

Catholic Relief Services/Uganda
Development Assistance Program (DAP)

Final Evaluation

REPORT

21 December 2005

Transfer Authorization Award No. FFP-A-00-02-00006-00

SO2: Increased effectiveness of FFP's PVO and Mission partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security, with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.

Acknowledgement

The external evaluators would like to gratefully acknowledge the support provided by the staff of CRS Uganda. In particular, we would like to thank the following persons who provided extensive support to the evaluation team and ensured that the conclusions reached were grounded in reality.

Michael Tewolde, Northern Area Manager, CRS
Michael Kazooba, Project Officer, DAP, CRS
Patrick Okello, Assistant Project Officer, DAP, CRS
Monica Atube, Assistant Project Officer, DAP, CRS
Simon Mukula, Data Base Manager, DAP, CRS
Stephen Openyi, Caritas Gulu
David Odoch, Church of Uganda

Finally, innumerable other staff of CRS, representatives of the DAP partners, and a multitude of DAP participants and beneficiaries provided useful insights, guidance, or logistical support for the evaluation. Our gratitude goes out to them as well.

Sincerely,

Michael D. DeVries, TANGO International
Peter O. Olupot, Consultant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
II. BACKGROUND	4
A. DAP History	
B. DAP Operating Environment	
C. Evaluation Methodology	
III. PROGRAM IMPACT ASSESSMENT AT THE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE LEVEL	7
A. Focus of the Final Evaluation	
B. 2002 Baseline Survey	
C. Changes in Area Cultivated	
D. Net Income Comparisons	
E. Targeting Information	
F. Impact on Women.	
IV. PROGRAM ACTIVITY ASSESSMENT	13
A. Assessment of Activities Under IR 1.1 - Agricultural Production	
1. Activity 1.1a Farmer Groups	
a. <i>Overview of Implementation Strategies</i>	
b. <i>Outputs Produced</i>	
c. <i>Who has Benefited?</i>	
d. <i>Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and the Quality of Outputs Produced</i>	
2. Activity 1.1b Access to Land	
a. <i>Overview of Implementation Strategies</i>	
b. <i>Outputs Produced</i>	
c. <i>Who has Benefited?</i>	
d. <i>Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs</i>	
3. Activity 1.1c Seed/Planting Material	
a. <i>Overview of Implementation Strategies</i>	
b. <i>Outputs Produced</i>	
c. <i>Who has Benefited?</i>	
d. <i>Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs</i>	
B. Assessment of Activities Under IR 1.2 - Community Capacities	
1. Activity 1.2a Community Rehabilitation Plans	
a. <i>Overview of Implementation Strategy</i>	
b. <i>Outputs Produced</i>	
c. <i>Who has Benefited?</i>	
d. <i>Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs</i>	
2. Activity 1.2b Valley Dam Rehabilitation	
a. <i>Overview of Implementation Strategy</i>	

- b. *Outputs Produced*
 - c. *Who has Benefited?*
 - d. *Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs*
- C. Assessment of Activities Under IR 1.3 - Crop productivity and Profitability
 - 1. Activity 1.3a Trials and Demonstrations
 - a. *Overview of Implementation Strategies*
 - b. *Outputs Produced*
 - c. *Who has Benefited?*
 - d. *Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs Produced*
 - 2. Activity 1.3b Knowledge Transfer
 - a. *Overview of Implementation Strategies*
 - b. *Outputs Produced*
 - c. *Who has Benefited?*
 - d. *Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs Produced*
 - 3. Activity 1.3c Marketing Associations
 - a. *Overview of Implementation process*
 - b. *Outputs Produced*
 - c. *Who has benefited?*
 - d. *Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs Produced*
 - 4. Activity 1.3d Market Analyses and Information Campaigns
 - a. *Overview of Implementation processes*
 - b. *Outputs Produced*
 - c. *Who has Benefited?*
 - d. *Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs Produced*

V. PROGRAM PROCESS ASSESSMENT

25

- A. Program Management
 - 1. Overview of the Management of the DAP
 - 2. Observations Relative to Program Management
 - Vision and Leadership*
 - Decision-Making*
 - Strategic and Operational Planning*
 - Communications*
 - Program Support*
- B. Partnership
 - 1. Overview of Partnerships in the DAP
 - 2. Observations Relative to Partnerships
- C. Program Integration
 - 1. Overview of Program Integration
 - Within the DAP*
 - With Other Programs Managed by CRS*
 - With Other Programs Managed by the Implementing Partners*
 - With Other Programs Being Implemented in the Same Sectors as the DAP by Other Organizations*

With National Level Strategies for Acholi Land.

2. Observations Relative to Integration
- D. Financial Management.
 1. Overview of the Financial Management of the DAP
 2. Observations Relative to Financial Management
- E. Human Resources Management and Development
 1. Overview of the Human Resources Management and Development in the DAP
 2. Observations Relative to Human Resources Management and Development
- F. Commodity Management
 1. Overview of Commodity Management
 2. Observations Relative to Commodity Management
- G. Monitoring and Evaluation
 1. Overview of Monitoring and Evaluation
 - Monitoring*
 - Evaluation*
 2. Observations Relative to Monitoring and Evaluation
 - Commodity Monitoring*
 - Monitoring for Reporting Purposes*
 - Monitoring for Programmatic Decision-Making*
 - Evaluation*
- H. Environmental Monitoring and Impact Mitigation
 1. Overview of Environmental Monitoring and Impact Mitigation
 2. Observations Relative to Environmental Monitoring and Impact Mitigation

VI. LESSONS LEARNED RELEVANT FOR THE DESIGN OF THE MULTI-YEAR ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (MYAP)

33

- A. Overall Strategy
 1. Analyzing Vulnerability
 2. Targeting the Extremely Vulnerable
 3. Alternative Group Configurations
 4. Use of Food
- B. From the Agriculture Experience
 1. Engaging Land Owners in Land Use Planning
 2. Seed Supply Systems
 3. The Soil Fertility Problem
 4. Selection of Target Crops
 5. Capital Mobilization
- C. From the Valley Dams Experience
 1. Continue the Valley Dam Component?
 2. "Software" Development
- D. From the Marketing Experience
 1. Marketing Entry Point
 2. Market Chain Analysis
 3. Vertical Linkages
- E. Process Lessons
 1. Staff Structure
 2. Staff Turnover
 3. Implementing Partnerships
 4. Monitoring and Evaluation

5. Linking Program Activities

6. Transparency

VI. CONCLUSION

38

A. Overview of Results

B. The Bottomline

ANNEXES

Annex A: Final Evaluation Scope of Work

Annex B: Evaluation Methodological Tools and Schedules

Annex C: Conversions to 2002 Values

TABLES

Table 1. Assessment of Impact Against the Program Strategic Objective	2
Table 2. Assessment of Achievement by Proposed Activities Under Each Intermediate Result	2
Table 3. Key Dates for the CRS DAP	5
Table 4. Average Area Cultivated by Participating Farmers for Selected Crops	8
Table 5. Average Crop Production (Kgs) per Household for Selected Crops	9
Table 6. Average Amount of Cash Received from the Sale of Selected Crops (Ug Sh)	10
Table 7. Average Expenditures on Agricultural Inputs for Selected Crops (Ug Sh)	10
Table 8. Average Profit from Specific Crops per Household and per Acre	11
Table 9. Proportions of Farmers in Different Classes of Income from Total Sales of Selected Crops	11
Table 10. Proportion Households by Type of Household, Gender of the Household Head and Wealth Category	12
Table 11. Average Area Cultivated for Selected Crops by Type of Household	12
Table 12. Number of Groups and Participating Farmers	14
Table 13. Number of Acres Accessed and Estimated Number of Households Benefiting	15
Table 14. Value of Seed Disbursed Through Seed Fairs/Seed Vouchers	16
Table 15. Summary of Valley Dams Completed, Under Construction and Planned for 2006	20
Table 16. Marketing Associations Formed	24
Table 17. Projected LOA Cash Expenditure Summary (US\$)	29
Table 18. Projected LOA Commodity Summary (MT)	31
Table 19. LOA Commodity Loss Summary through FY 05 Shipments Received (MT)	31
Table 20. Summary Assessment of Achievement on Activities Under Each Intermediate Result	39
Table 21. Summary Assessment of Impact Against the Program Strategic Objectives	40

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACDI-VOCA	Agricultural Cooperative Development International/Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Association
AER	Annual Estimate of Requirements
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ART	Ante-Retroviral Treatment
C&F	Cargo and Freight
CBO	Community-Based Organization
CEF	Community Extension Facilitator
CIP	International Potato Center
COU	Church of Uganda
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
CS	Cooperating Sponsor
CSR4	Cooperating Sponsor Results Report and Resource Request
DAP	Development Assistance Program
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FFP	Food for Peace
FFW	Food for Work
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FY	Fiscal Year
HIV	Human Immuno-deficiency Virus
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IEE	Initial Environmental Examination
IITA	International Institute of Tropical Agriculture
IR	Intermediate Result
Kg	Kilogram
LOA	Life of Activity
LRA	Lords Resistance Army
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOI	Market Opportunities Information
MT	Metric Ton
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
MYAP	Multi-Year Assistance Program
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory Services
NAM	Northern Area Manager
NARO	National Agricultural Research Organization
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NUSAF	Northern Uganda Social Action Fund
PMA	Plan for Modernization of Agriculture
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
SAARI	Serere Agriculture and Animal Research Institute
SO	Strategic Objective
TA	Transfer Authorization
TAC	Technical Adoption Committee
TL	Team Leader
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
UgSh	Uganda Shilling
UPDF	Uganda People's Defense Force
WFP	World Food Program
WVI	World Vision International

The FY 2002-2006 Development Assistance Program (DAP) CRS Uganda FINAL EVALUATION

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CRS commissioned a final evaluation of its FY 2002-2006 Development Assistance Program (DAP) in September/October of 2005, twelve months before the completion of the program. The objectives for the evaluation were two-fold, (1) to assess the overall impact of the program and (2) to identify lessons learned relevant for a Multi-Year Assistance Program to be designed to build on the experience of the DAP. This report summarizes the findings of the evaluation which investigated the impact of the program at the Strategic Objective level, the outputs produced by the program reflected at the activity level¹, who actually benefited from the program, the quality of the processes used to produce the outputs, and the major lessons learned from implementation of the program. The evaluation was conducted by two external consultants² supported by DAP partner and CRS staff over the period September 27 through October 14, 2005.

The FY 2002-2006 DAP has basically three components:

1. An agricultural rehabilitation component designed to re-establish production of traditional crops (IR 1.1);
2. A community asset rehabilitation component focused on valley dam restoration using Food for Work (IR 1.2); and
3. An agricultural development component designed to introduce new technologies associated with traditional crops to expand production with a marketing component intended to re-establish or strengthen marketing linkages for the production increases resulting from the program (IR 1.3).

The total value of the program at initiation was projected to be US\$ 8,919,554 which included US\$ 5,920,400 for the C&F cost of commodities, US\$ 1,801,000 in projected inland freight costs to be covered from monetization proceeds, US\$ 962,614 in Section 202E funds, and US\$ 234,740 in CRS cost-sharing funds. Monetization proceeds were projected to be US\$ 4,483,059 from monetization of 17,500 MT of wheat. In addition to the commodities requested for monetization, the program also planned to distribute 1,100 MT of corn, vegetable oil and pulses as direct distribution in food for work (FFW) in the valley dam component. By the end of the program in September 2006, it is projected that 73% of the FFW food will have been distributed, 89% of the proposed food for monetization will have been monetized and 86% of the proposed cash budget spent.

Over its life, the DAP proceeded through a number of implementation phases. The program was approved to begin October 2, 2001. However, monetization proceeds did not become available until April 2002, and little field work was undertaken in this initial phase, although the program was able to begin preparations for start-up. In April 2002, monetization funds became available and the program began field work. The security situation, however, quickly began to deteriorate as the effects of the Iron Fist operation in southern Sudan began to be felt

¹ The three Intermediate Results in the program were closely analyzed a year ago in the Mid-Term Evaluation and it was felt by the evaluation team that analysis at the activity level as described in the original project document would be more useful for assessing the quality of the program and generating lessons learned.

² One independent consultant from TANGO International and the recently recruited DAP Team Leader.

in northern Uganda.³ By June of 2002, the security situation had deteriorated to the extent that the program had to withdraw completely from Pader District and implementation in the valley dam component had to be suspended. The reduced security continued through early 2004. The situation began to improve in 2004, and activities on the valley dam component as well as program implementation in Pader District got underway. A Mid-Term Evaluation was conducted in July 2004 and the program since then has been working toward implementing the recommendations from the evaluation.

The tables below summarize the findings relative to impact at the strategic objective level and performance on the major activities that were proposed for achieving each of the three Intermediate Results (IRs).

Table 1. Assessment of Impact Against the Program Strategic Objective

Strategic Objective	Summary Assessment of Impact
To increase the agricultural income of 20,000 smallholder farm families in Northern Uganda by reestablishing livelihoods and strengthening marketing systems.	While the average area cultivated has declined since the program began due to increased security constraints, participating households have been able to obtain increased net income because of increased cash receipts for all crops. Agriculture production livelihoods have been re-established within the IDP camp context and marketing for agricultural production has expanded.

Table 2. Assessment of Achievement by Proposed Activities Under Each Intermediate Result

Intermediate Result/Proposed Activities	Summary Assessment of Achievement
Intermediate Result 1.1 Increased agricultural production by 20,000 farm families in targeted areas by 2006	
<i>Findings of the Mid-Term Evaluation conducted in July 2004:</i> Production targets for finger millet, groundnuts and maize have been consistently surpassed by the DAP. The production targets for sorghum, rice and beans have not been achieved. Production has been effected by irregular rainfall, the on-going security constraints and declining soil fertility.	
<i>Observations of the Final Evaluation on Proposed Activities under IR 1.1</i>	
<u>Activity 1.1a:</u> Establish 1000 farmer groups for participation in the program	The DAP has been very successful in establishing cohesive farmer groups likely to continue after IDP camps are closed and farmers return to their villages. A total of 1,088 groups have been formed and are still functional.
<u>Activity 1.1b:</u> Provide access to farm land for displaced, returning, and relocated farm families	It is projected ⁴ that the total acreage made available to farmers through the lobbying efforts of the DAP will be more than 10,000 acres for approximately 4,500 households. Farmer groups were also able to advocate for access to land themselves, and the DAP can take some credit for this through the group formation work.

³ The Iron Fist operation targeted LRA camps in south Sudan. In a retaliatory response, the LRA unexpectedly moved their operations into northern Uganda.

⁴ Complete figures on the land made accessible through the lobbying efforts of the DAP in 2005 available at the time of evaluation needed verification.

Intermediate Result/Proposed Activities	Observations on Achievement
<u>Activity 1.1c:</u> Facilitate the availability of locally produced seed/planting material of traditional crops to up to 20,000 program participants	The DAP has made significant seed available through seed fairs/seed vouchers, seed multiplication activities, seed loans and direct seed distribution. In the seed fair/voucher activity alone, 24,282 households (not mutually exclusive) were able to purchase seed of their choice from vetted seed vendors valued at a total of UgSh 364,230,000 (approximately US\$ 198,800)
Intermediate Result 1.2 Increased capacity for recovery and rehabilitation of 200 communities in targeted areas by 2006	
<i>Findings of the Mid-Term Evaluation conducted in July 2004:</i> At the time of the mid-term evaluation, no valley dams had yet been completed, although two were under construction. Therefore, there was basically no achievement against the intermediate result. The security situation in Kitgum District forced significantly delayed start-up of activities.	
<i>Observations of the Final Evaluation on Proposed Activities under IR 1.2</i>	
<u>Activity 1.2a:</u> Development of Community Rehabilitation Plans in targeted areas	At the time the DAP was approved, CRS was requested to focus this activity on rehabilitation plans only for the valley dams. Dam committees have been formed by the DAP for each dam. Those committees for the two completed dams are fairly ineffective.
<u>Activity 1.2b:</u> Rehabilitate 15 (revised to 9 following the Mid-Term Evaluation) multi-purpose community valley dams/tanks	Two dams have been fully completed, however, water availability from the dam, availability of alternative water sources in the camps, distance, and relatively low numbers of livestock have limited the impact of the completed dams. An additional four dams are under construction and four additional dams are targeted for FY 2006 for rehabilitation.
Intermediate Result 1.3 Increased crop productivity and profitability for 20,000 farm families by 2006	
<i>Findings of the Mid-Term Evaluation conducted in July 2004:</i> Using the assumption that increased productivity results in increased profit, all crops except rice showed increased profitability from the baseline. At least 20% of the program participants practice at least three improved techniques, and a total of 26 marketing associations have been formed.	
<i>Observations of the Final Evaluation on Proposed Activities under IR 1.2</i>	
<u>Activity 1.3a:</u> Conduct on-farm and farmer-managed trials and demonstrations of promising varieties of improved traditional Acholi crops	The DAP has tested seven new ⁵ varieties of groundnuts, four new varieties of sesame, five new varieties of sunflower, three new varieties of finger millet, two new varieties of sorghum, four new varieties of maize, one new variety of pigeon pea, six new varieties of sweet potato, and six new varieties of cassava. Tests were designed as yield comparisons with local varieties. In addition to yield tests, comparisons of various cultivation techniques for different crops were also set up. Demonstration plots were also established to display successful varieties and techniques.
<u>Activity 1.3b:</u> Transfer knowledge and skills in modern farming techniques to 20,000 farmers through demonstration sites and field days	Various tours, training events, field days, celebration days, and cross-visits were organized to facilitate knowledge transfer.

⁵ "New" here refers to new to the project area. Sources of new varieties included ICRISAT, Serere, CIP, and IITA.

Intermediate Result/Proposed Activities	Observations on Achievement
<u>Activity 1.3c:</u> Establish progressive marketing associations directly benefiting 20,000 farm families	A total of 36 marketing associations have been established in Gulu District benefiting approximately 750 farm families.
<u>Activity 1.3d:</u> Conduct market analyses and information campaigns targeting 20,000 farm families	A general Market Opportunities Information assessment and Market Chain Analyses for three crops have been completed. The DAP has also undertaken orientation and training activities in preparation for implementing an agro-enterprise development strategy.

In the judgment of the final evaluation team, the DAP has been a good investment in terms of having significant impact on vulnerability, livelihoods and food insecurity under the current circumstances and has established a solid foundation upon which to build.

II. BACKGROUND

A. DAP History

The Title II Development Assistance Program (DAP) being implemented by CRS Uganda officially began implementation on October 1, 2001, with an expected completion date of September 30, 2006. The program is composed of three components, (1) an agricultural component implemented in three districts, Gulu, Kitgum and Pader, through two partners, Caritas and the Church of Uganda, (2) a valley dam rehabilitation component being implemented with Caritas in Kitgum District and (3) an agricultural marketing component being implemented through the two partners in Gulu District. The Strategic Objective for the program is shown below.

Strategic Objective: To increase the agricultural income of 20,000 smallholder farm families in Northern Uganda by reestablishing livelihoods and strengthening market systems.

The program has three Intermediate Results and specific activities were proposed under each of these as shown below.

Intermediate Result 1.1: Increased agricultural production by 20,000 farm families in targeted areas by 2006.
<i>Activity 1.1a:</i> Establish 1000 farmer groups for participation
<i>Activity 1.1b:</i> Provide access to farm land for displaced, returning and relocating farm families
<i>Activity 1.1c:</i> Facilitate the availability of locally produced seed/planting material of traditional crops to up to 20,000 program participants.
Intermediate Result 1.2: Increased capacity for recovery and rehabilitation of 200 communities in targeted areas by 2006.
<i>Activity 1.2a:</i> Development of community rehabilitation plans in targeted areas
<i>Activity 1.2b:</i> Rehabilitate 15 (revised to 9 following the Mid-Term Evaluation) multi-purpose community valley dams/tanks
Intermediate Result 1.3: Increased crop productivity and profitability for 20,000 farm families by 2006
<i>Activity 1.3a:</i> Conduct on-farm and farmer-managed trials and demonstrations of promising varieties of improved traditional Acholi-crops.

Activity 1.3b: Transfer knowledge and skills in modern farming techniques to 20,000 farmers through demonstration sites and field days

Activity 1.3c: Establish progressive marketing associations directly benefiting 20,000 farm families

Activity 1.3d: Conduct market analyses and information campaigns targeting 20,000 farm families.

The total program cost at approval was estimated to reach US\$ 8,919,554, including US\$ 5,920,400 for commodities (C&F)⁶, US\$ 962.614 from 202e, and cost sharing from CRS of US\$ 234,740. Table 3 lists the key dates in the life of the program.

Table 3. Key Dates for the CRS DAP

Date	Submission/Event
April 15, 2001	DAP Proposal Submitted to FFP
August 1, 2001	Call Forward request for the August 3 rd cycle submitted to USAID and FFP
August 7, 2001	CRS authorized by FFP in the Transfer Authorization to call forward commodities
August 21, 2001	Transfer Authorization received and signed by CRS
October 1, 2001	Official start date as per the Transfer Authorization
March 26 - April 6, 2002	DAP Baseline Survey conducted in Pader and Gulu Districts
April 1, 2002	Actual Implementation commences upon receipt of first monetization proceeds
May - June 2002	Unexpected deterioration of security in Gulu, Kitgum and Pader Districts
June 2002	Suspension of activities in Pader District
October, 2003	Decision made to relocate planned activities for Pader District to Kitgum District because of security constraints
July 2004	Mid-Term Evaluation Implemented
October 2004	Resumption of program activities in Pader District
December 15, 2004	Final Mid-Term Evaluation Report Received by CRS
October 29, 2004	Revised targets based on Mid-Term Evaluation Proposed to FFP in FY 2004 CSR4
September 27 -October 14, 2005	Final Evaluation implemented
October 15, 2005	Draft Final Evaluation Report submitted to CRS
November 21, 2005	Finalized Final Evaluation Report submitted to CRS
September 30, 2006	Completion Date for the DAP

This report summarizes the findings of a final evaluation conducted for the program over the period September 27 through October 14, 2005. Two external consultants were commissioned to review the program to assess impact and identify lessons learned to inform the design of another DAP proposal to be submitted to Food for Peace (FFP) for FY 2007. Annex A contains the Scope of Work for the evaluation. DAP staff from CRS and the implementing partners provided support for the evaluation.

B. DAP Operating Environment

It is worth making a special note of the extremely difficult operating environment in which the CRS DAP is being implemented. The on-going war between the UPDF and the LRA has resulted in the following constraints affecting program implementation.

⁶ ITSH costs for distributed food were covered from monetization proceeds.

- ✿ Personal safety risks to program staff and participants⁷ and a general feeling of risk and insecurity.
- ✿ The closing down of areas, even entire districts, to access for program activities for extended periods of up to a year as in the case of Pader District.
- ✿ Shifting access even in those areas that are considered open, i.e., areas becoming open to access and others closing down.
- ✿ Military policies that mandate enforced displacement of people into IDP camps and restrict agricultural activities in some areas to cultivation of low profile crops.
- ✿ The need for security escorts and security to position themselves resulting in an effective work day in the field in many areas from 10:00 am to 4:00 pm.
- ✿ Road restrictions effective from 5:00 pm.

The achievements of the program should be understood in the context of this operating environment in order to give them due consideration.

C. Evaluation Methodology

A combination of quantitative and qualitative methods was used to gather information for analysis in the final evaluation. A quantitative survey was conducted to replicate the baseline information at the strategic objective level in order to assess the overall impact of the program. Some of the key parameters for the quantitative survey are listed below.

- ~ The sample frame was disaggregated by type of group ("graduated", "old", "new", "control") and district (Gulu Caritas, Gulu Church of Uganda, Kitgum Carita, Pader Caritas)
- ~ A sample of 1,121 respondents was targeted
- ~ A three-page questionnaire was developed
- ~ Enumerators were trained in Gulu on September 30, in Kitgum and Pader on October 2
- ~ Data was collected from October 3-7
- ~ Data cleansing and entry for 1,096 questionnaires was completed by the end of October
- ~ Processing was completed by mid-November.

A couple of points are worth noting. The timing of the Final Evaluation survey does not coincide with the timing of the baseline survey. The former is being done in October, the latter was conducted in April. This may have implications on comparing seasonal data between the two surveys. Farmers in the baseline likely had better recall of the second season, while farmers in the final evaluation survey will have better recall of the first season information.

Second, the conditions for farmers at the time of the baseline were different than they are now during the final evaluation survey. Most farmers now are living in IDP camps and have more limited access to land resources. During the baseline, many farmers had not yet been forced to move to protected camps and had access to their own land resources.

Despite these two differences, having baseline information against which to compare is useful and the analysis has gleaned some usefully information from the comparison as described in the next section.

⁷ Many examples of incidents abound. Most recently, the Technical Officer for Caritas Kitgum, Stalin Okot, was killed by LRA rebels in October shortly after the final evaluation was conducted.

Using qualitative methods, the evaluation team also assessed (1) the quantity and quality of outputs produced as reflected in the activities proposed in the original DAP document, (2) the quality of the processes used in implementing the program, (3) the beneficiaries of program interventions and (4) key lessons learned from the program. The following focus group discussions (FGDs) and key informant interviews were conducted by different members of the evaluation team.

- ~ Graduated participant groups (One FGD per District)
- ~ Participant groups selected in 2002/3 (One FGD per District)
- ~ Participant groups selected in 2004 (One FGD per District)
- ~ Participating women-headed households (One FGD per District)
- ~ CEFs (One Key Informant Interview per District)
- ~ TACs (One FGD per District)
- ~ Valley Dam Committee (One FGD)
- ~ Marketing Associations (Five FGDs)
- ~ Partner, including Government, field staff (One FGD per district)
- ~ Partner management staff (Three key informant Interviews)
- ~ CRS DAP Staff (Four Key Informant Interviews, One FGD)
- ~ CRS Program Support Staff (Two Key Informant interviews)

A data analysis workshop was held on October 8 to analyze the qualitative data collected and formulate initial findings and identify information gaps.

Annex B contains documentation describing the approach used in the evaluation, including descriptions of methodologies, work schedules, tools used, sampling summary, and persons interviewed.

The next section of the report summarizes the impact of the program at the Strategic Objective level. Section IV of the report documents the observations of the evaluation team relative to each of the proposed activities implemented by the program. Section V describes the observations of the evaluation team relative to the project processes used, including those for managing the program, for integrating the program internally and externally, for commodity management, for monitoring and evaluation, and for environmental monitoring and impact mitigation. Finally, Section VI proposes recommendations for the design of the next MYAP. In the conclusion provided in the last section of the report, the evaluation team summarizes the findings.

III. PROGRAM IMPACT ASSESSMENT AT THE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE LEVEL

A. Focus of the Final Evaluation

The DAP Mid-Term Evaluation conducted in July 2004 gathered data at the Intermediate Result level for analysis. Given that only a little over a year has passed since this data was collected, the Final Evaluation team decided that it would be in the best interests of the objectives of the evaluation to (1) obtain data at the strategic objective level to compare to information from the baseline survey that was conducted in April 2002 and to (2) obtain data on the performance of the program relative to the proposed activities under each intermediate result. The first would enable the team to meet the objective of assessing the impact of the program. The second would provide information on lessons learned at a practical level for the design of the MYAP. This section describes the information resulting from a rapid analysis of quantitative information obtained to replicate the baseline survey that was conducted in April 2002.

B. 2002 Baseline Survey

Baseline data was collected in 2002 at a time when crops were doing well and the context was just beginning to dissolve into major insecurity. In 2002, right after the baseline survey was conducted, severe insecurity broke out, and farmers were unable to continue to cultivate effectively and, in fact, lost a significant portion of their crop in the field. Therefore, production for most of 2002 was significantly lower than the baseline. The security remained about the same in 2003 but with shifting areas of conflict, so production continued to be affected. Late in 2004, the security situation began to improve. However, even up to the time of the final evaluation, farmers were still confined to IDP camps and restricted to farming in a protected perimeter around the camps.

The final evaluation is replicating the baseline, but at a time of year different than when the baseline was conducted. This will have implications on the quality of data. Farmers will be able to recall information about the first season but without full harvest information and will have to recall the second season information from last year. During the baseline, the opposite was true. Second season information was clear and first season information had to be recalled.

C. Changes in Area Cultivated

Table 4 provides comparative information on area cultivated by district. At the time of the baseline survey, farmers were beginning to be confined to "protected camps" and access to land was starting to be constrained. Since then, however, a greater proportion of the population has become confined to camps and the available land resources around these camps have been allocated to a greater number of farmers. As a result, the average area cultivated in major crops has declined significantly. At the time of the baseline survey, for example, a total of 6.39 acres was cultivated in selected crops on average over the two seasons. At the time of the final evaluation, this figure had dropped to 4.47 acres.

Table 4. Average Area Cultivated by Participating Farmers for Selected Crops*

District & Partner	Baseline (March/April 2002)		Final Evaluation (October 2005)	
	Season 1	Season 2	Season 1	Season 2
Caritas, Gulu District	3.73 Acres	2.27 Acres	2.52 Acres	1.75 Acres
Church of Uganda, Gulu District			3.75 Acres	1.88 Acres
Caritas, Kitgum District	Not available	Not available	2.29 Acres	1.84 Acres
Caritas, Pader District	4.71 Acres	2.19 Acres	2.76 Acres	1.08 Acres
All Districts	4.14 Acres	2.25 Acres	2.83 Acres	1.64 Acres
Total Area Cultivated, All Districts, Both Seasons	6.39 Acres		4.47 Acres	

*Finger Millet, Groundnuts, Sorghum, Maize, Rice, Beans, Cassava, and Sesame

D. Net Income Comparisons

Tables 5 through 9 provide comparative information on production, expenses and net income. Figures for cash received and expenditures on inputs have been adjusted to 2002 figures using an average annual inflation rate of 6.5%⁸. Annex C contains the conversion table. Table 5 on the following page compares levels of production for the selected major crops. As

⁸ Historical estimates of the inflation rates based on consumer prices range from 3.5% to 6.5% per annum. The larger figure has been used to adjust reported values in 2005 to 2002 values (conversion factor = .814).

reported in the previous section, acreage cultivated has declined since the time of the baseline, so production levels will also have declined. A very rough indicator of yield, disregarding the composition of production, is shown in the last line of Table 5 which compares all production from the selected crops against annual area cultivated. The numbers suggest that output per acre has declined significantly. This is consistent with reports on declining soil fertility resulting from the intensive cultivation occurring on the limited land resources around the IDP camps.

Table 5. Average Crop Production (Kgs) per Household for Selected Crops*

Crop	Baseline (March/April 2002)			Final Evaluation (October 2005)		
	% of Farmers Producing	Average Annual Production (Kgs)	% Sold	% of Farmers Producing	Average Annual Production (Kgs)	% Sold
Finger Millet	12.6%	426.7	36.1%	52.4%	188.7	35.9%
Groundnuts	18.8%	396.8	65.1%	35.5%	170.7	51.4%
Sorghum	11.4%	476.4	55.4%	12.8%	191.2	32.2%
Maize	13.9%	472.6	75.2%	6.3%	171.5	44.0%
Rice	3.1%	640.6	79.6%	2.3%	206.8	67.9%
Beans	11.0%	375.2	59.6%	5.7%	156.9	42.4%
Cassava	11.4%	339.3**	73.7%	0.5%	258.6	50.6%
Sesame	19.9%	260.3	64.8%	3.3%	112.3	39.5%
Sum of Annual Production	---	3,387.9	64.5%	---	1,456.7	60.0%
Average Area Cultivated Annually	---	6.39 Acres	---	---	4.47 Acres	---
Production per Acre Cultivated	---	530 Kgs.	---	---	326 Kgs.	---

*Finger Millet, Groundnuts, Sorghum, Maize, Rice, Beans, Cassava, and Sesame

** Season A only.

Table 5 also provides information on changes in the cropping patterns of farmers. Finger millet and groundnuts have become more important crops while maize, beans, cassava and sesame are being produced by fewer farmers than at the time of the baseline. At the time of the baseline, significant portions of all crops apart from finger millet were sold. That pattern has changed. While finger millet continues to be a food crop, sorghum and sesame are also now being produced primarily for consumption. The major cash crops at the time of the baseline were sesame, groundnuts, maize and cassava, given the number of farmers producing these crops and the proportions that were sold. At the time of the final evaluation, groundnuts had become the major cash crop while the importance of sesame, maize and cassava had all declined. Rice is also predominantly a cash crop, but is grown by relatively few farmers.

Table 6 on the following page shows the average cash income that farmers are receiving for the selected major crops. Note that the reported values have been adjusted to 2002 values for a more valid comparison. The comparison indicates that for all crops, even though production levels have declined, farmers are getting better prices for the portion of the production they are selling.

Table 7 on the following page compares average expenditures on agricultural inputs. As with cash received, the reported figures have been adjusted to 2002 values. Not surprisingly,

agricultural production costs have increased in the period since the baseline survey was conducted. Notable differences are a doubling of land costs, increased use of land preparation using a tractor, and increased costs of oxen for land preparation.

Table 6. Average Amount of Cash Received from the Sale of Selected Crops (Ug Sh)*

Crop	Baseline (March/April 2002)			Final Evaluation (October 2005)		
	Season 1	Season 2	Annual Total	Season 1	Season 2	Annual Total
Finger Millet	16,851	14,333	31,184	59,442	70,153	129,596
Groundnuts	51,613	45,980	97,593	79,743	88,083	167,826
Sorghum	14,857	10,341	25,198	53,237	76,740	129,977
Maize	23,422	20,901	44,323	36,062	44,904	80,966
Rice	78,151	27,688	105,839	86,490	85,513	172,004
Beans	28,330	18,113	46,443	42,687	53,096	95,784
Cassava	11,480	---	11,480	66,032	21,663	87,696
Sesame	20,519	20,932	41,451	43,978	81,366	125,344
Total	245,223	158,288	403,511	467,673	521,519	989,192

*Selected Crops are Finger Millet, Groundnuts, Sorghum, Maize, Rice, Beans, Cassava, and Sesame
Values have been adjusted to 2002 values

Table 7. Average Expenditures on Agricultural Inputs for Selected Crops (Ug Sh)*

Inputs	Baseline (March/April 2002)			Final Evaluation (October 2005)			
	Season 1	Season 2	Total	Season 1	Season 2	Total	
Seed	18,446	8,152	26,598	22,589	15,885	38,474	
Land Hire or Lease	12,535	7,278	19,813	20,916	15,912	36,828	
Land Preparation	Tractor	1,625	---	1,625	43,042	14,252	57,294
	Oxen	15,257	8,943	24,200	38,706	26,736	65,442
	Hired Labour	Included under All Other Costs			22,180	20,940	43,121
Planting	12,421	7,963	20,384	27,205	No Information	27,205	
Weeding	13,926	9,560	23,486	18,776	14,948	33,724	
Harvesting	12,066	8,354	20,420	15,283	14,662	30,485	
All Other Costs	45,634	26,025	71,659	18,960	9,893	28,854	
TOTAL COSTS	131,910	76,275	208,185	228,197	133,229	361,426	

*Finger Millet, Groundnuts, Sorghum, Maize, Rice, Beans, Cassava, and Sesame
Values have been adjusted to 2002 values

Table 8 on the following page provides a comparison of the average annual profit between the baseline survey and the final evaluation survey. For consistency in comparing figures, the same adjustment process as used in the baseline is used here, i.e., the proportion of produce sold was used to adjust expenditure costs before calculating the average profit. It should be emphasized that the profit indicated is not the average profit per household. No household produced all eight of the selected major crops for which the cash proceeds and input expenditures have been summarized.

Table 8. Average Profit from Specific Crops per Household and per Acre

	Baseline (March/April 2002)	Final Evaluation (October 2005)
Reported Total Sales - All Selected Crops	Ug Sh 403,511	Ug Sh 1,214,610
Average Total Sales Adjusted to 2002 Value	Ug Sh 403,511	Ug Sh 989,192
Proportion of Production Sold	64.5%	60.0%
Reported Total Production Costs - All Selected Crops	Ug Sh 208,185	Ug Sh 443,788
Average Total Production Costs Adjusted to 2002 Values	Ug Sh 208,185	Ug Sh 361,426
Adjusted Production Costs*	Ug Sh 134,279	Ug Sh 216,856
Profit	Ug Sh 269,232	Ug Sh 772,336
Average Annual Area Cultivated	6.39 Acres	4.47 Acres
Profit per Acre	Ug Sh 42,133	Ug Sh 172,782

*Adjusted Production Costs = Total Cash Costs * Percentage of Crop Sold

Table 9 disaggregates farmers by income classes relative to the average annual sales of production. The figures have not been adjusted to 2002 values, so the table does not provide a true comparison. However, the statistics are useful in showing that more households are able to attain higher levels of income than at the time of the baseline. The table also shows a greater clustering of households at the bottom of the continuum, which is important information for the design of future programs.

Table 9. Proportions of Farmers in Different Classes of Income from Total Sales of Selected Crops*

Sales (UgSh)	Baseline (March/April 2002)		Final Evaluation (October 2005)	
	Season 1	Season 2	Season 1	Season 2
0-10,000	37.4 %	43.3 %	46.4 %	64.9 %
10,000 - 50,000	46.2 %	45.6 %	16.1 %	11.1 %
50,000 - 100,000	10.2 %	8.4 %	8.5 %	6.7 %
100,000 - 200,000	4.1 %	1.3 %	8.4 %	8.8 %
200,000 - 300,000	1.0 %	.7 %	3.1 %	3.6 %
300,000 - 400,000	.2 %	.3 %	1.8 %	1.9 %
400,000 - 500,000	.5 %	.3 %	.9 %	.8 %
> 500,000	.3 %	0 %	1.7 %	2.2 %

*Selected Crops are Finger Millet, Groundnuts, Sorghum, Maize, Rice, Beans, Cassava, and Sesame

E. Targeting Information

In order to assess the effectiveness of the targeting of the DAP, information was gathered in the quantitative survey against a rough wealth ranking that used ownership of various assets

to determine whether a household was better off than other households. If a household owned more than one hut, a bicycle, a radio, at least one cow, at least six goats or at least five pigs, the household was considered "well-off". Given the absence of baseline information, it's not possible to determine the proportion of those households who are now "well-off" and who have been made so because of project interventions. Table 10 summarizes the information obtained from the sample in the survey.

The data seems to indicate that:

- The project is currently working mostly with households that are not well-off, nearly 60% of participants.
- A very high proportion of host households, i.e., those who have not been displaced, appear to fall in the not well-off category.
- Over 24% of participating households are women-headed households.

Table 10. Proportion of Households by Type of Household, Gender of the Household Head and Wealth Category

Type of Household	N(%)	Percentage	
		"Well-Off"	Not "Well-Off"
Displaced, Household Head Never Abducted	718 (65.5%)	40.1 %	59.9 %
Returnee, Household Head Abducted from a Camp	81 (7.4%)	34.6 %	65.4 %
Returnee, Household Head Abducted from the Home Village	261 (23.8%)	54.0 %	46.0 %
All Others (Host households)	36 (3.3%)	13.9 %	86.1 %
Female-Headed Households	265 (24.2%)	42.3 %	57.7 %
Non-Participant (Control Group) Households	90 (8.2%)	48.9 %	41.1 %
All Participating Households	1,096	42.2 %	57.8 %

**Report having more than one hut, a bicycle, a radio, at least one cow, at least six goats or at least five pigs.

The quantitative survey conducted for the final evaluation also disaggregated some of the information by type and location of the participating households. Table 11 summarizes information on area cultivated for the eight selected major crops by type of household.

Table 11. Average Area Cultivated for Selected Crops* by Type of Household

Type of Household		October 2005 Reported Area Cultivated	
		Season 1	Season 2
Community Extension Facilitator (CEF)		1.67 Acres	2.30 Acres
Technology Adoption Committee (TAC) Members		2.11 Acres	2.06 Acres
Graduated Farmers	Gulu Caritas	2.24 Acres	1.42 Acres
	Gulu CoU	1.56 Acres	1.54 Acres
	Kitgum Caritas	2.20 Acres	1.86 Acres
"Old" Farmers	Gulu Caritas	3.88 Acres	0.87 Acres
	Gulu CoU	1.95 Acres	1.02 Acres
	Kitgum Caritas	3.61 Acres	1.93 Acres
"New" Farmers	Gulu Caritas	3.36 Acres	2.02 Acres

	Gulu CoU	1.80 Acres	2.44 Acres
	Kitgum Caritas	3.27 Acres	1.84 Acres
	Pader Caritas	2.77 Acres	1.08 Acres
	Female-Headed Households	3.13 Acres	1.87 Acres
	Non-Participating Farmers (Control Group)	1.78 Acres	1.03 Acres

*Selected Crops are Finger Millet, Groundnuts, Sorghum, Maize, Rice, Beans, Cassava, and Sesame

F. Impact on Women.

Given the importance of reaching women in having impact on food and livelihood security, it is worth highlighting some of the gender dimensions reflected in the DAP. In terms of participation in the program, 60-65% of participating group members are women, around 80% of seed recipients who have received seed through seed vouchers are women, around 23% of the seed vendors at seed fairs are women, and 70 to 80% of the FFW recipients are women. Most of these women participants come from households who have male household heads. As Table 10 above indicates, however, around a quarter of all participating households are women-headed households, and Table 11 above indicates that these households have been able to establish agricultural-based livelihoods as reflected in the area they have been able to cultivate.

IV. PROGRAM ACTIVITY ASSESSMENT

A. Assessment of Activities Under IR 1.1 - Agricultural Production

1. Activity 1.1a Farmer Groups

a. Overview of Implementation Strategies

Over the life of the DAP, three cycles of farmer groups were formed. The first group of farmers was selected in October 2002. Approximately 40% of these groups were composed of farmers that had participated in previous programs with CRS or the partners and had their own land in order to jump start the DAP. These farmers completed a two-year training cycle with the program and were graduated in September 2004. At the time, the DAP was working in Gulu and Kitgum Districts.

The second cycle of farmers were selected in October 2003. These farmers would have completed a two year training cycle but based on the recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation, it was decided to continue working with these groups for a third year. These farmers are also all in Gulu and Kitgum Districts

In October 2004 at the beginning of FY 2005, the last group of farmers was selected for participation in all three districts.

Groups are generally formed by clan, village and common interest, and on average, the group size is around 20.

Following the Mid-Term Evaluation, it was decided to continue with the same LOA target for the DAP in terms of the number of farmer groups, but to also plan to work with the groups for a period of three years rather than two. All remaining groups were selected in 2005.

b. Outputs Produced

Table 12 below summarizes the achievements of the DAP relative to the number of farmer groups formed. As the table indicates the DAP exceeded the targets on the number of groups and number of participants.

c. Who has Benefited?

Members of the farmer groups formed by the DAP include a fairly wide range of participants, from poor to at least middle class, young to old, and men and women. Current information suggests that around 60% to 65% of the group members are women. People who do not have access to land have generally not been selected for participation unless the program has been able to facilitate access to land for them. Therefore, households at the lowest of the poverty spectrum are not included since they may not have the required access to land nor available labor capacity to be able to effectively undertake farming. Households with elderly or disabled adult members, for example, were not selected for participation in the DAP.

Table 12. Number of Groups and Participating Farmers

Registration Period	Districts	Descriptive Term	Number of Groups	Number of Farmers	Current Status
October 2001	Gulu, Pader*	"Graduated"	61	1,215	Graduated
October 2002	Gulu, Kitgum		215	4,671	Graduated
October 2003	Gulu, Kitgum	"Old"	291	5,782	Have completed two years
October 2004	Gulu, Kitgum & Pader	"New"	521	10,429	Have completed one year
TOTAL	All Districts		1,088	22,097	
LOA Target			1,000	20,000	

*The program worked with Pader farmers for two months before the security situation forced the suspension of program activities. The program resumed working with these farmers in 2004.

d. Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and the Quality of Outputs Produced

Most of the groups that have been formed are still functioning. In addition, because of the way the groups have been formed, they will likely continue to function in some form when decongestion occurs. The qualitative survey was fairly consistently in reporting that groups expect to stay together after decongestion.

Benefits within the groups seem to be fairly equitably distributed. Group leaders, for example, are not benefiting extraordinarily. Members of the Technology Adoption Committee(s) do receive more intensive technical training. However, the program has been transparent in discussing this with participants, and they have selected the members of the TACs, who agree to take on the responsibility to pass on the knowledge they receive from the program to other group members.

While the DAP has not specifically targeted group empowerment activities, some of the groups nevertheless have been able to advocate for additional access to land for group members. In addition, some of the older, graduated groups have started savings and credit activities in the form of rotating savings and credit associations.

The only weakness in the group formation activities of the DAP that were observed was that the interests of some members, e.g., youth and perhaps some women, were overshadowed. Group leaders tend to be older and youth are expected to defer to elders in northern Uganda.

Groups composed entirely of youth or women, may likely have somewhat different priorities than the current groups.

2. Activity 1.1b Access to Land

a. Overview of Implementation Strategies

Under this set of activities, the DAP actively lobbied for access to land for participants with different kinds of landowners, including institutions such as churches or government departments, as well as private landowners. In some cases, the private landowners became part of the participant groups. The project negotiated access to land at no charge with the understanding that the land would be returned to the owner when decongestion occurred.

b. Outputs Produced

Table 13 summarizes the achievements of the DAP relative to the number of acres of land to which the program successfully facilitated access for program participants.

Table 13. Number of Acres Accessed and Estimated Number of Households Benefiting

Period	Acres Accessed	Estimated Number of Households Benefiting
FY 2002	750 Acres	684 Households
FY 2003	630 Acres	574 Households
FY 2004	538 Acres	490 Households
FY 2005	12,316 Acres	2,883 Households
FY 2006	---	---
LOA TOTAL	2,418 Acres	2,204 Households
LOA Target	2,500 Acres	---

Following the Mid-Term Evaluation, the target for the number of acres was reduced from 2,000 to 1,650. The DAP will likely exceed either target in any case.

c. Who has Benefited?

The program specifically targeted households that did not have access to land or only had access to a very limited amount of land, insufficient to support the household. These people were not at the lowest end of the poverty spectrum, however, since they had to have some household labor capacity to be able to farm.

d. Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs

Access to land from institutional sources is fairly secure. However, access to land from private landowners for participating farmers depends fairly consistently on whether or not the landowner is a member of the farmer group. If he is a member, then access is fairly reliable. However, there are indications that if the farmer is not a member of the group, there are higher levels of suspicion and concern on the part of the landowner that he or she may eventually lose the land. In addition, the increasing soil infertility has raised concerns among

landowners that if they allow the groups to continue cultivating, when decongestion occurs and the farmers leave, they will leave behind depleted land of low quality. As a result, some landowners have taken to calling for the land back or otherwise reasserting their ownership of the land⁹.

As Table 13 indicates, there is a declining pattern in the ability of the program to be able to facilitate access to land. In the early years of the DAP, the institutional land that was available existed on a larger scale around the camps and it was easier to negotiate access. Over time, the protective halo around camps has grown, and new land is becoming available around camps and along roads. However, it is more difficult to negotiate access to this land from private landowners, especially in light of the points made in the previous paragraph as well as the perception that farmers should not receive land for free but should pay some sort of rent or lease fee.

During the time of the mid-term evaluation, there was a growing suspicion that soil fertility was declining in the land being cultivated around camps. While that was only a suspicion during the mid-term evaluation, there is a clear consensus now at the time of the final evaluation that soil fertility is declining.

3. Activity 1.1c Seed/Planting Material

a. Overview of Implementation Strategies

A number of different mechanisms were used to make seed or other planting material available to participating farmers. The largest activity was organizing seed fairs in which seed vendors and participating farmers were brought together. Participating farmers received seed vouchers worth UgSh 15,000 (around US\$ 8.50) with which they could use to purchase seed from vendors. The seed vendors themselves were registered, and their seed was visually inspected to ensure that minimum quality standards were met. The vouchers were then redeemed with CRS by the seed vendors.

A second seed activity involved organizing seed multiplication by local farmers of improved varieties that had been tested by the DAP and selected by farmers in the yield trials. This activity was used for varieties for which there was limited seed to be made available through seed fairs.

On a much smaller scale, one of the implementing partners in DAP experimented with making seed available through seed loans in which farmers were asked to repay three kilograms for every kilogram received.

b. Outputs Produced

Table 14 summarizes the outputs produced relative to the seed fairs/seed vouchers activity.

Table 14. Value of Seed Disbursed Through Seed Fairs/Seed Vouchers

Fiscal Year	Value of Seed Disbursed	Number of Households Purchasing Seed with Vouchers	Percent of Seed Vendors who Are Women
FY 2002	US\$ 40,561	4,875	19.3%

⁹ An anecdote heard by the evaluation team was the case where after allowing a farmer group access to his land, the landowner later planted his own crops on top of the crops already in the field that had been planted by the group members to reassert his ownership.

FY 2003	US\$ 61,661	7,816	23.2%
FY 2004	US\$ 1,660	200	25.0%
FY 2005	US\$ 94,925	11,391	25.0%
FY 2006	---	---	---
Actual Total LOA	US\$ 198,807	Not Available*	23.3%
LOA Target	US\$ 140,000	---	53%

Information on the levels of seed multiplication implemented by the program in 2002 and 2003 was not adequately documented. However, the following seed multiplication activities were achieved in FY 2004.

- Groundnuts (Serenut 4 or ICGV 12991) - 3,886 households received 8.05 MT of seed after multiplication
- Finger millet (Seremi 2) - 2,534 households received 3.942 MT
- Cassava (Six varieties) - 1,029 households received 1,908 bags
- Beans (K132) - 1,160 households received 5.25 MT
- Sesame (Sesame 2) - 4,396 households received 6.949 MT
- Sorghum (Sekedo) - 80 households received 40 kilograms
- Maize (Longe 5) - 300 households received 852 kilograms
- Sweet potatoes (Five varieties) - 689 households received bundles of cuttings

c. Who has benefited?

The DAP targeted farmers lacking seed as voucher recipients during seed fairs. A pre-seed fair seed needs assessment was undertaken but it is a committee at the community level that selected the beneficiaries. Hence, the DAP did not target any particular set of participants with seed activities, so beneficiaries from these activities generally covered the range of participants that have been included in the farmer groups. An additional dimension of beneficiaries from the seed activities is that farmers who sold seed at seed fairs were often former beneficiaries of seed fairs elsewhere.

d. Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs

The seed fairs/seed vouchers set of activities has been instrumental in facilitating the spread of new varieties of seed, especially for groundnuts, in the project area. The approach has a number of benefits including:

- Allowing farmers to choose the types of seed that best suit their individual interests and circumstances.
- Cultivating business linkages that reflect what would be expected to emerge when normality occurs.
- Exposing farmers to alternative seed sources, giving them a choice, not only of different varieties but also of different vendors.
- Boosting the local economy with an injection of cash.

The low participation of women vendors in the seed fair activity has been attributed to travel constraints. Under normal circumstances, women would be able to maintain their roles as vendors in the market place without significant need to travel. Under the present circumstances where travel can be severely constrained, women are a bit at risk of losing their positions in the market place, and the program should continue to monitor this, especially as normality begins to return.

The seed multiplication activities have also improved the availability of seed, but to a lesser extent than the seed fairs and with fewer additional benefits.

The small pilot seed loans activity has not been very successful. Respondents say that the amounts of seed made available are small. It would be expected, however, that this activity would be less popular given the alternative sources of free seed available. In any case, seed loan approaches have had difficulty maintaining the quality of seed.

Qualitative information from the evaluation provided some evidence that the program may be cultivating a moderate to low level of seed dependency. When respondents were asked where they would likely get seed when decongestion occurs, many said from their own sources or from vendors in the market. Some also said, however, that they expected to continue to be able to get seed from NGOs like Caritas and CRS. While this is likely to continue in the near term, developmental relief approaches need to be highly sensitive to cultivating dependencies like this.

Somewhat related to this in terms of building farmers' capacities to save their own seed, the availability of reliable and safe seed storage is a problem in the IDP camps where space does not allow for granaries and the risk of fire deters families from storing seed in huts.

The seed provided through the program was generally provided on time. The only case consistently cited as untimely was a recent distribution of sweet potato vines.

B. Assessment of Activities Under IR 1.2 - Community Capacities (Valley Dams)

1. Activity 1.2a Community Rehabilitation Plans

a. Overview of Implementation Strategy

In the original proposal, the development of community rehabilitation plans was proposed to address a range of community asset rehabilitation needs, including construction of community storage sites, construction of soil and water conservation demonstration sites, rehabilitation of community roads and rehabilitation of valley dams. At the request of FFP/Washington to scale back the size of the program, however, this activity was modified to focus specifically on rehabilitation plans associated with the valley dams.

Dam committees composed of 9 people were to be formed around each dam. The community selected the members of the committee and appointed the chairman, treasurer and secretary. At least three members of the committee must be women. The dam committees have developed by-laws to cover their functioning and are responsible for developing rehabilitation plans for repairing and maintaining the dams.

Training by the project included initial community sensitization, two-day training on dam management and maintenance, a two-day exit training at the point of turning over the rehabilitated dam to the committee, and commodity management training for the dam committee associated with the food-for-work.

b. Outputs Produced

All of the dams that have been completed or are under construction have dam committees formed around them. The planned sensitization and training has also been provided to each of them. Long term rehabilitation and management plans for the dams have not been fully developed, however. The training provided by the program advocated for monthly user fees, and some revenue has been generated from these. However, bank accounts have not been opened.

c. Who has Benefited?

At the time of the evaluation, there were people who certainly benefited from the water provided through the valley dams as discussed in the next section. These are indirect beneficiaries from the rehabilitation plans. At the moment, the only direct beneficiaries from the rehabilitation plans appear to be the members of the dam committees who are managing the revenue generated from the dam. Without bank accounts or clear bookkeeping records, it is difficult to see exactly how these dam committee members are benefiting.

d. Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs

The DAP has not given this set of activities sufficient attention. In fact, the Mid-Term Evaluation made the suggestion that this activity had in fact been dropped from the program when the decision was made to focus on valley dams. While the activities described in the next section on valley dam rehabilitation reflect the "hardware" side of the valley dam intervention, activities under this section should reflect the investments in the "software" side of the intervention.

The lack of attention on the software side has resulted in two major observations. Dam Committees do not have sufficient capacities to effectively manage the dam resource, and Dam Committee members are also not highly motivated to fulfill dam management functions. Life is difficult for everyone in the IDP camps, and nearly all families have to be strategic in how they invest their assets to produce their livelihoods. Given the marginal returns on time and effort managing the valley dam resource, especially during the maintenance periods when there is no water for distribution, most dam committee members are reluctant to invest time at the expense of other livelihood activities.

2. Activity 1.2b Valley Dam Rehabilitation

a. Overview of Implementation Strategy

Over the course of decades going back as far as the time when the British controlled Uganda, dams were constructed across small valleys in order to catch and store water especially in those areas which faced seasonal water shortages. Over the last couple of decades during the current conflict, this infrastructure has deteriorated through neglect. The strategy of the DAP was to rehabilitate these as a source of multiple use water with appropriate technological design, using food-for-work.

The design of the systems for filtering and dispensing potable and other use water was developed by a water design consultant. The design basically involves an intake from the dam channeling water to two outlets. One of these, passing through a sand filter into a sealed well, provides potable water. The other outlet before filtration goes to a trough from which water can be used for livestock and other uses.

FFW was to be used for all labor required for rehabilitating the dam structure and installing the piping and filtration systems. Community contributions included local materials. Otherwise all imported materials, costs of equipment and labor paid through food-for-work were provided by the DAP.

Field activities were the responsibility of Caritas Kitgum. Staff from CRS included an engineer to provide technical advice, and staff to monitor the distribution and use of food in the food-for-work activities.

b. Outputs Produced

By the time the ending date for the DAP is reached at the end of September 2006, it is expected that the DAP will have rehabilitated nine valley dams under current plans. Two

dams have been fully completed. Four dams are currently in the final stages of reconstruction and will have been completed by no later than mid-November. The DAP has short-listed six additional locations for the final year of the program and will select three from this list to begin reconstruction early in 2006. Table 15 lists the dam sites, the nearest IDP camp and the current status.

The LOA target for valley dams was originally 15, but this was revised after the Mid-Term Evaluation.

Relative to FFW in FY 2004 and FY 2005, around 120,000 rations of 2 kilograms of maize, 300 grams of pulses and 100 grams of oil has been distributed. Section V.G. below provides additional information on commodity management. The Recipient Status Reports indicated that 9,821 recipients have received these commodities. The records, however, do not eliminate duplication, so the exact number of mutually exclusive beneficiaries from FFW is difficult to extract from the hard copies unless it is sorted from the database

c. Who has Benefited?

One of the completed dams, Akworo, was successful in distributing water and when water was available, significant numbers of people from Amide camp used the dam for water. Records on the numbers or characteristics of the beneficiaries are not available.

The FFW recipients are also significant beneficiaries from this activity. Most of these are women and because they are self-selected, they tend to be from the lower end of the poverty continuum, although not from the lowest end since they need to be able-bodied.

Table 15. Summary of Valley Dams Completed, Under Construction and Planned for 2006

Dam Name	Nearest IDP Camp (Distance)	Current Status
Akworo	Amide (1.5 km)	Completed, currently not used because of insufficient water
Lagwal	Pajimu (1 km)	Completed, currently not used because of insufficient water
Wato Gali	Laboje (4 km)	Nearly complete, expected to be finished by mid-October
Kuluye Padibe	Padibe (4 km)	Nearly complete, expected to be finished by the end of October
Palabek	Palabek Gem (1.5 km)	Nearly complete, expected to be finished by the end of October
Lalee	Ogili (2 km)	Approximately 30% complete, expected to be finished by mid-November
Cin Kul	Lokung (6 km)	The DAP will select four from this short-list for rehabilitation in 2006.
Pobu	Palabek Kal (4 km)	
Ogwarpokai	Mucwini (2 km)	
Kolomodong	Oroin (6 km)	
Omiya Anyina	About 9km)	
Lagwel	Padibe (2 km)	

d. Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs

The valley dam component of the DAP faced a number of severe obstacles to implementation. Construction generally needs to be undertaken in northern Uganda primarily during the dry season from December through March. Although the period from December 2001 through March 2002 was relatively calm, funds were not available to begin the valley dam component. Then, in the middle of 2002, the security situation rapidly deteriorated making it virtually impossible to begin activities until early in 2004. Because two years were lost, the program decided to use heavy equipment from district government to try to make up the lost time. This equipment, however, has demands on it for other uses, so availability was not consistent.

Of the two completed dams, one (Akworo) provided water for a period of about ten months. Water levels now, however, are below the intake, which is cause for concern, since this is the period in which the dam should be filling. The other completed dam, Lagwal, has not filled apparently because too much water was being diverted upstream from the dam. The DAP working with the dam committee has negotiated a solution with water users above the dam to allow the dam to fill.

Paid wage labor is not common in the IDP camps, and the WFP distributions do not provide sufficient food and can be irregular, so FFW is a competitive option as a livelihood activity for some households especially when the ration is tied to work produced. Nevertheless, initially, the DAP had difficulty organizing FFW labor because of the competition with other freely distributed food.

Partly in response to the difficulties recruiting FFW labor, the work norm for the ration that was defined was revised so that it would be possible for those participants who wanted to invest time to complete more than one task or work norm in a day. Therefore, most FFW participants actually receive more than one ration in a day. This has not necessarily resulted, however, in a FFW daily ration exceeding the local market for the daily wage rate. The fact that people are not flocking to join the FFW would suggest that the current relationship between the FFW ration and the local market for casual labor is not a problem.

Most of the FFW ration appears to be consumed. There is not much local market for the commodities provided.

There has been relatively little impact so far from the valley dams because of the distance, availability of alternative water sources, relatively low numbers of livestock and limited amounts of water provided by the dams. The six dams completed or underway are located on average 2 1/3 kilometers from the nearest IDP camp, which means that people do not live around the dams nor do they go there unless security is available. Water is becoming more available in camps¹⁰, and although people have to pay for it, it is easily accessible and therefore preferred relative to taking the risk of going far distances to a dam. It is still too risky to invest in significant numbers of livestock, so dams are also not that useful for livestock water.

The most complete dam, Akworo, appears to be deteriorating already. Screens over the sand filter are pulled away. The filter itself is contaminated and the site is becoming overgrown. The water quality in the dam is fairly poor with invasions of red algae. The technical quality of the design of the rehabilitation seems suitable although the sand filter will require

¹⁰ Water available in the IDP camps is roughly estimated at 5 liters per person per day (Source: Environmental Assessment for DAP Kitgum Valley Dams (Draft), October 2005, CRS Uganda)

diligence maintenance. Given the problems with the capacities of the dam committees cited in the previous section, the hardware investments made by the DAP are at risk of being lost.

Given the probable scarcity of water for people and livestock after decongestion occurs, valley dam rehabilitation could be a valuable long-term investment if the issue of management of the dam can be sorted out and the security situation continues to improve.

C. Assessment of Activities Under IR 1.3 - Crop Productivity and Profitability

1. Activity 1.3a Trials and Demonstrations

a. Overview of Implementation Strategies

One dimension of increasing crop productivity is the introduction of new technologies and new techniques. The DAP facilitated the introduction of new technologies for agriculture through various forms of comparison trials and demonstrations. Most of the trials and demonstrations were oriented around on-farm variety trials and demonstrations. Some cultivation techniques were also tested and demonstrated, however, including line planting versus broadcast, monoculture versus inter-cropping, timeliness and quality of land preparation, weeding techniques, and different spacing practices. Key characteristics of the trials and demonstrations implemented were to ensure that they were conducted under farmer conditions without external inputs with the full participation of farmer groups. Yields harvested from demonstrations were disseminated to farmers interested in establishing their own trials.

b. Outputs Produced

Between 15 and 43 demonstrations sites were planned and implemented each season over the life of the DAP. Trials and demonstrations to compare yields of new varieties with traditional varieties were organized around the following new varieties:

ICRISAT Groundnut varieties - ICGV 12991 and ICGV 12988

Groundnut varieties obtained from Serere Tour - Serenut-1 Red, Serenut-2 and Obina

Sesame varieties obtained from Serere Tour - Sesame-1, Sesame-2, U4 and Adong

Sunflower varieties obtained from Serere Tour - PAN 7355, PAN 7351, PAN 7371, Sunfola, and Kolos

Sorghum varieties obtained from Serere Tour - Sekedo and Epuripuri

In 2005, additional trials and demonstrations are planned to test three varieties of rice including WAB, Narica 3 and Suprica 2 and tilling trials comparing oxplow, tractor and hand tilling.

c. Who has Benefited?

Members of farmer groups benefited from the trials and demonstrations depending on proximity to the demonstrations and willingness to observe and test ideas being presented. Technology Adoption Committee members tended to benefit more from the trials and demonstrations because of the increased access to technical training which complemented the trials and demonstrations.

d. Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs Produced

The trials of new varieties succeeded in introducing a number of new varieties in the project area as described in section IV.A.3 above. Farmers reported a preference for learning from demonstrations as opposed to workshop-based technical training. However, the quality of

demonstrations for showing comparisons or highlighting features of new technologies being displayed was sometimes compromised because the availability of land occasionally forced the location of the demonstration to be in a less than ideal place for allowing farmers regular access. Otherwise, however, farmer participation in establishing trials and analyzing results from demonstrations was very useful.

One lesson that emerged from the DAP is that in terms of having impact on productivity and net income, farmers did not always adopt the most productive varieties. Crop productivity was sometimes superseded by other preference factors when farmers selected varieties for their farms.

2. Activity 1.3b Knowledge Transfer

a. Overview of Implementation Strategies

In order to facilitate the transfer of knowledge from either technical training provided by the project or from trials and demonstrations, the DAP organized a system in which participants elected a Technical Adoption Committee (TAC) from among their members. These TAC members were the focal point for technical training and were responsible for passing their knowledge on to other farmer participants. TAC members were also responsible for gathering monitoring information regularly from other participating farmers. To support the TACs, specialized Community Extension Facilitators were recruited by implementing partners to organize and interact with the TACs.

Following a participatory needs assessment conducted with participating farmers to determine priorities, the DAP provided a range of technical training for program staff from all partners, CEFs and TACs through various mechanisms.

b. Outputs Produced

Technical Adoption Committees were formed and functioning in all farmer groups. Various training events including study tours and workshop-based training were provided each year in the program. The main event in 2002 was a study tour to Serere. In FY 2003, the main events included a three-day Training of Trainers workshop for 21 extension staff on communication and facilitation skills, training needs assessment, useful training tips, group dynamics, adult learning principles, PRA tools, administration and management principles. Also in 2003, 402 TAC members received training on seed bed preparation, soil and water conservation, improved varieties, weed management, pest and disease management, vegetable production farming as a business, and marketing. In FY 2004, training was provided for 10 community extension facilitators and 16 field staff on soil and water conservation, pests and disease management, post harvest handling, planting and weeding. Also in 2004, the DAP in collaboration with the district agricultural office trained 1,316 TAC members on various technical topics.

c. Who has Benefited?

Because of the significant engagement of the TAC members in the knowledge transfer activities of the DAP, they have benefited most from participation in the project.

d. Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs Produced

There is strong evidence that the TAC members, especially those in graduated groups, do provide technical advice. All TAC members collect data on production and yields from participating farmers and this on-going contact facilitates the transfer of ideas. There is some

anecdotal evidence, however, that a few groups rely more on CEFs than on the TACs for technical advice.

There is evidence that much of the knowledge that farmers have obtained through knowledge transfer activities will be useful when decongestion occurs.

3. Activity 1.3c Marketing Associations

a. Overview of Implementation process

The DAP strategy had planned to begin implementing the marketing component in the third year of the program after two years of building farmers’ capacities. In the marketing component, “graduated” farmer groups who had completed two years of participation were given training relevant to agricultural marketing, with emphasis on identifying crops to produce based on potential markets, understanding quality issues, and pricing. After training, the marketing associations were linked to buyers.

b. Outputs Produced

At the time of the final evaluation, 36 marketing associations had been established in six sub-counties of Gulu district. Twenty-six of these were formed in 2004 and another ten new associations were formed in 2005. Table 16 shows the marketing associations formed by each implementing partner each of the last two years.

Following the Mid-Term Evaluation, the decision was made to reduce the original target for associations from 100 to 26 and to reform the 26 into 8 large associations. These plans have been modified somewhat. An additional ten associations were formed since the mid-term and the DAP will focus on strengthening the 36 associations that have been formed.

Table 16. Marketing Associations Formed

Program Area - Gulu District	FY 2004	FY 2005	Total
Caritas	20	-	20
Church of Uganda	6	10	16
Total	26	10	36

Capacity building training needs assessments were conducted in collaboration with CARE, and capacity building training to date has focused on record-keeping, group dynamics and organizational management. A total of 78 members from the marketing associations have also been trained in CRS's agro-enterprise approach.

c. Who has benefited?

Farm families who are members of marketing associations have benefited from increased production and income from the sale of produce at good prices. Other farmers who were able to acquire seeds sold by the marketing associations for planting in their own fields have also benefited.

d. Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs Produced

The marketing associations that have been formed vary in their level of development depending on how long they have been working with the DAP. Most of the 26 associations formed in 2004 have bank accounts and have developed market linkages. The more recently formed groups are relatively weak.

Training in record keeping, group dynamics and management has been provided to the associations by CRS but there is need for further training in financial and organizational management so as to build their capacities more fully. Few of the associations that have been formed have really reached the level of being self-sustaining, functioning marketing associations.

The DAP has facilitated establishing linkages between associations and buyers, especially national and international organizations, which buy produce, primarily groundnuts, directly from the associations. Links with private traders are still undeveloped.

CRS is driving the marketing component; the implementing partners, COU and Caritas, are not participating directly, although they desire to increase their participation.

4. Activity 1.3d Market Analyses and Information Campaigns

a. Overview of Implementation processes

In support of the market association development activities, the DAP planned to undertake a number of different analyses to be able to understand markets in the north more clearly. These analyses included those intended to identify marketing opportunities and those for mapping out marketing channels. Since these analyses were research -oriented and somewhat independent of implementation activities, CRS took responsibility for completing the analyses.

b. Outputs Produced

A Market Opportunities Identification (MOI) exercise, an extensive market survey to identify commodities with market potential in the districts of Gulu, Kitgum and Pader, was carried out in collaboration with the IITA and Gulu district marketing department. Extension staff of implementing partners collected market data from their locations using the data collection forms. The information gathered was analyzed by IITA and is being disseminated to farmers over radio in a daily radio farmers' bulletin over MEGA FM in Gulu. One market-chain analysis was completed for groundnuts providing general market information in each of the three districts.

c. Who has Benefited?

Primary beneficiaries of this set of research activities have been the marketing associations and farmers who have benefited from the information broadcast by radio.

d. Observations Relative to Implementation Processes and Quality of Outputs Produced

The two research activities, the MOI and a market-chain analysis, have been useful for establishing a foundation for future marketing association capacity building and linkage development. The engagement of IITA and MEGA FM in processing and disseminating marketing information is useful. Extension workers from partner organizations are still collecting field data after harvesting seasons and passing it on to IITA for analysis and dissemination. Many farmers in the three districts including those from neighboring districts are able to receive the radio broadcasts.

The MOI survey, however, which was supposed to identify market opportunities for various crops in Gulu, Kitgum and Pader, did not identify the specific markets and the conditions to access those markets. In addition, the MOI study report needs to be made available to all stakeholders- farmers, partners, national and international organizations and district administrations.

The current market chain analysis describes various players in the market as well as provides some useful market information. Market leverage points, market bottlenecks or other market obstacles, which should be the focus of market interventions, however, have not yet been clearly defined.

V. PROGRAM PROCESS ASSESSMENT

A. Program Management

1. Overview of the Management of the DAP

Overall responsibility for vision and leadership for the DAP rests with the CRS Northern Area Manager based in Gulu. This position is also responsible for overseeing all other programs being implemented in the northern districts. When the DAP was designed, it was basically the only major program in the north so it made sense at the time for one position to be responsible for the DAP as well as for the whole program in the north. Since the DAP began, however, CRS has been successful in developing a number of different other programs, including an emergency program, an HIV/AIDS project and a community reconciliation project.

Annual operating plans for the DAP are developed with partners, including setting targets on outputs and budget. These do not change over the course of the year, however, quarterly plans are also developed from these, and these plans change to reflect contextual influences on the program.

The DAP is being implemented through CRS offices in Gulu and Kitgum, as well as through Caritas offices in Gulu, Kitgum and Pader and the Church of Uganda office in Gulu. The function of the CRS office in Kitgum is to monitor and provide technical support to the valley dam component, including FFW, being implemented by Caritas Kitgum. Programmatic support is provided primarily through the Gulu CRS office.

2. Observations Relative to Program Management

Program management covers a range of activities, including vision and leadership, decision-making, communications, and program support. The key observations that follow touch on these dimensions of management. Financial management and human resources management and development are also key elements of program management, and these are discussed in later sections.

Vision and Leadership. The DAP has had to face serious constraints to implementation resulting from the declining security situation that occurred beginning in the middle of 2002, and the program has been responsive to the need for change. Program management also has a clear vision for where the program should go.

Decision-Making. While not intended so, decision-making within the program is perceived to be relatively top-down and unilateral. This is partly a function of the occasional need to make rapid decisions to produce results in the program.

Strategic and Operational Planning. Operational planning appears to be fairly effective in developing plans with partners. However, the tendency to hold key information close at the top sometimes frustrates partners and staff.

Regularly monthly coordination meetings happen between partners in Gulu. These meetings are less regular in Kitgum and Pader.

Communications. Communications within CRS itself are generally okay, although sometimes the field office is affected by short notice requests from Kampala. Similarly, short notice on requests made by CRS to implementing partners for participation in events or information disrupts implementation plans.

Occasionally communications between partners within the program are sometimes not consistent or transparent enough, either from CRS to partners or vice versa. Communications in Gulu between partners is better than between Gulu and the partners/offices in Kitgum and Pader. Distance always has this effect, and programs need to make diligent efforts to ensure that outlying offices feel fully engaged.

Program Support. Some elements of program support are working very well, especially the communications systems for radios and internet/email access in Gulu. No significant problems were observed with regard to transport or vehicles for CRS, however, procurement of transport equipment for partners is perceived to be slow. From partner perspectives, there are problems with procurement, but much of this is due to transparency on procurement status and temporary substitutions of older equipment. All in all, program support is relatively good in the DAP.

B. Partnership

1. Overview of Partnerships in the DAP

The DAP was not designed as a partnership project in the sense that one of the expected outputs from the project from both the donor's perspective as well as from the implementing partners' perspectives was partner capacity building. CRS, however, recognized the value of working with local partners in terms of being able to expand impact and produce high quality results. Two implementing partners are currently working with CRS in the DAP. Caritas is responsible for implementation of the DAP in Gulu, Kitgum and Pader. The Church of Uganda is responsible for field activities in Gulu with camps distinct from those being served by Caritas.

The DAP has a number of technical partners, including IITA, CIAT, NARO/SAARI, CARE and District Government. IITA and CIAT provided technical support in the promotion of the agro-enterprise development approach within the marketing component of the DAP. NARO/SAARI has provided technical support in the improved germplasm. CARE has trained CRS partner staff and some farmers in organizational capacity assessments and group savings and credit mechanisms. District extension staff have conducted training in specialized topics, for example, disease and pest control, soil and water conservation, and vegetable production.

ACDI/VOCA has responsibility for monetizing commodities for all FFP Cooperating Sponsors, including CRS, in Uganda

2. Observations Relative to Partnerships

While the DAP has not specifically targeted partner capacity building as an output, there has nevertheless been significant capacity built for implementing partners in the DAP through training as well as provision of materials and equipment.

Where roles are clearly defined in the program and these roles are consistent with the customary roles taken by local and international partners in joint projects, the DAP has been highly effective. For example, in the agricultural components, Caritas and the Church of

Uganda clearly have responsibility for field implementation and can use their knowledge of the local context and access to communities effectively. CRS has responsibility for program monitoring and evaluation, coordination of technical support and stewardship of financial resources, and has been effective in fulfilling these functions.

In areas where the roles are less clearly defined, occasional friction has resulted as in both the marketing and valley dam components. USAID and FFP want to see results, and CRS is keen to fulfill its commitment to the donor. Often this means, that sometimes CRS has to overstep the bounds of best practice in working with partners. Partners need to recognize that this is why sometimes roles get confused. CRS on the other hand needs to be more transparent with partners in helping them to understand the rules and regulations with which CRS has to comply with.

C. Program Integration

1. Overview of Program Integration

The sections which follow describe different dimensions of program integration in the DAP.

Within the DAP. The DAP has basically three components relative to the organization of staffing and implementation. These are the agricultural components (both IR 1.1 and IR 1.3), the valley dam component (IR 1.2) and the marketing component (IR 1.3). These all operate somewhat independently. The agricultural components, for example, are being primarily implemented by Caritas and the COU in all three districts. The valley dam component is being implemented only in Kitgum District by Caritas but with strong oversight by CRS, and valley dam activities are independent of the agricultural component. The marketing component activities are being implemented almost entirely by CRS primarily in Gulu District.

With Other Programs Managed by CRS. There are three other programs being implemented by CRS in the north. These are the Emergency Program, Peace and Reconciliation Program and the HIV/AIDS Program. Integration with the DAP has been focused on joint training workshops and meetings at the regional level.

With Other Programs Managed by the Implementing Partners. Integration of the DAP with other programs managed by implementing partners has been focused on capacity development and technical support. With Caritas, the DAP has provided support to the Gender Program by helping with training in sustainable agriculture. Technical assistance for monitoring agricultural activities especially related to seed and input distribution has also been provided by the DAP to the Relief and Rehabilitation Program. With the COU, the DAP has provided technical assistance for training in production skills and group dynamics to other programs.

With Other Programs Being Implemented in the Same Sectors as the DAP by Other Organizations. The DAP has good working relationships with other programs being implemented by other organizations. For example, the DAP has worked closely with World Vision in the marketing component. The marketing associations supported by the DAP have produced groundnut seeds and cassava cuttings which are then purchased by WVI to supply to its program beneficiaries. Also, DAP activities implemented by the COU have been integrated with an FAO program involving distribution of seeds and implements.

With National Level Strategies for Acholi Land. The DAP strategy is highly compatible with other strategies for the north including the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF), the National Agriculture Advisory Services (NAADS), and the Plan for Modernization of

Agriculture (PMA) for Acholi Land. There is some evidence that activities being implemented by the DAP are being adopted by other organizations, especially the seed fairs and vouchers and data collection and reporting formats.

2. Observations Relative to Integration

Some degree of integration is happening at all levels within the DAP, which is positive. However, there are ways to improve the coordination and integration.

Relative to integration among the three components in the DAP, a more strategic integration may have resulted in expanded impact. For example, more integration between the agricultural and marketing components could have benefited a larger number of participants, particularly with expanded engagement of implementing partners in the latter. Similarly, a strategy in which the valley dam component would be more closely tied to the agriculture and marketing components would possibly have facilitated a longer term strategy for sustaining impact.

Relative to other programs being implemented by CRS, diligent efforts have been made to cultivate interaction between the programs through training and workshops at the regional level. This has not yet translated to activities on the ground, however. The CRS Northern Area Manager is responsible for both program coordination in the north and managing the DAP. This dual role may hinder effective integration since the tendency is to focus on the DAP since, if the DAP is unsuccessful, the NAM will be held responsible. There is less pressure on achieving effective integration of programs in the north.

Relative to integration within the implementing partners, integration with other programs is mostly focused where there are common activities.

The DAP has developed good relations/linkages with a number of other organizations, for example, IITA, CARE, and NARO. These are mostly ad hoc around specific issues and opportunities. Systematic coordination has not yet involved.

D. Financial Management.

1. Overview of Financial Management in the DAP

Overall budget management for the DAP rests with the NAM in Gulu. Budgets are prepared annually for CRS and the partners. Partner funds are allocated quarterly against the annual plans, and cash flow is provided monthly based on monthly financial liquidation reports. Compilation of financial reports for FFP is done for the Uganda expenses in the CRS headquarters in Kampala.

2. Observations Relative to Financial Management

Table 17 provides a projected summary of the LOA cash expenditure for the DAP. By the end of the program, it is estimated that 86% of the approved budget will have been spent.

Table 17. Projected LOA Cash Expenditure Summary (US\$)

Cost Center	Monetization Proceeds	202e	CRS Funds	Total
CRS Operating Expenses	\$ 1,820,900	\$ 697,820	\$ 220,763	\$ 2,739,483
DAP Partner Operating (PH) Expenses	\$ 1,037,405	-	-	\$ 1,037,405
NICRA @ 27%	\$ 764,730	\$ 112,000	-	\$ 876,730
ACDI/VOCA (Monetization Costs)	\$ 229,372	-	-	\$ 229,372

TOTAL Expenses	\$3,852,407	\$ 809,820	\$ 220,763	\$ 4,882,990
TOTAL Approved Budget	\$ 4,483,059	\$ 962,614	\$ 234,740	\$ 5,680,413
Percent of Approved Budget Expected to be Spent by LOA	85.9%	84.1%	94.0%	86.0%

As mentioned, overall budget management is fairly centralized at the top of the program, and information on the total financial management picture for the program is not widely disseminated. Partners, as a result, feel that they need more information around which to plan their annual activities. Since they may not have full information on what is available to the program, they don't really know if the requests they have made for funds are inside or outside of the LOA budget. Similarly, staff at lower levels in the program responsible for implementation planning appear to be not clear on the budget they have available within which to plan activities.

The partner monthly financial liquidation reports have been problematic, despite extensive training on financial management and persistent follow-up by program staff.

Monetization cash flows have been satisfactory.

All in all, financial management in the program has been good, despite some of the concerns raised by partners and staff. These concerns might be less a reflection of problems with financial management practices and more a function of the relatively less transparency within the program, especially describing the rationale behind the way decisions are made. The bottom-line, however, is that the DAP has done well in managing the financial resources to get the work done within the operating constraints faced in northern Uganda.

E. Human Resources Management and Development

1. Overview of Human Resources Management and Development in the DAP

Within CRS, the staff structure for implementing the DAP includes:

- The NAM in Gulu for overall management of the DAP
- An Agricultural Team Leader/Agricultural Project Officer and an Assistant Agricultural Project Officer, both in Gulu, who oversee the agricultural activities
- A Marketing Project Officer and Assistant Project Officer, both in Gulu, who oversee the marketing activities.
- A Rehabilitation Project Officer, a Civil Engineer, a FFW End Use Checker, and Commodity Officer, all in Kitgum, who oversee the valley dam rehabilitation and FFW.

Each of the partners have a senior DAP Coordinator position and a position that oversees field implementation in addition to the staff required for field implementation.

2. Observations Relative to Human Resources Management and Development

Within CRS, there has been relatively¹¹ high staff turnover. There are relatively few staff who have been with the DAP since its inception, and most staff have been in place for less than two years. The turn-over appears to be mainly staff taking advantage of opportunities elsewhere.

¹¹ "Relatively" here has two dimensions. Certainly relative to DAPs in other countries, turnover has been very high in the CRS DAP. However, it is less clear that the turnover in the CRS DAP is substantially higher than normal staff turnover in projects implemented in Uganda.

The project staff structure has at least two positions with somewhat complicated responsibilities. The Northern Area Manager, for example, is responsible for providing vision and leadership to the DAP as the senior staff member directly responsible for DAP implementation. This position is also responsible, however, for overall programming in the Northern Region, including ensuring that managers of other programs receive technical and administrative support as well facilitating cross-fertilization and development of synergies between programs operating in the north. A second example would be the DAP Agricultural Team leader who is charged with responsibility for coordinating activities across components while also being the position directly responsible for the technical quality of the agricultural components. The agricultural components have as a result seemed to have received special attention relative to other components.

The DAP has made significant investments in staff development both through technical training events but also through the acquisition of new skills and knowledge on the job. The staff turnover problem might, in fact, be partly a function of CRS producing highly competent staff.

F. Commodity Management

1. Overview of Commodity Management

Over the life of the DAP, the program received 810 MT of commodities for use in FFW, including maize, lentils (in FY 2002), split green peas and vegetable oil, and 15,600 MT of hard red winter wheat for monetization.. The FFW ration was composed of 2 kilograms of maize, 300 grams of lentils or split green peas, and 100 grams of vegetable oil. Wheat was the only commodity monetized for CRS by ACDI/VOCA. Table 18 summarizes the actual and projected commodity allocations over the life of the activity by fiscal year.

2. Observations Relative to Commodity Management

As shown in Table 18, by September 2006, the DAP will have utilized almost 74% of the planned LOA FFW food resources and over 89% of commodities for monetization. Given the fact that FFW activities did not begin until FY 2004 due to the security constraints, this achievement is commendable.

Table 18. Projected LOA Commodity Summary (MT)

	Valley Dam FFW	Monetization	TOTAL
FY 02	220	3,500	3,720
FY 03	---	3,500	3,500
FY 04	220	3,500	3,720
FY 05 (Projected)	370	3,500	3,870
FY 06 (Projected)	---	1,600	1,600
LOA Projected Disbursements	810	15,600	16,410
Proposed LOA Quantities	1,100	17,500	18,600
Percentage Achieved	73.6%	89.1%	88.2%

Table 19 summarizes commodity losses for both monetized food in the hands of ACDI/VOAC and food distributed in FFW by CRS in Kitgum. The losses shown are within industry standards.

Table 19. LOA Commodity Loss Summary through FY 04 Shipments Received - Monetized Commodities (MT)

Fiscal Year	Amount Purchased	Ocean Losses	Inland Losses	Amount Received in Kampala	Percent Lost
<i>Monetized Commodities</i>					
FY 02	3,500	16.1	.9	3,483	.49%
FY 03	3,501.2	30.1	(3.525)	3,474.6	.76%
FY 04	3,500	16.6	2.5	3,480.9	.55%
FY 05	---	---	---	---	---
TOTAL through FY 05	10,501.2	62.8	(.13)	10,438.5	.60%
<i>Distributed Commodities</i>					
FY 02	220	+0.15	0	220.15	+0.068%
FY 03	0	0	0	0	0
FY 04	220	1.545	0.25	218.21	0.82%
FY 05	370	0.95	0.056	368.99	0.27%
TOTAL through FY 05	810	2.345	0.306	807.35	0.32%

Monetization cost recovery has been just meeting industry standards. Cost recovery in 2002 was 60.19%, 80.64% in 2003 and 80.60% in 2004.

As mentioned previously, there is a possibility that the value of FFW rations may exceed the minimum daily wage rate since multiple rations may be disbursed daily depending on the work tasks completed. However, given that large numbers of participants are not joining the FFW activities, it is unlikely that the value of the ration exceeds the minimum wage rate.

G. Monitoring and Evaluation

1. Overview of Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring. Monitoring of implementation relies heavily on development of implementation plans. CRS has revised the Detailed Implementation Plan for the DAP a number of times over the life of the program. Annual plans are developed with implementing partners and these are revised quarterly. CRS staffs are generally responsible for monitoring implementation. On the frontlines, project participants, especially the TACs, are responsible for monitoring and recording yields for the farmers they contact.

Evaluation. A baseline survey was conducted in April 2002. A Mid-Term Evaluation was conducted in July of 2004. This final evaluation is being implemented in October 2005.

2. Observations Relative to Monitoring and Evaluation

The monitoring systems in the DAP generally produce pretty good information for reporting purposes, although there are some inconsistencies between CSR4s with information reported one year and not others.

There appears not to be much systematic information gathering for programmatic decision-making. For example, the program could be obtaining information on the quality seed disbursed by seed vendors to identify those vendors who habitually provide high quality and those that do not. Visual inspections at the time seed vendors are registered for seed fairs is one part of this monitoring system. Other parts could include obtaining information from seed buyers on their perceptions of the quality of the seed from vendor. Similarly, the program could be monitoring the diffusion of ideas from demonstration sites or TACs to determine the characteristics of those that are most effective and those that are least effective. The program could also be monitoring the self-reliant activities that farmer groups are

undertaking on their own and then analyzing these to determine characteristics of successful groups or to identify groups that can be used as positive deviant models for other groups. M&E systems that provide information for decision-making enable programs to enhance their impact by expanding activities that work, modifying those that are having less impact, and dropping those activities that have minimal impact.

The fact that a baseline exists for the DAP is quite positive. However, given that circumstances have changed since the baseline survey was conducted, comparisons to 2005 information have to be qualified.

The Mid-Term Evaluation provided the program with useful information at the Intermediate Result level as well as recommendations for improving the quality of the DAP. The report was significantly delayed, however.

The timing of the final evaluation is mostly to inform the design of the MYAP. It is a bit early in the final year of the DAP to fully assess the overall impact of the program. Had the evaluation been implemented a few months later, information for the CSR4 and the FY 2006 implementation plans would have been available.

H. Environmental Monitoring and Impact Mitigation

1. Overview of Environmental Monitoring and Impact Mitigation

The Initial Environmental Examination in the DAP focused on the impact of the valley dam activities. Annual environmental status reports were submitted with the CSR4s.

2. Observations Relative to Environmental Monitoring and Impact Mitigation

While the paperwork has been completed for the DAP relative to monitoring environmental impact, the practice in the field has not fully conformed with the proposed mitigation measures specified in the IEE. For example, it is not clear that a wetland monitor was retained, nor an environmental baseline survey conducted, nor regular monitoring of water quality and dam biodiversity undertaken.

The IEE overlooked other environmental impact now evident after the fact. For example, the promotion of agricultural productivity on confined land resources has resulted in declining soil fertility. If not monitored closely, this could result in invasive, noxious weeds or pests.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED RELEVANT FOR THE DESIGN OF THE MULTI-YEAR ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (MYAP)

A. Overall Strategy

While many lessons emerged directly from implementation of the various components of the DAP, some lessons also emerged relevant for the overall design of food security program. The most important of these are discussed briefly below.

1. Analyzing Vulnerability

At the time the DAP was designed, the conceptual framework for understanding food insecurity was oriented around supply of food, access to food and utilization of food. While these dimensions of food insecurity are still important, the focus has been expanded to include the concept of vulnerability. Vulnerability is defined as a function of exposure to risks offset by the coping capacities of those affected. Coping capacities are generally a function of the assets that households have including not only physical, financial and natural assets, but also the human assets and social capital, including political capital.

For the MYAP, it might be useful to expand the analysis of food security to include vulnerability analyses to identify the most critical risks and assets to target in order to build coping capacities. Some of the less obvious risks to examine are losing access to land either around the camps or in the home villages, the impact of HIV/AIDS, and the declining soil fertility around the camps.

On the asset side, it is important for the MYAP to specifically target assets that will ensure food security for vulnerable households now as well as assets that will be useful later when decongestion occurs and families return to their villages. With regard to the latter, the DAP has successfully cultivated stronger social capital through the group formation activities and has built human assets through much of the agricultural training this has been provided. The MYAP could look for additional investments in building or protecting assets that will be useful when households return to their home villages.

2. Targeting the Extremely Vulnerable

It is clear from the final evaluation that there are households at the extreme lower end of the poverty continuum that are not participating in the DAP. These include highly vulnerable households whose household heads are elderly or disabled or households with limited labor capacity. In fact, it is appropriate for these households not to have participated in the DAP because the interventions in the DAP, i.e., land-oriented or labor-based, would not have had impact on these households. These families, however, are some of the most highly vulnerable, food insecure households, and the MYAP may want to analyze their vulnerabilities and identify appropriate interventions targeting them.

3. Alternative Group Configurations

Farmer groups within the DAP have been formed around farmers from the same clan and village with a common interest. Groups are generally a mixture of both men and women from a range of age groups. This has certainly been successful and should be continued. In the interests of exploring additional structures that may enhance impact, however, the MYAP may want to pilot different ways of organizing groups. Formation of youth groups, for example, might result in a different set of group priorities related to agriculture. Similarly, since women are responsible for certain crops, formation of women's groups may also result in a different set of priorities.

4. Use of Food

It is apparent that the FFW in the DAP is meeting a food security safety net need, and the MYAP should look for ways to continue making food available for those households for whom the existing safety nets, i.e., the WFP food distributions, are insufficient or future safety nets when decongestion occurs are likely to be inadequate. Rehabilitation of valley dams may become an important intervention later when decongestion occurs and water needs outside of the IDP camps become more acute. However, until decongestion occurs, the MYAP may want to investigate other potential uses of food that are more critical now. This would include using FFW to build other community assets in the camps, for example, schools and clinics, or it might include other uses related to protecting assets, for example, if saved seed is being consumed, or supplemental feeding for those extreme poor households with limited labor capacity.

B. From the Agriculture Experience

A number of lessons emerged from the experience of program implementation associated with the agricultural components of the program. The most important of these are briefly discussed below.

1. Engaging Land Owners in Land Use Planning

The experience from the DAP clearly shows that where landowners have been engaged as group members, there are fewer problems with landowners withdrawing access to the land. Where landowners are not engaged, suspicions arise as to whether landowners may lose their right to the land or land is withdrawn because the fertility is declining and landowners don't want to receive highly infertile, relatively useless land when decongestion occurs. The MYAP should continue to engage landowners in the program and also work with them and other project participants to develop land use plans. The purpose of these plans will be to maximize productivity while also ensuring that when the land is returned to the landowner, the quality of the land will be better than when the program participants began working on the land. In the DAP, the strategy was to facilitate access to land. In the MYAP the strategy should now be to make the land more productive within a long term sustainable land use plan. Ideally, this will result in a win-win arrangement. Program participants will have access to land (and if done well can result in expanded access as other landowners see the benefits from making land available) and landowners will see improvements to their land.

When decongestion occurs, the landowner participants may not continue to remain as group members if the group relocates to a home village that is some distance away. However, there are obvious benefits to everyone if they are included now as participants under the strategy outlined above.

2. Seed Supply Systems

The DAP has been quite successful in establishing foundations for making high quality seed available in the program area. There are some signs, however, that seed dependencies on the program partners or other non-sustainable suppliers of seed are still evident. In the MYAP, CRS and her partners should continue expanding the agro-enterprise strategy with a specific focus on seed sub-sectors. One dimension of this would be to look for ways to integrate the developing seed supply systems in the project area with the wider systems for supplying seed in Uganda. Discussions are already underway with some private sector seed suppliers to become more engaged in the project area. This should be expanded in the MYAP.

Another source of seed for farmers is saved seed from the previous season. There are examples around the world where simple seed quality interventions focusing on improving seed selection, preservation and storage, have had impact on improving productivity, and the MYAP may want to explore these. Given the difficulty of seed/crop storage in the camps, the MYAP may also have to explore interventions that will allow farmers to effectively store seed. A focus on farmer-saved seed will not only have impact on the quality of seed, it will also impress upon program participants that they will have to depend more fully on their own sources of seeds rather than on seed from NGOs.

3. The Soil Fertility Problem

It is very evident that the promotion of productivity on relatively limited land availability because of the security situation has put enormous pressure on land resources, and soil fertility is declining fairly rapidly. When decongestion occurs and land becomes more widely available, this will become less of a problem. Nevertheless, soil fertility will still be a problem eventually. As is evident elsewhere, increasing population pressure has reduced the period for fallowing that used to allow land to recover fertility. The same will happen in northern Uganda at some point, and the MYAP should take the opportunity now to look at developing sustainable agricultural practices appropriate for northern Uganda. This may involve working with farmers on farming practices that increase soil fertility such as

manuring, composting and appropriate crop rotation practices. It may also involve engaging the private sector to provide selected farming inputs to complement these.

4. Selection of Target Crops

In the DAP, the target was to restore and expand production of traditional crops for which the program has been moderately successful. Given the relative scarcity of land, however, at least until significant decongestion occurs, the MYAP may want to position itself to be able to support crops that may emerge as having higher economic value in terms of the productivity of land. Analysis needs to be undertaken to determine those crops that merit this focus.

5. Capital Mobilizations

The marketing component of the DAP has already begun exploring ways to expand savings and credit activities within the marketing associations that have been formed. The final evaluation team also discovered evidence that some of the older farmer groups have started forming rotating savings and credit schemes. Capital mobilization in one form or another is often the glue that holds groups together. If not done well, it may also be the cause of group dissolution. Since that is the case, the MYAP may want to explore ways to provide basic principles and capacity building for capital mobilization for all groups formed by the program.

C. From the Valley Dams Experience

The lessons that emerged from the experience of program implementation associated with the valley dam component of the DAP are briefly discussed below.

1. Continue the Valley Dam Component?

If decongestion occurs, valley dam rehabilitation will be important as long as investments are made in both the hardware and software around the dams (see below). However, if decongestion does not occur, then the impact of the dams may be minimal, until people are actually living near them and managing the resource effectively. Valley dam rehabilitation could continue in the MYAP but the strategy should be focused on those dams that are readily accessible to users of the dam, i.e., within the protected halo around IDP camps.

2. "Software" Development

The final evaluation highlighted the fact that the software side of the valley dam component was relatively neglected by the project. The point was made very clearly that if the software side of managing the valley dam infrastructure is not made stringer, the investments made in the infrastructure itself will be lost. Having community Dam Committees is an appropriate approach. These committees, however, need to be motivated to fulfill their functions. Given the current context, almost all households have to focus their resources on generating livelihoods, and there is not much room for activities, which do not contribute to the livelihoods of households. Expecting dam committee members to effectively manage the dams without some sort of returns to their livelihoods will not work. Therefore, the MYAP should look for appropriate ways for whoever is responsible for managing the dam to be compensated sufficiently to be motivated to fulfill the management function. When the dams were originally built, government allocated a staff member to be responsible for managing the dam. Perhaps the dam committees should do the same and pay a salary for that person from revenue generated from the dam. This will reduce the demands on the dam committee while also clearly delegating someone to be responsible who should be motivated to manage the dam.

In addition to this structural question, if the valley dam component is continued, more investments need to be made in capacity building of community members to be able to plan strategically, develop operational rehabilitation plans, effectively address problems and capitalize on opportunities around the dam, generate revenue to pay operational costs, and effectively maintain the dams. The strategy should be to view the dam committee as the basis for a community-based organization and the project should invest the time and resources that it takes to build an effect CBO. The farmer groups in the DAP worked with the project for three years. A similar amount of time is likely to be required to build the capacities of dam committees.

D. From the Marketing Experience

The lessons that emerged from the experience of program implementation associated with the marketing component of the DAP are briefly discussed below.

1. Marketing Entry Point

In the DAP, the marketing component was strategically planned to begin in Year 3 after production increases have been realized from the program. The baseline survey conducted in April 2002, clearly showed that farmers were already undertaking significant cultivation in the project area. The average acreage under cultivation was over 4 acres in the first season and over 2 acres in the second season. There are opportunities to have impact with marketing interventions even at the beginning of working with farmer groups with the bit of surplus already being produced. In addition, a good understanding of markets also influences what farmers choose to produce as they try to capitalize on perceived market opportunities. As the MYAP continues working with farmer groups on marketing strategies, the program may want to begin earlier in the process building farmer capacities to understand markets and helping them develop marketing strategies.

2. Market Chain Analysis

The market chain analyses done in the DAP describe various players in the market as well as provides some useful market information. Market leverage points, market bottlenecks or other obstacles do not clearly emerge from the analysis. These are the targets for market development strategies. The MYAP may want to expand the market chain analysis to map out the flows of product up different marketing channels with information along the way showing quantities and prices. This will facilitate identification of points along the channel at which farmers may not be benefiting from prices received or obstacles to the flow of products.

3. Vertical Linkages

Without question, marketing will continue to be a critical focus for the MYAP. The DAP through the agro-enterprise approach has established a basic foundation with the formation of marketing associations and completion of some of the market analyses required to formulate a strategy. As the MYAP continues to implement an agro-enterprise approach, the program may want to consider strategically focusing on development of vertical linkages between the local markets in the north and other markets in Uganda and even outside of the country. Cutting edge private sector development projects work toward facilitating the development of linkages between producers and export markets. An approach similar to this that builds on the market analyses that have been done and the group formation work in the DAP could have significant impact.

E. Process Lessons

A number of major lessons have emerged from the experience of the DAP relative to the processes used in the program. The most important of these are described briefly below.

1. Staff Structure

While giving multiple hats to senior positions in the project, as in for example, the NAM and the DAP TL, is financially cost effective, there are programmatic costs in terms of effective implementation, especially in coordination across components or across projects. The tendency is to focus on the component (agriculture in the case of the DAP TL) or project (the DAP in the case of the NAM) at the expense of lost opportunities for cross-fertilization and synergized impact. The MYAP may want to consider a staff structure that clearly allocates a significant function to a single position. For example, the function of providing overall vision and leadership for the MYAP should rest with a position that only has this responsibility. The same principle would be applied for other major functions in the project.

2. Staff Turnover

The DAP has displayed significant staff turnover within the CRS DAP team. The consequence has been some loss in continuity of the program, costs mainly in terms of time associated with training new staff, and losses in outputs while new staff become attuned to their positional responsibilities. Generally, the job market appears to be unstable. In which case CRS may not be able to do much to change the situation but CRS needs to effectively establish other contributing factors and address the staff turnover challenge in the MYAP.

3. Implementing Partnerships

As mentioned in the section describing partnership above, the DAP was a results oriented project in which partner capacity building was not a targeted output. CRS chose to work with partners to expand impact and produce high quality results, as happened in the agricultural components. At times, however, the need to produce results at a more rapid pace forced CRS to overstep the bounds of true partnership with the local partners, as happened in the valley dam and marketing components. Given the donor's interest, the MYAP will also be results oriented, and CRS will certainly continue to work with local partners.

In order to capitalize on the benefits that accrue from true partners working together to achieve results, CRS is encouraged in the MYAP to be more transparent in sharing the applicable regulations to help the partners appreciate the obligations they face to produce results, i.e., help the implementing partners to understand budgeting parameters, procurement policies, and other elements of the policies (22 CFR 226 and 22 CFR Part 211) that guide the use of Food for Peace resources. The implementing partners on their side, need to recognize that the pressure to produce results will sometimes dictate behavior required to speed up implementation in order to meet program obligations.

On a special side note for immediate focus, CRS and the implementing partners should work together to solve the partner financial liquidation problem, so that systems are in place by the time the MYAP begins. This reporting problem seems to be the main source of cracks in partner foundation in the DAP.

4. Monitoring and Evaluation

The systems that the DAP has put in place for monitoring and evaluation are effective at producing information for reporting purposes. There are opportunities, however, for developing systems that will provide monitoring and evaluation information that can be used for decision-making to expand activities that have impact and modify or discontinue activities that do not have satisfactory impact. For example, additional systems can be put in place for monitoring the quality of the seed that vendors are providing in seed fairs. Systems can be

developed for monitoring diffusion of intervention around demonstration sites to determine the quality of the sites and identifying characteristics of demonstration sites that are highly effective. Systems can be developed for monitoring the performance of TAC members toward identifying characteristics of the most effective TACs. Systems can be developed for comparing the performances of different farmer groups relative to achieving self-reliance so that information can be used to guide formation of new groups. M&E systems customarily gather information for reporting purposes. The MYAP may want to expand this to gather information that can be used to enhance the impact of the program..

5. Linking Program Activities

As the MYAP addresses vulnerability and some of the other suggestions made above, the need to effectively interface with other programs providing services that the MYAP may not will be critical. This includes other programs within CRS as well as other programs within the partners and programs being implemented by other organizations.

6. Transparency

Some of the criticisms voiced by DAP partners and staff at lower levels on financial management, partner relations and program support, can easily be mitigated by more transparency. This would apply mostly around information related to donor regulations and the pressure CRS faces to produce results, but also around information related to the rationale when decisions are made or parameters within which the program must operate, such as resource parameters. A bit more transparency on these would enhance partner and staff relations in the program.

VI. CONCLUSION

A. Overview of Results.

Tables 20 and 21 summarize the findings of the final evaluation of the FY 2002 to FY 2006 DAP relative to performance against activities proposed under the Intermediate Results of the program and relative to impact at the Strategic Objective level.

Table 20. Summary Assessment of Achievement on Activities Under Each Intermediate Result

Intermediate Result/Proposed Activities	Summary Assessment of Achievement
Intermediate Result 1.1 Increased agricultural production by 20,000 farm families in targeted areas by 2006	
<i>Summary Assessment of the Final Evaluation on Proposed Activities under IR 1.1</i>	
<u>Activity 1.1a:</u> Establish 1000 farmer groups for participation in the program	Excellent results and a solid foundation upon which to build
<u>Activity 1.1b:</u> Provide access to farm land for displaced, returning, and relocated farm families	Targets have been met and surpassed but the impact on vulnerability and food insecurity is less than anticipated because of insecure access and declining soil fertility.
<u>Activity 1.1c:</u> Facilitate the availability of locally produced seed/planting material of traditional crops to up to 20,000 program participants	DAP has been highly effective in increasing seed availability in the current context. The low participation of women, however, is a concern.
Intermediate Result 1.2 Increased capacity for recovery and rehabilitation of 200 communities in	

targeted areas by 2006	
<i>Summary Assessment of the Final Evaluation on Proposed Activities under IR 1.2</i>	
<u>Activity 1.2a:</u> Development of Community Rehabilitation Plans in targeted areas	The DAP has not given this activity sufficient attention which puts the investments made in the rehabilitation of valley dams at risk.
<u>Activity 1.2b:</u> Rehabilitate 15 (revised to 9 following the Mid-Term Evaluation) multi-purpose community valley dams/tanks	The valley dam component has not yet had significant impact on food security or livelihoods, apart from the impact that FFW has had.
Intermediate Result 1.3 Increased crop productivity and profitability for 20,000 farm families by 2006	
<i>Summary Assessment of the Final Evaluation on Proposed Activities under IR 1.2</i>	
<u>Activity 1.3a:</u> Conduct on-farm and farmer-managed trials and demonstrations of promising varieties of improved traditional Acholi crops	While there is always room for improvement in the way trials and demonstrations are designed and monitored, this activity was successful in introducing new varieties
<u>Activity 1.3b:</u> Transfer knowledge and skills in modern farming techniques to 20,000 farmers through demonstration sites and field days	It is difficult to assess the effectiveness of the knowledge transfer activities since most of the focus was on seed. However, much of the training that has been provided will be useful when decongestion occurs.
<u>Activity 1.3c:</u> Establish progressive marketing associations directly benefiting 20,000 farm families	The targets were not achieved in training and the number of associations formed. However, a good foundation has been established on which to continue working.
<u>Activity 1.3d:</u> Conduct market analyses and information campaigns targeting 20,000 farm families	This activity was partially successful; farmers are not yet fully accessing markets but they have been trained and can make more informed market decisions on the choice of crops to grow.

Table 21. Summary Assessment of Impact Against the Program Strategic Objective

Strategic Objective	Summary Assessment of Impact
To increase the agricultural income of 20,000 smallholder farm families in Northern Uganda by reestablishing livelihoods and strengthening marketing systems.	While the average area cultivated has declined since the program began due to increased security constraints, participating households have been able to obtain increased net income because of increased cash receipts for all crops. Agriculture production livelihoods have been re-established within the IDP camp context and marketing for agricultural production has expanded.

B. The Bottom line

The CRS DAP in northern Uganda has been operating in an extremely difficult context, yet there have been some very significant achievements. The formation of farmer groups, the improved seed access resulting from the seed fairs/seed vouchers activities and the introductions of a wide range of new varieties of various crops have all been positive outputs produced by the project. On the negative side, the valley dam component has not yet had significant impact. Results are just starting to appear from the marketing component. All in all, however, the DAP has been a good investment in terms of having significant impact on

vulnerability, livelihoods and food insecurity under the current circumstances and has established a solid foundation upon which to build.

ANNEXES

Annex A: Final Evaluation Scope of Work

Annex B: Evaluation Methodological Tools and Schedules

Annex C: Conversions to 2002 Values

Conversion of Reported Values in 2005 to 2002 Values

Baseline Survey Conducted in March 2002

Inflation rate = 6.5% per annum

Inflation Factor

Calculation:

Mar-02	Mar-03	Mar-04	Mar-05	Oct-05
1.0	0.939	0.882	0.828	0.814

CASH RECEIVED

	REPORTED			ADJUSTED		
	Season	Season	Total	Season	Season	Total
	1	2		1	2	
Finger Millet	72,988	86,140	159,128	59,442	70,153	129,596
Groundnuts	97,915	108,155	206,070	79,743	88,083	167,826
Sorghum	65,369	94,227	159,596	53,237	76,740	129,977
Maize	44,280	55,137	99,417	36,062	44,904	80,966
Rice	106,200	105,000	211,200	86,490	85,513	172,004
beans	52,415	65,196	117,611	42,687	53,096	95,784
Cassava	81,080	26,600	107,680	66,032	21,663	87,696
Sesame	54,000	99,908	153,908	43,978	81,366	125,344
Total	574,247	640,363	1,214,61	467,673	521,519	989,192

		0			
--	--	---	--	--	--

	REPORTED			ADJUSTED		
	Season 1	Season 2	Total	Season 1	Season 2	Total
	Total Expenditures	280,199	163,589	443,788	228,197	133,229
Proportion of Production Sold						60%

	INPUT EXPENDITURES					
	REPORTED			ADJUSTED		
	Season 1	Season 2	Total	Season 1	Season 2	Total
Seed	27,737	19,505	47,242	22,589	15,885	38,474
Land Hire or Lease	25,682	19,538	45,220	20,916	15,912	36,828
Land Prep - Tractor	52,850	17,500	70,350	43,042	14,252	57,294
Land Prep - Oxen	47,526	32,829	80,355	38,706	26,736	65,442
Land Prep - Hired Labour	27,235	25,712	52,947	22,180	20,940	43,121
Planting	33,404	-	33,404	27,205	-	27,205
Weeding	23,055	18,354	41,409	18,776	14,948	33,724
Harvesting	19,429	18,003	37,432	15,823	14,662	30,485

All Other Costs	23,281	12,148	35,429	18,960	9,893	28,854
TOTAL COSTS	280,199	163,589	443,788	228,197	133,229	361,426