Following the lockdown in May 2021, the assessment was carried out online, with questions generated and delivered to officials via email and WhatsApp. The CoST Manager also followed up via email, introducing the ITI to each entity.

3 Self assessment conducted

All participating PEs received an email with dates to complete the self-assessment tool and a proposed deadline for completion. The email included information such as the interview date and time, as well as the self-assessment deadline.

4 Press release to create awareness

A press release was issued and distributed throughout the media, as well as on the CoST Uganda website, in order to increase awareness of the ITI.

5 Commission the ITI

PEs received letters of invitation to participate in the ITI process on June 18th, 2021. Emails and phone calls were sent in addition to the letters. Entities were also invited to the initial webinar where the ITI was commissioned.

6 Follow ups by the evaluators

The evaluators made telephone calls and emails to facilitate communications with PEs and access information. The communications included an overview of the ITI initiative, a synopsis of its benefits and methods, a list of the required information from PEs, and a copy of the formal invitation letter dated 18th June 2021.

6 Follow ups by the evaluators

The team gathered all completed self-assessments, followed up on responses, and double-checked for inaccuracies. All responders, including those who did not respond initially, received follow-up phone calls. 80% of the thirty PEs attested to receiving the self-assessment tool.

7 Development of dashboard

To simplify analysis, presentation, and interpretation, a data capture, data analysis, and ITI results sharing dashboard was created. The dashboard also serves as an online repository for all responses submitted by the PEs during the data gathering process.

8 Development of dashboard

The assessors ensured a standard communication system/process and protocol to inform the uniformity of results throughout the data gathering process, utilizing a well-laid statement referencing to the legal and regulatory framework. As a result of the lack of communication, there was no denial.

9 End of data collection

All 30 entities received three follow-up phone calls during and after the deadline. Finally, the CoST Manager sent an end-of-data-collection email to bring the process to a close.

10 Announcement of Findings

The announcement of the index findings will be a public event attended by all parties. It will also serve as a learning opportunity about the ITI and the value it delivers to Uganda.

Table 4 Entities and evaluators interaction protocol

2.6 Challenges and limitations and recommendations on the methodology

1. **The COVID-19 pandemic.** At the start of the exercise, a nationwide COVID-19 lockdown was implemented by Government consequently reducing the operation capacity of many Government offices down to at least 20% which made it difficult to retrieve data/ responses as contact personnel were largely unavailable/ unable to access their offices.
2. **Low disclosure on the recognized information platforms;** The GPP which was the official platform for procurement data had limited information for the 2017-2021. Data was often insufficient, uncategorized and unmined. In addition, other data sources for the desk reviews, selection of entities and projects included entity official websites, these are not updated occasionally and had outdated project and contract information. For instance, entities stop at disclosing/announcing the tenders and nothing beyond this is published. Disclosure was observed to be very low especially on local government websites.
3. **Low response rate;** there was a considerable delay across all the entities in responding to the letters of request to participate in the index, nominate contact persons, participation in the introductory webinar, and respond to the self-assessment. These delays necessitated that the deadline for data collection be extended twice, affecting the initial deadline of July 2021.
4. **Data complexities;** data retrieved from public platforms varied for some entities, although this was treated by multiple validations done by various reviewers in the methodology, there was a clear observation that the data disclosed had quality concerns, was outdated and needed frequent update, high level of data mining and validation.

Recommendations to improve the ITI methodology;

1. The data collection tool/methodology should be revised for brevity and conciseness in regards to the self-assessment or interview questions and the process. For instance, the process should be more participatory right from the onset; government and entities being indexed should discuss the methodology, selection of projects, and indicators under which they will be assessed to build ownership, appreciation and action on results.
2. Each index should commence with a physical inception meeting, well organized and planned across all the participating entities. The participating entities and projects should be announced weeks before the index.
3. For the case of Uganda, a mixture of both physical and online interviews would be the best option considering that many PE officials are often constrained in regards to capacity and equipment to provide all the necessary information promptly using the self-assessment tool; and provide the right level of depth and evidence required.

Chapter 3 | Main results

3.1 National ITI score

Figure 5 below presents the National Infrastructure Transparency Index Score for Uganda which shows the average score for the 30 procuring entities sampled during this exercise.




Figure 5 National Infrastructure Transparency Index Score for Uganda in the year 2021

The National Infrastructure Transparency Index for Uganda in 2021 stands at 20.8%, representative of 60 projects from 30 entities across the various sectors. In reference to the findings, access to infrastructure-related information remains limited across the country. Only one out of every five entities is proactively disclosing infrastructure data.

An emerging concern from the interviews is that citizens are not involved in the planning and implementation of infrastructure projects, citizen participation stands at 13.8%. Results from this index also reveal that there are weak capacities and processes for delivering infrastructure projects dimension has the lowest score at 13.5%. Despite the fact that openness which benefits the public good is mandated by law as indicated in the Enabling Environment dimension at 41.4%, contributing dimensions such as information disclosure is alarmingly low at 18.4%.

Government should demonstrate a stronger political commitment to greater transparency manifesting itself in bold actions on transparency, access to information and citizen participation in public infrastructure delivery processes.

3.1.1 Enabling environment

Figure 5 below shows the score for Enabling Environment and the variables (Legal framework and Digital tools) and sub variables (Access to public information regulatory framework, transparency standards in the public infrastructure sector, and national digital information tools)



Figure 6 National Score for Enabling Environment

Uganda was among the first African countries to enact an Access to Information Act 2005 and the 2011 Access to Information Regulations. Uganda's enabling environment for delivering infrastructure projects stands below average at 41.1%. In regards to the sub variables, the country has a plethora of legal instruments in place at 41.4%, access to information stands at 55%, national digital information tools at 42%, whereas, transparency standards in the public infrastructure sector are the least at 32%. The results from this dimension reveal that transparency and accountability are likely to be constrained if the enabling environment is not strengthened.

The country has a weak coverage on transparency in the public infrastructure sector at 32%

Dimension 1: Enabling Environment: indicators with the highest and lowest scores

The highest performing indicators under the enabling environment dimension include; existence of an access to information law at 100%, there is a national law guaranteeing proactive publication of information on public procurement processes at 100%, and a legal provision for the right to request for public information act 80%. This indicates that there are laws in place to promote easy access to information. The least scoring indicators under the enabling environment dimension included; there is no legal framework providing for the infrastructure data disclosure standard to be proactively published as open data, there is no organization responsible for the infrastructure data disclosure standard and no infrastructure projects geographic information system (GIS) platform. The poor performance of these indicators demonstrates that procuring entities and the country have limited knowledge and recognition of Open Data Standards.

Indicator	Description	Score
Access-to-public information law	There is a national law that guarantees the access to public information in all public sector institutions, which applies to all material held by or on behalf of public authorities with only few exceptions contained in the same law.	100
Proactive publication of information on public procurement processes	There is a national act or regulation that guarantees proactive disclosure of public procurement information in all public sector institutions.	100
Right to request public information	There exists within the national legal framework the right of citizens to request and obtain non-published public information with. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to both information and records/documents • no need to provide reasons for their requests • clear maximum timelines • access to all public institutions. 	80

Table 5 Dimension 1 Enabling Environment: Indicators with the highest scores

Dimension 1: Enabling Environment: Indicators with the lowest scores.

Indicator	Description	Score
Infrastructure data disclosure standard proactively published as open data	The national act or regulation with the infrastructure data disclosure standard requests proactive disclosure of infrastructure projects as open data.	0
Organisation responsible for the infrastructure data disclosure standard	Within the law or regulation there is an organisation responsible for overseeing the compliance of the publication of information according to the infrastructure data disclosure standard.	0
Infrastructure projects geographic information system (GIS) platform	There is a web platform tailored to the needs of citizens that allows in a simple and visual manner, access to a GIS database of infrastructure projects with key information on works under execution or recently executed.	0

Table 5 Dimension 1 Enabling Environment: Indicators with the lowest scores

3.1.2 Capacities and processes

Figure 8 below shows the national score for dimension Capacities and Processes and its variables and sub-variables. Results from the entity self-assessment survey revealed that **capacities and processes for delivering infrastructure projects are weak at 13.49%. There are weak institutional capacities at 16.87% and weaker institutional processes at 11.23%**. This dimension sought to measure the soundness of a procuring entity's procedures and capacities to disclose data and information. As observed from the Procurement Entity interaction checklist, disclosure is affected by various factors including lack of incentives and sanctions for non-disclosure, lack of tools/templates on what to disclose, and the poor attitudes of the public officers to publish information. Government is encouraged to strengthen systems and processes for information disclosure.



Figure 7 Capacities and processes analysis



Figure 8 Institutional capacities variable and sub variable




Figure 9 Institutional processes variable and sub variable

Dimension 2 Capacities And Processes: Indicators with the highest scores

As presented in table 6 below, indicators with the highest scores, *public officials revealed that their knowledge about the access to information law was at 20%, whereas knowledge about transparency initiatives in the infrastructure sector is at 17.73% and knowledge about the transparency data standard in the infrastructure sector is at 16%.*

Looking at the indicators with the highest scores, they present a revelation that there is a limited knowledge or use of the law in ensuring access to information, which ultimately affects the efforts of stakeholders to access and use infrastructure data to engage and influence decisions. The lack of appreciation of the law, reveals a low ability of the procuring and disclosing entities to disclose data on public infrastructure projects.

Dimension 2 Capacities And Processes : Indicators with the highest scores

Indicator	Description	Score
Knowledge about the access-to-information law	The officer who completes the survey knows the national access-to-information law on public information and the main provisions.	20
Knowledge about transparency initiatives in the infrastructure sector	The officer who completes the survey knows the existence of the transparency initiatives in the infrastructure sector and their objectives.	17.73
Knowledge about the transparency data standard in the infrastructure sector	The officer who completes the survey knows the national or subnational transparency data standard for the infrastructure sector and its requirements.	16

Table 6 Dimension 2 Capacities and Processes: Indicators with the highest scores

Dimension 2: Capacities and processes: Indicators with the lowest scores

As presented in table 7 below entities do not ensure documentation of non-compliance and sanctions at 4%. There are only 3.33% projects disclosed complying with the infrastructure data standard representing 3.33% of the total amount of investments on infrastructure projects. This finding reveals that, despite the vast investments the government puts into the sector, only a fraction is disclosed or accounted for to the public. Uganda spends **over 55%** (World Bank) of her budget on public procurement, whereas, Infrastructure funding currently comprises about 32.8% (Uganda Investment Authority) of the Government's total annual expenditure. It is imperative that documentation, and disclosure of critical information related to investments into the infrastructure sector be maintained, to enhance transparency and accountability.

Dimension 2 Capacities And Processes: Indicators with the lowest scores

Indicator	Description	Score
Documentation of non-compliance and sanctions	There is documentation at the entity acknowledging and following-up on non-compliance and sanctions imposed by controlling entities due to non-compliance with the access-to-information standards and/or state contracts.	4
Level of disclosed infrastructure projects	Proportion of projects on which information is disclosed, complying with the infrastructure data standard, compared with the total number of projects managed by the procuring entity, expressed as a percentage.	3.33
Level of investment represented by disclosed infrastructure projects	Amount of investment represented by projects on which information is proactively disclosed by the procuring entity, complying with the infrastructure data standard, as a proportion of the total amount of investment on infrastructure projects, expressed as a percentage.	3.33

Table 7 Dimension 2 Capacities and Processes: Indicators with the lowest scores

3.1.3 Citizen participation

Figure 9 below shows the national score for Dimension of Citizen Participation and its variables and sub-variables. Dimension 3 in the ITI assesses the opportunities provided by procuring entities for citizen participation and how citizens use the disclosed public information. Its indicators are evaluated through the same survey that is completed by the information officer or representative of each procuring entity.



Figure 10 National Score for Citizen Participation

As indicated in Figure 9 above, **the citizen participation dimension scored low at 13.79%, with its sub variables of existence of citizen participation opportunities scoring 16.83 use of information by citizens scoring 11.3%.** These results confirm the CoST finding in the citizens perception survey of 2019 where nearly 71% of the citizens indicating they were not satisfied with their level of involvement in public infrastructure projects, and 57% and 32% were not satisfied with their level of involvement in central and local government projects respectively. The low score on existing participation opportunities denotes a lack of implementation of the law given the fact that citizen participation is enshrined within the Constitution. Lack of citizen participation is an avenue for lack of transparency which breeds mistrust of the systems and processes for delivering public projects.

Dimension 3 Citizen Participation: Indicators with the highest scores

From the citizens participation dimension, indicators with the highest scores include institutionalization of citizen participation at 16.67%, whereas, awareness raising of participation opportunities stands at 16% and permanent and inclusive citizen participation is at 14.67%. These results reveal that, there are limited opportunities for citizen participation, citizens are not well informed about participation opportunities in the sector and there are limited permanent and inclusive citizen participation opportunities in the public infrastructure sector.

Dimension 3 Citizen Participation : Indicators with the highest scores		
Indicator	Description	Score
Institutionalized citizen participation	The institution has formal citizen participation opportunities that allow the procuring entity to listen and implement requests from the citizens that may be used for public infrastructure projects.	16.67
Awareness of participation opportunities	The institution makes an effort to ensure that citizens are aware of existing participation opportunities and of the availability of information related infrastructure projects.	16
Permanent and inclusive citizen participation	The citizens' participation opportunities are permanently available or are available with a constant periodicity through a variety of inclusive channels.	14.67

Table 8 Highest performing indicators under Citizen Participation

Dimension 3 Citizen Participation: Indicators with the lowest scores

As indicated in Table 9, Citizen Participation indicators with the lowest scores included requests and responses of access to information which scored least at 5.33%, evidence of joint ventures at 7.33% and mechanisms for documenting citizens' complaints scored 8%. The results indicate that entities do not make deliberate efforts to maintain records of requests and responses of access to information, hence the low score of 5.33%. The results infer that entities do not provide information on developed joint projects and collaborative procurements with other actors, and that, there are limited mechanisms for documenting citizens' complaints related to public infrastructure projects, whereas entities do not generate a log and document access to information requests and responses in an orderly systematically.

Dimension 3 Citizen Participation : Indicators with the lowest scores		
Indicator	Description	Score
Centralised citizen complaints	There is a mechanism that documents citizens' complaints related to public infrastructure projects, generates a log and manages responses in an orderly fashion.	8
Evidence of joint projects	The institution has developed joint projects with other actors out of the institution as a result of the information on infrastructure projects.	7.33
Requests and responses of access to information	Access- to-information requests and responses from the entity are recorded.	5.33

Table 9 Lowest performing indicators under Citizen Participation

3.1.4 Information disclosure

Figure 10 below shows the national score for the Information Disclosure dimension, its variables and sub-variables. Dimension 4 assessed the amount of data and information disclosed by the procuring entities according to the CoST Infrastructure Data Standard or the OC4IDS, and its indicators were measured through desktop research.

The results indicate that, the Uganda national score for **information disclosure is generally low as revealed in this index at 18.4%**. The variable for this dimension of disclosure practices within the sector stands at 18.38%. The performance of the sub variables under this dimension were below average including project identification at 53.3%, preparation at 15.33%, execution contract procurement at 28.63%, supervision contract procurement at 10.53%, execution contract implementation at 0.33% and supervision contract implementation at 0%. The results from this dimension indicate that Uganda is yet to record an increase in disclosure using international standards and that entities do not disclose information related to contract supervision and implementation. Government is encouraged to strengthen existing disclosure frameworks, put in place incentives and implement sanctions for non-compliance with transparency standards.




Figure 11 National Score for Information Disclosure

Dimension 4 Information Disclosure: Indicators with the highest scores

As indicated in table 10 below, project reference number at 96.67% project owner at 96.67% and project name at 95.33% are the indicators that had the largest scores under information disclosure. Information in this category is oftentimes disclosed across entities proactively, in compliance with the tendering processes. Such information is easily accessible across the national digital information system, the entity websites and the Government Procurement Portal (GPP). Although this information was found often disclosed across formal websites, entities rarely update these platforms in the instances where changes are made on projects. The findings also reveal that there is a lacuna with inconsistent reference numbers across the contracts and project documents, it is important for contracts and projects linked to a particular procurement be tracked using a unique identifier.

Dimension 4 Information Disclosure : Indicators with the highest scores		
Indicator	Description	Score
Project reference number	There is a number or code assigned to the project that uniquely identifies it.	96.67
Project owner	The entity in charge of project development and execution contract is clearly identified.	96.67
Project name	The project is clearly identified with the same name throughout the project cycle.	95.33

Table 10 Highest performing indicators under Information Disclosure

Dimension 4 Information Disclosure: Indicators with the lowest scores

As indicated in table 11, three indicators are not disclosed across the projects and entities assessed. These indicators include, reasons for duration changes, variation to contract scope, and reasons for scope changes. This finding further confirms results of the CoST Assurance processes that, there are no justifications with arguments on why changes/modifications are made to contract durations, scope and where they exist, they are not clearly stipulated or documented. Some entities do not have or know a formal way of communicating to citizens about variations and the challenges they face during project execution.

Dimension 4 Information Disclosure : Indicators with the lowest scores		
Indicator	Description	Score
Reasons for duration changes	Justifications with arguments why changes were made to the contract duration are available.	0
Variation to contract scope	Modifications to the project scope, if they exist, are clearly pointed out.	0
Reasons for scope changes	Justifications with arguments why changes were made to project scope are available.	0

Table 11 Lowest performing indicators under Information Disclosure

3.2 Procuring entities ITI score

Table 12 below shows the Procuring Entities ranked by the Information Transparency Index Scores. It further shows the breakdown by displaying the Dimension Scores that is to say Capacities and Processes, Citizen Participation and Information Disclosure under which the entities were assessed.

Table showing Procuring Entities ranked by ITI Score					
No	PE Name	PE ITI Score	Capacities And Processes	Citizen Participati on	Informati on Disclosu re
1	Kampala Capital City Authority	62.73	85.5	100	19.5
2	Uganda National Roads Authority	58.13	80.31	77.05	26.9
3	Office of the Prime Minister	48.11	65.67	75.05	15.9
4	National Social Security Fund	33.74	29.73	45.9	29.65
5	Office of the President	31.75	44.22	35.35	18.6
6	Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development	30.55	32.6	30.25	28.95
7	Lira District Local Government	22.45	16.82	38.4	17.4
8	National Water And Sewerage Corporation	20.38	28.6	11.7	18.6
9	Uganda Revenue Authority	11.54	0	0	28.85
10	Uganda Property Holdings	11.36	0	0	28.4
11	Mbale District Local Government	10.71	15.52	0	13.2
12	Masaka District Local Government	9.72	0	0	24.3
13	Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Sports	9.18	0	0	22.95
14	Uganda Electricity Distribution Company	9.16	0	0	22.9

15	Kayunga District Local Government	8.92	5.6	0	17.4
16	Law Development Centre	8.76	0	0	21.9
17	Ministry of Water and Environment	8.44	0	0	21.1
18	Entebbe Municipal Council	7.96	0	0	19.9
19	Nebbi District Local Government	7.96	0	0	19.9
20	Uganda Communications Commission	6.96	0	0	17.4
21	Tororo District Local Government	6.96	0	0	17.4
22	Mityana District Local Government	6.96	0	0	17.4
23	Jinja District Local Government	5.76	0	0	14.4
24	Arua District Local Government	5.76	0	0	14.4
25	Kiboga District Local Government	5.36	0	0	13.4
26	Parliament of Uganda	5.28	0	0	13.2
27	Ministry of Lands Housing and Urban Development	4.84	0	0	12.1
28	Makerere University	4.08	0	0	10.2
29	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	1.24	0	0	3.1
30	Bukedea District Local Government	0.8	0	0	2

Table 12 Procuring Entities ranked by ITI Score

Following the analysis of results, three entities emerged the best performing across the various dimensions in the first Infrastructure Transparency Index in Uganda. The reasons behind their performance is attributed to their appreciation of the need to open up, disclose information, and engage citizens and other stakeholders. The entities include;



Figure 12 Best performing entities in the 1st Index

Procuring entities grouped and ranked by their average score




Figure 13 Graph dividing the PEs with their average score

Figure 13 shows results of procuring entities ranked by their respective average score across the dimensions. From the results, Bukedea district local government was the least performer, whereas Kampala Capital City Authority was the best performing entity. It is important to note that all best and least performing entities were from the Local Government sector. Generally, Local Governments performed woefully bad, nearly all of them scoring less than 15%. This finding indicates that transparency and accountability within the Local Government is yet to be realized.

3.2.1 Results by procuring entities budget

Figure 15 below shows different groups ranked according to respective entities budget sizes with the average score received by each group. Quartile 2 had entities with the highest budget scoring 27.60%, followed by quartile 2 with 19.16%, quartile 4 with 8.94% and entities in quartile 3 had the least budget disclosed at 6.01%. It is important to note that results from this analysis reveal that entities falling under government companies tend to disclose budget information compared to other entities. The findings also reveal that entities with higher budgets tend to disclose more budget information compared to entities with small budgets. It should be noted that this analysis is representative of the 30 entities and 60 projects in this Index and may not necessarily represent a global result for all projects implemented by the Government. However, sustainability and consistency of disclosure in these aspects ought to be enhanced. Disclosure of budget information enables public scrutiny and appreciation of public projects and informs an appreciation of where the taxpayers' money or investments are going.




Figure 14 Procuring and Disposal Entities grouped by budget size

Entities in Quartile 1 ranked according to the PDEs budget size with the average PDE ITI score received




Figure 15 Entities in Quartile 1 grouped by budget size

Results from figure 15 above indicate that Uganda National Roads Authority had the highest budget and the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development had the least budget on the projects included in the Index.

Entities in Quartile 2 ranked according to the PDEs budget size with the average PDE ITI score received




Figure 16 Entities in Quartile 2 ranked and grouped by budget size

From the results in figure 16, National Social Security Fund had the highest budget size and Office of the Prime Minister had the lowest budget on the projects included in the Index. This quartile also provided entities with the highest budget in the Index.

Entities in Quartile 3 and 4 ranked according to the PDEs budget size with the average PDE ITI score received




Figure 17 Entities in Quartile 3 and Quartile 4 grouped by budget size

Results from figure 17 indicate that, Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development had the highest budget across the two quartiles 3 and 4, and Kayunga district local government had the lowest budget. These results present a progressive picture regarding the budget allocations of the entities from the lowest to the highest.

3.2.2 Results by procuring entities type

Entities were grouped and ranked by type to identify the scores of each entity and type including local, and central government agencies and government companies. From figure 19, ranking entities according to the type of government entity they belong to, government companies scored 23.91%, government agencies scored 15.87% while central government scored 15.22% and local governments were the least transparent at 12.47%. This finding indicates that there are limited efforts for enhancing transparency at type of entity level across the 30 entities.




Figure 18 Entities ranked and grouped by type showing average score of each

3.2.3 Results by procuring entities sector

Figures 19 and 20 below indicate the **average score** of the 30 entities organized by sector as categorized in the Government Procurement Portal. The sectors assessed include; Local economic development, public sector management, works and transport, gender Labour and social development, and education sectors. Results from the analysis reveal that entities under Works and Transport Sector had the highest average index score of 24.40% while entities in the Education sector had the lowest average index score of 7.34%. Across the sectors, performance in regards to transparency in the delivery of infrastructure is low.




Figure 19 Entities ranked and grouped by sector showing average score for each




Figure 20 Entities ranked and grouped by sector showing average score for each

3.2.4 Sub-rankings

Table 13 below presents the sub rank of entities of type, across central government, the office of the prime minister emerged the best with a score of 48.11%, followed by Office of the President with 31.75% and the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development emerged third with 30.55%. The Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development was the least in this category with 1.24%.

Central Government entities sub ranked

Rank	Type	PE Name	PE Score	ITI
1	Central Government	Office of the Prime Minister	48.11	
2	Central Government	Office of the President	31.75	
3	Central Government	Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development	30.55	
4	Central Government	Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Sports	9.18	
5	Central Government	Law Development Centre	8.76	
6	Central Government	Ministry of Water and Environment	8.44	
7	Central Government	Parliament of Uganda	5.28	
8	Central Government	Ministry of Lands Housing And Urban Development	4.84	
9	Central Government	Makerere University	4.08	
10	Central Government	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	1.24	

Table 13 Central Government Entities Sub Ranked according to their performance

Government Agencies sub ranked according to their performance

From table 14 below, entities were sub ranked by type to identify the most transparent across the dimensions. Results from the analysis revealed that Uganda National Roads Authority emerged the best with a score of 58.13% followed by National Social Security Fund with 33.74%. The least entity in this category was Uganda Communications Commission with 6.96%.

Rank	Type	PE Name	PE ITI Score
1	Government Agency	Uganda National Roads Authority	58.13
2	Government Agency	National Social Security Fund	33.74
3	Government Agency	Uganda Revenue Authority	11.54
4	Government Agency	Uganda Electricity Distribution Company	9.16
5	Government Agency	Uganda Communications Commission	6.96

Table 14 Government Agencies sub ranked according to their performance

Procuring entity scores sub ranking by type

From table 15 below, entities were sub ranked by type of Government Company to identify scores of the most transparent entities in this category. Results from the analysis indicate that, under the sub rank scores for Government Company, the National Water and Sewerage Corporation had the highest ITI score of 20.38% while Uganda Property Holdings 11.36% had the lowest score in the sub rank.

Rank	Type	PE Name	PE ITI Score
1	Government Company	National Water And Sewerage Corporation	20.38
2	Government Company	Uganda Property Holdings	11.36

Table 15 Sub ranked Procuring and Disposal Entities of type Government Company

Local government entities sub ranking

Results from the analysis presented in Table 16 below, revealed that Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA) had the highest score of 62.73%, followed by Lira district local government at 22.45%. The least was Bukedea district local government with 0.8% in the category. For purposes of this Index and from the categories in the GPP, KCCA is ranked among Local Governments. Local government's performance in regards to existing capacities, processes and systems, level of disclosure and citizen participation in public infrastructure requires enhancement.

Rank	Type	PE Name	PE ITI Score
1	Local Government	Kampala Capital City Authority	62.73
2	Local Government	Lira District Local Government	22.45
3	Local Government	Mbale District Local Government	10.71
4	Local Government	Masaka District Local Government	9.72
5	Local Government	Kayunga District Local Government	8.92
6	Local Government	Entebbe Municipal Council	7.96
7	Local Government	Nebbi District Local Government	7.96
8	Local Government	Mityana District Local Government	6.96
9	Local Government	Tororo District Local Government	6.96
10	Local Government	Arua District Local Government	5.76
11	Local Government	Jinja District Local Government	5.76
12	Local Government	Kiboga District Local Government	5.36
13	Local Government	Bukedea District Local Government	0.8

Table 16 Local Government entities sub ranked as per performance

Procuring entities ranked by score in Citizen Participation Dimension

Table 17; presents results from an analysis of entities performance on their level of citizen participation in public infrastructure delivery processes. From the analysis, only 8 out of 30 entities provided vivid information regarding this dimension, with the rest of the 22 scoring 0%. Kampala Capital City Authority took the lead with 100% in this dimension, followed by Uganda National Roads Authority with 77.1% and Office of the Prime Minister with 75.05%.

These results reveal that there is **a big discrepancy between the highest and lowest entity in citizen participation with 22 entities scoring zero**. These results may not necessarily mean, entities do not deliberately consider documenting and publishing information regarding their level of citizen engagement processes, but, the lack of responsiveness in the assessment signifies a weak efforts in this aspect. It is therefore critical that government enforces the constitutional mandate on citizen participation in service delivery.

No	PE Name	3 Citizen participation
1	Kampala Capital City Authority	100
2	Uganda National Roads Authority	77.1
3	Office of the Prime Minister	75.05
4	National Social Security Fund	45.9
5	Lira District Local Government	38.4
6	Office of the President	35.35
7	Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development	30.25
8	National Water And Sewerage Corporation	11.7
9	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	0
10	Ministry of Water and Environment	0
11	Uganda Electricity Distribution Company	0
12	Uganda Property Holdings	0
13	Uganda Revenue Authority	0
14	Law Development Centre	0
15	Ministry of Lands Housing and Urban Development	0
16	Parliament of Uganda	0
17	Makerere University	0
18	Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Sports	0
19	Uganda Communications Commission	0
20	Masaka District Local Government	0
21	Bukedea District Local Government	0
22	Entebbe Municipal Council	0
23	Mbale District Local Government	0
24	Kiboga District Local Government	0
25	Jinja District Local Government	0
26	Tororo District Local Government	0
27	Arua District Local Government	0

28	Mityana District Local Government	0
29	Nebbi District Local Government	0
30	Kayunga District Local Government	0

Table 17 Entities ranked by score in Citizen Participation Dimension

Entities ranked by score in by Capacities and Processes Dimension

As indicated in table 18 below, the 30 entities were assessed to identify their level of compliance, existence of systems, processes and capacities. Only 10 of the 30 entities had the requisite information on this dimension in the self-assessment whereas the rest of the 20 entities did not have. Kampala Capital City Authority emerged best in this dimension with a score of 85.5%, followed by Uganda National Roads Authority with 80.5% and Office of the Prime Minister with 65.67%.

Majority of the entities did not provide or publish information on this dimension. The weak or lack of compliance with and enforcement of existing systems, processes and capacities is a major cause for alarm for the country if we seek to achieve the national development plan III¹, and; Increase the stock and quality of strategic infrastructure to accelerate the country's competitiveness. Enhance human capital development; and. Strengthen mechanisms for quality, effective and efficient service delivery, and strengthen infrastructure which is one indicator to the realization of vision 2040, "A Transformed Ugandan Society from a Peasant to a Modern and Prosperous Country within 30 years.

Procuring Entities ranked by Capacities And Processes Dimension Score		
No	PE Name	2 Capacities and processes
1	Kampala Capital City Authority	85.5
2	Uganda National Roads Authority	80.3
3	Office of the Prime Minister	65.67
4	Office of the President	44.22
5	Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development	32.6
6	National Social Security Fund	29.73
7	National Water And Sewerage Corporation	28.6
8	Lira District Local Government	16.82
9	Mbale District Local Government	15.52
10	Kayunga District Local Government	5.6
11	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	0

¹ National Development Plan III stipulates the country's strategy for the next five years.

12	Ministry of Water and Environment	0
13	Uganda Electricity Distribution Company	0
14	Uganda Property Holdings	0
15	Uganda Revenue Authority	0
16	Law Development Centre	0
17	Ministry of Lands Housing and Urban Development	0
18	Parliament of Uganda	0
19	Makerere University	0
20	Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Sports	0
21	Uganda Communications Commission	0
22	Masaka District Local Government	0
23	Bukedea District Local Government	0
24	Entebbe Municipal Council	0
25	Kiboga District Local Government	0
26	Jinja District Local Government	0
27	Tororo District Local Government	0
28	Arua District Local Government	0
29	Mityana District Local Government	0
30	Nebbi District Local Government	0

Table 18 Entities ranked by score in by Capacities and Processes Dimension

Entities ranked by score in Information Disclosure Dimension

Results from table 19, presents the assessment on dimension 4 scores of all the 30 entities in regards to information disclosure and general principles. The National Social Security Fund had the highest dimension score of 29.65% while Bukedea District Local Government scored 2% as the lowest dimension score in the sub rank. These results denote that disclosure is still very low across the entities given the performance in this index. On the other hand, entities provide more information when approached at their on disposal and minimal information is proactively disclosed.

No	PE Name	4 Information disclosure
1	National Social Security Fund	29.65
2	Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development	28.95
3	Uganda Revenue Authority	28.85
4	Uganda Property Holdings	28.4
5	Uganda National Roads Authority	26.9
6	Masaka District Local Government	24.3
7	Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Sports	22.95
8	Uganda Electricity Distribution Company	22.9
9	Law Development Centre	21.9
10	Ministry of Water and Environment	21.1
11	Entebbe Municipal Council	19.9
12	Nebbi District Local Government	19.9
13	Kampala Capital City Authority	19.5
14	National Water And Sewerage Corporation	18.6
15	Office of the President	18.6
16	Kayunga District Local Government	17.4
17	Lira District Local Government	17.4
18	Mityana District Local Government	17.4
19	Tororo District Local Government	17.4
20	Uganda Communications Commission	17.4
21	Office of the Prime Minister	15.9
22	Arua District Local Government	14.4
23	Jinja District Local Government	14.4

24	Kiboga District Local Government	13.4
25	Mbale District Local Government	13.2
26	Parliament of Uganda	13.2
27	Ministry of Lands Housing and Urban Development	12.1
28	Makerere University	10.2
29	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	3.1
30	Bukedea District Local Government	2

Table 19 Entities ranked by score in by Information Disclosure Dimension

Although KCCA emerged the best in the Citizen Participation dimension, capacities and processes, they are ranked 13th in information disclosure. Entities are likely to strengthen one aspect of project delivery and not all project delivery phases. In addition, disclosure tends to be high in most donor funded, and hybrid projects and less on non-demanding such as Government of Uganda funded projects.

3.3 Infrastructure projects scores

Table 20 below presents result scores from the analysis on the performance of individual infrastructure projects in this index. All 60 selected Infrastructure Projects scored low scores, there is a difference of 38.8% between the highest scoring project and the lowest scoring project. 18 projects scored above 20% indicating only a third of the projects with the rest performing below. From table 20, the following projects scored the highest scores.

1. Provision of Consultancy Services for Detailed Design and Construction Supervision of the Lubowa Housing Project by National Social Security Fund (40.3%)
2. Renovation of Truck Yard and Verification Bay at Malaba OSBP under Lot 2 by Uganda Revenue Authority (37.3%)
3. Construction of regional offices for the offices of OAG in Moroto by Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development (33.5%)

The following projects scored the lowest scores

1. Procurement of Civil Works for the Construction of a Pit Latrine and Kitchen at Kampiringisa Songhai Model Centre by Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (3.1%)
2. Construction of maternity in malera h/c iii by Bukedea District Local Government (2%)
3. Rehabilitation of 10 boreholes by Bukedea District Local Government (2%)

Selected Infrastructure projects ranked according to project score

Infrastructure Projects ranked according to Project Score				
No	PE Project Name	PE Name	PE Score	Project Score
1	Provision of Consultancy Services for Detailed Design and Construction Supervision of the Lubowa Housing Project	National Social Security Fund	40.3	
2	Renovation of Truck Yard and Verification Bay at Malaba OSBP under Lot 2	Uganda Revenue Authority	37.3	
3	Construction of regional offices for the offices of OAG in moroto	Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development	33.5	
4	Renovation of warehouses at Plot 1/240,1/238,1/293,and 1/357 Shimanzi Mombasa	Uganda Property Holdings	28.4	
5	Renovation works at Plot 9695/12 Changamwe Mombasa Kenya	Uganda Property Holdings	28.4	
6	Construction of Busia water supply and sanitation project	Ministry of Water and Environment	28.1	
7	Construction of a two classroom store and supply of 36 three seater desks and installation of A 10,000 litre tank at Gayaza Mulira primary school and Zzimwe cope primary school.	Masaka District Local Government	27.7	
8	Periodic maintenance of Kibuye - Entebbe road (22km)	Uganda National Roads Authority	27.5	
9	Construction of facilities in selected institutions in Uganda in 5 lots	Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Sports	26.6	
10	Construction of 40m span Bridge and Multiple Cell Box culverts on Lugogo Swamp crossing along Kyamukonda-Kasozi-Ngoma Road	Uganda National Roads Authority	26.3	
11	Construction of regional premises for the office of OAG in hoima	Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development	24.4	

12	33kv powerline extension and transformer installation for system improvement at Lugusulu TC Mawokota Sembabule District.	Uganda Electricity Distribution Company	22.9
13	Evacuation line, substation and capacitor banks for power generated from ACWA 11	Uganda Electricity Distribution Company	22.9
14	Repair of Leaking Roof (LDC/WRKS/2020-2021/00014)	Law Development Centre	21.9
15	Repair of Toilets (LDC/WRKS/2020-2021/00007)	Law Development Centre	21.9
16	Construction of 50,000 litres masonry rain water harvesting tanks.	Masaka District Local Government	20.9
17	Renovation of Packwach Office	Uganda Revenue Authority	20.4
18	Procurement for the renovation of a three classroom block at nakivubo primary school	Kampala Capital City Authority	20.1
19	Busambaga road drainage construction 1.0km	Entebbe Municipal Council	19.9
20	Construction of a 2 classroom block at kigungu p/s	Entebbe Municipal Council	19.9
21	Construction of a Classroom Block (NMC794/WRKS/2017-2018/00001)	Nebbi District Local Government	19.9
22	Construction of two classroom blocks a with offices at otwago nfe	Nebbi District Local Government	19.9
23	External facelift and repair of entrance to Ministry of Education and Sports at Embassy House	Ministry of Education, Science, Technology and Sports	19.3
24	Variation No.2 of contract for Execution of General Infrastructure Works at Lubowa Housing Project – Phase 1 – Lot 4	National Social Security Fund	19
25	Construction of KCCA Philip Omondi Stadium	Kampala Capital City Authority	18.9
26	Construction and commissioning of two 162m3 steel reservoir tanks in Nyungwe - Mubende and Kiwamirembe in Kajjansi town council under Lot 1 & 2	National Water & Sewerage Corporation	18.6
27	Construction of the Proposed Office Building for Resident District Commissioner Nakapiripirit	Office of the President	18.6

28	Construction of the Proposed Renovation of Government Property at Plot 4, Mackinzie Valley Kololo	Office of the President	18.6
29	Earth rocketing and road reinstatement at Jinja - Iganga Road and railway crossing works for the 4th new pumping main Masese to Rubaga 1 and 2 under reservation scheme	National Water & Sewerage Corporation	18.6
30	Borehole silting and drilling supervision of four boreholes at; buwalulanamungo s/c, jjinjamaanyi s/c, nakyewa&nabumbungu in bulera s/c.	Mityana District Local Government	17.4
31	Construction of production office block phase iii	Mityana District Local Government	17.4
32	Fencing of aswa livestock holding ground and renovation of production dept. office	Lira District Local Government	17.4
33	Provision of works for construction of fences at seven digital terrestrial television broadcasting sites (dttb)	Uganda Communications Commission	17.4
34	Provision of works for construction of fences at three digital television broadcasting site (dttb) - lot 3	Uganda Communications Commission	17.4
35	Rehabilitation of 4 classrooms at ayel p/s	Lira District Local Government	17.4
36	Rehabilitation of an abattoir in bbaale sub county	Kayunga District Local Government	17.4
37	Renovation of a severn class room block at Pajangango primary school under DDEG.	Tororo District Local Government	17.4
38	Supply and installation of window glasses to the district council hall	Kayunga District Local Government	17.4
39	Upgrading of Malaba HC 3 to HC4, Malaba Town Council under Transitional development grant.	Tororo District Local Government	17.4
40	Construct roof water harvesting scheme and boreholes in primary schools (under dry lands project)	Office of the Prime Minister	15.9
41	Construction of community grain warehouses (under dry lands project)	Office of the Prime Minister	15.9
42	Construction of a 4 in one teachers house and four brick lined stance VIP pit latrine at Butangala primary schools	Jinja District Local Government	14.4

43	Construction of a 4 in one teachers house and four brick lined stance VIP pit latrine at Kagogwa primary schools	Jinja District Local Government	14.4
44	Construction of classroom block at imvepi ps	Arua District Local Government	14.4
45	Construction of in patients department (ipd) and three units of staff houses at siripi hc	Arua District Local Government	14.4
46	Construction of Nakasongola water supply and sanitation system phase 1	Ministry of Water and Environment	14.1
47	5stance lined pit latrine at Lwamata hciv	Kiboga District Local Government	13.6
48	Borehole casting & installation of 05 boreholes	Kiboga District Local Government	13.2
49	Civil maintenance works (partitioning offices, painting offices, tiling floors)	Parliament of Uganda	13.2
50	construction of classroom blocks, OPDs and Staff Houses in various schools and Health Centres in the District	Mbale District Local Government	13.2
51	Construction of Manafwa Rd, Market Place, Central Rd, North Rd, Pallisa Rd - Bishop Wasikye & Nkokonjeru Terrace	Mbale District Local Government	13.2
52	Repair works on the stone pitching around a multi-level car park.	Parliament of Uganda	13.2
53	Procurement of civil works and repairs at at at Luwero zonal office under F&A	Ministry of Lands Housing and Urban Development	12.1
54	Upgrade of SLAAC data processing centre room at the Department of survey and mapping Entebbe.	Ministry of Lands Housing and Urban Development	12.1
55	Office partitioning at existing commerce building for department of development studies	Makerere University	10.2
56	Partitioning works at former commerce building	Makerere University	10.2
57	Procurement of Civil works for Construction of a suspended Ceiling at UGIP-Songhai Administration Block	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	3.1
58	Procurement of Civil Works for the Construction of a Pit Latrine and Kitchen at Kampiringisa Songhai Model Centre	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	3.1

59	Construction of maternity in malera h/c iii	Bukedea District Local Government	2
60	Rehabilitation of 10 boreholes	Bukedea District Local Government	2

Table 20 Selected Infrastructure projects ranked according to project scores

Infrastructure Projects by quartile with the average project score for each

Figure 21 divides the projects by quartiles with their average score to have an extra view of the distribution. The quartiles presents a set of projects from different sectors against their level of performance across the dimensions. Results from the analysis in figure 12 reveal that projects in quartile 1 had the highest average score of 27.87%, projects in quartile 2 had the second-highest average score of 19.33%, projects in quartile 3 had the third-highest average score of 16.40% and projects in quartile 4 had the lowest average score of 9.90%. The results denote a sharp difference between the highest-scoring procuring entities and the lowest scoring procuring entities. There is a considerable difference between the projects in the first quartile and the least performing projects.




Figure 21 Infrastructure Projects by quartile with the average project score for each

Conclusions

From the scoring

1. The Uganda national ITI score in the year 2021 stands at 20.8%.
2. Uganda's performance in the enabling environment dimension is at 41.4%, information disclosure at 18.4%, citizen participation at 13.8% and capacities and processes at 13.5%.
3. National score for information disclosure is generally low at 18.4%. In this index, Local governments scored least.
4. Best entities include: KCCA, UNRA and OPM with 62%, 58%, and 48%, respectively.

Level of Transparency

1. Most transparent projects were from NSSF at 40.3%, URA at 37.3% and MoFPED at 33.5%. The least transparent projects were from the Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development at 3.1% and Bukedea district at 2%.
2. Official data platforms had limited information for the period 2017 – 2021. Data was insufficient, unclassified, and unmined.
3. Low levels of responsiveness. Only one in every five entities who received the self-assessment survey completed it; the vast majority (20) did not attempt the survey, while four entities did not complete it.
4. There is a large discrepancy in the level of responsiveness of entities all through the Index. Transparency is not yet a culture across the entities.

Access to Information

1. The access to information law is still loosely known and implemented by public officials at 20%.
2. Disclosure is not yet the norm and culture across entities. Only 5% of the entities have records on requests for information, and 8% record complaints.
3. GPP majorly discloses tendering data but lacks project data. Only one out of five entities proactively discloses infrastructure data.
4. 18.4% of the public accesses information upon request and 11.3% use the disclosed information. Whereas, only 5% of the entities have records on requests for information, and 8% record complaints on infrastructure projects.

Enabling environment

1. Despite the enabling environment for delivering infrastructure projects at 41.2%, its implementation in the infrastructure sector is not visible.
2. Public officials' capacity to implement transparency standards and initiatives enshrined in the law is weak.
3. There are weak capacities and processes for delivering infrastructure projects at 11.23%.
4. Local Governments lack capacity and human resources to enhance transparency in the sector, with most of them understaffed. In addition, interactions with public officials revealed that municipalities do not have information officers.

Citizen Participation

1. Citizen participation in infrastructure projects delivery processes is low and requires strengthening.
2. Although data is disclosed, only a fraction of citizens use it to influence. Most data is complex for the local person to comprehend.
3. Opportunities for citizen participation are deficient at 16.8%.
4. Citizen participation is yet to be institutionalized across entities with the current status at 16.6%
5. Permanent and inclusive citizen participation are weak at 14.67%.

Recommendations

1. Through the OPM, the government should demonstrate a stronger commitment and actions to enhance infrastructure transparency.
2. OPM should consider making the Baraza approach mandatory across all infrastructure projects to enhance citizens' scrutiny and accountability.
3. The Ministry of Finance and PPDA should strengthen disclosure by issuing a standard disclosure framework/template and training officials on how to publish data. Disclosed data should be analysed, monitored and feedback provided to entities.
4. The Ministry of ICT should strengthen entities' capacity in the implementation of the Access to Information Law, and enforce mechanisms for institutionalizing access to information. The Ministry should monitor performance of entities in this regard and provide status reports for improvement.
5. NITA-U should ensure all entity websites are functional and well maintained.
6. Ministry of Local Government should strengthen monitoring of local governments to ensure compliance with the legal framework and systems in the sector to enhance their levels of transparency.
7. The Ministry of Local Government should lobby for increased financing and strengthen human resources for Local Governments, especially information officers.
8. MoWT should strengthen its oversight role as the lead sector entity in monitoring performance of projects and providing status reports on the infrastructure sector.
9. PDEs should strengthen their internal data management and archiving systems to ease retrieval and sharing. Information on engagements with citizens and public complaints/feedback on infrastructure projects should be well documented.
10. Government through MoFPED, MoWT and OPM should support CoST Uganda to deliver an annual ITI and;
11. Adopt the Index as an annual national performance indicator in the sector in addressing corruption risks.

Annex 1 Evaluation instrument

The Evaluation instrument can be accessed via

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1BjEeJjD_LdVzRWVqEN96mv-HnPeX2vRqXm3WU222GjE/edit?usp=sharing

Annex 2: List of websites and platforms consulted: Under the enabling environment dimension the websites accessed are presented via this link:

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1i9ygeWvC39yZo1h47soLZNTR4CrgnUk/edit#gid=267108019>

Annex 3 | Procuring entities survey can be accessed via this link:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1wuxubKudaEL36PyQ8_eJwKFRM2lprMji1hg3Qua-VXo/edit?usp=sharing

Annex 4 The Procuring entities' interaction checklist

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LDGm85Rqt76Hz3OqI_02ogGCnB0tE0G5lkZ4VhdPP-8/edit

Annex 5: National ITI scores in detail

Table showing the National ITI Scores for Uganda in detail can be accessed via this link:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1jnDq8P6UduNTtydkEwW0oyA7RTMNI8GxIQFk6rO6xg/edit?usp=sharing>

Annex 6 Procuring entities scorecards

The scorecards are shown here as links and can be viewed via this link

<https://iti.africafoicentre.org/procuring-entities-iti>

Annex 7: Statement from the launch of ITI results, 3rd December 2021, Kabira Country Club, Kampala. https://www.cost.or.ug/download/uganda-stands-at-20-8-cost-ugandas-1st-infrastructure-transparency-index_statement/