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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DanChurchAid (DCA) has been working in Uganda since 1979 but only opened the Uganda Country Office in early 2004. DCA is a faith-based, ecumenical, non-missionary and non-profit organisation and its vision is “a world at peace, free from poverty, discrimination and oppression, where resources are evenly distributed and individual’s dignity is respected.” DCA globally works through partners to implement interventions through five programme types including (i) Political Space/Good Governance; Right to Food; (iv) HIV/AIDS; and (v) Humanitarian Mine Action.

This evaluation targeted the PT 1 which is the Political Space/Good Governance and PT 3 on Food Security. The Food Security activities supported by DCA Uganda have been operating within the Political Space Programme since 2006. However, a Mid Term Review of the programme in 2008 recommended a clear strategy that would support sustainable security and livelihood activities within the Programme. This led to the integration of Political Space and Food Security components into one Programme (PT1/3).

PT1/3 programme interventions aim at enhancing and widening opportunities for marginalized communities in Karamoja region and Amuria and Katakwi districts of the Teso sub-region. The main purpose of the programme was to contribute towards overcoming marginalization and enabling citizens to take up the role of influencing the development agenda into their hands. The human rights based approach to development and gender equality underpins the PT1/3 programme components as it does with all DCA programmes.

The objectives of the evaluation were to identify and assess the extent to which the programme has achieved its goals and objectives, analyse the context in which the programme has operated and how relevant it is for the integrated Political Space/Food Security Programme and to make recommendations for the programme’s thematic focus for the next period 2011-2016. The evaluation assessed the relevance, performance and impact; efficiency, and sustainability and based on the conclusions reached made some overarching recommendations to guide future programming.

The evaluation methodology involved document review, focus group discussions (FGD) and key informant interviews. DCA Staff, Partner staff, Local Government officials, Community leaders and members of communities. The methodology used a holistic approach in which evaluation questions were developed from the ToR and adapted to specific Partner situations and to the strategic objectives of the PT1/3 programme.

While the geographical focus is Karamoja and Teso sub-regions, the Programme has strategic linkages to advocacy organisations operating at national level with strong connections to these sub regions. For better management and improvement of working relations with Partners, the Programme currently has the Political Space
Programme Officer in the Kampala Office and the Food Security Programme Officer in the DCA field office in Moroto.

Karamoja region is the least socially and economically developed part of Uganda, Nationally, since 1990 the population living below the poverty line has declined from 56% to 31% in 2008, while for Karamoja has increased to 82 with Moroto and Nakapiripirit recording close to 90%. The region suffers from a myriad of problems resulting from many years of social, political, economic and cultural marginalization. The region is also characterised by periodic and extended droughts, sporadic and often brutal violence, cyclical cattle raiding and chronic food insecurity. This in a way influences the nomadic-pastoral nature of the Karimojong characterized by movement of long distances in search of water and pastures for their animals. To survive, the Karimojong and their cattle depend on a highly mobile lifestyle in which men, women and children oscillate between homesteads and mobile cattle camps.

The Teso sub-region has over the last fifty years been shaped by armed conflict to a varying degree. The players in these conflicts have also been varied. They include1: As a result of these violent events, the Iteso people have experienced internal displacement of populations, loss of sources of livelihood – especially through loss of cattle and food, gross violations of human rights such as rape. The worst affected populations are from Amuria and Katakwi districts.

The PT1/3 was designed within the national, regional and Karamoja specific policy context and was found to be well aligned with national and Karamoja policy priorities. The evaluation findings established that most of the PT1/3 Programme interventions are concentrated in Moroto2, Nakapiripirit, Amudat and Kotido and no interventions in Kaabong and Abim which are also districts in the Karamoja sub-region.

Although the PT1/3 components were supposed to be implemented as an integrated programme, the evaluation has established that integration has not been fully achieved, although reasonable progress has been made towards long term impact on the lives of the people of Karamoja and the targeted areas of Teso sub-region.

Furthermore the evaluation established that a number of interventions aimed at sustainable use of natural resources by the Karimajong and strengthening their resilience to drought conditions have achieved a reasonable level of success and they include training and deploying community health workers equipped with mobile kits who are able to diagnose and treat animal diseases as well as building capacities of communities to take care of their animals. Water harvesting efforts through desilting of water ponds in the target areas has also made water available for vegetable growing and other domestic uses. Initiatives to provide goats for women and children have been undertaken and these have empowered and uplifted the status of women

2 This now includes Napak which became a new district effective 1st July 2010
in their communities. Women are able to use got products for income and household consumption. Cereal banking has been useful for providing food to communities during drought when there is less food available and incomes for the cereal bankers.

Community Land Associations (CLAs) have been formed in a few selected areas and DCA partners have supported them to advocate for land rights and legal ownership of land. A few women have been able to register land in their own names. However, the evaluation has further established that food production at household level is not yet fully realized. Very few members of the community are involved in food production but numbers are increasing as interventions on food security are consolidated.

With regard to the cross-cutting issues, the evaluation noted that the rights based approach to programming is informs partners programming though not yet well internalised by some of the partners and communities served. It was further established that capacity building initiatives by DCA to strengthen the advocacy capacity of partners has not been followed by concrete advocacy campaigns indicating that the programme has not fully achieved the purpose of strengthening partners to become strong and effective advocacy agents. Similarly gender programming has been challenging for some partners although some progress has been made in targeting women and girls.

Factors that have contributed to the achievement of success include the fostering of strategic partnerships which include the partnership with ACTED and C&D and KADP for drought preparedness systems and building resilience of the Karimojong. Factors have hindered progress towards success include a high degree of dependency and apathy, and the cyclic periods of hunger the in the two regions caused by prolonged droughts and floods. The evaluation has also affirmed the choice of partners as appropriate and highlighted areas of improvement.

The evaluation has identified a critical mission link as Functional adult literacy (FAL), a necessary component for transforming lives of both women and men.

Overarching recommendations have been made for consideration to strengthen the follow-on programme for the next five years. They include undertaking vulnerability mapping for appropriate targeting, developing of gender mainstreaming guides and tools, continued capacity support to partners for right based programming, consideration for expansion of programme coverage to include some other districts share some of the pastoralist challenges because of their vicinity to Karamoja. A call for pragmatic advocacy is made for early and significant impact. Section recommendations have been and are specific to issues as discussed.
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Founded in 1922 in Denmark, DanChurchAid (DCA) has been working in Uganda since 1979. Initially, DCA worked with Lutheran World Federation (LWF) and through the Church of Uganda to distribute relief food to the drought affected Karamoja pastoralists and later on HIV/AIDS in Rakai and north-western Tanzania. DCA is a faith-based, ecumenical, non-missionary and non-profit organisation and its vision is “a world at peace, free from poverty, discrimination and oppression, where resources are evenly distributed and individual’s dignity is respected.” DCA globally supports church-based agencies, humanitarian organisations and other non-religious civil organisations to implement interventions through five programme types including (i) Political Space/Good Governance; (ii) Humanitarian Assistance; (iii) Right to Food; (iv) Access to Service with a focus on HIV/AIDS; and (v) Humanitarian Mine Action.

The Country Office for Uganda was established in 2004 as part of the decentralization process. DCA implements its interventions through Partners. DCA has a strong commitment and conviction to the Rights-Based Approach (RBA) to development where issues of gender equity, marginalisation and social justice underpin the various initiatives, while mindful of cultural sensitivity.

This evaluation targeted the PT 1 which is the Political Space/Good Governance and PT 3 on Food Security. The Food Security activities supported by DCA Uganda have been operating within the Political Space Programme since 2006. However, a Mid Term Review of the programme in 2008 recommended a clear strategy that would support sustainable security and livelihood activities within the Programme. This led to the integration of Political Space and Food Security components into one Programme (PT1/3).

The PT1/3 is implemented as part of the DCA Uganda country programme. Whereas the political space programme is implemented in most of DCA Regional Offices globally the integrated programme is implemented in Uganda only. The programme has supported CSOs and Government initiatives that aim at enhancing and widening opportunities for communities in Karamoja region. The main aim of the programme was to contribute towards overcoming marginalization and enabling citizens as key players (rights holders) to start influencing the development agenda and to uphold rights-based and gender sensitive approaches. DCA was also committed to positively improving socio-economic conditions of Karamoja region to move towards parity with other regions in terms of poverty reduction and empowerment of the people.

The PT1/3 Programme addressed the complex problems in Karamoja which include marginalization, political exclusion from decision making processes
and allocation of resources. In addition, the Programme addressed issues of sustainable access to food and adequate nutrition through production, entitlements and increased purchasing power for women. Later on, the programme added Teso sub region, particularly, the districts of Amuria and Katakwi.

1.2 THE PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The Terms of Reference (ToR) provided the Evaluation team with a detailed Scope of Work to guide the achievement of the following objectives:

i) To identify and assess the extent to which the programme has achieved its goals and objectives.

ii) To analyse the context in which the Programme has operated and how relevant it is for the integrated Political Space/ Food Security Programme.

iii) To make recommendations for the programme’s thematic focus and how it could be further developed and strengthened over the next period 2011-2016 to realise its objectives.

The ToR required the evaluation team to assess relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency, and sustainability. The evaluation would also draw lessons from implementation experiences of the partners and learning from the communities.

1.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE INTEGRATED PT1/3 PROGRAMME

While globally the DCA implements Political Space Programme as a standalone, the Uganda Programme implements the integrated Political Space and Food Security as a combined Programme (PT 1/3). While the geographical focus is Karamoja and Teso sub-regions, the Programme has strategic linkages to advocacy organisations operating at national level with strong connections to these sub regions. For better management and improvement of working relations with Partners, the Programme currently has the Political Space Programme Officer in the Kampala Office and the Food Security Programme Officer in the DCA field office in Moroto-Karamoja. The two Officers jointly manage the Programme on a day-to-day basis, with the support of the Regional Representative (RR) based in Kampala and Programme Type Advisors at the DCA headquarters.

1.4 THE CONTEXT OF DCA UGANDA PROGRAMME OPERATIONS

Karamoja, Teso and Northern Uganda sub regions have lagged behind the rest of Uganda in terms of development over the years. One of the biggest challenges facing Karamoja and the surrounding areas in the post-independence era of Uganda is linked to a complex mix of armed conflict and poverty.

1.4.1 The Karamoja Context
As recommended in the Mid Term evaluation, Karamoja and Teso remain the geographical focus given the challenges associated with the region. Karamoja lies to the Northeast of Uganda, bordering Kenya in the east, Sudan in the
north, the districts of Sironko, Kapchorwa and Bukwo in the south, and the districts of Amuria Katakwi, Otuke and Kitgum in the west.

By the time of the evaluation, Karamoja had 7 districts\(^3\) covering 27,000-sq. km. which is approximately 10% of the country. The population of Karamoja is estimated at about 1.1 million people (UBoS 2009).

It has an ethnically diverse, but related population\(^4\) most of whom are agro-pastoralists, herding cattle, sheep and very limited small-scale and largely seasonal agricultural production. The main social group, which constitutes the Karimojong, includes the Matheniko, Pian, and Bokora. The other smaller groups include the Pokot, Tepeth, Nyakwae, Jie, Dodoth, Ik (Teuso), Napore, and Labwor. The majority of the Karimojong are predominantly pastoral people. These one million inhabitants of Karamoja share ethnic roots and livelihoods with pastoralist groups in Sudan and Kenya, and also with their Iteso neighbors.

The Karamoja region suffers from a myriad of problems resulting from many years of social, political, economic and cultural marginalization. The region is also characterised by periodic and extended droughts, sporadic and often brutal violence, cyclical cattle raiding and chronic food insecurity. The nomadic cattle keepers of Karamoja barely manage to survive during long periods of drought, water resources are insufficient for the breeders and their livestock. The majority of the populations of Karamoja depend on livestock farming for their subsistence, where cattle are seen as a depository of food and wealth.

However, Karamoja region has a semi-arid climate with semi-arid vegetation composed of mainly thorny shrub and short savannah. The area also has bimodal variable rainfall patterns. This in a way influences the nomadic-pastoral nature of the Karimojong characterized by movement of long distances in search of water and pastures for their animals. To survive, the Karimojong and their cattle depend on a highly mobile lifestyle in which men, women and children oscillate between homesteads and mobile cattle camps. Karamoja region is the least socially and economically developed part of Uganda, even among the generally poorer parts of northern Uganda as a whole. Nationally, since 1990 the population living below the poverty line has declined from 56% to 31% in 2008 while for Karamoja has increased to 82% (see Uganda Poverty Incidence) with Moroto and Nakapiripirit recording close to 90% (UBOS 2008, Levine, 2009).

\(^3\) Moroto, Kotido, Kaabong Nakapiripirit, Abim, Amudat and Napak

\(^4\) Including The Matheniko, Pian, and Bokora, with groups of Pokot, Tepeth, Nyakwae, Jie, Ik, Napore, and Labwor.
By 2007, Moroto, Kotido and Nakapiripirit districts had the lowest Human Development Index (HDI) in Uganda of 0.216, 0.292, and 0.37 respectively compared with the national average of 0.581 (MoFPED, 2003). Table 1 illustrates comparative development and humanitarian indicators of Karamoja region in comparison to the national.

The apparent failure of Government and other development actors to fully address pastoral destitution has encouraged the 'institutionalisation' of violent conflict and raiding as part of pastoralism in Karamoja.

It is plausible to say that the response from government and development partners over the years has been too little, fragmented and disproportionate to the magnitude of the humanitarian crisis in the region. Consequently, poverty has remained pervasive in Karamoja despite several development initiatives targeting the area. This is compounded by the ongoing insecurity that is propagated as indicated in box 1.

Table 1: Comparative Humanitarian and development indicators – Karamoja and National

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparative Humanitarian and Development Indicators</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Karamoja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population [UBOS]</td>
<td>28.9 million</td>
<td>1.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy [UNDP 2007]</td>
<td>50.4 years</td>
<td>47.7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population living below poverty line [World Bank 2006 OCHA/OPM 2008]</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal mortality rate (per 100,000 live births) [UDHS 2006, WHO 2008]</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) [UNICEF/WHO 2008]</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under five mortality rate (per 1,000 live births) [UNICEF/WHO 2008]</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rate [UNICEF/WHO 2008]</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11% and rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunization (children 12 to 23 months, fully immunized) [UDHS 2006]</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to sanitation units [MoH 2007, OCHA/OPM 2008]</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to safe water [UDHS 2006]</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy rate [UNDP HDR 2006, UDHS 2006]</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4.2 The Teso Context

The Teso Sub-region is comprised of the districts of Amuria, Katakwi, Soroti, Kaberamaido, Kumi, Serere, Bukedea and Ngora. The Teso sub-region has over the last fifty years been shaped by armed conflict to a varying degree. The players in these conflicts have also been varied. They include:

- The Karimojong cattle rustlers/warriors – to survive, the Karimojong and their cattle depend on a highly mobile lifestyle. This movement is not only confined within Karamoja, but usually overflows across to bordering districts of Amuria and Katakwi in the Teso sub-region. Although, these Teso districts have had a close relationship with Karamoja, they have at the same time suffered the negative effects of cattle rustling, food looting and killing of people by the Karimojong;
- The Alice Lakwena invasion from northern Uganda which recruited hundreds of young people into rebel ranks – these young people were later killed in clashes with government troops;
- The Insurgent armies who later merged into a loose political armed coalition called the Uganda People’s Army (UPA) – who’s negative effects involved rapes and killings of civilian people and the violations of their human rights;
- The Uganda Government troops or National Resistance Army (NRA) later known as Uganda Peoples Defence Force (UPDF) – some of who carried out human rights violations, rapes and killings of civilian people in their operations; and
- Thugs locally referred to as ‘Osupulia’ who took advantage of the unrest in the area to loot property and rape women and girls.

As a result of these violent events, the Iteso people have experienced internal displacement of populations, loss of sources of livelihood – especially through loss of cattle and food, gross violations of human rights such as rape. The worst affected populations are from Amuria and Katakwi districts.

The Karamajong and the Iteso are both traditionally pastoralist communities. The two groups have strived for amicable relations and depended on each other for their survival by, for example, trading and intermarrying. Their relationship as neighbours has also been characterised by conflicts involving cattle rustling and disputed boundaries. Gradually some Iteso gave up pastoralism and became settled cultivators. The interdependence of the Karamajong and Iteso continued as did the conflicts – with the Karamajong coming to Teso in search of water and pasture during the dry season.

1.5 POLICY CONTEXT

Up to 2009, the main development policy framework was the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) which has been succeeded by the National Development Plan (NDP). The PEAP like its successor provided the overarching goal for all the development interventions in the country. However, in order to critically address the development challenges of Northern Uganda, the

---

Government of Uganda has put in place the Peace, Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP) for northern Uganda. The PRDP is a post-conflict recovery plan designed to eradicate poverty and address inequality in northern and the larger part of eastern Uganda including the Karamoja and Teso sub-regions. The overall goal of the PRDP is to consolidate peace and security and lay a foundation for recovery and development. This is to be achieved through four core strategic objectives that are mutually reinforcing:

- Consolidation of state authority;
- Rebuilding and empowering communities;
- Revitalization of the economy; and
- Peace building and reconciliation.

Furthermore, since 2007 the Government of Uganda has been implementing a more specific Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Programme (KIDDP) developed to address the specific disarmament and development challenges of the region. The programme has taken both civilian and armed approaches, but with disarmament as the central theme of the programme against which all other interventions are anchored. Within KIDDP, the Karamoja Action Plan for Food Security (KAPFS)\(^6\) is designed to ensure sustainable food security and increased household income in Karamoja was drawn. Its objectives are:

- To increase crop production and productivity;
- To increase livestock production and productivity;
- To increase the functionality of existing water production facilities (dams and Valley tanks);
- To provide storage (silos) facilities for community agricultural produce;
- To improve, access to markets, value addition and other income generating products; and
- To strengthen the capacity of the various Actors/stakeholders for effective and efficient utilization of resources.

There are also Sector Development Plans, District Development Plans (DDP) and Sub-County Development Plans (SCDP). In addition, each sector has a strategic plan. A Pastoralist Policy is currently under discussion and when put in place, it will hopefully provide a framework to guide interventions in Karamoja. One can safely say that policy and planning frameworks are in place. The challenge remains the less than adequate implementation mechanisms and vices like corruption that erode the limited resources available for implementation of these plans and programmes.

- Despite the progress made on these development policy initiatives the problem in Karamoja is far from solved. As noted by parliamentarians from the Greater North in their Strategic Plan 2010-2014: The military response to the Karamoja conflict has greatly undermined the functioning of the civilian authority (for instance court process, elders, prisons and the civil service do not function normally)
- Delivery of basic social services has continued to deteriorate as a result of lawlessness, but also marginalisation.

---

- Disarmament phases have left those who surrendered their guns at the mercy of those who did not. This continues to provide an incentive for further acquisition of guns.
- Cattle raiding is not only a danger to the various Karimojong households, but also among neighbours, especially in Teso. In terms of human welfare impact, it is estimated that cattle raiding has had a far worse impact on Karamoja than the 20 year LRA war in the Acholi & Lango sub regions.
- Government policies and programmes have not recognized pastoralism as a viable way of life and therefore legal institutional frameworks have either ignored or kept silent on poverty and marginalization of Karamoja.

By way of concluding this short policy discourse on Karamoja, it is worth noting that there has been little understanding of Karimojong society by both the colonial and post independence governments of Uganda. This implies that any efforts to develop Karamoja region have largely been about applying standards and policy concepts ignorant of the traditional and environmental setting and thus rejected by the Karimojong.

As already noted above, the causes of the marginalization and impoverishment of Karamoja are largely a combination of limited access to pastoral land, land aridity, cattle rustling and inter and intra ethnic conflicts, and exclusion of the majority of the Karimajong (as rights holders) from key-decision making processes on issues that affect them.
2.0 PROCESS, METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS

2.1 EVALUATION DESIGN

The evaluation exercise of the PT1/3 programme, including report writing, was spread over the period from the last week of June to August 2010. The Evaluation team was composed of three consultants - Basil Kandyomunda, Maude Mugisha and Jackline Kabahinda. The trio are Ugandans with a combined rich experience in programme design and reviews / evaluations, gender and human rights based programming, NGO management, poverty analysis, policy analysis and advocacy.

The review started with an introductory meeting between the Review Team members and the DCA Great Lakes Regional Programme staff. The purpose of this initial meeting was to discuss and agree on design and process issues. This was followed by review of key documents by the team to gain insights on progress and achievements of the PT 1/3 programme as well as programmatic, institutional and technical issues concerning the management of the programme. (See annexes 1 and 3 for Documents reviewed and evaluation program). Thereafter, the team made field visits to Kampala based partners (namely: ACTED, MRGI, UJCC, UCAA, CoU PDR) before going to Karamoja and Teso to visit the partners based in the two regions as well as visit impact sites to talk to the rights holders who are the focus of the programme. Two partners, namely UDN and ULA were met after returning from the field. A telephone discussion was also held with the Executive Director of Uganda Women’s Network (UWONET), a potential partner to DCA at the time of the evaluation. The discussion focused on the areas and issues that UWONET had proposed to address in partnership with DCA.

2.2 METHODOLOGY

2.2.1 Overall description of Methodology

The evaluation methodology involved document review, focus group discussions (FGD) and key informant interviews. DCA Staff, Partner staff, Local Government officials, Community leaders and members of communities.

The evaluation methodology used a holistic approach in which evaluation questions were developed from the ToR and adapted to specific Partner situations and to the strategic objectives of the PT1/3 programme. The evaluation assessed the following:

- **Relevance** – focusing on the extent to which the Programme conformed to DCA policies (Political Space, Right to Food, Rights-Based Commitment and Gender Equality) as well as priorities of Partners and intended rights-holders;
- **Effectiveness** – focusing on the extent to which programme activities have achieved their objectives, including the complementarity or synergy within the programme. Under this, the degree to which DCA’s approach and support is aligned with other Aprodev/ACT partners in the country was considered;
- **Efficiency** – focusing on how well the various cross-cutting issues and Partners’ projects transformed the available funding and other resources
into the intended results for rights holders/ intended beneficiaries, in regard to quantity, quality, timeliness and cost (value for money);

- **Impact** – focusing on changes in the lives of rights-holders as well as in gender structures and relations brought about by the programme;
- **Sustainability** – focusing on the continuity of benefits from the Programme; and
- **DCA Programme Management, Capacity support and Set-up** – focusing on capacity for the implementation of the Programme, that is, structural/organizational set-up, staffing, technical and management competence, skills, attitudes, level of satisfaction, systems, procedures, relations and any other mechanisms or processes that support efficient, effective and coherent delivery of the integrated Political Space/ Food Security Programme at DCA and at Partners level.

### 2.2.2 Document Review

The review of documents provided the evaluation team with information on the PT1/3 programme and related policies, guidelines and reports. It also served to cross-check the qualitative findings from the field. The following documents were examined:

**Dan Church Aid Uganda Programme Documents** –
- Food Security Strategy for Uganda
- DCA Integrated Community Development and Advocacy Strategy
- Gender and Equality, Programme Policy
- Political Space Programme Policy
- The Right to Food, Programme Policy
- Rights Based Commitment, Programme Policy

**Partner Documents including** –
- Proposals to DCA;
- Monitoring Reports;
- Annual Reports;
- Briefing Papers; and
- IEC Materials.

A complete list of documents is annexed.

### 2.2.3 Focus Group Discussions

Focus group discussions (FGD) were convened with both duty bearers (e.g. Local Government Leaders, Partner Organizations), and rights holders (e.g. Cereal banking groups, Women’s Associations, Water committees and other community groups). FGD with government officials sought to establish:

- Development priorities of the district;
- Local Government leaders’ knowledge of Partner programmes funded by DCA;
- Type and nature of development programmes in the district (s);
- Ways in which duty bearers’/partners’ work is related to the DCA policies and strategies in congruence with district plans; and
- Relationship between local government and civil society in the district.
Meanwhile, FGD with partners sought to establish:

- Relationship between DCA and Partner;
- Design of the programme funded by DCA;
- Programmatic achievements in relation to
  - Poverty reduction in Karamoja/Teso Regions
  - Linkages between Partner and communities
  - Nature of participation of communities
  - Benefits to the communities
  - Impact of Partner interventions on gender relations and practices
  - Unintended results (if any).

- Efficiency issues
  - Resources available for the programme and how they are allocated
  - Funding modalities (DCA/Partner)

- Application of rights-based approaches and gender equality
  - Application of RBA to partner programming
  - Nature and quality of participation of the rights holders
  - Accountability of Partners to rights-holders
  - Targeting of marginalized/vulnerable groups (women, youth, children and People with Disabilities)
  - Linkages to international human rights standards
  - Gender equality programming and addressing women’s and girls’ human rights

- Sustainability
  - Mechanisms in place to ensure continuity of benefits of the programme
  - Exit/integration/replication strategies for long term sustainability

FGD with rights holders sought to establish:

- Nature of partner service delivery at community level;
- Implementation modalities and participation;
- Programme achievements from rights holders perspective;
- Key issues of concern to the community;
- Who else is working in the community and what they do?

2.3 PROCESS CHALLENGES

The bad terrain in Karamoja makes accessibility to impact sites rather challenging and therefore limited the number of impact sites that could be visited within the time the team could spend in Karamoja and Teso regions.

Although some partners were initially busy with their own official activities and could not fit in the proposed itinerary of the evaluation, the team was able to accommodate this by rescheduling meetings. The challenge of language barrier was overcome through use of local interpreters.
3.0 EVALUATION FINDINGS

3.1 RELEVANCE OF THE DCA PT 1/3 PROGRAMME

In the context of this evaluation, we take relevance to be a measure of the extent to which the DCA program interventions in the country meet the target population needs and country priorities, and are consistent with the donor policies.

3.1.1 Programme Focus

DanChurchAid has been supporting programmes in Karamoja for over 20 years. In 2006, the programme was designed against the backdrop of multiple complex humanitarian and development challenges facing Karamoja. These challenges include vulnerability, marginalization, inter and intra-tribal and ethnic rivalries, political exclusion from decision-making processes thus exacerbating deprivation from access to and control over resources or public services. National socio-economic indicators still show immense disparity where Karamoja lags behind the rest of the country.

The evaluation findings indicate that most of the PT1/3 Programme interventions are concentrated in Moroto\(^7\), Nakapiripirit, Amudat and Kotido and practically no interventions in Kaabong and Abim. Kaabong is one of the least targeted districts of Uganda with very few development interventions by non-state actors. Although DCA elected to operate through partners, there is no clear mechanism and criteria to guide in the selection of where to locate programme interventions. The evaluation team did not get any information in this regard. Discussions with partners alluded to reasons like:

“*We work in the most neglected and poorest areas*”.

“The whole of Karamoja is marginalised and so we picked on just a few sub-counties*”.

Selecting geographical areas of focus in Karamoja is rather challenging as the whole sub-region is marginalised and vulnerable. Nevertheless, the evaluation team noted that partner activities had fairly targeted the most vulnerable groups. A good example of this is the Caritas Moroto Social Services and Development (SSD)\(^8\) selection of Kodonyo valley, an area that had no access road and no agencies had ever worked there before. With SSD’s intervention a road has been constructed and the area is now accessible. As a result, the first ever school in the area has been constructed with resources from the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF).

Although the Political Space and Food Security programme components were supposed to be developed and implemented as an integrated programme, the evaluation team did not experience a situation where partners and the community indicated that integration has been achieved. In addition communities seemed not to fully appreciate the need for integration. In fact, in the case of Karamoja, partners mentioned that food security comes first and everything else next. One of the Partners mentioned that DCA did introduce them to the Political Space ‘idea’
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7 This now includes Napak which became a new district effective 1\(^{st}\) July 2010
8 SSD is one of DanChurchAid Partners working in Karamoja
but have not given enough guidance and capacity support to help them understand what it is all about and how best to implement the programme. The evaluation team therefore considers that although the Political Space Initiative is a justified and relevant intervention, it may not have been a priority for the people of Karamoja. Inevitably, this probably explains why the food security interventions have thrived more in Karamoja than the Political Space related interventions.

The team also notes that one of the impediments to integration has been the implementation strategy of the programme which has essentially been through funding stand-alone projects which in most cases are implemented in different target areas / districts or sub counties and hence less or no interface between the two programme strategies. This does not aid integrated programming at all. The ideal would be an infusion of political space and food security activities funded projects.

Nonetheless, the Political Space Programme is important for addressing structural causes of poverty, particularly the nature of causes of poverty in Karamoja. The programme, however, needs to be elaborated further and contextualised so that its relevance and applicability is understood by both partners and communities.

The evaluation team upholds the recommendation of the 2008 mid-term review that the geographical focus of the programme remains Karamoja and the justification for extension into the neighbouring districts of Amuria and Katakwi in Teso sub-region. The reasons for this are well elaborated. The evaluation team further observes that the negative effects and attendant problems of Karamoja affect a larger area besides Amuria and Katakwi. It affects all the neighbouring districts to Karamoja stretching from Bukwo, Kapchorwa, Sironko, to Otuke, Pader, and Kitgum. The evaluation team therefore recommends that future programme interventions should consider targeting some of these districts as well, especially the bordering sub-counties. However, the efficacy of this would need to be explored further in light of the fact that Karamoja is a large region and many areas still remain unreached. The decision of DCA about whether to expand to the mentioned districts or not should be guided by the resources available and the capacity of partners to take up this expansion.

3.1.2 Congruence of Programme Objectives and priorities

In terms of the relevance of population targeting; the PT1/3 Strategy paper is clear and identifies it as: “the politically marginalized and poor people living in northern Uganda, specifically, the agro-pastoralists in Karamoja. The indirect target group will be the conflict affected small peasant-farmers in Teso regions of Northern Uganda.”

The Strategy, however, does not sufficiently break down this larger group of rights holders into sub groups such as men, women, youth and children (girls and boys) for targeted programming. For instance, among Partner projects, there appears to have been none specifically targeting the youth and children as rights holders.

---

9 The Karimojong are thus unique in that they are the only group of people in Uganda who live agro-pastoralist lifestyle. They combine pastoralism and large concentration of cattle compared to other neighbouring districts in Teso, Lango and Acholi with less number of livestock.
groups. In Karamoja, the youth and children do not have a voice. Culturally, they are not expected to participate or inform decision making. Hence, unless targeted specifically and engaged, there would be no way they would be part of PT 1/3 as active participants. For example, in Kodonyo Valley, when the evaluation team asked young people below 20 years to stand up and contribute to the discussion, none stood up or volunteered to say anything. The elders claimed that they do not know their ages. A young girl, whose appearance indicated that she was being prepared for marriage, was asked to contribute to the discussion. She was shocked and hid her face in her palms. It was probably the first time she had been asked to speak in a gathering where there are elders.

Furthermore, the young people who participated in focus group discussions in another area revealed that their biggest problem was early marriage. Boys are forced to marry when young to show that they are now men. The evaluation also established that young boys are initiated into the warrior culture which, in addition to fuelling conflict, interferes with their normal psychological and social growth and educational attainment. Girls’ experiences are more of rape and forced marriage to perpetrators. In other circumstances, girls are exchanged for food during the time of famine, or even for local brew by their fathers. Culturally, when girls start menstruating, they are considered mature for marriage. Such circumstances justify disaggregation of target groups for purposes of effective programming.

Overall, gender issues are not adequately integrated because there is no gender analysis at design phase. Empowering women to participate in decision making processes at all levels is very critical and goes hand-in-hand with sensitising the communities to understand and appreciate gender equality.

### 3.1.3 Relevance of Programme Objectives and Activities

The focus of the PT1/3 programme is relevant in that the Karamoja region which has been its main area of operation has the highest prevalence of food insecurity (20%), especially in the southern part of the region: Moroto (30%) and Nakapiripirit (23%). Approximately, 208,000 Karimojong people are food insecure and 387,000 are deemed to be moderately food insecure (total 595,000 persons). One of the major root causes for this is because the Karimajong have been systematically deprived

---

**Box 1: PT1/3 Objectives**

**Development Objective**
Karimojong are enabled to exercise their right to participate for increased influence and control over the distribution of resources

**Immediate Objectives**
1. The capacity of the Karimojong to use available natural resources (land and water) and income resources (livestock and cereals) in a more effective, efficient and sustainable manner is strengthened.
2. Agro-Pastoralists are empowered to challenge power structures and processes that reinforce their socioeconomic and political marginalisation.
3. Legal and moral duty bearers are mobilised to defend the rights of the Karimojong to access natural and public resources.
4. DCA has been instrumental in facilitating increased capacity of Partner organizations in strategic reflections on conflict management, in Advocacy, project planning and outcome oriented monitoring, reporting and evaluation.
of their most fertile pastoral land by the successive government regimes of Uganda through appropriating it for national game parks, game and forest reserves and mineral prospecting sites. 

The PT 1/3 Programme development objective and immediate objectives (outlined in Box 1) had both practical and strategic underpinnings. The Practical aspects of the Programme were aimed at strengthening the capacity of the Karimojong to use available natural resources and their income resources in a more effective, efficient and sustainable manner. Alongside this, the Programme would also mobilise legal and moral duty bearers to defend the rights of the Karimojong to access natural and public resources. This is relevant for addressing Karamoja’s development needs and is consistent with objective 5 of the KIDDP which aims at providing an enabling environment for safeguarding peoples’ basic human rights as well as civil, political, economic and cultural rights during and after disarmament. Strategically, the Programme sought to empower the Karimojong to challenge power structures and processes that reinforce their socioeconomic and political marginalisation.

Partner projects have certainly contributed to the achievement of PT1/3 programme objectives. The evaluation of partner interventions reveals that they have been consistent with and have contributed to a measured realisation of both the practical and strategic aspects of the programme. That is, both the development objective and immediate objectives, especially 1, 3 and 4. However, the realisation of objective 2, in particular, has not been fully achieved because the expected interventions in the Karamoja region by partners such as the Uganda Debt Network (UDN) have not materialised during the lifespan of the programme. And although the Karamoja Agro-Pastoral Development Programme (KADP) did implement some community based monitoring and evaluation activities in a few sub counties, the rest of the players have been more involved in interventions aimed at boosting food security and less of mobilising rights holders to claim their rights.

Likewise, programme interventions in the Food Security cluster; have mainly concentrated more on distribution of goats and sheep, cassava cuttings and seeds, and less on “empowering agro-Pastoralists to challenge power structures and processes that reinforce their socioeconomic and political marginalisation”.

Clearly, the Political Space programme is better positioned and appropriate to addressing this historical problem by enabling the Karimajong to claim their right to land for livelihood purposes. However, within the food insecure circumstances, access to food is of paramount importance. Therefore in the short and medium terms food security issues remain a key priority.

3.1.4 The Appropriateness of Combining PT 1 and 3

Although the mid-term review recommended the integration of PT 1 and 3, the evaluation established that PT 1 and 3 did not readily blend, at least during
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implementation. Apparently, interventions under each component have been implemented in different communities and by different partners with no or inadequate coordination. The organized platform meetings did not effectively harness synergy between the two programme components. Because of this, the evaluation team would like to note that although the integrated PT1/3 programme is relevant and feasible, it has not adequately achieved the expected results. But it is reasonable to say that within the context of Karamoja and Teso where the programme was implemented, Food Security interventions can make more sense alongside the political space component if appropriately coordinated. Hence, to ensure better results, PT 1 and 3 programme components should be targeted to same communities to reinforce each other with human rights principles at the heart of the programme.

Indeed, the PT1/3 is a rights-based programme. Food security is a socio-economic justice issue. With the number of poor Karimajong increasing, as a result of dwindling herds and more turning to food production and agriculture, DCA is correct in supporting and promoting their economic participation. In addition they need to be empowered to challenge policies that perpetuate unfair and inequitable distribution of resources.

### 3.1.5 Appropriateness of DCA Programme policies

The evaluation found DCA policies on development and humanitarian work – for example, political space, Right to food, Rights Based Approaches Commitment policy, and Gender Equality Commitment policy – relevant and appropriate. However, the challenge lies with Partners capacity to adapt them to local circumstances. For instance, the evaluation team did not come across any tools that are being used to translate and integrate policy principles and values into programme interventions.

DCA elected to focus on Karamoja and the areas of Teso that are marginalised and impoverished. The designed interventions are aimed at facilitating the affected people and duty bearers to address the causes of marginalisation and vulnerability. In order to do this in a sustainable manner, the rights holders must be active participants and the interventions should be aimed at enabling them to have greater influence on actions that are aimed at addressing the root causes of their marginalisation. The rights holders should be enabled to influence those with responsibility and power to make the necessary changes to enable them secure and enjoy their rights and entitlements. For that matter, the Rights Based
commitment is relevant and appropriate because it promotes ownership, participation and increased chances for sustainability.

Experience in areas like Katakwi and Amuria where the rights holders have been empowered through interventions of UDN and TEDDO, political and civil leaders were more accountable. They are taking greater responsibility to equally bear on the technical staff to ensure that they deliver.

Likewise, the principle of Gender Equality as prioritised by DCA a critical component that cuts across programme interventions. The Karimojong are a strong patriarchal society. There urgent need to address cultural barriers that undermine girls and women’s self-determination. Understanding and appreciating the value of women and girls in their society is important for bringing about any change in Karamoja.

3.1.6 Conformity with government priorities
An attempt was made to review key national and sectoral policies and programmes to assess the extent to which the DCA PT1/3 interventions are aligned to the national priorities and programmes. Overall, the analysis reveals that the programme is adequately aligned.

Since 1992, the Uganda Government has implemented a comprehensive of decentralization policy toward strengthening local governance. The 1997 Local Government Act operationalised the decentralisation policy. Under this framework, the main role of the Central Government is the formulation of national policies and monitoring of the implementation of those policies while local governments take the responsibility for service delivery. The evaluation team finds the choice of strategy to support partners working at the various levels including national and local levels to be commendable. However, a noticeable shortcoming is that DCA Partners are not yet engaging sufficiently and appropriately with local governance structures.

PT1/3 is aligned directly to at least four of the National Development Plan (NDP) strategic objectives, namely:

- Increasing household incomes and promoting equity;
- Increasing access to quality social services;
- Strengthening good governance, defence and security; and
- Promoting sustainable population and the use of the environment and natural resources

Box 2: NDP Strategic Objectives

1. Increasing household incomes and promoting equity
2. Enhancing the availability and quality of gainful employment
3. Improving stock and quality of economic infrastructure
4. Increasing access to quality social services
5. Promoting science, technology Innovation and ICT to enhance competitiveness
6. Enhancing human capital development
7. Strengthening good governance, defence and security
8. Promoting sustainable population and the use of the environment and natural resources
PT1/3 is also aligned directly to at least 2 of the 4 strategic objectives of the PRDP which basically functions within the NDP. The plan focuses on the sustainable development of Acholi, Teso, Lango and Karamoja, with the aim of mobilizing human and financial resources for the conflict-affected districts. PT1/3 has contributed to the achievement of strategic objectives: 2) rebuilding and empowering of communities; and 3) revitalization of the economy. In fact, the PRDP makes a case for provision of humanitarian assistance and community recovery, which therefore affirms DCA’s work with the Soroti Catholic Diocese Integrated Development Organization (SOCADIDO) post Teso floods humanitarian interventions. Being a disaster prone region, humanitarian emergency interventions are still important when such crises occur, but should not be the flag bearer interventions in Karamoja and Teso. A “twin-track” approach is needed – invest more in development oriented interventions while maintaining readiness for responding to humanitarian emergencies as they arise. It is against this background that the evaluation team applauds the development of community based Early Warning Systems (EWS) by the Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED) and other stakeholders as important initiatives. The DCA-ACTED collaboration on this is an important linkage for reinforcing DCA supported interventions.

PT1/3 is in accord with the *Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Programme* (KIDDP) which is a medium-term framework harmonising the various interventions by the Government and its development partners in the region. The KIDDP’s overall goal is to contribute to human security and promote the conditions for recovery and development in Karamoja. The KIDDP highlights a progressive shift of policy focus in Karamoja, from humanitarian issues to recovery and development processes. PT1/3 has contributed to 3 of the KIDDP components, namely: 3) support the provision and delivery of basic social services; 4) support the development of alternative means of livelihood; and 5) undertake stakeholder mobilisation and education.

Likewise, PT 1/3 is aligned to the principle objectives of the Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA) which provides the framework for transforming Uganda’s agriculture from a subsistence-based to a commercial-oriented sector. The main goals of the PMA include increasing incomes and improving the quality of life of subsistence farmers through increased productivity and greater access to markets. Prosperity for All (PFA) popularly referred to as “Bonna Bagagagawale” in Luganda\(^\text{12}\) which is an attempt to achieve similar goals of PMA through integrated socio-economic programmes for example food security, home improvements, income generation, microcredit, improved marketing targeted to the rural poor.

Having said that, it is important to note that since 1997, the decentralisation policy gives local governments responsibility to plan and deliver the national policies through local government development plans. The findings on the ground, however, reveal that majority of partners are not participating in the local government development planning processes. Most partners neither declare their budgets and funding to local government authorities nor share reports with them, particularly the CAO’s office. This is not being supportive of local governments by

\(^{12}\) Luganda is one of main languages in Uganda and is understood by a large number of people in Uganda
civil society organisations and is sometimes interpreted as a form of arrogance on the part of CSOs. Whilst one of the root causes of the problems of Karamoja, for instance, is lack of effective government, it is important that CSOs follow set procedures by local governments as well as seek to influence the work of local governments. However, it equally important that CSOs strategically keep a comfortable distance from government both at national and local level to be able to question and challenge policies and actions that work against the people.

3.1.7 Addressing the Root Causes and Barriers of Marginalisation
PT1/3 was developed mainly to respond to the identified problems, as pointed out in the context analysis to include: limited access to pastoral land, land aridity, cattle rustling and inter and intra ethnic conflicts, marginalization and exclusion of women from key-decision making processes. In section 3.2 of this report, the evaluation team attempts to discuss the extent to which each of the various interventions (projects) supported by DCA have contributed to addressing these root causes.

However, the Evaluation Team noted that there was less interaction and intermingling between Partners and the Karimojong communities. Individuals who are not Karimojong tend to keep a safe distance from the ‘ways’ of the Karimojong. This could be addressed by adopting the ‘immersion principle’\(^\text{13}\). Otherwise, \textit{Ad hoc} interaction with the communities could be interpreted as having less commitment to the people. Partners who are still linking with Karamoja through outreaches should consider increasing their presence in the region either by setting up field offices or through working more closely with community based organisations on the ground. The collaboration between UDN and TEDDO is an example of what could happen, its challenges notwithstanding.

3.1.8 Recommendations on Relevance of PT1/3
In light of the findings on the relevance of the PT1/3 Programme, the Evaluation Team submits the following recommendations for DCA consideration.

\textbf{Need for visible results} – Because of prevalent apathy within communities and the high dependency syndrome, it is important to demonstrate that change is possible. Hence, DCA partners could work with communities to set up model projects that show what can be achieved. This incremental change is critical for transforming Karamoja. This could involve working with selected groups of agro-pastoralist to demonstrate that reducing the numbers of cows and improving the quality of feeding results in more benefits; supporting the setting up of demonstrations gardens within the communities and owned by community members. These could then be scaled up and experiences shared with other stakeholders. The Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) is already piloting this approach and it could be explored further by DCA and Partners.

\textbf{Improved cooperation with local government} - The government and NGOs need to work together because they are aiming towards similar goals. Their success depends on each other. It is therefore recommended that DCA partners work more
closely with local governments while maintaining their independence without compromising their advocacy role.

**Increased interaction and intermingling with people (immersion principle) at community level** – This is important for building trust and mentoring people to undertake their own development for sustainability.

**Improved targeting mechanisms** – This is necessary to reach the most vulnerable sub counties within the Karamoja and surrounding districts. A sub county based vulnerability mapping exercise should be undertaken to identify the most vulnerable communities to inform future programming.

**Expansion of DCA Programme Coverage** – To go beyond the current districts of operation. The programme could be expanded to districts neighbouring Karamoja including: Bukwo, Kapchorwa, Sironko, Otuke, Pader and Kitgum.

**Ensuring Greater Impact** – a sub county-based integrated planning should be adopted. Once the most vulnerable sub counties have been identified, the next level of planning should be clustering and teaming food security and political space partners to target specific sub counties.

**Undertaking Gender Analysis to Inform Programming** – In-depth gender analysis should be done as part of situations analyses.

**Targeting excluded and vulnerable groups** – such as the youth, elderly and persons with disabilities. These identified groups particularly the youth ought to be specifically targeted in the future programme development.

**Increased Participation of Rights Holders** – Whereas there is relatively high level participation of rights holders during implementation, it is not as high at the design stage and monitoring and evaluation. Participation should be encouraged at all stages of the project cycle including documentation of results.

**Increased Transparency and Accountability** – For purposes of promoting transparency and accountability, partners and DCA should share work plans and reports with local authorities, particularly the office of respective CAO of the district where interventions are being supported. In addition, partners should participate in district development planning processes and ensure that the planned partner interventions are reflected in the district development plans as required.

**Further Elaboration of the Political Space Programme** – This programme component needs to be elaborated further and contextualised so that its relevance and applicability is understood by both partners and communities.

### 3.2 PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT

This section examines performance of the PT1/3 in light of what was expected to be achieved at the design of the programme and the impact on the rights’ holders.
3.2.1 Effectiveness of the programme
This section examines implementation modalities and the extent to which the programme has achieved intended results and the challenges that may have been encountered during the process of implementation. This has been done based on both the development objective stated as “the people of Karamoja are enabled to exercise their right to participate, for increased influence and control over the distribution of resources” and the four immediate objectives that are well documented in the programme log frame. The analysis is therefore, based on the programme commitments as stated in the log frame. Achievements are analyzed against the indicators specified for the immediate objectives and programme components (which are treated as Result Areas [RA]).

3.2.1.1 RA 1: The Capacity of Karimajong to use available natural sources (land and water) and income resources (livestock and cereals) more effectively and sustainably

Karamoja is a region with varying climatic conditions with wet, semi-arid and arid areas. Most of the fertile land is gazetted land by the central government and inaccessible for use by the people. The semi-arid and arid areas which form the biggest part of Karamoja region are prone to droughts, which forces the Karimajong pastoralists to move in search of pasture and water during dry seasons. The focus of the programme under review was mainly on the semi-arid and arid areas where agro-pastoralists experience harsh climatic conditions. Access to and management and control of natural and income resources is a key issue for the people of Karamoja mainly because of their vulnerability and marginalization in relation to land use for grazing their cattle and cultivation; and water for cattle, crop farming and human consumption.

Generally the Karimajong lifestyle and livelihood is heavily dependent upon two main practices – extensive livestock keeping which also plays a very significant role in the religious, social and cultural aspects of the people, and the growing of cereal crops, mainly sorghum in the drier parts and maize in the wetter parts of the region such as the southern parts of Nakapiripirit district and in the western part of Moroto District which is now Napak District since July 2010. Millet and pulses are also grown on a more limited scale.

The areas of intervention identified at the design of the programme were aimed at “alleviating immediate causes of poverty and to facilitate mental space for the Karimajong to address structural causes of their impoverishment”. The assumption was that releasing the pastoralists from concentrating on everyday survival issues especially during the dry season, would give them time to settle and focus on longer term issues. This would change their situations as the engage in debates on their circumstances of poverty and marginalisation. The interventions designed by DCA supported partners aimed at strengthening the drought resilience of the Karimojong by helping them to secure water sources, preserve food and learn new skills for sustaining their lives especially in times of draught and food scarcity. Specifically, DCA supported interventions included:

- Facilitating the establishment of local structures and self-help groups to save and preserve cereals for sale and consumption during dry seasons, when less food is available;
- Maintenance and repair of water sources to ease the search of water for cattle and the people of Karamoja;
- Facilitating control and management of goats and goat products for women and children in periods when male Karimajong are grazing cattle far from the settlements where women and children live;
- Facilitating control and treatment of livestock diseases through community based livestock drug outlets; and
- Facilitating increased production of household food in dry season using dry land farming/organic methods.

**Achievements:**
The evaluation established that there are a number of interventions supported by DCA aimed at sustainable use of natural resources by the Karimajong as well as in the neighbouring districts of Katakwi and Amuria where the Karimajong take their cattle for grazing during the dry spells. These initiatives are undertaken by partners and have included cereal banking, protection of water sources, goat rearing by women and children; support to prevention and treatment of livestock through drug outlets.

**Cereal Banking:**
Over a number of years the Karamoja Agro-Pastoral Development Programme (KADP) has supported cereal banking groups to buy and store cereals and sale later when prices are better. This is two pronged: to make cereals available for food during drought when food is less, and seed for planting when rains begin as well as providing income to the cereal bankers. This has been done through a revolving fund disbursed to the groups by the KADP. Over time, the cereal banking groups have transformed into cereal bank associations to manage the revolving fund. In addition to the revolving fund, KADP provides training for the groups in business skills and access to markets. According KADP, most of the associations are able to control and issue loans to groups, collect loans and keep records of effective and non-effective groups (KADP Annual report 2008).

Inform from annual reports of KADP indicate that by the end of 2008, seven (7) cereal bank associations were fully registered at the sub-county and district levels. And at the beginning of the following year (2009), KADP fully divested its support role to four cereal banking associations in Pian and Bokora. The groups had built capacity to manage their own finances, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of their own programmes and were able to carry on their work without the support to KADP. Indeed, the cereal banking group that the evaluation team met in Bokora was self propelling. This is in consonance with the objective of building the capacity of the Karimajong to use available resources in a sustainable manner. The fact that cereal banking associations are able to continue on their own is testimony to the possibility of sustainable local initiatives.
However, the evaluation team is of the view that these groups need occasional support in the form of refresher courses and new information that will help them to do other things such as accessing markets and improving on their incomes, group development, and leadership and management skills. They also need to be supported to know how to nurture younger groups or assist other community members to establish similar groups in order to scale up the good practice.

(ii) **Support to prevention and treatment of animal diseases:**
Three of DCA Partners, namely; KADP, ACTED and C&D have trained community animal health workers (CAHWs) on disease surveillance, diagnosis, financial management, participatory monitoring and evaluation and equipped them with mobile starter kits to build the capacities of other livestock keepers both at their communities and neighbourhood.

Throughout the period of the programme, 78 CAHWs are reported to have been trained. In addition, a number of people are reported to have benefited from 2 pastoralists’ field schools located in Pian centre and run by KADP. The District Drug Authority has certified these CAHWs as having capacity in managing and administering livestock drugs.

Having animal health workers and animal drugs at community level that are easily accessible is very important for the pastoralists. This had all long been an area which government had neglected. Knowing that the Karimajong depended on their animals as much as they do and having bigger herds than other parts of the country, it would be expected that government would have made it a priority to ensure that there is reasonable service delivery. Nevertheless, shortage of veterinary personnel in the region notwithstanding linkages between the CAHWs and the District Production Department and especially with the District Veterinary Office that are continuously being developed to ensure easy flow of information between the CAHWs and these department. The evaluation team was informed by the CAO of Moroto that there were only two veterinary doctors in the district. This is unbelievable but is the reality.

(iii) **Protection of water sources**
On the other hand, KADP has supported community based borehole repairers (CBBRs) and water user committees (WUC) to create awareness on the need to contribute towards spare parts for the borehole equipment and services. This has been done through training of both CBBRs and water user committees to take up responsibilities of ensuring that water sources are maintained with community contributions for repairs. Six associations of CBBRs have been registered with the sub-counties and districts across KADP programme area. With some form of payment, it is reported that the CBBRs have continued to provide repair and maintenance services for the boreholes and break downs are reported to have reduced. It should be noted here that according to the National Water Policy, maintenance and repairs of rural water supplies is a responsibility of consumer communities, since district local governments receive inadequate funding to enable them cover rural water provision. For that matter WUCs and CBBRs fit very well within this wider policy framework.
A key livelihood issue for Karamoja has for a long time been making water available for people and animals especially during the dry periods. This should be a priority for government, according to many people consulted during this evaluation. They still wonder why there is still no large scale project to solve the water problem of Karamoja, an area that has the potential for contributing to increased food availability and incomes for the people of Karamoja and the country at large. Nevertheless, with support from this program, communities with water ponds have been trained on how to de-silt and maintain these water sources for their livestock. These ponds hold water for reasonably longer periods after rains. In addition, spring protection in the more mountainous areas of the Tepeth has been undertaken and this has made water available for livestock there. Water harvesting efforts through de-silting of water ponds in the target areas has also made water available for vegetable growing and other domestic uses. Water ponds and pans are indeed used for watering livestock as well as some irrigation of household vegetable gardens. The rationale behind maintaining these water ponds and pans through protection and de-silting is to enable pastoralists stay slightly longer in the wet season grazing areas thus giving a bit more time for the grasses in the dry season grazing areas to rejuvenate. It is a form of natural resources management (NRM) and drought risk reduction (DRR). The animals will thus have grasses to feed on for a bit longer during the long dry spells before distress selling and other coping mechanisms can be utilized (both positive and negative).

Efforts to repair water sources including bore holes, springs and water ponds aimed at reducing the search for water for cattle and the people have greatly involved the people at community level and can be said to have achieved a level of success. Reports of KADP reveal that objectives of this component were achieved to the greatest extent. However, it is important to note that the initiatives have largely been undertaken only in Moroto and Nakapiripirit and focuses on a few sub-counties. The initiatives are still small scale and would require to be scaled up to other areas including Kotido and Amudat. This also applies to the control and treatment of livestock through community based livestock drug outlets and training of community based animal health workers which has significantly addressed the problem of animal deaths.

Furthermore, C&D and KADP have been involved in supporting various schools and heath centres in their target areas of operation to undertake rain water harvesting through provision and installation of guttering equipment and water tanks.

However, it encouraging that there is now a Karamoja food security action plan. Hopefully, this action plan will be supported by the necessary resources and well established implementation mechanisms to make a positive difference in the lives of the Karamajong. DCA and Partners should explore opportunities for strengthening collaboration with key stakeholders for mutual support and collaboration. There are also experiences and lessons to share from the ongoing interventions on food security by DCA Partners in the region.
(iv) **Goat rearing by women and children:**

In Karamoja, the cow is a symbol of wealth. The more a household has, the wealthier such a household is considered to be. However, cows are owned and controlled by male members of the household. Women do not own cows and largely do not have responsibility over cows. Men and boys take care of cows while women undertake other roles within the household. Initiatives to provide goats for women have been appreciated by women who have received them.

Some of the DCA partners (KADP and SSD Caritas Moroto) have supported women's groups in their areas of operation and provided them with goats. Women have owned improved goats through cross breeding of local goats and Boer buck breeds for increased milk yield for household consumption and incomes. Women goat groups are equipped with knowledge and skills of managing new cross-breeds. Members of such groups have benefited from training, exchange visits and monitoring processes designed to support the groups to manage their goats. KADP has also provided goats to members of cereal banking groups and this has reinforced and improved the social status of women who have received the goats. The women met during field visits mentioned that they are in charge of the management of their goats and are happy about it. One group started a small slaughter house and sell goat meat. KADP reported that there is evidence that some women groups have been able to raise improved breeds and able sell at reasonably good prices.

**Box 4: KADP Supported Nabokat Women's Goat Group - Community Based Livestock Market Outlet**

Karamoja Agro-pastoral Development Programme (KADP) is using the traditional economic activities of the Karamojong to bring development to the region. Implementing projects in Moroto and Nakapiripirit districts During drought, Karamojong women, children and old people are often left for months without animals to provide them with milk.

... Traditionally, the ownership of livestock among the Karamojong was a preserve of men. Members of the Nabokat Women's Goat Group have changed this attitude and have been taught how to diagnose, administer treatment and purchase drugs for their goats. They have also received training on adding value to goat meat using a local method called 'akuring' that preserves the meat enabling it to last for up to a year.

A noticeable effect of the project is marked increase in goat milk produced by members, which is sold to neighbouring communities to supplement incomes. With the extra money, cattle rustling has also reduced since men from families that are implementing the project have no more need to participate in raids to increase their wealth. ... Due to the success of the project, women are being included on councils of elders in their districts. This is a breakthrough for women's rights in the highly paternalistic Karamojong society.

With the formal recognition, women are able to participate in conflict resolution and community and district development. Among the Matheniko, reputed to be one of the most conservative Karamojong groups, women can now operate their own businesses, sell their goats to contribute to their children's education and pay for their son's dowry.

The Nabokat Women's Goat Group is an example of a simple community- based organization, whose impact has not only changed the economic landscape in Moroto and Nakapiripirit, but is also breaking social barriers and assisting in national peace building and development.

*Source: KADP Files*
Nonetheless, the challenge is that many goat kids do not survive. Discussions with a cereal banking group in Bokora whose members also received goats in Bokora revealed that many of the goat kids had died. Sampling a few members and asking them about the welfare of their goats, 5 out of 8 mentioned that their kid goats had died. This was attributed to the long distances the kids have to walk to the protected kraals and the diseases that they are exposed to in the congested UPDF protected kraals. In addition, some of the women mentioned that they also need ‘bigger goats’ (read cows!). This affirms that women also desire to own a cow which is a symbol of wealth for the Karimojong.

(v) Increasing production of household food
Provision of agricultural inputs and storage facilities (silos) for communities as was seen in Apetolim to store their harvest and preserve part of it for sell later at a more favourable price, is intended to assist the people in these areas to access and increase incomes. The storage facilities, constructed by Omanimani Community Development Organization (OCODI) in form of silos, also encourage people to grow more food crops because they have somewhere safe to store their food. Community members expressed hope that food silos will help them store food for times of need instead of selling all their harvests. They also hoped that the silos will protect their harvest against pests that usually attack harvest when stored in their small houses. The evaluation team found that community members did provide the land for the silo and security of materials during construction. Communities have organized themselves through working together which also provides an opportunity for sensitising them about issues like HIV, gender equality and reproductive health. Mobilisation for their participation becomes much easier.

However, the increase in food production at household level is not yet fully realized. Very few community members are involved in food production. Cereal banking has been useful for providing food to communities but at a higher cost. This means that most of the community members cannot afford – food is only available for those who have money. In addition, the production and eating of vegetables among the Karimojong is still very limited. Hence, more work needs to be done to convince them to grow and eat vegetables as part of improving nutrition.

While interacting with some of the community members in Apetolim, the evaluation team was informed that settling in the area had helped them to adjust to a new way of life. These are Karamajong who had been displaced by insecurity in their home areas and were encourage settling in this area at the border with Amuria, which was more secure. They mentioned that they are learning crop farming. One of them said:

“As for me, I was a rustler. I lived a wild life, not caring for anything. Now I am here, I have a wife and I go everyday to the garden to dig. My wife takes care of our child and also helps me in the garden. This is new to me and I like it.” (Participant, focus group discussion, Apetolim).

However, while during the discussion with this particular group, the evaluation team was frustrated by the drunken state of most of the participants. At eleven o’clock in the morning the majority were drunk, both women and men. They kept...
interruption the discussion until the evaluation team decided to select the few sober ones and asked the rest to leave the meeting place. This was reported to be a problem in the area. The OCIDI field officer working with the community mentioned that they start drinking early and engaging them in anything needs to happen early in the morning before most of them get drunk. This, if it continues, will hinder efforts to work with this community. Sensitisation on prevention of alcoholism needs to be integrated in community approaches used to work with such groups.

In another areas visited earlier before Apetolim, it was mentioned that when there is good harvest, a lot of food is wasted on festivities involving brewing and consuming a lot of alcohol and people spend many days without doing any work. It was reported that cereal banking in that particular community had helped people to realise that they should not waste so much food in these events but to store it for income and food a later time.

3.2.1.2 RA 2: Empowerment of Agro-pastoralists to challenge power structures and processes that reinforce their socio-economic and political marginalization

Karamoja as a region has suffered from social, political and cultural isolation. The absence of a clear, consistent and enforced government policy on conflict and insecurity in Karamoja over the years contributed to its marginalization. Now with KIDDP in place and being implemented the situation is changing. The tendency has been to aim at ‘changing the Karimajong and their way of life’ rather than trying to understand them better and support them to cope with adversity while helping them to adapt to changing situations. Both the colonial and post-independence governments viewed the pastoralist way of life as chaotic, economically unproductive and environmentally destructive. Efforts were made to settle pastoralists through imposition of boundaries, gazetting of land for game and forest reserves, restriction of movement to dry season grazing areas, forced de-stocking and marginalization of customary institutions.

Areas of intervention planned to respond to the situation described above included:

- Sharing of research information among the Karimajong themselves who have been the subject of many studies and yet information obtained through these studies has not been taken back to the people who need to use it to improve their lives;
- Awareness raising about rights and building capacity for advocacy among the people of Karamoja; and
- Supporting the establishment of local groups and building their capacity to monitor the proper use of government and private funds invested in Karamoja, and literacy training for Karimajong so that they are able to read
Processes of empowering agro-pastoralists in Karamoja region have included a wide range of partner interventions. They include the Uganda Joint Christian Council (UJCC) initiative - “Support to Decentralization through the Karamoja traditional system” aimed at strengthening decentralization by enhancing community participation in development and demanding accountability from their local government leaders in Karamoja. UJCC has implemented the programme in Kotido, Kaabong and Moroto districts focusing on two sub-counties in each district. The programme has trained members of local government staff (49) in issues of conflict sensitivity approaches, decentralization and the rights based approach to development. A training of trainers course in participatory resource monitoring and tracking (PRMT) was done for 64 community members and these have in turn reached 400 Parish leaders and 1600 village leaders respectively and sensitized them on PRMT. UJCC reports to have reached 1,719 citizens in Karamoja through community dialogues conducted at parish level in the three districts and 229 citizens participated in discussions of ‘issues of concern to the citizens’. Drama groups in the three districts have been supported to spread information on citizen participation on decentralized governance.

While reaching big numbers as mentioned above is quite impressive, some questions should be answered through a more result oriented reporting so that achievements are clearly highlighted. Many of the partners continue to report by describing what they did without reflecting on the effect of their actions and what was achieved. For instance when it is mentioned that “participated in discussions of ‘issues of concern to the citizen”, does not make much sense unless the ‘issues of concern’ are mentioned and follow-up actions and results achieved highlighted.

In Katakwi and Amuria districts of Teso sub-region, UDN in collaboration with Teso Dioceses Development Office (TEDDO) have worked with CBOs to strengthen their capacity to work with communities on monitoring service delivery programmes by government and other actors in their communities. This has been an important collaboration where a National NGO has support a local NGO (faith-based) to strengthen their capacity. Both organizations report of a mutual learning cooperation arrangement that has strengthened the quality of work done by TEDDO at community level. The CBOs supported by UDN and TEDDO have increasingly become independent and it is expected that they would become autonomous entities at community level able to work independently of both UDN and TEDDO.

Meanwhile, in Amuria district the community based monitors felt they had influenced change and as a result the communities were being to notice greater penetration of government services:

- Rural Feeder roads have been monitored and shoddy works exposed and presented to the authorities concerned for action as observed in one of their reports;
- More teachers’ houses are reportedly constructed in Amuria Districts;
- NAAADS programmes for the first time reached the target beneficiaries in Orungo Sub County. According to one monitor, the first batch of implements
was intentionally delayed, with some beneficiaries left out. “It has been a
different story in 2009-2010 where everything has been delivered correctly,
courtesy of our monitoring system”...., and

- Health services improved e.g. Magoro maternity ward now under
  construction. The community groups also monitor cleanliness at the Health
  centres.

What is of concern for the evaluation team is the creation of community based
monitoring and evaluation groups with various allegiances. It was common
practice to hear mention of “our groups”, “their groups”, “UDN community
groups”, “TEDDO groups” This may in the long term turn into handicap that might
hamper their long term survival and efficacy.

Participation of some elders from Karamoja in regional pastoralist elder’s forum in
Nairobi – bringing together pastoralists from Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania to
discuss issues affecting pastoralists in the region. This was facilitated by KADP in
2009. Again here one would ask what has been achieved through attending such
an important forum. There is no evidence that there was information and
knowledge sharing on return from the forum.

On the other hand, alleviating the immediate causes of poverty and empowering
the Karimojong to address structural causes of their impoverishment is surely
beginning to happen among limited numbers of the Karimojong through
awareness raising. However, not many Karimojong have been reached within the
Political Space Programme. Most of the successes of empowering communities
have happened in Teso through the work of TEDDO and UDN. Most of the
initiatives in Karamoja are food security related and needs based. A large number
of Karimojong are still dependent on food aid. For instance, Wold Food Programme
(WFP) is still feeding large numbers of people in Moroto district. The evaluation
team did not come across interventions where communities are effectively claiming
their right to food. Hence, much more still needs to be done to support them to
question their continued dependence on food aid and to demand for this situation
to be changed.

3.2.1.3 **RA 3: Legal and moral duty bearers are mobilized to defend the
rights of the Karimojong to access natural and public resources**
The lack of government policy on key issues such as pastoralism and clear
leadership on development for Karamoja has led to allocation of inadequate
resources to Karamoja. This has in a sense served as a disincentive to donors’
investment in the region. As a result, Karamoja remains marginalized in terms of
access to resources for development. Luckily, discussion on a pastoralism policy
have been initiated and when in place, the policy will guide development
practitioners in the Karamoja region and hopefully encourage government to
channel resources to improving the life of pastoralists.

Areas of intervention planned in relation to mobilization of duty bearers included:
- Mobilization and training of pastoralist MPs in rights based advocacy for
  agro-pastoralists, linking the MPs with their constituents through dialogues
  and exposure of the MPs to good practices from other countries;
• Lobbying for the implementation of the 1998 Uganda Land Act;

• Facilitating exposure visits for Ugandan and other journalists to Karamoja so as to contribute to a better understanding of the agro-pastoralists and their situation; and

• Documenting the relationship between poverty and marginalization in Karamoja and the issue of access to and control of land.

**Achievements:**
A number of DCA partners have undertaken initiatives that contribute directly or indirectly to the achievement of this objective focusing on duty bearers. The work of UJCC on strengthening decentralization and linking the traditional system of government and the local government system is an important element. The traditional leaders have been trained and sensitized about the operations of the local government system and how this operates in a decentralized structure. This according to UJCC has helped traditional leaders to understand how local governments work and the nature of services that are expected to be delivered. The traditional leaders in turn are able to understand what rights they need to claim on behalf of their communities as well as the obligations they have as leaders in bringing about peace and harmony in the region.

A Parliamentary bulletin produced quarterly and addressing relevant issues related to bills being discussed in Parliament has been useful in providing information to the legislators and advocacy organizations. UJCC has addressed key issues in the Mortgage bill, the Criminal Court Bill and the bill on the regulation and interception of communication. These bills have been passed into law with the contribution of UJCC and other civil society organizations. In addition key among the bills that UJCC contributed to was the Domestic Violence Bill that has also been passed by Parliament and contains key provision for protecting women, girls and children against domestic violence. This is an applaudable innovative strategy that is well targeted. This kind of work needs to be strengthened and expanded to reach more areas in Karamoja and Teso regions.

Strengthening collaboration between Members of Parliament (MPs) and Religious Leaders as duty bearers has been another effort to bring together the two as a way of strengthening the relationship between legislators and religious leaders. Issues in the meeting organized by UJCC included the concern by citizens over the low level of attendance of MPs at plenary and committee meetings; limited consultations with the constituencies they represent and the use of the
constituency development fund given to each Member of Parliament. A key issue related to the situation of Karamoja raised with the Parliamentarians was about the human rights abuses in the forced disarmament in Karamoja, which according to the religious leaders, Parliament had not given due attention.

Another area of focus has been challenging religious leaders to take up governance issues as an important aspect of their role as leaders. Often politicians have said that religious leaders should stay away from politics and governance issues. This has been interpreted to mean that religious leaders should not question what government is doing so some have desisted from getting involved in supporting communities to demand their entitlements but concentrated on provision of services to complement government efforts. Service delivery has been seen as the best way of translating God’s concern for His people and to work to relieve the suffering of the poor and marginalized people by responding to their needs. However the programme through the political space component has illuminated the role of religious leaders and agencies in confronting barriers that continue to stand in the way of people meeting their needs. Some of these barriers are related to governance and therefore promoting good governance is clearly a responsibility that religious leaders cannot circumvent.

Faith based institutions involved in development work have realized that it is not enough just to provide services to the people but that it is important to support the people to stand up for themselves and demand for accountability in service delivery by government and other duty bearers. A discussion with the staff of SSD Moroto revealed that the idea of the political space from a rights perspective is getting clearer and that communities had started to embrace it.

The work of KADP in supporting the identification and formation of Community Land Associations (CLAs) is a case in point where communities have been supported to organize themselves to claim their rights. KADP backed CLAs have been trained on the importance of acquiring a certificate for customary land ownership participants including both women and men have been trained in community land rights and the importance of legal land ownership. KADP involvement in sensitization, meetings, training and discussions led to 82 participants and 8 CLAs actively advocating for legal land ownership, management and sustainable use. Formation of CLAs is an important development at community level and the momentum needs to be sustained to address the issues of land.

Through support from Minority Right Group International (MRGI), KADP was able to train 24 pastoralists’ elders on Human Rights approaches and perceptions in the context of International and National Laws and Conventions, and what this means to the Karimajong pastoralists in the context of their issues. It was realized that there was need for active advocacy work for the Pastoralists issues. This led to the formation of the Karamoja Pastoralists Advocacy Forum. While the evaluation team was not able to meet any members of this forum, it is important that this be followed up to explore ways of working with this group through which the pastoralists would raise their voices. The Karamoja Civil Society Network known as Riamriam is bracing itself to support such advocacy efforts. The evaluation team met the coordinator of the network. The network is strategically
positioned and potentially a useful arrangement. DCA partners would do well to explore possibilities of working with the network to advance the cause of pastoralists.

The work of Uganda Land Alliance of supporting communities in Karamoja (Iriri Sub-county) to undertake community mapping of their land and having the land registered in their names is a commendable initiative. ULA in collaboration with local government is assisting people to do their own mapping of land. In addition ULA has launched a petition for de-gazetting part of the wildlife reserve which covers most of the fertile areas in Karamoja, mainly in Iriri Sub-County. The challenge here is that Uganda Wildlife Authority is vigorously fighting to preserve this land as it has the water table for the region. ULA may need to engage experts to analyze the pro and cons of this move and what is advantageous for the people of Karamoja in the long run in terms of sustainable environmental management.

The Uganda Land Alliance is also advocating, through the national land policy development process for a provision specifically to address the issues of Karamoja. Initially, ULA held wide consultations with communities in Karamoja so that their interests are addressed by the new land policy. One of the issues raised by the communities was the issue of recognition of communal resources in the National Land Policy. Through working closely with the drafting team of the National Land Policy, it is expected that positive provisions to advance the cause of the Karimojong will be realized. ULA is also working with other partners including Oxfam UK to push for the passing of the pastoralism bill which, it is hoped, will pave the way for due recognition of pastoralism as a valid way of life that needs to be supported and transformed for the benefit of the pastoralist communities in the country, the majority of whom are in Karamoja.

The mobilization of duty bearers to defend the rights of the Karimojong to access natural and public resources is an area where efforts have been limited by scope and duration. ULA is doing a commendable job in Iriri sub-county by supporting the mapping exercise by the communities. It is pleasing to hear that some community members, including a few women have had land registered in their names. However, this initiative is still young and only in Iriri Sub County. According to ULA this initiative is a pilot and hopefully, it will be replicated. It is expected that the success of this will eventually be replicated to more areas, by government and other partners.

By way of concluding this section, the Evaluation team would like to note that there are many good things happening as a result of DCA Partner interventions as highlighted. However, the evaluation team has also observed that the rights based approach to programming is not yet well internalised by some of the partners, especially those focused on service delivery which is essentially a needs based approach. More work needs to be done ensure that the rights-based programming is well understood, appreciated and applied. This could be done through a mentoring approach to partners with this need.
3.2.1.4: RA 4: Strengthen the capacity of NGOs to work strategically for poverty eradication and inclusion of agro-pastoralists and small scale peasants in local and national policy processes

The areas of intervention in this respect focus on the role and added value of DCA in capacity building of partners to work strategically for poverty eradication and inclusion of agro-pastoralists and small scale peasants in the Karamoja/Teso area in local and national policy processes. Planned interventions were aimed at:

- Strengthening the capacity of programme partners on issues related to advocacy, outcome oriented monitoring and evaluation;
- exploring ways of addressing and managing the conflict between the Karimajong and the Iteso in order to develop a distinct peace and reconciliation strategy;
- exploring the possibilities and strategies to strengthen the links and cooperation between local CBOs in Teso/Karamoja and NGOs at national level;

Achievements:

In order to improve its partners’ capacity to implement effective advocacy campaigns, DCA undertook to train selected staff of partner organizations in advocacy. The training involved a 4-Module targeted skills-building programme. The training modules included (i) planning an advocacy campaign; (ii) building relationships with Government; (iii) working with Media; and (iv) working in coalitions. Through a combination of training and technical assistance, DCA partners were taken through a process aimed at building their skills in advocacy. 28 staff members of 14 partner organizations participated in the training. An evaluation of this process however, revealed that most partners had not sufficiently used the skills gained for effective advocacy. To quote from the evaluation report of the PACT (Policy and Advocacy Training) and paraphrased:

“While DCA invested significantly in training the partner organizations, utilization of the skills acquired remained a challenge to most organizations. This was because of various reasons ranging from lack of resources to departure of the trainees for better jobs to resistance by the local governments. Transition from service delivery to advocacy for better services was an uphill task for some partners that were not originally practicing advocacy. .... local governments looked at the new approach to development with suspicion and surprise.... some the organizations decided to take it slow and with no regular and consistent follow-up by DCA, the advocacy activity was more or less left in the back burner.”

Box 7: Objective 4 Indicators:

- Advocacy issues taken up by DCA partners are supported by reliable documentation and effective communication strategies.
- DCA and partners have gathered sufficient knowledge and experience to contribute to the development of a peace and reconciliation strategy for Uganda/region.
- Increase in partners’ plans reflecting a right based approach and progress reports include assessments of outcome and discussions of lessons learnt.
- Outcome, lessons learnt and the feasibility of approaches chosen are discussed at programme steering committees.
- Steering group agreeing on a strategy on how to strengthen the relationships between local CBOs and national NGOs in Kampala.
This indicates that the programme has not fully achieved the purpose of strengthening partners to become strong and effective advocacy agents. It would be useful for DCA and Partners to reflect on why they have not been able to utilize the skills gained and what needs to be done differently to ensure that future capacity building efforts are effectively utilized.

More discussion on DCA’s contribution to capacity building of her partners is in section 3.5.

3.2.2 Factors that have contributed to the achievement of the objectives

Various factors have contributed to the achievement of set objectives. These include the flexibility and timeliness of funding. Partners mentioned that DCA is very flexible in their funding modalities. They are open to discussion with partners about partner priorities although they also have their own priorities. They are open to co-funding of programmes with other donors and in some cases they have contributed to matching funds so that partners can be able to access other grants. Partners also said that, in comparison with other partners, they are happy with the flow of funds from DCA. They mentioned that funds are released timely. Some partners mentioned that sometimes there are delays but these are usually explained and does not make the partners anxious. Some partners have been provided with vehicles outside their programme grants and this has facilitated their work. They mentioned that this has been a big boost to the organisations to do their work in the field better.

Another aspect that was mentioned is that DCA has encouraged partners to collaborate on certain issues and supported them in this partnership. Uganda Debt Network and TEDDO entered into a collaborative partnership with the encouragement and support of DCA to implement together a CBMES project with communities in Katakwi and Amuria. This partnership, according to the two partners, has worked very well and achieved better results for the communities. However, both partners mentioned that the early phase of the partnership was quite challenging but hurdles have been overcome and they are working well together. In the same vein, UDN sought partnership with KADP of Moroto. However this relationship did not materialise as KADP was experiencing some internal challenges. At the time of the evaluation, UDN was in the process of identifying another partner to work with in Karamoja region.

According to the majority of the partners, working closely with local authorities (community leaders) in the respective areas of operation has also been seen as a facilitative factor. Winning the trust and confidence of local authorities is critical for working in a decentralised structure. Most of the partners say they have endeavoured to work more closely with government. However, discussions with local authorities pointed to the contrary. There has been little sharing of information and joint planning with local governments. Therefore whilst working with local community leaders who are part of the rights holders is good, the partners need to scale up this collaboration to higher level especially with local governments at the sub county and district levels. This, as already stated elsewhere in this report should involve participation in the local government development planning processes, sharing of information and reporting.
Another factor that has been important in the implementation of the programme has been the existence of a programme advisory committee. In order to promote coordination between DCA and its partners, avoid duplication of work and facilitate strategic reflections and the sharing of lessons learnt, a programme advisory committee (PAC) was established. The PAC consists of DCA partner organisations being supported under the framework of the PSP and DCA. The purpose of establishing the PAC was to facilitate joint sharing of lessons learnt and strategic reflections on the feasibility and impact of strategic approaches adopted by the political space programme. The objective was to strengthen impact and synergy of project activities funded under the framework of the PSP. There was also a possibility that the PAC would take care of the HIV/AIDS Programme and other cross-cutting issues which included training in advocacy, rights based programming, outcome monitoring and promotion of gender equality.

3.2.3 Factors that may have hindered the achievement of objectives
A number of factors have had a negative effect on the achievement of set objectives. Some of these include a high degree of dependency that has been perpetuated by the conflict situation in Karamoja and the Teso region especially the new districts of Katakwi and Amuria. Karamoja has experienced cyclic drought and periods of hunger over a long time. In Karamoja, drought reduces agricultural output to less than 30% of normal levels leaving the over 1 million people food insecure. This is demonstrated by the presence of the UN World Food Programme that has been in Karamoja for over the last 40 years, although not providing food aid on a continuous basis. Some years have hard good harvests and therefore reduced the need for food aid in some areas of Karamoja. Amuria and Katakwi districts in Teso region experienced food insecurity following limited recovery from the floods of 2007 due to poor first-season harvests (July-August 2008), but also due to occasional cattle raids from the Karimajong which goes along with looting of food from granaries and in gardens especially cassava. The displacement of the people in these areas by the LRA forced them into camps where they had to depend on food aid.

All these factors have led to the majority of populations in these areas dependent on food aid over long periods. Displacement of population due to the conflicts has also meant that people are unable to access their fields for cultivation and therefore have to be fed. In addition the helplessness caused by conflict also means that humanitarian aid has included other necessities of life such as provision of household utensils and agricultural tools for returning IDPs to their original communities. This means that people have developed a dependence syndrome always expecting outsiders to come to their aid and this has killed initiative and creativity for survival and traditional coping mechanisms have been undermined.

Another related factor, according to partners met is the unreasonable expectations from communities. It was reported that communities have developed a habit of always expecting agencies, especially NGOs working with them to provide incentives in form of cash for participating in programme activities like meetings or undertaking tasks that would normally be viewed as voluntary and for the good of the community. This is not happening in conflict areas only but is a national problem!
Furthermore, the majority of the partner CSOs mentioned inadequate funds and other resources to match the expectations of the rights-holders / communities they are targeting to work with. Most of these organisations (especially local NGOs) have few funding partners and their commitments only limited to very short spans, often one-year commitments.

3.2.4 Changes in the context and their effect on the program

The relationship between the state and civil society in Uganda can be viewed as a ‘love-hate’ one. Many times, government officials are reported saying that they value the contribution of NGOs and view them as complementing government. When civil society organisations are delivering services like building schools, providing additional resources to support government units to implement their mandates, they are viewed as good partners doing a good job. However, when CSOs challenge government about issues like corruption and lack of transparency and accountability, then they are castigated for being unpatriotic and less objective.

Having said that, it is important to note that Government especially at local government level has to a large extent welcomed the contribution of CSOs to humanitarian and development work. However the challenge has been and remains that some CSOs do not submit their work plans and reports to the local governments of the areas where they work as required by the Local Government Act (1997) and other policy guidelines in relation to collaboration with government. This has in some cases resulted in local government viewing the NGO sector as lacking transparency while they (NGOs) encourage communities to demand accountability. Some of the local governments have also lacked the mechanisms for guiding NGO work in the districts.

In Karamoja and Teso sub-regions the limited relationship with the state has been more collaborative than confrontational and more supportive than challenging. However in view of the issues of marginalisation and abuse of rights as has been the case in Karamoja and some areas of Teso sub-regions, civil society has the moral duty to stand against the ills perpetuated by bad governance and outright neglect and marginalisation of people in these regions.

On the other hand majority of the individuals and groups consulted cited corruption as a major problem affecting delivery of services in Karamoja, Teso and elsewhere in Uganda. Poor service delivery especially in road construction where bribery to district officers (councillors and technical persons) results into shoddy work by contractors, provision of medicines in hospital and health centres, where medicines are stolen by health workers, and the water sector, where contractors do not put water points as agreed but get away with it. There are a number of special government development programmes covering Karamoja and Teso regions, such as NUSAF and NUREP and PRDP. However, there are reports (through discussions with local authorities, young and older people in Karamoja and Teso that serious problems exist, including diversion of development funds to elites’ pockets, poor coordination among NGOs and phantom projects which are reported as completed when nothing or little has been done on the ground. The
unstable security situation in the region apparently provides an ideal environment to hide such abuses.

The challenge is that in the face of such corruption, people at community level do not take a proactive stance against corruption. In most of these areas affected by conflict and insecurity, people are busy with daily livelihood and survival concerns and claiming their right to development is still far-fetched. Participants in the regional workshops pointed out that people at community level are ignorant of their rights as citizens and demanding accountability from leaders and service providers does not come readily. This is why the work of UDN and TEDDO in establishing Community Based Monitoring groups is important and should be supported to cover all districts of operation.

Furthermore, the Constitution of Uganda and the Local Government Act, provide for participation of citizens in development policy processes and decision making. For that matter, the process of local government development planning is supposed to be a participatory “bottom-up” process. However, in spite of districts being made smaller and smaller, consultations with communities are rarely undertaken and citizen participation in decision making is still very limited only to Council Members and rarely anchored in the communities.

In Karamoja and Teso regions, pastoral communities had their own mechanisms for resolving local level disputes, both within their communities and with others. These were based on traditional institutions such as mediation through a council of elders. These institutions were respected by community members and hence those affected generally complied with decisions, including punishment of offenders and compensation. However, in recent times, these resolution mechanisms have been weakened or overlooked, by for instance the army which has deployed heavily in a bid to pacify the region. The recent years have been marked by cordon and search operations, introduction of protected kraals.

The evaluation revealed that the youth are emerging as new centre of power in Karamoja, probably threatening the tradition societal power system mainly vested in the clan elders. With easily available cheap small arms that have flooded the region due to the prevalence of conflicts in neighbouring areas and countries especially Southern Sudan and Somalia, the youth has emerged as a new centre of power in the community as they gain access to arms and use them to steal cattle and are becoming richer than the elders who have traditionally had greater wealth than other members of the community.
In addition, an Oxfam GB Conflict Study report revealed that although cattle rustling was traditionally perceived as a cultural practice, it has now taken a new tinge. It is believed that stolen cattle are often sold commercially with the help of corrupt businessmen and politicians\textsuperscript{14}. This means therefore that the mechanisms for addressing the issue of cattle rustling have to change.

### 3.2.5 Effectiveness of implementation strategies and modalities

Most DCA partners are located or have a presence in the regions of focus, that is, Karamoja and Teso regions. A few who are not based in the area have field contacts or work in collaboration with local CBOs. Others like UJCC use an outreach approach through already established structures within their mandates. The evaluation team notes that there is a reasonable balance in the mixed bag of strategies and modalities employed by DCA partners to be able to deliver the programme effectively.

However, the challenge is that there seems to be limited cohesion between and amongst the partners despite the fact that there is a partner's platform for sharing information and building synergy. The various partner organisations hardly realise they are implementing the Integrated PT 1/3 programme. Each one is minding about their own project and in most instances there is hardly any sharing of information or resources between even partners operating in the same or neighbouring communities.

The partners forum was first and foremost seen by partners as an initiative of DCA and not theirs. Initially the agenda setting for the platform was even perceived as DCA’s issue, although now the organising partner plays a bigger role. At the partners’ platform meeting, the partners are only sharing information from their individual projects which were developed separately in different locations with different communities and therefore with little chance of reprogramming. During project implementation of the various partners, there is little or no interaction as different partners have different locations and hence little or no integration at all. For instance, the evaluation team found hardly serious interaction and sharing of information between the three partners of the European Commission Humanitarian Aid partnership project. Each one has a separate funding agreement with DCA, and each reports separately.

Even among the partners that are jointly implementing a project like UDN and TEDDO, there evaluation team found undertones of “competition” rather than “collaboration”. There were expressions of disagreements in strategies and approaches within the projects being implemented by the same partner but funded by different partners. For instance the operational modalities for the UDN /TEDDO CBMES work in Amuria were different and contradictory in some instances with the UDN CBMES project interventions funded by CONCERN Worldwide in different sub counties in the same district.

\textsuperscript{14} Oxfam Karamoja Conflict Study: A report, 2000, p.30
For the future, the evaluation team recommends more integrated programme planning, so that right from the start the various partners are aware that they are planning and contributing to the same programme.

### 3.2.6 Choice of partners in relation to the Programme objectives

Based on the objectives and components of the programme, the choice of partners is quite appropriate. While a few partners have programmes cutting across DCA programme components, at least each partner contributes to the realization of the objectives of the specific components of the programme. While the process of designing the programme is not mentioned, it appears to the evaluation team that the programme design sufficiently considered the due contribution of each partner.

A gap in the programme alignment with Partners is the gender mainstreaming component. While the programme document articulates issues of gender equality in the situation analysis there are no gender specific indicators and indeed the programme components as stated in the document are gender neutral. As the saying goes, ‘what is not counted does not count’, gender equality was relegated to the margins by the design of the programme. Fortunately however, some of the Partners were already well ahead in addressing gender equality issues and have addressed some issues albeit with some gaps. KADP, UDN, SSD and ULA are an example of this. The evaluation team was pleased to note that SSD, a faith based organisation has made some progress in addressing gender issues. Just to quote a statement made by one of the staff during discussions:

“There has been a shift towards gender equality as the rural women have got involved in the trainings and they have become trainers in turn for the other villagers which empowers them. Issues such as SGBV and FGM have been addressed. They have been integrated in all projects though it has been recognised as a unique aspect deserving a lot of attention because of the structure of power stance in Karamoja. There has been gender mainstreaming training for all staff. The surgeons who perform FGM have been sensitised and lobbied to campaign against the practice.” – staff, SSD

The work of the Moroto Nakapiripirit Religious Leaders Initiative for Peace (MONARLIP) during 2008/2009 funded by ICCO and DCA focused on sensitising the people of Karamoja about women’s rights. Some of the interventions targeted
men specifically and urged them to value their wives and daughters and not to mistreat women or treat them like possessions. The intervention also focused on family planning and child spacing and discouraging polygamy through discussions on problems related to this practice. Other issues included cross-generation marriages - marrying off very young girls to old men; the dangers of cattle rustling and the need to live in harmony with their neighbours in Teso. Women were encouraged to talk to their husbands and girls to convince young men and discourage them from rustling with messages in form of pictures indicating that they (young women) do not want to marry cattle rustlers.

The choice of experienced International NGOs like ACTED, C&D in the consortium with KADP to implement project focusing on drought preparedness activities in pastoral areas in semi-arid lands was also appropriate. The two (ACTED and C&D) have developed expertise in the field of developing strategies provision for water for humans and animals; promoting livestock and livelihoods and developing early warning system. The partners have also proved to work well with communities and in close cooperation with district authorities probably better than with any other partners in ensuring that technologies, capacities and design of their interventions reflect the priorities of the rights holders and duty bearers.

Furthermore the choice of national partners (CSOs) working at the national level such as UDN, ULA, UJCC, and UCAA to participate in the programme implementation was a good strategy, in as far as getting the issues of Karamoja onto the national agenda. However, this primary motive should have been made more succinct and the success indicators pegged to this goal.

Although the religious organizations have tried to address gender inequality, their interventions are still too little and not deep enough. The intention seems to be there but it is not dynamic enough and there is a pronounced conservatism that protects patriarchy in religious circles. It is rather difficult to ‘touch’ because strong intentions are expressed in support of gender equality by religious leaders. However, this spirit of conservatism against gender equality is there, hovering over religious leadership. Religious leaders need to come out boldly and pronounce themselves on gender equality and direct the development agencies under their constituencies to put in place strategies to address gender inequality and to promote gender equality.

Other Partners are still slow on gender equality promotion and lack both the will and intent to address it more strategically. On a more considerate note one can say that the intent may be there but the how to address strategic needs of women and girls in relation to men and boys is lacking.

3.2.7 Effect of choice of partners on RBA and Gender Programming

Working with a rights-based and gender equality approach is deliberately the chosen path of the programme. This is definitely an applauded choice and should be nurtured and sustained with passion and enthusiasm by DCA partners. For many development actors, the needs approach has been the ‘normal’ approach to development work and this has over the years proved inadequate. On the other hand patriarchy takes lead in Uganda’s society. Partners’ engagement with gender equality issues has already been elaborated in 3.2.6 and need not be repeated
here. However, it is important to emphasize that RBA and Gender Equality integration calls for a change in the mindsets and attitudes of rights holders and duty bearers alike, not just to give it lip service, as is sometimes the case. It is a process and takes time to get rooted. However this cannot and should not be used to evade accountability for mainstreaming rights and gender in their (partners) programming. The two are fundamentally critical for successful and sustainable interventions.

3.2.8 Impact on Gender structures, Relations and Practices
The programme design did not have a deliberate focus on influencing gender structures, relations and practices. However this focus is called for in a programme of this nature and the evaluation team notes that it is an area that deserves due attention in a follow-on programme. Among DCA current partners, there isn’t a single women’s organization, (although it is understood that discussions for partnership are under way with UWONET. While gender integration and mainstreaming would be more ideal, the situation of Karamoja where patriarchy is still entrenched, a lot more work needs to be done to analyze gender issues and devise strategies to address them through a multiplicity of approaches. Empowerment of women and girls particularly in decision making and leadership in their communities is critical and women’s organisations have developed and continuously improved approaches to do this especially at grassroots level. Working with and supporting women’s groups at the grassroots in both Karamoja and Teso is important for reaching the most disadvantaged although largely all women in Karamoja are disadvantaged.

3.2.9 The Need for Functional Adult Literacy
The evaluation team observes that one missing link in the programme is the issue of functional adult literacy (FAL). Functional literacy was a cry from both rural women and men met in the field as well as some of the technical people met at different levels. Without command of these much needed skills among a society that is largely illiterate, the Karimojong will always be fatally disadvantaged, unable to upgrade subsistence and cattle symbolism into more profitable ventures to provide income and a better life. Without functional adult literacy, the Karimojong, especially the women will continue to lack the confidence to take up leadership roles in their communities and to demand attention to their rights. The evaluation team would like to say that FAL is a necessary ingredient for transformation and could well be integrated into already ongoing interventions. This could be taken up through a pragmatic advocacy approach by Partners operating at community level.

In concluding this section, the evaluation team would like to say that as Mwalimu Julius Nyerere pointed out once – ‘it is only the people who can develop themselves’, communities largely progress through their own efforts. The role of Government is mainly to set the parameters in which development can best occur (security, policies, legislation), and currently the policy framework exists albeit with gaps. The driving force of development though is the power of the people. Their energies need to be encouraged and supported at their level. It is the view of the evaluation team that DCA Partners should not underestimate their potential influence to cause significant change through their efforts in building the confidence of the Karimojong to take up their own causes. The shift to Karamoja
as ‘a new area of focus’ provides an opportunity for DCA and Partners to galvanize resources which include strategic alliances and partnerships (both CSOs and Donors) to move up the gear and do more of what the intention has been through the PT 1/3, and that is to make the Karimojong and their Teso neighbours to own their power to effect beneficial change in their lives.

**Recommendations**

- In order to realise better impact, DCA and Partners need to consider the relevance of Functional Adult literacy to the populations in Karamoja. The high illiteracy rates in the region is a bigger barrier to people’s achieving their aspirations and self-determination. FAL is the key for opening up a new chapter of life for the majority of the Karimajong, both women and men.

- Gender equality programming is still a weak link in the DCA Partner programmes. It is critical that capacity for this be built to ensure that gender equality remains at the centre of DCA work.

- Programming for support towards alternative livelihoods for disarmed people especially the youth (the Karachunas) so that they do not become redundant and regress to raiding in search of livelihood.

- Strengthening the relationship between the Karimajong and the Iteso: It is suggested that in order to strengthen the relationship between the two neighbours, joint activities/programmes should be undertaken where the two people interact. This would help foster understanding between them. Search activities have already been initiated organisations like the Teso Initiative for Peace (TIP), Teso Women Peace Activists (TEWPA) and there are probably other initiatives by other agencies.

- Consolidate Food security strategies and support to marketing: Food security is key to improving the situation of the Karimajong and has a strong bearing for improved security. DCA and Partners could explore strategic partnerships with UN WFP who are already taking this route.

- Advocacy for agro-pastoralist policies: Some of DCA Partners are already involved in initiating debates for agro-pastoralist friendly policies. Uganda Land Alliance is one of the Partners pursuing this cause. DCA should galvanise the Partner networks to support advocacy for such a policy with ULA taking the lead.

- Pay more attention to drought management /environment protection to mitigate climate change and environmental degradation: This is an area where there has been little progress in terms of protecting natural resources. DCA would do well to support partners to integrate this component in their work.

- The example of the collaborative effort between UDN and TEDDO is commendable. It is important to encourage increased collaboration between national level partners and already existing NGOS/CBOs at local level for
building synergies and cross-fertilization for mutual learning. These need not be only between DCA partners but other development actors as well.

- The focus on duty bearers has been limited in the programme under review. There is need to increase the scope of interventions focused on duty bearers. This would involve supporting the capacity development of the principal duty bearers at district, sub-county and village levels. This could be done through existing partnerships or through engagement of one or two partners, who are capacity builders, an idea that was reflected in the log frame of the current programme but seems to have been lost, is still valid. Capacity building services could also be out-sourced.

- DCA should encourage and support Agro-Pastoralist Members of Parliament (MPs) to form a caucus or working group on issues of pastoralism so as to promote the interests of pastoralists at policy making level. This need not to be a new initiative, but rather could be collaboration with Oxfam which is already engaging MPs on issues of Karamoja and Northern Uganda through the Greater North Parliamentary Forum (GNPF).

- For purposes of increasing its leverage on the development work in Karamoja and the surrounding districts, DCA needs to join and be part of the Coalition of Pastoral Civil Society Organizations (COPACSO), where a number of its partners are already members. COPACSO provides a forum for networking and the members recognise some inspiration and support from each other as a group aimed at influencing policy. For instance, as result of COPACSO’s inputs into the PEAP and National Development Plan, Pastoralism is now beginning to be recognized as a livelihood. During the Land Policy Review Process, COPACSO were quite influential and managed to push pushed a chapter on vulnerable groups which include pastoralists to be incorporated into the document.

- Continue support and encourage increased sensitization of women and men at community on rights and obligations in the new programme.

- The goat initiative which is treasured by women should be expanded in terms of building skills of women to manage goats as well as ensuring that they are able to access the services of the community animal health workers and to drugs to treat their goats. Without this the efforts of women in goat rearing will not bring them the benefits that would accrue from more healthy goats.

- **Better use of the partners platform** – Some Partners mentioned that while they appreciate the Partners’ Platform and the sharing that happens there, the Platform could better be used by partners mapping out what they are

---

15 COPACSO is a loose coalition of NGOs/CBOs working with pastoral communities in Uganda. Its membership include ULA (Current Chair), Panos Eastern Africa, SNV-Uganda, OXFAM GB, CARE, MRG, Uganda Women Tree Planting Movement (UWPTM), New Horizons, Nakasongola Pastoralists Association, Kayunga Pastoral Advocacy Group (KPAG), Uganda Environmental Education, Kiboga (Pastoralist Women alliance on breaking Cultural chains), Matheniko Development Forum, Riamiriam Civil Society Network (Moroto) in Karamoja region, Farm Africa Uganda, CARITAS, and FODEPA. Although principally based in Kampala, the coalition meets regularly and share the secretariat functions on a voluntary rotating basis.
3.3 EFFICIENCY

3.3.1 Quality Assurance, Monitoring and Documentation

At DCA Level, comprehensive monitoring of the programme has been undertaken by staff in charge of the Programme. Support visits to Partners have been undertaken to discuss progress of activities and identify any constraints and challenges to implementation. Reports of monitoring have been prepared, key action points highlighted and followed up. In addition a mid-term evaluation of the political space programme was undertaken in 2008 and recommendations for major shifts made. One notable recommendation from the evaluation was that the political space and food security components be integrated into one programme. As a result, a food security strategy was developed and an officer for this component recruited and stationed in a field office closer to the region where key partners focusing on food security are located.

Placement of a field officer in the region is a commendable step that has made the presence of DCA in the field more recognised and appreciated by both partners and the local government authorities met during the course of this evaluation. The added value of the field office is that it provides for closer monitoring and support to partners but its impact was not yet fully realized as the Programme Officer has been in place for one year and the food security strategy has just recently been approve (June 2010).

One area that partners raised some concern about the issue of monitoring and follow-up. While the evaluators received reports of monitoring visits which are comprehensive with follow-up actions suggested, partners still complained about insufficient monitoring by DCA. They mentioned that DCA has not adequately visited the field where Partners work to provide on-site support and interact with the communities supported. In spite of having a resident DCA staff (supposed to have competences in Food Security programming) even Karamoja based partners implementing Food Security interventions, reported not be receiving adequate monitoring, and follow-up support from this office.

Furthermore, at partner level, it was reported that monitoring of implementation is done but not in a systematic way. Most of the partners visited do not have clear monitoring systems and results cannot easily be traced. Even those with monitoring systems established do not seem to be using them effectively. Discussions with partners revealed that there was a gap in tracking results and impacts on rights holders. Officers in charge of programmes talk so passionately about their work and results achieved but when asked about whether such results are documented or reflected in reporting, responses were in most cases not in the affirmative. So much energy is put into implementation but little effort in effective monitoring and documentation of results, impacts and lessons learned. Some of the partners met admitted to the evaluation team that their monitoring systems and documentation of processes were not well developed and is a gap in their
work. A few partners undertook baseline studies and these were useful in the design of interventions supported by DCA. Monitoring, quality control and documentation are important for gauging impact and for drawing lessons to inform future programming and improvement and should therefore be given more attention.

### 3.3.2 Financial Management

#### 3.3.2.1 Ensuring Transparency and accountability

The scope of this evaluation did not call for an in-depth examination of the processes and practices of partners. However a cursory look and reading of Partners of DCA gives a perception of entities that employ largely participatory methods in their work which open up the organisation for the scrutiny of its own stakeholders such as members and rights holders. However, the fact that most of the interventions by Partners are not initially demanded by communities but Partners have taken the initiative to work in these areas means that the communities are not yet able to question the nature of interventions that Partners ‘bring into their communities. It takes a process of empowerment for communities to be able to engage with development practitioners and be able to shape the processes that they get engaged in. It may therefore not be fair to pin down Partners about issues of being accountable to partners. However one would expect that this would be what Partners expect to happen and should therefore build accountability processes into the programme interventions to allow communities to interrogate the appropriateness of interventions in which they are involved. This is important building demonstrates respect for the community.

The issue of transparency and accountability by CSOs/NGOs to the rights holders is an issue that continues to be debated. While advocacy CSOs of the kind of DCA Partners are focusing on the very important aspects of building the capacity of rights holders to monitor service delivery and hold duty bearers accountable, the issue of accountability by DCA partners to communities they work with, like it is the case with many CSOs/NGOs, is still gray. The majority largely still use a top-down approach where ‘they bring programmes to the community’. Whilst some undertake baseline studies, they do not take it a step further to provide feedback to communities and to develop community action plans that would be more driven by communities. This is the beginning of the process of empowering communities.

The evaluation team would like to suggest that DCA Partners would do better if they monitored their own practices and ensure that they comply with their values of transparency and accountability so that they can better advocate for the same with communities to the their duty bearers. “Walking the Talk” should be seen to happen at least among the DCA Partners where the rights approach to programming is central.
In terms of ensuring that partners manage transparent and accountable financial systems as a requirement, before any approval of partnership and funding, DCA undertakes a 5-step assessment of a potential partner. Step 0 includes as section that assesses management, administrative and finance procedures. Seven key elements that examines whether the organisation meets the basic minimum requirements for having systems that assure transparency and accountability are assessed. It is also a requirement that once funded, the partner must undertake external audits every year by an approved auditor using and adhering to international audit standards and practices. Guidelines that meet DCA standards are provided to ensure that the appointed auditor adheres. For the majority of the partners, they run separate bank accounts to ease audit, follow-up and reconciliation. In a few cases, and especially for the partners that receive budget support (basket funding), the requirement for a separate account is waived off.

In addition, the partner cooperation agreement has a clause that requires that the implementing partner to “produce narrative and financial reports under the general administrative provisions applicable for grants obtained by DCA from state appropriations/DANIDA”.

Furthermore, the Finance Officers undertake regular field monitoring visits to do on spot checks as well as value for money by tracing and comparing money spent with actual activities undertaken in the community.

The evaluation findings indicate that all funded partners visited had undergone this procedure before approval of funding. There is also evidence of the Finance and programme team making periodic monitoring visits, as well as evidence of audited accounts. However, having in place systems and procedures is one thing while adhering religiously to the same systems and procedures is another. The integrity and sanctity of the system is best preserved by a collective effort of management, and the Board of each organisation. These two can collude and abuse the system. There are incidences where fraud has been committed because the custodians of the systems decided to abuse them themselves.

3.3.2.2 Planning and Budgeting

The findings indicate that it is a common practice for both programme and finance staff of the partner organisations and even DCA Regional Office is involved in setting budgets, to create a foundation for good cooperation and coordination during spending and budget monitoring. The findings also revealed that generally most partners prepare their budgets in time, and the budgets for the programme were prepared in accordance with the planned activities. DCA staff has been providing back-up support to the partner organizations to ensure that budgets meet the minimum standards before they can be funded.

Ordinarily, there should be a project officer who should be the budget holder. This however varies from partner to partner. Bigger organizations have project focal officers while smaller ones like OCODI have the Executive Director / Coordinator as the budget holder.
The evaluation also revealed that whereas the Board members of the majority of the partners were involved in the approval processes of annual and other periodic plans and budgets, project planning and budgeting and approval was mainly by management and the Board members are informed through consolidated periodic (mainly quarterly) planning, budgeting and reporting processes

3.3.2.3 Basic Accounting
Available information from Audited Accounts and reports from the monitoring log frames by the Finance Teams indicate that to a large extent, funded partners were trying to adhere to basic accounting practices such as:

- Backing up every financial transaction with a ‘supporting document’, e.g. a receipt, invoice or sign sheet (e.g. for many travel reimbursements);
- Maintaining a cashbook for recording pay outs and receipt transactions which are referenced with relevant supporting document;
- Carrying out bank reconciliations, and;
- Maintaining a Chart of Accounts, and or specific cost centre codes for the project.

Having said that, it is also true to say that some of the organisations have had some difficulties and shortfalls especially given the nature of the field operations, for instance where banking services are not a given, but also in situations where there is limited staffing to maintain an airtight accounting system. In some cases, it is merely the failure of management to enforce the accounting systems. However, there is evidence of the DCA Finance teams providing advice on how to improve these practices.

3.3.2.4 Financial Reporting
Ordinarily financial reporting the first beneficiary of financial reporting should be the Board of Directors / Trustees to enable them effectively oversee the finances of the organisation. The funding partners need reports to check the use of their money, and often as a condition for further funding. Where possible the partners should be sharing the financial reports with rights holders and duty bearers for purposes of increasing accountability and confidence building. An annual external audit basically should be to verify the accuracy of the financial statements.

The evaluation team found varying practices. There are partners who generate monthly reports others do it on a quarterly basis, others on half yearly basis, depending on the need and use of the reports (internally and externally). There was an effort by a number of partners to compare income and expenditure reports with the project budgets. All these are essential for informing project managers to make vital decisions for effective and efficient use of the budget to generate desired outcomes. DCA / partner cooperation agreements have a clause on how to treat unspent balances at the end of the year and at the end of the project. So far this has been adhered to.

The evaluation reveals that whilst the majority of the partners were making an effort to undertake annual audits on time as advised, preparing and submission of financial reports to DCA has not been efficient. It was established from DCA programme staff that the majority of partners delay in preparing and submitting
financial reports without plausible reasons. It was also noted that it is the same partners that delay reporting whose reports are also of poor quality. This could an indication of lack of capacity for financial reporting in these organisations. However, this is not an issue that Partners should be excused for or should relax about. Resources availed for work should not been taken for granted. This issue will be addressed in more depth under the section on cost efficiency (3.3.3).

3.3.2.5 Internal controls

There are a number of internal controls that should be in existence and in practice for a financially healthy organisation. The evaluation team could not go into detail with each partner, but these are at the core of the financial audit processes, but also regularly checked by the financial monitoring teams whenever they go out on monitoring missions. The partner assessment steps also include verification of some of these controls such as:

- Having Bank accounts and clear instructions on the accounts
- Policy detailing who can / should authorise expenditure of the project funds
- Having appropriate staff employed to manage finances
- Verifying procurement policies
- Asset management systems
- Having a registered audit firm selected by the Board to audit the organisations books

Box 9: Generic Internal Financial Controls

- Cash is kept safely in a locked cashbox or safe, in the custody of one individual
- All cash received is banked intact, i.e. without any being spent
- All cheques are signed by at least two authorised signatories
- Cheques are signed only when all the details have been properly filled in (i.e. no signatories ever sign blank cheques)
- Bank reconciliations are checked by someone who did not prepare them
- Existence of written policy detailing who can authorise expenditure of different types or value
- All transactions are properly authorised
- Cash payments are authorised by someone other than the cashier
- Different steps in the procurement process, (e.g. ordering receiving and paying) are shared among different people.
- Expenses claims for staff advances are checked by the same person who authorised the advance
- Staff salaries (including advances and loans deductions) are checked each month by a senior manager
- Statutory deductions (e.g. payroll taxes) are properly made and paid on time
- All fixed assets (e.g. vehicles, computers, equipment) owned by the NGO are insured and controlled using a fixed assets register
- There is an approved policies and procedures manual in place which is relevant to the organisation, and known by staff
- A properly registered audit firm is selected by the trustees

However, as already noted above, having a system in place is one thing, but compliance is another. There are instances within the partner organisations where these controls are well documented on the books but have been abused, such as in the case of KADP. In some cases the controls are also not well developed and differentiated appropriately. While it is not the intention to insinuate any wrong doing, the evaluation team would like to make some observations.

Prudent management of financial resources is at the heart of development partnership. Uganda has a bad name in mismanaging resources and CSOs need to be a good example of better discipline in management of resources, before they can challenge misuse of resources in other sectors. Any indication of financial mismanagement should be dealt with comprehensively and decisively. Partners should endeavour to establish ‘waterproof’ and ‘airtight’ financial management systems and be transparent about all their financial dealings. Where Partners
need assistance in this area, they should be able to discuss with DCA so that a solution is found. The evaluation team would like to recommend that there should be ‘zero tolerance’ for any acts of fraud or embezzlement of resources in Partner organisations.

Financial Management is one of the key areas where APPRODEV Partners and/or ACT Alliance should agree on standards and put in place measures to enforce them. Tools for enforcing these standards should be harmonized so that as ‘donors’ the APPRODEV or ACT should speak the same language in enforcing these standards. This observation is being made by the evaluation team because it was observed during the evaluation exercise that some financial management complacency seems to have engulfed some of the Partners of DCA. In principle, both parties in a partnership should build trust and practice it. This trust should be respected by both sides. DCA’s is known by Partners to be flexible and trusting of Partners. However, it appears to the evaluation team that this trust on the part of DCA is not being respected by some Partners. Partner leadership and management at all levels should be seen to value integrity and be able to enforce it. Where this fails to happen, then both parties of the partnership should recognise this failure and either find ways to resolve problems emanating from the breach of trust or ‘agree to disagree’.

3.3.3 Cost-efficiency
There are basically three categories of PT1/3 funded partners. First are the Karamoja – Teso based partners and these include; SSD, OCODI, KADP, TEDDO, and SOCADIDO. The second category includes those partners that are headquartered in Kampala but have operational field offices. These include; ACTED C&D, and ULA. The third category comprises of partners that have headquarters in Kampala but operate through grassroots structures / groups. These include; UCAA, COU-PDR, UDN (through CBMES groups) and MRGI which was operating through KADP.

In terms of cost efficiency, the evaluation team found that most of the field based (local partners) are more efficient in the use of their budgets, because there are less transactional costs involved in the management of their budgets. They also live closer to the target areas where they undertake the project activities. The next more cost efficient category are those with field offices which take charge of activities and implement according to agreed plans. Although there are some transactional costs involved in bank transfers, splitting costs between Kampala headquarters and the field, ultimately, there are more funds that flow to the target groups.

The team finds the less cost efficient model to be of the purely Kampala headquartered partners, albeit with field / community based groups such as the case of UCAA and UDN and UJCC. The work involves sending teams from Kampala or may be based in the region, undertake training or follow-up activities such as workshops, meetings and community dialogues and then return to Kampala. The evaluation team was informed that they avoid leaving money behind with the groups because they are volunteers and to avoid grooming a dependency syndrome. Certainly, the community based groups need mentoring and monitoring. This process involves high transactional costs in form of transport,
allowances for Kampala based staff. The team in this case recommends that such partners should identify and work with a regional /district based partners or establish field offices. The UDN / TEDDO partnership project in Amuria provides a case of good practice.

3.3.4 Budget Support Vs Project funding
The other typology we discuss here is the budget support funding versus project based funding. For a long time even before PT1/3 DCA’s funding for some partners such as UDN, UJCC, and UCAA has been to support their strategic programmes (what is popularly referred to as core funding). This is important for programme sustainability because it strengthens the capacity of the organisation to prioritise important issues. Admittedly, unless such funding is pegged towards specific result areas within the strategic plan, it is very difficult to isolate the impact of core funding support in relation to the overall PT1/3 intended impact. Core funding also faces challenges when an organisation has limited sources of funding. On the other hand, for the majority of the partners it has been project support, where measuring results is straighter forward. Therefore project funding in this case can be said to be a more cost-efficient alternative.

However, the team does not necessarily recommend a project mode of funding as the best alternative. Instead we recommend that DCA the review its funding modalities taking into consideration where it should take a longer term commitment towards supporting the partners to implement their strategic plans / programmes – with specific commitments towards specific result areas that are of common interest to both parties.

3.3.5 Budget Utilisation
Generally, budget utilisation has been at more than 80% with a projection of hitting 100% this year. The major snag has been on partners’ failure to requisition and to account 100% before the close of the year. Any unutilised funds before the close of the year are returned to the donor.

3.3.6 Recommendations
1. **Establish more efficient accounting systems:** The once cherished manual accounting systems are no longer feasible in the computer era and holding on to old systems retards organizational capacity development. The consultant team recommends that Partners still using manual accounting systems move towards computerized accounting systems. Computerised accounting systems are much quicker and more transparent. As part of organizational capacity strengthening, DCA should support partners that are still running manual accounting systems to change to more efficient systems. There are various packages to select from guided by experts in the field. Training in managing the systems and application of packages would be required. This learning could actually be done through twinning partners using such systems for the first time with other partners with strong financial accounting systems for purposes of mentoring.

2. **Strengthen Internal Control Measures:** Internal control measures in development work are as important as they are in business. Value for money must always be considered in development programming. It is a well known
fact that external audit methods use a sampling approach and with the questionable levels of professionalism and unethical behaviour among some external auditors in Uganda, it is important to institute additional measures to check non-compliant behaviour and practices. It is therefore important that DCA institutes an internal (DCA and Partners) financial monitoring and internal regular audit mechanism that will check the management of budgets and provide compliance support to partners. Zero tolerance for unethical behaviour in financial management and utilization should be enforced.

3. **Revisit outreach strategies to Karamoja and Teso regions**: Having looked at the capacities and competences of the various partners and their implementation modalities, the evaluation team observes that national level partners such as UDN, UJCC, UCAA, and UWONET should revisit their outreach strategies towards the region. It is not advisable for a national NGO to go down to the grassroots to compete for turf and constituency with CBOs and local NGOs. It does not make sense. Even if they did, they should be choosing and working with the local grassroots organisations to reach their target rights holders. The national level NGOs (read partners) should reposition themselves to support capacity building entities for the local NGOs and CBOs. This is actually likely to enhance possibilities for integrated programming for the future DCA programme.

4. **Strengthen monitoring and evaluation systems of Partners**: Most of the partners mentioned that they have monitoring and evaluation systems in place but admitted that these weak. Even Partners who have established strong systems in place do not appear to be using them effectively and that is why majority have problems reporting results. DCA and partners should review the current monitoring systems and identify the bottlenecks for application. DCA should provide technical support to Partners for effective use of monitoring and evaluation systems to capture results and impacts.

5. **Strengthen internal audit, financial and systems monitoring**: While it is important to have policies and systems in place, there must be proof that they are working. Partners must be required to share financial and narrative reports with the district authorities as well as rights holders through periodic accountability forums.

### 3.4 SUSTAINABILITY

#### 3.4.1 Programme Sustainability
Sustainability of a programme like DCA’s PT1/3 an organization is dependent on a number of inter-related elements. These include: DCA’s reading of, internalization of and responsiveness to changes in needs, interests and priorities – the changes arise from shifts in the broader social, political and economic environment; the need to develop a diverse range of 50 organizational forms (e.g. alliances) to meet needs and interests in a strategic and ethical manner; and the importance of building strong relationships with central and local government, the private sector, the media and the beneficiaries. It is also dependent on the availability of appropriate support and resources; the need to attract, develop and retain
appropriate human and financial resources; and the importance of creating an enabling environment and fiscal framework.

The long term sustainability of the programme activities and benefits is dependent on the nature of the interventions being implemented by a partner, and the strategies for instance which may determine the level and nature of involvement of the rights holders in the various processes and the nature of interventions.

3.4.2 Participation and Influence of Rights Holders

First, the evaluation team found two sets of programmes: those supporting political space interventions; and food security. What is however common is that DCA stresses rights-based approach and gender equality programming as a central theme in the design and delivery of programmes. There is evidence of participation of rights holders although there is still a lot of room for improvement. The team found the curve of participation more pronounced at the level of implementation, and less pronounced at the start – designing the programmes, and likewise in monitoring and evaluating the interventions. Less participation of rights holders in programme design was found out to be due to inadequate funding to a participatory design process when a partner is not sure that they will even be funded. On the other hand, less participation in monitoring and evaluation which was also identified as the main cause for difficulties the partners have in reporting results was largely a design oversight on the part of many partners. However, the team finds the level of participation of rights holders in the TEDDO and UDN in reporting exemplary.

In terms of the cited high level of participation in the implementation of the programme activities for the majority of the partners, the team also still found processes still being influenced more by programme staff and less by the rights holders. However, examples of good practices do exist in projects implemented by partners such as Uganda Land Alliance’s Community Mapping Activities in Iriri (Napak district), Uganda Change Agent’s activities of identifying, training and mentoring local change agents; MRGI’s initiative of Council of Pastoral Elders; SOCADIDO’s farmer groups in Obalang; and ACTED’s work in setting up community led Early Warning Systems (EWS) and Pastoral Field Schools in Nakapriprit.

In all these cited examples and others visited by the evaluation team, there was evidence that even if the funding to the project interventions came to an end, most of these groups have potential to remain operational and to expand.
Having said that, however, the long term humanitarian work of food relief has made majority of the people develop a dependency syndrome. The majority of the Karimajong even those without a single cow have for a long time not considered agriculture as a viable alternative means of livelihood. In addition, there are still too many international humanitarian agencies that are more inclined towards humanitarian relief with the same communities where DCA partners are trying to promote the reverse thus clash of programming approaches.

3.4.3 Major factors influencing sustainability

3.4.3.1 Partner Presence
The evaluation team found three categories of partners working with DCA on PT 1/3. The first category constitutes partners who are local organisations based in Karamoja and Teso regions. They have their operational structures in the region and some at the grassroots. The second are Kampala based partners with operational offices in the region such as ACTED and C&D. The third category constitutes those based in Kampala and just move to the region implement planned activities and just come back to Kampala, but leave behind operational structures (mainly volunteers, or committees. Examples are UJCC, UCAA, MRG and UDN. The team found that the partners without permanent presence in the region spend lesser time with the target communities. Their presence is more characterised more by hopping into the region, run a workshop move out until the next activity. The rights holders do not feel the presence of and mentorship from the partners. Conversely, the team found communities (rights holders and duty bearers) appreciating more the partners that have more permanent presence in the communities such as OCODI in Apetolim, SSD in Kodonyo Valley, SOCADIDO in Obalang, ACTED in Nakapriprit.

3.4.3.2 Type of Intervention
The major programme interventions supported in Karamoja fall within the ambit of Food Security component of the program. The team finds the processes adopted by the various partners to a large extent promoting sustainability. However, there are several factors that affect sustainable food security in Karamoja. The key factors include: insecurity, climatic factors in terms of long droughts and heavy rains when they do appear, and lack of government to have an effective food security policy in place. Furthermore, there are too many non-state actors in Karamoja with various often conflicting programming approaches. Majority of the actors still treat Karamoja as an area in crisis and hence deserving humanitarian aid, which promotes dependency among the communities. However, the good news is that even the agencies like the United Nations World Food Program (UNWFP) are gradually repositioning the Karamoja program to shift from humanitarian food distribution to supporting food long term food security including production and access to markets.

3.4.3.3 Effect of taking a Rights-based Approach
As already noted in section 3.1 above, taking a rights-based approach to programming laces the rights holders at the core and which means they influence the interventions for their own good and in accordance with their priorities. However, the evaluation team did not find any of the projects to have reached this
level but can generally conclude to have witnessed potential for sustainability among the community led initiatives especially farmer groups.

3.4.4 Exit and Integration or replication strategies

The team found majority of interventions were not well integrated with the government systems save for the ULA community mapping interventions, and ACTED’s Early Warning Systems and Farmer Field Schools. In a number of other cases, projects were running independent of government and hardly sharing or reporting to local governments what their were doing. This is a concern for local government authorities as voiced out by the CAO, Moroto; and RDC Moroto / Napak:

“As a District, we are thinking of locking out some NGOs from operating in Moroto District because they do not report about their activities and what they do is not known or seen. ...It is difficult for us to monitor the achievements of certain NGO projects because one does not know who is responsible for what. Some NGOs clamour over who has done what and sometimes one finds two NGOs claiming to have done the same activity, for example two NGOs claiming to have constructed the same borehole” (CAO Moroto).

“NGOs should declare their work plan, what they have for the area and try to synergize and merge their work plans so that there is no duplication of projects in the same area. They should try to work together to move the community forward. Bogus NGOs should be discouraged and reported so that there is no situation of NGOs claiming other people’s work: (Deputy Resident District Commissioner (Deputy RDC) Moroto/Napak)

The findings further reveal that majority of the partners do not have developed strategy for exit that they had discussed with the rights holders. Even DCA does not have a clear exit strategy that it has discussed with the partners either for the programme in general or for Karamoja – Teso region.

3.4.5 Recommendations

1. To ensure sustainability of programmes and capacity at community level, the evaluation team recommends that partners based in Kampala with outreach programmes to communities should identify and work with regional or district based partners who work more closely with communities. This is more cost effective and sustainable.

2. DCA should revisit their funding modalities – project funding vis a vis core support/budget support and decide on the best option on a case basis. This team however recommends that DCA take a longer term commitment to partners and support strategic plans but with resource commitment to specific result areas of interest to both parties.

3.5 PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT, CAPACITY SUPPORT AND SET-UP

3.5.1 Programme Management

The political Space programme type (called PT 1) was the only one of its kind implemented in Karamoja – Teso. It is a Uganda country programme managed by
the Kampala based regional office. It is managed by two programme officers, one in Kampala and the other in Karamoja field office. Both officers are answerable to the RR through the Programme Coordinator.

The evaluation team noted that DCA has during the last 5 years invested heavily in the development management systems and policies aimed at ensuring effective and efficient delivery of the programmes. In effect, there is admission on the side of management that this has taken more time, and to a large extent affected the pace of programme performance.

It is also noted that over the last 5 years of the programme inception and implementation, DCA has continued to build its capacity through making necessary changes and boosting its staffing levels to respond to the rising demands from the programme implementation. For instance, recently a Programme Coordinator has been recruited to ensure that the various programmes being implemented / supported by DCA are properly coordinated to ensure optimal results. The Programme Coordinator is well experienced in development programming and particularly well knowledgeable about the Karamoja region development issues.

Over the last 5 years DCA has initiated programme management changes aimed at obtaining the optimal structure that can best manage the programme. Initially, most of the programmatic management work was undertaken by the RR and one Programme Officer, supported by the Finance management staff. Later, another Programme Officer was recruited and placed in Moroto, mainly to play an oversight role of the funded partner projects. The latter is based in Moroto, Karamoja but she comes to Kampala often to participate in internal staff and programmatic meetings.

The Evaluation team would like to observe that whilst it is understandable that the Political Space and Food Security have been implemented as an integrated programme, the responsibilities of the two programme officers have not been very clear. Technically both have been heading the same programme – PT 1/3 which creates confusion among the two. However, our observation as a team is that one Programme Officer seems to have dominated the decision making space either by virtue of his being based in the Kampala office, or by the way the responsibilities have been shared between them. The team noted that majority if not all the initial project assessments have been done and initialled by one programme officer which gives the impression that he has worked a Pseudo-head of the programme.

However, since DCA has now recruited a Programmes Coordinator, then there should be clear cut and assigned responsibilities to each of the two and their performance monitored accordingly. Even in the event that the decision is upheld to keep the programme as an integrated programme, each Programme Officer should have equal powers, probably each taking care of one component.

### 3.5.2 Capacity Building Project for Partners

Immediate objective 4 aimed at strengthening capacity of partner organisations in strategic reflections on conflict management, in advocacy, project planning and outcome oriented monitoring, reporting and evaluation. Essentially, this objective
constitutes the bulk of programmatic activities directly implemented by DCA Regional Office or through outsourcing.

In addition DCA established and has been supporting platform meetings where the partners meet and discuss issues of common interest affecting their projects but also agreeing on common strategies. These meetings have been commended by the partners they offer them an opportunity to learn and share.

The platforms were viewed by partners as relevant in moderating partner expectations from DCA and also helping partners internalize further DCA policies (e.g. once they have been newly introduced or modified). The platforms were also considered by partners as having potential for building synergies for effective joint advocacy and taking on strategic issues that require a unified CSO voice like the struggle for more space for civic engagement in Uganda through political expression and challenging rigidities presented under the NGO Act.

A number of activities had been accomplished, aimed at strengthening capacity of partner organization in: effective result based planning, monitoring, and documentation and reporting; rights-based programming; and advocacy. The various capacity sessions undertaken by DCA drew a high degree of commendation from the partners. The trainings included the advocacy trainings/PACT, as well as RBA and gender training, planning monitoring evaluation and reporting (PMER). The knowledge obtained was being used by the partners in other aspects of their respective organisations and even beyond such organisations.

Besides, DCA was perceived as being supportive and responsive in strengthening institutional and organizational capabilities of the partner organisations. DCA was for instance commended in respect to availing partners with vehicles and financial management packages and institutional evaluations, to enhance implementation of project activities. Challenges remained around full follow-up by both DCA and partners, so that the agreed upon positions reach a conclusive end. Some partners appreciated the effort of the Programme Officers in being in close contact with the partners and the platforms were appreciated as having been useful and could even be better utilised. DCA Officers in charge of the programme remained challenged on how they could encourage or compel partners if necessary to deliver on their promises, especially for those partners that are tasked to be the lead organisations on some advocacy issues.

The evaluation team would like to challenge DCA partners to use the Partners’ Platform to reflect on their own performance in terms of issues like financial management, programme reporting and any other issues that are important for programme delivery on their part. As leaders, they must take responsibility for the integrity of the organisations they lead and that of civil society at large.

3.5.3 Role and Procedures of DCA Regional Office and Headquarters

Essentially, DCA has been preoccupied with setting up systems, procedures and manuals to support the implementation of the programme. It was evident that DCA had elaborate procedures, for example in respect to approval of projects. These included partner profiling; having prior relationship and understanding the
values, processes and status of a potential or current partner, in order for DCA to assess what value such a partner was able to contribute of ascertaining the partner’s relevance to the programme. The project assessment by a Programme Officer; assessment by the Project Approval Committee and having in place monitoring charts for each partner were in the opinion of the evaluators, good practices and processes that added value to delivery of the programme.

Quality assurance by the DCA Headquarters through PT Advisors was well received in as far as supporting delivery of the programme in the Teso-Karamoja region was concerned. There was a clear understanding of relationship in reference to the regional office seeking support at headquarters as well as clear appreciation of what each unit or component of the head office contributed to the local delivery of the programme, particularly in respect to quality assurance, management support and decision-making, financial transactions, support, auditing and capacity building functions.

3.5.4 Value Addition of DCA M&E to the Programme
The M&E function of DCA, through the Regional Representative, Programme Officers and the finance section of the Office, was regarded as strong, consistent and supportive to delivery of the programme. Besides, there is strong will and commitment on the side of DCA to this function and there is evidence of constant contact with the partners to ensure that the projects deliver their activities. Through the various monitoring reports of the programme, it was clear that issues of concern or interest to DCA and partners were often captured, discussed and concluded through follow-up mechanisms.

3.5.5 Mechanisms for Sharing and Learning
DCA often utilised the platforms for the opportunity of sharing and learning any new aspects or policy options about the programme. As part and form of programme monitoring, the partners appreciated the partner platforms because they have helped them to enhance their understanding of the programme. The meetings were also helping the partners to network, share, learn and hence promoting synergy. However, the partners felt that follow-up after the meetings was inadequate. The partners go back and get engrossed into implementation until the next partners’ platform.

However, DCA also was said to having started honouring partners’ invitations to attend partner activities, functions or events, both in Kampala and Teso-Karamoja. This was making DCA appreciate the operating environment of the partners. It further boosted DCA knowledge of the partner activities and often used such information to relate better with the partners.

3.5.6 Organisational Set-up and Effect on Partnerships
DCA signed cooperation agreements as a basis for a relationship with each partner. This facilitated mutual understanding of the nature of the relationship, clarity on management issues and practices, like the implication of corruption on the relationship. In terms of set-up, it was appreciated that the Programme Officers were often the first points of call and contact with DCA. This was useful in having quick access to DCA and often easy and quick feedback to the partner. By this arrangement, through 2006-2010, the programme was generally seen as
having registered good to excellent working relationships between DCA and the partners.

While most of the Partners were full of praise for DCA, a few partners were rather indignant about the relationship with DCA. They mentioned that DCA is not open about their future plans on how they intend to move forward with them. One of the Partners mentioned that they are not very comfortable with the partnership as yet as DCA seems to be ‘trying’ them and not sure of them. This particular partner mentioned that there is poor communication between them and DCA did not seem to be interested in the whole programme of the organisation but in just a few areas they want to support. They felt that more could be done to enhance a more effective partnership and create better synergies.

3.5.7 Staffing and Management Competency issues

Various partners were impressed by the quality of staffing at DCA. They for example held the current crop of Programme Officers in high esteem. The Officers were regarded as generally accessible, simple and approachable and in continued communication with the partners. The mutual and respectful regular interaction by DCA by way of phone calls and e-mail inquiries or updates largely initiated and encouraged by the Officers, especially over the last two years of the programme, was commended by partners. The diverse knowledge, synthesis and support by Programme Officers that was often available for partners to tap into, especially in areas of clarity and guidance on policy matters and processes, governance, advocacy, reporting, public finance and budgeting, gender equality and rights based programming and policy were highly appreciated by the partners. This equally reflected the high degree of competence of programme management.

In spite of the acclaim of DCA staff as captured above, some partners were concerned about the somewhat slow response of DCA to partners in some cases. The major concern was the slow feedback on projects, particularly during project development and release of finances for implementation of project activities. This meant that often, there were chances of rushing implementation of project activities in order to be in the DCA time for accounting (by December 31st of a given year) or else the partners loses the money allocated by DCA during such a fiscal period.

There was also an impression that the programmes were under capacitated, given the big volume of partners (seen during platforms and other meetings by DCA). This meant that the programme staffs often tended to be ‘overloaded’”. This had a negative implication on the efficiency of the programme staff, morale and perhaps health. The programme officers also tended to be engaged in what one respondent referred to as ‘administration and paperwork overdrive’ rather than engaging with the partners on real issues that are core to the mandate of PT 1/3. This translated into divided more attention to playing the administrative and clerical bulk of the programme as opposed to paying much more attention to strategic aspects of the programme and accompanying partner capability in analysis, designing strategies for implementation, advocacy, fundraising, institutional building and general implementation support.
The overall evaluation of the partner perspectives of the partnership with DCA is that satisfaction levels differ with partners. The general picture is that DCA is a good partner, flexible, trusting and responsive; there are areas that need to be improved such as providing timely feedback on reports and other queries and putting more effort into building genuine partnership. On the other hand, partners also recognise that there are weaknesses on their part that need to be addressed for the partnerships to work more smoothly.

**Recommendations**

DCA could consider the following to enhance the management component of the programme:

- **Have a mechanism that provides for a clear timeframe in providing feedback on the side of partners and to partners on the side of DCA.**

- **Issues of staffing have to be looked into more critically. The core competence of the Programme Officers should be looked into more seriously, with a view to avail them more room to provide oversight functions of the programme, synthesising and internalising the requisite support to partners; and less of being bogged down into or by administrative and clerical work of the programme. Administrative issues should be appropriately allocated to release time of the programme officers to concentrate on programme issues. If necessary, job descriptions of the programme officers could be reviewed to reflect this new rationalisation.**

- **There should be a formant on reporting, to enable partners report spot for DCA programme reporting and follow-up with a view to strengthening and producing programme deliverables/ feeding into the programme indicators. The format should do compromise the capturing of lessons, and telling the stories of the rights holders.**

- **Issues of staff morale, areas of interest and remuneration need further consultations within DCA, with a view to improving from the current remuneration and compensation levels and evidence of exercising the values of DCA, particularly the rights based approaches and principles.**
4.0 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The evaluation team has considered carefully the intentions and spirit of the PT 1/3 and the two components – Political Space and Food Security. The team has also considered the justification for integration of the two components recommended by the mid-term evaluation and the recently approved food security strategy. The team is strongly convinced that the two components would achieve greater results if conscious integrated programming is achieved. The team believes that the Political Space interventions are an important step towards enabling rights holders to engage and influence decisions. The team therefore recommends that DCA and partners engage in a self learning exercise to find out the best strategy to integrated planning and targeting. The two interventions if implemented together in the same location can achieve more significant and sustainable results than stand alone food security and political space interventions.

2. The team notes with satisfaction the will and commitment of DCA for gender equality integration and promotion being central to the integrated political space and food security programme. However, the consultants have also observed that some partners are struggling with the practical application of gender equality and the rights based approach to programming. The will and a level of commitment are there at partner level as well. However, the missing link seems to be the ‘how to’ of gender programming within the rights based context. The evaluation team recommends that DCA develops a gender programming framework informed by a comprehensive gender assessment and analysis to inform such a framework. This framework should be supported by gender equality programming guidelines and tools that would give practical steps of how to integrate and mainstream gender into programming. This would also entail gender programming capacity building for some of the Partners.

3. While the Rights Based Programming concept is not so new and is generally accepted as ‘the way to do development, currently the practicability of it is still elusive to many development actors. Partners need to be taken through the whole package of the Rights Based Approach and Programming – from analysis, to design, planning, monitoring and evaluation. There are already elements of these aspects within partner programmes and some partners are good at it while others are yet to get there. DCA technical support in this area may also need more sharpening in order to ensure that the programme delivers accordingly. However, DCA and partners need to set benchmarks for rights-based programming and gender mainstreaming against which the future partner projects will be measured for compliance.

4. The Karamoja question characterised by cattle rustling, agro-pastoralism, marginalization, cultural issues, remains complicated because it does not only affect the Karamoja sub-region but all the neighbours. Addressing poverty issues in any of the surrounding districts would just be partial without taking into account the reality of being a neighbour to Karamoja. It is therefore important that this part of north-eastern Uganda be given attention in an interconnected perspective. The evaluation team would like
to suggest that the feasibility of expanding the geographical scope of DCA programme in Uganda as a whole be considered in a broader perspective of the region in relation to Karamoja and expand the coverage to include the neighbouring districts of Bukwo, Sironko, Kapchorwa, Otuke, Pader and Kitgum. It is understood that Karamoja is already large an area and no single programme can cover it comprehensively. However, addressing the issue of Karamoja in consort with its neighbours is critical for peace, security and development of the whole region. This is also the spirit of PRDP and within this framework, more can be achieved. DCA may want also to discuss this approach with other development actors and donors particularly the APPRODEV family and the ACT alliance.

5. Participation as a key element of democracy is expensive and requires persistence in order to take DCA partners have done well in involved rights holders in implementation of activities. However, the Partners could do even better by involving rights holders in the analysis, design, monitoring and documentation and reporting processes so that it is demonstrated that the rights holders own the programmes and the interventions are demand driven by the communities.

6. In operational terms, the evaluation team would like to recommend advocacy at community level to address the rights and needs of the poor people. This kind of advocacy is called pragmatic advocacy, denoting its technical content, designed to have an early and significant impact on the rural communities and empower them to do their own advocacy for better services. DCA Partners will need to mesh their activities with those of other actors on the ground and work closely with Local Government.

7. DCA is held in high esteem by partners for being a true partner, because it takes a conscious stand to growing with the partners and respecting their values, trusting them and being flexible. The partners however, do not seem to have reciprocated in equally generous terms. Partners remain not honouring their part of the bargain for instance, timely reporting, planning and in some cases implementing and adhering to their own internal policies, procedures and systems. The evaluation team therefore recommends that without retracting on the good attributes of partnership, DCA should be stricter in demanding compliance for instance in reporting and accountability. Partners must be responsible for their actions. There might be need for sanctions and rewards. And that is where integrated targeting and programming is important. Non-compliant partners can be sanctioned without compromising the programme promises to the targeted rights holders.

8. Furthermore, the evaluation team recommends that the partners should be involved in the design of the future programme. More realistic and possibly quantifiable indicators should set. This way it would be possible to tell how much each funded project will contribute to the achievement of set indicators and the funded projects would be better balanced.
9. Targeting is of paramount importance in programming. Currently DCA is targeting Karamoja and Teso Region (basically Amuria and Katakwi). However, if the main influencing factor for DCA programme is vulnerability, then there is needed to venture into deeper analysis of vulnerability in the target regions. First, is to analyse which groups of rights holders are more vulnerable in order to ensure their inclusion. Next, would be the geographical targeting within the region. Within Karamoja there are some districts, and some sub-counties and communities that are more vulnerable than others. There are some sub-counties that are hardly being served especially in the area of development work. The team therefore recommends that a more thorough but quick mapping of the various districts and sub-counties of Karamoja in terms of their development needs and how much is being done by development partners (if any) in those districts and sub-counties. This can based on the work already done by UNOCHA work but also District Planning Departments can be consulted. This would promote integrated planning with the local governments as well as better outreach in terms of targeting.
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Annex 2: TERMS OF REFERENCE

END OF PROGRAMME EXTERNAL EVALUATION FOR PT 1/3 GREAT LAKES 2006-2010

1) BACKGROUND

DanChurchAid (DCA) is seeking consultancy services to conduct a) End of Programme external Evaluation for PT 1/3 Great Lakes 2006-2010 and b) Context Analysis of the Programme.

DanChurchAid (DCA) was founded in 1922 in Denmark and is today one of the major Danish humanitarian NGOs, working with development and emergency aid in Africa, Asia, Central America, the Middle East, Central Asia and Eastern Europe. DCA’s vision is a world at peace, free from poverty, discrimination and oppression, where resources are evenly distributed and individual’s dignity is respected. DCA is a faith-based, ecumenical, non-missionary and non-profit organisation. It is a member of the international alliance of Action by Churches Together (ACT). For more information please visit our website: www.dca.dk

In order to enhance local capacities beyond emergency and rehabilitation to long-term and sustainable development interventions, DCA globally supports church-based agencies, humanitarian organisations and other non-religious civil organisations to implement interventions through five programme types a) Political Space/Good Governance b) Food Security c) HIV/AIDS d) Humanitarian Assistance and e) Humanitarian Mine Action. DCA implements its interventions through Partners. DCA has a strong commitment and conviction about application of rights based approaches to development where issues of gender equity, marginalisation and social justice underpin the various initiatives, while mindful of cultural sensitivity.

2) DANCHURCHAID GREAT LAKES REGION

With a regional office in Kampala that opened in 2004, as part of the DCA decentralization process. DCA supplements efforts of governments and other players in Uganda, Tanzania and Burundi through long-term partnerships and support to various faith-based and civil society organisations to respond to emergencies and implement development projects. Indeed, DCA has a long history in the Great Lakes geographical area that includes Kagera (in north-western Tanzania), Rakai in south/central of Uganda and Teso and Karamoja (in eastern Uganda). DCA support to projects in Tanzania dates as far back as the 1960s and in Uganda since 1979 and begun in Karamoja under the Church of Uganda through the Lutheran World Federation. In Uganda, DCA through the partners implements interventions under a) Integrated Political Space/Food Security programme b) HIV/AIDS and c) Humanitarian Assistance. To-date DCA has partnered with over 28 civil society and church-based organisations in Uganda alone, of which over 16 have implemented interventions in the Karamoja-Teso region or raised public policy and resourcing issues about the region at the Local Governments and national levels.

3) THE INTEGRATED POLITICAL SPACE/FOOD SECURITY PROGRAMME (PT 1/3)

The PT 1/3 Programme in the Great Lakes is only implemented in Uganda. Its geographical focus is mainly Karamoja sub-region and parts of Teso in Uganda, but with strategic attention to organisations operating at national level. As part of the DCA decentralization process, to improve working relationship with Partners and representation, the Programme currently has the Political Space Programme Officer in Kampala office and the Food Security Programme Officer in the DCA field office in Moroto-Karamoja. The two Officers jointly manage the Programme on a day-to-day basis, with support of the Regional Representative (RR) based in Kampala and Programme Type Advisors who are essentially based at DCA headquarters. The Food security activities supported by DCA in Uganda have been operating within the Political Space programme since 2006 to date. In 2008, a mid-term review of the programme was undertaken. The findings and recommendations revealed that there
was need to have a clear strategy that would support sustainable food security and livelihood activities within the Programme. It was also seen as relevant and justified to call the programme an integrated Political Space and Food Security Programme (PT 1/3).

In 2006, the programme was designed against the backdrop that Karamoja faces the most multiple complex humanitarian and development challenges compared to the rest of Uganda. They are, inter alia, vulnerability, marginalization, inter and intra-tribal and ethnic rivalries, political exclusion from decision-making processes thus exacerbating deprivation from access to and control over resources or public services and poverty. The poverty, for instance going by socio-economic development indicators are the worst in Karamoja, punctuated by semi-arid conditions amidst cattle rustling and high illiteracy levels amongst the population, mainly the women and girls. In the rim of the Programme, the civil society is weak in Karamoja sub-region and the population’s awareness of civil and political rights is low, especially in the rural areas, to the detriment of promoting good governance. Uganda’s legal, institutional, policy and programming frameworks have largely remained void of the way of life of the people in Karamoja as to design and implement interventions that are relevant to the development needs and aspirations of the agro-pastoral nature of the sub-region.

Besides, Karamoja sub-region has been a victim of poor political leadership and marginalization at various levels and actions of individuals, colonial and post-colonial Governments in Uganda. Little wonder that in spite of the various development interventions, Karamoja has essentially remained at the periphery of Uganda’s applauded economic growth and development endeavours over the last twenty years. Evidently, such structural and dynamic challenges conspire to perpetuate axes of multi-dimensional exclusion. These reinforce patriarchy, economic disadvantages and other discriminatory systems that subordinate the status and position of people, especially the women, through disempowerment. The said Programme mid-review team in 2008 agreed that geographical focus on Karamoja continued to be well justified in view of the challenges. The team further recommended the need to extend the Programme activities to the neighbouring districts of Amuria and Katakwi in Teso sub-region, due to the negative effects out of the attendant problems emanating from Karamoja. It was recommended to support and facilitate access to improved livestock production and management, focus on water harvesting techniques and natural resource management as well. So, the Food Security Strategy was also developed in 2010 to complement Political Space Programme Strategy.

During 2006-2010, the PT 1/3 programme has, therefore, supported or supplemented CSOs and Government initiatives that enhance and widen opportunities for communities to meet their needs and basic services, promote community participation, ownership and empowerment, local level and national advocacy. Through this, DCA is committed and convinced towards overcoming marginalization, citizens being key players in influencing development agenda that espouses equitable and gender sensitive approaches. DCA is further committed to uplifting socio-economic indicators of Karamoja to be in parity with those of the national average.

4) PT 1/3 PROGRAMME PARTNERS

Under the Programme DCA currently (2010) works with the following 14 partners and have different sizes, capacities and projects which all logically make a contribution to the realisation of the Programme Immediate Objectives;

1. Uganda Land Alliance (ULA)  
2. Uganda Debt Network (UDN)  
3. Uganda Joint Christian Council (UJCC)  
4. Karamoja Agro-pastoral Development Programme (KADP)  
5. Social Services and Development (SSD)/ Caritas Moroto  
6. Church of Uganda- Teso Diocese Development Organization (TEDDO)  
7. Soroti Catholic Diocese Development Organisation (SOCADIDO)  
8. Church of Uganda, Planning, Development and Rehabilitation (PDR)
9. Omanimani Community Development Initiative (OCODI)
10. Uganda Change Agent Association (UCAA)
11. Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED)
12. Italian Cooperation and Development (C&D)
13. Uganda Women’s Network (UWONET)

Other key stakeholders of the programme include a) Kampala based Diakonia, Lutheran World Federation, Christian Aid and ICCO b) Karamoja/Teso based a) Katakwi District Local Government b) Amuria District Local Government c) Moroto District Local Government and d) Nakapiripirit District Local Government.

5) PT 1/3 PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES

Development Objective:
The people of Karamoja are enabled to exercise their right to participate, for increased influence and control over the distribution of resources.

Immediate Objectives:
1. The capacity of the Karimajong to use available natural resources (land and water) and income resources (livestock and cereals) in a more effective, efficient and sustainable manner is strengthened.
2. Agro-Pastoralists are empowered to challenge power structures and processes that reinforce their socioeconomic and political marginalisation.
3. Legal and moral duty bearers are mobilised to defend the rights of the Karimajong to access natural and public resources.
4. DCA has been instrumental in facilitating increased capacity of partner organisations in strategic reflections on conflict management, in advocacy, project planning and outcome oriented monitoring, reporting and evaluations.

6) OBJECTIVES OF THE CONSULTANCY

DCA is seeking consultancy services to conduct an End of Programme external Evaluation for PT 1/3 Great Lakes 2006-2010 with a view to the following;

iv) To identity and assess the extent to which the programme has achieved its goals and objectives.

v) To analyse the context in which the Programme has operated and how relevant it is for the integrated Political Space/ Food Security Programme.

vi) Make recommendations for the programme’s thematic focus and how it could be further developed and strengthened over the next period 2011-2016 to realise its objectives.

7) SCOPE OF THE CONSULTANCY

The Consultant(s) Team has a responsibility for conducting the Evaluation exercises guided by the TORs. The exercise will involve meeting programme stakeholders in Kampala, Teso and Karamoja. It will also cover selected projects and cross cutting interventions that DCA has supported through the period 2006-2010 under programme. The scope of a programme evaluation, however, will not be a sum of the projects that have been supported under the period; but rather the extent to which the projects have contributed to the programme objectives and outcome indicators. It will not be about the very details with the projects, but only a view of how (especially at the level of the rights-holders) the results
created by the projects have contributed to the achievement of the programme objectives and indicators. The cross cutting interventions will include selected capacity building, Partner platform meetings and joint advocacy efforts.

8) KEY ISSUES
The external evaluation is meant to answer the broad questions about PT 1/3 Programme in regard to the DCA criteria of Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and sustainability... The consultancy will specifically respond to the following key guiding questions;

i) Relevance
This should focus on the extent to which the Programme conforms to DCA policies (Political Space, Right to Food, Rights-Based Commitment and Gender Equality) as well as priorities of Partners and intended rights-holders.

- To what extent is the current programme focus (thematic, geographical, and rights-holder) still relevant and valid?
- To what extent have programme activities been relevant to the expressed priorities of both men and women rights-holders targeted?
- To what extent have the programme activities been relevant for achieving the programme objectives?
- To what extent is the approach chosen by Uganda to combine right to food interventions and political space interventions in one programme relevant and valid?
- To what extent have DCA Programme policies (Political Space, Right to Food, Gender Equality and Rights-Based Commitment) been relevant and valid for supporting programme work in Uganda?
- To what extent do the DCA Programme Partners consider rights-based and gender equality work as relevant and valid in their context? To what extent do partners understand and appreciate these approaches?
- To what extent has the DCA programme supported activities, particularly under the Right to Food work, related to the government priorities and programmes?
- To what extent do the DCA Programme Partners apply the Rights Based Approaches in their programming? What is the demonstrable evidence to this?
- To what extent do the DCA Programme Partners address Gender and Gender equality? What is the demonstrable evidence to this?
- To what extent are the implementation strategies of DCA Programme Partners relevant and valid in the Ugandan context?
- To what extent do the implementation strategies/ methodologies of DCA Programme Partners address the underlying factors that create and maintain gender inequality? What is the demonstrable evidence to this?
- To what extent has DCA through the Programme-supported Projects contributed to addressing the ‘root causes’ as well as the ‘barriers’ to the marginalisation and vulnerability of the most discriminated groups in the targeted areas?
- How relevant are the Political Space and Food Security Strategies in meeting the expectations of the Programme Partners?
- Based on the experiences of the current rights-holders supported under the Programme, what are their views and recommendations about Relevance?
- Make recommendations on how the Programme relevance could be improved for better results and to guide future programming.

ii) Effectiveness
This should focus on the extent to which programme activities have achieved their objectives, including the complementarity or synergy within the programme and with other DCA programmes in countries. This
section should also assess the degree to which DCA’s approach and support is aligned with other Aprodev/ACT partners in country.

- To what extent have the Programme objectives been achieved?
- To what extent has the Programme contributed to poverty reduction?
- What factors have led to the achievement of the Programme objectives?
- What are the gaps/factors that may have hindered the achievement of the Programme objectives?
- Have there been any significant changes in the context and in state/civil society relations in Uganda during the programme period that has either enhanced or hindered the achievement of the Programme’s objectives?
- How effective are the implementation strategies/methodologies and modalities (outreach, operational, etc) of the DCA Programme partners in facilitating the achievement of programme objectives?
- How has the choice of partners facilitated or hindered (skills, knowledge, attitude, staffing, size, policies, values, practices and other capacity issues) the Programme from achieving its objectives?
- How has the choice of partners facilitated or hindered the effectiveness of a rights-based and gender equality approach in the programme?
- To what extent do the projects under the Programme complement one another to achieve the Programme Goal and Immediate Objectives? (Geographically, targeting, thematically, etc.)
- To what extent has there been synergy between DCA’s integrated Political Space/Food Security Programme and its other programmes in the Great Lakes? Has this lead to enhanced effectiveness?
- Is there any synergy between the integrated Political Space/Food Security Programme with programmes of other like-minded organisations (particularly Aprodev/ACT agencies), or other funding agencies in Uganda? Has this lead to enhanced effectiveness?
- In what way did the integrated Political Space/Food Security Programme contribute to the strategic goals of DCA?
- To what had advocacy and networking contributed to positively changing the conditions which perpetuate poverty, oppression, violence and conflict?
- How could advocacy and networking be strengthened to promote active dialogue among civil society organisations, the state, development partners or the media, at the local, national and regional level?
- To what extent has the Programme enhanced partnership with the Partners?
- Based on the experiences of the current primary beneficiaries through the Programme what are their views and recommendations about Effectiveness?
- Make recommendations on how the Programme Effectiveness could be improved for better results and to guide future programming.

iii) Efficiency

*This should focus on how well the various Cross-cutting and Partners’ projects or activities transformed the available funding and other resources into the intended results for rights holders/ intended beneficiaries, in regard to quantity, quality, timeliness and cost (value for money).*

- To what extent is the Programme funding utilised by the Partners through transparent and accountable means? What is the demonstrable evidence to this?
- How efficient have the funding modalities used by the programme been?
- Were the programme activities implemented in a cost efficient manner compared to other alternatives?
- To what extent has support to programme implementation been cost efficient? Assess the overall costs of Programme implementation 2006-2010 compared to the outcome and/or any verifiable impact
- Based on the experiences of the current primary rights-holders in the Programme, what are their views and recommendations for improved efficiency?
vii) Impact

- What are the most significant changes in the lives of the rights holders, their access to entitlements, their relation to the duty bearers, or within institutions (laws, policies, practices, resource allocations etc.) that can be attributed to the programme?
- What are the most significant changes in terms of gender structures and relations that can be contributed to this programme?
- To what extent have there been changes in targeted rights-holders’ access to government resources and services?
- Were there any unintended results or negative impact of the programme? Explain?

v) Sustainability

This should focus on the extent to which the existence of the continuity or longevity of benefits from the Programme and Projects could continue or be pro-longed even upon the winding up or re-focusing of the current state of the Programme (e.g. revised objectives, modes operandi or geographical focus).

- Are the benefits from the Programme, especially at rights holders’ level likely to continue after the finalization of the programme? What is the demonstrable evidence to this?
- What are the major factors which have influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of programme activities? To what extent has the rights-based approach facilitated or hindered sustainability?
- Have the projects had credible exit, integration or replication strategies in case of eventual phase? What is the demonstrable evidence to this?
- Based on the experiences of the current primary rights-holders under the programme, what are their views and recommendations for enhanced sustainability?
- Make recommendations on how sustainability component could be improved for better results and to guide future programming.

vi) DCA Programme Management, Capacity support and Set-up

This should focus on capacity of the Programme, structural/organizational set-up, staffing- numbers, technical and management competency, skills, attitudes, level of satisfaction, systems, procedures, relations and any other mechanisms or processes that support efficient, effective and coherent delivery of the integrated Political Space/ Food Security Programme at DCA and at Partners level.

- To what extent were the project activities implemented according to the relevant DCA guidelines e.g. PPM, Procurement Manual etc.? What are the strengths and what are the gaps?
- With specific examples, to what extent did the cross-cutting capacity building project achieve the objectives? What facilitated and what inhibited the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- Assess the role and procedures of the Regional and Headquarters in quality assurance (programme design, methods of work and management) of programme implementation.
- To what extent has DCA Monitoring and Evaluation added value to the achievement of the programme’s objectives?
- What upward and downward mechanisms are in place to ensure sharing and learning from project monitoring for improved programme delivery? What is the demonstrable evidence for this?
- How has the DCA structural/organizational set-up facilitated or hindered the achievement of the programme objectives and good partnerships?
• To what extent has the staffing (numbers, technical and management competency, skills, attitudes, level of satisfaction, support etc.) facilitated or hindered proper delivery of the Programme?

• Make recommendations on how the Programme Management, Capacity support and Set-up could be improved for better results and to guide future programming.

Need section on method, team composition, timing and outputs (see TOR on PPM)

vi) Recommendations

In view of the above key guiding and other relevant questions, the Consultant(s) shall assess and make appropriate recommendations that could support the development of the Program 2011-2016. Specifically review and advise on the thematic areas; development approaches used and theories of change; the types of partners and their geographical location, intervention logic and modalities, operational, strategic or any other associate relevant issues.

9) METHODOLOGY

The End of Programme external Evaluation for the integrated Political Space/ Food Security Programme will be done in a participatory manner, using participatory tools. Interviews with key informants within the major stakeholders of the Programme national, local and community levels will include, but not be limited to, legal duty bearers and rights holders—primary beneficiaries in the communities. Others will include partners, international and local NGO representatives, APRODEV/ACT agencies and DCA staff at Kampala and Moroto offices. The consultant(s) will determine and suggest whether the exercise of Context Analysis will as well take this approach.

In both the Programme Evaluation and Context Analysis, the Consultant(s) will develop appropriate tools and a detailed proposed schedule for the exercises, which will be discussed and finalised with the relevant DCA staff in liaison with expected respondents. Such tools, nonetheless, should enhance stakeholders’ participation and ownership, for the exercise to maximise the learning aspect of the Evaluation and Context analysis processes. These will be vital in informing the design of the new Programme 2011-2016. While the Consultant(s), is/ are expected to expound on the appropriate tools and/ or instruments, it is envisaged that the methodology will at least include the following;

Review of relevant Documentation at DCA and Partners’ level

Relevant Programme documents required will be shared with the evaluation team in order to facilitate the understanding and comprehension of Programme matters. These, albeit, will include the soft and/ or hard copies of Programme Document 2006 – 2010, documents on Political Space Strategy, Food Security Strategy, DCA Decentralisation process, Programme Context, Regional Strategy, reports/ evaluations of DCA capacity building support, Programme Mid-Term Reviews etc. Job Descriptions of two relevant P.Os, Project development (Steps) and Programme Budget 2006 – 2010. Other documents will be samples of Programme audit, Project audits, End of Project reports, selected Monitoring visit reports by DCA and Partners, Annual financial and narrative reports and Partner Platform reports.

Documents at the level of Partners may include DCA transfers documents, activity reports, as well as Financial management, Human resources, Gender or other relevant policies. Evaluation reports, Management letters, annual work plans and reports, Quarterly or monthly financial and narrative reports could also be relevant reference materials.

Interviews with DCA staff

This could be at DCA HQs (e.g. Country Co-ordinator, Programme Type Advisors), Regional Representative, Finance Officer and Programme Officers at Kampala and Moroto offices.

Field visits to Partners
Interviews with national, Teso and Karamoja Partners and visits to selected Partners on the basis of their choice or Consultant(s), but taking into consideration coverage, levels of funding, secular and faith-based as well as geographical representation.

**Field visits to Projects**
The Consultant(s) will visit selected projects on the basis of their choice, as well as interact with the intended men and women rights-holders, and other rights holders that may be deemed relevant.

**Interview with duty bearers and other stakeholders**
On the basis of their choice, the Consultant(s) will hold discussions with stakeholder duty bearers and members of relevant networks, forums or agencies.

10) TEAM COMPOSITION, QUALIFICATIONS AND FIELD EXPERTISE FOR THE ASSIGNMENT

The consultancy is expected to be undertaken by a team of 2 or 3 people who are development management professionals. Key expected competences include:

i. Proven understanding and experience of rights and gender based programming, plus community empowerment approaches and advocacy.

ii. Working knowledge of participatory approaches, development management and theories of change.

iii. Proven experience with NGO/CBO based development assistance in Uganda and the East African region.

iv. Proven understanding and experience with regard to both socio-economic and macro-economic policy issues and frameworks for poverty reduction strategies in Uganda.

v. Proven experience and conceptual understanding of the current international development issues and paradigms.

vi. Experience in working with and/or reviewing similar programmes either as part of a team or individually.

11) ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, MANAGEMENT OF THE ASSIGNMENT AND REPORTING

**DCA**
- Within DCA, the overall coordination and responsibility will lie with the Regional Representative (R.R).
- For day-to-day management and reporting, the responsibility will lie with the Programme Officer (P.O) Political Space.
- The R.R will be responsible for issuing the Contract and ensuring that the deliverables of the Evaluation and Context analysis are met.
- The R.R shall provide overall comments, the review process, approve, or otherwise, of the draft and final reports of the Evaluation and Context analysis.
- The P.O will be the link between the Consultant(s) Team and other stakeholders.
- The P.O will coordinate with the Consultant(s) Team Leader and other members of the Team, in regard to the planning and implementation of the Evaluation and Context analysis.
- Review, provide comments upon and approve the evaluation deliverables;
- Track progress of tasks within the timeframes and assessment of the quality of product.
- The P.O will ensure the logistical requirements and prompt payment of the Consultant(s) as per the terms of the consultancy.
- The P.O will Share final reports with relevant stakeholders.

**Consultant(s) Team**
- The Consultant(s) Team will operate under the overall guidance and responsibility of a Team Leader.
• During the exercises of Evaluation and Context analysis, the Consultant(s) Team will remain in close consultation with DCA, at least weekly, through the P.O.
• The Consultant(s) Team will, at least weekly, keep DCA informed about their field visit schedule and status of the assignment.
• Prepare Inception Report for the assignment containing the proposed methodology and tools, list of key informants and a detailed schedule/timeframe or Work plan for the Evaluation and Context analysis exercises. The Report should also contain a financial proposal and expected outputs. It is on the basis of the Inception Report that successful Consultants shall be selected and consultancy fees mutually negotiated if need be and agreed.
• Coordinate the interview schedules, including field visits.
• Share the 1st Draft Report to DCA and make 2 PowerPoint presentations about the Evaluation and Context analysis exercises, at a 1-day debriefing/ Feedback seminar involving the Programme stakeholders. The participants at the seminar will respond to the presentations as an input to be captured by the Consultant(s) into the two reports.
• On the basis of a debriefing, prepare a 2nd Draft and/ or Final reports to DCA.

12) TIMINGS and outputs
The Starting and Ending periods as well as expected deliverables of the Assignment are as per the Roadmap attached. The details of the schedules will be discussed and agreed between DCA and the Consultants.
### Annex 3: DCA PT 1/3 Programme Evaluation Field work Itinerary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day / Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 17th June</td>
<td>8.30 am</td>
<td>DCA program staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00 am</td>
<td>ULA</td>
<td>Lawanda Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.30 pm</td>
<td>ACTED / C&amp;D</td>
<td>Bukoto – (follow ACFODE road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 22nd June</td>
<td>8.30 am</td>
<td>MRGI</td>
<td>Kansanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00 am</td>
<td>UJCC</td>
<td>Old Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00 am</td>
<td>UCAA</td>
<td>Old Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 pm</td>
<td>PDR</td>
<td>Namirembe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 27th June</td>
<td>8.30 - 10.30 am</td>
<td>Travel to Moroto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 28th June</td>
<td>8.30 - 10.30 am</td>
<td>Meet Martha (DCA Field Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.30 – 5.00 pm</td>
<td>Meet district officials (CAO, LC V, etc the usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 29th June</td>
<td>9.00 – 5.00 pm</td>
<td>Meet other stakeholders such as FAO, World Food Program, Save the Children, RIAMRIAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 30th</td>
<td>9.00 – 3.00 pm</td>
<td>A stakeholder workshop which is organised by Diakonia but DCA staff should attend as a stakeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 1st July</td>
<td>8.30 – 10.30 am</td>
<td>SSD / Caritas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00 – 5.00 pm</td>
<td>Meet impact groups (rights holders) in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 2nd July</td>
<td>8.30 am – 10.30 am</td>
<td>KADP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00 – 5.00 pm</td>
<td>KADP field meetings with impact groups (rights holders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 3rd July</td>
<td>8.30 am – 9.30 am</td>
<td>OCODI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00 am</td>
<td>Field visit to impact groups(^\text{16})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Rest day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 5th July</td>
<td>8.30 am – 10.30 am</td>
<td>SOCADIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00 – 5.00 pm</td>
<td>Field meetings with impact groups (rights holders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 6th July</td>
<td>8.30 am – 10.30 am</td>
<td>TEDDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00 – 5.00 pm</td>
<td>Field meetings with impact groups (rights holders)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{16}\) We drive one way to the field and proceed to Soroti
### Annex 4: List of Participants (Persons / Groups Consulted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sn #</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Organisation</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Address/Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antony Grange</td>
<td>Country Representative, DANCHURCHAID</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Human Rights House, Nsambya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol xx</td>
<td>Program Coordinator, DANCHURCHAID</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julius Kapwepwe</td>
<td>Programme Officer, PT1/3, DANCHURCHAID</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robina</td>
<td>Finance Officer DANCHURCHAID</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Amot</td>
<td>Finance Coordinator</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Ouma</td>
<td>District Chief Administrative Officer,</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0752 636 939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Opio</td>
<td>Deputy Resident District Commissioner</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Moroto District Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Olupot</td>
<td>Secretary Board of Directors, Moroto/Nakapiripirit Religious Leaders Initiative for Peace (MONARLIP)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0772 551 352 0392 815 048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sylvia Atugonza</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator: RIAMIRIAM CIVIL SOCIETY NET WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martha Iriama</td>
<td>DANCHURCHAID Field Officer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0772 348 941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrana Andrew</td>
<td>World Food Programme (WFP)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew.andrana@wfp.org">andrew.andrana@wfp.org</a> 0772 324 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Okedi Richard</td>
<td>World Food Programme (WFP)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td><a href="mailto:okedi@wfp.org">okedi@wfp.org</a> 0777 773 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engborg Kasper</td>
<td>Head of Office UNOCHA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>UNOCHA Office, Moroto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abula Vincent Omala</td>
<td>Team Leader, Integrated Implementation Officer, Save the Children in Uganda</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Moroto Field Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. Thomas Achia</td>
<td>Development Director –</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CARITAS – SSD MOROTO OFFICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nyango John Bosco</td>
<td>Program Assistant (CARITAS – SSD)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sr. Jane Rose Dropia</td>
<td>Finance/Administration Manager (CARITAS – SSD)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Namer Ann Grace</td>
<td>Community Development Manager (CARITAS – SSD) (CARITAS – SSD)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kodet John Mark</td>
<td>Program Officer, Sustenance of livelihoods. (CARITAS – SSD)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Amollo</td>
<td>Accountant (CARITAS – SSD)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokeris Anna Patricia</td>
<td>Program Officer Gender and development (CARITAS – SSD)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abura Stephen</td>
<td>Program Officer governance &amp; conflict transformation KADP</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0772905481 <a href="mailto:abura_stephen@yahoo.co.uk">abura_stephen@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akol Bernard</td>
<td>M&amp;E Officer KADP</td>
<td>M</td>
<td><a href="mailto:benolil@yahoo.co.uk">benolil@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokii J.B</td>
<td>Program Officer Livelihoods KADP</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0772389904 <a href="mailto:baptistlokii@yahoo.com">baptistlokii@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokure Anne</td>
<td>Micro-finance Officer KADP</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0782511106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomukol Raphael</td>
<td>Community Facilitator OCODI</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0775515107.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Fr. Opio Silver</td>
<td>Coordinator SOCADIDO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Apio</td>
<td>Project Coordinator SOCADIDO</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Agelo</td>
<td>Programme Officer SOCADIDO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obolonge Ruth</td>
<td>Community Mobiliser SOCADIDO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olwok Pious</td>
<td>Community Development Officer (CDO) SOCADIDO</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asio Suzan</td>
<td>Coordinator TEDDO</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okello Amos</td>
<td>Programme Officer Good governance, TEDDO</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulo Winnie FO</td>
<td>Field Officer TEDDO</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilla Susan</td>
<td>Field Officer TEDDO</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odaro Jude</td>
<td>Programme Assistant Uganda Debt Network (UDN)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Oyulu</td>
<td>Programme Assistant UDN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rukia Nakamate</td>
<td>Communications Officer UDN</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumwebaze Patrick</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Apolot</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastien Lambroschini</td>
<td>Country Director ACTED</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Kisiigha</td>
<td>Deputy Executive Secretary for Programmes, UJCC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>POSITION/ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Byerya</td>
<td>Accountant, UJCC</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon Joyce Nima</td>
<td>Head, Department, Peace Building and Conflict Transformation, UJCC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Aciro</td>
<td>Executive Director, UWONET</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyeko Robert</td>
<td>Accountant, Uganda Land Alliance (ULA)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwebe John Kalibala</td>
<td>Program Assistant, Legal Services, ULA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpalanyi Michael</td>
<td>Networking and Capacity Building Officer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Mulindwa</td>
<td>MRGI</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robina Apunyo</td>
<td>COU PDR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimuda</td>
<td>COU, PDR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Mbogo</td>
<td>COU, PDR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Akello</td>
<td>Executive Director, UCAA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosette Mpaulo</td>
<td>Finance Officer, UCAA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF GROUP</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longaroi Cereal bank Group</td>
<td>BOKORA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabokat women group (Goat keeping and goat meat sellers)</td>
<td>MATHENIKO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apetolim Food Banking Group</td>
<td>NAPAK</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aminanaros Farmer Field School and Savings and Credit Group</td>
<td>AMURIA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodonyo Valley</td>
<td>Moroto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>