



Formative evaluation of World Food Programme's Livelihoods Programme, Karamoja, Uganda

Final Report

Prepared for //
Department for International
Development

Date // 27 July 2012

By // Julian Gayfer, Joseph
Barnes, Mary Jennings, Agnes
Kayondo

IOD PARC is the trading name of International
Organisation Development Ltd //

Omega Court
362 Cemetery Road
Sheffield
S11 8FT
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) 114 267 3620
www.iodparc.com

Contents

Acronyms	iii
Executive Summary	5
Introduction	9
Approach and Methodology	9
Programme Context	15
Context at the time of programme design	15
Programme Intentions	17
How the context has evolved since 2010	18
Programme Implementation	19
Findings	25
The nature of NUSAF 2 (WFP)	25
How well is NUSAF 2 (WFP) delivering?	29
Increasing productivity and beneficiary livelihood security	31
Building Capacities	33
Use of relationships, knowledge and skills	34
Relevance of approach	36
Efficiency of Programme delivery	39
Likelihood of the sustainability of results.	45
Unintended consequences	48
Global importance to WFP	48
Conclusions: Moving Forward	50
Merit and worth	50
Key challenges	51
Strategic Options for DFID and NUSAF 2 (WFP)	54
Annex 1: Outline Terms of Reference for Formative Evaluation	56
Annex 2: Revised detailed Logical Framework	62
Annex 3: Terms of Reference for Summative Evaluation	65

Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix	67
Annex 5: People Met	71
Annex 6: Documents Reviewed	74
Annex 7: Desk Review of Available Survey Data	79
Annex 8: ESC Comments	86
Annex 9: Evaluation Team Response to ESC Comments	90

Acronyms

ACF	Action Against Hunger
CAO	Chief Administrative Officer
CESVI	Cooperazione Sviluppo Onlus
CFSVA	Comprehensive Food Security & Vulnerability Analysis
CFTPP	Cash and Food Transfers Pilot Project (Lesotho)
COOPI	Cooperazione Internazionale
DHO	District Health Office
DFID	Department for International Development
ECD	Early Childhood Development Centres
EDR	Emergency Drought Relief Programme (Swaziland)
EMOP	Emergency Operation
ESC	Evaluation Steering Committee
EU	European Union
EVH	Extremely Vulnerable Households
FACT	Food and Cash Transfers (Malawi)
FI	Food Insecure
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
GAM	Global Acute Malnutrition
GoU	Government of Uganda
HISP	Household Income Support Programme
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
IP	Implementing Partner
KALIP	Karamoja Livelihoods Programme
KIDDP	Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Programme
KPAP	Karamoja Productive Assets Programme
MAP	Medical Assistance Programmes
MCHN	Mother and Child Health and Nutrition
MFI	Moderately Food Insecure
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory Services
NUSAF	Northern Uganda Social Action Fund
OPM	Office of the Prime Minister of Uganda
PADC	Pian Agro-Pastoral Development Centre
PMC	Project Management Committee
PRDP	Peace Recovery and Development Plan
PSNP	Productive Safety Net Programme
PWP	Public Works Programme

SAGE	Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment
TL	Team Leader
TOR	Terms of Reference
UBOS	Uganda Bureau of Statistics
UK	United Kingdom
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WFP	World Food Programme
WB	World Bank

Executive Summary

- i. The purpose of this formative evaluation is to provide an independent assessment on the *merit* and *worth* of the World Food Programme (WFP) strategy on livelihood recovery in Karamoja. The primary audience for this evaluation report is DFID, although it also aims to speak to other stakeholders, especially the Office of the Prime-minister and WFP; and to provide the basis for a dialogue within the partnership.
- ii. The object of the evaluation is the DFID-funded (2010-2013) WFP livelihood programme, a component of the Government of Uganda Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF 2).
- iii. NUSAF 2 (WFP) consists of three main components: i) a Public Works Programme, ii) a Household Income Support Programme, and iii) institutional development. The goal is to improve the access of 77,000 moderately food insecure households with labour capacity (approximately 50% of the population in the Karamoja sub-region) to income-earning opportunities and better socio-economic services.
- iv. The evaluation process and product has been designed to be a tool for improvement, 15 months into the three-year DFID funding commitment. A detailed methodology which applied the DAC criteria (efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, and sustainability) and included an Evaluation Matrix was provided in the Inception Report. This was discussed with the National M&E Technical Working Group Sub-committee on Evaluation.
- v. The enquiry stage included focus group discussions within 20 communities who are receiving transfers from the programme (14 food aid, 6 cash), using a purposive sampling approach. To complement this, key informant interviews were conducted at the community, sub-county, district, and national levels. The confidence of the evaluation team in the representativeness of the evidence gathered was strengthened by validation meetings on emerging findings facilitated by the team in Moroto and Kampala.
- vi. The UNDP development index puts Karamoja as one of the world's poorest places. Over 80 percent of the population live below the poverty line. Recurrent shocks, including drought and conflict, have left people structurally vulnerable to hunger. Livelihood strategies in this semi-arid region are primarily pastoralism and rain-fed agriculture. Climatic instability compounds this.
- vii. NUSAF 2 (WFP) builds on the WFP Karamoja Productive Assets Programme (KPAP): a response to the WFP strategic shift from food aid to food assistance. KPAP was informed by WFP's global experience, particularly Ethiopia and India. In 2010, WFP was viewed by DFID as the best-positioned actor in Karamoja to implement a livelihoods programme at the scale required by NUSAF 2.
- viii. During 2011, the first year of NUSAF 2 (WFP) implementation, rains in Karamoja were exceptionally longer and later than usual. In the same year WFP Uganda experienced significant restructuring, including: downsizing, change of Country Director, and four different heads of sub-office in Moroto (the regional coordination office for Karamoja). In 2012, both the EU-funded Karamoja Livelihoods Programme (KALIP) programme and the World Bank-funded NUSAF 2 (WB) components are starting to come on stream.
- ix. NUSAF 2 (WFP) is a programme with enormous expectations placed on it from all stakeholders, including national and local government, communities, WFP, and DFID. It has introduced, in a short space of time, a dramatic shift in the type of programming used in Karamoja, and it has done so at a very large scale.

- x. Whilst NUSAF 2 (WFP) is termed a livelihood programme, it has elements that attempt to provide a productive safety net, strengthen livelihoods, and enhance social protection. The majority of public works efforts are roads and dams. As currently structured, these assets have provided valued employment, but they reflect a series of disconnected projects rather than being part of a local-level livelihoods strategy.
- xi. Household Income Support has tended to be delivered through large-group community gardens and the distribution of large numbers of fuel efficient stoves. The gardens appear to have effectively sensitised people to new agricultural options – particularly vegetables – but the processes observed have limitations in terms of facilitating knowledge transfer, significant levels of production, or post harvest processing. Furthermore, there is no evidence of the early adoption of soil and water conservation measures, and little analysis of the impact of opening land for community gardens on diversion from livestock grazing or the risk of land degradation.
- xii. The programme was implemented and scaled-up rapidly. WFP’s operational capacity and existing work with KPAP provided a unique platform for NUSAF 2 (WFP), which has given it a substantial head-start over NUSAF 2 (WB) and KALIP. Undoubtedly, NUSAF 2 (WFP) has also benefitted from WFP’s significant credibility and relationships in Karamoja in achieving this. As a result, there is a real sense of demand for, and ownership of, NUSAF 2 (WFP) at both the local government and community level.
- xiii. The programme is innovative in that: it is primarily a government-designed programme being implemented by WFP, it is primarily a food-based development programme being funded by DFID, and it is primarily a group-based programme operating in a fragile context.
- xiv. This innovation and speed has not come without a price. In terms of both the menu of activities and the implementation on the ground, there is little evidence that NUSAF 2 (WFP) provides any meaningful support to the currently dominant primary livelihood in Karamoja. In many ways, WFP may be right not to attempt to include pastoral livelihood support when it lies outside of the organisation’s comparative advantage, and it is intended to work alongside the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) and KALIP.
- xv. However, this only holds if strong links to KALIP and the NAADS are developed. Beyond dialogue between WFP and FAO at the national level, there is no clear evidence of meaningful partnership between these programmes. For example, there is duplication of activities on the ground and neither work-norms nor transfer rates are harmonised.
- xvi. There are significant gender dimensions to livelihoods in Karamoja. Agriculture is traditionally a domain associated with women, who already have a very high labour burden. Travelling outside of the village and being given cash transfers expose women to greater risks of gender-based violence. Additionally, there is evidence that some polygamous households are being excluded from transfers. There is no clear evidence that the programme has a gender strategy or a conflict analysis. And, there is no linkage with income generation opportunities for women and youth.
- xvii. There is also no evidence of a clear steering committee providing strategic leadership, or of strong learning and coordination platforms at local and district level. This has led to a lack of clarity on key programme objectives. As a social protection programme, NUSAF 2 (WFP) is currently unable to ensure entitlement, timeliness, predictability, or transfers based on actual household size. As a livelihood programme, the work cycles are insufficiently linked to seasonality, and is work undertaken on a project-by-project basis rather than via a predetermined list of projects with a sequential implementation. There is a risk that NUSAF 2 (WFP) is moving people from dependency on food aid to dependency on inputs, with no clear links to seed traders or research stations.

- xviii. Implementation challenges and beginning-of-year delays appear to be leading to greater focus on the public works programme at expense of the household income support programme. The time and effort required at the beginning of each year in developing sustainable community approaches does not seem to be given sufficient priority. Delays in both 2011 and 2012 have led to poor community consultation by some Implementing Partners. Project Management Committees have been established, but there appears to be no maintenance or sustainability plans for most assets.
- xix. The issues faced by WFP in implementing NUSAF 2 (WFP) appear to be well understood by programme and field staff. Staff and Implementing Partners are striving to learn and improve the programme. It should be recognised that Karamoja is an extremely challenging environment to work in, and WFP field staff and Implementing Partners are demonstrating real and valuable commitment to the programme on a daily basis.
- xx. Where problems do exist, however, these seem to have been exacerbated by a ‘disconnect’ between human resource behaviours and programme needs in WFP. The limited number of staff has led to WFP focusing on managing Implementing Partners rather than facilitating programme learning and maintaining a strategic view. Disruptive restructuring at a critical time has undermined capacity development of counterparts. And, WFP has not drawn adequately on international experience or provided mentoring to programme staff. There is a contrast between the high-level of policy investment by WFP in the initial development and communication of the programme strategy – with benefits for national ownership – and underinvestment in programme design and implementation capacity.
- xxi. These problems have been manifested in long delays to cash (and to a lesser extent food) transfers: a direct result of inadequately designed and trialled cash transfer mechanism. There is no data available on how cash is used, and market price data has not been mapped to distributions. The technical capacity required by Implementing Partners was underestimated, and has relied on inputs from district officials rather than developing the capacity of districts. There has been very limited technical quality assurance of assets, and activities have generally reflected Implementing Partners comparative strengths rather than community demands or the agro-ecological context.
- xxii. Despite the significance of these challenges, the conditions that led to NUSAF 2 (WFP) being funded by DFID still hold. The programme targeting – based on a participatory assessment by the International Organisation of Migration – is generally of good quality. The balance between cash and food seems to be appropriate. Through the combination of WFP and Implementing Partners, the programme is able to reach all villages in Karamoja, has identified the most vulnerable, and is able to operate in all locations despite insecurity. It seems very unlikely that at this juncture any other government institution, UN agency, or NGO would be able to replicate this. WFP is still seen as the partner most trusted by local authorities and communities in Karamoja. And, there is evidence that the coordination between WFP, IPs and districts is improving.
- xxiii. Based on the findings of the evaluation and the context of Karamoja we conclude that *there is merit* in the broad approach being taken by NUSAF 2 (WFP). Important aspects of the programme are working. It has reached a large target group of the moderately food insecure in a relatively efficient way and the food and inputs distribution through the Public Works Programme and the Household Income Support Programme is an essential element of a recovery effort, in what remains a very fragile environment. However given the current operating capacity, positioning and trajectory of the programme we *question the worth* that will be realised in respect to the development objectives.

xxiv. We do not foresee sufficient value by end 2013 from a continuation of the programme in its current form; given the longer term development objectives which underpinned the original funding commitment. Any form of shock in Karamoja is likely to quickly undermine any gains that are being made, and the consumption smoothing that is evident is both temporary and unreliable. We therefore see a need for the programme to be re-set (sharper focus, greater analytical and technical capacity and attention to quality) if the potential value of the three year investment, as part of the wider GoU led strategy on Karamoja, is to be realised.

xxv. As it stands both the performance and value of the programme are compromised by NUSAF 2 (WFP) continuing to serve two distinct needs, both insufficiently. Clarifying the strategic objective of the programme – as either the recovery of livelihoods or a part of a social protection system – will create the basis for common methodologies, key indicators, and operational alignment to be developed. In terms of a new strategic direction we have identified (in outline form) two options.

Option A: Shift the focus towards livelihoods: especially the development of individual skills and household productivity. This could still be backstopped by an employment safety-net that is grounded in disaster risk reduction and that delivers community assets which are clearly linked to livelihood needs: redesigning the menu of activities to focus the Public Works Programme on soil and water conservation. This option implies a need for clear shared vision of what it would take to shift the livelihood of a Karamoja household forward, it also relies on the aspects of the programme that are currently the weakest. Therefore for this to be successful WFP would need to significantly step up in terms of its delivery capacity regarding the transfer of technical knowledge and skills, and the development of stronger links to the markets.

Option B: Narrow the programme to what WFP and the Implementing Partners currently do best: providing an employment safety-net. This could focus on delivering community assets that are designed to complement the livelihoods programme, agro-pastoral field schools, and integrated watershed planning currently being promised by KALIP. It could also focus on delivering a system that could be integrated into national institutions. The major downside of this approach is that KALIP does not have the same reach as NUSAF 2 (WFP): and as such some areas would be left without livelihood support.

xxvi. In terms of risk we judge Option B and its narrowing of the programme to refocus on Public Works Programme (which is already starting to happen by default) to be the least risky option in terms of delivery of a set of programme outputs. Option A is the most challenging option - enhancing the focus on Household Income Support backstopped by high quality community soil and water conservation assets built through the Public Works Programme - but also the one that we would consider most likely to deliver at the level of programme outcomes (livelihoods). This would require stronger strategic leadership from DFID, especially on donor harmonisation with the EU and World Bank, and in holding WFP to account. It would also demand urgent and significant investment by WFP in its programmatic capacity and operational alignment to the programme objectives.

Introduction

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide an independent assessment on the merit and worth of the World Food Programme's (WFP) strategy on livelihoods recovery in Karamoja¹. The object of the evaluation is the DFID funded WFP Livelihood Programme (2010 -2013); an element of the Government of Uganda (GoU) led second Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF 2). This formative evaluation looks at the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and the sustainability of the approaches that have been adopted by WFP and its partners.

The development objective of the WFP Livelihoods Programme (hereafter NUSAF 2 (WFP)) is to improve access of beneficiary households in Karamoja to income-earning opportunities and better basic socio-economic services. It targets 77,000 moderately food insecure (MFI) households using cash and/ or food transfers, and works across all seven districts of the Karamoja region.

Approach and Methodology

The evaluation – both in terms of process and product – has been designed to be a tool for improvement, 15 months into the three year DFID funding commitment. This acknowledges the Livelihoods Programme as a partnership between WFP, the Office of the Prime-minister (OPM), DFID (core funder²), local government structures in Karamoja and a group of international and national NGOs³ (hereafter the 'Implementing Partners' (IP)) who support programme delivery in Karamoja.

The enquiry of the evaluation team⁴ has been focused on the relevance and quality of the processes for programme implementation and the strength of the partnership(s). Through an examination of what is/ what isn't working at this juncture the team has reached a judgment on the likelihood of the ambition and the targeted outcomes of the Programme being achieved by the end of the funding period. On this basis a number of strategic options have been derived. We have also provided the basis – subsequent to clarity on direction - for a revised detailed logical framework⁵ for the programme against which the livelihoods approach can be monitored and reviewed, and draft terms of reference⁶ for the lesson learning element of a programmed summative evaluation of NUSAF 2 (WFP) in early 2014. The detailed methodology including an evaluation matrix (enquiry framework against core and sub-questions) for the evaluation is described in the Inception Report⁷.

The approach taken by the evaluation team is characterised by:

- A *systems view* of the Livelihoods Programme. Looking at how the linkages and communications between the different actors both within government structures (national

¹ See Annex 1 for Terms of Reference for the Formative Evaluation

² Other donors are contributing to WFPs work in Karamoja including; Japan, Germany, Korea

³ NGOs involved in 2011 were ACF, CARITAS, CESVIO, COOPI, MAP International, Plan Agro-Pastoral Development Centre (PADC), Samaritan Purse, World Vision and IOM.

⁴ IOD PARC a UK based consultancy (www.iodparc.com) - Julian Gayfer (TL), Joseph Barnes, Mary Jennings, Agnes Kayondo

⁵ See Annex 2 for proposed basis for re-setting the Programme Logical Framework.

⁶ See Annex 3 for proposed ToR for summative evaluation.

⁷ See Annex 4 for Evaluation Matrix.

– local) and within WFP (and its Implementing Partners) and with other donor partners have developed.

- An *appreciative enquiry* approach – in discussions with key informants focusing on the positives of the first 15 months of operation.
- A *theory of change* lens to establish where the core contribution of the programme lays and what a stretching yet achievable set of results at the end of three years could look like.
- Drawing on *WFP monitoring data* to establish a picture on implementation and reflection by the Programme and its partners on performance in 2011.
- Guided by a *review of best practice* establishing if/ how the NUSAF 2 (WFP) engagement is set to contribute to wider learning and policy development on social protection in Uganda (cash transfers, conditional/ unconditional, public works).
- Gathering *qualitative data* through use of a survey tool and a series of key informant interviews and group discussions working across the districts of Karamoja and ensuring representation of the different agro-ecological zones, ethnic groups and programme modalities (food transfers/ cash transfers). This used a sampling approach (see Box below) designed to provide a representative view of the programme.

Sampling approach

District; purposive selection – our basis was ethnicity, population and agro-ecological zones

Sub-county; purposive selection – our basis was number of beneficiaries, representation of cash and food transfers and implementing partners.

Parishes within sub-county and villages within the parishes; as guided by implementing partners.

The Karamoja region is composed of six livelihood zones⁸ (see Figure 1 overleaf) with the zones falling broadly within one of three livelihood systems: a predominantly ‘agriculture-based’ livelihood system in the western part of the region, a largely ‘agro-pastoral’ system in the region’s midsection and a mainly ‘pastoral’ system in much off the east of the region⁹.

Assisted by a small number of field assistants and the staff of IPs, the evaluation team engaged with a total of 20 communities drawn from 5 of the 7 districts. The numbers of communities being proportionate to the spread of targeted beneficiaries (see Table 1 below); recognising that the success of the programme will be largely dependent on what happens in Kaabong and Kotido districts which together represent over 50% of the targeted beneficiaries. Our enquiry focused primarily on communities involved with food transfers (14 out of the 20) reflecting the limited extent to date (approx 10%) of the use of cash transfers.

⁸ According to the Fewsnet Livelihood Zoning Workshop of 2009

⁹ FAO Uganda 2010 Karamoja Seasonal Assessment 2010-2011

Table 1: Coverage of the community level enquiry

District	Number of targeted beneficiaries	Communities sampled
Kaabong	23,004	7 (2 cash transfer/ 5 food)
Kotido	16,741	4 – all food transfer
Moroto	11,269	4 (2 cash/ 2 food)
Napak	12,692	1 cash
Nakapiripirit	6,338	4 (1 cash/ 3 food)
Amudat	3,421	District only
Abim	1,968	District only

In all districts the team drew on documentation provided by WFP and the implementing partners supplemented by discussions with key informants. In each of the 5 districts where community level discussions took place the team covered 2 sub-counties/ district and 2 parishes/ sub-county and 1 village/ parish. In total 12 sub-counties out of a possible 43 were covered through this approach.

The team complemented the gathering of evidence at the meso (district) and micro (community) level with a series of key informant interviews at the macro (national) level. This engaged with senior representatives of all the major organisations involved including the Permanent Secretary and Under-Secretary of OPM, and a number of individuals with extensive experience in Karamoja¹⁰.

Throughout the process the team received excellent cooperation from those involved in programme implementation. The time spent on preparation for the field visits proved valuable in terms of the quality/ richness of the discussions at the community and district level which ensued. The team has also benefited from the ready access to information¹¹, individuals and perspectives provided by WFP Country Headquarters in Kampala. No significant constraints were encountered in delivering the evaluation. Some limitations with transport meant that some of the planned community visits in Amudat and Napak were unable to take place.

The confidence of the team in the evidence assembled and reviewed was strengthened by the validation meetings used at the emerging findings stage. This involved a focus group meeting in

¹⁰ See Annex 5 for list of people consulted

¹¹ See Annex 6 for list of documents reviewed

Moroto attended by WFP staff, all IPs and with District representation, and a meeting with WFP Uganda staff in Kampala both of which served to validate and enrich the findings.

As part of our enquiry the team also did a ‘stock take’ on the nature and availability of existing quantitative data sets and analysis for the Karamoja region. (See the box below for some examples of the surveys conducted). Our enquiry¹² into the nature of the surveys and the availability of the raw data sets indicates that there is a richness of material that has the potential to be drawn upon to establish an effective retrospective baseline at the Goal and Purpose (outcome) level for NUSAF 2 (WFP), once clarity on programme direction and an associated logframe is achieved.

Examples of surveys conducted in Karamoja Region of relevance to tracking household status/ change

Northern Uganda Survey (2004 & 2008): 2004 (baseline study for NUSAF 1) and 2008 (impact study and baseline for NUSAF 2)

Food Security & Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA) Uganda (2009): Karamoja data includes District examples. Food insecurity, Education, crop production, access to water etc.

Karamoja Seasonal Assessments FAO Uganda, 2010-2011 (repeating): in reference to a livelihoods baseline 2008-2009 – information on change re crop and livestock production and access to other sources of income. Also market prices and market conditions. Considers livelihood zones and wealth categories (very poor, poor, middle, better off).

Karamoja Crop and Livestock Production and Productivity Assessments (repeating), FAO: State of processes and constraints that existed during the season and informs future implementation (what to deliver, to whom and how much).

Nutrition Surveillance Survey – tracking of health, nutrition, food security, household incomes (3x/ year DHO/ ACF/ UNICEF)

The dominance of households who fall within the broad category of moderately food insecure (currently estimated at over 80% of the population in Karamoja), coupled with the scale of the NUSAF 2 (WFP) means that existing data sets that are broad in reach, can be used with some confidence in interpreting trends on the wider set of changes to household livelihood status to which the NUSAF 2 (WFP) programme is looking to make a significant contribution. Having data which stretches back to 2004 is important given the volatility of conditions that households can experience (climatic variation, security).

There is an increasing range of donor and NGO funded activities in Karamoja, working towards the broad goal of livelihood improvement/ building the resilience of food insecure households. These are of varying scale, maturity and orientation and expected to align with an overarching strategy – the Karamoja Action Plan for Food Security 2010-2015 – coordinated by the Department of Karamoja Affairs of the OPM. Given the relative scale of NUSAF 2 (WFP) to these other initiatives – see Table 2 below - the findings of this evaluation should inform the wider discussion on future programming for recovery and development in Karamoja, alongside contributing evidence on conditional transfers to inform the wider social protection agenda now emerging in Uganda.

¹² See Annex 7 for a desk review of the quantitative and qualitative data sets and analysis on household status / change in Karamoja.

Table 2: Estimated Population Benefiting from the NUSAF 2 (WFP) Livelihoods Programme in Karamoja

District	Est. Pop ¹³	No. of H/hs reached by NUSAF 2 (WFP) in 2011 ¹⁴	Estimated Total No. of individuals reached by NUSAF 2 (WFP) ¹⁵	Proportion of the population reached by NUSAF 2 (WFP)
Abim	55,200	2,002	15,215	28%
Kotido	204,600	16,841	127,992	63%
Kaabong	345,300	22,711	172,604	50%
Moroto	121,300	12,240	93,024	77%
Napak	176,500	13,249	100,692	57%
Nakapirpirit	143,800	6,287	47,781	33%
Amudat	101,100	3,030	23,028	23%
Karamoja region (Total)	1,147,800	76,360	580,336	51%


Whilst the evaluation team has benefited considerably from the exchange with key officials and the members of the Evaluation sub-committee (ESC) the views expressed within this report are those of IOD PARC. Any inaccuracies remain the responsibility of the evaluation team.

¹³ National Population Projection 2010, UBOS

¹⁴ NUSAF 2011 Summary of Beneficiaries (Beneficiary numbers after re-verification) and beneficiary numbers for cycle 4 in annual reports for Moroto and Napak

¹⁵ Average household size of 7.6 is used, as reflected in the FAO, Karamoja Crop and Livestock Production & Productivity Assessment, 2010

Figure 1: Livelihood Zones of Karamoja



Programme Context

Context at the time of programme design

Karamoja

Karamoja is home to 1.2 million people. UNDP's development index puts Karamoja as one of the world's poorest places. Malnutrition in the region is the highest in Uganda, adult literacy rates remain at just 6 percent, and over 80 percent of Karamoja's population live below the poverty line. In four of the five districts in Karamoja, completion rates for primary education range from 6 to 10 percent. In Abim, the one district with higher completion rates, there is a 33 percent gender disparity.

Government and WFP perceive the circumstances of Karamoja to be quite distinct from other parts of Northern Uganda. The region is seen to have special development needs and relatively inexperienced and under-resourced local level political leaderships and structures. Cattle rustling, marginalization and the proliferation of small arms in the northeast of the country (despite disarmament efforts) have continued to constrain development in Karamoja.

This semi-arid region forms part of a broader cluster of neighbouring pastoral and agro-pastoral areas, which include north-western Kenya, south-eastern Sudan and south-western Ethiopia. The region is prone to increasingly frequent and severe natural disasters, especially droughts, in part as a result of climate change. Both local elders and FAO technical staff report high levels of variability in the climatic cycle, leading to unpredictable rainfall patterns. This variability creates problems for both major livelihood strategies practiced in Karamoja: pastoral cattle-keeping and rain-fed agriculture.

Recurrent shocks caused by frequent drought, ongoing violence, severe environmental degradation, poor infrastructure, high poverty rates and weak agriculture have eroded people's capacity to cope and left them structurally vulnerable to hunger. As a result, relatively small shocks can lead to high levels of acute under-nutrition. Drought in 2007 led to rates of global acute malnutrition (GAM) in Moroto and Nakapiripirit districts exceeding the critical threshold of 15 percent.

There is a significant gender dimension to the experience of, and vulnerability to, poverty. Agriculture is associated with women and girls, cattle herding to men and boys. Polygamy is widespread and each wife is expected to support her own household. Household livelihoods do not provide women with sufficient access to food to meet the needs of their young children at the early stages of life. As a result of these challenges, stunting rates are well above 30 percent in most districts, and over 80 percent of children and 50 percent of women in Karamoja suffer from anaemia. In such a drought prone area accessing water, and firewood as the main source of energy and as virtually the only means for poor women to earn cash, places a significant workburden on women and their children.

Conflict and insecurity are both significant features of the Karamoja context. The local practice of cattle 'sharing' involves violent raids to steal livestock from other groups. This has been exacerbated in the past decade by organised commercial raiding. Karamoja was also adversely affected by the effects of the civil war that ranged across Northern Uganda between 1986-2006.

Since 2008, disarmament and a transition to recovery programming have been implemented through the Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Programme (KIDDP) 2007-2010. This medium-term framework harmonized the various interventions by the Government

and its development partners. The livelihood component of the KIDDP is implemented through the Karamoja Action Plan for Food Security (KAPFS). The sustainable development of Karamoja has been guided by the Peace, Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP) for Northern Uganda. Central government policy for Karamoja now falls under the political leadership of the First Lady – the Minister for Karamoja Affairs.

WFP

The WFP Corporate Strategic Plan (2008-11) marked a ‘shift’ for the organisation, from a food aid to a food assistance agency. The plan foresaw WFP becoming a more strategic partner in longer-term developmental contexts, integrating its work into country-led plans and programmes. WFP has been present in Karamoja for over 50 years providing life saving relief to the most vulnerable. The last big emergency was in 2009, when over 90% of the Karamoja population received food aid. The relief operation is down to around 150,000 in early 2012.

Uganda was one of the first countries to design a new portfolio of programmes under the food assistance direction, commencing with a Country Strategy that involved extensive consultations with the Government of Uganda and development partners. The Country Strategy (2009–2014) identifies three priority areas: (i) emergency humanitarian action; (ii) food and nutrition security; and (iii) agriculture and market support.

Elements of the resultant programming specifically linked to Karamoja include the development of productive safety nets, reforestation, watershed infrastructure, livelihood diversification, post-harvest handling, and agricultural support through partners including National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS), Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF) and FAO. The Country Programme documents state that *‘these efforts will be scaled up based on a careful review of results and capacity.’*

Implementing this strategic shift in Karamoja has been a major challenge. Three years of drought leading up to 2009 resulted in a major Emergency Operation (EMOP) for that year, which provided general food distribution to almost the entire population of Karamoja. This time was used to reinvent WFP’s approach to Karamoja, resulting in the Karamoja Productive Assets Programme (KPAP). KPAP was a specific attempt to ‘break the eternal emergency’ response to Karamoja that many donors had increasingly begun to voice concern over.

KPAP was designed to support asset-building through the use of food aid, with a further intention to explore cash transfers. In 2010, the first year of KPAP, WFP supported some 50,000 poor households across the sub region with conditional food transfers in exchange for their participation in public works activities. A menu of activities was made available to Implementing Partners based upon research of other WFP livelihoods programmes, particularly in India and Ethiopia (including one visit to Ethiopia by WFP’s National Programme Officer). At the time of KPAP design there was little formal corporate guidance available within WFP on the design of food for assets.

Partly as a result of this, the Country Programme document made a clear exception to the commitment to medium-term sustainability in relation to Karamoja: *‘The need for further WFP-specific interventions to complete the transformation in this region will be assessed towards the end of the Country Programme’*. Nevertheless, KPAP was intended to support the broader objective of *‘build[ing] the capacity of district local governments in planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluation and reporting... The hand-over to district governments will be tracked and evaluated to ensure that the efforts are sustainable.’*

KPAP was situated as part of a lifecycle-approach to WFP programming in Karamoja, backstopped by targeted general food distribution and a self-selecting hunger safety-net of

Mother and child health and nutrition (MCHN) programmes, Early child development (ECD), and school feeding. In 2010, KPAP was successful in reaching the targeted households. It was also seen as a success by the Country Office simply as a result of not failing nor experiencing a backlash by communities. With a reduction in general food distribution from around 100 percent of the population to around 16 percent, and KPAP beneficiaries being asked to work for food for the very first time, this acceptance was by no means guaranteed.

DFID

DFID is one of a number of development partners that are assisting the Government of Uganda (GoU) with recovery and reconstruction in Karamoja through a mixture of initiatives aimed at addressing risk and building the resilience of vulnerable people. Together with others, including the World Bank, DFID decided to provide support to the second Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF 2) under the leadership of the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM).

The primary livelihoods lens used in NUSAF 2 is that of agricultural productivity. In the context of Karamoja, this has sat within a wider policy debate about support to pastoralist livelihood strategies that ultimately led to the EU funding a complementary support window, KALIP¹⁶ approved in 2009. The two programmes, KALIP and NUSAF 2, are both intended to work in collaboration on the ground with district-level technical offices, under the coordination of the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO).

The primary context-related drivers that led to UK financing of the Karamoja component of NUSAF 2 being directed through WFP was the strategic positioning of KPAP in the Karamoja livelihoods landscape combined with the ability of WFP to rapidly scale up the programme to reach all villages in all districts. KPAP already included many of the NUSAF 2 activities, and the weak experience of the earlier NUSAF in Karamoja demonstrated that at that point in time the capacity gaps were too many and the fiduciary risk was too high for direct implementation through sub-counties or districts.

Domestically for DFID, the UK Minister for International Development had expressed the Coalition Government's interest in non-budget-support activities that could reach scale. An assessment of multilateral partners was underway in DFID at the time, the public version of which was published in March 2011. Of the major organisations operating in Karamoja at scale, only UNICEF and WFP came out strongly in this assessment, especially in the essential areas of fragile-state operations, alignment with UK priorities, and financial management. The 3-year NUSAF 2 (WFP) programme with an initial UK commitment of £15m replaced KPAP in 2011.

Programme Intentions

There are three components to NUSAF 2 (WFP):

- i) A Public Works Programme (PWP) providing food or cash transfers in exchange for unskilled labour. Intended to alleviate pressure on household budgets by providing temporary employment to poor households with labour capacity during the periods of greatest stress¹⁷; and to create socio-economic assets in and around communities which, in turn, will help build social and ecosystem resilience.

¹⁶ KALIP – Karamoja Livelihoods Programme; a Government of Uganda programme funded by the European Union

¹⁷ In Karamoja, the critical time of year in this regard is the 9-month period between January and September – often referred to as the 'lean' or 'hunger' season. It is during this period that negative coping mechanisms, such as charcoal production, are most widely adopted.

- ii) A Household Income Support Programme (HISP) providing inputs and training to individual and or small groups of poor households. This is intended to enhance productivity within the household's principal livelihoods systems, as well as to diversify into appropriate and viable livelihood alternatives.
- iii) An Institutional Development component; 'capacity building' mainstreamed into the sub-project cycle and designed to take place through '*a strategic and systematic interaction between the OPM and WFP as the joint action unfolds*'. This is intended to enable the necessary skills to be transferred to Government (at the district and sub-county level) and to communities '*so that they are better equipped to directly implement programmes such as NUSAF 2 in the future*'.¹⁸.

The 3-year target for the programme is to reach and have an effect on the lives of 77,000 moderately food insecure households – poor households with spare labour capacity – through a blending of PWP and HISP and integral to this, the use of cash and/or food transfers.

The WFP programme fits within the results frameworks for components 1 & 3 of NUSAF 2 and as such aims to contribute to three intermediate outcomes:

- Strengthened communities and local authorities which can manage (prepare, implement and evaluate) a poverty targeted public works programme.
- Increased stock of community¹⁹ productive assets through the Household Income Support Programme.
- Improved capacity in performing technical, administrative and managerial functions at community and local government authority levels.

How the context has evolved since 2010

In Karamoja, 2011 was an exceptional year for rains: they arrived late, but lasted much longer than usual, stretching well into October. Despite some initial delays, NUSAF 2 (WFP) implementation took place in all sub-counties, a year ahead of World Bank/Government NUSAF 2 activities (hereafter NUSAF 2 (WB)) in Karamoja, and the effective start date of KALIP. Both programmes are now due to come on stream in 2012.

Meanwhile, NAADS – a potential partner – has experienced disruption during the year as a result of fallout from audit investigations. There was also a shift in the political context after district elections brought in many new councillors with an agenda for change. In December 2011, three international NGOs were expelled from Moroto District, including one of WFP's major implementing partners, Samaritan's Purse.

WFP in Uganda has also experienced significant restructuring during 2011. The Country Director – a former head of policy during the development of the Strategic Plan – moved to a regional position based in Nairobi. There was also significant downsizing, with many sub-offices being downgraded to field offices, reductions in staff numbers, and closing of the Abim office. With the exception of refugee operations, Karamoja is now the only region with food-based programmes implemented by WFP Uganda.

¹⁸ Project Document, The livelihoods program under the framework of the second Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF2), OPM & WFP.

¹⁹ The use of the term 'community' here seems inconsistent with the modality of a Household Income Support Programme

WFP Moroto Sub-Office now acts as a regional coordinator of all other field offices in Karamoja. There have been four heads of office during the lead-up and implementation of the first year of NUSAF 2 (WFP) activities. Only the first of these was a permanent position, with two national officers acting as stand-in heads and one United Nations Volunteer being posted as a holding-arrangement.

Globally, WFP now has a comprehensive set of guidance on livelihoods programming, published in 2011. There is, however, no evidence that this has been used to help review or strengthen NUSAF 2 (WFP).

Programme Implementation

NUSAF 2 (WFP) reporting on activities undertaken in 2011 – see Table 3 below – indicates that targets were generally met or exceeded for all projects.

Table 3: Planned and Achieved NUSAF 2 Projects²⁰ in 2011

NUSAF 2 Component	Activity Category	Asset Type	Unit	Plan	Output
Public Works Programme	Livelihood Infrastructure Development	Roads and Culverts	Number	101	200
		Surface Dams	Number	97	130
		Sub Surface Dams	Number	1	1
		Micro irrigation	Number	0	6
	Environmental Conservation	Woodlots	Acres	128	621
		Soil Erosion Prevention	Numbers	21	6
		Energy Saving stoves	Numbers	16	4000
Household Income Support	Enhancement of traditional livelihoods	Dairy Production	Number	3	3
		Fodder Banks	Acres	20	2
		Staple Crops	Acres	406	526
	Diversification of Livelihoods	Cassava	Acres	14	42
		Orchard	Acres	15	7
		Legumes	Acres	26	55
		Oil seeds	Acres	44	58

²⁰ Source: WFP 2011 Progress Report on NUSAF 2 in Karamoja Sub-region January – December 2011

A more detailed assessment of implementation with breakdown by District is provided in Table 4 (see overleaf). This has been compiled by the Evaluation Team drawing from the individual IP²¹ reporting. The differences in figures between the two Tables indicate some weaknesses in the monitoring arrangements for the programme. For example the quality of the 2011 data is compromised by different reporting styles. Some IPs have included acres for vegetables under crop production acres, while others used crop production acres to refer to those dedicated to staple crops (millet, sorghum, beans, groundnuts etc).

However the figures in both Tables 3 & 4 do not provide a sense of the extent of completion of roads, dams etc. Table 5 (see overleaf) provides this assessment²². The figures indicate that in many cases structures remain incomplete. Reasons given for non-completion of assets were:

- Heavy rains between August and December 2011 which interrupted road and dam works.
- Delays in rolling out programme activities in 2011, resulting in loss in work cycles.
- Delays in food/cash distributions which negatively impacted community participation, commitment to asset creation and reduced work cycles.
- Delays associated with approval of sub projects, which subsequently affected release of funding for road work and dams.
- Lack of local labour that is skilled enough to do the more complicated work such as laying culvert lines and construction of drifts for the roads.
- Delays in inputs delivery (tools for road and dam works); delays attributed to poor access.
- Approved budgets for roads did not allow for completion to recommended standards.

A notable area of success across the districts was vegetable production in the rainy season with beneficiaries growing cow peas, red and green peppers, cabbage, onions, egg plant, tomatoes and spinach. For many, growing these vegetables was new, and women in Kaabong spoke of not knowing they could have vegetables in the dry season (e.g. onions). In one instance, in the green belt zone, the group agreed to sell part of the vegetables and use the earning to boost their group saving (village saving), hire tractors to open land and lend cash to individuals.

However, there is concern that whilst growing vegetables was a very positive once-off experience that participants would like to repeat, there was little, if any, seed stored either by individuals or groups. Beneficiaries say that vegetable seed is not available in the market raising the issue of access to seed on a sustainable basis.

There is also a recognition that 2011 was ‘a unique year’ whereby the rains extended to November and in many places harvested good yields. WFP staff are concerned that this was atypical and is unlikely to be repeated.

²¹ The figures do not include contributions from IOM given differences in their reporting as well as form of activities.

²² There are differences between the data presented in Tables 3, 4 & 5. This reflects the different sources used by the evaluation team – WFP 2011 Progress Report and our summation of the individual IP reports - and the specific purpose of each Table. Whilst it has not been possible to give confirmed figures on achievements of ‘projects’ the figures in Table 3 & 4 provide a sufficient indication of the relative scale of planned activity vs output to support the findings and conclusions of the draft report. The figures in Table 5 relate to a sample of IP achievements and provide a valid insight into the extent of sub project completion.

Table 4: Planned and Achieved NUSAF 2 Projects

Household Income Support		Abim	Kaabong	Kotido	Moroto	Napak	Nakapiripirit	Amudat	Grand Total
Crop Production (acres)	Planned	1142.6	37,264	7939	7844	23324.5	1163	164	78,841
	Actual	1027.3	37,264	5749	2130	20092	548	69.25	66,880
Vegetables (acres)	Planned	0	1,835	249	53.5	9524	628	0	12,290
	Actual	0	1,863	189	50.5	4785	327	0	7,215
Fodder banks (acres)	Planned	0	46	0	0	25	0	0	71
	Actual	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fuel Efficient Stoves (numbers)	Planned	729	12,120	5420	3360	4140	960	0	26,729
	Actual	571	8,528	3851	6993	7194	618	0	27,755
Public Works Projects									
Surface Dams (New)	Planned	0	78	12	5	0	2	0	97
	Actual	0	70	12	5	0	1	0	88
Surface Dams (Rehabilitation)	Planned	0	9	40	1	0	2	0	52
	Actual	0	9	40	1	0	2	0	52
Sub Surface Dams	Planned	0	0	36	1	124	0	0	161
	Actual	0	0	36	0	55	0	0	91
Mini Dams	Planned	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	10

Household Income Support		Abim	Kaabong	Kotido	Moroto	Napak	Nakapiripirit	Amudat	Grand Total
	Actual	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	10
Road Rehabilitation (Kms)	Planned	20.5	575	93	16.5	457.8	0	0	1,163

Table 5: Extent of Completion of Surface Dam and Road Rehabilitation Sub Projects²³

District	Partner	Asset Type	Plan	Actual	Extent of completion ²⁴	Comments
Moroto	COOPI	New surface Dams (number)	3	3	71%	Planned maximum capacity of dams for water holding not reached
		Rehabilitation of Surface Dams (number)	1	1		
	Samaritan Purse	Roads Rehabilitation (kms)	16.5	9	50-100%	The 9 kms are 100% completed, with the remaining 7.5kms only partially done , with work on sloping and ditching pending
Napak	ACF	Sub Surface Dams (number)	124	55	60%	The attempted surface dams are on average 60% completed. Depth of the excavated dams varies from 1-2meters and did not reach expected depth of 2.5-3m
		Roads Rehabilitation (kms)	405	165.8	50-100%	Excavation and ditching work pending on some roads
	Samaritan Purse	Roads Rehabilitation (kms)	52.8	34.2	50-100%	The 34.2 kms are fully (100%) completed, with the remaining 18.6kms only partially done , with pending works on sloping and ditching
Nakapirpirit	COOPI	New surface Dams (number)	2	2	77%	Planned maximum capacity of dams not reached
		Rehabilitation of Surface Dams (number)	1	1		
	PADC²⁵	New surface Dams (number)	1	1	20%	Only clearing and minimal excavation work completed
		Rehabilitation of Surface Dams (number)	6	6	20%	
		Roads Rehabilitation (kms)	12	12	40%	Murram and culvert placing pending
Amudat	COOPI	New surface Dams (number)	2	1	76%	Planned maximum capacity of dams not reached
		Rehabilitation of Surface Dams (number)	2	2		
Kotido	CARITAS	Surface Dams (new)	6	9	75%	Planned capacity not reached for some dams
		Rehabilitation of Surface Dams	9	9	75%	

²³ Source: Compiled by the Evaluation Team using Progress reports (1 January to 31 December 2011) and through consulting with Implementing Partners

²⁴ Refers to the average level of completion of the attempted sub project

²⁵ Pian Agro-Pastoral Development Centre

District	Partner	Asset Type	Plan	Actual	Extent of completion ²⁴	Comments
		(number)				
		Roads Rehabilitation (kms)	60	49	80%	Ramming and laying of gravel
Kaabong	ACF	Surface Dams (number)	75	67	50-80%	Six new dams and four rehabilitated dams were fully completed. The remaining 57 dams are only partially (50-80%) complete because they did not reach the desired depth of 3m
		Roads Rehabilitation (kms)	538	380.6	100%	The attempted 380.6km of roads were fully completed. 25.5kms (Karenga, Kathile & Sidok sub counties) were taken over and completed by local government.
	CESVI	New surface Dams (number)	3	3	70.7%	Extent of completion of all dams is 70.7%
		Rehabilitation of Surface Dams (number)	9	9		
		Roads Rehabilitation (kms)	37	29.5	83%	

Findings

The nature of NUSAF 2 (WFP)

Whilst termed a 'livelihoods programme' NUSAF 2 (WFP) has a number of facets, most notably - strengthening of livelihoods, social protection and graduation – which bring into question what is the core substance of the programme and therefore the basis on which it should continue to move forward and be ultimately judged.

How does the public works programme strengthen livelihoods?

PWP consists of large numbers of people working on road and dam construction, community gardens or environmental conservation in return for food or cash. Through payment in food/cash, public works have helped to smooth consumption (though somewhat haphazard), and to develop a work ethic among people. The transfers are much appreciated especially in a context where there is little other employment opportunity. The immediate benefits of individual PWP projects will be discussed later in terms of their contribution to beneficiaries. In this section we discuss the aspects that relate to strengthening livelihoods.

Road construction has facilitated social services through easier access (e.g. early childhood development centres, food distribution, access for ambulances) but it is much less clear how they facilitate livelihoods or how they link to markets. Markets in Karamoja, which are barely functional, would need considerable further development if the benefits accruing from the roads are to be maximised. As yet, the roads that have been constructed tend to be village access roads rather than roads that connect to markets or to the district road network. Arrangements for their maintenance are not in place. There are very limited transport services. The primary form of mobility is still by foot.

Through the provision of drinking water for animals, dam construction (which is valued by local people) can enhance livelihoods but to achieve this there is need for a systematic approach that selects and sites dams in such a way that they support settlements, agricultural production (e.g. small scale irrigation) or passing pastoralism along well-established grazing routes. As currently structured, the productive assets created under NUSAF 2 (WFP) are rather less a part of a long term integrated livelihoods programme and more a series of projects that have limited connection to each other. The dams would need to be part of a broader approach to watershed management that would include reservoirs, small scale irrigation etc.

Trees and vegetables are grown in community gardens but the large numbers involved make it difficult to provide adequate training to individuals such that they can transfer the learning to their own homesteads. The large number of people involved relative to the size of the plots cultivated means that individuals get very little return for their work – though a few communities have managed to store some maize as seed for next year. Vegetable growing was a success across all districts with some notable examples observed both in terms of skills development and in generating a surplus and income (e.g. Kotido). There is considerable potential to capitalise on the investments made in 2011 in vegetable production and this should be followed in a systematic way so that it extends beyond a short term measure. An important test will be whether people participate in community gardening in 2012 when no transfers are available under the HISP (in 2011 community gardening received food transfers under PWP).

One of the most significant contributions to pastoral livelihoods planned in NUSAF 2 (WFP) were fodder banks. As far as we are aware, only two have been developed so far. Taking into account the programme capacity issues identified in this evaluation, there is a strong argument for

focusing NUSAF 2 (WFP) on the comparative strengths around agriculture. However, this does serve to emphasise that the WFP programme can only be one input to development of a more diverse livelihood strategy, and the importance this places on harmonisation between the various livelihood actors in Karamoja.

Activities have been managed by specially-established Project Management Committees (PMCs) at the community level. These have been supported through ongoing contact with IPs. It is, however, unclear what incentives exist for PMCs to continue their role once support from IPs ceases and no further value-transfers are attached to the asset. This creates a high level of risk that assets (roads, dams, gardens) will be unsustainable, particularly as they are not explicitly linked to other complementary interventions that support livelihoods.

Moreover, if livelihoods are to be strengthened and diversified there is need for additional complementary programming, such as 'livelihood packages' in order to generate alternative income streams. The forthcoming roll-out of parish development plans may provide a more sustainable framework into which the current WFP programme can be integrated. Achieving this, however, will require considerable planning and is unlikely to take place in 2012 because of time pressures.

From a gender perspective, the gender division of household tasks and reproductive activities around food production and cooking means that women have a very high labour burden both in terms of agricultural production and as collectors and users of firewood (the latter is done by adolescent girls as well as women). Collecting firewood is one of the few economic activities open to women in Karamoja and is carried out by the poorest women. They can spend over three hours per day gathering fuel and carrying heavy loads. This burden leaves them with little time for productive activities or leisure, can cause long-term health problems and increase their vulnerability to physical or sexual violence. While tree growing has been introduced, there is little evidence that women's demand for fuel and energy for either household or economic (brewing) use has been adequately considered. For example, in some locations only fruit trees have been introduced.

What relevance do the public works have to social protection?

The development of productive assets is part of WFP's safety net framework as set out in its Country Programme (2009-2014), and corporately, WFP has been reviewing its own approach to social protection²⁶. DFID is also leading a discussion on the potential contribution of public works programme to wider social protection in Uganda²⁷.

International experience indicates that a social protection approach must include a number of elements including; an entitlement to support provided on a systematic, regular, timely, and predictable basis, and transfers adequate to meet needs (targeting is key). Based on the field work for this evaluation, we found few of these elements in place under the NUSAF 2 (WFP) programme:

- *Entitlement:* Currently, NUSAF 2 (WFP) is not able to absorb newly identified vulnerable people onto the eligibility list (targeting was done in 2010) e.g. new widows, recently orphaned households, households that are caring for orphans, some polygamous households.

²⁶ See Evaluation of the WFP Livelihood Programme in Karamoja, Inception Report, IOD/PARC, Feb 2012, p. 8.

²⁷ DFID and Irish Aid are funding the piloting of Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment (SAGE) which includes four locations in Karamoja.

- *Timely*: There have been considerable delays in delivery of food (by several months) undermining the objective of providing food during the hungry months; the cash transfer process has been fraught with administrative problems causing extensive delays (payments received in December for work done in June/July).
- *Predictability*: The transfer is not predictable e.g. six cycles of work were planned in each location but in practice only four happened. The public works ceased in December 2011 and is unlikely to start before April 2012 (at best). The work is undertaken on a project-by-project basis which takes time to design, plan and attain approval (rather than a pre-determined list of projects whose implementation is sequential as happens under PSNP in Ethiopia). Furthermore, there are already funding gaps for 2013 and there is no evidence that funding will be forthcoming from the Government of Uganda.
- *Adequacy of transfers*: Transfers are calculated as a flat rate based on an average household size of 7.6 people. This does not take account of actual household size and thus can be said to be supply rather than demand driven. In Kaabong, PMC members pointed out that this risks penalising those households that are caring for orphans – many of whom are not on the extremely vulnerable household (EVH) list.

Because of rising food prices, cash transfers have not kept their food value and some beneficiaries argued that the cash transfer should be matched to current food prices in the market²⁸. In the context of inflation and rising food prices where cash transfers did not maintain their food value, no adjustment was made²⁹. The rise in food prices meant that food recipients are likely to have enjoyed accelerated income growth relative to cash recipients, whose income gains have been compromised by inflation. This may be an important factor behind what our enquiry showed to be a strong preference by beneficiaries for food transfers³⁰.

In the context of Karamoja one can view³¹ the various efforts related to supporting vulnerable households and communities as a component of social protection, and this includes the steps being taken to move households away from a dependency on food aid to more sustainable livelihoods. Three streams of protection can be constructed; (a) direct transfers which are conditional on adopting a sustainable pattern of living (e.g. new agricultural practices), (b) public works – cash or kind (food) transfers – giving people the opportunity to ‘own’ what they construct, and (c) social assistance (cash transfers) to the most vulnerable – mostly pensions. An important part of this philosophy is to develop a concept of a social security framework which goes beyond the transfers of cash/ food to individual households.

Is it feasible to expect graduation?

The Programme Document³² for NUSAF 2 (WFP) states that ‘*taken together, the HISP and PWP should help 74,057 households to ‘graduate’ from dependence on humanitarian assistance towards self-sufficiency – a process which should be complete within a three year timeframe*’.

²⁸ The anomaly is that while Uganda is the second largest supplier of food to WFP, food prices have been increasing over the last few years making it difficult for vulnerable households in Uganda to meet their needs.

²⁹ In Swaziland’s Emergency Drought Relief (EDR) programme in 2007/08, social transfers were delivered half in cash and half in food. In Lesotho’s Cash and Food Transfers Pilot Project (CFTPP) in 2007/08, a lag between price monitoring and response resulted in declining transfer value, until a once-off adjustment of 25% was made towards the end of the five-month intervention. In Malawi’s Food and Cash Transfers (FACT) project in 2005/06 and 2 Dowa Emergency Cash Transfers (DECT) project in 2006/07, transfers were index-linked to local food prices, and were adjusted before each monthly disbursement. See Rachel Sabates-Wheeler and Stephen Devereux, *Cash Transfers and High Food Prices: Explaining outcomes on Ethiopia’s Productive Safety Net Programme*, Institute of Development Studies and Centre for Social Protection, paper presented at the CPRC conference: Ten Years of War Against Poverty, University of Manchester September, 2010.

³⁰ The exception being some households close to urban areas where the local economy is cash (and markets are functioning).

³¹ Interview with the NUSAF 2 Programme Director

³² Project Document, The livelihoods programme under the framework of the second northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF2) in Karamoja sub-region, OPM & WFP.

Our enquiry suggests that there is confusion about what constitutes graduation. The assumption is that a move from food aid to food assistance is somehow reflective of a shift toward development with graduation seen as rooted in public works.

Within WFP a view was shared by a number of respondents that the programme was not designed to have a graduation element (unless people self-select out of the programme). This view contends that it is very unlikely that the beneficiaries, who have been identified because of their vulnerability, can be food secure within the timeframe of the programme. The first year may have proved that people are willing to work and do have an interest in growing their own food; but the level of remuneration is too small to meet anything other than an immediate food gap.

We concur with this view, and suggest that the claim of ‘graduation’ should be dropped as it is unrealistic within the three year timeframe of the programme. The wider context does not support graduation especially as so many people in the same locations are on social transfers, there is very little money in circulation, and markets remain undeveloped. Even when there was good surplus in many areas in 2011 (a unique year of rains), poorly developed post-harvest management undermined much of the benefits. A minority of households may currently have potential for graduation but to realize this will require a much wider range of support than hitherto is available, not least access to inputs to their own gardens, training and technology, infrastructure and market development, credit and savings to underpin other income earning activities.

Vision of NUSAF 2 by WFP

The issues faced by WFP in implementing NUSAF 2 appear to be well understood by WFP programme and field staff. Indeed, there is clear evidence of a process of iterative improvement underway, led by the Country Office. These improvements include shifting IPs to 24-month contracts, greater involvement of district staff in planning, and the diversification of cash transfer options.

Despite this awareness by programme staff and the serious attempt at improvement, the programme was subject to over 10 weeks delay at the beginning of 2012 largely due to the process of re-contracting IPs and concerns over the matching of donor funding to programme requirements. This limited any opportunity to implement lessons learned from year 1 in year 2. For example, good quality community-level planning was sacrificed in 2011 by some IPs in order to begin planting in time for the rains. They are now susceptible to making the same compromise in 2012.

Furthermore, the programme does not appear to be institutionally equipped to reflect and evolve the vision for NUSAF 2. For instance, we found no evidence of effective structures³³ for strategic direction or strong leadership of the programme, nor is there any platform for the involvement of sub-offices and implementing partners in programme decision-making. WFP appears to be focusing its stretched capacity largely on the management of the programme and IPs. This is reflected in a focus on output-level data management rather than outcomes, and a lack of comprehensive programme guidance.

All of this speaks to the lack of clarity about the programme’s key objective. If it is to strengthen and diversify livelihoods, then one would expect to see a strong shift within the mix of activities

³³ Provision within the Project Document for a National Steering Committee – comprising the NUSAF 2 Technical Support Team and WFP Country Office – to be responsible for overseeing the delivery of the project.

towards HISP, including enhancing the transfer of knowledge and skills in agricultural practices. However, the evidence from the field is that in the face of delays the IPs and sub-offices are being pulled more strongly towards PWP, at the expense of HISP.

If the core purpose of the programme is to prevent the erosion of livelihoods, then this refocusing on PWP may well suffice. However, we contend that for the WFP livelihoods programme to attain its maximum effect, a more integrated approach is required. This must be strategic and have coherence with other programmes in Karamoja (e.g. NUSAF 2 (WB), FAO/KALIP). It needs to be a part of a wider livelihoods model and shared theory of change, and linked to the proposed parish development plans. Without such an approach it will be difficult to graduate people, eventually, to sustainable food security.

How well is NUSAF 2 (WFP) delivering?

Targeting

Vulnerability in Karamoja is endemic and is a regular feature of ‘normal’ life, though cattle raiding, theft and insecurity, and drought exacerbate it. However, even within the same locality, vulnerability varies according to age, gender, marital status - especially polygamy -, and access to labour. In 2010, the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) carried out a vulnerability analysis in Karamoja which categorized households into Extremely Vulnerable (EVH), Food Insecure (FI) and Moderately Food Insecure (MFIs) households. The IOM exercise covered all five districts in Karamoja³⁴; this represented 1,332 villages and 73,276 households in these villages. The categorization included the following criteria: household labour availability, household food consumption, household water usage, household livestock ownership, household use of coping strategies and household food expenditure.

As this vulnerability analysis was readily available, WFP decided to adopt it rather than carry out another vulnerability analysis. At a later stage, households identified as being Food Insecure were merged with those identified as being Moderately Food Insecure given the fact that although these households do not meet the strict methodological criteria set by WFP/IOM, the line between food insecure and moderately food insecure was deemed thin, and many MFI households were identified by their respective communities as being among the most vulnerable.

Inevitably, there are complaints about the methodology but our enquiry found that to a considerable extent it has proved effective in identifying the vulnerable. Notable is the fact that no one contested the vulnerability analysis: whilst there were some complaints, these largely related to insufficient coverage. WFP staff consider that targeting has improved and that there are fewer cases of complaints. WFP/IPs are finding ways to clean up the vulnerability lists and a process of verification takes place each year. There is a general recognition of the need to support very vulnerable people including the old, widows, and those who are disabled, and there were few complaints about those on the EVH list. However, people confuse having a vulnerable person in the house (which may have an able bodied person) with being classified as a vulnerable household.

There is a consensus by both WFP field staff and communities that the need – in terms of the number of vulnerable people - is still great and that there were some constraints to the methodology. This particularly relates to the use of quotas/ceilings for each location which does not consider the total number of households that are vulnerable and in need. There is no dispute

³⁴ Since then, two further districts have been created from these five.

about those on the MFI list but many more households consider that they should also be registered on the list, and that there are some people on the list who are unable to work and should be on the EVH list. Transfers to Extremely Vulnerable Households is complicated by the fact that this is part of WFP's General Food Distribution and not funded under NUSAF 2; currently there are no systematic arrangements for transfers between the two lists (although in a few cases this has been managed at the field-office level) suggesting the need for flexibility between two funding streams.

Polygamous households have emerged as a unit that requires disaggregation in any targeting. Polygamy is widespread in Karamoja and a man may have as many as six wives, sometimes more than this. Each wife is responsible for her own household – herself and her children. In official data, the husband is usually registered with one wife while the other wives are registered as heads of households. The level of vulnerability amongst the wives is very variable; frequently the older wives are more vulnerable while the husband directs more resources to the younger wives – but this is not always the case. Polygamous wives do not share amongst themselves – this applies to food aid or cash – and thus it cannot be assumed that if one member (whether husband or a wife) participates in NUSAF 2 (WFP) that the other family members will benefit³⁵.

Other excluded groups include migrants who have returned in the last couple of years, and recent orphans. Furthermore, there is no provision for expanding the list even where households' circumstances change and they become more food insecure or where an able bodied person moves out of a registered household e.g. due to marriage³⁶.

Complaints on the targeting exercise itself include that it was done quickly, that communities were insufficiently involved to balance the consultation that was done at the LC level; although the vulnerability analysis was done on a house-to-house basis in some locations it is reported that if no one was at home they were excluded. Working primarily with the LCs was perceived as politicising the process. In some places, IOM was not trusted and people were not clear about the purpose of the registration and would have liked to register; on the other hand, WFP considers that the fact that it was not widely known meant that respondents gave more honest answers than they would have if it was known that it was a WFP vulnerability analysis – with its association with being a food aid organisation.

Our conclusion is that the targeting for the programme is effective subject to efforts for continuous fine tuning and cleaning of the lists. A key element would be to move the extremely vulnerable who are on the MFI list onto the EVH list to create the opportunity for more able bodied MFI households to participate. Institutional constraints to moving people across should be examined by WFP to avoid the current rather inflexible system which, to a considerable extent, assumes that poverty and need have been static since 2009.

³⁵ With the NUSAF 2 (WFP) each wife had the opportunity to register but not all were able to because of limitations with numbers and who is considered more or less food insecure. In some cases one or two wives may have registered while others were left out.

³⁶ The perception of WFP in Kaabong is that the margin of error is about 5%, and one field example suggests that the error is 4.1%, but this has not been verified. The focus group discussion on emerging findings confirmed the consensus that the targeting approach is a workable one for the remaining two years of the programme.

Increasing productivity and beneficiary livelihood security

Developing livelihood security

Implicit in the NUSAF 2 objective is behaviour change, reflecting a move away from dependency on food aid by the people of Karamoja to developing sustainable approaches to livelihoods. In the short period since food/cash for work was introduced by KPAP (2010) people in Karamoja have proven that they are willing to work and that the issue for the future is one of opportunity rather than dependency. During the enquiry for this evaluation, no one complained of having to work; rather more people want to be included. The willingness to work is evident by the large numbers who participated in community gardens and dam and road construction; in practice, many activities were over-subscribed relative to the size of the work involved.

Facilitating such behavioural change is a complex, time-consuming process, especially among a population that has such a low literacy rate (10%)³⁷. Government capacity at district level is too limited to implement such an approach that requires investment of time, communication, and considerable field work, but WFP, through using IPs, is well positioned to do so. The programme has reach to all villages in Karamoja, has identified the most vulnerable, and is able to operate in all locations despite insecurity (albeit reduced levels of insecurity). This is a significant achievement and would be difficult at this juncture for any other organisation to replicate, whether government, UN or NGO.

However, IPs consider that the investments in developing sustainable community approaches are not adequately appreciated by WFP Kampala. This is reflected in the significant delays in signing contracts with IPs and in releasing funds such that by the time IPs receive authorisation to mobilise the season is well advanced and they must quickly focus on activities (inputs and outputs) with inadequate time for processes that underlie success.

Productivity

In terms of productivity, we distinguish between productivity in green belt, agro-pastoral, and pastoralist areas, and the productivity of the assets created under the public works programme. A key issue is the interpretation of 'productivity': it can relate to the volume of production (immediate benefits) or productive skills learnt (a more long term approach). In green belt areas there has been an opening of land with tractors to improve the amount of land brought into production – a clear immediate increase in productivity but with some associated risks of land degradation. Moreover, while this will bring land into agricultural production it reduces the land traditionally available for grazing in stress periods. There seems to have been little analysis within NUSAF 2 (WFP) of the impact of opening up land and how it interacts with diversion of livelihoods from livestock grazing to agricultural production, or the high risk of land degradation without accompanying soil and water conservation measures.

In agro-pastoralist areas, the focus has been on increasing plot sizes and transferring cultivation practices to large numbers of participants working on these large gardens. However, it proved difficult to transfer new practices to large numbers of people and equip them with skills that results in increased production at their own homesteads. Indeed, the implementing partners indicate that the groups were far too large and that working with small groups will need to be a feature of the programme in 2012. Working in large groups is also likely to have been an

³⁷ Some reports say the level of adult literacy is as low as 6% and that there is significant gender disparity with women having the lowest levels.

inefficient use of labour in that when the produce was divided between all the beneficiaries the benefits to individuals was very small. Indeed, there were probably less benefits for individual households than if the same time was invested in working their own plots – even using inefficient methods.

It is still very early to gauge the extent of productivity gains in agro-pastoralist areas as it will take more than a year to go from food insecurity to sustainable production, but there is evidence that some progress has been made. However, the NUSAF 2 (WFP) model risks moving people from food aid dependency to dependency on receiving inputs from external providers. There has been little storage of seed and few links established between communities and seed traders or research stations. Moving forward an approach that seeks to increase productivity on participants own land/size would reflect a greater emphasis on letting farmers try different varieties and practices (e.g. drought resistant, early maturing and practices) depending on local conditions.

For pastoralist households, the model of promoting agricultural production is deemed relevant as the practice in Karamoja is that only some of the pastoralist family moves with the animals (the men and some boys), and the women stay behind and have always tried to grow crops. However, the menu proved – in practice – to be limited for pastoralists e.g. 46 fodder banks were planned for Kaabong but none were implemented. This suggests that pastoralism as part of a diverse livelihood strategy is not seriously considered by the programme but in any event may not be WFP's comparative advantage. This gap may be filled by the EU/FAO KALIP programme which amongst its activities includes the training of 350 animal health workers.

Community gardens are productive assets but much more time needs to be invested in transferring skills that are learnt in community gardens to the household plots. Furthermore, transferring skills in such an environment with its history of food aid, insecurity, lack of trust, and low education levels, requires an intensity of sensitisation that IPs consider is not fully appreciated. The sensitisation challenge is enormous and should not be a one-off initiative but needs to be on-going.

Access to and quality of productive assets

It is more accurate to describe the identification of projects for public works as projects that are in keeping with community interest rather than that they are 'demand driven'. The process of identification was late in starting in 2011 and implementing partners did not have much time to sensitise communities. Commentators stated that communities have a lack of confidence in taking on projects or in their ability to achieve them (no experience, low levels of education) and thus accept projects that are suggested to them by implementing partners or district officials.

The development of assets has been effective in strengthening confidence and giving communities a sense of self-reliance and this is seen to be a significant achievement where many have lost so much in respect to their traditional livelihood base and are learning new ways of building their asset base.

The nature of the PWP productive assets (dams, access roads and community woodlots/ gardens) are all very much appreciated by both communities and district officials. The access roads have facilitated service providers to come into communities and to provide community members with access to services and markets in nearby centres and parishes. In particular, it has enabled food to be delivered into villages rather than headloading, soldiers are using the new roads for patrol, and they have facilitated the expansion of the early childhood development programme being implemented by the district in conjunction with WFP and UNICEF (Kaabong). However, there must be concern about whether vehicles and trucks will be able to pass in the rainy season as no systematic arrangements has been made for their maintenance, though they may continue to function as footpaths. The potential scale of this challenge is illustrated in Kaabong where 200

access roads have been completed. This includes two kms of roads in Kathile and 4 kms in Karenga which have been taken over by the district for maintenance, but these are exceptions.

Concerning dams, they are much appreciated by communities as drinking water for animals and to a lesser extent for small scale irrigation. They have extended water availability by up to four months which is a big improvement for those who own animals (probably not the poorest). However, many of the dams were not completed due to early rains and need deepening if their use is to be maximised for providing water for a period beyond four months and covering at least some of the lean period.

Quality assurance is supposed to include signing off on design and construction and monitoring but technical input has been limited and very stretched e.g. one engineer for 200 projects (Kaabong). The programme has not defined any quality standards to guide quality assurance across the programme. The engagement of the District Technical Officers – to the extent this has been possible given the wider demands on their time – brings the possibility of an individually applied quality framework derived from government practice. .

There is a clear desire among focus groups to learn more about agricultural production, and the introduction of vegetable growing has been particularly successful. The first year illustrated that there was good potential for significantly increasing vegetable production in people's own homesteads (Kaabong, Kotido, urban Moroto), though the vegetable production was not a success in Nakapiripirit. Some households were able to sell small quantities, which is a contribution to household income and this income is controlled by women; in other locations while there was a surplus of vegetables there was no local market and no preservation methods. The early maturing period of vegetables helped to provide food during the hungry months while they were waiting for cereals to mature. The long vegetable growing season last year, a result of the very good rains, meant that the quality of diet at household level improved; women in one community in Kotido anecdotally linked the birth of healthy babies to their better nutrition.

The community gardens have strengthened the notion of working together to achieve an aim and this is particularly beneficial in a context where there is little trust among people and few traditions of working together to achieve a common aim. However, the benefits gained have been undermined in some locations where insufficient land security for community gardens has been an issue - some owners have taken the land back after a year (when the land has been improved by the labour of others), which completely undermines the objective of creating community productive assets. Agreements need to be negotiated with land owners to ensure that this does not become a feature of NUSAF 2 (WFP).

Building Capacities

Capacity development of government institutions and community is a pillar of NUSAF 2 (WFP). It is also a commitment in the WFP Country Programme, and is in line with the WFP Strategic Plan. The major modality for developing capacity at the district level appears to be experiential learning through local government staff implementing alongside WFP Field Staff. This involvement has grown considerably over the first year of implementation: from no involvement of district officials in the first round of IP selection, to an eventual situation of joint field visits, reviews, and recommendations for the second round of contracting IPs.

The capacity development activities of IPs appear to have been mixed, and mostly focused at the community-level. Some IPs, such as COOPI, were reported by both district officials and communities to have included valuable community-level skills training, exchange visits, and links to local research stations. Other IPs, such as IOM, introduced Green Resource Centres, which are seen as having high potential as centres of innovation.

IPs appear to be unsighted on any expectations of the programme regarding their support to the capacity development of local government; nor has local government any perception of NUSAF 2 (WFP) adding-value in terms of building capacity. If anything, the achievements of the first year – in terms of quality assurance – have relied heavily on the involvement of district production officers. The increasing occurrence of joint monitoring in the programme, as well as the involvement of district officers in training Project Management Committees, is an important asset of the programme and should be continued.

At the local level, we found no evidence of community institutions being built (the PMCs have a more narrow and limited role), or other capacity being systematically developed. Community gardens tend to be far too small (5-6 acres) for the large numbers (often as many as 60 - 300) who wish to participate. As a result, individuals do not get adequate training, or outputs from their labour. Moreover, the level of applied learning that takes place in the gardens is even less clear in terms of the depth of knowledge and skills that are currently being transferred to people's own plots.

This suggests that at the household level a more systematic approach to training is required one that ensures that the key principles of agronomic practices are imparted. This needs to be on an on-going basis in line with the agricultural cycle. If people are to improve their capacity to a level that transforms their productivity they need more intensive training. Much smaller groups (circa 15 people) are required and this has already been proposed by some of the IPs. There are existing farmer training models (e.g. Farmer Field Schools) that work with small groups and that are proven to be effective in the region.

Use of relationships, knowledge and skills

Beneficiary relationships:

Investment in relationships among beneficiaries through working in groups has been particularly positive, and has given communities a sense that they can achieve things if they work together. While most people attended for work as required there were examples of individuals not turning up but still expecting to be paid.

While the majority of participants are women, there were varying degrees of gender analysis carried out to inform the projects and limited efforts made to engage men. There is little evidence of a gender analysis informing the programme on the effects on women's workload in terms of increased weeding responsibilities when large tracts of land are opened by tractors, or whether women are able to benefit from their labour or whether cash crops were kept by men.

In terms of use of local knowledge there is a vacuum in indigenous knowledge to inform crop production and the programme has not drawn on indigenous livestock knowledge. In terms of facilitating inclusive processes within communities there is ample room for WFP to encourage the tapping of informal structures e.g. elders, women's groups, or youth.

Relationships with Implementing Partners

The programme has been effective in using implementing partners who have been operational in Karamoja for some time; there was an open call for NGOs with a proven track record in working in specific sub-counties (not just Karamoja) and WFP have drawn selectively on these. In general, good relationships prevail between IPs and WFP, partnerships are emerging at the local level and IPs say they have adapted to working with WFP's systems and ways of working. IPs have worked hard to fill gaps that WFP have not been able to deliver on e.g. when there were problems with the process of developing IDs/photographs, or to pay up front for inputs. For its part, WFP

is deemed by IPs to be flexible when changes in market prices significantly affect the original budget. However, the nature of the relationship is still essentially a contractual one between WFP (an organisation whose strength is working in emergency contexts) contracting NGOs who have a similar humanitarian background³⁸, rather than a more engaging form of partnership. IPs have good approaches to community sensitisation and some partners have demonstrated strong mobilisation skills, while others have brought in innovation (e.g. IOM Green Resource Centre).

Relationships with local government

WFP's relationship with local government is good, it is seen as a very credible trusted organisation and a very (if not the) most loyal organisation in the region. Local government officials (technical as well as administrative and political) are well-informed about NUSAF 2 (WFP) and have participated in joint monitoring. The programme has received good technical input from local government officials e.g. production officers, agriculturalists and engineers. The fact that IPs are on the front line of criticism has resulted in IPs functioning as a buffer that insulates WFP from criticism by local government and beneficiaries e.g. when there have been delays in food and cash transfers.

More broadly, WFP-Uganda itself has limited staff and has drawn upon – in a limited way - its corporate expertise internationally to inform the design and implementation of the programme. WFP has yet to maximised its relationship with FAO (although this is improving). For example, FAO could help through the Farmer Field Schools model with training IPs/communities to assist in improving production practices.

Internally, WFP has restructured and downsized in 2011. There has been a high turnover for the head of sub-office post in Moroto (4 times since NUSAF 2 commenced), leading to frustration on the part of other stakeholders. Furthermore, we found no clear chain of communication between Country Office and Sub Offices when it came to communicating pipeline delays. Whilst new arrangements have now been put in place, and the same level of disruption should be avoided in the remainder of the programme, it still suggests a worrying disconnect between the human resources behaviours and the programme needs in WFP.

At the local government level, there has been clear visibility of the anti-corruption team from central government, which appears to have helped the overall environment for development programming. Better strategies need to be developed by NUSAF 2 (WFP) to take advantage of this type of opportunity. For example after the last district elections, there was no sensitisation of newly elected politicians by the programme. This proved to be detrimental to multiple relationships in Moroto, where the incorrect assumption by WFP that the technical wing of the district would fully brief incoming politicians was only noticed after significant problems emerged that jeopardized programme implementation.

The presence of large numbers of NGOs, particularly in Moroto (where there are around 150), has resulted in several NGOs/agencies working in the same communities without proper coordination. Combined with the coming on stream of KALIP funding through different implementing partners to those used by WFP, there is a growing risk of NUSAF 2 (WFP) working in isolation from other players.

³⁸ There are a large number of NGOs whose experience is in emergency work in Karamoja that either moved from other parts of Northern Uganda following the peace process, or came to assist in the 2009 drought year and have remained.

Conclusion on effectiveness

Though effectiveness was adversely affected by problems of timeliness in 2011, there were important gains which have set a basis on which to build. WFP and IPs assess their effectiveness in terms of the amount of activities that they undertook. However, if a sustainable livelihoods programme is to evolve, a clear strategy, and coordination and partnership with other stakeholders is required. It is unlikely that WFP can achieve the intended results on its own. In terms of the livelihoods programme, its strength is that it has a poverty-targeted approach with reach to every village in Karamoja (an unrivalled position for any organisation). Community assets are being created but there are questions regarding the utility of the assets, or indeed who benefits from them. There is a much greater need to focus on the development of individual skills and farming practices and this requires a coordinated approach with others such as FAO. Rather than trying to adjust the programme to deliver on all the outcome areas the focus should be on the value and relevance of what WFP does well - a critical backstop in times of need. In this regard it can be argued that the programme could more easily be adapted to meet with a Social Protection agenda than a livelihoods one.

Relevance of approach

Cash and food value-transfer modalities

WFP commissioned a feasibility study to assess the potential for having a cash transfer programme in Karamoja. This analysis provided the basis for the design and decisions on where to carry out food and cash transfers³⁹. Cash transfers using a mobile phone system of payment were piloted on a small scale in seven out of forty four sub-counties (using Stanbic Bank and MTN).

The decision to limit the cash transfers to communities near trading centres and markets appears to be a sound rationale on the basis that such communities preferred cash, they operate in a more cash-based economy, and have access to a wider range of goods for which they need cash. Yet, even then, interviews conducted for this evaluation indicate that there is no consistency in the preference for cash e.g. in Moroto district, beneficiaries in Nadunget wanted food but in Moroto town they wanted cash (and displayed more entrepreneurial skills).

One of the perceived benefits of cash distribution is that people make a mental shift away from a sense of food dependency. However, in terms of how participants are experiencing the cash programme, because of the extensive delays and widespread errors in payments, there is concern among beneficiaries that they are being cheated. They feel vulnerable to being defrauded because they do not understand the MTN system and how it is intended to work, and there are high levels of frustration with the system. Beneficiaries reported that delays in payment have meant that some have got into debt as they are paying local interest rates of 10% per month. The MTN system seems to have been launched without piloting, and problems continue to persist. WFP are aware that serious improvements need to be made and are engaged.

As a result of inflation and rising food prices delayed cash transfers have failed to maintain their food value. Rural communities were consistent in their preference for food transfers, referring to the lack of local markets at which to buy food.

³⁹ Levine, S. & Carrington, G. Is cash-voucher programming a feasible alternative for WFP in Uganda?, Report for WFP, February 2009.

Women (and some men in Kaabong and Nakapiripirit) pointed to intra-household conflict arising from the introduction of cash into the household. References were made to increased domestic violence, and how men demanded money whereas women say that men do not demand part of the food transfers but see it as food for the family. While it might be expected that there would be a preference for cash transfers as it allows more choice in terms of usage, women were unanimous in their preference for food.

In terms of enabling households to invest or establish small scale businesses, the size of the transfer is too small, whether in food or cash, and community members say it would need to be doubled to about 60,000/= to be an effective catalyst. Data on how beneficiaries are using the cash is not being collected by WFP or its implementing partners.

There were also food delays reportedly because of high regional demands for food and problems of procurement in the region. WFP has several measures in place to mitigate risks/bottlenecks in pipeline including weekly meetings but still the problems have persisted. This suggests that some of these problems are of a structural nature with issues regarding the nature of accountability and decision making that the development approach of NUSAF 2 (WFP) demands. WFP is confident that it is in a better position this year but there is still the risk of regional forward purchasing of grain from Uganda which may lead to a repeat of the same problems.

Menu

The HISP Investment Menu provides for a range of activities consisting of dairy production, high value crops, labour saving technologies, agro-forestry/tree propagation, post-harvest management and value addition and markets⁴⁰. Some beneficiaries deem that it should be extended to include more vegetables, access to tractors to open up land, seed banks, and pesticides. The menu for PWP includes⁴¹ community roads, small valley dams, irrigation, land husbandry and soil conservation. The same menu of activities was provided for all three agro-ecological zones, although whether it is sufficient for each of these is uncertain. A limitation of the menu is that it does not reflect a gender perspective. In the social, climatic and economic context, and if women are to free up time to engage in more livelihood activities and public works, we might expect the menu to also include household water and fuel needs, and food processing (e.g. drinking water, small scale irrigation, solar energy, solar lamps to charge mobile phones, firewood, biomass systems).

There also appears to have been inconsistent and fairly narrow implementation of the menu of activities according to the comparative strengths of the Implementing Partner. For instance, agribusiness and value addition have not been included in practice, whereas fuel efficient stoves were subsequently added and over 4000 were distributed against an original plan of 16. While such stoves have the potential to make a significant contribution to reducing women and girls' workloads and reduce the demand for firewood, there is need for follow-up on their use and performance if their adoption is to be sustainable. There may also be potential for income generation by training groups to make the stoves locally.

Furthermore, there appears to have been inconsistency in the use of value-transfers in support of activities. For example, in some areas food transfers appear to have been given for activities that would be classed as HISP (such as community gardens) in addition to those classed as PWP (such

⁴⁰ The Household Income Support provides for Dairy production, High value crops, Poultry/egg production, Piggery, Improved goats, Aquaculture/integrated farming, Labour-saving technologies e.g. animal traction, Apiary - honey production, Agro-forestry/tree propagation, Post-harvest handling and Value addition & marketing.

⁴¹ The PWP menu includes roads (Community roads, Bridges and Culverts), water (Valley tanks, Small valley dams, and Sanitation systems) and other basic infrastructure (Drainage facilities, paving markets and car parks in urban areas, Dykes in flood-prone areas, Reforestation, Land husbandry and soil conservation measures).

as ponds). The use of value-transfers appears to have been better defined for 2012, partly as a result of strategic discussions with FAO. As the programme is currently implemented, however, this is likely to lead to an even greater focus on PWPs, when HISP already appears to be absent from some areas in Moroto.

Security

A sense of insecurity is widespread in Karamoja and relates to conflict between different clans; between the Karamojong and neighbouring districts within Uganda, and between the Karamojong and their Kenyan neighbours, the Pokot and the Turkana. The situation has improved in the last few years resulting from the disarmament process and the heavy presence of UPDF, and there has been much emphasis on cross border peace processes. However, commentators see the peace as fragile. Many of the main routes are now deemed safe but there are also many locations where WFP only enters with an armed escort (NGOs do not use such escorts). WFP say that their work is respected by communities and that this affords them much protection.

In addition to concerns over regular cattle raiding, palpable during the field visits was the fear of petty crime and thuggery within communities and within ere/manyattas perpetrated largely by youth targeted at personal property and food. Women spoke of their fear of acquiring anything new in case it attracted attention (e.g. one woman spoke of people coming to her house at night demanding she hand over new utensils that she had bought for brewing beer). Other examples include food being taken from women on their way home following food distribution, the harvest being stolen from the traditional field stores, or vegetables being stolen from gardens. Such theft is serving to undermine the desire for investing in income generation.

Violence against women, girls and children is widespread including rape and domestic violence. During the field work we encountered a number of child protection initiatives spearheaded by NGOs but much less attention seems to be given to gender based violence. With regard to their role in conflict, women can play an aggravating role by expecting their men to raid cattle to support the family. This points to the need for a livelihood focus and linkage with income generation programmes for youth and women.

The number of livestock in Karamoja has dropped significantly. In Moroto and Kotido commentators stated that it had dropped approximately 50% in the last three years. Respondents attributed this rapid decline to a number of factors including animal disease which spreads rapidly when animals are in large kraals (one of the practices associated with government policy to protect animals), cattle raiding and theft.

Although security agencies have proved to have sufficient capacity to suppress violence and illegality that might threaten government control in Karamoja, they do not yet have the capacity to provide effective and trusted policing and justice services to most ordinary people and communities, and in some villages visited during the field work we encountered communities that feared the army and the police. It appears that whilst at one time Karamoja had very disciplined youth, today traditional, community-based mechanisms for regulating conflicts and providing justice have broken down. These mechanisms have struggled to keep up with the increasing intensity and violence of conflicts, environmental degradation, and displacement of communities, and have suffered in particular with the marginalisation of elders as a result of small arms influxes and conflicts between the roles of community elders and the formal representatives of the state. There are also accusations that traditional mechanisms in some cases

entrench elitism and paternalism⁴². Yet, there is agreement that they have the potential to play an important role in peace and resolving conflict, and in promoting social cohesion among communities⁴³.

NUSAF 2 is intended to contribute to peace and development through providing social and economic interventions⁴⁴. There is a view that ‘fast and rapid development’ (food security, social protection, learning/ education) and - as a result (young) people being occupied (and unavailable for conflict) - will incentivize people to embrace peace. In this context, development interventions such as WFP’s programme are welcomed. It is somewhat surprising therefore that WFP documentation does not include a conflict assessment or on-going conflict risk analysis. The notion of conflict analysis, ‘do not harm’ or promoting inter-ethnic cooperation is not evident in the work of WFP or implementing partners, except in so far as how incidences affect daily operations (WFP has a very strong intelligence capacity and radio network).

Conclusion on relevance

Given the current context and level of development in Karamoja (fragility, low productivity, declining livestock, history of dependency) NUSAF 2 (WFP) is relevant as a measure supporting resilience but it needs to be more nuanced if it is to contribute to livelihood recovery. Relatively simple tools are being used to address a complex environment, and there is a risk that ‘a one size fits all’ approach across agro-ecological zones prevails when there is need for more refining, and adaptation to different micro-environments. The relative use of cash and food transfers has been appropriate. The programme would benefit from stronger over-sight and guidance.

Efficiency of Programme delivery

Delays in inputs

Compared to other programmes (e.g. KALIP) which have experienced mobilisation delays, WFP has been relatively quick in mobilising IPs and in getting NUSAF 2 (WFP) up and running, and WFP is to be complemented on this. However, the implementation process has incurred considerable delays.

There have been extensive delays in the release of funding and this in turn has affected the delivery of inputs especially seeds, and the carrying out of consultation processes on sub-projects and to encourage ownership. At field level, the delays relate to; (a) insufficient time for IPs to mobilise, (b) insufficient sensitisation and project identification at community level, (c) a slow process of sub-project approval, (d) a complex and slow process of procuring seed (e) delays in transferring resources to IPs and a change mid-stream that required IPs to advance funding to be later reimbursed by WFP (most smaller sized NGO IPs have not been selected to participate in the programme for 2012/13 – only the bigger organisations are left).

There is insufficient sequencing of activities to take account of seasons especially the dry, hungry months. For example, at the time of the field visits (February/ March) people in parts of Kotido are already eating leaves and collecting rats and grasshoppers, yet there are no on-going PWP activities. Based on last year’s experience, it will be some 4-5 months before beneficiaries receive the next transfers because contracts – at the time of our enquiry in February/ March – were not

⁴² Minority Rights Group International, Resolving conflicts using traditional mechanisms in the Karamoja and Teso regions of Uganda, (undated, 2009?)

⁴³ *ibid*

⁴⁴ NUSAF 2 Operational Manual, OPM, 2010.

yet signed with IPs, and time will be required to undertake sensitisation of communities, sub-project identification and approval, procurement of seed and other inputs, and completion of a cycle of work.

The delays in starting the activities in 2011 had a number of impacts: it meant that only four cycles of work were completed when six were planned; this deprived communities of transfers in the lean season; late planting with reduced yields; and some investments did not yield benefits as they were planted too late e.g. fruit trees, some sorghum seed in Moroto and Kaabong. The negative effects of delays were mitigated by the fact that 2011 was a year with exceptional surpluses.

Timeliness of the transfers

There were considerable delays in provision of transfers, both food and cash, in 2011. WFP acknowledges that there were serious bottlenecks in food supply resulting in delays in food distributions on several occasions throughout the year. For example, one community in Kaabong district reported that they waited 3-5 months for food transfers after the work cycles were completed. This adversely affected the objective of bridging the food gap during the lean season for participating households.

The cash transfer process has been fraught with difficulties. WFP Uganda had no previous experience in mobile phone cash transfers but issued a broad tender asking for solutions that resulted in Stanbic Bank and MTN winning the bid to implement Mobile Money. There were long delays in issuing identification documents (inclusive of photographs). The MTN network proved to be unreliable and erratic during most distributions. Beneficiaries experienced long delays in payment e.g. in Moroto there was no payment for three work cycles between July and December; sim cards that had been issued to beneficiaries were not accepted (Kaabong); some people received a double payment while other received nothing; there are constant MTN connectivity problems causing delays in payments; beneficiaries do not understand how the system is to work; and dealers run out of money.

WFP is well aware of the problems, and acknowledges that it underestimated the work required to get cash transfers functioning, even though they account for less than 10% of transfers. The Karamoja experience points to an underinvestment in in-house technical knowledge resulting in WFP (as well as beneficiaries) becoming a victim to high-tech proposals that sound good but that go badly wrong. Sub-offices indicate that a consultant is to review the system in mid-March. It is understood that globally WFP is also trying to improve cash transfer modalities.

Delays in transfers undermined confidence and trust in the programme. It has created tensions between beneficiaries and supervisors and representatives of the project management committees, undermining social cohesion. It has also exposed local government officials to criticism (Moroto); and there were tensions between IPs and communities. In our view most people are participating in the programme because there are (as of now) few options.

The programme staff dedicated to NUSAF 2 (WFP) is very small. For example, in Kotido there is one full time field monitor while the rest of the management and field inputs are on a part-time basis. Despite the hard work done by those involved, this staff complement is inefficient and results in most of WFP staff time input to the management of Implementing Partners, rather than facilitating learning and delivering on the capacity development elements of the programme. Other field level arrangements also create inefficiencies. For example, communicating between counterparts and IPs is a major part of the Field Monitor role in this programme. And yet, because they are not provided with mobile telephones by WFP, the incentive is for staff to use the organisations cars and armed escorts to regularly visit offices to collect data instead of spending their own money on calls from the field.

Stimulus to the local economy

The cash transfer paid by WFP is less than NUSAF 2 (Northern Uganda) which pays 4,000 Ush, and it is understood that KALIP will pay about 7,000 Ush in order to fulfil the commitment by that programme to providing local liquidity. Depending on the understanding of purpose of NUSAF 2 (WFP), it can be argued that the KALIP rate may in fact be more efficient at enabling people to accumulate assets and, ultimately, begin to move out of poverty. If, however, the WFP programme is intended to be ‘a holding strategy’ that stops people from adopting negative coping strategies then the current rate can be seen to be efficient (although the willingness of communities to work for it may be eroded by KALIP operating in the same area).

There is a need for NUSAF 2 (WFP) to review and more explicitly articulate the programme’s strategy for capacity development. In our view, this should consider how to build from the current relationships that have been established with districts and communities through joint reviews; and should aim to enhance the efficiency of household income support by focusing on enhanced productivity (and post-harvest handling) within existing plots before opening up new gardens.

The focus of IPs on block gardens

Generally speaking, the primary focus of IPs appears to have been on increasing production through community gardens rather than the productivity of individual homesteads. The anticipated programme shift towards PWP – seen as the inevitable consequence of the delayed start in 2012 - is likely to exacerbate this trend towards large projects and project groups. The small size of these block gardens relative to large group sizes makes them inefficient in terms of production per household. There is also very limited evidence of lessons learned being transferred to homesteads, especially as programme tools have been distributed between multiple households that are unaccustomed to shared ownership.

It is our view that the efficiency of the programme, in terms of increasing both productivity and knowledge transfer, would be best enhanced through a stronger focus on HISP activities. The technical capacity of both government and NAADS in terms of the reach of agricultural extension is highly limited. As a result, IPs are the main actors to bridge this gap in the medium term, and build skills within communities. By (inadvertently) moving away from HISP, NUSAF 2 (WFP) risks losing an opportunity and responsibility to enhance skills and provide critical advisory services in these areas.

Well designed block gardens could still be a part of this strategy in flat areas in order to illustrate practices that are not easily demonstrated at individual household level e.g. digging trenches and soil conservation, use of tractors, disease and pest control. To achieve this efficiently, however, ownership and knowledge transfer should both be enhanced through the allocation to individual households of areas larger than they would usually cultivate, combined with a demonstration plot within the block that each household can replicate.

Use of Implementing Partners

The use of IPs has been efficient. IPs have demonstrated good community development skills including facilitation, mobilisation and supervision skills, and they have done a good job in trying to reach and work with the most vulnerable. They have staff at parish and community level, and some have staff at sub-county level also. For example, COOPI and MAP have a team leader at district level, one supervisor at sub-county level, a community mobiliser at sub-county level, and one mobiliser per parish, all of which are paid positions. In addition the Programme has Project Management Committees (chosen from representatives of the community) and a chairperson where there is a community garden (unpaid).

IPs acknowledge that they underestimated and under-budgeted for the level of technical expertise required to support the programme. The Technical Capacity of IPs in 2011 is indicated in Table 6. IPs have drawn – where possible - on the district technical staff. This has been a positive development but is not sufficient in terms of responding to the emphasis that needs to be placed within the programme on knowledge and skills transfer. There have been moves by a number of the IPs in 2012 to increase their technical capacity by budgeting for additional national experts or specialised consultants as project advisors⁴⁵. However, the extent to which this change – the addition of a few agronomists and engineers - will be able to adequately cover the year on year increase in project sites, remains a concern.

These problems are particularly acute and important in respect to agricultural production. It is difficult to envisage how adequate expertise and training can be provided to communities based on the projected levels of technical input across the wide ranging areas of concern, including; identification of appropriate seed for the different agro-ecological zones, agronomic skills development, procurement and saving of seed, and post-harvest management and marketing.

Table 6: Technical Capacity of Implementing Partners (2011)

Partner	No. of Staff on NUSAF ²	Details
ACF (Kaabong)	65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 agronomist (shared with Napak), 1 roads & dams engineer • 1 project officer, 1 assistant project officer (agric. & development training) • Field supervisors, 10 team leaders, 46 field assistant
CESVI	46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 area manager, 1 engineer (roads and dams for five months) • 1 agronomist (shared with Abim), 4 programme staff • Parish level and community mobilisers
World Vision	34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 nutrition officer /agronomist (based in Abim) • 1 livelihoods officer (based in Abim), 1 Engineer (based in Pader) • 3 field monitors, 1 coordinator, 10 parish TLs, community mobilisers
CARITAS	42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • project manager, project officer and two field supervisors (all trained in agriculture/agronomy) • 38 parish supervisors and field mobilisers
MAP International	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 programme officer, 2 project assistants • 1 sub county supervisor, 3 parish mobilisers and 9 village mobilisers
Samaritan Purse	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 programme manager • 2 sub county supervisors, project assistants, community mobilisers (community development/ social workers)
COOPI	34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 agronomist • 1 water engineer , 1 agricultural officer & 1 environmental scientist • 30 field level staff for mobilisation and supervision
PADC	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 agronomist (full time), 1 civil works officer (part time) • 2 field officers • 12 parish mobilisers &45 village mobilisers

⁴⁵ For example in Kaabong ACF has recently recruited an engineer to oversee some 240 dams and road construction projects; World Vision has one agronomist who is based in Abim who is responsible for supporting Kaabong, Kotido and Abim; COOPI has one agronomist for Mortoto district.

Contracting process for recruiting implementing partners

The recruitment of IPs improved in 2012 in comparison with 2011 in that districts were fully engaged in the process of assessment. This resulted in a rationalisation of IPs to a few in each district while others were no longer retained because of inadequate performance in the first year. Those that have been recruited in 2012 have been given a 2-year contract and in some cases have been asked to extend their brief to cover those communities where IPs were not retained.

The contracting process has been inefficient in that new contracts for the IPs were not signed until early March 2012. This resulted from the lag between the original one year contracts which finished in December 2011, followed by a time gap (while IPs were re-appraised). This gap – at a critical period in the planning and implementation cycle - has resulted in IPs being unable to retain staff, having to recruit new staff and having to remobilise their teams.

The delays in contracting IPs for 2012 will inevitably result in less time being available to; carry out sensitisation and planning work with district officials and communities, hold adequate community consultation on sub-projects for public works or on the identification of sites for work, or ensure adequate knowledge sharing and consultation with farmers on preferred seed varieties and on seed procurement (which took up to 5 weeks in 2011) prior to the onset of the rains.

Data management

There are a number of data systems involved in the programme, the largest being the tracking and allocation of food-for-work, the tracking and allocation of cash-for-work, and the tracking of results. Of these, the food-for-work tracking system appears to have had the fewest issues, reflecting WFP's experience in this area. By comparison, that data management of cash distributions appears to have been extremely inefficient, reflecting the large number of different partners and technologies used in the implementation of the cash modality.

Different cash-partners undertake each step of identifying the beneficiaries, verifying their identity, tracking their work, allocating payments, transferring cash, and making payments. There is no common system to manage this, with each IP developing their own solution. As a result, large data files have to pass between different partners – some of whom hold records under different variations of local names. The system has multiple opportunities for error.

Results data is being collected from IPs in both a narrative and numeric form. Currently, this data has to be manually extracted, aggregated and analysed on an ad hoc basis. Excel spreadsheets are being used, but these appear to have been completed inconsistently, and without regularised protocols. There are plans to introduce a database to provide some of these functions, and reporting chains seem to have been clarified as a result of experiences in 2011. There is, however, no shared view among IPs or WFP of what the impacts of the programme should be, or how to best track these. Whilst some IPs, such as ACF, are developing their own in-house solutions, others are waiting for WFP to specify what the requirements of the programme are. In parallel, the KALIP team appear to already be working on a similar solution.

There is a real possibility that the consequences of this situation will be the fragmented and inconsistent collection of outcome indicators, offering poor value in terms of both programme strategy insights and the robustness of evaluative evidence. This needs to be addressed immediately through a clear process of identifying key outcome indicators, common methodologies and timeframes for collection as soon as possible. Such a process should involve the active participation of all IPs, coordinating district officials, and the KALIP M&E team.

Strengthening of internal capacity

Organisationally, WFP appears to have made few investments in its capacity to deliver the programme. The agency provided very little technical input beyond the menu of activities during the first year. To address this, it is planned to involve 2-3 agricultural and water experts from partner organisations from May 2012. Whilst this is a positive move the impact that this expertise will be able to make on a programme covering 75,000 households over the remaining 18 months of programme implementation is uncertain, in the absence of a more concerted push on programme quality by WFP-Uganda.

Operationally, a number of changes made by WFP in 2011 should begin to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the programme: including clarifying the reporting structures for IPs, communicating pipeline issues, and establishing Moroto as a lead for the region. There is also a suggestion that a reporting database will be established to provide better access to information for Government, WFP and IPs. However, without a consistent mechanism for tracking outcomes, a database that only includes the current output-level data is unlikely to enhance the efficiency of the programme in terms of delivering results. A similar monitoring system to that proposed by WFP is currently being developed for Karamoja by KALIP, creating a high risk of duplication of effort between these two large programmes.

Alignment – UN agencies

The relationship between WFP and FAO at the country level has been strengthened. At the field level there has been discussion on how to align the HISP incentives with Agro-pastoral Field Schools, and there have been moves to conduct a joint pilot of a watershed-management approach in five locations.

Conclusion on efficiency

The modality of using of IPs is efficient in terms of reaching and addressing vulnerability across all villages in Karamoja, and overheads are low. There are – at present - few other real alternatives for consideration which would offer better value for money. However, there are inefficiencies in the contracting process between WFP and IPs, and between this programme and that of other programmes in terms of coherence and coordination. IPs have good structures to get down to community level but the challenge is the quality of work due to time and technical constraints. Considering the reputational implications that NUSAF 2 holds for WFP, we would have expected to see the development of a much clearer communications strategy to keep stakeholders informed about; expected delays, what the reasons are for these delays, and how WFP are working to resolve the situation.

Likelihood of the sustainability of results.

Our assessment of the likelihood of Programme Assets being utilized and livelihood practices being continued beyond the programme end date (2013) looked at both the PWP and HISP experience.

Assets created through public works projects

Community Access Roads and Small Dams (water ponds, surface dams and charco dams)

Community assets such as roads, dams are highly valued by communities, are being utilized and are likely to continue so beyond the programme. Limitations are around seasonal nature of the roads. Many will become inaccessible to vehicles early into the rain season and difficult to use for walking. There are plans to complete projects that were not finished last year. In our view assets may be utilised/sustained in the short term but not in the longer term unless there is real effort in 2012 to consolidate the structures created in 2011, with much greater input both technically and socially. Currently there is little evidence of strong community structures with the ability to maintain the assets created. It is imperative that efforts are made to find ways of maintaining the assets, and provide the requisite skills for their maintenance without this being linked to transfers. Solutions may be found within communities, or in the structured relationships between village and sub county level leaders (LC1 & LC3) and district level technical departments.

Community Woodlots

The extent of early success with the woodlot sub projects varied within and between districts. In Kaabong poor survival rates were reported in about 75% of woodlots⁴⁶. A key factor was woodlots being planted too far away for communities to go to water and protect young trees. In contrast - in Kotido and Moroto - IPs reported instances of survival rates of around 90%. Success was associated with the potential to link the woodlots to a clear individual/ household level benefit, income generation, and public institutions such as schools. For example in Kotido (Rengen sub county), where survival rates were higher each beneficiary was allocated a number of trees in the woodlots under which they inter planted with vegetables which provided a good incentive for watering both trees and vegetables.

There is a need for a much greater focus on understanding how local people interact with their environment and wood resources, and how this can be enhanced i.e. what are the wood resources that people use, what are their priorities (e.g. charcoal for income generation). There may also be opportunities to integrate income earning activities with woodlots e.g. apiary, or security fencing for the *ere/manyyatta*. Key issues where there is already considerable national and international experience on communal management of planting/ natural forest management to draw on are: who owns the land (clans or individuals) and whether there is potential for joint management of woodlots, who will own the trees that are grown in long run and whether those that contributed most labour (usually women) will reap the benefits.

Household Income Support- sustainability of livelihood practices

The diversification of livelihoods through stronger engagement in crop production and broadening the range of agricultural enterprises undertaken is a welcome concept among the communities met. Many focus groups and district officers cite a loss of head of livestock of around 50 percent in the past 3 years, and communities are convinced that any new livestock will be stolen.

⁴⁶ Source: WFP Field Monitor, Kaabong.

There is very strong interest in growing all types of vegetables and this is a significant achievement in the first year. There has also been some success regarding cereals⁴⁷ and some income generation from sales of produce. However, our enquiry has identified a number of challenges constraining agricultural production/ increased productivity, which must be addressed to ensure sustainability. These are:

- How to ensure sustainable sources of seed especially for the new crops introduced for purposes of diversifying livelihoods such as cassava, fruit trees, legumes, oilseeds, vegetables. This is important especially as there are still no formal seed markets with certified and accredited traders⁴⁸ and skills for seed selection and management are still limited. The potential for seed saving as an income generation activity should be examined⁴⁹ and conducted alongside building capacity for selection and management of seed. Good indigenous seed management and preservation practices should be utilized for seed preservation.
- Timely delivery of seed The late delivery of seed for block gardens as well as the individual household gardens was a commonly mentioned problem. The impact of this was less apparent in 2011 because of the unusually long rain period and the effects of late planting less adverse. In a typical year where rains are from March to September (in agro pastoralist zones) with a dry spell of a couple of months in between (June and July) late delivery of seed might mean farmers completely missing the opportunity to plant.
- Access to preferred and suitable varieties for the micro climates The main focus for 2012 should be identifying/ providing the right varieties for micro climates, and the link with farmer participatory research. In Kotido there was a strong preference for beans (k 20) which children particularly like. While the Sekedo variety of sorghum is supposed to be drought resistant and quick maturing (100 days) a community in Katikekile reported that the sorghum (sekedo 5) provided took very long (more than eight months) to mature and was not tolerant to dry conditions – ‘it became like elephant grass’. This raises issues related to the quality of the seed and whether the community was given the correct variety or is a case of mislabelling of seed. Undoubtedly there is need for links to research that addresses the local problems of drought resistance, early maturity, pest and disease resistance and locally preferred tastes.
- Pest and disease management- Pest management was a problem in 2011 and there were big losses in yield because of pests and diseases (e.g. there was widespread loss of sorghum, while in Katikekile there was loss of cucumber and watermelon, and in Nadunget complete loss of cassava). Some farmers say that while they were trained in pest management the organic products did not work (Iri Cash Community). There appears to be little capacity among beneficiaries in terms of recognizing the pests and diseases (especially for the new crops), its management or procuring inputs to control them.

Many of the IP field staff do not have agricultural training and relied upon district technical staff who have limited capacity to monitor fields regularly. Building capacity within the communities for pest and disease management is important for sustainability especially as access to agricultural advisory services in the region remains poor.

⁴⁷ Some communities visited still had some group produce in a community store. In one village in Kotido the team observed six 100kg bags of sorghum in store by time of our enquiry (February 2012).

⁴⁸ FAO (2010) Karamoja Crop and Livestock Production and Productivity Assessment Report.

⁴⁹ Example of Lomokori Village in Rikitae Parish in Kotido where Oxfam had built a storage facility that was being used by NUSAF 2 beneficiaries.

Lesson learning

The districts and IPs held end of year (2011) district review meetings which focused on identifying ‘what went well, less well and how to improve in 2012’. Whilst this is a positive development a review of the meeting reports indicates that the focus of the reflection was mainly at the level of activities. It is unclear how the findings of these reports are collectively analysed and fed back into programme strategy and management. It is also important to ensure that lessons are shared both across NUSAF 2 (e.g. by bringing people from the seven districts together for transfer of lessons across) and in ways that strengthen linkages between different players e.g. KALIP.

The Food Security and Livelihood Working Groups at district level are supposed to meet monthly, thereby providing a structure for sharing and lesson learning. We found variation across the districts. In Moroto the working group had not met for eight months. KALIP are now providing some support to help maintain/ re-energise these district structures.

There are also a number of wider contextual issues that affect results and sustainability. These include; (a) continuing insecurity – security has improved but theft is a serious problem where people are anxious that if they acquire anything new, including new crops and harvest, it will be taken from them, (b) understaffing within local government and the difficulties of attracting and retaining qualified and experienced staff; and (c) variable climatic conditions which has meant that indigenous knowledge on the rain cycle, and some crop varieties, are no longer used.

Participation

District authorities were not involved in the beginning of NUSAF 2 (WFP) but over time this has improved and now the programme works through the Local Government which has led to great community engagement. Local Government is strengthening the programme in terms of the technical (production officers, CDOs) and political oversight that it provides.

At the community level there are Project Management Committees comprised of representatives of the community who work with and mediate between the project and the community. Within communities we found a high demand to participate, and even those who were not beneficiaries and participants knew NUSAF 2 (WFP) well.

Conclusion on sustainability

Livelihoods practices have not yet been transferred as the focus has been on production rather than changing the skill set. People have been given ‘an experience’ which is a good base from which to work – but it is not sufficient.

If the programme continues to be implemented in year 2 & 3 in the same way as in 2011 (year 1), we predict that there will be little of the assets created that will sustain in the medium-long term as real sustainability has not - to date - been a strong feature of the engagement. In the first year, the implementation process was rushed to get activities up and running with the intention that people would have food/ cash transfers when they needed them most. Unfortunately year two (2012) will see the same rushed process being repeated because of delays in signing contracts with IPs. The opportunity through the (new) 24 month contracts to consolidate gains made will come for 2013.

Delays in implementation increase the risks related to normal/poor rains (2011 was ‘unique’ in terms of good rains). To be seen as successful, the programme will need to shepherd people through a year of bad rains to see what can be realised (in terms of resilience). This would require a reorientation to risk within the programme and associated technical, social and institutional elements.

Unintended consequences

People's experience of working in a group was consistently mentioned to the evaluation team as a positive and people appreciated working together and creating an asset (a road or a dam). This augers well for the programme and could be used to build a sense of social cohesion and help overcome fear and isolation.

Delays in delivering food and cash transfers not only affected the relationship communities had with implementing partners but, by association, also the Local Government. Discussions with politicians in Moroto suggest that communities blamed the Local Government for allowing such delays and expected it to take responsibility for non-delivery of the transfers, and indirectly led to the undermining of the Local Government.

Global importance to WFP

NUSAF 2 can be considered a global flagship programme for WFP. It represents one of the first examples of WFP implementing its corporate shift from a food aid to a food assistance agency. It is also a rare example of DFID funding development-orientated programming through the use of food aid. As a result, there is expectation that the lessons learned from NUSAF 2 (WFP) will be implemented elsewhere by WFP and will be of wider interest across the donor community. The shift from unconditional to conditional transfers was also substantial, and was very much intended as a statement about the strategic vision for WFP programming in Karamoja, in what is still an extremely fragile environment. The consequences of failure for NUSAF 2 (WFP) are not only likely to have significant reputational repercussions, but could also expose large numbers of vulnerable people to even greater risk.

There is little evidence of the scale and type of institutional investment in the design of NUSAF 2 that might have been expected, given the significance to WFP. The menu of programme activities appears to have been primarily identified and designed by WFP programme staff in the Country Office, neither of whom had previous experience of livelihoods programming in a context like Karamoja nor received any mentoring from more experienced colleagues. In the Headquarters of WFP (Rome) there is a team of well-recognised experts in livelihoods programming, with recent involvement in pastoral livelihoods in South Sudan, Ethiopia, and Northern Kenya.

It appears that the detailed design and technical specifications of activities has largely been left to individual Implementing Partners to manage. This approach extended to the implementation of value-transfer modalities, where WFP left the design of cash-transfer mechanisms entirely to bidders themselves because the Country Office reportedly did not have the expertise available to know what was required at a technical level.

Overall, a theme that emerges is the contrast between the high level of organisational investment by WFP at the policy level – which appears to have paid dividends in terms of national ownership of NUSAF 2 (WFP)– and the underinvestment in quality programme design capacity, and operational readiness. An example of underinvestment in programme capacity is the poor fit between the budget year used by the programme and the seasonal calendar, which results in delays in contracting severely jeopardising the community-planning of agricultural activities in time for the rains. Another example is of the actual work cycles and food/cash distributions

taking place across the year according to operational timeframes, rather than the lean periods identified in WFP's own Country Programme document⁵⁰.

⁵⁰ Six full 6-week cycles were programmed in 2010. In reality, only 4 were completed between March and December 2011 (the lean season identified by WFP runs January to September), with cash transfers for the final work cycle only taking place in February 2012.

Conclusions: Moving Forward

Merit and worth

Based on the findings of the evaluation and the context of Karamoja we conclude that **there is merit in the broad approach being taken by NUSAF 2 (WFP)**. Important aspects of the programme are working. It has reached a large target group of the moderately food insecure in a relatively efficient way and the food and inputs distribution through PWP and HISP is an essential element of a recovery effort, in what remains a very fragile environment. However given the current operating capacity, positioning and trajectory of the programme we **question the worth that will be realised in respect to the development objectives** and see a need for the programme to be re-set (sharper focus, greater analytical and technical capacity and attention to quality) if the potential value of the three year investment as part of the wider GoU led strategy on Karamoja is to be realised. Our concern is that NUSAF 2 (WFP) has become, and – if current form/ path is maintained - is likely to remain a rather superficial solution to a very complex situation.

NUSAF 2 (WFP) is a programme with enormous expectations placed on it from all stakeholders, including national and local government, communities, WFP, and DFID. It has introduced, in a short space of time, a dramatic shift in the type of programming used in Karamoja, and it has done so at a very large scale.

The programme also implemented and scaled-up rapidly. WFP's operational capacity and existing work with KPAP provided a unique platform for NUSAF 2 (WFP), which has given it a substantial head-start over NUSAF 2 (WB) and KALIP. Undoubtedly, NUSAF 2 (WFP) has also benefitted from WFP's significant credibility and existing relationships in Karamoja in achieving this. As a result, there is real sense of demand for, and ownership of, NUSAF 2 (WFP) at both the local government and community level.

The programme is innovative in that: it is primarily a government-designed programme being implemented by WFP, it is primarily a food-based development programme being funded by DFID, and it is primarily a group-based programme operating in a fragile context.

This innovation and speed has not come without a price. In terms of both the menu of activities and the implementation on the ground, there is little evidence that NUSAF 2 (WFP) provides any meaningful support to the currently dominant primary livelihood in Karamoja. In many ways, WFP may be right not to attempt to include pastoral livelihood support when it lies outside of the organisation's comparative advantage, and it is intended to work alongside NAADS and KALIP.

There is a clear community demand and need for support to alternative livelihood strategies, particularly agriculture. However, despite this focus on agricultural livelihoods, WFP has not as yet sufficiently invested in the programmatic or operational quality required to deliver results and improve value-for-money. Activities appear to be largely ad hoc, of variable quality, and without clear pathways of how this will lead in a sustained way to increased household income. Most activities lack the complementary partnerships that they need. There is little evidence of WFP's regional programming experience being drawn on in a meaningful way, with the small number of dedicated programme and field staff largely overwhelmed by management tasks.

NUSAF 2 (WFP) is proving effective in ways other than planned, such as communities realizing that they can grow vegetables, can have multiple harvests, and can work effectively in groups. There is little evidence, however, that the programme outputs are sustainable, and many of the decisions taken appear to reflect the needs of the operation rather than programme objectives. An

important example of this is that the programme timing is planned around the January - December programme planning cycle, which clashes with the seasonal calendar in Karamoja. As a result, delays at the beginning of each year have forced IPs to rush implementation at the cost of proper participation and change the nature of what activities people implement.

Contracting delay is one example of operational inefficiencies that have created a high risk of weak performance in both 2011 and 2012. Only late rains in 2011 avoided the complete failure of community gardens. Another example is the serious disruption to cash distributions and a major pipeline break that have placed community participation and IP-Local Government relations under enormous strain. Whilst such problems can never be completely avoided, better communication with stakeholders could have significantly reduced their impact.

WFP is very aware of many of these problems and is actively learning at the operational level. It is also implementing plans to draw on additional expertise and has been investing in the relationship with FAO to plug some programmatic gaps. However, in our view, there is still a gap in terms of a sufficient sense of urgency or accountability in its response. The programme team has been underinvested in, and human resources decisions have constrained the potential of staff at the field level. This structural weakness, combined with abandoning the Country Programme document commitment to *'[scale] up based on a careful review of results and capacity'*, has not only resulted in inconsistent core activities, but also in significant gaps in programme learning: most noticeably in relation to gender and to conflict analysis.

Key challenges

What is NUSAF 2 (WFP) – is it indeed a 'livelihoods programme'? The programme is not framed as a livelihoods programme that seeks to address for example, disaster risk reduction, and there is little assessment of livelihood risks. If the programme is a recovery and transitional programme, there is no vision of what people are transitioning to, except the general concept of food security. Our understanding is that livestock continues to form the livelihood base of the people of Karamoja (with varying intensity/ accompanying scale of agricultural production) but there is little evidence that NUSAF 2 is engaging in a way that is about protecting existing livelihoods.

The high level of livelihood vulnerability and food insecurity in Karamoja means that there is going to be an ongoing need for an organisation that provides food as a safety net, and an ongoing need for long-term investment in livelihoods. Using WFP to provide both of these in Karamoja - at this juncture - represents a real opportunity for efficiency. There is a lack of alternatives in Karamoja and the WFP organisation is uniquely placed to fill this role in terms of presence and credibility, and in line with its corporate goals. **However, in our view, in attempting to combine the two objectives of livelihood programming and a safety-net, NUSAF 2 (WFP) is delivering neither very well.**

In moving forward two interlinked elements stand out. Firstly, clarifying and communicating more clearly a realistic vision for the programme (see next section on some options for this) and aligning structure, capacity and delivery modalities behind this. Secondly, addressing the disjointed relationship between NUSAF 2 and KALIP, a process that needs to be led by OPM, DFID and the EU. Doing so would provide the opportunity to develop a common approach to Karamoja that supports both primary and diverse livelihood options. It should also be used to drive forward programmatic alignment around a common participatory, watershed-based and seasonal methodology that is owned and led by the local government in Karamoja.

Co-ordination

In its first year of operation, NUSAF 2 (WFP) has been the largest livelihoods programme in operation in Karamoja, and it has gained substantial operational experience; 2012 will see other programmes coming on stream such as NUSAF 2 (WB) and KALIP (EU/ FAO) both of which include public works programmes and which will engage with the same districts and communities. Although a *Handbook for Implementation* of NUSAF in Karamoja has been developed by OPM, as yet, there has been little discussion at the field level on how the two NUSAF 2 programmes – (WFP) and (WB) - will work together nor how they will be harmonised. While the GoU is legally and institutionally responsible for coordination and ensuring that all actors are ‘reading from the same script’, the arrival of new players provides WFP with the opportunity to actively contribute in ways that inform a strategy for the effective roll out of the entire NUSAF 2 (and KALIP) framework in Karamoja.

With the introduction of Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment (SAGE) pilot projects in four sub-counties of Karamoja, there is also the potential for mutual lesson learning in relation to targeting, , and the use of MTN mobile money. It is likely that some people currently on the EVH list will be eligible, but it may also include a minority that are on the MFI list.

The impending roll-out of NUSAF 2 (WB), KALIP (EU/FAO) and the SAGE pilot in Karamoja raises a number of **coordination issues** which will need to be managed in order to avoid challenges, parallel programming, and for effective delivery to households and communities.

Targeting

The target group for the WFP programme is based on lists of vulnerable people generated through a vulnerability analysis while the NUSAF 2 (WB) focuses on poor households (to be identified at *ere/manyatta* level) through an extended PRA exercise and includes a range of different vulnerabilities⁵¹. It is likely that many people/households will be eligible to participate in both programmes, as well as KALIP. This offers the opportunity to expand the coverage of public works to a wider number of households (field visits suggest high demand), but it is unclear how this will be managed by NUSAF 2 (WFP)/NUSAF 2 (WB) /KALIP to ensure that as many poor households as possible are included, if that is indeed the aim.

The commencement of NUSAF 2 (WB) and KALIP, along with the work of numerous NGOs, creates a scenario whereby, for the first time, households may have a range of possibilities to engage in productive activities. Households that have more than one able bodied person will be able to spread their labour across a number of public works programmes with the accompanying benefits of having access to both cash (under NUSAF 2 (WB) or KALIP) and food under NUSAF 2 (WFP). If well designed, a clear vision, and agreed with beneficiaries, the combination of access to both cash and food over a period of time would give households the opportunity to increase their assets/standard of living and ultimately graduate from food assistance - though measures to encourage savings, investment in livelihood assets and skills development would also need to be introduced. Conversely, those that have only one able bodied person are likely to remain in the food for work programme and need continuous social protection support in the medium term. In the short term, NUSAF 2 (WFP) may see the profile of its beneficiaries change and this should be monitored.

⁵¹ These include IDP Returnees, IDPs in camps, Widows/Widowers, Orphans, PLWAs, Ex-combatants Former abductees, Female headed households, Child mothers, Unskilled & unemployed youth, Disarmed Karamajong youth, Elderly, Child headed households, Persons with disability, and Landmine victims.

Consideration should be given to the objectives of the public works in terms of who they should reach. For example, one option is that NUSAF 2 (WB) and KALIP, could explicitly target the same beneficiary households as NUSAF 2 (WFP) in order to deepen their agricultural skills (KALIP) and/or enable them to earn regular cash income (NUSAF 2 (WB) so that they have a better chance of diversifying and sustaining alternative livelihoods.

There is also great scope for developing complementary activities to boost livelihoods. For example, where roads or dams are being built under NUSAF 2 (WFP) complementary activities such as watershed management could be undertaken by KALIP. Harmonisation and planning is needed to offer communities viable and complementary work opportunities, which take account of the yearly cycle to ensure that there is an adequate supply of labour both for the infrastructure and for agriculture. Linked to this are options to pilot ways to engage indirectly with reducing the level of theft and thuggery that prevails within communities; through collaboration across the three public works programmes, creating employment opportunities for male youth enabling them to earn or diversify their livelihoods.

NUSAF 2 (WB and WFP) could also consider moving away from targeting towards offering public works employment for anyone who desires it (self-selection). This assumes that the remuneration (whether food or cash) is the same in both programmes (which is the intention) and that there is a more strategic approach to the productive assets that are created.

Approaches

It is inevitable that NUSAF 2 (WB) and KALIP (as well as a number of NGOs) will be operational in some of the same communities giving rise to the need for harmonisation of approaches so as not to cause confusion amongst community members. Demands on community resources (project management committees, participation of elders, community contributions) will also need to be carefully managed to ensure that people, and their leaders, are not over-burdened.

Unless there is collaboration on approaches across the three public works programmes (operational in the same sub-counties/villages), the potential for confusion and misunderstanding in the minds of local people is significant e.g. on the nature of the work, hours/days required to work, pay rates/food value, number of work cycles, efficiency of payments, skills development.

Our understanding is that NUSAF 2 (WB) will provide cash payments in return for public works participation at a rate of Ush 4,000/= per day ; currently WFP gives Ush 3,200/= but plans to increase it in line with NUSAF 2 (WB). However, it is understood that KALIP will pay Ush 7,000/= . Thus, it is likely that members of the same household will work on different projects at different rates. Different rates will give rise to competition for KALIP work and over time may see a widening of the poverty gap between community members with the more able bodied working for KALIP and the less able bodied working with NUSAF 2.

Based on wide international experience, it is likely that men will dominate where there is good remuneration (e.g. KALIP) while women will remain working for lower value food transfers. This has important implications for polygamous households (the norm in Karamoja) where women are dependent on their own resources to support themselves and their children, as well as female heads of households.

Capacity

Within NUSAF 2 both the (WFP) and the (WB) elements will use NGOs as implementing partners. This may; (i) create competition for NGOs (or their best staff), (ii) see different approaches being implemented in the same community under NUSAF 2, and (iii) it may risk

technical and administrative staff being spread too thinly across the programmes, where the same NGO is implementing both components.

Monitoring and Evaluation

WFP currently reports to both district and OPM level, and it is important that it continues to measure and report on its own performance. However, with the roll-out of NUSAF 2 (WB), it will be important that WFP's contribution is placed within the wider efforts that are on-going under NUSAF 2 generally, and it would make sense to have an element of joint reporting so that the combined value of multiple interventions can be assessed.

Coordination of processes at district and regional level

Although there is a Karamoja Working Group (chaired by the EU and WFP – chair to be taken over shortly by Irish Aid) our understanding is that it does not include coordination of livelihoods interventions. Similarly, there is a steering committee on social protection but it does not cover public works. A Cash-For-Work sub-group of the Karamoja Working Group sought to harmonise pay rates among partners, including NGOs, but it did not reach agreement on updating rates in 2011 from 2009 levels and has not been recently active. To overcome the problems associated with multiple programmes implementing similar components but using different modalities and possibly undermining each other, there is need for a mechanism to ensure ongoing collaborative programming both between NUSAF (WFP) and NUSAF (WB) as well as between NUSAF and other players.

Strategic Options for DFID and NUSAF 2 (WFP)

This evaluation has identified a need for the programme to be re-aligned. We do not foresee sufficient value by end 2013 - given the longer term development objectives which underpinned the original funding commitment - from a continuation of the programme in its current form. Any form of shock in Karamoja is likely to quickly undermine any gains that are being made, and the consumption smoothing that is evident is both temporary and unreliable.

As it stands, both the merit and the worth of the programme are compromised by NUSAF 2 (WFP) continuing to serve two needs: both insufficiently. Clarifying the strategic objective of the programme – as either the recovery of livelihoods or as part of a social protection system – will create the basis for common methodologies, key indicators, and operational alignment to be developed. The new strategic direction needs to be agreed by OPM, LCs, DFID, WFP, and IPs together. It also needs to be the platform for a clear partnership with KALIP. Broadly there are two options.

- *Option A:* In our view the greatest potential for the programme is to shift the focus towards livelihoods: especially the development of individual skills and household productivity. This could still be backstopped by an employment safety-net that is grounded in disaster risk reduction and that delivers community assets which are clearly linked to livelihood needs: refining the menu of activities to focus the PWP on soil and water conservation. Not only does this option imply a need for a clear shared vision of what it would take to shift the livelihood of a Karamoja household forward, it also relies on the aspects of the programme that are currently the weakest. Therefore, for this to be successful, WFP would need to significantly step up in terms of its delivery capacity regarding the transfer of technical knowledge and skills, and the development of stronger links to the markets.
- *Option B:* Narrow the programme to what WFP and the IPs currently do best: providing an employment safety-net. This could focus on delivering community assets that are designed to complement the livelihoods programme, agro-pastoral field schools, and integrated

watershed planning currently being promised by KALIP. It could also focus on delivering a system that could be integrated into national institutions. The major downside of this approach is that KALIP does not have the same reach as NUSAF 2 (WFP): and as such some areas would be left without livelihood support.

In terms of risk we judge Option B and its narrowing of the programme to refocus on PWP (which is already starting to happen by default) to be the least risky option in terms of delivery of a set of programme outputs. Option A is the most challenging option - enhancing the focus on Household Income Support backstopped by high quality community soil and water conservation assets built through the PWP - but also the one that we would consider most likely to deliver at the level of programme outcomes (livelihoods). This would require stronger strategic leadership from DFID, especially on donor harmonisation with the EU and World Bank, and in holding WFP to account. It would also demand urgent and significant investment by WFP in its programmatic capacity and operational alignment to the programme objectives.

To support the discussions of OPM, WFP & DFID we have provided (see Annex 1) two outline logframes that the NUSAF 2 (WFP) Programme could work to. We have also provided (Annex 2) an outline (part) Terms of Reference for an end of programme summative evaluation focused on the lesson learning elements. This recognises that the accountability element of the ToR could only be framed once there was an agreement on the direction the programme is taking.

Annex 1: Outline Terms of Reference for Formative Evaluation

Terms of Reference for: An Evaluation of the World Food Programme’s Livelihoods Programme in Karamoja, Uganda

1. Objective

- 1.1. To conduct a formative evaluation of the World Food Programme’s (WFP) Livelihood Programme in Karamoja, north-east Uganda, under the second Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF II).
- 1.2. The findings of this study will inform future programming for recovery and development in Karamoja, and will contribute evidence on conditional transfers to inform the wider social protection agenda now emerging in Uganda.

2. Scope

- 2.1. The purpose of this evaluation is *to assess the merit and worth of the WFP’s strategy on livelihoods recovery in Karamoja*. The study will assess the programme against the following four parameters:

Effectiveness:

- How effective has the targeting methodology been in reaching vulnerable households and individuals?
- How effective is the programme in terms of increasing beneficiaries’ productivity, access to productive assets and livelihood security?
- What is the quality and utility of the assets created under the programme?

Relevance:

- How relevant is the social transfer approach and the ‘menu’ of WFP supported activities to the context across different agro-ecological zones in Karamoja?
- How clear is the distinction between the food / cash for work and household income support components of the programme?
- Is the basis for deciding between food or cash transfer appropriate for beneficiaries’ needs and socio-economic context?
- How appropriate is cash as a means of payment for public works participants?

Efficiency:

- How efficient has WFP and its partners’ delivery of this programme been and has it responded to beneficiaries’ needs?
- Do the implementing agencies have the requisite skills to deliver livelihood approaches and is the programme developing government’s institutional capacity?
- Does the programme provide value for money in terms of costs and benefits, particularly when compared with past emergency food aid programmes?
- To what extent is the programme complementing other Karamoja food security initiatives such as the EU funded KALIP programme?

Sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of programme assets being utilised and livelihood practices being continued beyond the project end date?
- How many beneficiary households are likely to have ‘graduated’ from humanitarian assistance by the project end date?
- Are lessons being transferred to partners (including Government) in order to strengthen long-term sustainability?

2.2. The evaluation should identify any unintended outcomes of the intervention for beneficiaries. These may include (but will not be limited to):

- Opportunity costs of engaging in public works programmes;
- Opportunity costs of investing in WFP supported agricultural interventions compared to investment in livestock
- Impact on social cohesion and, or women's empowerment at household and community level

2.3. The evaluation should refer specifically to the effectiveness of the intervention in addressing issues of exclusion of vulnerable groups, including women and girls, and to the particular influence of the intervention upon these groups.

3. Methodology

3.1. The evaluators will take an ‘improvement-and-accountability’ approach towards this assignment, using a context, inputs, process and products (CIPP) evaluation model⁵²

3.2. The evaluation is expected to adopt a mix of quantitative data collection and qualitative approaches such as document review, stakeholder interviews, site inspections, system analysis, inventory and resource record reviews and cost / benefit analysis.

3.3. The study will be carried out across the three livelihood zones of Karamoja (agricultural, agro-pastoral and pastoral) as well as in the semi-urban setting for cash transfers.

3.4. The evaluators are expected to interview key stakeholders, for example, the World Bank, NUSAF II Director, the relevant officials in the Office of the Prime Minister, DFID, the office of the Minister of State for Karamoja, etc.

3.5. The evaluators are expected to review and analyse data from the GoU’s Food Security Plan for Karamoja, the 2010 IOM/WFP community targeting exercise, information/data from the recent food security and nutrition assessment surveys (conducted by WFP/UNICEF, ACF/UNICEF and others) and the Karamoja Food Security Analysis conducted for FAO/ECHO (2010). Other relevant evaluations of food security and livelihood recovery programmes in Karamoja, as well as other similar programmes implemented elsewhere by WFP, should also be considered⁵³.

3.6. The evaluators will also develop a logical framework for the project against which the Livelihoods approach can be monitored and reviewed. This will be representative of the programme’s objectives and theory of change and will include quantifiable outputs and outcome indicators and targets, appropriate means of verification and risks/assumptions. The evaluators should establish baseline information for each of the logframe indicators.

3.7. In addition, the evaluators should help develop a graduation model for determining when participants graduate from the Programme.

⁵² As developed by Shufflebeam

⁵³ WFP’s evaluation department (OED) and DFID’s office in Rome (UKRep Rome) can assist

3.8. All data should be disaggregated, including by sex, age and disability wherever this data is available. Poverty measures should also be included through proxy indicators such as education, existing household assets (including land and livestock), household food security, and household monthly expenditure. The evaluation should, wherever possible, use existing information produced by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) as part of its normal programme of work.

4. Outputs

4.1. Key outputs include:

- An evaluation report, to include comprehensive analysis of the evaluation questions and a set of actionable recommendations;
- A project logical framework and associated data management and survey tools for verifying project outputs and outcomes;
- A graduation model for participants to graduate from the Programme;
- Dissemination of the evaluation findings to a cross section of stakeholders;
- Terms of reference for a summative evaluation of the project to be carried out in 2014/15.

5. Skills and qualifications

The evaluation team will have extensive experience of conducting improvement-and-accountability evaluations in related sectors. It is expected that a significant portion of this task, including undertaking surveys, data collection, data entry and data analysis, will be subcontracted to a local service provider that will be identified through a competitive bidding process.

The evaluation provider is expected to demonstrate:

- Excellent value for money: including competitive consultancy rates, a detailed financial plan, a clear methodology to ensure products will be delivered in line with agreed costs, a mitigation strategy for financial risk, and clear financial reporting processes.
- An excellent understanding of evaluation principles and methodologies: including capacity in a range of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods, notably the CIPP approach; evidence of research or implementation expertise in social transfers and/or food security programmes; and an awareness of gender, social and poverty analysis in evaluation.
- Expertise in communications, dissemination and advocacy around evaluation findings: including a good understanding of the use of evidence-based approaches to influence stakeholders.
- A high quality proposal for this assignment: including a good understanding of these terms of reference; an evaluation methodology which meets international best practice; and a realistic and adequate workplan to deliver outputs.
- A qualified, structured team: including a thorough understanding of the historical, cultural and socio-economic dynamics of Karamoja and its people. The study leader will have proven financial and human resource management skills, and in the production of timely, high-quality reports. There should be a balance of appropriate skills and expertise within the team in evaluation methodologies, sector expertise, and social analysis; and appropriate involvement of local partners to build evaluation capacity and provide value for money.

6. Logistics and procedures

6.1. The evaluator will be responsible for:

- Securing office space, equipment and transport and managing logistics.
- Recruiting, training and quality assuring interviewers, data entry technicians, supervisors and drivers. All interviewers and supervisors should be fluent in the local languages.
- Obtaining permission to conduct interviews and conducting interviews following survey protocols
- Presenting findings to the Government of Uganda, WFP and DFID and any other stakeholders determined appropriate;
- Publishing the evaluation reports;
- Providing complete data sets and questionnaires to the peer review group, as requested.
- Ensuring independence and upholding ethical standards in line with agreed DAC evaluation criteria.

7. Reporting

7.1. The evaluators will be contracted by DFID and will report to the Northern Uganda Recovery and Development Adviser (NURDA) based in Kampala. The NURDA will monitor progress against agreed outputs and will approve all reports for payment purposes. The final report will be discussed, reviewed and signed off by DFID Head of Programmes and the Permanent Secretary in the Office of the Prime Minister before it is put in the public domain.

7.2. The evaluation team will liaise with the WFP Livelihoods Programme Officer, based in Kampala regarding matters related to field work, access to staff, records, beneficiaries and assets created under the programme.

7.3. The evaluation will be peer reviewed by the National Evaluation Committee, chaired by the Prime Minister's Office. Comments provided by the National Evaluation Committee will be published with the evaluators' final report.

7.4. A draft evaluation report and logical framework will be presented to the steering committee by March 2012 and the final report to be presented and disseminated by April 2012.

8. Timing

8.1. The duration of the contract is expected to be from January 2011 until May 2012. March 2012 produce a draft evaluation report and logical framework. The final Report to be presented and disseminated by May 2012.

9. DFID Co-ordination

The evaluators will be contracted by DFID and will answer to DFID's Northern Uganda Recovery and Development Adviser (NURDA) based in Kampala, who will be the overall coordinator.

10. Background

10.1. Context

10.1.1. For many years, the deeply impoverished population of Karamoja in northern Uganda have been receiving humanitarian aid, in response to the effects of both conflict and economic crisis. This context is changing. Following the return of relative peace to the north, the GoU has embarked on a programme of recovery and reconstruction, under the Peace, Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP) for Northern Uganda and delivered through the second Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF II). This has enabled GoU to promote food security and development in the Karamoja region.

10.1.2. Development partners are assisting GoU through a mixture of initiatives aimed at addressing risk and building the resilience of vulnerable people. Together with others, DFID is funding WFP to deliver a livelihoods oriented programme across Karamoja. This aims “to improve access of beneficiary households to income earning opportunities and better basic socio-economic services”. The programme targets poor households with labour capacity.

10.1.3. A number of assumptions underlie WFP’s Livelihoods Programme strategy, which need to be tested. The Project Document calls for an external evaluation at the end of the first year.

10.2. The WFP productive asset approach

10.2.1. The WFP Corporate Strategic Plan (2008-11) marked a ‘shift’ for the organization, from a food aid to a food assistance agency. Under the new strategy, WFP will flexibly deploy a range of tools including food, vouchers and cash transfers and capacity building, in response to emergencies and to address recovery, preparedness and building resilience. Importantly, the Strategic Plan foresees WFP becoming a more strategic partner in longer-term developmental contexts, integrating its work into country-led plans and programmes.

10.2.2. In Uganda and elsewhere, WFP has been supporting asset-building assisted by food aid⁵⁴. Through its Karamoja Productive Assets Programme (KPAP) in 2010, WFP supported some 50,000 poor households across the sub-region to receive conditional food transfers, in exchange for their participation in public works activities. Currently, through a new phase of this programme under NUSAF II (the Livelihoods Programme), WFP is expanding support to reach 75,000 households over the next three years (2011-2013).

10.2.3. There are two components to the Livelihoods programme. The first is a public works programme (PWP) which provides food or cash transfers in exchange for unskilled labour. The PWP has two aims: to alleviate pressure on household budgets by providing temporary employment to poor households with labour capacity during the periods of greatest stress⁵⁵; and to create socio-economic assets in and around communities which, in turn, will help build social and ecosystem resilience. The second component is a Household Income Support Programme (HISP) intended to support poor households to enhance productivity within their principal livelihoods systems, as well as to diversify into appropriate and viable livelihood alternatives.

10.2.4. Taken together, the HISP and the PWP will help address the underlying causes of food insecurity and vulnerability. The programme aims to help 74,057 households to ‘graduate’ from dependence on social assistance towards self-sufficiency – a process which should be complete within a three-year timeframe.

10.2.5. The objective and intended outputs of the WFP programme are:

Objective:

- To improve access of beneficiary households in Karamoja to income earning opportunities and better basic socio-economic services

Intended outputs (‘intermediate outcomes’ in the project log-frame):

- Strengthened communities and local authorities which can manage (prepare, implement and evaluate) a poverty-targeted public works programme (PWP).

⁵⁴ See document WFP/EB.A/99/4-A Enabling Development (1999).

⁵⁵ In Karamoja, the critical time of year in this regard is the 9-month period between January and September – often referred to as the ‘lean’ or ‘hunger’ season. It is during this period that negative coping mechanisms, such as charcoal production, are most widely adopted.

- Increased stock of community productive assets through the Household Income Support Programme (HISP)
- Improved capacity in performing technical, administrative and managerial functions at community and local governmental authority levels

11. Annexes

- Programme document – WFP/OPM NUSAF2 Livelihoods Programme

Annex 2: Revised detailed Logical Framework

Based on our analysis of the dual intention for NUSAF 2 (WFP), of enhancing livelihoods whilst providing a productive safety net, we can elaborate two main options for the development of a logical framework. Each of these options focuses on a single outcome-level purpose, as per the DFID logframe.

The level of outcomes and outputs are interpreted according to DFID norms, which tend to be at a more ‘upstream’ level than UN norms. Where possible, we have drawn upon the NUSAF 2 results framework and the WFP strategic results framework.

Option A: refocusing NUSAF 2 (WFP) to enhance Household Income Support (with a focus on WFP Strategic Objective 3: Restore and rebuild lives and livelihoods in post-conflict, post-disaster or transition situations)

Example result	Example indicators
Goal: Increased household income and food security among targeted households	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of HHs reporting increased income from asset created Household food consumption score
Purpose: More productive and resilient livelihoods strategies are practiced by poor-households in Karamoja	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of assets created through FFA/FFW managed and maintained on a regular basis by communities/households Household savings rates
Output 1 – Enhanced productivity from household assets among targeted households	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of beneficiary households involved in income generating business activities Household asset score Number of memberships in community savings associations/formal finance institutions Amount of savings per member in total savings scheme (in USD)
Output 2 – Targeted communities practice diverse livelihood strategies based on sustainable land use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of completed IGA subprojects Community-level strategies for management of agrarian and pastoral livelihoods, including access to water.
Output 3 - Improved capacity in performing technical, administrative and managerial functions at community and LGA levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seasonal timeliness of activities and value-transfers Transparency and accountability for the use of resources at community, district and national levels, including NGOs and CBOs Percentage of sub-counties with operational Community Level Tracking System Number of unqualified audits National Capacity Index (NCI)
Output 4 – Management of conflict and reduction in community and household	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actions taken to reduce gender-based violence Community initiatives to reduce intra-community theft

Example result	Example indicators
level violence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of livestock, crop and inputs theft • Involvement of youth in income generation opportunities • Security of tenure of improved land
Output 5 – Strengthened partnership for development and community participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of joint community-based watershed planning and management sites that include NUSAF 2, KALIP and NAADS • National Capacity Index (NCI) • Hand-over strategy developed and implemented

Option B: restricting WFP’s role to the provision of a productive safety-net and enhancing Public Works Projects (with a focus on WFP Strategic Objective 2: Prevent acute hunger and invest in disaster preparedness and mitigation measures)

Example result	Example indicators
Goal: More resilient access to income earning opportunities and food consumption for vulnerable households	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Household income • Youth employment among vulnerable households • Household savings levels
Purpose: Prevent acute hunger and invest in productive community assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Household food consumption score • Disaster preparedness index • Community asset score • Gender difference in consumption
Output 1 – Adequate employment opportunities over assistance period for targeted households at risk of falling into acute hunger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No of HHs with increased employment opportunities • Coverage of targeted households • Seasonal timeliness of employment opportunities and value-transfers • Amount of savings
Output 2 – High-quality community productive assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of rehabilitated and improved land through social and water conservation • Assets contributing to the resilience of pastoral livelihoods • % of assets created through FFA/FFW managed and maintained on a regular basis by communities/households • % of beneficiaries with increased access to social services (schools, clinics, markets, etc.) due to road construction/rehabilitation
Output 3 - Strengthened communities and Local Authorities which can manage (prepare, implement and evaluate) a poverty-targeted Public Works Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Capacity Index (NCI) • Early-warning systems; contingency plans; food security monitoring systems: in place and enhanced with WFP capacity development support • Percentage of PWP sub-projects completed

Example result	Example indicators
	according to design and within timeframe
Output 4 – Strengthened partnership for Karamoja	Harmonisation of labour and wage norms for Karamoja Policy integration with national social protection systems

Annex 3: Terms of Reference for Summative Evaluation

Terms of Reference for Summative Evaluation of World Food Programme's Livelihoods Programme in Karamoja, Uganda 2014-2015

Introduction – Background to the programme and its evolution over the period of implementation

Key issues to be considered from a lesson learning perspective⁵⁶

Reflecting a global shift by WFP towards longer term development

- To what extent does NUSAF 2 reflect a 'shift' for WFP from a food aid to a food assistance agency e.g. in terms of being a more strategic partner in longer-term developmental contexts, integrating its work into country-led plans and programmes?
- How effective has WFP head office been in providing appropriate technical support to the country office to achieve this shift e.g. in the application of its comprehensive set of guidance on livelihoods programming, (published in 2011)? What measures are being taken to learn and disseminate lessons in NUSAF 2 (WFP) to be implemented elsewhere by WFP?
- How effective has WFP been in developing inter-linkages between NUSAF 2 and other WFP programmes in Karamoja e.g. self-selecting hunger safety-net of MCHN, ECD, and School Feeding, and its Extremely Vulnerable Household Programme.

Strategic guidance and oversight

- How is NUSAF 2 (WFP) informed by, and in turn how does it influence policy dialogue and dynamics at national level e.g. on pastoralism, large-scale agricultural production, mining, social protection, food security, conflict and security?
- How effective has the strategic leadership at WFP at the national level been in providing comprehensive programme guidance to achieve the outcomes of the programme, and what level of input have sub-offices and implementing partners had in programme decision-making?
- How relevant has the assessment of livelihood risks been?
- What has been the impact of internal restructuring of WFP been on the delivery of the programme?

Coordination and Collaboration with other actors in Karamoja

- How effective has coordination and collaboration with other actors in Karamoja been and what is the comparative advantage of WFP relative to these actors e.g. National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS), Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF) and FAO/EU KALIP, Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment (SAGE)?

⁵⁶ Aspects of accountability can only be determined once clarity on programme direction and associated logframe in place providing the reference point for assessing results.

Reaching the poor

- How effective has the programme been in reaching the able bodied poor and how responsive has it been to the dynamics of poverty e.g. those who experience change in their circumstances.
- How does the programme respond to gender differences in access to resources and decision-making and what lessons have been learnt (including in relation to polygamous households)? What benefits accrue to men and women (separately) from the assets created under PWP and HISP?

Impact on livelihoods

- How have public works contributed to improving livelihoods (roads, dams, community gardens), who has benefited from the assets created, and how sustainable are the assets?
- Has the Household Income Support Programme (HISP) supported poor households to gain and sustain new skills and increase productivity within their principal livelihoods systems, as well as to diversify into appropriate and viable livelihood alternatives?
- What has been the balance of resources allocated to PWP and HISP, and was this appropriate?
- What lessons have been learnt in terms of supporting pastoralist livelihood strategies?
- What lessons have been learnt from working in different agro-ecological contexts, and from different climatic conditions? To what extent has the resilience of livelihoods been tested over the life of the programme and what lessons have been learnt?

Social protection

- What role has NUSAF 2 played in terms of providing social protection to participants (on a systematic, regular, timely, and predictable basis, and transfers adequate to meet needs)?
- What lessons are to be learnt from the use of food and cash transfers e.g. where cash transfers did not maintain their food value; use of mobile phone technology; reliability of food delivery?

Implementation modalities

- How efficient and effective was the use of implementing partners and what lessons have been learnt in terms of costs, technical expertise, community development, partnership and sustainability.

Capacity building

- How effective has WFP been in building the capacity of district local governments in planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluation and reporting, and what lessons have been learnt?

Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Criterion	Core Evaluation Questions	Additional Questions			
		Context	Inputs	Process	Product
Effectiveness	<p>How effective has the targeting methodology been in reaching vulnerable households and individuals?</p> <p>How effective is the programme in terms of increasing beneficiaries' productivity, access to productive assets and livelihood security?</p> <p>What is the quality and utility of the assets created under the programme?</p>	<p>What change has DFID, WFP, local government and national government been experiencing?</p> <p>Is the demand driven design of sub-projects effective?</p> <p>Have households experienced a change in resilience?</p>	<p>What resources have been invested (relationships, time, knowledge, skills, leverage) by the participants?</p> <p>What resources have been invested (money, time, knowledge, skills, reputation, leverage) by all the development partners?</p>	<p>How effective have the development partners been at facilitating inclusive processes? What organisational features contributed to this?</p>	<p>What difference have participants experienced to their livelihoods? How does this compare to the scale of investment?</p>

Evaluation Criterion	Core Evaluation Questions	Additional Questions			
		Context	Inputs	Process	Product
Relevance	<p>How relevant is the social transfer approach and the ‘menu’ of WFP supported activities to the context across different agro-ecological zones in Karamoja?</p> <p>How clear is the distinction between the food / cash for work and household income support components of the programme?</p> <p>Is the basis for deciding between food or cash transfer appropriate for beneficiaries’ needs and socio-economic context?</p> <p>How appropriate is cash as a means of payment for public works participants?</p>	<p>What are the drivers of food insecurity and livelihood vulnerability in Karamoja?</p> <p>Can NUSAF 2 (WFP) contribute to a National Social Protection System?</p>	<p>Is the activity menu sufficient for different livelihood strategies?</p>	<p>Is the distribution of cash and food assistance appropriate?</p> <p>How have participants experienced the implementation of the programme? What part of this experience stands out for them; and why was this important?</p>	<p>What organisational capabilities have been built, and how can these be used in the future?</p>

Evaluation Criterion	Core Evaluation Questions	Additional Questions			
		Context	Inputs	Process	Product
Efficiency	<p>How efficient has WFP and its partners' delivery of this programme been and has it responded to beneficiaries' needs?</p> <p>Do the implementing agencies have the requisite skills to deliver livelihood approaches and is the programme developing government's institutional capacity?</p> <p>Does the programme provide value for money in terms of costs and benefits, particularly when compared with past emergency food aid programmes?</p> <p>To what extent is the programme complementing other Karamoja food security initiatives such as the EU funded KALIP programme?</p>	Has NUSAF 2 (WFP) driven wider changes in the Food Security System?	Does the use of Implementing Partners represent Value for Money?	Have synergies been realised with other elements of PRDP?	Are assets of sufficient quality and timeliness?

Evaluation Criterion	Core Evaluation Questions	Additional Questions			
		Context	Inputs	Process	Product
Sustainability	<p>What is the likelihood of programme assets being utilised and livelihood practices being continued beyond the project end date?</p> <p>How many beneficiary households are likely to have 'graduated' from humanitarian assistance by the project end date?</p> <p>Are lessons being transferred to partners (including Government) in order to strengthen long-term sustainability?</p>	<p>How does the wider context affect programme results?</p> <p>What is the culture and social history of participants in NUSAF 2 – how does this affect the programme?</p>	<p>Which institutions have enabled the establishment of the programme, which jeopardised it?</p>	<p>To what extent has participation shaped the programme implementation?</p> <p>Which institutions enabled and which institutions detracted from inclusive and enabling programme implementation?</p>	<p>Are local institutions being strengthened?</p> <p>What institutional changes have taken place and what implications will these have on future programming?</p>

Annex 5: People Met

istrict/ Organisation	Name	Job Title
Kampala		
DFID	Howard Standen	Climate Change Advisor
	Dr Pius Ojara	Task Team Leader for Northern Uganda
	Dr Rachel Waterhouse	Social Development Advisor
	Ying Staton	Programme Manager
	Simon Kenny	Results Adviser
Irish AID	Pronch Murray	Development Specialist
USAID	Martin Fowler	Agriculture and Livelihoods Advisor – Economic Growth Group
FAO	Mario Samaja	Deputy Director FAO
	Stella Sengendo	Programme Officer Food Security and Agricultural Livelihoods
Trocaire	Sean Farrell	Head of Country Office
OPM	David Rider Smith	Advisor
	Timothy Lubanga	Assistant Commissioner for Coordination & Monitoring
	Juliet Ssekandi	Senior Evaluation Research Fellow (DFID SEBDDM II)
	Dr. Robert Lim Lim	Director- NUSAF2 Technical Support Team
		The Evaluation Sub-Committee
WFP Uganda Country Office	Hakan Tongul	Deputy Director
	Sarah Laughton	Head of Programme Uganda Country Office
	Marco Cavalcante	Deputy Head of Programme
	Jimi Richardson	Food & Nutrition Security Coordinator
	Emmanuel Odongo	Programme Officer- Recovery
	Nicholas Lakwonyero	Programme Officer
	Collins Nyeko	Pipeline and Budget Coordinator
Others	Harriet Fowler	Key Informant

District/ Organisation	Name	Job Title
	Rita Dedeng	Key Informant
Moroto		
WFP Sub Office	Tiziana Zoccheddu	Former Head of Sub-Office
	Sarah Balaba	Acting Head of Sub-Office
	Swaleh Gule	Senior Programme Office
Samaritan's Purse	Adam Riddell	Programme Manager
ACF	Charles Dashe	Head of Region Karamoja
	Ahamed Hassen Hadji	FSL Programme Manager
	Cuthbert Aongat	FSL Assistant Programme Manager
KALIP	Alastair Taylor	Technical Advisor
	Jimmy Ochien	Programme Coordinator
FAO	Edward Okori	National Programme Officer, Karamoja Region
Local Government	Edward Eko	Assistant CAO/ NUSAF 2 District Focal Person
	Andrew Achila-Odongo	District Production Officer
	Francis Okwii	Agriculture Officer
	Lometo Caesar Laimeu	LC , Speaker
	Ikiamo Camsto	Secretary for Production
Kotido		
WFP Sub Office	Gilbert Buzu	Head of Sub Office
	Eunice Twanza	Deputy Head of Sub Office
	Gertrude Akullo	Field monitor
MAP International	Evelyn Adyego	Programme Officer –MAP International
	Brenda Acha	Coordinator
CARITAS	Kapel Moses	Field Officer
	Emojong Paul	Programme Coordinator
World Vision	Ochan Francis	Programme Officer
Local Government	Mark Locheng	Assistant CAO
	Sarah Narem	NUSAF 2 District Focal Person
	Lochoto Mathew	LC 3 Chairperson, Rengen Sub County
OXFAM	Ernest Lokong Angella	Water Resource Management Officer
Kaabong		
WFP Sub Office	Mr. Joseph Okellowange	Head of Sub Office

istrict/ Organisation	Name	Job Title
ACF	Moses Ebong	Programme Officer
Local Government	John Bosco Okello	CAO/ District Focal Point NUSAF 2
	Evelyn Nakwang	Community Development Officer, Kalapata Sub county
Napak		
Local Government	Lemukoc Anthony	LC3 Iriiri Sub County
Nakapiriprit		
WFP Sub Office	Joyce Achom	Head of Sub Office
	James Odongo	Programme Assistant
	Ocom Gabriel	Field Monitor
	Osia Richard	Senior Logistics Assistant
PADC	Alinga Helen	PADC Field Coordinator
Local Government	Huliol Jobs	Deputy CAO
	Tenzei Mario Lokol	District Agricultural Officer
	Lokium Paul	Deputy District Internal Security Officer
	Ilukol Phillips Nicholas	Gombolola Internal security officers
Amudat		
Local Government	Lochoro Miriam	NDO
	Achochoro Becky	Councilor

Annex 6: Documents Reviewed

WFP INTERNAL DOCUMENTS

- WFP, 2010. *Karamoja Agricultural Zone Profile May 2010*. [word document] 14 August 2010
 WFP, 2010. *Karamoja Agropastoral Zone Profile May 2010*. [word document] 14 August 2010
 WFP, 2011. *Key to all Community Sub Project Sites – IOM Area of Operation*. [word document] 2011
 WFP, date not specified. *Key to CESVI Area of Operation*. [word document] n.d.
 WFP, 2011. *Mapping of NUSAF 2 Community Sub Project sites*. [map image in word document] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *Mapping of NUSAF 2 Project sites*. [map image in word document] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *Sub-Project List for Monitoring and Reporting*. [excel] July 2011
 WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 Sub-Project Summary, Samaritan Purse*. [excel] December 2011
 WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 Pian Agro-Pastoral Development Centre (PADC), Partner's Narrative Progress Annual Report*. [word document] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 Community Sub-Projects Sub County Level Joint Monitoring Form*. [word document] 23 June 2011

Abim

- OCHA, *Partnership for Humanity, 2011. Abim District Planning Map* [map] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *Abim NUSAF 2 Annual Evaluation*. [word document] 20 October 2011
 WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 District Review Meeting, Abim District*. [presentation] October 2011
 WFP, 2011. *Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF 2) Abim Sub Office Brief Summary of Activities*. [word document] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 First cycle report CESVI Abim*. [word document] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 IOM Abim First cycle narrative progressive report*. [word document] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *CESVI Abim Sub-Project List for Monitoring and Reporting*. [excel] 19 July 2011
 WFP, 2011. *Summary of Achievement of NUSAF 2 Programme in Abim District Caseload for the Karamoja Region*. [excel] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *Summary of Achievement of NUSAF 2 Programme in Abim District*. [word document] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *CESVI, Abim Third cycle narrative report: Second Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF 2)*. [word document], 1 September 2011.
 WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 IOM Community Sub-Projects in Abim District*. [presentation] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *District Joint Monitoring Report for Abim 20th-21st July 2011*. [word document] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 Second cycle narrative progress report CESVI Abim*. [word document] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 Third cycle narrative progress report IOM Abim*. [word document] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 Annual Review Meeting for 2011, Abim updates*. [word document] 2011

Kaabong

- WFP, 2011. *ACF NUSAF 2 Narrative Final Report, Kaabong District*. [word document] 2011

Moroto

- WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 Coopi Narrative Final Report Moroto District*. [word document] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *Images demonstrating the Abim Achievements*. [images] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *Samaritan's Purse NUSAF 2 Narrative Final Report (Moroto District)*. [word document] 2011
 WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 Coopi Moroto District Narrative Final Report*. [word document] 2011

Kotido

WFP, 2011. *Kotido NUSAF 2 Review - Workshop Report*. [word document] 17 October 2011

Napak

WFP, date not specified. *ACF Napak Updated Beneficiary Figures* [excel] n.d.

WFP, date not specified. *Napak Updated Beneficiary Figures* [excel] n.d.

WFP, date not specified. *NUSAF 2 Samaritan's Purse Annual Report 2011 Napak District* n.d.

WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 ACF NUSAFII Napak Narrative Final report*. [word document] December 2011

Nakapiripirit and Amudat

WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 District Level Joint Monitoring, Nakapiripirit district feedback*. [word document] 2011

WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 Review Meeting Minutes, Amudat District*. [word document] 2 November 2011

WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 Coopi Narrative Final Report Nakapiripit and Amadat (Lorengedwat Sub-county)*. [word document] 2011

WFP, 2012. *IOM Fourth Cycle NUSAFII Report Nakapiripirit and Amudat*. [word document] 1 January 2012

WFP, date not specified. *Coopi Sub project locations – Nakapiripirit and Amudat*. [excel] n.d.

WFP, date not specified. *IOM Sub project locations – Nakapiripirit and Amudat*. [excel] n.d.

WFP, date not specified. *PADC Sub project locations – Nakapiripirit and Amudat First Projects and Second Projects* [excel] n.d.

WFP, 2011. *Pian-Agro-Pastoral Development Centre (PADC) Final Sub-project Report 2011 Nakapiripit*. [excel document] 24 January 2012

WFP, 2011. *NUSAF 2 2011 Final report Coopi Amudat (Loroo Sub County)*. [word document] 2011

REPORTS

ACF International, December 2010. *Integrated Nutrition Surveillance System in Karamoja Region Final report number 004*

ACF International, September 2011. *Nutrition Surveillance Karamoja Region, Uganda, Round 6*

DanChurchAid, 2004. *Climate Change and Adaptation Strategies in the Karamoja Sub-region*. Kampala: DanChurchAid

De la Brière & Rawlings, L.B., 2006. *Examining Conditional Cash Transfer Programs: A Role for Increased Social Inclusion?* Washington D.C: The World Bank

Devereux S., & Guenther B., 2009. *Agriculture and Social Protection in Ethiopia FAC Working Paper No. SPO3 January 2009*

DFID, 2007. *Social Protection Briefing Note Series, number 5, Social Protection and Financial Services Enhanced Payment Options for Social Transfer Schemes*

DFID, 9 November 2011. *Transferring cash and assets to the poor, Report by Comptroller and Auditor General*. London: Department for International Development.

Emwanu T., Okiira Okwi, P., Hoogeveen, Johannes G., Kristjanson, P., Henniger, N, 2007. *Nature, Distribution and Evolution of Poverty and Inequality in Uganda 1992 – 2002*. Kampala: The Uganda Bureau of Statistics and International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI).

Food and Agriculture Organization Uganda, 2010. *Karamoja Seasonal Assessment Final Report November 2010*

Food and Agriculture Organization, May 2010. *Baseline household economy assessment of Karamoja; Baseline livelihood profiles of Karamoja*. Kampala: FAO Uganda and European Commission

Food and Agriculture Organization, 2010. *Karamoja Crop and Livestock Production and Productivity Assessment Report*. Kampala: FAO.

Kabeer, N., Huda, K., Kaur S., Lamhauge, N., October 2011. *Productive Safety Nets for Women in Extreme Poverty: Lessons from pilot projects in India and Pakistan*.

Levine S., September 2010. *What to do about Karamoja: Why pastoralism is not the problem but the solution; A food security analysis of Karamoja*. Food and Agriculture Organization.

Levine, S. & Carrington, G. 2009. *Is cash-voucher programming a feasible alternative for WFP in Uganda?* WFP

Majewski B., Davies, M., Khogali, H., Waugh, R., February 2011. *WFP's Role in Social Protection and Safety Nets: A Strategic Evaluation*. WFP.

Makerere University School of Public Health, 2010. *Food Security and Nutrition Assessment for Karamoja Sub-region*

McAllister Anderson, I., Robinson, I., 2009. *10th EDF Karamoja Livelihoods Programme (KALIP) Technical Reference Guide*

McCord, A. & Slater, R., 2009. *Social Protection, Rural Development and Food Security: Issues paper*

McCord, A, 2011. *Public Works Programmes in Uganda, A Scoping Study: Key issues and areas for further Analysis*, Department for International Development (DFID)

McKinney, P., April 2009. *VAM Food Security Analysis, Comprehensive Food Security & Vulnerability Analysis Uganda*. Rome: WFP

National Audit Office, 2011. *Transferring cash and assets to the poor*. London: Department for International Development (DFID)

ODI, September 2009. *Social Protection, Food Security and Rural Development on the role of social protection in rural development*. London: ODI

Productive Safety Net programme 2007. *Graduation Guidance Note, Addis Ababa Protection and Safety Nets Terms of Reference*

Republic of Uganda, Office of the Prime Minister, 2011. *Government Annual Performance Report 2010/11, Volume 1 – The Report*

Republic of Uganda, Office of the Prime Minister, 2011. *Government Annual Performance Report 2010/11, Volume 2 The Data Annex*

Republic of Uganda, Office of the Prime Minister, 2007. *Peace, Recovery and Development Plan*

for Northern Uganda (PRDP) 2007-2010.

Rotman, S., Montesquiou A., Yemtsov R., 2010. *Breaking the Poverty Cycle: Graduation in Social Safety Nets*

Sabates-Wheeler, R. & Devereux, S., 2010. *Cash Transfers and High Food Prices: Explaining outcomes on Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Programme* Institute of Development Studies and Centre for Social Protection

Sabates-Wheeler, R. & Devereux, S., 2011. CSP working paper number 023, *Transforming Livelihoods for Resilient Futures: How to Facilitate Graduation in Social Protection Programmes*

Shah S., 2011. *Cash or Food Aid? Assessing the role of resource-based transfers in achieving female empowerment and gender equity in social protection programmes*

Stites E, Akabwai D., Mazurana D. & Ateyo P., 2007. *Angering Akujũ: Survival and Suffering in Karamoja: A Report on Livelihoods and Human Security in the Karamoja Region of Uganda.* Feinstein International Center: Boston

The Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS), 2009. *Northern Uganda Social Action Fund Impact Evaluation Report*

The Uganda Bureau of Statistics, 2005. *Report on the Northern Uganda Baseline Survey 2004*

The Uganda Bureau of Statistics, 2008. *Impact Evaluation of Northern Uganda Social Action Fund, 2008 – Community Questionnaire 22 July 2008* [excel]

The Uganda Bureau of Statistics, 2008. *The Northern Uganda Survey (NUS) 2008 Impact Assessment – Household Questionnaire 17 July 2008* [excel]

The Uganda Bureau of Statistics, 2011. *Uganda National Panel Survey 2009/2010 (Wave 1) Report on the Key Findings*

Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS), 2009. *Northern Uganda Social Action Fund Poverty Reduction Impact Assessment*

WFP, February 2011. *Strategic Evaluation of WFP's Role in Social Protection and Safety Nets*, May 2011. Rome: WFP.

WFP Office of Evaluation, 2011. Evaluation Brief, *Strategic Evaluation of WFP's Role in Social Protection and Safety Nets*

WFP, 5 May 2011. *Summary Report of the Strategic Evaluation of WFP's Role in Social Protection and Safety Nets*. Rome: WFP

WFP Uganda, 2007. *Emergency Food Security Assessment of Karamoja Region, March-April 2007*

WFP, 2011. *From Food Aid to Food Assistance:*

WFP, 2011. *The Second Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF 2) Programme Guideline for Implementing Partners Karamoja Sub Region*

WFP, August 2011. *Karamoja Market Update August 2011*

WFP, August 2010. *Karamoja Pastoral Zone Profile June 2010*

WFP, Evaluation Reports, May 2011. Agenda Item 7, '*Management Response to the recommendations of the strategic evaluation of WFP's role in Social Protection and Safety Nets*'

WFP, Vinck, P., 2006. *Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA) Rural Uganda Conducted July – August 2005*. WFP

World Bank, *Safety Nets How To: Graduation, Key Program Processes*

Annex 7: Desk Review of Available Survey Data

Existing documents in terms of quantitative data/ qualitative analysis on household status/ change in Karamoja.

1. Northern Uganda Survey (2004 & 2008)

Notes: Two have been conducted (2004 and 2008) as baseline studies for the NUSAF I & II. The NUS 2008 also served as impact assessment for NUSAF I. The 2008 impact study findings are based on a panel of households covered in NUSAF region. The studies are intended to provide data on demographic and socio-economic characteristics of household population for monitoring development performance as well as providing baseline indicators for different socio-economic and vulnerable groups.

Coverage: All NUSAF implementation districts. For Karamoja (all the districts as they existed in 2004 and 2008)

Sample size- 770 households (in Karamoja in 2004) and 606 in 2008.

Holder of data – UBOS/OPM

Follow up survey- Possibly Impact Assessment of NUSAF 2

Data/information of interest-

- Consumption expenditure and poverty
- Housing and household characteristics
- Welfare indicators and Vulnerability
- Sources of earning for households
- Access to selected services (schools, markets- input/produce, feeder roads, community roads, safe drinking water within 1 km from village centre, distance to financial services)
- Coverage of NUSAF I sub projects, involvement of communities in selection of sub projects and Impacts of sub projects

2. Nature, Distribution and Evolution of Poverty and inequality in Uganda 1992-2002 (UBOS and ILRI 2007)

Notes : Report compiled by UBOS and ILRI using data from the National Population and Housing Census of 2002 and the National Household Survey of 2002/3 and examines changes in poverty over the period 1992-2002 as well as providing estimates of Ugandan poverty and inequality at the district, county and sub county levels. Estimates of well being presented in the report are based on statistical techniques that combined existing survey and census data sets.

Holder of data-UBOS

Data/information of interest- poverty statistics

Table: Uganda Rural Poverty Rates by District and County, 2002

District County	Individual head count index % inds below Poverty Line (std. error)		Poverty Gap index % Pov Line (std. error)		Poverty inequality (std. error)		Estimated number of poor H/Hs (std. error)		No. of individuals from 2002 census
Kotido	91	1.28	48	2.13	0.37	10.43	540,496	7576	591,870
Dodoto county (now Kaabong)	95	1.42	51	2.58	0.33	12.52	363,464	5456	384,211
Jie County (now kotido)	90	1.72	45	2.16	0.35	2.56	138,864	2,659	154,603
Labwor County (now Abim)	74	1.36	32	1.16	0.44	2.83	39,288	722	53,056
Moroto District	89	1.29	45	1.73	0.35	1.57	168,391	2450	189,907
Bokora county (Now Napak)	90	1.20	46	1.70	0.35	1.84	101,179	1,352	112,697
Matheniko county (now Moroto)	87	1.83	43	2.15	0.37	1.86	60,711	1,278	69,863
Nakapiripirit District	86	2.08	41	2.05	0.42	10.57	132,988	3,213	154,494
Chekwii county	89	1.29	45	1.71	0.37	2.16	46,358	673	52,199
Pian county	88	2.21	42	2.55	0.40	16.21	33,968	856	38,723
Pokot county (Now Amudat)	83	3.40	37	2.94	0.42	4.64	52,504	2,161	63,572

Comprehensive Food Security & Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA), Uganda (2009)- WFP VAM Food Security Analysis

Notes: This is a national study with data for the Karamoja aggregated for the region but with some district level detail provided. *The analysis of primary data was designed to capture the following information: (a) food security and nutrition profiles and socio-economic characteristics of sampled households; (b) household food consumption (frequency, diversity, and source); (c) access to health, water, sanitation and education; (d) household exposure and response to risk, including coping strategies; and (e) assets and livelihoods (e.g. income/livelihood sources, ownership of physical assets such as land, livestock, agricultural production). The data collection occurred during October until mid-November 2008.*

Coverage of Karamoja districts – all seven

sample size- unknown)

Holder of data- WFP

Follow up survey- ??

Data/information of interest-

Food Insecurity

- Food insecurity, highest in Karamoja at 20%
- Moroto 30%, Nakapiripirit 23%
- Approximately 208,000 people are food insecure and 387,000 are moderately food insecure
- General poverty, asset poverty and personal insecurity are forces driving food insecurity in Karamoja

Proportion of female headed households

- Proportion of female headed households 63% -Moroto, 69%- Nakapiripirit, 85% -Kaabong a reflection of pastoralist/ agro pastoralist lifestyle
- **Education**- Kaabong, Kotido, Moroto, Nakapiripirit have highest household head illiteracy rates (87-94%). On average 88% of hh heads are illiterate
- **Displacement**- main causes in karamoja are banditry and droughts. In Moroto around 10% of hhs have been displaced
- **Crop production**- lowest crop diversity in Karamoja region. Government Extension as sources of seed reported by 9% in Nakapiripirit. Main constraint of crop production is irregular rains reported by 90-95% h/hs in Kaabong, Moroto, Kotido, Nakapiripirit. Poor seed reported by 40% h/hs in Moroto
- Larger areas of land cultivated in the northern strata (in regions of Acholi and Karamoja). Particularly in Moroto (3.4 acres). Fewer agriculturalists in north, lower population density and less competition for land.
- Around 50% of households reported owning livestock in Acholi and Karamoja. Kotido (42%) Nakapiripirit reported 72% of households owning animals of some sort. (Cultural proclivity for under-reporting animal ownership). Nakapiripirit reported the greatest average
- Ownership of goats (10), local cattle (11) and sheep (6) In Nakapiripirit 71% of the households owned livestock.
- Theft was an important constraint Nakapiripirit (35%) and Moroto (33%), where insecurity due to this was an important constraint. In Moroto 39% of the responses given by households said that poor breeds were a major constraint. In Kaabong the main constraint given was civil insecurity (73%), this was also important in Moroto (59%).
- **Housing structures**- 3.5 people per room, 97% houses with mud walls, houses having bamboo and wood walls (72%-Moroto & 31%- Nakapiripirit)
- **Lighting and cooking energy sources** -84% using candles/ firewood
- **Access to water**- % of h/hs greater than 1km away from a water source (Kotido 1-10%; Abim and Nakapiripirit 20.1-35%; Moroto 50.1-65%; Kaabong 10.1-20%). % h/h that are less than 30mins from safe water source (Kaabong, Kotido & Moroto 30.1-50%, Nakapiripirit 50.1-65%)
- Abim (15%).households reported having to travel 'more than 2 hours but less than half a day' to their main source of water
- In Moroto, 60% of the households reported that they were more than 1km away from their main water source.

- The least amount of water per household consumed is Kaabong where only 41 litres per day is consumed and in Kotido where only 7 litres per person per day was reported as being consumed. Karamoja only 11% were using 15 liters per person per day. Main source was reliable only half of the time (30% in Karamoja).
- **Sanitation**- 91% h/hs in Karamoja have no toilets. Reasons for not using latrines 64% ignorance and 50% lack of availability
- **Asset holdings and wealth index**- Asset poor households 75.1-100% in Kaabong, Moroto, Nakapiripirit, 50.1-75% in Kotido /Abim
- **Financial Capital and livelihood strategies**- lowest daily wage Kaabong and Moroto 1000-1200USH
- Geographic distribution of the four main livelihood activity groups- distribution of h/hs involved in Agriculturalists, agro-laborers, agro pastoralists, agro traders groups given by district (Kaabong, Moroto, Nakapiripirit, Kotido and Abim)
- Extension services- rating extension services as poor- 60%- Kaabong; No veterinarian extension services -54% in Nakapiripirit
- Household expenditure-

3. **Comprehensive Food Security & Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA), Uganda (2005)- WFP VAM Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping**

Notes: Data collected July – August 2005. It is a national report with data on Karamoja generalized for the region and some specific to districts. At the time Karamoja consisted of Kotido, Moroto, and Nakapiripirit. Sample households were drawn from all the three districts.

4. **Baseline Household Economy Assessment of Karamoja: Baseline Livelihood Profiles of Karamoja May 2010- FAO**

Notes: Purpose for the survey was to i) construct livelihood profiles for three zones with accompanying baseline information, ii) make recommendations on alternative possibilities for livelihood protection assistance, and iii) make recommendations on future monitoring of food security for purposes of early warning and decision making on provision of humanitarian assistance.

Coverage of Karamoja – Data gathered in May 2010 in three livelihood zones in Karamoja: i) Central and Southern Karamoja Pastoral Livelihood Zone (UG25); ii) Karamoja Livestock Sorghum Bulrush Millet Livelihood Zone (UG23); iii) South Kitgum Pader Abim Simsim Groundnuts Sorghum Livestock Livelihood Zone (UG21)

Sample size- not specified

Holder of data- FAO

Data/information of interest-

Livelihood Profiles

- Zone description (general description of local livelihood patterns)
- markets (marketing of local production and on any importation of staple food into the zone)
- seasonal Calendars
- Wealth Breakdown (describes four main wealth groups ('very poor', 'poor', 'middle' and 'better-off'), explaining the differences between these groups and how this affects potential access to food and cash income)

- sources of Food and Sources of Cash; expenditure Patterns (proportion of annual cash budget households at the different wealth levels spend on food, on household items, on production inputs)- (for bad year 2008-2009)
- Hazards that affect the zone
- response Strategies
- Key indicators to monitor in each livelihood zone, based upon an understanding of local livelihood patterns
- Programme implications

5. Karamoja Seasonal Assessment 2010-2011, FAO Uganda

Notes: The purpose of the assessment was to review the performance of the 2010 rains and growing season and to evaluate food security prospects between time of study and the next rains/harvests in 2011. **Household Economy Analysis (HEA)** was used to determine which areas will face deficits in 2010-11, the number of people affected and the magnitude and timing of these deficits. HEA involves putting together two types of information; a) livelihoods baseline information and b) monitoring and/or seasonal assessment data. Livelihoods baseline data relating to 2008-09 (the reference or baseline year) is available for 3 livelihood zones in Karamoja (one agricultural, one agropastoral and one pastoral)

Coverage: Study covered all districts and livelihood zones of Karamoja districts – all seven
sample size- (not specified)

Holder of data- FAO

Follow up survey (October-December 2011)

Data/information of interest-

- The assessment provides information on the following:
 - Crop production- crop performance by district and livelihood zones compared to 2008
 - Livestock production-districts and livelihood zones reporting reduction in cattle numbers since 2008
 - Changes in milk production compared to 2008
 - Changes in firewood collection and charcoal burning
 - Changes in Market prices
 - market prices for firewood and charcoal, construction labor, agricultural labor, milk, sheep, goats, cattle, sorghum and maize
 - Food security- projected food security prospects, income projections for main sources of income, seasonal patterns of consumption and expenditure and timing of deficits for very poor households and numbers facing deficits and durations

6. Karamoja Crop and Livestock Production and Productivity Assessment, 2010-FAO

Notes: Study is complementary to the HEA. HEA looks at outcomes of production processes (as influenced by socio-economic, environmental and political factors e.g. access to inputs, assets, climate, diseases, conflict etc. This study looks at state of processes and constraints as existed during the season and informs implementation- what to deliver, to whom and how much. The assessment determined the food self sufficiency trends and sustainability of households in Karamoja that depend on crops or livestock production or a mix of the two, as the basis of their livelihoods.

Coverage – Kaabong (lobalangit, Lokori, Lolelia, Loteteliet, Lomeria, Toroi, Kathile, Nariamaoit parishes); Kotido and Abim (Adea, Awach, Wilela, Losakuca, Watakao, Lopiyo, Losilang, parishes); Moroto and Napak (Iriiri, Lorengcora, loyaraboth, Tepeth, Kalokengel, Lokali, lopee, Lobuneit, Mogoth parishes); and Amudat & Nakapiripirit (Achorichor, Kokuwaum, Lokatapan, Lotaruk, Natirae, Abiliep, Acegeretolim, Kalokwameri, Katabok parishes)

sample size- 1155 households (352 –agricultural zone; 404- pastoral; and 399 in agro pastoral zone)

Holder of data- FAO

Follow up survey- October-December 2011 (conducted with HEA)

Data/information of interest-

- Household characteristics by zone
- Main income sources (disaggregated by zone and district)
- Amounts of income generated
- Average acreage cultivated per h/h (data disaggregated by zones)
- Acreage for different crops (sorghum, maize, bulrush millet, cassava, ground nuts, simsim and cotton)
- Sources of seed/planting materials
- Harvests and yields per h/h for major crops grown in 2010
- Constraints affecting crop production
- Marketing of crop produce, produce prices,
- Livestock ownership, how h/hs increase livestock stocks, milk production (months and quantities),
- Access to agricultural advisory services

7. **Nutrition Surveillance Karamoja Region, Uganda. Round 6, September 2011**

Notes: Conducted by, DHO ACF UNICEF. The nutrition surveillance system was designed to i) monitor the overall nutritional status of children aged between 6 and 59 months, ii) identify rates of acute malnutrition among children 6 to 59 months of age, iii) monitor health and morbidity, food security (FS), and water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) factors linked to acute malnutrition, iv) build the capacity of district nutrition focal persons (DNFP) and health workers on implementing and running a nutrition surveillance system, and v) strengthen DHOs skills to identify acute malnutrition trends, through the monitoring of aggravating factors of acute malnutrition, and contributing to the design of appropriate interventions accordingly.

Coverage – all Karamoja districts

sample size- 2,858 households with 2,935 children measured (about 480 h/hs per districts)

Holder of data- UNICEF

Follow up survey- Surveillance conducted three times a year- May, August/ September and December.

Indicators for which data is collected include:

- Anthropometric indicators (GAM, SAM, chronic stunting and underweight)
- Nutrition indicators
- Health indicators

- Food Security (main food sources per district)
- Main household expenditure per district
- Food Consumption Score (Household food consumption score per district & per livelihood zones)
- Household Dietary Diversity Score- per district/ livelihood zones
- Child meals by district / livelihood zones
- Household consumed foods
- Exclusive breast feeding
- Coping mechanisms
- Water Sanitation and Hygiene Indicators (primary water sources, water treatment, time to water sources, hand washing, human waste disposal)

8. Climate Change and Adaptation Strategies in the Karamoja Sub-Region, May 2010

Notes: The main purpose of the study was to assess and document the impact of climate change on the food security situation of the Karimojong. The specific objectives of the study were to: (i) assess how the activities promoted and facilitated by KADP have contributed to addressing the challenges faced by the communities as a result of climate change, (ii) identify the food security challenges that are related to climatic change with specific focus on KADP working areas, (iii) Document how the challenges posed by climate change on food security in Karamoja has been addressed by KADP and by other actors (iv) provide an overview and critic of key government interventions at policy, institutional, programming and practice as well as the legal framework it operates under.

Coverage: Nakapiripirit & Moroto (sub counties of Lokopo, Rupa, Lorengedwat, Nabilatuk)
sample size- 120 respondents

Holder of data- DanChurch Aid, Great Lakes Region Office)

Follow up survey??

Data/information of interest-

- Study conducted in Moroto and Nakapiripirit Districts
- Climate trends (rainfall variability/ temperature variability)
- Local perception of climate change
- Vulnerabilities and impacts of climate change
- Coping mechanisms
- Adaptation measures-adaptation, mitigation needs and available technologies in Uganda and the region
- Food security situation in sub region and KADP focus areas

General comments on the existing data

- Studies conducted prior to 2008 data are not disaggregated for livelihood zones.

Annex 8: ESC Comments

Comments on: Draft Report: Formative Evaluation of World Food Programme's Livelihoods Programme, Karamoja, Uganda. IOD/PARC

1. General

- Content filled, generally well written, informative evaluation report
- Unclear application of CIPP methodology
- Unclear how assessment is being made throughout the report. Statements are not referenced to particular methods or sources, so given the qualitative nature of the inquiry, one might question the representativeness of the findings.
- Some mixed issues and mixed messages in the report. Are the IPs effective or not (in some parts of the report Y/N), is the programme on track or not? This again relates to whether the analysis of the evidence generated has been systematically applied. Difficult to tell.
- Generally the report is a bit repetitive and could be cut down by 20-30 pages to make it more readable. For example, sections on nature of NUSAF 2 and how well it is delivering are addressed again in part under relevance of approach, productivity, efficiency and sustainability.
- The report does provide useful information on the program, and people perceptions. However, there is a need to restructure it, and have a clear message all long.
- The writer was soft on the program, even when the evidence suggest otherwise, thus the mix message in some sections/paragraphs.
- It will be better to reorganize the report such as to have a section on how the program was designed (targeting, package, etc.) once have to read to close to the end to know that the daily rate for the public works. Yet we don't even know how many days a week/ how many months per year, etc.
- The findings can concentrate on a review of the intent design in terms of a way to reach the goals, and how the actual implementation deviation from the original design.
- The report gives a lot of figures, without mentioning the source. How reliable are there?
- It will have been good to have a quantitative assessment as well. This would mean to include objective measure of efficiency, targeting, productivity, etc.
- It will have been good to have information on the project budget, and an assessment of it.
- The report could gain in developing a bit on potential social conflict (polygamy household were only one spouse benefit; domestic violence); especially as FGDs were organized.
- The report mentioned cash transfer vs food transfer. Will be good to have a small analysis of pro and cons of each approach.

2. Specific

Executive summary

Number (iii).. after this paragraph, the report focus on two components: PWP and HISP. Do we really have 3 components? (vs para 34 for example)

Number viii) Given that WFP has undergone enormous changes, the huge expectations on the programme by the stakeholders may prove difficult to achieve.

The up scaling should have been done after a review of the program. May be the time frame of 3 years is short.

Number xi)... Gardens have effectively sensitized people... limited evidence of knowledge transfer... Impact of opening land is it not so early (15 months) to expect these outcomes?

What was the essence of using community gardens, wouldn't individual gardens do better on a livelihood program?

..... there is little evidence that NUSAF 2 (WFP) provides any meaningful support to the currently dominant primary livelihood in Karamoja. This statement is true of most NUSAF income support projects. Chief Administrative Officers in districts like Mbale are failing to say any results in various enterprises funded. This means there is a design problem. Such funding should be targeted to the economic poor and not every body. Some people need safety net programs and not IGAs.

Number xiii) The programme is innovative.. The innovations require a long period and gradual changes for effective implementation.

Number xvi) There are significant gender dimensions to livelihoods in Karamoja. These imply that the programme's design should be changed.

Number vii). In 2010, WFP was viewed by DFID as the best-positioned actor in Karamoja to implement a livelihoods programme at the scale required by NUSAF 2. **Number xvii).** There is also no evidence of a clear steering committee providing strategic leadership, or of strong learning and coordination platforms at local and district level. This has led to a lack of clarity on key programme objectives. **Number xviii)** Implementation challenges and beginning-of-year delays appear to be leading to greater focus on the public works programme at expense of the household income support programme. All these suggest that the choice of WFP may not have been right. Can this be reviewed/revised at this time?

p.9 Unclear how an evaluation can be formative at the mid-way point in the programme

p.10 Sampling approach unclear. What is the purpose of outlining a sampling frame? To show representativeness? If so, at what level, community, household? On what criteria were the districts purposively selected? 20 communities were selected from 5 districts, but it does not say 20 out of how many?

p.18 Para 35, seems to imply that use of cash and/or food for work is outside of the framework of PWP and HISP

p.19 Para 42, seems to imply that the works themselves are the primary objective, as opposed to the capacities of individuals/ accessing food/cash

p.20 Para 44, introduction of a case study – appears to be a bit out of context. What does this specific case of vegetable production come from, and what does it relate to in terms of the larger debate?

p.21 Box, there is no way of verifying this data without more information. Are these figures high/low returns compared to the norm, are the productivity levels high/low compared to the norm. Case studies useful when situated within a broader context of data averages, to present the case, or show the exception.

pp.22-23 Table 4. Seems to be variations in the data? Compared with Table 3, p.19 which talks of 97 surface dams planned and 130 built, whereas in Table 4 it does not quite add up to that (depending on what's in/out)

p.24 Findings. The evaluation framework is missing – linking the questions (which are also missing) to the method. What is meant by the 'nature' of NUSAF 2 ? Under the heading 'how does the PWP strengthen livelihoods' are you not moving into an assessment of relevance, effectiveness etc.? When reading it, it appears to mix the theory of change (which could usefully and clearly be spelt out) with an analysis of this in practice.

p.26 Para 59. As above, the evaluation seems to ebb between the theory and the analysis of the implementation of the theory. Para 59 seems to step back to unpack the theory, but after two pages of analysis which seem to address issues of effectiveness and efficiency and relevance covered later in the report.

p.27 Para 61. When stated ‘there is a view’ is that one person’s view? Is it an accepted view amongst a group (inside/outside WFP)? Should we lend credence to this view?

p.28 para 65. Conclusory statement that NUSAF 2 “has become and is likely to remain a rather superficial solution to a very complex situation”. This comes half way through the document, and is not substantiated.

p.28 para 70. “[the methodology for targeting has] to a considerable extent been effective in identifying the vulnerable”. How is this statement backed up by evidence? What assessment was done of the targeting? How representative was the assessment? Can you be sure?

p.31 para 80. The argument is unclear here. Why does collective working on large plots result in less produce for each member? Less than what? Less than letting them work on their own plots and providing assistance at that location/level?

p.32 para 88. Would be interested to know what dam construction without reference to cattle drinking points leads to the possibility of damage to the dam structure

p.34 para 100 While the stated strength of the programme is seen to be its poverty-targeted approach, this was in fact designed by IOM and adopted by WFP – so it can’t really be attributed to WFP can it?

p.35 para 101. Shouldn’t this section on relevance have come much earlier in the report?

p.35 para 103 – question of whether/how this programme of cash transfers is or is not connected to the other wider initiative of unconditional cash transfers being rolled out by MGLSD with financing from DFID/ Irish Aid. Lessons?

p.38 para 117. Conclusion seems shy away from asking whether or not WFP is the right organization to be leading this programme. The statement that ‘the relative use of cash and food transfers has been appropriate’ does not appear to match the evidence presented in the report.

p.40 para 132. Reference to training at household level seems to deviate from the subject in this section of the report, which is capacity development of government institutions.

p. 41 para 139. The statement that ‘the use of IPs has been efficient and has added genuine value to the programme’, appears to be unsubstantiated and even potentially contradictory to other statements/evidence presented. The concept of ‘added value’ is also unclear, added on what? Without the IPs there would be no programme!

p.44 para 152- There is quite a lot of repetition in the report from hereon. Seems to cover aspects covered earlier in the report.

Para13, gives year and source for the 80%. The 2009/10 UNHS has shown a strong improvement in the region.

Table 3, the figures on energy stoves (6 vs 4000) deserve more assessment/explanations.

It is not easy for the reader to conciliate table 3 and 4. For example if you look at plan surface dams in both tables. One will expect the total of planned surface dams to be the same in both tables.

Para14, more evidence is needed to make this statement.

Examples on Page 21; they took vegetables to Kaabong market 4 times (is it in year?). Thus how does the 60,000 adjusted with household size compare to poverty line for example... Will be also good to compared various transfers amount to minimum wage if any, or to international standard.

Para16, it would have been to design a scenario based on few assumptions, on what a “normal” year will be.

Para15, “a surplus on income (e.g. Kotido). Some statistical evidences are needed to make such a statement.

Para68. The figure, specify if this is a sample size for IOM.

Para78, will be good to have a figure on delay, how long?

Para79; better to look at yields; I emphasized on David comments on standard, norm, by type of crop, and how beneficiaries are doing.

Para89, this is more about productivity that access to productive assets.

Annex 9: Evaluation Team Response to ESC Comments

Evaluation of the World Food Programme's Livelihoods Programme in Karamoja, Uganda

Response of the Independent Evaluation Team to comments provided by individual members of the Evaluation Sub-committee of the National Working Group on Monitoring and Evaluation

The finalisation of the Evaluation Report by the independent team from IOD PARC⁵⁷ has been informed by comments provided by some of the members of the ESC both prior to (in writing) and during the Stakeholders Meeting on 20/06/12. The Evaluation team had previously presented to and discussed the methodology and key observations from the Inception Phase of the formative evaluation with the ESC on 05/03/12.

- The Evaluation team appreciates the broad endorsement that the ESC comments provide to the content and utility of the report.
- There were some suggestions to restructure the report and in particular to organise around the evaluation questions provided in the ToR. In finalising the report we have kept with the original structure of the narrative as we feel that this best serves to build an argument for the need to consider the strategic options developed in the conclusions section. The team used the framework of the evaluation questions to develop and validate emerging findings and from this a sense of the key issues that were pertinent for moving forward emerged. These then formed the spine for structuring the narrative.
- In the absence of a clear theory of change within the original programme documentation the approach taken in the report was to focus on looking at any gaps between planned and actual implementation based on the experience of year 1 of the evaluation and in reference to quantitative and qualitative information. An important finding of the report was the apparent lack of clarity over the programme's key objective and a shared theory of change to which the programme mapped as an external intervention.
- The ESC members flagged a number of instances within the report where claims seemed to have a weak evidence base backing them up. We have looked at these and, where considered appropriate, adjusted some of the language. In many cases our confidence in our claims has come from the critical step taken in the evaluation process on validation of findings. In particular the meeting held in Moroto on 22/03/12 where a series of challenging statements were vigorously discussed.

⁵⁷ IOD PARC (www.iodparc.com), a UK based consultancy

- Some of the ESC comments looked towards the report providing assessments / concluding statements on the performance of WFP as an agency. The report has been prepared and finalised on the basis of a brief for the evaluation to understand the *merit* and *worth* of a programme approach involving WFP and a range of partners. A brief to provide a performance review of an implementing agency would generate a different style of report.
- There are a number of comments and questions posed as a result of reading of the report which chime with the views held by the evaluators. Our hope is that such opinions by ESC members will serve to inform the dialogue around next steps for the NUSAF 2 (WFP) programme and the wider efforts of GoU with the continuing support of the donor community in Karamoja.
- In response to ESC comments, and in addition to the need signalled by the comments for minor edits, a number of specific changes have been made to the report text:
 - The (Box) examples on vegetable growing have been removed as these are useful in terms of illustration but do not have value in terms of building up an evidence backed argument.
 - We have more explicitly acknowledged and moved ‘up the text’ the findings on the institutional development (‘capacity building’) component of the programme.
 - We have included the evaluation matrix (framework) which guided our field enquiry in the Annex of the report and in the form originally presented in the Inception Report.
 - We have introduced an additional table on the planned vs achieved activities in 2011 and noted the weaknesses in the programmes M&E systems that the observed discrepancies in data suggest.

The evaluation team has benefited from and valued the scrutiny provided by the ESC to the draft report and their engagement in and support to the evaluation process.

Julian Gayfer

Evaluation Team leader

July 2012.