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Preamble

The Country Programming Framework (CPF) is a joint framework which forms the basis for strategic cooperation over the next five years (2015 – 2019) between the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the Government of the Republic of Uganda, represented principally by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), collaborating with the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE), Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives (MTIC), Ministry of Karamoja Affairs (MOKA) and the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM). The CPF defines in a measurable way the kind of assistance the Government, private sector, civil society and general public in Uganda can expect from FAO during the planning period, thereby enhancing predictability and transparency of FAO's interventions in the country. The framework is also a tool for resource mobilization and presents to donors and all other stakeholders a clear and concise picture of what FAO intends to achieve over the planning period, and the resources needed to accomplish the tasks.

The CPF has been developed in line with the national medium term development priorities as articulated in the National Development Plan II (2015/16 – 2019/20), the agriculture sector priorities for the same period, as well as FAO's regional and global priorities and mandate. It is also consistent with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF, 2016 – 2020).

The development process for the CPF involved high level and wide-ranging consultations with representatives of Government and other stakeholders involved in supporting the agriculture sector. Through the consultations, an assessment of priority areas needing external support was made and those most appropriate for FAO Uganda (FAOUG) Country Office's interventions identified. These priority areas are indicated in Table 1.

Many aspects of Uganda’s agriculture sector encompassing cultivation and management of crops and trees, rearing of animals and fish, as well as processing and marketing of their products need external support. Other areas include development of infrastructure (e.g. grain silos), research into fruit and vegetable growing, bio-fortification of staple crops, implementation of a wood energy programme, linkage with financial institutions, and surveillance and control of animal and crop diseases. A process of prioritization was applied to determine the most appropriate intervention areas that match both the resource mobilization potential and the capacity of FAO Uganda Country Office. Consultations with donors and other development partners provided further input in the prioritization process, and a final validation workshop confirmed them.

Other UN agencies, international development partners, government ministries and agencies, civil society, research and academia, media and the legislature are all vital stakeholders in supporting implementation of the CPF. In the course of implementation, FAO will also collaborate with these and other entities as need arises.

This CPF elaborates the focus areas in a set of programming themes which, if fully implemented, will imprint FAO's mark on the development of the agriculture sector in particular, and Uganda in general.
Table 1: Outcome Areas and Outputs of FAO’s support to Uganda, 2015 – 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME AREAS</th>
<th>Outcome 1: Sustainable production and productivity of agriculture, forestry and fisheries commodities for men, women and youth in targeted populations increased</th>
<th>Outcome 2: Environment for equitable access by men, women and youth to, and utilization of agricultural knowledge and information for decision-making, enhanced</th>
<th>Outcome 3: Resilience of vulnerable communities and households to livelihood threats, and food and nutrition insecurity, improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.1: Availability and equitable access by targeted men, women and youth to production assets, knowledge and services for production increased</td>
<td>Output 1.2: Growth and development of marketing systems, value addition, agro-processing and standards enhanced</td>
<td>Output 1.3: Capacity of selected public, civil society and private institutions for quality agricultural services and assets acquisition enhanced</td>
<td>Output 1.4: Sustainable management of natural resources strengthened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.1: Capacity of selected public, private sector and civil society institutions to acquire, manage and utilize agricultural information strengthened</td>
<td>Output 2.2: Capacity of selected institutions for communication and advocacy strengthened</td>
<td>Output 3.1: Livelihoods of targeted vulnerable households protected and diversified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.3: Capacity of relevant public institutions to coordinate stakeholders for agriculture, food and nutrition planning strengthened</td>
<td>Output 3.2: Capacity of selected institutions for disaster risk management and Early Warning strengthened</td>
<td>Output 3.3: Capacity of selected communities for climate change adaptation and mitigation strengthened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 3.4: Capacity of selected communities for disaster risk management and Early Warning strengthened</td>
<td>Output 3.5: Capacity of selected communities for disaster risk management and Early Warning strengthened</td>
<td>Output 3.6: Capacity of selected communities for disaster risk management and Early Warning strengthened</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation of the interventions to achieve the stated outcomes is expected to cost USD $100 million over the five years. CPF implementation will be done through projects and programmes formulated to cover specific gaps in the three outcome areas above.

---
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### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADI</td>
<td>African Agribusiness and Agro-Industries Development Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATF</td>
<td>African Agricultural Technology Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCRA</td>
<td>African Climate Change Resilience Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAADP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCD</td>
<td>Climate Change Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPF</td>
<td>Country Programming Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIGI</td>
<td>Centre for International Governance Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP</td>
<td>Country Programming Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSF</td>
<td>Country Support Strategic Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLG</td>
<td>District Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRM</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSIP</td>
<td>Development Strategy and Investment Plan (Agriculture sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPRES</td>
<td>Emergency Prevention System for Trans-boundary Animal and Plant Pests and Diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP</td>
<td>Economic Recovery Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO-NPA</td>
<td>FAO News, Publications and Announcements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAOUG</td>
<td>FAO-Uganda Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOWODE</td>
<td>Forum for Women in Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFS</td>
<td>Farmer Field School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNS</td>
<td>Food and Nutrition Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSAL</td>
<td>Food Security and Agricultural Livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoA</td>
<td>Horn of Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDDRSI</td>
<td>IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAD</td>
<td>Inter-Governmental Authority on Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPC</td>
<td>Integrated Food Security Phase Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPoA</td>
<td>Istanbul Plan of Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDPG</td>
<td>Local Development Partner Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGS</td>
<td>Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAIF</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICE</td>
<td>Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWE</td>
<td>Ministry of Water and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAADS</td>
<td>National Agricultural Advisory Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARO</td>
<td>National Agricultural Research Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>National Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEMA</td>
<td>National Environment Management Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>New Partnership for African Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPM</td>
<td>Office of the Prime Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>FAO Regional Office for Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REOAOA</td>
<td>FAO Sub-regional Office for Eastern and Central Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFE</td>
<td>FAO Sub-regional Office for Eastern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFA</td>
<td>State of Food and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP</td>
<td>Technical Cooperation Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBOS</td>
<td>Uganda Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDHS</td>
<td>Uganda Demographic and Health Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF</td>
<td>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHS</td>
<td>Uganda National Household Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOCAT</td>
<td>World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG</td>
<td>Voluntary Guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FAO Mission

“Helping to build a food secure world for the present and future generations.”

FAO Mandate

“To help raise the levels of nutrition, improve agricultural production and productivity, better living standards of rural populations and contribute to the world economy with the overall objective of assisting the world to achieve food security for all.”
Introduction

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) is a multilateral agency established in 1945 with the mandate to monitor the global supplies of food, fibre and forest products and to enhance their production. It serves as a neutral forum where all nations meet to negotiate matters of policy and other agreements relating to its mandate. It is a source of knowledge and information, and also helps developing countries to modernize and improve agriculture, fisheries and forestry practices, to ensure good nutrition and food security for all.

To meet the demands of its mandate, FAO’s work hinges around five global strategic objectives. FAO operates a decentralized structure, with headquarters located in Rome, Italy, and regional and country offices, charged with the responsibility of working with partners in pursuit of its mission and objectives. The Africa Regional Office (RAF) is in Accra, Ghana, while the Sub-regional Office for Eastern Africa (SFE) and the Sub-regional Emergency Office for Eastern and Central Africa (REOA) are in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and Nairobi, Kenya respectively. The FAO Uganda Country Office draws from expertise in these offices, which oversee the activities of the Country Office, and from its sub national offices (see Map 1).

Global Strategic objectives

SO1: To contribute to the eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition
SO2: To increase and improve the provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner
SO3: To reduce rural poverty
SO4: To enable more inclusive and efficient agriculture and food systems at local, national and international levels and
SO5: To increase resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises

1.1 Historical Perspective

FAO has a long association with Uganda. From as far back as 1959, it has supported the Government of Uganda to undertake various evaluation and research such as; on carp and tilapia fish for aquaculture, control of ticks and tick-borne diseases, tsetse fly and other livestock diseases. The highlight of the association was in 1979 when FAO and the Government of Uganda signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for the establishment of a Representation Office in Uganda. Subsequently, the FAO Uganda Country Office opened in 1981 in Kampala, and has remained operational since then.

Over the years, the stature and influence of FAO in Uganda has grown considerably. Currently the country programme comprises well over 20 projects with a combined budget of close to USD 70 million, which makes FAO one of Uganda’s significant development partners. FAO projects are mainly field-based, addressing on-ground pertinent issues.

The mid-term review of the Country Support Strategic Framework (CSSF) 2010 – 2014, the predecessor of this CPF, indicates that substantial progress was made in all the focal areas\(^1\) of the framework, resuultantly addressing some of Uganda’s medium-term priorities. This illustrates FAO Uganda’s capacity to achieve the objectives of its programmes and projects, and

\(^1\) PFA1: Policy, strategy and Planning; PFA2: Production and Productivity; PFA3: Value addition, agro-processing and marketing; PFA4: Agricultural Knowledge, Information and Education; and PFA5: Sustainable Natural Resource Management
Country Programming Framework

2015 - 2019

Areas of DLG Capacity Assessment
Food and Nutrition Security
Agricultural Extension
Agricultural marketing and Finance
Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction
District Oversight

1.2. Rationale for Country Programming

A Country Programming Framework is principally a document of agreed priorities of FAO and the Government of Uganda. It defines areas of emphasis and the intended outcomes of FAO's support to Uganda. It is a planning tool by which FAO prioritizes, guides and manages its assistance at the country level coherently.

Framing of the CPF took into account the national medium-term development priorities as articulated in the National Development Plan (NDP) II 2015/16 – 2019/20, which is the overall development framework for Uganda, with a special focus placed on the agriculture sector priorities. Other planning frameworks that fall within FAO's mandate were also considered, a list of which is outlined in Section 2.3 and annexed.

Until very recently, FAO's support programme emphasized emergency and rehabilitation. The current CPF focuses more on long-term development objectives aimed at revitalizing agricultural production and productivity and spurring economic development for the country. The character of the support programmes is dictated by the situation in a given locality such as in Northern Uganda and Karamoja.

1.3. Methodology for CPF Development

The process of developing the CPF involved a number of steps:

i) A comprehensive literature review of key government development policy and planning frameworks was undertaken. Relevant regional and international frameworks were also reviewed.

ii) Consultations were held with individuals and groups representing key institutions in Uganda, including government/public, private sector, research and academia, and civil society organizations, who are either current or potential partners of FAO, and the local development partner working groups. The consultations provided a sense of what these stakeholders perceive as priorities for FAO. In addition, assessment of local government capacity was done, whose findings were factored in the formulation of the CPF.

iii) In-house consultations within FAO Uganda were held to brainstorm and agree on outcome areas, key outputs and priority interventions.

iv) A national validation process, involving key government and development partners, was held to confirm the strategic direction and priorities of the CPF for the next five years.

2 At the time of preparing this CPF, only an early draft of the NDP II was available. It's proposed priorities for the agriculture sector were used with the understanding that they will not change significantly in the final version.

3 Consultations were held with officers of FAO Country office in Kampala and Field/Sub offices in Moroto, Kotido, Kaabong, Kitgum, Gulu, Lira, Kabale, Mubende and Nakasongola
2.1. National Context

Uganda’s favorable climate and relatively good soils contribute significantly to the success of the country’s agriculture sector, and hence the sustenance of the majority of the people. Temperatures vary only a few degrees above or below 23°C, and most areas receive adequate rains to allow for two cropping seasons a year; and where that is not possible, there is usually sufficient rain to allow for annual cropping. Areas where rainfall is low and uncertain can still support pastoralism, thereby potentially making the whole country agriculturally productive, although production remains low.

The country is endowed with significant amounts of surface water. Fifteen percent of the land surface comprises lakes and rivers, most of which contain significant fisheries resources, and a significant proportion has potential for aquaculture. There are some irrigation schemes, mainly for rice and vegetable production, but given the amount of surface water available, additional irrigation is feasible.

Uganda’s population stands at 34.9 million, 51.4 percent female and 48.6 percent male, the majority of whom (81.6 percent) live in rural areas. At a growth rate of 3.03 percent per annum, the country’s population is getting younger as 56 percent are under 18 years of age and 31.4 percent are between 10 - 24 years.

2.2. Situation and Outlook

Uganda has enjoyed economic growth over the past couple of decades, with an average GDP growth of 5 percent. Recent estimates for 2014 put GDP growth at 4.7 percent per annum (constant market prices), while annual inflation is generally under control at an average of 6 percent owing to tight fiscal management (UBOS 2013). However, the government budget deficit continues to rise resulting from a combination of factors, such as the low domestic revenue generation, high expenditure, withdrawal of direct budget support by some donors and large trade deficits, reflecting low production capacity and hence over-reliance on donor funding. Coupled with this, the country is burdened by a population that is largely poor and growing at a very fast rate, which at 3.03 percent per year is unsustainable for the economy.

Fig 1: GDP growth at market and basic prices 2009/10 - 2013/14

Source: UBOS Statistical Abstract 2014

4 National Population and Housing Census 2014 Provisional Results.
2.2.1 Food and Nutrition Security

Food and nutrition insecurity exists when people lack choice, have anxiety about running out of food, or are forced to make changes in their preferred eating habits, due to economic constraints. It can be a consequence of poverty or a result of failed harvests due to adverse weather conditions.

Achieving food security means ensuring quality (utilization/nutrition) and continuity of food access (stability), in addition to quantity (availability and access) for all household members.

Rural Uganda is generally food secure (IPC Phase 1), with the exception of the Karamoja sub-region, which mainly experiences stress (IPC Phase 2). The northern region also presents a few pockets of stress (IPC 2013 & 2014). The figure below illustrates the food security situation countrywide over the last five years, based on IPC analysis.

Fig 2: IPC Analysis Maps 2009-2014

In recent years, repeat dry spells characterized the seasons, and extended lean periods, lowered crop and livestock productivity. This led to erosion of livelihoods as households sold some of their productive assets to acquire food. With the continuing reality of climate change, the food and nutrition security situation is likely to worsen.

Many households, especially female-headed ones, lack access to diverse diets, which is indicative of food insecurity. There are wide disparities in household food consumption across the country, with Karamoja, West Nile and south-west regions most affected. Uganda loses close to USD 899 million annually, equivalent to 5.6 percent of the GDP, due to effects of malnutrition (COHA 2013). This compares unfavorably with loss through low productivity in the agriculture sector of USD 201 million annually. Improved agricultural production should ideally result in better nutrition, thus efforts are being made to make agriculture more nutrition-sensitive.
2.2.2 Gender

The role of women in agriculture is very important, more so because the men, who traditionally engaged in menial tasks of cultivation and livestock keeping, tending to cash crops, and timber and charcoal production, are gradually shifting from this responsibility and resorting to petty trade, while a significant proportion have resorted to idleness. With this withdrawal of male labour from farming activities, the burden of supporting households has been relegated to women. In this new role, women experience severe constraints, such as limited access to the key factors of production: like land, capital and micro-finance facilities,⁵ which reduce the efficiency of production at household level. This is the cost that gender inequality imposes on the agriculture sector, as well as on the women themselves. Decision-making on what to do with the produce is more often taken by the male spouse, who also determines how the proceeds from produce sales are spent (Bosworth 2003). Such imbalance has a negative effect, not only on the household, but on the entire sector. (Annex 7 contains a gender review of the CSSF 2010-2014 which will be complemented by a comprehensive analysis of the gender situation in FAO-mandated areas).

2.2.3 Climate Change

Climate change is a major challenge to food and agricultural development in Uganda (FAO 2010). Since 1960, mean countrywide annual temperatures have risen by 1.3°C, a rate higher than global and regional averages (Mc-Sweeney et al, 2007; Lindsey et al 2011). With average temperatures expected to increase by between 0.7°C and 1.5°C by the 2020s (NDP, 2010), and the changing rainfall patterns, it is expected that the socio-economic impacts of climate change on agriculture, livelihoods, food security, health and other sectors, will continue to threaten, and perhaps even reverse the development gains and jeopardize the Government’s economic development and poverty eradication goals. Evidence available indicates that climate change in Uganda creates conditions which favour the spread of human, crop and livestock pests and diseases, including areas where they were originally non-existent (Environmental Alert, 2010).

2.2.4 Agriculture Sector

The agriculture sector, which is dominated by smallholder farmers who produce most of the crop and livestock products on subsistence basis, accounts for 22.2 percent of total GDP and 52 percent of the value of total exports in FY 2013/14. It is a source of livelihood for more than 70 percent of the country’s population, and employment for 66 percent of the labour force.⁶ Besides meeting household food needs, the sector is an important source of raw materials for local industries. Despite the critical importance of the sector, growth rates remain low, at 1.3 percent in 2012/13 and 1.5 percent in 2013/14.

2.2.4.1 Crops

Only one-third of the country’s arable land is under cultivation, which is indicative that the country’s potential for agricultural development is far from being realized.

The main food crops are bananas, cassava, Irish potatoes, sweet potatoes, maize, millet, rice, sorghum, beans and groundnuts, while the main cash/export commodities are coffee, cotton, tea, tobacco, and sugar. The Government has placed emphasis on increasing the production and productivity of maize, coffee, beans, tea, bananas, cassava and rice as strategic crop commodities. Whereas this subsector contributes the highest GDP proportion of 12 percent in FY 2012/13, production over the years remained constant, registering a modest growth rate of 2 percent.

---

⁵ SOFA 2011, CEDAW2010
⁶ UBOS, 2014 (Statistical Abstract)
⁷ This categorization is no longer applicable since at household level the traditional food crops are grown both for consumption and income.
Production is low owing to inadequate access to agricultural inputs and technology, weak extension service delivery, inadequate access to markets, credit and information, low investment and economically important crop diseases (like the African Cassava Mosaic Disease, Cassava Brown Streak Disease and Banana Bacterial Wilt Disease).

**Fig 3: Average annual growth and total(cumulative) growth in production volumes of major commodities**

2.2.4.2. **Livestock**

The livestock subsector contributes about 3 percent of total GDP, and has over the years maintained a steady albeit slow growth of around 3 percent, which is expected to continue over the medium term. According to 2012/13 estimates, the livestock subsector comprises approximately 14.6 million goats, 13 million cattle, 4 million sheep, 3.7 million pigs and 38 million poultry in 2013 (UBOS 2014). Livestock keeping systems range from the low output traditional nomadic pastoralism, practiced in semi-arid areas like Karamoja, to a combination of relatively higher output intensive (breed improvement) and extensive forms (ranching) in the south western region of the country.

This difference is evidenced in the milk production statistics where 25 percent of the milk produced in the country is from the south western region while only 7 percent is produced in Karamoja. Over the years, there have been outbreaks of trans-boundary animal diseases such as FMD, CBPP, CCPP and PPR, and parasites and vectors whose effective surveillance and control is often beyond the means of the livestock keepers. This impacts greatly on production and productivity. Although the Government tries its best to provide epidemiological and diagnostic services, it is constrained by insufficient financial and human resources.

**Fig 4: Annual growth in production volumes of Milk and Beef**

8 UBOS 2014 Statistical Abstract
2.2.4.3. **Fisheries**

The fisheries subsector contributes about 2 percent of GDP from fish and fish products from Lake Victoria (about 46 percent), Lake Albert (38 percent), Lake Kyoga (10 percent), and lakes Edward and George contributing the rest. There has been a decline in the annual fish catch in the last couple of years, partly due to overfishing and use of unsustainable fishing gear in most of Uganda’s water bodies, and this is projected to decline further unless measures to curb these malpractices are put in place. The major challenges facing capture fisheries include the use of poor fishing technologies, weak enforcement of fishing regulations and weak implementation of fish processing and safety standards.

Fish production through aquaculture has been going on in Uganda for many years, and there are a number of on-going initiatives to promote aquaculture. There are an estimated 12,000 farmers involved in aquaculture, altogether producing about 15,000 tonnes of fish (FAO, 2014). The level of production is still very low compared with capture fisheries, though the potential is huge.

**Fig 5: Annual growth in production volumes of Fish**

![Graph showing annual growth in production volumes of Fish]

2.2.5 **Environment and Forestry**

This subsector, which comprises 15 percent of total land area occupied by natural forests, of which about 7 percent is gazetted government forest and 11 percent privately owned⁹, contributes about 2 percent of GDP. Uganda’s forest ecosystems are rich in biodiversity, providing a myriad of uses and environmental services to the communities and the world at large. Eighty percent of the forests are woodlands and the rest are tropical high forest and plantations. Approximately 30 percent of the natural forest (both woodland and tropical high) are found in Protected Areas, and therefore under government stewardship, while the remaining 70 percent are either under private or customary management. The former category is being degraded at an alarming rate of about 17 percent per annum owing to demands for timber, charcoal, and arable land which highlights the need for establishment of plantation forests for future benefit. Smallholder forest producers are not well-positioned to take advantage of conservation initiatives that would otherwise economically benefit them because, whereas they own and manage the forest resources, regulation is a public sector responsibility.

2.2.6 **Water Resources**

Uganda has abundant water resources in lakes and rivers, which are yet to be fully exploited for agricultural production due to the high cost of infrastructure development and technologies. Sizeable tracts of the country remain marginally productive owing to absence of water either for irrigation or for livestock consumption. Additionally, several studies

---

undertaken by the Ministry of Water and Environment show that previous investments in the water sector, especially in the cattle corridor and Karamoja, have been rendered ineffective by very low participation of the community and public sector in the management and maintenance of the water facilities.

### 2.2.7 Outlook

There are many opportunities and advantages to be exploited to build a robust and dynamic agriculture sector. The Africa Agribusiness and Agro-industries Development Initiative (3ADI) postulates that agriculture should become the main driver in stimulating the economic growth of the continent.\(^{10}\) It proposes that investments in the sector should go beyond improvements in on-farm productivity to embrace agribusiness and agro-industries’ development of highly productive and profitable agricultural commodity value chains that effectively link small and medium size producers to markets, supplying high-value and nutritious food, fibre and feed, and utilizing natural resources in a sustainable manner. FAO, alongside the African Union and the African Development Bank, is a promoter of this initiative.

In light of climate change adding an extra layer of vulnerability to already fragile contexts, compounding and exacerbating poverty and food insecurity, stakeholders in the Horn of Africa, under the IGAD umbrella (IDDRSI), are emphasizing building of resilience to counter the threats to livelihoods especially in arid and semi arid areas. The resilience agenda hinges around understanding the key causes of vulnerability (resilience context analysis), developing Country Programming Papers (CPP) tailored to unique local contexts, and mobilizing funds for the member countries to respond appropriately. Uganda as a member of IGAD is party to this discourse.

The Rome Declaration on Nutrition 2014\(^{11}\) calls upon United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, led by FAO and WHO, to support national governments in developing, strengthening and implementing their policies, programmes and plans to address the multiple challenges of malnutrition. This is in anticipation of integrating the vision and commitments for better nutrition into the Post-2015 Development Agenda and a related global goal on nutrition.

### 2.3 Analysis of Policies, Programmes and Related National Priorities

Uganda has endorsed a number of international and regional policy frameworks which have been reviewed in the formulation of this CPF for their strategic direction. These include the Istanbul Plan of Action, Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) and the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). National frameworks, which have a bearing on the agriculture sector, including the national policies on agriculture, food and nutrition, gender, water, forestry, trade, climate change, disaster risk reduction, such as the Uganda Vision 2040, National Development Plan, Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan, were also reviewed.

The objectives of the referenced policies, programmes and priorities are in annex 5.

---

\(^{10}\) 3ADI 2010  
\(^{11}\) International Conference on Nutrition (ICN 2), November 2014
2.3.1 **Challenges Facing the Agriculture Sector**

The challenges facing the agriculture sector are of institutional and systemic nature. Key among these are:

1) Inadequate financing of the sector and its local government departments.
2) Inadequate human resource capacity (staffing levels, motivation and welfare) at both national and sub national levels.
3) Lack of clarity regarding the agricultural extension service system\(^\text{12}\)
4) Weak implementation of policies and enforcement of management regulations and standards especially in the fisheries and forestry subsectors.
5) Low levels of commercialized agricultural production, weak agribusiness support and finance, high dependence on subsistence-oriented production and weak linkages to formal markets.
6) Inefficient labour force in the agriculture sector inhibited by gender and socio-cultural practices, high burden of malnutrition and an escalating prevalence of HIV and AIDS that affect especially women and youth.
7) Crop and livestock diseases of trade importance.

2.4. **Governance System and Relevant Stakeholders**

The Office of the Prime Minister is responsible for coordinating policy implementation and monitoring in the country, which involves providing oversight for line ministries in different sectors. The responsibility for governance in the agriculture sector lies with the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, which is the main counterpart of FAO in Uganda. The nature of the agriculture sector is one that requires a multi-sectoral, interdisciplinary approach to addressing key issues in the sector. Therefore, the ministries of Water and Environment; Trade, Industry and Cooperatives; Gender, Labour and Social Development; Local Government; and Karamoja Affairs, are working in partnership with FAO and MAAIF to promote agriculture and rural development, contribute to food security and address environmental protection.

The above institutions are responsible for policy formulation, regulation and technical oversight of programmes. Implementation is largely undertaken at, and by, district local governments with the collaboration of local and international partners. The academia, research institutions, private sector, the media and the communities also play significant roles.

\(^{12}\) NAADS is under review and restructuring. The GoU and FAO are in discussion to adopt the farmer field school methodology as the approach for delivery of agricultural extension.
3.1. Comparative Advantage Analysis

FAO’s position as a global leader, and its capacity as the world’s agricultural knowledge agency for policy development, integrated capacity building, technical cooperation, response to agricultural emergencies, and support to rehabilitation/recovery, support to rural and agricultural investment, collection and dissemination of global information, and for the development and implementation of major international treaties and agreements, are its value-addition.

3.1.1 Revealed Comparative Advantages in Uganda

FAO’s broad mandate covers multiple disciplines of food and agriculture, with a globally unique pool of experts in agriculture, crop and livestock production, forestry, fisheries, natural resource management and legal matters. FAO in Uganda can leverage this expertise and resources to technically support a broad range of initiatives and interventions by the Government and other actors in the food and agriculture sectors.

FAO is the only UN organization mandated to collect, analyze, interpret and disseminate information related to food and agriculture, and has strong expertise in the collection, generation and management of data and statistics. This is critical in the support to improving food and agricultural statistics (in terms of both quality and availability) as well as the strengthening of information systems (for nutrition, food security and early warning).

FAO Uganda enjoys close working relationships with, and easy access to, several ministries, departments and agencies of government concerned with agriculture, forestry, fisheries and natural resources, built over years of collaboration.

FAO has extensive experience in facilitating policy dialogue and consensus-building on policy and technical solutions on the sustainable use of resources for food and agriculture.

The Comparative Advantage refers to those functions and tasks that FAO can execute better than any other organization in the specific area of its institutional mandate.

FAO’s comparative advantages at the global level are:

1. Authority and status as a global intergovernmental organization;
2. FAO as an honest broker;
3. Unparalleled information source and institutional memory;
4. Broad networking capacity with Members and other partners;
5. Decentralized capabilities;
6. Professional and multidisciplinary staff;
7. Capacity to respond to unforeseen needs of member countries; and
8. Responsible financial and administrative management.
production, and in assisting countries in developing and implementing sound natural resource management policies, programmes and projects, strengthening capacity, preparing effective legislation and creating national and regional strategies to achieve agricultural and rural development goals. For instance, FAO works closely with the AU and IGAD to develop policy and systems on resilience in the Horn of Africa region, which Uganda, as a member country of both regional bodies, will directly benefit from in its efforts to build resilient livelihoods and systems for her populations.

FAO developed, tried and tested models to improve rural livelihoods, using participatory processes and methods focused on the needs of the rural poor. FAO also has experience in strengthening rural institution capacities to improve rural development and food security and in creating enabling environments for producer organizations to thrive. The farmer field school (FFS) approach has been developed, adapted and continuously improved as a vehicle to deliver a wide range of services and inputs (ranging from agronomic skills development to microfinance, resource management and climate change adaptation). FAO in Uganda has extensive skills and capacity in FFS, which can be capitalized for extension service improvement.

FAO has first-hand experience in working at country level to support smallholders, cooperatives and farmers’ organizations in improving production systems and access to productive resources, strengthening resilience, and increasing integration into markets and participation in value chains. In Uganda, FAO developed and supported value chains in several commodities, working with various groups, including farmer groups and cooperatives.

FAO has expertise in developing guidelines, norms and standards for crisis prevention and risk management in food and agriculture and disseminating them through global networks and approaches, such as the Voluntary Guidelines (VGs) on Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forestry, Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS), Land tenure issues in Disaster Risk Management (DRM) manuals, DRM systems analysis, etc. The EMPRES system is already being used in Uganda to support livestock disease surveillance and early warning.

3.1.2 Perceived Comparative Advantages in Uganda

The stakeholder perceptions of FAO, obtained through a consultative process, are that the assistance provided to the agriculture sector in Uganda, though commendable, is still thinly spread. The allocation of funds for projects has progressively increased for development programmes and the coverage has also widened. Nonetheless, it is still insufficient to adequately cover the magnitude of intervention requirements, given the effort required for the rehabilitation of agricultural systems in Northern Uganda and the realization of the climate change adaptation agenda.

FAO is also recognised for collaborating closely with government institutions, but to avoid being slowed down by institutional inefficiencies, it must increase the efforts at building the capacity of these institutions to deliver in a timely manner.

3.2. Mapping FAO’s Comparative Advantages against the Strategic Objectives and Priorities

3.2.1 FAO Global Strategic Objectives

The Strategic Objectives (SOs) express the development outcomes, in countries, regions and globally, expected to be achieved over a long-term (ten-year) time frame by members based on
FAO’s value-added interventions.

Five (5) Strategic Objectives were defined in the FAO Strategic Framework for 2010 – 2019 as follows:

1. Contribute to the eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition;
2. Increase and improve provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner;
3. Reduce rural poverty;
4. Enable more inclusive and efficient agricultural and food systems at local, national and international levels;
5. Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises.

The strategic framework (2010 – 2019) defined a sixth Objective to ensure technical quality, knowledge and services, gender and governance were incorporated as cross-cutting themes. Four (4) Functional Objectives were also defined: Outreach; Information technology; FAO governance, oversight, direction; and Administration.

3.2.2 **FAO’s Medium Term Plan 2014-2017 and Programme of Work and Budget 2014 - 2015**

The Strategic Framework 2010 – 2019 is being implemented through four year plans, the current one being the Medium Term Plan 2014 – 2017, with clearly defined Outcomes and Outputs at global, regional and country levels. The four-year plans are broken down into biennial implementation work-plans and budgets, the current one being the Programme of Work and Budget 2014-2015, specifying the products and services to be delivered during that time period, the requisite resource allocation, and the M&E and reporting processes.

3.2.3 **FAO Regional and Sub-regional Priorities**

FAO’s regional priorities for Africa are defined through the biennial Africa Regional Conference (ARC), the latest being the 28th ARC which was held in Tunis in March 2014. The priorities from the 27th ARC (held in Libreville, Gabon in 2012) were endorsed by the 28th ARC and are:

1. Priority 1: Increase production and productivity of crops, livestock and fisheries;
2. Priority 2: Promote sustainable use and management of natural resources;
3. Priority 3: Support to market access and sanitary measures for better trade; and
4. Priority 4: Promote knowledge management information and advocacy in Africa.

The priorities for the Horn of Africa (HoA) are contained in the results matrix developed at FAO’s Sub-regional Office for Eastern Africa (SFE) in March 2012 and are based on the following four Outcomes:

1. Outcome 1: Governments, peoples and development partners commit to a hunger-free HoA;
2. Outcome 2: Policies and institutions support the realization of a hunger-free HoA;
3. Outcome 3: Increased investments in agriculture and food security promote prosperity and peace; and
4. Outcome 4: Successful programmes and innovations are scaled up for rapid impact.
3.2.4 Revised Core Functions - Means of FAO Action

FAO’s core functions represent the means of action through which FAO delivers its programme, and they are specified below:

1. Facilitate and support development and implementation of normative and standard-setting instruments such as international agreements, codes of conduct, etc.;
2. Assemble, analyze, monitor and improve access to data and information;
3. Facilitate, promote and support policy dialogue at global, regional and country levels;
4. Advise and support capacity development at country and regional level for evidence-based policies, investments and programmes;
5. Advise and support uptake of knowledge, technologies and good practices;
6. Facilitate partnerships between governments, development partners, civil society and private sector;
7. Advocate and communicate in areas of FAO’s mandate.

**Fig 6: FAO Uganda comparative advantage**

**Global Goals:**
1. Eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition
2. Elimination of poverty and driving forward economic and social progress for all
3. Sustainable management and utilization of natural resources
4. Advocacy and communication

**Strategic Objectives:**
1. Contribution to eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition
2. Increase and improve provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries
3. Reduce rural poverty
4. Enable more inclusive and efficient food systems
5. Increase resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises

**Core Functions:**
1. Development and implementation of normative and standard-setting instruments
2. Assemble, analyze, monitor and improve access to data and information
3. Facilitate, promote and support policy dialogue
4. Capacity development for evidence-based policies, investments and programmes
5. Generate and disseminate knowledge, technologies and good practices
6. Partnership brokerage between government, development partners, civil society and private sector
7. Advocate and communicate

**Revealed Comparative Advantages:**
1. Broad mandate, and expertise in the agriculture sector
2. Unique mandate for agriculture information and knowledge management
3. Extensive policy dialogue and consensus-building experience
4. Custody of tried and tested models and best practices for participatory rural livelihood development
5. Track record of supporting grassroots farmer organizations
6. Expertise in development and dissemination of guidelines, norms and standards for crisis-prevention and risk management

**FAO Uganda Actual Comparative Advantage:**
1. Broad mandate relevant to agriculture sector
2. Wide technical expertise and field presence
3. Consensus-building between stakeholders
4. Development and dissemination of tested models & guidelines for participatory rural livelihoods
5. Record of supporting grassroots farmer organizations and private sector
6. Credibility / strong financial management systems
7. Unique mandate for information and knowledge management in agriculture sector
8. Partnerships / collaborations for HR capacity

**Gaps:**
1. Thin spread of TA
2. Slowly emerging funding vis-à-vis needs (rehabilitation and CC adaptation)
3. Dependency on specialized government institutions creates delays in delivery
4. Need to operationalize strategic partnerships

**Resources:**
1. Credibility to donors increases resource mobilization ability
2. Regular budget from member countries guarantees minimum resources for emerging priorities
3. Integrated information and accounting systems that strengthen financial stewardship
4. Technical presence in field offices and logistical resources that facilitate programme delivery
5. Annual delivery increased over the duration of the CSSF 2010/14
6. Partnerships and collaborations that enable amassing of HR capacity

**Influence:**
1. Authority to request any member nation to submit info
2. Intergovernmental status and neutrality as a member of the UN to provide neutral platform for dialogue and knowledge sharing

**Partnership:**
1. Country level presence to respond to demands
2. Membership of the UN country team and contributes to UNDAP
3. Close collaboration with global and regional intergovernmental organizations like EAC, IGAD, NEPAD, IFAD, COMESA
3.3. Delivery Capacity of FAO in Uganda

FAO's capacity to deliver programmes in Uganda is demonstrated by the experience in the country in terms of portfolio, number and size of projects, human resources and history. The list of past and ongoing projects is highlighted in Annex 4 and explained in 3.3.2 below, while the level of programme delivery over the past five years is illustrated in Figure 7.

3.3.1 Resources and Delivery

Currently, FAO Uganda has a total of 70 national and international staff and personnel distributed throughout its offices: the country office in Kampala, and field offices in Moroto, Kotido, Kaabong, Lira, Gulu, Nakasongola and Mubende. The technical expertise locally available is in: agronomy; veterinary; fisheries; livelihoods; resilience and DRR/M; gender; natural resources management; food and nutrition security; among others. Additional expertise can be drawn, where necessary, from the SFE and RAF.

3.3.2 Key Achievements and Lessons Learnt

The delivery capacity of FAO Uganda is further illustrated through the key achievements from the preceding CPF. CPF 2010-14 was based on five priority areas (i) Strategy, policy and planning, (ii) Production and productivity, (iii) Value addition, agro-processing and marketing, (iv) Agricultural knowledge, information and education, and (v) Sustainable natural resource management under which FAO implemented several projects aimed at building capacity of national and local government institutions, farming communities, traders and processors. FAO supported updating and development of the National Dairy Strategy and its investment and implementation plans. Interventions at national and local government, and community levels, aimed at enhancing production and productivity of crops, livestock and fisheries, combined with the establishment of coordination structures, strengthened the mobilization, training and engagement of farmers in accessing improved livestock breeds and planting materials. Interventions aimed at transforming subsistence to market-oriented farming included support to development of dairy, honey, seed and ware potato, pineapple, mango and maize value chains. Implementation of the IPC contributed to the improvement of food security analysis and decision-making. Interventions aimed at strengthening the capacity of national and local government institutions, NGOs and farming communities for sustainable management of natural resources and climate change adaptation and mitigation, helped improve watershed planning and community field practice.

Among the key lessons learnt are: building institutional capacity enhances effectiveness of policy design and implementation; strengthening linkages among farmer organizations and private sector traders/processors enhances access to, utilisation of, and output from quality inputs; the value chain approach increases production and productivity, farm-gate prices, produce quality, access to credit, inputs, extension services and market information; and, coordination among multiple actors improves utility of agricultural data/statistics.
3.4. Priorities for the CPF 2015 – 2019

Prioritization of what FAO Uganda will focus on during this CPF involved analysis of the comparative advantages, summary of needs arising out of the situation analysis and a generation of a common thread in the different frameworks as illustrated in Figure 8 below. (The Priority Framework matrix is contained in Annex 1).

Fig 8: The prioritization process

The result of this prioritization exercise is the synthesis of the CPF’s priority areas of focus identified together with, and validated by, key stakeholders in the sector, as stated below:

1. Production and productivity of agriculture, forestry and fisheries commodities;
2. Agricultural knowledge and information; and
3. Resilience to livelihood threats with emphasis on climate change.
The three priority areas identified through the prioritization process are the basis for the results that FAO will be responsible for to the Government of Uganda over the next five years. This chapter describes the outcomes, outputs and related interventions for each of the priority areas, which are also summarized in the matrix in Annex 2. The delivery of these outcomes will integrate cross-cutting issues like gender, governance, HIV and AIDS, land rights and the right to food, and will be guided by the human rights based approach. FAO will collaborate with partners to create synergies and complementarities with related initiatives within the agriculture sector and with any other programmes in related sectors.

The results in this CPF reflect the interventions carried over from previous commitments in the CSSF 2010-2014 and planned work agreed with the Government of Uganda.

### 4.1. Priority Area 1: Production and Productivity of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Commodities

As recognized from the situational analysis and priorities of the different frameworks, Uganda has the potential to produce enough food to meet her consumption needs and export the surplus to countries within the region and beyond. The realization of this potential requires addressing the challenge of low production levels which is largely due to low productivity. This low production and productivity is characterized by low acreages, inadequate access to inputs and technologies, low volumes of harvests/produce, and low levels of commercialization which the interventions under this priority area will seek to address. This will be done through partnerships with national and local government institutions (MAAIF, MWE, MTIC, DLGs and NARO), private sector actors (umbrella organizations, individual traders and marketing associations), and the farming communities themselves.

This priority area will be addressed through one outcome area achieved through four outputs.

#### 4.1.1 Outcome Area 1: Sustainable Production and Productivity of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Commodities for Men and Women in Targeted Populations Increased

Under this outcome area, FAO and the Government will work with farmers and pastoralists to increase their access to quality seeds, tools, livestock breeds, veterinary drugs and care, and knowledge through training, and the beneficiaries will be drawn from all sections of primary producers in an equitable manner. The farmers will be supported to engage in commercial production, value addition and marketing, while the traders and their associations will be supported to access business and financial knowledge and services, as well as facilitate their access to trade knowledge and standards. The public and private institutions will be supported to improve their capacity in service provision, oversight and regulation and sustainable natural resources management.
Output 1.1: Availability and Equitable Access by Targeted Men, Women and Youth to Production Assets, Knowledge and Services for Production Increased

In order to increase the availability and access to productive assets, knowledge and services, the rural farming communities will be supported through innovative extension and participatory approaches such as farmer field schools and agro-pastoral field schools, small scale, labour-saving and appropriate technologies and services for irrigation, mechanization and commercialization. This will be done through providing support to:

i. dissemination of appropriate, innovative, time saving and sustainable technologies, practices and tools for intensification of production;

ii. improvement in access to facilities and services for increased mechanization, and commercialization by women, men and youth; and

iii. development of appropriate and sustainable water for production infrastructure while putting into consideration the needs of men and women producers for irrigation.

Output 1.2: Growth and Development of Agribusiness (Marketing Systems, Value Addition / Agroprocessing) Enhanced

The enhanced growth in market-oriented production will be achieved through availing agribusiness knowledge to organized groups of farmers and traders, and increasing the awareness of, and access to, agroprocessing technologies, market information, markets, trade platforms and quality standards by all actors along the agricultural product value chain. The interventions will involve:

i. supporting the development of producer and trader organizations and platforms;

ii. increasing access by men and women to appropriate value addition technologies of selected commodities;

iii. institutional support to development of marketing systems, trade policies and agreements, and coordination mechanisms;

iv. supporting capacity enhancement in agribusiness including mainstreaming of the value chain approach in the extension system; and

v. supporting awareness creation on, and dissemination of, national and international standards for agribusiness stakeholders.

Output 1.3: Capacity of Selected Public and Private Institutions for Gender Responsive Agricultural Service/Asset Provision Enhanced

Building the service delivery capacity of public and private institutions will focus on improving their effectiveness in generating and sharing knowledge, technologies/inputs and

---

13 This output does not directly result in sustainable increase in production but is expected to spur the production and productivity in all three sectors as a result of increased market activity in agricultural commodities.

"When it comes to hunger, the only acceptable number is zero"

Jose Graziano da Silva, FAO Director General
ideas, as well as providing regulatory oversight, all of which are essential in the drive towards improving the resource-use efficiency for productive purposes and therefore sustainable improvement in agricultural productivity and profitability. The interventions will include:

i. supporting research institutions to generate gender specific knowledge on selected commodity value chains;
ii. supporting the development of ecosystem based production and preservation technologies for crop, forestry, livestock and fisheries;
iii. supporting the strengthening of the extension system; and
iv. provision of institutional support for enhancement of quality and standards.

**Output 1.4: Sustainable Management of Natural Resources Strengthened**

The need to conserve, protect and enhance natural resources, and therefore prevent resource depletion and degradation of agro-ecosystems that could potentially arise from the drive to expand agriculture production, will guide the interventions under this Output which will involve:

i. promotion of a catchment/watershed approach to natural resources management;
ii. providing technical assistance for sustainable natural resources management;
iii. supporting the promotion of the bio-energy programme;
iv. supporting equitable access by men, women and youths to value chain technologies for natural resources products and services; and
v. supporting the restoration and value addition of forest resources.

### 4.2. Priority Area 2: Agricultural Knowledge and Information

Three of FAO's core functions revolve around knowledge and information management to support learning and evidence-based decision-making. The challenges in the agriculture sector (and related sectors) in the country can only be best understood, articulated, advocated for, and accorded timely and appropriate responses if there is sufficient and credible data and information complemented with widely accessible mechanisms for generating and sharing knowledge. The weaknesses in knowledge and information management systems and accessibility mechanisms, characterized by delayed, infrequent or incomplete update, and/or inadequate coverage, scope and disaggregation of national agricultural and FSN statistics, will be addressed under this priority area.

The institutions and actors involved in acquisition and management of agriculture sector related information (production, marketing, trade, environmental, etc.) will be the main focus under this priority area, and they include UBoS, ministerial departments responsible for planning, communication and advocacy, public universities, public and private information service providers and all entities involved in the coordination of FSN activities.

There will be one outcome area under this priority area which will be delivered through three outputs.
4.2.1 **Outcome 2: Environment for Equitable Access by Men, Women and Youth to, and Utilization of, Agricultural Knowledge and Information for Decision-Making, Enhanced**

Under this outcome area, the capacity of public and private sector organizations for generation, management and communication of agricultural information and knowledge will be strengthened. To maximize the utility and effectiveness of the improved availability of quality information for planning and learning purposes, the capacity of public institutions involved in the coordination of stakeholders in the sector will be strengthened. The use of innovative and efficient approaches, methods and technologies for data capture and management, and information and knowledge sharing, communication and utilization in decision-making will be promoted.

**Output 2.1: Capacity of Selected Public, Private Sector, Civil Society and Farmer Organizations to Acquire and Manage Agricultural Information Strengthened**

The existing initiatives and processes for generating agricultural and related statistics and information will be built upon, streamlined and rendered more effective by strengthening the capacities of the institutions and individual actors involved. This will be achieved through:

i. providing support to public institutions for acquisition, management, analysis and dissemination of sex and age disaggregated agricultural production statistics and marketing information;

ii. supporting knowledge generation, documentation and dissemination of knowledge products for policy makers and end users; and

iii. providing support to relevant public and civil society organizations to undertake a gender assessment in the agriculture sector, and strengthen capacity to analyze and use sex disaggregated data in policy analysis, programme and project planning, and evaluation.

**Output 2.2: Capacity of Selected Institutions for Communication and Advocacy Strengthened**

This Output will focus on bridging the gap, and establishing an effective linkage, between knowledge generation and communication, by addressing the technical and procedural challenges among the information providers and users. The intervention will involve supporting the:

i. development of capacities of service providers for knowledge management and innovative communication of agricultural information; and

ii. promotion of information and communication technology and networking among stakeholders for communication and dissemination of agricultural information.
Output 2.3: Capacity of Relevant Public Institutions to Coordinate Stakeholders for Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Planning Strengthened

The ultimate objective of improving access to information and knowledge is to facilitate, evidence-based, well-coordinated and timely decision-making. To achieve this, the interventions will involve supporting:

i. establishment and management of food and nutrition information systems;
ii. establishment of information and knowledge management platforms; and
iii. training (e.g. in coordination and planning, information management, communication).

4.3. Priority Area 3: Resilience to Livelihood Threats with Emphasis on Climate Change

The emerging phenomenon of climate change, though partly caused by agricultural activities, has been recognized as a major threat to agriculture. The climate change consequences that affect agriculture include rising temperatures, pest and disease incidents, water shortages, extreme weather events and loss of biodiversity. These cause reduction in crop productivity, and its associated effects of reduced food and income security and therefore vulnerability of communities. Climate change, along with environmental degradation, has been identified as a long-term stressor, and one of the risks affecting the resilience of livelihoods (OECD, 2014). Resilience is the ability of households, communities and nations to absorb and recover from shocks, whilst positively adapting and transforming their structures and means for living in the face of long-term stresses, change and uncertainty (Mitchell, 2013).

Building resilience, which is the focus of this priority area, requires strengthening the absorptive, adaptive and transformative capacities of the system (communities and governance mechanisms). It involves: actively understanding the risks and how they impact on systems; determining the levels at which those risks are best managed; applying a set of resilience principles to strengthen the system’s capacity to absorb shocks or adapt and transform so as to reduce exposure to shocks.

The systems approach to resilience-building implies that this priority area will involve stakeholders at various levels: from vulnerable communities and households to public and private institutions involved in the delivery of services which contribute to the strengthening of resilience (National Early Warning Systems (OPM, and MAAIF), CCD (MWE), other UN agencies, academia, private sector, and civil society).

This priority area comprises of one outcome area which will be delivered through three outputs.

4.3.1 Outcome 3: Resilience of Vulnerable Communities and Households to Livelihood Threats, and Food and Nutrition Insecurity Improved

This outcome area will focus on building absorptive, adaptive and transformative capacities by protecting and diversifying the livelihoods of communities, strengthening early warning systems, and strengthening disaster risk management and climate change adaptation at all levels. Special focus will be placed on Karamoja sub-region and the cattle corridor which are especially adversely affected by the effects of climate change due to their semi-arid nature and low livelihood diversification levels.

Output 3.1: Livelihoods of Targeted Vulnerable Households Protected and Diversified

This will involve protecting the livelihoods capital assets (productive, natural, financial, social and human)\textsuperscript{15} of the vulnerable households, and availing them options to diversify livelihoods (food and income sources) and therefore reduce their vulnerability. The interventions will involve supporting:

i. adoption of sustainable and time saving livelihood technologies and practices;
ii. gender-sensitive diversification of incomes and livelihoods; and
iii. access to appropriate and labour saving technologies for women.

Output 3.2: Capacity of Selected Institutions (Public, Civil Society and Communities) for Disaster Risk Management and Early Warning Strengthened

The collaboration between institutions, civil society and communities for disaster risk management and early warning will be strengthened by building the necessary capacity at different levels. The interventions will focus on:

i. strengthening the technical capacity for early warning, preparedness, contingency planning and response;
ii. supporting capacity development and implementation of gender responsive disaster risk management frameworks and plans; and
iii. supporting capacity development for comprehensive early warning systems and timely dissemination of information.

Output 3.3: Capacities of Selected institutions (Public, Civil Society and Communities) for Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation Strengthened

Similar to disaster risk management, effective climate change adaptation and mitigation requires collaboration between stakeholders at different levels (institutional, civil society and community), which will be strengthened by addressing the challenges at those levels. The interventions will include:

i. increasing access to knowledge on climate change adaptation by national, district and community institutions;
ii. Supporting water for production investments and management, and equitable access by men, women and youth;
iii. promoting sustainable land management and agricultural resilience technologies and practices for climate change adaptation;
iv. supporting initiatives on reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation; and
v. supporting initiatives for utilization of ecosystem services and products by women and youth as businesses.

\textsuperscript{15} Sustainable Livelihoods Framework
5.1. Institutional and Organizational Arrangements

FAO in close cooperation with the Government of Uganda represented by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), will lead the implementation of the CPF, albeit through a participatory and multi-sectoral approach. Other UN agencies, international development partners, government ministries and agencies, such as the ministries of Water and Environment; Trade, Industry and Cooperatives; Karamoja Affairs; and the Office of the Prime Minister, civil society, research and academia, the media and the legislature are all vital stakeholders in supporting the implementation.

As previously mentioned in Section 1.3 above, to ensure harmonization and coherence, FAO will share regular briefs on the CPF on implementation with the Agriculture Sector Working Group, Environment and Natural Resources Working Group, and the Local Development Partner Working Groups (LDPG) on agriculture.

To operationalize the CPF implementation, FAO in consultation with MAAIF will identify the most appropriate partnerships and modalities to implement particular programme activities, including formation of a CPF implementation/ steering committee. FAO Uganda’s roles will essentially be resource mobilization and management, coordination and technical backstopping. The selection of implementing partners will be guided by criteria such as institutional and technical capability, comparative advantage, sound financial management and accountability, and past experience in implementing similar programmes and projects. For interventions related to cross-cutting issues, FAO will work with other UN agencies through joint programmes and programming, mainly under the UNDAF.

5.2. M&E Plan

To ensure that the interventions remain on track and that the set objectives and results are achieved, the CPF will be monitored for progress and evaluated through partnerships with all stakeholders involved in implementation, and data collection and compilation procedures aligned to national information and reporting systems.

The M&E plan is based on the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) approach, through which objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs) were defined for each of the results (Outcomes and Outputs) based on the vertical and horizontal logic between them, and the risks and assumptions identified as conditions for their attainment (Results Matrix in Annex 2, A). To align the CPF M&E plan with national monitoring systems (e.g. for the NDP II and UNDAF), the indicators were selected to closely match national level statistics (especially in the UBoS annual statistical abstracts), UNDAF M&E plan and FAO’s Strategic Framework. The indicators are disaggregated, by gender, age and/or geographic location to match the target groups of each intervention and result. The means of verification (MoV) will be existing data sources and national statistics (including minutes, attendance lists, resolutions, budgets, accounts,
stakeholder feedback, results of focus group discussions, project documents, surveys, research reports, annual and partner reviews, external evaluation reports, local, national and global statistics and data).

The M&E calendar (Annex 3) was also designed to match the availability of these national statistics, with the mid-term review planned for 2017 and evaluation planned for 2019 heavily reliant on the annual statistics of those respective periods. The FAO corporate (annual and biennial) monitoring and reporting processes will contribute to the CPF Output and process monitoring by measuring progress in the projects implemented in each year and biennium.

The CPF Implementation or Steering Committee will double as the M&E management group involving government stakeholders, especially from MAAIF (Planning Department) and MWE (CCD), and FAO programme management team, and will oversee the execution of the M&E plan to ensure that the monitoring and learning processes remain useful in guiding the CPF implementation and accountability for results.

5.3. **Resource Mobilization**

FAO will fulfill its commitment to national priorities identified in this CPF with commensurate resources. Mobilization of these resources will be guided by the following principles:

i. all resources mobilized will be in support of achieving the stated outcomes and outputs and delivering on agreed results;

ii. resource partnership agreements comply with FAO's and resource partners’ rules and regulations;

iii. all resources mobilized are monitored and accounted for, strengthening close relations with resource partners, and built on trust and mutual accountability;

iv. all resource mobilization efforts are coordinated and harmonized Organization-wide by establishing a supportive internal enabling environment.

The resources will comprise financial, human and physical (goods and services) resources. Human resources will be drawn from FAO’s own staff and personnel from the Headquarters technical departments, regional, sub-regional and country (and its field/sub-) offices. Staff seconded from government departments, Associate Professional Officers, volunteers, interns and local partners will also add to the pool of human resources.

In terms of financing, an estimated USD 100 million, summarised in Table 24 below, is expected to deliver the three outcomes of the CPF. The amount is arrived at cognizant of the past deliveries, and fundraising potential of FAO Uganda, part of which is already available in ongoing projects. Combined with this, the technical resources that FAO Uganda can draw upon, will define the scope of programming under this CPF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME AREA</th>
<th>Estimate of resources required (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable production and productivity of agriculture, forestry and fisheries commodities for men, women and youths in targeted populations increased</td>
<td>45,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment for equitable access by men, women and youth to, and utilization of agricultural knowledge and information for decision-making, enhanced</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience of vulnerable communities and households to livelihood threats, and food and nutrition insecurity, improved</td>
<td>40,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The budget will be biennially adjusted taking into account the evolving needs and priorities of the Government and resource partners, and how FAO, based on its comparative advantage, is best suited to provide support. Potential sources of financing will include FAO internal funds (TCP, Telefood and other internal FAO resources to leverage further resources from resource partners), UN administered funds, Government resources through Unilateral Trust Funds (UTFs) and multi/bilateral funds.

Annex 2B highlights the indicative resource requirements for implementing this CPF. A detailed resource mobilization strategy and action plan will be developed in the first six months of implementation. An action plan to develop the resource mobilization strategy is in Annex 6.
## Annex 1: CPF Priority Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPF Priorities</th>
<th>Relevant National Sector Priorities</th>
<th>FAO Regional/Sub – regional priorities</th>
<th>Relevant UNDPF Priorities</th>
<th>Other National/Regional and International Frameworks and Commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPF PRIORITY 1: Production and Productivity of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Commodities</strong></td>
<td>NDP II (as part of Vision 2040): Enhancement of production and productivity, and increase in access to critical farm inputs, labour and productivity in agriculture and stock of new jobs along the agricultural value chain; Restoration of integrity and functionality of degraded fragile ecosystems; Sustainable use of ENR, Afforestation and reforestation, and reduction in encroachment on wetlands. DSIP: Increasing rural incomes and livelihoods; Improving household food and nutrition security</td>
<td>1. Increase production and productivity of crops, livestock and fisheries; 2. Promote sustainable use and management of natural resources; 3. Support market access and sanitary measures for better trade.</td>
<td>3.1 Natural resources management and climate change resilience</td>
<td>Istanbul Programme of Action (2011- 2020): Increasing productive capacity, generating full and productive employment and decent work for all people especially for the youth. CAADP: Improving rural infrastructure and trade related capacities for market access; Extending the area under sustainable land management and reliable water control systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **CPF PRIORITY 2: Agricultural Knowledge and Information** | | 4. Promote knowledge management information and advocacy in Africa | - | CAADP: Improving agricultural research, technology dissemination and adoption. |

| **CPF Priority 3: Resilience to Livelihood Threats with Emphasis on Climate Change** | NDP II (as part of Vision 2040): Improving the country’s resilience to climate change | | 3.1 Natural resources management and climate change resilience | CAADP: Increasing food supply, reducing hunger and improving responses to food crises; |

| **Annexes** | **CPF Priority Matrix** | | | |

---
## Annex 2A: CPF Results Matrix

### CPF Priority Area 1: Production and Productivity of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPF Results</th>
<th>Baseline 2015</th>
<th>Targets 2019</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1:</strong> Sustainable production and productivity of agriculture, forestry and fisheries for men, women and youth in targeted populations increased.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Per capita food production index[^2]</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>At least 3%[^3] increase in the index for the targeted districts</td>
<td>- Primary data from Statistical Abstracts (UBOS) and National agricultural statistics (MAAIF)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Productivity[^4] of strategic crops, livestock, and fisheries</td>
<td>Sample crop yields from national averages (2013) [MT/ Ha]: Maize – 2.5; Rice – 2.3; Cassava – 3.5; Beans – 4.4;</td>
<td>At least 5% increase in yield or productivity (in targeted districts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Area of forest under sustainable forest management[^5] (hectares)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>3% increase (in targeted districts)</td>
<td>- National forestry/biomass statistics (MWE, NFA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Value of productive assets[^6] owned/inputs used by households</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>10% increase (for targeted households)</td>
<td>- FAO household survey data/reports;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Functionality of input markets (availability, quality and prices of inputs)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Qualitative improvement (in targeted districts)</td>
<td>- LSMS-ISA/UNPS (WorldBank and UBOS) data/reports;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- % of producers (&quot;agric HHs&quot;) accessing extension services over 6-month period (see Output 1.3, Indicator 3)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>At least 50% (in targeted districts)</td>
<td>- Market survey reports (Uganda Seed Traders Association);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.1:</strong> Availability and equitable access by targeted men, women and youth to production assets and services for producers increased.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proportion (% of producer and trader organizations using standardized practices and technologies along selected commodity value chains</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>At least 80% of supported producer and trader organizations using agreed standards and practices</td>
<td>- Enterprise survey data/reports (FAO);</td>
<td>Agribusiness growth continues to create demand and incentives for smallholder agricultural, fishery and forestry production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- % change in (number, value, volume) of activities/transactions managed by agro-enterprises</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Increased by at least 30% (of supported enterprises)</td>
<td>- District Commercial Office data/reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Change (percentage) in sales/turnovers of agro-enterprises</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>At least 30% (of supported enterprises)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

[^1]: All household level indicator data will be disaggregated by sex and/or age of household head (where applicable) to capture gender responsiveness.

[^2]: Separate indices for crop, livestock and fish production for the targeted districts, deflated to base year prices using suitable deflators, will be combined into a single Food Production Index on the basis of value of output data (obtained from UBOS Statistical Abstracts). The “per capita food production index will be derived using population in the denominator. (Further guidance on this index can be obtained from www.faostat3.fao.org).

[^3]: The Uganda national average annual increase in Net Per Capita Production Index Number (2004-2006 = 100) between 2008 and 2012 was – 1.9% (FAOSTat and WorldBank).

[^4]: Measures proposed: Crops: output per hectare of land or per Kg of seed/input; Livestock: yield/TLUs, Fisheries: capture fisheries - per area of water body; aquaculture – total fish production.

[^5]: Although there is not yet any internationally agreed definition of “sustainable forest management” this information is required by many international agencies like CBD, UNFP, ITTO and FAO (FAO and World Bank, 2008); the criteria used for its estimation will be documented.

[^6]: List of productive assets: land, tools/implements, livestock, etc.
### CPF Priority Area 1: Production and Productivity of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPF Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline 2015</th>
<th>Targets 2019</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.3: Capacity of selected public, civil society and private institutions for agricultural service/asset provision enhanced</td>
<td>- % change in institutional capacity (human, financial, logistical, technical and organizational/management) of public, CSO and private service providers</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>At least 20% increase in aggregate value of capacities of support ed institutions</td>
<td>- Capacity assessment data/reports (FAO)</td>
<td>Conducive (political, economic, social) enabling environment for rural smallholder production, transformation of production systems, and natural resource management (including access rights and public-community partnerships in conservation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public perceptions/ satisfaction with service provision</td>
<td>Low (TBD)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>- Household survey data/reports (FAO); LSMS-ISA/UNPS (WorldBank and UBoS) data/reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- % of producers contacted by, or accessing, extension services over 6-month period (see Output 1.1, Indicator 3)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>At least 50% of (in targeted districts)</td>
<td>- Household survey data/reports (FAO);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.4: Sustainable management of natural resources strengthened</td>
<td>- Number of public institutions that received technical assistance in sustainable NRM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Improved by 15% (in targeted districts)</td>
<td>- FAO Project Reports; - Household survey data/reports (FAO);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- % of producers accessing extension services and/or training materials on NRM best practices and approaches over 6-month period</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>At least 50% of (in targeted micro-catchments)</td>
<td>- Household survey data/reports (FAO);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- % of producers applying sustainable NRM techniques in their fields</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>At least 50% (in targeted micro-catchments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNDAF Outcome:**

**Outcome 3.2. Infrastructure, Production & Trade:** By end 2020, Uganda’s stock of infrastructure adheres to physical planning policies and standards to support production and trade; production systems (agriculture, industry, mining & tourism) are internal & international market oriented, competitive, climate resilient, environmentally friendly, gender responsive, green technology driven and generating sustainable job opportunities for all, particularly women and youth; Trade is formalized, competitive, scalable, ICT-enabled, regionally integrated, promoting SMEs and corporate governance

**FAO Regional Results:**

**Outcome 1: Crops, livestock and fisheries production increased**

**FAO Organizational Results:**

**Outcome 2.1: Producers and natural resource managers adopt practices that increase and improve agricultural sector production in a sustainable manner.**

---

7 Institutional capacity can be defined as “the ability to perform tasks and produce outputs, to define and solve problems, and make informed choices” (European Commission, 2005. Institutional Assessment and Capacity Development - Why, What and How? Aid Delivery Methods Concept Paper).

8 Subjective indicator based on client-side (community) appreciation / utilization / access to services.
# CPF Priority Area 2: Agricultural Knowledge and Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPF Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline 2015</th>
<th>Targets 2019</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 2:</strong> Environment for equitable access by men, women and youth to, and utilization of, agricultural knowledge and information for decision-making, enhanced.</td>
<td>- Diversity, quality and accuracy of information systems and outlets/portals providing regular agricultural information</td>
<td>1 (Country STAT)</td>
<td>At least 3 (to include the CountrySTAT, FNS website &amp; portal; Information System at NECOC(^9))</td>
<td>MAAIF/FAO ISFNS/IPC data mapping reports;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of users/users(^1) of agricultural information</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>20% increase in users/uses</td>
<td>- Agricultural information utilization survey reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sufficiency of agricultural data and technical knowledge towards serving information and knowledge needs (for early warning, monitoring, resilience measurement, reporting, policy formulation and technical innovation)</td>
<td>Partial(^12)</td>
<td>Increase sufficiency by 30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2.1:</strong> Capacity of selected public, private sector and civil society organizations to acquire and manage(^13) agricultural, food and nutrition security information strengthened</td>
<td>- Institutional capacity (technical and functional) of public, private and civil society organizations to collect, process and disseminate information;</td>
<td>Limited capacity(^14)</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>Continued growth in ICT access by public institutions and service providers (including cheaper technology and tools for data collection and processing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of institutions with enhanced ability to manage agricultural information</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD(^15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Types/diversity and quality of agricultural information collected and processed by public, private and civil society organizations</td>
<td>Categories of information(^16) (TBD)</td>
<td>Expanded/diversified categories of information (crop disease, forestry, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2.2:</strong> Capacity of selected institutions for communication and advocacy strengthened</td>
<td>- Institutional capacity (technical and functional) of public, private and civil society organizations for community advocacy</td>
<td>Limited capacity(^17)</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>Continued expansion and availability of communication channels and mass media (esp. cheaply accessible to rural users)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of communication channels (media and publications) and advocacy campaigns engaged in by public, private and civil society organizations</td>
<td>3 (Newsletters, website, bulletins)</td>
<td>At least 7 (covering multimedia channels, publications)</td>
<td>- Capacity assessment/data reports (FAO); - 2° data from scanning publications/media for advocacy content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Timeliness and relevance(^18) of information and advocacy messages for decision-making</td>
<td>Poor (TBD)</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9 National Food Security and Nutrition Information System coordinated at national level by MAAIF and decentralized up to the district level.
10 NECOC: National Emergency Coordination and Operations Centre at the Office of the Prime Minister.
11 The users apply to individuals (who will be disaggregated by gender and age) and institutions, while the uses include in publications and citations.
12 At baseline, information is available for only 50% of the indicators used in IPC; the target is to have information available for all the indicators.
13 Information management in this context refers to the entire process of collection, processing, analysis, and dissemination of information/data.
14 Score aggregating quantitative and qualitative data.
15 Number of institutions benefiting from the capacity-building interventions.
16 Market information, climatic data, production statistics, livestock disease data, nutrition and health data.
17 The communication and advocacy strategy by REACH (Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger, a joint UN programme on nutrition) is still under development.
## CPF Priority Area 2: Agricultural Knowledge and Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPF Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline 2015</th>
<th>Targets 2019</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2.3:</strong> Capacity of relevant public institutions to coordinate stakeholders for agriculture, food and nutrition planning strengthened.</td>
<td>- Institutional capacity (technical and functional) of public institutions, for coordination of utilization of FNS information for response planning</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>- Capacity assessment data/reports (FAO);</td>
<td>FNS policy framework and strategic planning agenda continue to be driven by need for improved, evidence-based decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number, and membership/participation of active FNS coordination platforms / forums</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>- Minutes / reports from coordination platforms;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Level of coherence/harmonization of FNS plans</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>- 2 data from FNS plans reflecting participatory/joint planning;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNDAF Outcome:**

**Outcome 3.1. Natural Resource Management & Climate Change Resilience:** By end 2020, Natural resources management and energy access are gender responsive, effective & efficient, reducing emissions, negating the impact of climate-induced disasters and environmental degradation on livelihoods and production systems, and strengthening community resilience.

**Outcome 3.2. Infrastructure, Production & Trade:** By end 2020, Uganda’s stock of infrastructure adheres to physical planning policies and standards to support production and trade; production systems (agriculture, industry, mining & tourism) are internal & international market oriented, competitive, climate resilient, environmentally friendly, gender responsive, green technology driven and generating sustainable job opportunities for all, particularly women and youth; Trade is formalized, competitive, scalable, ICT-enabled, regionally integrated, promoting SMEs and corporate governance.

**FAO Regional Results:**

**Outcome 4: Improved Information and Knowledge Management**

**FAO Organizational Results:**

**Outcome 1.3:** The decisions of member countries and their development partners regarding food security and nutrition are based on evidence and high-quality, timely and comprehensive food security and nutrition analysis that draws on data and information available in the network of existing sector and stakeholder information systems.

## CPF Priority Area 3: Resilience to Livelihood Threats with Emphasis on Climate Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPF Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline 2015</th>
<th>Targets 2019</th>
<th>Means Of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 3: Resilience of vulnerable communities and households to livelihood threats, and food and nutrition insecurity, improved.</strong></td>
<td>- Livelihood capital assets (human, physical, financial, natural and social) at household level</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Improved by 10% (in targeted districts)</td>
<td>- FAO studies, enriched with data from UBoS (Statistical Abstracts) and other national/district institutions and departments</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adaptive capacity of vulnerable households/communities</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Increased by at least 10% (in targeted districts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Income and food access at household level</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Increased by 10% (in targeted districts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 3.1: Livehoods of targeted vulnerable households protected and diversified.</strong></td>
<td>- Number of households applying or utilizing diversified production technologies and practices</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>20% increase (for targeted households)</td>
<td>- Household survey data/reports (FAO);</td>
<td>Conductive (political, economic, social) environment favouring rural smallholder production and engagement in income generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Level of household food production</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Increased by 35% (for targeted households)</td>
<td>- LSMS-ISA/UNPS (WorldBank and UBoS) data/reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of alternative livelihood options engaged in by households</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>20 percent increase (for targeted households)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

18 Measuring the utility of the advocacy/communicated information by looking the policies influenced, interventions generated, and seeking the opinions of policy makers, beneficiaries of responses.

19 All household level indicator data will be disaggregated by sex and/or age of household head (where applicable) to capture gender responsiveness.

20 All three outcome indicators will aim at fitting FAO’s Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA) model, expressed (for household i) as Ri = f (IFAi, AAi, NAAi, APTi, ABSi, SSNi, CC, EIi, St, ACi), where: IFA = income and food access; AA = agricultural assets; NAA = non-agricultural assets; APT = agricultural practice and technology; ABS = access to basic services; SSN = social safety net; CC = climate change; EI = enabling institutional environment; S = sensitivity; and AC = adaptive capacity.

21 In terms of production practices and systems, coping strategies, and livelihood alternatives.
## CPF Priority Area 3: Resilience to Livelihood Threats with Emphasis on Climate Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPF Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline 2015</th>
<th>Targets 2019</th>
<th>Means Of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 3.2: Capacity of selected institutions (public, civil society and communities) for Disaster Risk Reduction and Early Warning strengthened</strong></td>
<td>- Institutional capacity (technical and functional capacity) of public, civil society and community institutions) for disaster risk reduction and early warning systems</td>
<td>Limited capacity</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>- Capacity assessment data/reports (FAO); Intersectoral coordination of DRR/EW initiatives by the Government (OPM) continues to grow and expand (to include MAAIF, MoWE, MoH, research and academic institutions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Quality and timeliness of DRR / EW information and alerts</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>- Reports of assessment / review of DRR / EW systems and publications;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Level of integration of DRR/EW response recommendations in sector planning</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>- Sector planning document review reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 3.3: Capacities of selected institutions (public, civil society and communities) for climate change adaptation and mitigation strengthened</strong></td>
<td>- Institutional capacity (technical and functional capacity) of public, civil society and community institutions for CC adaptive and mitigation capacities</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>- Capacity assessment data/reports (FAO);</td>
<td>The policy environment and sector budgetary allocations continue to support climate change adaptation and mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Level of integration of CC adaptation and mitigation strategies in sector plans at all levels</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>- Sector planning document review reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Number of public, civil society and community institutions and groups promoting CC adaptation and mitigation in their communities</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD (based on number of institutions supported)</td>
<td>- Household survey data/reports (FAO); - LSMS-ISA/UNPS (WorldBank and UBoS) data/reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNDAF Outcome:**

**Outcome 3.1. Natural Resource Management & Climate Change Resilience:** By end 2020, Natural resources management and energy access are gender responsive, effective & efficient, reducing emissions, negating the impact of climate-induced disasters and environmental degradation on livelihoods and production systems, and strengthening community resilience.

**FAO Regional Results:**

**Outcome 2: Enhanced natural resource management practices**

**FAO Organizational Results:**

**Outcome 5.3: Countries reduce risks and vulnerability at household and community level.**

---

22 Score aggregating quantitative and qualitative data.

23 Qualitative indicator: baseline situation is considered weak (or still in its infancy) due to gaps in DRR / EW systems and information which are sometimes late, infrequently updated, inaccessible and/or inaccurate.
## Annex 2B: CPF Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME AREA 1: Sustainable production and productivity of agriculture, forestry and fisheries commodities for men, women and youths in targeted populations increased</th>
<th>Indicative Resource Requirements (USD)</th>
<th>Implementing Partners National / International</th>
<th>Resource Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate of Total Resources Required ($)</td>
<td>Available Funding ($)</td>
<td>Resource Mobilization Target ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.1:</strong></td>
<td>45,000,000</td>
<td>1,654,192</td>
<td>43,345,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and equitable access by targetted men, women and youths to production assets, knowledge and services for producers increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAAIF, MTIC, MWE, Local governments, Civil society Private sector organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.2:</strong></td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td>1,654,192</td>
<td>23,345,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and development of agribusiness (marketing systems, value addition / agro-processing) enhanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.3:</strong></td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of selected public, civil society and private institutions for agricultural service/asset provision enhanced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.4:</strong></td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable management of natural resources strengthened.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indicative Resource Requirements (US$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME AREA 2</th>
<th>Estimate of Total Resources Required (Million $)</th>
<th>Available Funding</th>
<th>Resource Mobilization Target (gap)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of equitable access by men, women and youths to and utilization of agricultural knowledge and information for decision-making, enhanced.</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>233,800</td>
<td>14,766,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 2.1:
Capacity of selected public, private sector and civil society organizations to acquire, manage agricultural, food and nutrition information strengthened

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Resource Mobilization Target (gap)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 2.2:
Capacity of selected institutions for communication and advocacy strengthened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Resource Mobilization Target (gap)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 2.3:
Capacity of relevant public institutions to coordinate stakeholders for agriculture, food and nutrition planning strengthened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Resource Mobilization Target (gap)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>233,800</td>
<td>4,766,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OUTCOME AREA 3:
Resilience of vulnerable communities and households to livelihood threats, and food and nutrition insecurity, improved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Resource Mobilization Target (gap)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,000,000</td>
<td>21,536,276</td>
<td>18,463,724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 3.1:
Livelihoods of targeted vulnerable households protected and diversified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Resource Mobilization Target (gap)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>642,000</td>
<td>9,358,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(TCP 500,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 3.2:
Capacity of selected institutions (public, civil society and communities) for disaster risk reduction and Early warning strengthened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Resource Mobilization Target (gap)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output 3.3:
Capacity of selected institutions (public, civil society and communities) for climate change adaptation and mitigation strengthened.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Resource Mobilization Target (gap)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>20,894,276</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Resource Mobilization Target (gap)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000,000</td>
<td>22,355,608</td>
<td>76,575,732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resource Partners

- FAO/TCP
- European Union
- Govt’re of Ireland
- Govt’re of Belgium
- Govt’re of United Kingdom
- MAAIF, Private sector Civil Society Organizations
- FAO/TCP
- European Union
- Government of Ireland
- Government of Belgium
- Government of United Kingdom
- Democratic Peoples Republic of China
- Government of Norway
- CERF
- IFAD
## Annex 2C: Indicative TCP Pipeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPF Implementation Cycle*</td>
<td>Start: Year 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame for the Indicative TCP Pipeline*</td>
<td>Start: Year 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. to CPF Priority Outcome/or Output*</th>
<th>TCP contribution to CPF result - Title and Scope/type of interventions (TCP and TCP facility)*</th>
<th>Indicative biennium for resource allocation *</th>
<th>Indicative resource requirements/range (US$)</th>
<th>Implementing Government institution/partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPF Outcome 1: Sustainable production and productivity of agriculture, forestry and fisheries commodities for men and women in targeted populations increased</td>
<td>Support to the formulation of the SPGS phase III programme (TCPf)</td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>67,011</td>
<td>MWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPF Outcome 3: Resilience of vulnerable communities and households to livelihood threats, and food and nutrition insecurity, improved.</td>
<td>Emergency measures for foot and mouth disease outbreak containment (TCPE)</td>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>MAAIF, DLGs, and FAO Forestry Division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Compulsory fields
Annex 3: Monitoring and Evaluation Framework/Plan

 CPF Priority Area 1: Production and Productivity of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPF Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Method/ Frequency /Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Outcome 1: Sustainable production and productivity of agriculture, forestry and fisheries commodities for men, women and youth in target-ed populations increased** | - Per capita food production index  
- Productivity of strategic crops, livestock, and fisheries | - Primary data from UBoS Statistical Abstracts and National agricultural statistics (MAAIF) | **Methods:**  
- Compilation of datasets, extracting and analyzing relevant variables, disaggregating by target districts;  
- Household semi-structured interviews.  
**Frequency:**  
- Baseline (2015); Mid-term review (2017); Evaluation (2019); (aligned to UNDAF IMEP4 and NDP M&E plan)  
**Responsibility:**  
- FAO Uganda (Programme Management and M&E unit)  
- CPF Implementation Committee |
| **Output 1.1: Availability and equitable access by targeted men, women and youth to productive assets and services for producers increased.** | - Area of forest under sustainable forest management (hectares) | - National forestry/biomass statistics (MWE, NFA) | **Methods:**  
- FAO household survey data/reports;  
- LSMS-ISA/UNPS (WorldBank and UBoS) data/reports;  
- Market survey reports (Uganda Seed Traders Association);  
- DLG reports |
| **Output 1.2: Growth and development of agribusiness (marketing systems, value addition/ agro-processing) enhanced.** | - Value of productive assets owned/inputs used by households  
- Functionality of input markets (availability, quality and prices of inputs)  
- % of producers ("agric HHs") accessing extension services over 6-month period | - FAO household survey data/reports;  
- Enterprise survey data/reports (FAO);  
- LSMS-ISA/UNPS (WorldBank and UBoS) data/reports;  
- Market survey reports (Uganda Seed Traders Association);  
- DLG reports  
- District Commercial Office data/ reports | **Methods:**  
- Enterprise surveys using -structured interviews;  
- Capacity assessment surveys (based on FAO guidelines) using structured interviews, stakeholder discussions, etc.;  
- Compilation of 2° and 1° datasets, extracting and analyzing relevant variables, disaggregating by target districts (where applicable);  
- Scoring for progress reporting ("traffic light system"):  

| Progress towards achievement of the output is in serious jeopardy due to impediments or risks that are expected to significantly affect progress. |
| Red "R" | >85% |  
| Progress towards achievement of the output is in jeopardy and action is required to overcome delays, impediments and risks. |
| Yellow "Y" | 65%-85% |  
| Progress towards achievement of the output is as foreseen and impediments or risks are not expected to significantly affect progress. |
| Green "G" | <65% |  
**Frequency:**  
- Annual;  
**Responsibility:**  
- FAO Uganda (Programme Management and M&E unit) |
| **Output 1.3: Capacity of selected public, civil society and private institutions for agricultural service/ asset provision enhanced** | - % change in institutional capacity (human, financial, logistical, technical and organizational/management) of public, CSO and private service providers  
- Public perceptions/satisfaction with service provision  
- % of producers contacted by, or accessing, extension services over 6-month period | - Capacity assessment data/reports (FAO)  
- Household survey data/reports (FAO);  
- LSMS-ISA/UNPS (WorldBank and UBoS) data/reports | **Methods:**  
- Household survey data/reports (FAO);  
- DLG reports  
- Office data/reports |
| **Output 1.4: Sustainable management of natural resources strengthened.** | - Number of public institutions that received technical assistance in sustainable NRM  
- % of producers accessing extension services and/or training materials on NRM best practices and approaches over 6-month period  
- % of producers applying sustainable NRM techniques in their fields | - FAO Project Reports;  
- Household survey data/reports (FAO);  
- LSMS-ISA/UNPS (WorldBank and UBoS) data/reports  
- Office data/reports | **Methods:**  
- Household survey data/reports (FAO);  
- FAO Project Reports;  
- Household survey data/reports (FAO);  
- DLG reports  
- Office data/reports |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods:</th>
<th>Frequency:</th>
<th>Responsibility:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Compilation of datasets, extracting and analyzing relevant variables, disaggregating by target districts;  
- Household semi-structured interviews. | **Frequency:**  
- Baseline (2015); Mid-term review (2017); Evaluation (2019); (aligned to UNDAF IMEP4 and NDP M&E plan) | **Responsibility:**  
- FAO Uganda (Programme Management and M&E unit)  
- CPF Implementation Committee |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPF Priority Area 2: Agricultural Knowledge and Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPF Results</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Outcome 2: Environment for equitable access by men, women and youth to, and utilization of, agricultural knowledge and information for decision-making, enhanced.** | - Diversity, quality and accuracy of information systems and outlets/ portals providing regular agricultural information | - MAAIF/FAO ISFNS/ IPC data mapping reports; | Methods:  
- Extracting and analyzing relevant variables from mapping reports;  
- Agricultural information utilization surveys (measuring system quality, technical quality and service quality) using key informant questionnaires and interviews, document review, data traffic counts, etc.  
Frequency:  
- Baseline (2015); Mid-term review (2017); Evaluation (2019); (aligned to UNDAF  |
| **Output 2.1: Capacity of selected public, private sector and civil society organizations to acquire and manage agricultural, food and nutrition security information strengthened.** | - Institutional capacity (technical and functional) of public, private and civil society organizations to collect, process and disseminate information;  
- Number of institutions with enhanced ability to manage agricultural information;  
- Types/diversity and quality of agricultural information collected and processed by public, private and civil society organizations | - Capacity assessments data/ reports (FAO);  
- 1° and 2° data from policy brief/ documents reflecting use of agricultural data | Methods:  
- Capacity assessment surveys (based on FAO guidelines) using structured interviews, stakeholder discussions, etc.;  
- Compilation of 1° and 2° data from review/ scanning of documents, publications and media content, qualitative data analysis (structural and thematic coding);  
- Compilation of minutes and reports and interpreting them to identify patterns and themes;  
- Scoring for progress reporting (“traffic light system”):  
  - Green “G” (65%-85%)  
  - Yellow “Y” (60%-85%)  
  - Red “R” (50%-65%)  
Frequency:  
- Annual;  
Responsibility:  
- FAO Uganda (Programme Management and M&E unit) |
| **Output 2.2: Capacity of selected institutions for communication and advocacy strengthened.** | - Institutional capacity (technical and functional) of public, private and civil society organizations for community advocacy  
- Number of communication channels (media and publications) and advocacy campaigns engaged in by public, private and civil society organizations  
- Timeliness and relevance of information and advocacy messages for decision-making | - Capacity assessment data/ reports (FAO);  
- 1° data from scanning publications / media for advocacy content | |
| **Output 2.3: Capacity of relevant public institutions to coordinate stakeholders for agriculture, food and nutrition planning strengthened.** | - Institutional capacity (technical and functional) of public institutions, for coordination of utilization of FNS information for response planning  
- Number, and membership / participation of active FNS coordination platforms / foraums  
- Level of coherence/ harmonization of FNS plans | - Capacity assessment data/ reports (FAO);  
- Minutes / reports from coordination platforms;  
- 1° data from FNS plans reflecting participatory/ joint planning; | |

---

24 UNDAF Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Plan  
25 If established, the CPF Implementation Committee will also oversee the M&E processes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPF Priority Area 3: Resilience to Livelihood Threats with Emphasis on Climate Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPF Results</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Outcome 3:** Resilience of vulnerable communities and households to livelihood threats, and food and nutrition insecurity, improved. | - Livelihood capital assets (human, physical, financial, natural and social) at household level | - FAO studies, enriched with data from UBoS (Statistical Abstracts) and other national/district institutions and departments | **Methods:**  
- Household semi-structured interviews;  
- Compilation of datasets, extracting and analyzing relevant variables, disaggregating by target districts;  
**Frequency:**  
- Baseline (2015); Mid-term review (2017); Evaluation (2019); (aligned to UNDAF IMEP and NDP M&E plan)  
**Responsibility:**  
- FAO Uganda (Programme Management and M&E unit)  
- CPF Implementation Committee |
| **Output 3.1:** Livelihoods of targeted vulnerable households protected and diversified. | - Number of households applying or utilizing diversified production technologies and practices | - Household survey data/reports (FAO);  
- LSMS-ISA/UNPS (WorldBank and UBoS) data/reports | **Methods:**  
- Household semi-structured interviews;  
- Capacity assessment surveys (based on FAO guidelines) using structured interviews, stakeholder discussions, etc.;  
- Compilation of 1° and 2° data from document reviews, qualitative data analysis (structural and thematic coding), disaggregating by target districts (where applicable);  
- Scoring for progress reporting (“traffic light system”):  
| Green “G” (≥85%) | Progress towards achievement of the output is as foreseen and impediments and risks are not expected to significantly affect progress.  
| Yellow “Y” (65%-85%) | Progress towards achievement of the output is in jeopardy and action is required to overcome delays, impediments and risks.  
| Red “R” (<65%) | Achievement of the output is in serious jeopardy due to impediments or risks that are expected to significantly hinder progress.  
**Frequency:**  
- Annual;  
**Responsibility:**  
- FAO Uganda (Programme Management and M&E unit) |
| **Output 3.2:** Capacity of selected institutions (public, civil society and communities) for Disaster Risk Reduction and Early Warning strengthened | - Institutional capacity (technical and functional capacity) of public, civil society and community institutions for disaster risk reduction and early warning systems | - Capacity assessment data/reports (FAO);  
- Reports of assessment/review of DRR / EW systems and publications;  
- Sector planning document review reports |  |
| **Output 3.3:** Capacities of selected institutions (public, civil society and communities) for climate change adaptation and mitigation strengthened | - Institutional capacity (technical and functional capacity) of public, civil society and community institutions for CC adaptive and mitigation capacities | - Capacity assessment data/reports (FAO);  
- Sector planning document review reports |  |

A. Lessons Learnt from Previous Programmes and Projects

The lessons learnt and experiences obtained from some of the recent projects and programmes (including the projects listed in this Annex, most of which comprised the CSSF 2010-2014) that FAO has implemented in Uganda over the years range from the empirical conclusions based on studies (outcome assessments and evaluations) to the normative or subjective assertions mostly based on observations (by internal and external stakeholders) and beneficiary testimonies. Below is a summary of the lessons compiled from several internal and external studies, including the CSSF 2010 – 2014 mid-term review, and how they have been factored into the design of this CPF.

1. Programming:

The Farmer Field School (FFS) approach has proven to be a versatile and dynamic method of delivery of training and extension, input support and entrepreneurial skill development services aimed at addressing rural production and livelihood constraints in a wide variety of contexts: emergency relief and rehabilitation (e.g. in northern Uganda), control of crop diseases (e.g. the banana bacterial wilt), promotion of sustainable land management and environmental conservation (e.g. in the Kagera basin), and the building of resilience among pastoral and agro-pastoral communities (e.g. in the arid and semi-arid regions of Karamoja and the central cattle corridor). The lessons drawn from projects that have used the FFS approach over the past few years, and their implications for programming, can be summarized as follows:

a. Group mobilization and intensive training activities imply significant resource overheads which when costed require an equally significant marginal improvement in productivity and/or incomes of the beneficiaries to deliver a positive benefit-to-cost ratio in the short term. For instance, the average cost of establishing and supporting one FFS member through one season has been costed at an average of USD 150, implying that the farmer’s productivity should increase to yield at least USD 150 in the total value of produce or incomes in one season. This has proven to be an unrealistic prospect in many cases, given the other constraints to production and incomes (like access to land, labour and climatic factors) that are beyond the scope of the FFS interventions. However, the inclusion of intangible benefits, like knowledge and empowerment, and the expected long-term improvement in the beneficiaries’ production, entrepreneurial and marketing processes, as well as the expected diffusion to non-beneficiary farmers (who adopt by copying from the beneficiaries) provides a more realistic and favourable cost-benefit analysis of the FFS approach. The implications of this in programme and project design is that short-term targets must be more realistic and less ambitious, and longer-term and intangible benefits must be considered and mentioned while setting targets and accounting for results.

b. The sustainability of the long-term benefits of the FFS interventions hinges on the ability of the members to continue operating in cohesive producer groups and umbrella organizations like the FFS Networks (or even become Rural Producer Organization and Area Cooperative Enterprises as part of the Government-led drive to revitalize cooperatives), and access demand-driven public and private extension and advisory services. This calls for a two-pronged approach to incentivize the skilled FFS facilitators to continue providing extension services in these communities and to institutionalize and integrate the FFS approach into the public extension systems of district local governments.
c. The inherent distortions in input and produce markets and incentives for production and enterprise caused by targeted hand-outs have the potential to negate the benefits of the FFS interventions and cause dependency among farmers. This has been acknowledged and all efforts at addressing it undertaken through conducting analysis of seed systems, supporting local seed multiplication initiatives, and inclusion of progressive farmers and value chain support initiatives to promote and sustain local enterprise.

2. Monitoring:
The lack of up-to-date national statistics in the sectors under FAO’s mandate has been cited as one factor that reduces the quality of project design, establishing baselines and targets, monitoring progress, and evaluation for impact. This problem is more pronounced for the indicators that are aggregated at national and sector-wide level, especially for the Programme outcomes, since at project level, the locally disaggregated statistics are easily obtained by conducting smaller studies restricted to the target areas. The lessons learnt from this situation have been applied in the design of initiatives aimed at capacity building and strengthening access to information and knowledge under this CPF, which are specifically customized to focus on improving the frequency and quality of statistics generated by the concerned institutions in the agricultural, forestry and fisheries sectors.

3. Institutionalization/Coordination:
The need to coordinate with multiple stakeholders in the agriculture, forestry, fisheries, water, food security and nutrition sectors and subsectors throughout the whole programming cycle (from design to implementation and monitoring) to foster capacity-building, technology transfer, policy coherence and sustainability, while avoiding duplication of effort and conflicting initiatives, cannot be overemphasized. The chief stakeholder is the Government through its institutions at national and sub-national levels. However, despite signing Memoranda of Understanding with local governments for coordination and supervision of project implementation, some of the shortcomings identified include weak integration of FAO activities in district local government plans arising out of inadequate participatory and consultative planning. Additionally, there is a disconnect between the central government line ministries and departments on one hand and their technical departments at local government level on the other, which weakens the institutionalization of even the government-steered TCP projects at sub-national level. Addressing these issues has been at the forefront in the design of this CPF with increased focus on upstream support to strengthen public institutions in planning, coordination, technical and functional capacity to deliver services in FAO’s areas of mandate.

Some of the achievements highlighted in the mid-term review of CPF 2010-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subregion</th>
<th>Highlighted achievements/changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teso</td>
<td>Improvement in household livelihood capitals and food security as seen in: improved housing structures; increased ability to pay school fees for children; improved access to food, markets, and credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamoja</td>
<td>Improved access to quality seeds and planting materials; increased crop acreages; livelihood diversification; increased access to food and markets (for food, produce and livestock); increased ability to pay school fees; improved nutrition and dietary diversity; improved access to veterinary services, pasture and water, and consequent improvement in livestock health and productivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acholi</td>
<td>Improved access to food, markets and credit; improved nutrition; increased competitiveness of farming practices and commercialization (arising out of exchange visits); improved entrepreneurial skills and record-keeping among farmers; increased household incomes and ability to pay school fees for children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunyoro</td>
<td>Improved household incomes with low rates of borrowing at 5%; Increased maize production, access to storage facilities, collective bulking and marketing and therefore improved prices; improved housing structures; increased ability to pay school fees for children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fruit value chains:** Increased access to improved fruit seedlings and fruit production; improved access to food and markets; beneficiary households have built permanent houses, taken to farming as a business (due to lower interest rates by savings/credit associations), and are able to pay school fees for their children.

**Potato value chains:** Increased access to quality potato seed and increased production/output of potatoes; increased access to storage facilities for ware and seed potatoes (some beneficiaries have built individual storage facilities through low-interest loans); improved access to food and markets; increased household incomes and ability to pay school fees for children among beneficiaries; increased entrepreneurship among beneficiaries (due to low-interest loans).

**Honey value chains:** Improved productivity, production and local processing of honey; improved markets/prices due to increased access to agro-processing and packaging machines/technologies; product diversification (production of candles from bees-wax); improved household incomes and ability to pay school fees; improved health of household members due to frequent use of honey.

**Dairy value chains:** Increased milk productivity (6 litres per cow per day up from 3 litres) due to acquisition of improved breeds; improved market access/availability due to acquisition of milk cooling facilities and tanker; some beneficiaries have built permanent houses and are able to pay school fees for their children.

**B. Past and Ongoing Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Implementation Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of an updated national strategy for the dairy sector and dairy value chain development</td>
<td>TCP/UGA/3202</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase supply of Mukene (<em>Retrineobola argentia</em>) for human consumption</td>
<td>TCP/UGA/3204</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to Agribusiness mini-estates to promote the commercialization strategy of the Agricultural sector in Uganda</td>
<td>TCP/UGA/3301</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved resilience capacities of communities in Northern Karamoja</td>
<td>OSRO/UGA/007/SPA</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Household Food Security and Nutritional Status of poor communities in Eastern Uganda</td>
<td>OSRO/UGA/772/UNJ</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency support to drought affected households in Northern Uganda through Farmer Field Schools</td>
<td>TCP/UGA/3203</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation of Agricultural and Economic livelihood opportunities in return areas</td>
<td>OSRO/UGA/903/NOR</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamoja Livelihood Agro Pastoralist Opportunities</td>
<td>OSRO/UGA/002/BEL</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of food security in cross border districts of Burundi, DRC, Rwanda and Uganda in support of modernization of agriculture under the NEPAD/CAADP framework</td>
<td>GTFS/RAF/391/ITA</td>
<td>2007-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for rehabilitation, development and sustainable management of forests in Northern Uganda</td>
<td>TCP/UGA/3303</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food security risks in the Great Lakes region – rapid threats to banana diseases</td>
<td>OSRO/RAF/301/BEL</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional cassava initiative in support of the vulnerable small holders in central and Eastern Africa</td>
<td>OSRO/RAF/912/EC</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional initiative in support of vulnerable pastoralists and agro-pastoralists in the Horn of Africa</td>
<td>OSRO/RAF/011/EC</td>
<td>2010 - 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of post-harvest storage facilities in Northern Uganda</td>
<td>UGA/09/001/01/34</td>
<td>2010 - 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership between WFP and FAO for purchase for progress in Northern Uganda</td>
<td>OSRO/UGA/005/WFP</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming the Right to Food into Sub national plans and strategies</td>
<td>GCP/INT/087/GER</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Implementation Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the multi-sectoral approach to gender-based violence prevention and response in North and North-East Uganda</td>
<td>OSRO/UGA/103/UNJ</td>
<td>2011 - 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Agricultural Assistance to Congolese Refugees and food insecure pastoralist communities in Karamoja subregion</td>
<td>OSRO/UGA/402/CHA</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Agricultural Assistance to South Sudanese Refugees in Northern Uganda</td>
<td>OSRO/UGA/401/CHA</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Food Security and Diversification of Livelihood Opportunities for Communities in Karamoja</td>
<td>OSRO/UGA/101/EC</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Food Security and Agricultural Livelihoods of the War Affected Communities in Acholi and Teso (ALREP)</td>
<td>OSRO/UGA/102/EC</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Workers to Analyse and Respond to the Interactions between HIV/AIDS and Food Security</td>
<td>UNJP/UGA/039/UNJ</td>
<td>2010 - 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural adaption to Climate Change in the Central cattle corridor.</td>
<td>GCP/UGA/041/BEL</td>
<td>2013-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Climate change Alliance: Agricultural adaption to climate change.</td>
<td>GCP/UGA/041/EC</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of commercialization of agriculture among resettling populations in Gulu, Kole and Lira districts of Northern Uganda to restore livelihoods and reduce poverty</td>
<td>GTF/S/UGA/022/ITA</td>
<td>2012-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Information system for food and nutrition security.</td>
<td>TCP/UGA/3402</td>
<td>2013-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to enhancing development of commercial aquaculture</td>
<td>TCP/UGA/3501</td>
<td>2014-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to strengthening of formal and community based seed production and marketing systems in Uganda</td>
<td>TCP/UGA/3502</td>
<td>2014-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans-boundary agro-ecosystem management project for the Kagera River Basin</td>
<td>GCP/RAF/424/GFF</td>
<td>2010- 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved food security, livelihoods and resilience of vulnerable pastoral communities in the Greater Horn of Africa through the Pastoral Field School approach</td>
<td>OSRO/RAF/103/SWI</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming food loss reduction initiative for smallholders in food deficient areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>To start soon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5: Major Programmes and Policies in FAO-Mandated areas in Uganda

The Istanbul Programme of Action (IPoA, 2011-2020)

The Istanbul Programme of Action charts out the international community’s vision and strategy for sustainable development of least developed countries for the decade 2011-2020 with a strong focus for developing their productive capacities. The purpose is to eradicate poverty and achieve internationally agreed development goals with a special focus on MDGs. Its objective is to achieve sustained equitable and inclusive economic growth of at least 7% annually. Strong focus is on structural transformation through increasing productive capacity, generating full and productive employment and decent work for all people especially for the youth.

Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP)

This framework provides the guide for growth oriented agricultural development agenda aimed at increasing agricultural growth rates to a minimum of 6% per annum to create wealth needed for rural communities and households in Africa to prosper. The Agenda hinges around 4 pillars of: extending the area under sustainable land management and reliable water control systems; improving rural infrastructure and trade related capacities for market access; increasing food supply; reducing hunger and improving responses to food crises; and improving agriculture research, technology dissemination and adoption. Additional emphasis is on capacity strengthening for agribusiness and improving access to information for agricultural strategy formulation.

Uganda Vision 2040

This framework aspires to transform the agriculture sector from subsistence to commercial in order to make it profitable, competitive and sustainable and provide food and income security to the people of Uganda. It visualizes a sector growing at 5% per annum, creating considerable employment opportunities along the entire value chain for production and marketing. This is hoped to be achieved through mechanization, introduction of modern irrigation systems, continued investment in technology improvement through research for improved seeds, breeds and stocking materials, and investment in the development of fertilizer and agro based industry. Others are reform of the extension system, improving access to information and strengthening the legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks.

National Development Plan (NDPII)

The NDP II covers the period 2015/16 – 2019/20 and is a successor to NDP I which was implemented in the period 2010/11 - 2014/15. It is the comprehensive national development planning framework adopted by the Government of Uganda which embodies the long, medium and short term development planning mechanism at various levels of administration. The strategic objectives of the NDP II are: to increase sustainable production, productivity and value addition in key growth opportunities; to increase the stock and quality of strategic infrastructure to accelerate the country’s competitiveness; to enhance human capital development; and to strengthen mechanisms for quality effective and efficient service delivery. This framework operationalizes the five year period of the Vision 2040 which focuses on transforming the agricultural sector from being predominantly subsistence to becoming more commercial. The priority areas for the agriculture sector are: enhancement of production and productivity, and increase in access to critical farm inputs, labour and productivity in the sector; and to create considerable employment opportunities along the agricultural value chain. Others are: reform of the extension system, improving access to information and strengthening the legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks.

Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan (DSIP)

The DSIP articulates the agriculture component of national development and is the focal point for alignment in this CPF. Its objectives have largely remained the same as during the 2010/11 – 2014/15 period given that the prevailing situation has not changed much. The development objectives of the DSIP include: increasing rural incomes and livelihoods, and improving household food and nutrition security. The investment programmes of DSIP are: enhancing production and productivity, market access and value addition, improving the enabling environment; and institutional strengthening in the sector.

United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

The UNDAF describes the collective response of the UN system to national development priorities as espoused in the NDP. For the period 2016-2010, the three strategic areas of focus are: governance, human capital development and sustainable and inclusive economic development. FAO will contribute mainly to the strategic area on sustainable and inclusive economic development particularly the outcomes on: natural resources management and climate change resilience; infrastructure, production and trade; and employment.

The United Nations in Uganda recognizes the importance of institutional development, human rights and gender equality, and accountability and transparency which FAO Uganda also espouses.

FAO Global Strategic Framework

The FAO Global Strategic Framework 2010 – 2019, broken down into four-year Medium Term Plans and biennial Programmes of Work and Budget, provides the overarching strategic direction for the organization. It has five objectives (refer to page 1) which represent the main areas of work which FAO concentrates its efforts on to achieve its vision and global goals. Technical quality, knowledge and services, gender and governance are integral to the achievement of these objectives.

Falling within FAO's Regional Office for Africa (RAF), and the Sub-regional Office for Eastern Africa (SFE), FAO Uganda’s programme contributes to the Global Strategic Framework through the Africa regional priorities which are: increase production and productivity of crops, livestock and fisheries; promote sustainable use and management of natural resources; support market access and sanitary measures for better trade; and promote knowledge management information and advocacy in Africa.

Rationale

Over the past several years, FAO Uganda has benefitted from funds for agenda on climate change, food security and sustainable agriculture in the country. The purpose of the proposed fundraising strategy is to increase effectiveness in resource mobilization and reduce dependency by diversifying funding sources through a realistic plan that offers a progressive move towards implementing a more diverse and sustainable fundraising strategy and donor portfolio.

Throughout the time of the implementation of the CPF, FAO will maintain focus on longer-term programming, promoting sustainable livelihoods and commercialization of agricultural products in line with the Uganda's NDPII. In this proposed scenario there are additional needs to increase focus of donors on areas/pillars which have been receiving comparatively less attention in the last few years such as production, transformation and commercialization of agricultural production.

FAO in Uganda will need to leverage its considerable technical expertise to support country capacities in areas that are still not sufficiently supported by development partners, such as natural resource management, livestock management, forestry and fisheries as well as value addition and strategic intervention through value chain approach in order to attract additional resources.

FAO Uganda remains a key rehabilitation and development actor in Uganda, and its mandate and its unique approach to supporting resilience and livelihoods is gaining more attention in areas like Karamoja characterized by episodes of food insecurity and malnutrition, and in crisis situations (influx of South Sudanese refugees). FAO Uganda will promote interaction and working relationships with other agencies potentially involved in issues related to social services, protection and safety nets to intervene in areas with high levels of vulnerability to shocks and natural disasters.

FAO will also need to explore expansion of joint programming (e.g., with IFAD, UNICEF, WFP, ILO, UNDP and UNOPS) to attract more funding from resource partners interested in seeing more efficient and synergistic collaborative approaches among agencies.

In terms of potential resource partners, FAO will continue to depend on traditional donors familiar with its work and mandate for most of its support over the next five years. These include the main OECD donors, including the European Union, Italy, Belgium, Germany, Spain, Norway, Sweden and United Kingdom, among others. Emerging and traditional donors with a focus on bilateral support to the Government could potentially expand their interest in the FAO approach in strategic partnership with national institutions, mainly on components related to technical assistance and training.

The table in Annex 2B outlines resource requirements across CPF outcomes and outputs. This will underpin a more elaborate analysis of potential resource partners and drive the development of a resource mobilization action plan around the CPF with the guidance of FAO's Resource Mobilization and Operations Support Service. The resource mobilization strategy and action plan will be aligned with Government of Uganda priorities (as outlined in the NDPII and Vision 2040), CAADP, UNDAF, and FAO resource mobilization priorities at global, regional and sub-regional levels. As part of an overall CPF monitoring and evaluation plan, the resource mobilization strategy, action plan and targets will undergo periodic review and adjustment in accordance to changing conditions in the resource environment.

The roadmap for development of the resource mobilization strategy and action plan is given in the Table below.
## Action Plan to develop RM Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeframe 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To increase the donor focus on areas historically inadequately funded</td>
<td>1.1 Conduct a resource trend analysis</td>
<td>Preliminary Research via ADAM</td>
<td>FAOR DFAOR AFAOR/P</td>
<td>J F M A M J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Conduct a donor mapping exercise</td>
<td>Participation in donor group meetings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Identification of resource gaps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Engage and re-engage resource partners</td>
<td>Arrange field visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Review relevance of inadequately funded areas to CPF priorities</td>
<td>Consultation/interaction with donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To increase and diversify donor portfolio to fund the CPF</td>
<td>3.1 Analysis of existing bilateral and potential agreements for areas that FAO can leverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To enable bi-lateral agreements between donors and the government to leverage FAO’s capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 7: Gender Review of the CSSF 2010-2014

1. **Introduction:** In compliance with the Country Programme Framework (CPF) formulation guidelines and the FAO policy on Gender Equality, FAO Uganda committed to improve its advancement to gender equality in order to promote food and nutrition security and contribute to eradication of poverty in the country through mainstreaming gender issues in the new CPF (2015-2019). As a requirement, FAO Uganda conducted a rapid gender analysis of the current Country Support Strategic Framework (2010-2014) that has guided all FAO interventions in the country, in order to identify the strengths and the gender gaps that could be addressed in the new CPF formulation.

2. **Objectives of the assessment were:**
   i. To assess the progress of FAO Uganda in mainstreaming gender equality and implementation of the gender policy through the CSSF 2010-2014; and
   ii. To identify the strengths and gaps in relation to gender mainstreaming in the CSSF and propose recommendations for action.

3. **Scope:** The analysis focused on the CSSF document because it is the foundation planning tool for all projects implemented by FAOUG in the 2010-2014 period.

   The review therefore assessed the situational analysis of the CSSF 2010-2014, the priority areas (the outcomes and intervention areas), and the indicators that were set to measure progress.

4. **Methodology:** The analysis used the following criteria to evaluate the extent of gender mainstreaming in the CSSF document:
   a) A set of questions that are based on the guidelines set by the Social Protection Division (ESP) for gender stock taking of documents were used and these included;
      - Does the document address gender issues i.e. using sex disaggregated data and age? Is reference made to socio-economic groups or vulnerable groups?
      - Does gender and social economic analysis exist?
      - Are specific approaches and strategies used to address the different priorities of men and women discussed in the conclusions and/or recommendations?
   b) The FAO gender markers were subjected to the outcomes, the intervention areas and the indicators that have a human component. Below is a table with the scores that were applied;
   c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G0</th>
<th>The activity does not address gender equality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>The activity addresses gender equality only in some dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2a</td>
<td>The activity addresses gender equality is a systematic way but this is not one of the main objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2b</td>
<td>The activity addresses gender equality and/or women’s empowerment as its main focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   The findings of the assessments were triangulated by cross-checking with a few programme documents that have been formulated in the period 2010-2014.
Findings of the Gender Analysis of the CSSF 2010-2014

Situational Analysis: In this section of the CSSF, there is a paragraph on gender that affirms that men and women have different development incentives and contribute differently in the agriculture sector, and therefore recommends pursuing gender equality in all development interventions.

However, it does not point out how this gender gap affects the agriculture sector and does not suggest ways through which these constrains should be addressed in order to equitably involve men and women in the achievement of sustainable increase in production and productivity of the vulnerable households, which is the goal of the CSSF (2010-2014).

The CSSF (2010-14) does not mention whether any country gender analysis of the agriculture sector was done, and neither was there utilization of secondary data related to gender equality and women’s empowerment in the sector. Also there was no evidence of the use of sex disaggregated data in its analysis. This calls for a deeper attention to gender mainstreaming in the new CPF formulation process.

Outcomes, Intervention areas and the indicators: Out of the 10 outcomes in the 5 intervention areas, only one outcome (Outcome 4.2) scored a G2a, meaning that gender equality was addressed in a systematic way, although this was not the main objective of the outcome. The rest of the outcomes scored G1, meaning that they only addressed gender equality in some dimensions e.g. by having one activity that was specific to gender equality.

Out of a total of 21 eligible indicators that have a human component (out of the total 85), only 2 were gender sensitive and able to track progress towards gender equality. This is far below the minimum standards prescribed by FAO’s policy on gender equality that calls for gender disaggregated data in all activities.

Conclusion: Generally, the CSSF (2010-14) took some steps to address gender equality through mainstreaming gender issues. However, this was inadequate and thus estimating its contributions to gender equality and women empowerment became difficult.

Steps taken to mainstream gender in the CPF 2015 - 2019:

The design of the CPF has taken into consideration the gaps in the CSSF 2010 - 2014 and has worked towards meeting the minimum standards of mainstreaming gender as stipulated in the guidelines developed by the Economic and Social Development (ESW) unit of FAO to comply with the UN System’s Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women. During the formulation process, the Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development, women organisations and the gender focal point person in MAAIF were involved in consultations. A review of existing data was done to assess the constraints of women and men in agriculture and these analyses were used in mainstreaming gender issues in the CPF interventions.
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