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1. Background
Barazas are community forums organized by the government of Uganda:
- information: government officials inform citizens about budgeting, spending, planning etc.
- deliberation: citizens can engage with government officials

→ Citizens could hold the government accountable.
→ Barazas could improve public service delivery.

A rigorous impact evaluation was needed:
1. What is the impact of sub-county level barazas on public service delivery?
2. What is the relative importance of the information/deliberation component?
3. Should barazas be organized at the sub-county level or at the district level? (jurisdictional tier)

2. Data
baseline (2015): 12 545 households, 400 officials

The government faced implementation challenges.
→ end-line data collection after partial roll-out
→ strategies to reduce potential selection bias:
1. balance between planned-to-treat-but-not-treated sub-counties & control sub-counties
2. matching of treated sub-counties to similar control sub-counties
3. updated minimal detectable effects

end-line (2020): 6 700 households, 260 officials

3. Results: confirmatory analysis
- nested/two-step randomization design
- following a pre-analysis plan
- using an overall index & sector indices

We find no significant impact of barazas on public service delivery, except for in the agricultural sector.

4. Results: exploratory analysis
The results of the confirmatory analysis hide significant impacts on individual outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean baraza info. deli</th>
<th>district baraza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obtained seed from govt.</td>
<td>0.121 (0.326)</td>
<td>0.004 (0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extension visit at home</td>
<td>0.178 (0.056)</td>
<td>0.037 (0.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farmer associations/groups in village</td>
<td>0.403 (0.030)</td>
<td>0.087 (0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiting time at water source</td>
<td>3.198 (1.638)</td>
<td>-0.286 (0.152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school has electricity</td>
<td>0.338 (0.473)</td>
<td>-0.040 (0.042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school has water facility</td>
<td>0.703 (0.457)</td>
<td>-0.023 (0.048)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Results: heterogeneity analysis
The results of the confirmatory analysis mask significant heterogeneity:

Barazas are more effective for households
- in remote areas.

Barazas are more effective for sub-counties
- with <1.5 years between treatment & end-line
- with high elite capture
- with high ethnic fractionalization:

6. Conclusion
Barazas address diverse issues in a heterogeneous setting.
→ treatments are unlikely to be standardized
→ large scope of impacts: highly localized & context specific
→ difficult to capture ATE: impact is diluted if outcomes are averaged