



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

**MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT FOR
STABILITY, PEACE AND RECONCILIATION IN NORTHERN UGANDA PROJECT
(SPRING)
FINAL**

Submitted by:
Kenwill International Limited

Submitted to:
SPRING/USAID Kampala

Contract No.:
617-C-00-08-00007-00

April 2010

This report is made possible by the support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of Kenwill International Ltd., and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID, the United States Government or Emerging Market Groups Limited.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations.....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Executive Summary.....	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Project Background.....	1
1.2 SPRING Mid-Term Review.....	3
1.3 Evaluation Methodology.....	4
1.3.1 Evaluation Design.....	4
1.3.2 Sampling Procedure.....	4
1.3.3 Data collection Methodology.....	4
1.3.4 Evaluation Challenges.....	5
1.5 Report Layout.....	5
CHAPTER TWO: EVALUATION FINDINGS.....	6
2.1 Assessment of Progress towards Attainment of Project Results.....	6
2.1.1 Peace Building and Reconciliation Component.....	6
2.1.2 Economic Security and Social Inclusion.....	10
2.1.3 Access to Justice.....	15
2.1.4 Progress towards Attainment of SPRING Aim/Purpose.....	18
2.2 Integration of Cross-cutting Issues.....	19
2.2.1 Children and Youths.....	19
2.2.2 Re-integration of Ex-combatants.....	19
2.2.3 Environment.....	19
2.2.4 Land.....	20
2.2.5 Geographic and Ethnic Divisions.....	20
2.2.6 Linking Grass Roots to National Processes.....	20
2.2.7 Project Communication Activities.....	21
2.2.7 Anti-Corruption.....	22
2.2.8 Mainstreaming of Gender.....	22
2.3 SPRING Integration Model.....	23
2.4 Assessment of quality of project management practices.....	24
2.4.1 Effectiveness of Project Management Structures.....	24
2.4.2 Grant Management Processes.....	26
2.4.3 Assessment of Quality and Appropriateness of the Performance Monitoring Plan.....	27
2.4.4 Communication with USAID and Local Development Partners.....	28
2.4.5 Systems for Tracking Funding Streams.....	28
CHAPTER THREE: CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
29	
3.1 Progress towards Anticipated Outcomes.....	29
3.1.1 Peace and Reconciliation.....	29
3.1.2 Economic Security and Social Inclusion.....	30
3.1.3 Access to Justice.....	31
3.2 Cross Cutting Issues.....	33
3.2.1 Special Considerations and Crosscutting Issues.....	33
3.3 Communication.....	33

3.3	SPRING Model.....	33
3.4	Project Management	35
3.4.1	Quality of Project Management.....	35
3.4.2	Effectiveness and Efficiency Grants Management Process.....	36
3.4.3	Performance Monitoring Plan.....	36
3.4.4	Communication to USAID and Local Development Partners.....	36
3.5	Overall Conclusion and Recommendation	37
	Reference Materials	39
	Annexes	40
	Annex 1: SPRING Stability Fund and AVSI Sub-grants	40
	Annex 2: Evaluation Data Collection Tools	43
	Annex 3: Progress towards Planned Targets for Economic Security Component.....	60
	Annex 4: SPRING’s Contribution to PRDP	62
	Annex 5: MTE Information on SPRING Communication Activities.....	63
	Annex 6: Number of farmers by vulnerability.....	65

Abbreviations

ACADOS	:	Aids Clients and Disabled Orphans Support
ADFA	:	Apac District Farmers Association
ARLPI	:	Acholi Religious Leaders Peace Initiative
AVSI	:	AVSI Foundation (Italy-based International NGO)
COTR	:	Contracting Officer's Technical Representative
CPA	:	Concerned Parents Association
CPAR	:	Canadian Physicians for Aid and Relief
CRR	:	Centre for Reparations and Rehabilitation
CSM	:	Conflict-Sensitive Mainstreaming
DLGs	:	District Local Governments
EMG	:	Emerging Markets Group
GLACCR	:	Great Lakes Centre for Conflict Resolution
IRC	:	International Rescue Committee
IEE	:	Initial Environmental Examination
IPs	:	Implementing Partners
IR	:	Intermediate Results
KKA	:	Ker Kwaro Acholi
KSWVO	:	Kisa Ber War Victims Support Organization
LRA	:	Lord's Resistance Army
MTE	:	Mid-Term Evaluation
MTR	:	Mid-Term Review
NECPA	:	North East Chili Producers Association
PMP	:	Performance Monitoring Plan
PRDP	:	Peace Recovery and Development Plan for Northern Uganda
SO9	:	Strategic Objective 9
SPRING	:	Stability Peace and Reconciliation In Northern Uganda Project
STF	:	Straight Talk Foundation
UMECS	:	United Movement to End Child Soldering
USAID	:	United States Agency for International Development
USG	:	United States Government
VSLAs	:	Village Savings and Loan Associations
DA	:	Development Assistance
DCOF	:	Displaced Children and Orphans Fund
ESF	:	Economic Support Funds
LC	:	Local Council
FGD	:	Focus Group Discussions
USD	:	United States Dollar
UGX	:	Ugandan Shillings
WACFO	:	Women and Children First Organization

Acknowledgments

This publication has been made possible through contributions of different stakeholders. Kenwill International Limited (KENWILL) therefore extends her appreciation to USAID and SPRING for entrusting her with and funding the SPRING mid-term evaluation assignment. Special thanks also go to SPRING Team for their input in designing, organizing and coordinating the evaluation, implementing partners for mobilizing farmers and participating in evaluation data collection processes.

KENWILL also wishes to thank communities (beneficiaries) and different local government officials that agreed to participate in the evaluation processes.

Special thanks also go to the SPRING Evaluation Team comprising consultants, KENWILL projects staff, and research assistants for successfully carrying out the evaluation.

We thank you all for your valuable contributions and hope that the evaluation report will be a key step and resource for facilitating development of communities in Northern Uganda

Robert Waswaga
Team Leader
Kenwill International Limited

Executive Summary

This document is a mid-term evaluation for Stability, Peace, and Reconciliation in Northern Uganda (SPRING). SPRING is a USAID funded project which commenced with the signing of the contract on 13 December 2007 and will end on 13 December 2010. The project mitigates causes and consequences of conflict through stability, peace and reconciliation. The project contributes to USAID Uganda Mission strategic objective number nine (SO9) for a more peaceful environment and improved governance through its intermediate results. A mid-term evaluation of SPRING, a contractual obligation, was commissioned to assess progress towards intended results, identify areas for improvement, and highlight potential areas of intervention by USAID mission. Key findings from the mid-term evaluation are presented hereunder:

Key Achievements by SPRING

The overall assessment shows that SPRING is on course to achieve most of its targets and results. The evaluation shows that USG investment in northern Uganda communities through SPRING is a worthwhile venture which, if continued, will result in future resilience for the communities in northern Uganda. By the time of the evaluation, the project had registered different results which were being felt and enjoyed by beneficiaries. Some of the targets set in the PMP have already been realized. Below are key achievements of SPRING:

Peace and Reconciliation

- The PMP target for increased positive relations between communities in the north is 91 percent and the evaluation reports 88 percent. The difference is not statistically significant, implying that this target is already attained.
- The indicator of personal security (safety of property) has already exceeded its PM target of 75 percent by 4 percentage points.
- Structures that will significantly increase cooperation and information sharing between all three spheres of individual, household, and community levels have been achieved.
- Through integration with the economic sector, SPRING has established impressive frameworks for effective community relations practices resulting in positive engagement between members of farmer groups and the various community agencies representing the needs of resettling communities.
- The indicator of improved positive relations targets 96 percent by March 2010 and this survey indicates that 80 percent of sampled respondents feel so.
- About 36 percent of sampled farmers reported that SPRING groups have helped them to cope with effects of the war.
- The Peace Education program has contributed to the development of the national curriculum and policy development.
- Twenty eight (28) organizations have been trained in conflict sensitivity programming.
- 480 facilitated events geared towards strengthening understanding among conflict affected groups have been carried out.
- This evaluation predicts that the recommended investment in the SPRING program will be repaid many times in terms of community harmony and the consequent potentially massive financial savings that can accrue from the unique arrangement of social infrastructure the programs have created that allows district and community agencies to work holistically together in strengthening local communities.

Economic Security

- About 66 percent of sampled farmers have experienced increases in productivity of different SPRING supported agricultural enterprises. Overall, productivity of SPRING supported enterprises has increased by 59 percent, while income or revenues from sale of such crops has doubled (98.7%) over the last two harvest seasons.
- Thirty five (35) marketing committees have been formed and are supporting farmers to access markets and earn better prices for their produce. About 39 percent of farmers market their produce through marketing committees, while 27 percent market through farmer groups.
- The concept of savings continues to grow among farmer groups. About 70 percent of sampled farmers are participating in village savings and loan association through saving and borrowing. Savings have been instrumental in helping families meet urgent household needs.
- SPRING/AVSI's support to microenterprises through business loans and vocational training have yielded the following benefits: i) business expansion, ii) ability to afford three meals per day for family members, iii) increased unity and harmony in the family, iv) ability to afford medical treatment for children and v) purchase of household items. Veterinary services and products have been taken closer to rural farmers through opening up veterinary businesses through the SPRING UVA Livestock Health Promotion project, increased capacity of veterinarians to offer technical field follow-up visits.

Access to Justice

- SPRING has enhanced land tenure security for her economic security beneficiaries. All sampled farmers (99.6%) were confident that their rights as a group to the acquired land where SPRING warehouses are situated were free from any outside interference and as such they have not had any dispute since the signing of the agreements. About 22 farmers supported through NECPA in Minakulu, Ngai and Otwal Sub-Counties have registered and acquired certificates of customary ownership for their lands with Sub-County authorities.
- 95% of SPRING farmers are aware of their land rights.
- SPRING and CRR had carried out eight mobile legal aid clinics, referred 58 cases, and successfully mediated three land disputes.
- Some farmers supported by NECPA have acquired loans from banks to further their economic activities using land certificates. The certificates were acquired after receiving information and advice on registering land under customary ownership through CRR.

Impact on Children

- The findings of the SPRING Child Impact report conducted in September of 2009 are validated by the MTE findings which show that SPRING farmers are able to respect their children's rights such as access to food and better nutrition and education, health and other development needs.
- Parents have been able to take their children to school by using proceeds from enterprises supported by SPRING as well as meet medical expenses for their children. Evidence from SPRING monitoring information shows 83 percent are able to meet medical expenses for their children and 84 percent of school going-age children (7-18) are enrolled in schools.

- SPRING is supporting the Concerned Parents Association (CPA) and the Women and Children First Organization (WACFO) to implement projects that promote child care self support groups.
- Supported farmers have been able to provide food for their family members, including children through consuming part of the harvests or using farm income to purchase food items
- SPRING has empowered youth with vocational skills which have enabled them to employ themselves and earn income for supporting their families.
- The unity and cooperation created in working in groups is invaluable to children as it promotes safety, security, and general wellbeing within their environments. Children are learning how to relate to others through the modeling of their social environments, so their chances of developing positive interaction skills are greatly enhanced.

Challenges and Gaps

- Short project timeframe has affected all activities of the project as some activities need to be implemented over a reasonable time (at least 2-3 years) for project management and results to be well felt by communities. Below are some of the major examples highlighted in the report:
 - Peace and reconciliation activities are not necessarily short- term impact activities. Behavior change requires a lot of complex processes and initiatives and the short duration of the SPRING project limits the achievability of the outcomes. The short term funding of the projects may impact on the ability of SPRING IPs to attract and retain suitably qualified and experienced staff that could be engaged on future projects.
 - Sustained support (training on roles and management) of marketing committees is critical for CMCs to effectively play their roles. More follow up and capacity building is needed for CMCs to effectively bulk and collectively market their produce.
 - The feasible timeline to realize enhanced animal productivity is two years, and the SPRING UVA project life span was cited to be extremely too short.
- Prolonged dry spell in northern Uganda has negatively affected crops and yields.
- Delayed process of signing memorandum of understanding with District Local Government has delayed commencement of project activities.
- Lack of shared understanding on integration within SPRING Team and Implementing Partners and lack of a strong integration strategy at the beginning of the project curtailed level of integration at the very beginning of the project.
- The PMP has been overtaken by change in the project strategy to where some indicators are not very relevant to the current project strategy and activities.
- There is lack of regular communication between SPRING and district local governments.
- Lack of organizational capacity of local implementing partners has required more capacity building support from SPRING slowing down and prolonging planned implementation timelines.

Recommendations

Against the above background, SPRING should improve different management practices and processes and focus her efforts to ensuring integration of different activities and monitoring progress against planned results and performance targets. The capacity of partners to successfully integrate the project will be greatly enhanced if management develops a stronger integration strategy to guide the project over the remaining period of the project.

Future Interventions

SPRING is on track to meet its targets set in the performance monitoring plan. While a six months extension could lead to greater impacts that are more widely felt by SPRING beneficiaries it is not tenable within the current contractual arrangements. USAID should therefore design another phase of the project focusing on economic development of communities in northern Uganda since there is ample evidence showing that communities are at the point of development. The new intervention should follow the same model of integration with economic security being the fulcrum of integration; with peace, reconciliation and access to justice supporting development activities. Peace and reconciliation are critical for a community which is emerging from conflict as demonstrated by the current SPRING project. However, as communities embark on economic development, it is only logical that economic security takes centre stage. Reasonable time (at least five years) should be dedicated to implementation of such projects to facilitate proper project implementation and overseeing of different changes attributed to the project. The areas of focus for peace building and justice are highlighted below:

Peace Building and Reconciliation

- Emphasis should be placed on peace activities that target entire households (children, husband, wife and the community).
- Capacity building of IPs and local governments in conflict resolution should be enhanced.
- Aligning economy with peace should be expanded to formal and informal business sectors as well as households. This should be extended to USG economic development interventions at household level as well. Therefore it is recommended to scale up similar intervention such as the International Alert, “Building A Peace Economy” project.
- Unpacking ‘P’ in PRDP activities should be expanded to Karamoja and Teso regions to address spillover efforts of the LRA conflict to these regions. The recommendations from the research taken during the current and future phases should be reviewed and adopted to implement a peace project targeting different stakeholders beyond the PRDP timeframe.
- The peace education project should be reviewed and expanded to all education institutions in northern Uganda. Better planning and supervision ought to be carried out to improve project efficiency and effectiveness.
- Conflict sensitive mainstreaming should be an on-going activity for USAID partners and should be tailor-made to different contexts of supported partners.
- More resources need to go into conflict assessment and supervisory visits by GLACCR to ensure that the training has been translated into change.
- Local Governments should be supported in the same area since they (Local Governments) oversee and directly take charge of programming and development issues within the district.

Access to Justice

- The land tenure security project and mobile clinics should be scaled-up to reach individual farmers in more sub-counties and parishes in northern Uganda.
- The cooperation between the formal and informal justice systems should be strengthened.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a brief project description and background to the SPRING mid-term evaluation, evaluation methodology and report layout.

1.1 Project Background

The United States Government (USG) has been working with the Government of Uganda (GoU) to ensure peace and security, good governance, access to social services, economic growth, and humanitarian assistance in northern Uganda. In August 2004, the U.S. Congress passed the *Northern Uganda Crisis Response Act* which calls upon the USG to support efforts for a just and lasting peaceful resolution of the conflict. To meet that objective, the Stability, Peace and Reconciliation in Northern Uganda (SPRING) project was designed and launched by United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in 2007. SPRING is an integrated program to promote peace and stability in northern Uganda. SPRING supports the Government of Uganda's priority to establish the conditions for a transition from relief to recovery and development for northern Uganda as outlined in the *Peace, Recovery, and Development Plan for Northern Uganda (PRDP)* and the *Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP)*.

The purpose of SPRING is to address the causes and consequences of violent conflict in northern Uganda in order to promote stability, peace, and reconciliation. The purpose of the project is to be fulfilled by reducing conflict; preventing the escalation of social, economic, and political tensions; and strengthening institutions for the promotion of peace and reconciliation. SPRING falls under the USAID mission's Strategic Objective (SO) 9, *More Peaceful Environment and Improved Governance*, structured as a crosscutting SO. SPRING supported core activities fall under three components each with a program goal and expected outcomes (intermediate results) that contribute to SO9 as presented hereunder:

Component 1. Peace-Building and Reconciliation: The goal for this component is "Ugandan capacity to mitigate conflict and promote peace and reconciliation increased." The expected outcomes for this component include: (i) institutional framework for reconciliation strengthened, (ii) local, district, and regional reconciliation mechanisms supported; (iii) access to accurate and reliable information increased; and, (iv) conflict sensitivity mainstreamed into USAID programming in northern Uganda.

Component 2. Economic Security and Social Inclusion: Economic security and social inclusion enhancement among vulnerable and conflict-affected populations, including demonstrated benefits for vulnerable children is the component objective. Anticipated outcomes of component activities are: (i) increased access to and adoption of economic opportunities in conflict-affected areas; and, (ii) broad-based civic participation expanded.

Component 3. Access to Justice: The access to justice component envisages improved access to justice by vulnerable and conflict-affected populations while its intended outcomes include: (i) access to legal aid and dispute resolution by vulnerable and conflict-affected populations increased; and, (ii) awareness of human rights and land/property rights increased.

Besides the three core components, SPRING has mainstreamed cross-cutting themes in its implementation. In some cases, special interventions have been supported by SPRING to address specific issues related to some of these cross-cutting themes. The cross-cutting themes include youths, land, geographical and ethnic divisions, and linkages between Grassroots Processes and National Level Processes, gender, environmental concerns and anti-corruption.

Project Implementation Strategy

Emerging Markets Group (EMG) (principal contractor) in partnership with (sub-contractors) Cardno Agrisystems, AVSI and Straight Talk Foundation Uganda (STFU) manage project implementation on behalf of USAID. The four organizations are referred to as “SPRING Team”. Cardno Agrisystems provides technical support for peace building and access to justice component, AVSI takes lead in implementing activities for addressing priorities of vulnerable youths, while STF manages project communication activities.

Program activities are implemented by SPRING Team and Implementing Partners (IPs). SPRING designs and awards short-term quick impact grants to IPs and closely works with them to ensure proper implementation and attainment of project objectives. A request for applications is normally issued out for local and international organizations to submit their applications to SPRING office in Gulu. A pre-award survey is conducted among potentially successful applicants to ascertain their preparedness in managing a sub-grant and ability to adhere to grant management policies and guidelines. The SPRING Gulu Office prepares Memorandum of Negotiations (MONs) for successful applicants and submits them to USAID for approval before issuing of award letters and signing of sub-grant contracts. A total of 28 sub-grants comprising of 18 economic security, seven reconciliation and peace building, and three access to justice grants had been awarded by the time of the review (Annex 1).

Furthermore, the current strategy involves using farmer groups as a focal point for integration of project activities. Farming households that are benefiting from economic security grants are also targeted for peace and access to justice activities.

Target Areas and Groups

SPRING is implemented in six districts. The six districts include four Acholi region districts of Amuru, Gulu, Kitgum and Pader and two Lango districts of Lira and Oyam. Economic security grants are being implemented in 15 sub-counties in all targeted districts. The sub-counties targeted by SPRING activities are: Atiak and Pabbo in Amuru district; Lakwana and Lalogi in Gulu district; Adwari, Okwang and Orum in Lira district; Minakulu, Ngai and Otwal in Oyam district; and Acholibur, Lira Palwo and Puranga in Pader district. Most of the peace building and access to justice activities are district-wide, though a deliberate effort by IPs has been made to ensure that sub-counties targeted for economic security are also targeted for the two components for proper integration of activities.

SPRING direct beneficiaries include farmer households working in farming groups, farmer groups, secondary school teachers and students, out of school youths, investors and the local business community, IPs, and USAID partners. Indirect beneficiaries include members of the general public that have benefited from communication activities as well as community members

who will use the marketing centers (stores and processing equipment) constructed by SPRING in targeted sub-counties.

1.2 SPRING Mid-Term Review

Background

The SPRING contract was signed in December 2007; implementation commenced in January 2008 with preparatory work; award of sub-grants to different implementing partners commenced in November 2008 and ended in December 2009. SPRING has reached its mid-term point and as a key requirement of the contract, a Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) has been carried out by Kenwill International Limited (KENWILL).

Evaluation Objectives

SPRING MTE objectives were fivefold, namely:

- i) To examine and identify the impacts or effects/results registered and being felt by beneficiaries (individuals and institutions);
- ii) To assess the extent to which the project is progressing towards attaining its objectives corresponding to the three components;
- iii) To assess the extent to which special considerations have been promoted by or integrated into project implementation;
- iv) To assess the quality of project design (model) and management practices;
- v) To make appropriate recommendations for improving *future* project design (model), management and realization of project anticipated impacts.

Expected Outputs

Four deliverables were expected from the evaluation as presented hereunder:

1. An inception report to be reviewed by USAID and SPRING. The report will include:
 - i) Detailed work plan with a timeline for each evaluation activity to be undertaken, including field work.
 - ii) Methodology.
 - iii) Team composition and roles.
2. MTR Report Outline
3. Oral debriefing to USAID, to present key findings, conclusions and recommendations prior to submission of draft report.
4. Draft evaluation report in both hard copies (5) and one electronic copy for review by USAID.
5. Submission of final report in both hard copies (5) and one electronic copy incorporating feedback from USAID.

Evaluation Stakeholders and Results Users

The evaluation enlisted participation from different categories of stakeholders. These included: SPRING IPs, USAID officials and partners working in northern Uganda, individual farmers, farmer groups, marketing committees, Local Government officials (Resident District Commissioners, District Planners, District and Sub-county Community Development Officers, District and Sub-county Production Coordinators, Sub-County Chiefs and LCIII Chairpersons) and SPRING Team.

The intended audiences for the SPRING MTE results are: USAID officials, SPRING Team, IPs, and Government of Uganda.

Tasks Accomplished

The consultant team carried out a comprehensive review of documents, prepared an inception report and discussed it with SPRING Team, then made adjustments to it, trained data collectors, pre-tested and improved beneficiaries' questionnaire and focus group discussion guides and collected data with the help of research assistants from the project area. The consultants also processed, cleaned and analyzed data to compile a draft SPRING MTE report which was submitted to SPRING and USAID for comments.

1.3 Evaluation Methodology

1.3.1 Evaluation Design

A mixed evaluation design was adopted, which consisted of adopting a before (baseline) and after project (mid-term) evaluation design without a control group on one hand, and one-shot evaluation design on another hand. A before-and-after evaluation design without a control group involved determining the magnitude and direction of project benefits (impacts/effects) on beneficiaries as mirrored by result indicators in SPRING Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP). One-shot evaluation was used to assess different aspects (project management, assessment of the model) of the project as at the time of the evaluation and in regard to what is expected.

1.3.2 Sampling Procedure

A multi-stage sampling procedure was adopted to select IPs, districts and sub-counties of operation and farmer groups using different methods. First step involved purposive selecting all seven IPs for reconciliation and peace building, five for economic security, and three for access to justice. This was followed by selecting three districts (Amuru, Gulu and Oyam) and four sub-counties (Atiak, Lakwana, Minakulu and Otwal) where economic security IPs implement their activities and farmer groups benefiting from SPRING activities are located. Farmer groups were selected using cluster sampling technique. All farmers in a given selected farmer group were interviewed to capture information on the three components and project communication activities.

It is important to note that besides IPs implementing economic security projects, IPs of peace and justice components were implementing district-wide activities. The Evaluation Team therefore interviewed some beneficiaries from these partners in focus group discussions held in Gulu district to gauge their level of interaction with, and benefit from, these two components.

1.3.3 Data collection Methodology

Data was collected using a combination of methods and tools. It consisted of interviewing 294 farmers benefiting from SPRING activities and 27 key informants (Local Government officials, IPs and SPRING Team), and holding 11 focus group discussions with different categories of stakeholders (4 FGDs with farmer groups, 3 FGDs with marketing committees, 2 FGDs with youths, 1 FGD for teachers, and 1 FGD for veterinarians). A comprehensive document review was also carried out prior to, during and after field work. Data was collected using structured

questionnaires, focus group discussion guides and key informant interview guides for different categories of respondents (Annex).

1.3.4 Evaluation Challenges

The evaluation team faced the following challenges:

- Most of the grants/projects under peace and justice components commenced implementation in the second half of 2009. In fact, some partners had just signed grant agreements. It was therefore challenging to evaluate progress towards results for some of these projects and more especially the entire peace and reconciliation component. The evaluation team assessed the soundness of these projects and how they are contributing, or plan to contribute, to the component goal¹. Additionally, beneficiaries of economic security were requested to give feedback on peace and justice activities as part of the integration process.
- It was challenging to link and measure contribution for some of the peace and access to justice projects to component results and indicators as such activities reflected change in project strategy which had not been reflected by the original project monitoring performance plan.
- The SPRING MTE scope of work grossly underestimated the level of effort for carrying out the entire exercise. The evaluation team spent more time on the exercise than anticipated.
- Some members of the Evaluation Team fell sick immediately after field work. This delayed the process of completing the report in time. An extension of submission date was sought and granted to enable the team complete the report.

1.5 Report Layout

The report is organized in three parts. Part one presents preliminary information for the evaluation. This is followed by part two which is the main body of the report. It has three sub-sections comprising of an introduction (brief project description, mid-term review issues, methodology and report layout), chapter two which presents MTE findings, and chapter three which presents conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations. Annexes are the third and last part of the report, which present additional supportive information for the evaluation.

¹ This was possible for projects on which sufficient information was gathered.

CHAPTER TWO: EVALUATION FINDINGS

This chapter presents evaluation findings along five key evaluation themes. These themes include i) assessment of progress towards planned results, ii) SPRING integration model, iii) mainstreaming of crosscutting issues, iv) project management practices v) and recommendations for future project designs. Key evaluation findings are presented highlighting key achievements, strengths and areas for improvement. Findings on each theme are presented hereunder.

2.1 Assessment of Progress towards Attainment of Project Results

2.1.1 *Peace Building and Reconciliation Component*

The intermediate result of the component is “*to enhance Ugandan capacity to mitigate conflict and promote peace and reconciliation increased.*” The peace and reconciliation component has seven Stability Fund projects which started during the second half of 2009. The share of peace projects in the overall SPRING Stability Fund is 34.13 percent which is equivalent to USD 1,060,052. Many of these partners had just started implementing their activities and some were preparing to start implementation.

Evaluation Focus and Approach

Due to limited implementation of peace and reconciliation projects, the evaluation team was constrained in assessing the different behavioral changes or outcomes taking place within the community as a result of these project activities. Although Stability Fund projects for peace and reconciliation were very relevant, it was challenging to directly link them to outcome and output indicators presented by the SPRING PMP. The evaluation therefore assessed the different projects supported under the component to determine their viability, logic and partners’ capacity to successfully implement the activities. Comments on a selection of peace projects that were evaluated are presented below.

Program Progress and Key Evaluation Findings

The impressive proposed plans for the Peace and Reconciliation component to create and strengthen social fabric have more than justified the investment by USAID which, if continued, will result in future resilience for the communities in northern Uganda. Specifically, the Peace and Reconciliation component has:

- Achieved structures that will significantly increase cooperation and information sharing between all three spheres of individual, household and community levels;
- Through integration with the economic security sector, SPRING has established impressive frameworks for effective community relations practice resulting in positive engagement between members of farmer groups and the various community agencies representing the needs of resettling communities;
- Through International Alert, it has created and empowered business community groups to become a “driving force” in engaging with investors and other service providers to achieve enhanced services and peace for local communities;
- Through the Peace Education program, it has contributed to the development of the national curriculum and policy development.

- Through local organizations like the Great Lakes Centre for Conflict Resolution (GLACCR), SPRING increased the capacity of IPs to be conflict sensitive in their programming.

Keys to successful Peace and Reconciliation program implementations

- The Director of Peace and Justice Programs position is vital to the strategic development and direction of the program by energizing the program, providing leadership and support to IPs and staff in implementation strategies, work planning, priority setting and evaluation of outcomes.
- Political support is vital for Peace and Reconciliation to be sustained. Most local leaders acknowledge the need for Peace programs but feel that right now the priority is economic development. In this regard there is a need to foster wider awareness at the political level of the benefits achieved to date by SPRING and of the potential economic and social contribution that the programs can deliver in the years ahead.
- There is need to ensure that the programs can attract and retain sufficient numbers of high-quality staff.

Barriers to successful Peace and Reconciliation program implementations

Despite the program's successes to date, this evaluation identified certain elements of the program that limit the potential for full impact. Programmatic limitations are related to:

- The late start for peace and justice projects meant a compromise on the implementation period for grants that really should have been longer. Ideally, peace and justice projects need to be implemented over an extended period of time, because the activities are usually working with latent conflicts that require the unpacking of root causes and addressing of behavior change at the individual and community level.
- Uncertainty in terms of targets and poor timing of some project activities. For example unpacking "P" in PRDP project is commendable but what happens to results from its research since SPRING will be ending in December 2010.
- Challenges of integration as stated under the section on integration and limited capacity of IPs.
- Peace and reconciliation are not necessarily short- term impact activities. Behavior change requires a lot of back and forth processes and initiatives and the short duration of the SPRING project limits the achievability of the outcomes.
- The short term funding of the projects may impact on the ability of IPs to attract and retain suitably qualified and experienced staff. The short term nature of funded projects does not provide adequate time for training staff, implementing and applying robust practice frameworks.
- There is an assumption that IPs are themselves well versed with issues of peace. Engagement with some of the partners showed that they do have a lot of local knowledge of the communities but this did not directly translate into peace-building skills and practice.
- There is lack of awareness by some key decision makers amongst the implementing partners of the underlying need and importance of taking an integrated approach to development. Most respondents looked at the SPRING funding as enabling them to continue with their own existing programs or "business as usual" without innovation to achieving results.

Assessment Findings on Sampled Peace Projects

The evaluation team assessed four out of seven sampled peace projects. The team was not able to access sufficient information on the remaining three IPs as most staff members for these IPs were new and did not have adequate information on all assessment issues. A brief project description and strengths and areas for improvement for assessed projects are highlighted below.

Peace Education by UMECS Phase Implementation	
Program Description and Strengths	Remarks/Recommendations
<p>The implementation of the Peace Education program is the brain child of the United Movement to End Child Soldiering (UMECS). The goal is to mainstream peace education, guidance and counseling through the national education and teacher training systems.</p> <p>At the time of the evaluation, UMECS had just completed its first induction of 88 teachers who will be involved in the pilot project in seven secondary schools in the different districts. The activities that were due were the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Developing the curriculum for the pilot secondary school programs - Rolling out the programs in term 1 and 2 - Documenting the progress - Mainstreaming into the national curriculum after ministry approval <p>The curriculum will be supported by other activities like peace clubs, drama, debates and sports.</p> <p>The program is responding to the needs of children who have grown up in conflict zones and are still affected by the impact. The entire curriculum seeks to resolve issues like trauma, drugs abuse, alcoholism, fighting and theft in schools. It goes beyond the school context to address problems of domestic violence, religious differences and relationships at home and in the community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although there is an implementation strategy, the piloting in schools was rather rushed because the training manuals were not yet ready. What is available is a curriculum framework. The modules developed by the trainers did not follow any format and need to be more developed since some look like lecture notes. There will be further need to develop a students' manual and a training of trainers' manual in addition to the facilitators' manual. • It is assumed that teachers will be able to interpret the materials and break them down to classroom modules. This may not be the case because teachers have received different initial training. The training manual will need to guide the teachers on what activities to do, such as role plays or games and debating topics. • The teachers have not yet developed work plans for their individual schools. UMECS needs to play a supervisory role to see how each pilot school will kick-start the program. • Peace clubs might require some seed funding to start, and basic equipments like drums, T-shirts, balls and others. • Each school needs to have a baseline against which it will be measured to see whether peace education has caused a change within the student/teacher/community environment. • Parents need to be involved at an early stage since they will give the ultimate testimonies on whether students have actually changed their behavior beyond the school gates into the households where they interact with siblings and community members. • Institutional measures will have to be set up for the success of the program. For example, the school will have to put official time and a budget for the school activities for both the curriculum and extra activities. The issue of teacher transfers has also to be examined to ensure continuity of the program. Head-teachers in private school must ensure that teachers in the program are on payroll.

Unpacking the 'P' in PRDP BY Pincer: Phase Planning USD 200,000 for 6 months	
Program Description and Strengths	Remarks/Recommendations
<p>The proposed program by Pincer is to conduct action research that is to cover districts in Acholi and Lango sub-regions. The organization is a think-tank and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program is relevant for the situation in the North and to inform future USAID programs. However the timing of the program to inform the

<p>consulting firm that was already running another USAID funded project. According to their Team Leader, very little attention has been given to peace per se in the PRDP and instead other sectors have taken priority. At the time of evaluation, the firm had just finished a comprehensive literature review and were due to start on the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create dialogue with peace actors in the district to learn their roles, perceptions and philosophy of change regarding peace - Dialogue with the local populations that have gone through conflict experiences in the last 21 years as well as key informants - Measure the degree of roundedness through a household survey to investigate trauma, resilience, legal and economic elements - Dialogue with national actors and validate findings through a stakeholders forum 	<p>current SPRING phase may not be appropriate since the project ends around the same time that SPRING winds up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the time of evaluation, the organization had not yet developed a work plan on how it was going to implement the project given the intensity and depth of the task at hand. The Director needs to review this before the actual implementation of the project. • There are no process indicators that will measure progress. Although this is a research, it is a long term activity and SPRING should have some checklists for measuring work in progress. • They have not seriously considered integration and the opportunity still exists to formalize it in their strategy. • In another phase, the research needs to cover Karamoja, Teso and West Nile to give a picture of district spill-over effects.
--	---

Building a Peace Economy by International Alert: Phase Implementation UGX: 500,000,000/=	
Program Description and Strengths	Remarks/Recommendations
<p>International Alert (IA) is implementing the ‘Building a Peace Economy’ project in northern Uganda. It focuses on how investors can develop conflict sensitive approaches to investing in the north. This was in response to several investors taking the districts and local communities for granted. Activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aligning economy with peace where a guide has been developed for big investors - Enabling actors to understand the context and impact of conflict like politics and land - Giving ways of minimizing adverse effects and promoting the positive effects - Involving the business community in all dialogues affecting them <p>IA has been getting a lot of demand for the guidelines and presentations from organizations like Uganda Investment Authority, Aga khan, Private Sector Foundation, and others. Districts like Kitgum have formed strong business associations as a result of this engagement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The situation is still fragile and issues like the discovery of oil in Amuru, coming elections and the recovery stage of the communities affect the micro and macro levels and the project objectives. • Business people confuse peace building with reconciliation of returnees and ex-combatants. • To have greater impact, IA might have to partner with other organizations like banks and manufacturers to give the business communities a holistic package. The reality is that peace is the ‘software’ that may need to be backed by ‘hardware’ to ensure that businesses are getting a good deal. It is also an opportunity for the economic component of SPRING to see how to integrate the two components for full impact, e.g. by offering marketing skills. • It is recommended that the project be given an extension since the activities are processes and need follow-up to assess behavior change and to draw lessons learnt.

Conflict Sensitivity Mainstreaming Training by GLACCR : Phase Implementation - USD 100,000	
Program Description and Strengths	Remarks/Recommendations
<p>The Great Lakes Center for Conflict Resolution (GLACCR) is a local NGO that was tasked with undertaking conflict sensitivity mainstreaming training for all SPRING implementing partners as well as other USAID agencies.</p> <p>The major activity that they have undertaken is training of 22 SPRING partners. What they have done is to take the trainings to the districts since partners work with their local leaders during implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intervention was timely to ensure that SPRING does not intentionally or otherwise create more conflict in the different areas that it is going to operate in. Most of the participants were hearing about the topic for the first time and were more accustomed to conflict management rather than sensitivity. • When awarding the contract, it was as if all IPs would have a similar start date. The reality is that some projects are starting; others are in implementation, while others like Mercy Corps are

<p>The materials that they use were developed with input from International Alert who were amongst the pioneer organizations to implement conflict sensitivity mainstreaming training globally.</p> <p>Activities are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 day trainings on mainstreaming conflict sensitivity into planning and implementation - Developing checklists and visiting partners to measure them against the checklists - Plan another training of M&E - Will hold a 1 day follow-up meeting at the end of the project 	<p>winding up. That means that the training on planning and implementation are not always relevant at the time. Others may need only one component while others might require training on transition and sustainability. GLACCR will need to customize this so that it is not ‘a one size fits all’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We recommend that this becomes an ongoing program to encompass all the partners at their different stages of project cycle. More resources need to go into conflict assessment and supervisory visits by GLACCR to ensure that the training has been translated into change. • More district staff should be involved in the trainings.
--	---

2.1.2 Economic Security and Social Inclusion

Economic Security and Social Inclusion is the second component of SPRING project. The component goal is “*Economic security and social inclusion enhanced among vulnerable and conflict affected populations.*” By the end of January 2010, SPRING had contracted 17 Implementing Partners with grants totaling USD 1,768,113 to implement projects and activities directly contributing to the attainment of component goal and its specific outcomes. The funds allocated to economic security projects were 56.94 percent of the SPRING Stability Fund.

Farmer groups with an average membership of 30 are being supported by a majority of SPRING Implementing Partners.

A set of activities have been implemented to enable realization of the component goal and outcomes.

- Provision of agricultural production trainings to farmer groups.
- Provision of farming inputs to farmer groups under loan arrangements. The inputs include improved seeds of rice, beans, chilli, ground nuts, maize and sim sim.
- Provision and installation of agro-processing inputs; particularly groundnuts shellers, maize-mills, rice hullers and oil pressers.
- Erecting of 30 warehouses and four machine houses for farmer groups.
- Promoting collective marketing through groups
- Promoting village savings and loan associations among farmer groups.
- Increasing access to and consequent utilization of veterinary services, specifically in Amuru and Gulu districts.
- Vocational training for youth and support to micro-enterprises.

Component Progress Towards Outcomes

Outcome 1: Increased access to and adoption of socio-economic opportunities in conflict affected areas.

Skills Trainings and Follow-up Support

Survey findings show that the 294 farmers sampled by the survey had attended different SPRING supported trainings aimed at improving production and productivity at individual

farmer and group levels. Respondents had undergone crop agronomy trainings [88%], crop storage/post-harvest handling (14.6%), business skills (14.3%), produce marketing (13.3%), group dynamics (8.8%), and produce processing (3.7%). A key observation on the approach to capacity building of farmers was that each IP used her own approach. For the majority of skills training there was no standardized approach or set minimum standards to guide capacity building of farmers through use of agreed training materials such as manuals. SPRING's partner AVSI, however, was implementing a standardized Business Skills Training and Group Dynamics curriculum for its six implementing partners..

Ninety one percent of the survey respondents mentioned receiving agricultural related follow-up services. About 84 percent of this group said they were satisfied with the quality of the follow-up visits. The reasons for satisfaction were cited to be the following: i) guidance on prevailing crop production problems, ii) encouragement to scale up production and join collective marketing , iii) reminding them of what they had forgotten and iv) provision of market information.

Benefits of Trainings

The trainings conducted by SPRING IPs had helped farmers in different ways. Farmers confessed to registering increase in crop yields (66.3%), having crops of good quality and growing well (52.4%), increase in income (20.1%), able to identify crops which grow well (13.9%) and building peace within groups and community (6.1%).

Provision of improved seeds

Inputs provided by SPRING Implementing Partners to farmer groups included improved seeds of maize (51.4%), groundnuts (47.6%), sim sim (38.1%), rice (29.3%), and others seeds – beans and sunflower (8.5%). The seeds were distributed in accordance with criteria (on amount to be received and how to pay back to the group) set by IPs. For example, NECPA distributed *chilli* seeds as grants, while KSWVO and ADFA distributed the seeds as farmer group seed loans. The recovery methodology of seeds from the individual farmers to the groups was twofold; some farmer groups required in kind recovery, while others came through cash worth [UGX 100,000]. Only 10 percent of 163 farmers that submitted information on repayment of seed loans in Atiak and Minakulu confessed to have repaid their loans. The key gaps observed in the process of distributing and recovering seeds from farmers included:

- Poor quality of unshelled groundnuts [some rotten] and under-allocation of the claimed weight per beneficiary farmer. This was mentioned by farmer groups in Atiak Sub-county, Amuru district, who were expecting shelled groundnuts and instead received unshelled groundnuts which reduced the total amount of seed received.
- Other reasons for non-repayment of seed loans included: no crop harvest (16%), poor harvest (23%), group leadership not collecting the seed loan re-payment (14%), and not being aware of paying back the seeds (4%).

Value addition through provision of agro-processing equipment

SPRING supported farmers to adopt practices which enabled them to add value to their produce and earn better farm incomes. These included providing and installing agro-processing machines for groups and encouraging farmers to adopt good post-harvest management practices.

Although the installing of agro-processing machines was not complete at the time of the evaluation, farmers were requested to indicate to the evaluation team different practices they had adopted to earn a better price from their produce. Different practices adopted included: storing produce in a cool dry place reported by 59 percent, drying seeds reported by 58 percent, sorting good from bad seeds reported by 36 percent, packing in gunny bags (sacks) reported by 35 percent and cleaning the store where the harvest is kept reported by 9 percent of sampled respondents. Besides these practices, value addition in terms of producing new products was not taking place due to delayed installation of equipment.

Promotion of the collective marketing and management of warehouses

In a bid to promote collective marketing by farmers, SPRING supported construction of warehouses and formation of marketing committees. Group members contributed local materials (bricks and sand) for the warehouses, and in some cases a member of the group donated land on which the warehouse was constructed. This process promoted shared ownership and sustainable use of warehouses.

Warehouses are to serve as stores and bulking centers managed by marketing committees. Each warehouse is managed by a collective marketing committee (CMC) constituted by representatives from farmer groups that own and are to use the store. Marketing committees were at different levels of development and execution of their roles. NECPA had a better equipped and experienced marketing committee compared to ADFA and KSWVO committees. A literature review also shows that IRC supported groups had strong and well-organized marketing committees functioning in accordance with defined guidelines.

The evaluation therefore sought to ascertain whether collective marketing was happening as a key step of addressing value chain constraints among supported farmers. Issues explored during the evaluation included marketing arrangements, support from marketing committees and the source of information on markets. Evaluation findings are hereunder:

- The main arrangement for marketing crops being through marketing committees was reported by 39 percent, followed by individual arrangements reported by 34 percent, groups reported by 27 percent and IPs reported by nine percent of sampled respondents.
- The main role of marketing committees in marketing crops was looking for good markets reported by 45 percent of sampled farmers. Other roles included bargaining for suitable market (26.9%) and controlling quality and transporting crops (3%). This information is complemented well by testimonies from the farmers presented in Text Box 1.
- Radio stations were the main source of information on markets, reported by 64 percent of the sample. This was followed by SPRING IPs (46%), friends (37%), marketing

Text Box 1: Effect of Stores on Marketing of Produce

“I have also started having hope of selling some of my produce since now there is a store in which I can keep part of my harvest that is for sale. I used to keep at home before but would get tempted to eat all the harvest”.

“As committee members, we have been able to interest produce buyers in purchasing our produce. We do not have to worry about how to transport our produce to town anymore. We just call the buyers and they tell us to raise a quantity they want so that they come and buy at once. We don't have to think of transport”. – FGD Notes for Marketing Committee Representatives at Pupwonya Village, Atiak Sub-county, Amuru District

committees (35%), weekly markets (28%) and other sources like newspapers and cooperative societies (11%).

The concept of collective marketing is systematically being embraced by farmers as evidenced by the role played by marketing committees in marketing produce and providing information to members. The level of orientation (training on roles) of marketing committees and IP support are critical for marketing committees to effectively play their roles. NECPA had worked with her groups over the time and the marketing committee formed has quickly taken-up the challenge by practicing bulking and collective marketing.

Promoting farmer groups village savings and loans associations

SPRING is promoting group savings and loans as a mechanism for sustainably addressing financial needs of farmers. Evaluation findings show that 70 percent of the 281 individual farmer survey respondents mentioned participating in VSLAs through either borrowing or saving or both with an average saving of UGX 136,989 at the time of the survey. Savings have been instrumental in helping farmers pay their children's fees (51%), meeting urgent family needs (33%), medical care (17%), purchasing animals (13%) and other needs (household basic necessities, business start-up capital, expanding farming activities) reported by 18 percent of sampled respondents.

Furthermore, 47 percent of the survey respondents mentioned having borrowed from VSLAs with average loan amount received being UGX 57,290. Among those who had submitted information on loan amounts (86 persons), 50 percent used the funds to pay children's fees, 48 percent opened up new businesses, 32 percent bought assorted assets, while 16 percent used the borrowed funds on funeral services, garden preparation and medical bills.

Vocational Training Support to Vulnerable Youths

SPRING's youth and education partner, AVSI, worked with ACADOS implementing partner to support vulnerable youth to complete vocational skills training. Youth in Lalogi Sub-county whose formal vocational skills training had been halted by lack of fees for over one year were supported by ACADOS implementing partner to complete their education. All the youth interviewed within the focus group said that they were presently engaged in productive work in relation to their acquisition of the vocational skills. At the time of the study they had completed the training and were awaiting their certificates' release. Through a focus group discussion with youth supported to complete vocational skills training, one participant testified that,

“ACADOS has helped me as well as my family members. By paying my fees my parents were relieved of the financial burden and released to meaningfully meet my siblings' educational needs. Presently, I am earning some money of which I partly use to financially support my immediate family members”. FGD Notes for ACADOS Vocational Training Beneficiaries.

Support for micro-enterprise development.

SPRING through ACADOS identified and supported 35 vulnerable community members who were already running small scale business such as restaurants (food joints) in the trading centers, kiosks, and crop produce business. The identification of the 35 persons was done by ACADOS

in liaison with the local leaders. The selection criteria entailed among others having a running business and being a person who was once abducted. The support was a loan worth UGX 250,000 per person and was received in August 2009 with a recovery schedule of October 2009 to March 2010. Through a focus group discussion, it was revealed that the loan beneficiaries have honored their schedule of loan recovery with the exception of one person who defaulted on one installment. The various benefits realized were mentioned to be business expansion, ability to afford three meals per day for family members, increased unity and harmony in the family, ability to afford medical treatment for children, paying rent, purchase of household items out of realized business profits.

It was noted that the beneficiaries operate independently with no need for a forum to draw them together. This is because they operate different businesses and are a far distance apart in their operations. The beneficiaries expressed need for more loan allocation.

Promotion of Access to Veterinary Services

SPRING through UVA implementing partner has and continues to promote Livestock Health Services in Gulu and Amuru districts. UVA supported Private Veterinary Practitioners through concurrent provision of grants and loans to build on the past Veterinary Civic Action Program [VETCAP] implemented by the US military civil affairs team. Through the grants and loans support to veterinary practitioners, more farmers especially in the rural areas are being reached with animal health services for a fee. This effort continues to contribute to healthier and productive livestock that increase economic security for livestock farmers. Through focus group discussions with the supported veterinarians, it was pointed out that veterinary services have been taken closer to the rural farmers through opening up of more veterinary shops, increased capacity of veterinarians to offer technical field follow-up visits. Some of the supported veterinary practitioners bought motorcycles to enable them access farmers and their animals.

The challenges cited by the veterinary practitioners include the low farmers' capacity to afford the animal health services and the wrong attitude of expecting free services. It was also mentioned that the feasible timeline to realize enhanced animal productivity is two years, and the SPRING project life span was cited to be extremely too short [six months]. Preferred project duration was highlighted to be cognizant of how long the animal requires to reach maturity and the aspect of the gestation period.

The sustainability efforts explored by UVA were pointed out to be the business skills trainings, revolving loans and the farmers' growing uptake of private veterinary services.

Progress towards Component Targets

The information presented above attests to the fact that SPRING had made critical inputs for enhancing agricultural productivity and farm incomes of supported individuals. A review of SPRING monitoring data for the last two harvest seasons shows that productivity across SPRING supported crops has increased by 69 percent against a target of 40 percent over the baseline of 254 kilograms per acre². It is worth noting that maize and groundnuts registered 197 and 59 percentage increase in their productivity respectively. These changes are against the

² Calculations are based on the average productivity for the two seasons and the baseline survey figures as presented by SPRING results monitoring sheet in Annex 3.

baseline of 256 kilograms for maize and 202 kilograms for groundnuts respectively. The average farm income (crop sales) has doubled (changed by 98.7%) against the project target of 25 percent over the baseline of UGX 189, 53 (Refer to Annex 3 for detailed information).

Integration of Economic Security Projects with other Components

Economic security projects were integrated with peace and justice components. At design level, NECPA and KSWVO were well integrated compared to other projects. Other projects have been integrated by ensuring that supported farmers benefit from activities of peace and justice components (partners).

Additional Challenges in implementing the component

- Lack of minimum standards for construction of warehouses is a challenge. The warehouses differ in quality and finishing. For example, some warehouses/stores had transparent iron sheets to aid lighting (good practice), while others did not have such provisions. In addition, others had large ventilation while others had very small ventilation which impact on the aeration process within warehouses. In other instances, processing equipment were installed and left very small space for sorting, cleaning and storage. One would wonder where farmers will store their produce and how quality will be maintained.
- There is no intentional cross-learning across implementing partners. Whereas SPRING held several coordination meetings with IPs, most of these meetings were mainly addressing performance and compliance issues as opposed to learning and improving practices.
- There were no generic guidelines by SPRING to guide minimum performance of project deliverables.
- Timeline accorded to achieve project outcomes was unrealistic. The underlying processes of drawing farmers together, supporting them to work together towards progress and having to manage farmers' stay together amidst success necessitate at least to operate for six seasons [three years].
- With exception of NECPA, sampled economic security partners could not point to the value added to their intervention by integration approach.
- The prolonged dry spell in northern Uganda greatly affected SPRING supported activities. Some farmers registered zero harvests during the first planting season of 2009.

2.1.3 Access to Justice

The access to justice component envisages improved access to justice for vulnerable and conflict-affected populations as its contribution to stability and reconciliation in northern Uganda. The intended outcomes of this component include: (i) access to legal aid and dispute resolution by vulnerable and conflict-affected populations increased; and, (ii) awareness on human rights and land/property rights increased. This component was assessed to determine the progress towards component goal and expected outcomes. It should be noted that the strategy for attainment of above objectives has undergone two significant changes from 2007 till April 2009. These changes include:

- Change from focusing on training formal justice stakeholders to strengthening informal justice system and supporting farmer groups through land tenure security.
- Working through IPs as opposed to SPRING direct implementing activities.

SPRING is supporting three short-term grants as a strategy for realizing component objectives. These include “*Empowering Farmers through Land Tenure Security*” being implemented by Centre for Reparations and Rehabilitation, “*Culture as a Tool for Development*” implemented by Ker Kwaro Acholi [KKA] and “*Key Stakeholder Collaboration on Land*” by Acholi Religious Leaders Peace Initiative [ARLPI]. All these grants started being operational during the second half of 2009 and in January 2010. Therefore, progress towards implementation of granted projects and component objective is limited.

Progress towards Results

a. Access to legal aid and dispute resolution by vulnerable and conflict-affected populations increased.

SPRING in partnership with CRR has put in place mobile legal aid clinics to various sub-counties where other SPRING IPs are implementing their activities with farmer groups. CRR provides legal advice to farmers with disputes that require legal intervention. If it is a land related dispute, CRR evaluates it and determines whether there is need for mediation. Cases where mediation is an option for dispute resolution are registered and scheduled for mediation. In instances where the beneficiaries have a dispute that is outside the mandate of CRR, a referral mechanism has been provided and the client is referred to a relevant institution.

By the time of the evaluation, CRR had carried out eight mobile legal aid clinics, referred 58 cases and successfully mediated three [3] land disputes. Results from the survey conducted among SPRING supported farmers revealed that 24 percent of them had sought redress; and 10 percent have had the problem resolved, while 4.4 % of the respondents had the problem re-occur.

A review of the process for providing and accessing legal aid services revealed the following challenges:

- The involvement of SPRING in mobilization of clients through other IPs delays outreach and affects outreach effectiveness.
- There is no mechanism for follow-up of referred clients to ascertain whether or not they have obtained redress.
- The distance between the villages, parishes and sub-county (point of meeting) is long and makes access to the service difficult and yet a third (32.7%) of sampled farmers confessed to having land disputes. The nature of disputes included encroachment [18.7%], boundary disputes [12.9%] and retracted land gifts [4.8%].
- Farmers are not aware of other services provided by CRR besides assistance offered in signing of Land Agreements for the farmer group.
- There is no flexibility in project outreach strategy. Legal aid and advice is limited to only SPRING farmer groups and yet other community members are in need of the service.
- The outreach to farmers is limited. Survey results show that there are more land disputes which are not proportionate to the intervention carried out and the number of mediations and referrals made by CRR.

b. Awareness of human rights and land/property rights increased

SPRING had carried out awareness activities through its communication activities and CRR. SPRING radio programs have disseminated information on human/property rights and avenues

for dispute resolution while CRR had held focus group discussions with two representatives from each farmer group.

Awareness on Rights

At the time of the MTE, it was found that the majority of respondents knew where to access justice and the main institutions that provide the service. They also knew where to go for redress when they had a dispute. However, there are institutional challenges that prohibit them from accessing justice in certain instances. These include but are not limited to corrupt tendencies within the judicial system. The richer litigants are said to influence the system to their advantage and to the disadvantage of the poor litigants, thus denying them justice.

The information from evaluation of communication activities revealed that SPRING radio messages pertaining to human rights issues are insignificant. Only 2 percent confessed to having heard about human rights issues from “*dongo paco karacel*”.

Property Rights

Through CRR, SPRING has supported farmers in obtaining security of tenure for the land where group warehouses are situated through signing of land agreements. The process begins with identification of the land by the community, consultations are then carried out by CRR with the various stake holders and the agreed terms and conditions are reduced into writing and signed by all relevant actors – namely, the SPRING Economic Security Implementing Partners, farmer group representatives, local leaders [LC I, II and III], pre-determined land owners, neighbors to the land being donated, elders and family members in the presence of the community members. By the time of the evaluation, seventeen [17] land agreements had been signed.

Survey results from farmers showed all sampled farmers (99.6%) were confident that their rights as a group to the acquired land and warehouses were free from any outside interference and as such they have not since the signing of the agreements had any dispute. This was further confirmed by the farmers in the different focus group discussions that were carried out.

Gap

There is a mismatch between project input and existing problems pertaining to land issues. Training only two group representative per farmer group does not guarantee trickle down of acquired knowledge on human rights and land issues to other farmers and households.

Observations on Access to Justice Component

The synergy among different access to justice IPs is not evident. Each IP is not aware of what other IPs are doing, and are therefore working in isolation. This deprives them of peer learning as it does not promote cooperation and can easily lead to conflict.

The current project component strategy heavily focuses on strengthening the informal justice system with limited focus on strengthening the formal justice system. This is partly responsible for invisible or lack of apparent linkage between the two systems.

The Access to Justice component is very limited in scope compared to other economic security and peace components. This is evidenced by limiting legal aid to only land related issues, least number of IPs and small share of micro-stability grants allocated to access to justice issues (8.9%).

It is the evaluation team's opinion that the scope of project on empowering farmers through land tenure security is too narrow to warrant full project funding or the relatively high number of staff currently working on the project. It is an activity that can be carried out by few staff or as a process based consultancy.

2.1.4 Progress towards Attainment of SPRING Aim/Purpose

The overall goal of SPRING is to mitigate causes and consequences of conflict in order to promote stability, peace, and reconciliation. The PMP defines different result areas and corresponding indicators for tracking progress towards attainment of SPRING's overall goal. The individual farmer survey sought to ascertain progress towards the overall goal and findings are presented hereunder.

Most of the farmers have been affected by conflict. Interestingly, only 6 percent have experienced inter-group conflict although these groups have been a solace to 36 percent of them in helping them to socialize after war and help them forget the deaths of their loved ones. Half of the respondents no longer have an issue with returnees and relate to them freely although 8 percent are still experiencing negative issues with them and believe that their families should be held responsible for their actions.

As one of the positive trends, tribalism is no longer a big problem and almost 80 percent of the respondents knew of an inter-marriage between Langi and Acholi. They also said they would elect a community leader of another tribe. Still most of them felt that their property was safe and that they could travel safely and freely discuss issues pertaining to conflict in northern Uganda. However a third of them still felt that they and their daughters will be victims of gender based violence.

At least half of the respondents had participated in peace events in the last year, and most popular were dance and drama events.

The above findings indicate the SPRING project aim is likely to be achieved. The population is already showing a sense of positive attitude even before they go through peace building training. A few patches of angry and traumatized people will need to be reached out to in order to address their resentment.

- The indicator of improved positive relations targets 96 percent by March 2010 and this survey indicates that 80 percent of respondents feel so.
- The PMP target for increased positive relations between communities in the north is 91 percent and the evaluation reports 88 percent. The difference is not statistically significant, implying that this target is already attained.
- The indicator of personal security has already exceeded its target by 4 percent.

- The number of people trained in conflict mitigation or resolution skills with USG assistance was 715 compared to the project target of 2,245. Most of the farmers and district persons interviewed wished for such training but had never received it.
- By the time of the evaluation 3000 people had been reached through completed SPRING supported community based reconciliation activities, compared to the overall target of 7,015.

2.2 Integration of Cross-cutting Issues

2.2.1 Children and Youths

Impact of spring on the children of beneficiaries

In order to identify how SPRING is contributing to improving welfare of children, a special impact study was commissioned and completed in September 2009. The study shows that SPRING is significantly contributing to child development and welfare within the community. A full assessment report can be availed by SPRING. The findings of this report are validated by MTE findings which show that SPRING farmers are able to respect their children's rights such as access to food and better nutrition and education, health and other development needs. In general, MTE findings indicated the following:

- Parents have been able to take their children to school by using proceeds from enterprises supported by SPRING as well as meet medical expenses for their children. Evidence from SPRING monitoring information shows that 83 percent of supported farmer households have their children going to schools, 83 percent are able to meet medical expenses for their children and 84 percent of school going-age children (7-18) are enrolled in schools.
- SPRING is supporting Concerned Parents Association (CPA) to implement a project which promotes child care cooperatives. This project will strengthen child protection within the community as farmers embark on economic recovery activities.
- Vulnerable youths have been supported through different projects under AVSI sub-grant to acquire vocational and business skills. These skills have enabled them to start income generating activities and manage their businesses.
- Supported farmers have been able to provide food for their family members, including children through consuming part of the harvests or using farm income to purchase food items.
- The unity and cooperation created in working in groups is invaluable to children as it promotes safety, security, and general wellbeing within their environments. Children are learning how to relate to others through the modeling of their social environments, so their chances of developing positive interaction skills are greatly enhanced.
- Youths (18-25 years) constitute 19 percent of members of SPRING supported farmer groups.

2.2.2 Re-integration of Ex-combatants

It is estimated that over 830 ex-combatants of LRA have benefited from different projects supported by SPRING. This translates to about 10 percent of SPRING economic security farmer groups. SPRING has adopted an inclusive approach to working with ex-combatants without exclusively targeting them.

2.2.3 Environment

USAID contract with EMG requires the latter to ensure that project activities are compliant with the former's policies and guidelines pertaining to sustainable use of the environment. SPRING

was covered under umbrella Initial Environmental Examination (IEE) which did not necessitate carrying out an environmental impact assessment. However, SPRING was required to carry out assessment of projects and their activities to determine compliance and file periodic reports to USAID. The evaluation team was informed by the SPRING Team that very few SPRING activities promoted the use of fertilizers or pesticides, however, with those that did, SPRING received prior procurement approval from the USAID contracting officer. It was observed that periodic reports were not filed by EMG.

2.2.4 Land

SPRING is funding a project for enhancing land tenure security which has enabled farmers to sign land agreements with owners where SPRING warehouses have been constructed. The project also provides legal advice and mediation services to the community on issues pertaining to land. These activities have led to increased level of awareness on land rights (95% of farmers are aware of their land rights³). In addition, about 22 farmers supported by NECPA in Minakulu, Ngai and Otwal have registered their land with sub-county authorities as a result of information and advice received from CRR meetings with them. Some seven farmers have used certificates of customary ownership received from the sub-county to access loans from PostBank Uganda Limited.

2.2.5 Geographic and Ethnic Divisions

SPRING conducted a geographical assessment to identify areas which needed intervention and key programming issues for consideration by SPRING. The geographical assessment helped SPRING to select fifteen sub-counties where economic security activities are being implemented. SPRING also targeted sub-counties on the border between Acholi and Lango regions as a mechanism for addressing ethnic tensions between the two communities resulting from atrocities committed by LRA against the latter.

2.2.6 Linking Grass Roots to National Processes

The Peace, Recovery and Development Plan for Northern Uganda (PRDP) is a comprehensive framework designed by the Government of Uganda with support from the international community for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the northern Uganda following two decades of civil war and unrest. SPRING is one of the mechanisms through which USG contributes to PRDP. As part of implementation mechanism, SPRING has entered into Memorandum of Understanding with the 6 [Six] different districts namely Kitgum, Gulu, Oyam, Lira, Amuru, Pader. It is important to note that SPRING is not allowed to provide direct funding to the District Local Governments (DLGs) by USAID policies. Detailed evaluation findings on SPRING's contribution to PRDP are presented in Annex 4. In summary SPRING is contributing to consolidation of state authority through its land tenure security project, creation of mechanism for land conflict resolution and legal referrals. The economic security component is contributing to empowerment of conflict affected households through improving farm productivity and use of land. This component is also contributing to revitalization of the economy through promoting adoption of commercial farming. SPRING has supported different peace and reconciliation activities such as projects and information dissemination.

³ SPRING indicator variance analysis (Feb 26, 2010)

The above information illustrates existence of a clear strong link between SPRING and PRDP. However, interactions with local government officials revealed that higher local governments (District Local Governments-DLGs) officials were not aware of SPRING contribution to PRDP and their development plans, especially in Oyam district. This anomaly is attributed to lack of regular communication between SPRING head office/IPs and district authorities as opposed to sub-county authorities.

2.2.7 Project Communication Activities

Communication is a cross-cutting theme within SPRING and is considered a critical component in promoting stability and peace within northern Uganda. In the SPRING project, communication is included in the three components of peace and reconciliation, economic security and social inclusion as well as access to justice. It plays multiple roles in the transition process – it allays fears, increases self-efficacy and conveys facts⁴. Straight Talk Foundation (a consortium member) is mandated with responsibility of managing project communication activities. Using both print and electronic media, STF disseminates information on peace, access to justice and economic security through regular print (SPRING Newspaper) and radio programming to the community. SPRING hosts two radio programs (*Dongo Paco Karacel* in Acholi region and *Peace Maker* in Lango region) and produces a farmers’ newspaper in the local language (Luo) as part of the communication strategy.

The evaluation therefore sought to establish which radio stations and programs SPRING farmers tune in to, how different programs have helped them, and most importantly whether farmers have ever listened to SPRING radio program (*Dongo Paco Karacel*) and how it has impacted on their lives. Detailed information on all these issues is presented Annex 5, while key findings are presented hereunder.

Radio Listenership, Programs and Messages Received

SPRING MTR findings show that Mega FM is the station with the largest listenership as reported by 63 percent of sampled farmers, followed by Unity FM at 26 percent and Radio Was at 12 percent. The rest of the radio stations mentioned were listened to by less than 10 percent each.

In terms of programs listened to by sampled farmers in the three sampled sub-counties, “farmers’ world” program (*Lobo pa lupur*) on Mega FM was the most listened to program reported by 40 percent, followed by program for farmers reported by 27 percent, SPRING supported *Dongo Paco Karacel* at 12 percent and SPRING supported ‘Peace Maker’ at nine percent. Other programs were mentioned by less than nine percent each.

The top three messages received by farmers from mentioned radio programs were good farming methods reported by 22 percent, marketing of agricultural produce reported by 10 percent, health issues reported by eight percent and *Dongo Paco Karacel* reported by four percent of sampled farmers. Other messages were reported by less than five percent of sampled farmers.

In terms of ranking of what radio program was considered most helpful, sampled farmers reported “farmers’ world” as the most helpful program (36.4%), followed by peace and

⁴ SPRING (Feb-March 08), Communication Assessment Report

reconciliation (8.8%), VSLA (3.1%) and children's program (1.4%). The five top most reasons why such programs were considered most helpful were: teaching good farming methods (31%), giving guidance on where to market produce (16.3%) and where to get seeds (9.5%), creating unity (7.5%) and promoting peace and harmony (7.1%).

Listening to SPRING Radio Messages and its Contribution to Farmers

Sampled farmers were specially asked whether they had listened to SPRING program (*Dongo Paco Karacel*) and 29 percent of all sampled farmers had listened to this SPRING program. Good agriculture (farming), and reconciliation and peace, were reported to be the most helpful aspects of the program reported by 16 and seven percent of sampled farmers respectively.

Discussion

The findings presented above on SPRING communication activities indicate that the choice of radios for hosting SPRING programs was well-informed. Findings also show that farmers listened more to economic recovery related radio programs compared to other categories of radio programs. Farmers also attach lots of importance to radio programs promoting economic security compared to peace and reconciliation. Economic security benefits of radio programs are highly rated among SPRING farmers. This is an indicator that households are in the phase of economic recovery.

2.2.7 Anti-Corruption

The evaluation sought to ascertain whether EMG had developed and implemented the required anti-corruption procedures for the program. EMG had adopted the following measures in this regard:

- Committees are used to procure goods and services for the project and her partners as well as selecting and recommending IPs to be awarded grants.
- Carrying out pre-award assessments to ascertain levels of professionalism within potential partners in accordance with USAID funding policies.
- Building capacity of partners to manage SPRING granted resources.
- Carrying out routine monitoring and expenditure verification visits on partners.
- Commissioning external annual and special audits for project financial activities. In 2009 EMG/SPRING commissioned Earnest and Young to carry out a special per diem verification exercise for all staff after getting tips that staff had over-claimed per diem expenses than actual expenses. All inflated expenses are being recovered from implicated staff. The management has prequalified and negotiated special rates with service providers for hotel services as a key implementation from the audit and in order to avert misuse of project resources.

It is important to note that special audits could be extended to expenditure aspects such as construction of warehouses, procurement of input for IPs and general services to ascertain the level of prudence exhibited in use of project resources.

2.2.8 Mainstreaming of Gender

Our discussions with the SPRING Team revealed that there were no special considerations given to promoting gender equity issues in project implementation. However, a review of beneficiary data (Annex 6) shows that 57 percent of 8,275 beneficiaries were women. Female headed

households constituted 13 percent of all beneficiaries. FGDs with farmers indicated benefits from SPRING supported activities such as paying school fees for children, access to food for household members and acquisition of social assets have acted as a uniting factor for male and female members of beneficiary households. The information received on peace building and reconciliation has helped beneficiary households to adopt dialoguing approach to solving family conflicts between wives and husbands. This approach has minimized domestic violence within supported households.

2.3 SPRING Integration Model

A key evaluation issue was to ascertain the extent to which three project components were being integrated in practice, impact of integration, limitations of integration and existing opportunities for integration. The SPRING Project integration can be defined as the purposeful harmonization and management of the functions, resources, systems and processes of the three components of economic security, peace and access to justice. This is done to attain stability and reconciliation in northern Uganda. Below are findings on different issues pertaining to SPRING's programming approach of integrating the three components.

Integration Approach

The integration process entailed the following:

- SPRING has supported organizations through its SPRING Stability Fund and AVSI sub-grants to implement activities under the three components. A total of 28 grants have been awarded to IPs to undertake different projects. These included 18 economic security, seven peace and reconciliation and three access to justice grants. The total grant amount was USD 3,105,471, with 56.94 percent allocated to economic security, 34.13 percent allocated to peace and reconciliation and 8.93 percent allocated to access to justice components.
- Building an integrated team of professionals comprising of component heads and program managers for each IP. These included Director for Peace and Justice Components and economic security advisor. The Deputy Chief of Party provided oversight on economic security component and AVSI has a special grant for supporting vulnerable youths. Additionally, Straight Talk Foundation provided leadership for SPRING communication activities.
- Integration was also reflected in joint projects' appraisal, activity reviews and planning by SPRING staff.
- SPRING had supported some projects which were focusing on activities belonging to more than one component. IPs with activities integrated at either design, implementation level or both included KSWVO, Mercy Corps, CPA, A4A, NECPA, GLACCR, CRR, KKA, IA, WACFO, and CPA groups. It is important to note that NECPA had a unique opportunity of directly interacting with the three components within the arrangement of their project original design.
- Through SPRING, IPs were addressing multiple needs of farmer groups. For example, farmers benefiting from economic security grants have benefited from a project on

“*Empowering Farmers through Land Tenure Security*” implemented by CRR (access to justice IP).

- At beneficiary level, farmer groups are used as focal points for integrating all activities.

Benefits of Integration

The process of integrating the three components was not strong at the beginning of the project and during the first batch of grants. Different component heads seemed to have implemented their activities independent of each other. This limited the extent to which the model could register benefits. However, at the time of the evaluation, there were concerted efforts to have integration taking place as reflected by different projects placing greater emphasis on integration. The benefits accruing from the integration approach were:

- Enhanced ownership and security of warehouses constructed by SPRING. This has assured farmers’ ownership and use of warehouses to further their economic empowerment aspirations without fear of losing warehouses to unscrupulous members.
- SPRING peace building activities (including radio programs) have contributed to improving relationships within groups, households and communities. This has contributed to increased program impact as evidenced by stability and cooperation testimonies by supported groups.
- Enabled IPs to carry out economic security activities without interruptions resulting from group and community conflicts.
- Synergy and improved use of resources and efficiency of operations.
- Promoted a holistic image of SPRING.
- IP Staff capacity developed to be conflict sensitive in their performance and interaction with communities.
- Some farmers supported by NECPA have acquired loans from banks to further their economic activities using land certificates. The certificates were acquired after receiving information and advice on registering land under customary ownership.

Drivers for and Limiting Factors to Integration

Driving Factors	Limiting Factors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desire for improved program quality ▪ Joint planning and reviews ▪ Competent staff in key positions ▪ Capacity building for IPs ▪ Leveraging of resources ▪ Efficiency of operations ▪ Feedback from external sources ▪ Synergy ▪ Availability of funding ▪ Community needs which are integrated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of a clear integration strategy at the beginning of the project • Lack of synergy by component heads to integrate activities at the beginning of the project • Inadequate leadership in facilitating integration of the three components. • Tensions in management • Lack of shared understanding of the integration and its process within SPRING Team and IPs • Unbalanced implementation of project components

2.4 Assessment of quality of project management practices

2.4.1 Effectiveness of Project Management Structures

The MTE assessed whether SPRING management had developed project capacity to adapt and respond quickly to changes on the ground and how effective SPRING’s internal management structures were in delivering effective project activities and meeting project objectives. The

SPRING management has developed good capacity to respond to changes on the ground as evidenced by the following management strategies and practices:

- Short term projects or quick impact approach has been adopted as a main strategy for implementing activities and realizing project objectives. The quick impact projects consist of short-term and innovative projects implemented by SPRING IPs.. Partners are awarded grants through a competitive application process. By the time of MTE, 28 projects were being or had been supported by SPRING.
- There was ample commitment within the SPRING Team to deliver on project targets and requests from USAID. SPRING management had provided room for result-based teamwork (delivering on specific targets and outputs). All three components of the project were fully under implementation as evidenced by the completed grant award process. The management was focusing its efforts on managing the grants and implementation process as they prepare for end of project evaluation and exit from the community.
- SPRING management has continuously built capacity of IPs to improve project designs, effectively implement project activities and adhere to USAID funding guidelines. This was being done through formal trainings, follow-up and supervisory support and taking lead on certain aspects such as store construction and procurement of inputs. The capacity building, though not originally planned, was necessary after the pre-award assessments of local organizations revealed serious human resource, technical and systemic gaps which would have affected grant administration on the part of SPRING.
- There was proper management of project monitoring and evaluation functions as evidenced by coordinated and regular monitoring of progress towards anticipated results. The M&E specialist was effectively carrying out M&E function through re-designing of M&E tools, supervising data collection, controlling data quality through spontaneous data verifications with different sources, processing and helping the technical heads to report on progress against their component or activity targets.
- The management has closely involved IPs in decision making process to foster ownership and to make implementation much simpler and easier on the part of IPs.
- Positions of project managers for each IP were created to improve project supervision and support to the partners. Project managers have been vital in supporting IPs during project implementation and acting as a quick link between SPRING management and IPs.
- The management also hired a civil engineer to manage the process for construction of stores for IPs. This enabled the project to ensure store construction follows sound civil works guidelines.
- High levels of professionalism have been exhibited by the staff and lauded by local government officials as evidenced by feedback from one of evaluation stakeholders, *“SPRING’s approach to working with groups is very professional. We are always informed of their activities. I attended one of the trainings out of curiosity and discovered that the trainings are well organized and facilitators are very experienced.”* Mr. Okwang Robert Alem (Chief, Minakulu sub-county, former Sub-county chief for Ngai Sub-county)
- Weekly reviews are held between component team leaders and project managers to identify and address issues which are affecting or have potential to affect attainment of project objectives. Additionally, the Chief of Party (COP) and component heads meet fortnightly to identify and agree on strategies for improving project performance.

These strategies have been adopted in order to fast-track implementation of project activities which had started slowly due to delayed signing of memoranda of understanding with district local governments. The delays were also occasioned by absence of a stronger integration strategy, departure of earlier technical advisors for peace and justice components and limited capacity of implementing partners. The limited capacity of partners has been exhibited by poor quality of proposals and inadequate organizational systems for managing USAID grants.

Besides the above sound management practices, there were some areas which need to be done better if the project is to achieve its objectives and if management of future projects is to be effective as mentioned hereunder.

- There was no clear demarcation between some roles of technical advisors and project managers which was a source of conflict and issuance of contradicting instructions to IPs.
- The human resource function was not well managed as evidenced by a presence of role conflicts, absence of clear job descriptions and clear performance appraisal systems.
- Whereas SPRING is highly regarded at sub-county level, district authorities felt that they were not well informed of what SPRING was doing and some felt excluded from project implementation.
- The SPRING Team is of the opinion that the home office has not rendered adequate support to COP and that the COP has not given adequate support to component heads.
- Cardno Agrisystems has not effectively played their role within the consortium. This is depicted by initial slow progress of the peace and justice components for which Cardno Agrisystems was anticipated to provide technical leadership within the consortium.
- Some IPs felt that there was over interference by SPRING staff in their project activities and that SPRING has violated part of the sub-grant agreement signed with them on issues concerning procurement. In the words of one IP representative,
“SPRING just complicates our lives. For example, they took away store construction from us without clear explanation and ended up building stores which were smaller than what we had planned to construct. Yet at a higher cost than originally anticipated! The increased costs have made some of us (IPs) to get fewer inputs than planned as they had to use part of the input budget to off-set increased construction cost”. **Anonymous IP Representative**

2.4.2 Grant Management Processes

The evaluation assessed effectiveness and efficiency of SPRING’s grant management system. The system is generally effective and efficient. It takes approximately two to three months to have one cycle of grants awarded and activities commencing. . A total of 28 grants had been awarded by the time of the evaluation. Key strengths of the system included:

- Ensuring that credible organizations access grants from SPRING. A pre-award assessment of due diligence is carried out on organizations with promising and potential projects to determine organizational strengths and weakness in managing a USAID grant.
- Participation of district and local government in pre-award surveys which promotes ownership and in-built capacity building which enables partners to implement activities within USAID grant guidelines.
- USAID mission clearance of potential grants is critical in ensuring that SPRING adheres to funding guidelines.
- There is strong link between technical heads, grants manager and accounts department which strengthens adherence to guidelines in all aspects of the grant by a particular IP.

- The process minimizes risks involved in big expenditures and therefore a procurement ceiling of UGX 10 million (approx USD 5000) has been set for partners. Any procurement above this cap is carried out by SPRING to minimize risks of fraud and mismanagement.

It is worth noting that effectiveness and efficiency of the grants management system at SPRING is constrained by the following factors:

- Unlike international organizations, local organizations have limited capacity in designing good projects (includes budgeting) and most of the time do not have adequate systems for managing USAID grants. Although building capacity of partners was not originally within the design of SPRING, the management has had to provide capacity building to improve quality of project ideas and ensure sound systems are in place. This has tended to slow down the rate at which a given grant making cycle can be completed.
- IPs are of the opinion that there is too much interference in management of project by SPRING staff.
- The supervision has not been effective in some cases and as a result, some partners have implemented critical activities without thorough preparation. For example, UMECS was not able to train teachers for peace education in counseling because user manuals were not ready. The evaluation team was not able to access a CSM manual, except power point presentation, implying that the training could have been carried out without a manual. Such practices lower the quality of activities and reduce contribution to beneficiaries.

2.4.3 Assessment of Quality and Appropriateness of the Performance Monitoring Plan

The management of SPRING is supported by a Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) which was completed in April 2009. The evaluation assessed the quality and appropriateness of SPRING in enabling management to track project progress and see how it can be improved. The assessment revealed strong points of the PMP in meeting its purpose as well as areas which need improvement (gaps). These two aspects are presented hereunder:

Strengths

- The PMP provides a good framework for generating information on different measurement areas. It gives a standard interpretation of different indicators and links component goals and outcomes. This enables different components to gauge their contribution to the project aim and USAID mission SO9.
- It is quite convenient and easy to follow by implementers. Each indicator has a definition and an accompanying type of analysis to be conducted to generate information for it
- It sets specific indicator targets given the baseline status and therefore SPRING management is able to reflect on the nature and quality of progress at any given point in time.

Gaps

- The indicators for measuring peace building and reconciliation and entire project contribution to stabilizing northern Uganda are not very elaborate in terms of clarity and their ability to be monitored adequately.
- A good number of indicators, especially for access to justice component and some for peace building component seem to have been overtaken by changes in the project strategy.

Focusing on quick impact projects which are not solely building capacity of formal institutions has made many indicators redundant and not relevant.

- The PMP does not give room for capturing detailed qualitative information on perceptions and attitudes as presented in stories, testimonies and quotes. Some un-intended project impacts or outcomes cannot be captured within the framework of the existing PMP.
- The basis for setting targets is not clear. Consequently, some targets seem to be ambitious while others seem not be worth pursuance.
- The PMP was not accompanied with data collection tools for indicators and this deprived project managers of testing the quality of different indicators to determine their clarity, relevancy, adequacy and whether they could be tracked at an affordable costs.

2.4.4 Communication with USAID and Local Development Partners

SPRING management keeps USAID Mission in Kampala and local development partners informed of project progress and any new developments through presentations at district cluster meetings and sharing of SPRING annual reports. In addition to project annual reports, SPRING management is obligated to submit quarterly reports to USAID Mission. Other communication avenues include sharing special reports and regularly exchanging information with the Contracting and Technical Representative (COTR) in charge of SPRING at USAID.

In terms of the timeliness and sufficiency of information, sub-county local government officials confessed to being informed of all SPRING's IP activities in their locations. However, district authorities expressed ignorance of what SPRING and some of its IPs are doing in their districts. In addition, it was also reported that communication with USAID has at times not been timely and regular.

2.4.5 Systems for Tracking Funding Streams

SPRING is funded through three funding streams within USAID. These included Development Assistance (DA), Displaced Children and Orphans Fund (DCOF), and Conflict Mitigation and Management (CMM) funds. The original contract between USAID and EMG required the latter to track and report activities funded by each of the funding activities. This condition has not been fulfilled by EMG as funds were not coming in at the same time and a basket approach was adopted in managing funds to where it was impossible to isolate funds according to sources of funding. In addition, the different streams of funding within USAID did not view this requirement as critical. For example, DCOF did not desire to be directly associated with projects and activities but was interested in ensuring that SPRING activities benefit children.

CHAPTER THREE: CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents conclusions and lessons learned from evaluation findings. It also makes appropriate recommendations for improving SPRING performance, and designing/management of future projects along key evaluation themes.

3.1 Progress towards Anticipated Outcomes

3.1.1 Peace and Reconciliation

Conclusions

- Clearly, the program objectives relating to individual and community capacity building, access and equity and maintaining a harmonious and peaceful society are still relevant. The Peace and Reconciliation component is being administered efficiently and with due diligence concerning compliance procedures. Nevertheless, the remaining timeframe may not be adequate for all results to be realized.
- The evidence from this evaluation is that although not yet fully in practice, peace particularly when working in conjunction with the other two components, is a brilliantly conceived and potentially powerful community development and engagement concept. The component also functions with a relatively low quantum of inputs and requires more relationship building at the community level and networking.
- Over the remaining period, more time and effort should be geared towards ensuring successful implementation of peace projects. This will allow for further planning such that the capacity of the programs can be expanded in future years. This evaluation predicts that the recommended investment in the SPRING program will be repaid many times in terms of community harmony and the consequent potentially massive financial savings that can accrue from the unique arrangement of social infrastructure the programs have created that allows district and community agencies to work holistically together in strengthening local communities.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

- SPRING investigates how to facilitate the provision of professional training for staff and consortium members in practice frameworks, developmental approaches to community engagement, community capacity building, advocacy and research techniques.
- Additional dedicated resources within SPRING be planned to ensure more effective administration of the Peace and Reconciliation component including:
 - Specialized training for IPs of skills and program delivery methodologies while working with grass root communities
 - Development and implementation of an ongoing evaluation methodology that assesses and quantifies outcomes of Peace and Reconciliation relation to best practice.
 - Greater profiling of the work undertaken by and achieved by each partner

It is recommended that the guidelines be reviewed to clarify the following:

- The roles of the managers within the programs;
- The roles of IPs, project managers of SPRING supported IP projects versus the role of SPRING Technical Advisors/Director;
- An agreed definition of what “integration” means in the context of the delivery of each project as a key strategy of SPRING;
- Other forms of flexible contractual arrangements for IPs subject to satisfactory performance as measured/ evaluated against criteria outlined in the contract.

3.1.2 Economic Security and Social Inclusion

Conclusions

The Economic Security and Social inclusion component is on right track for realizing its goal and registering its intended results. Evidence shows increase in productivity and farm incomes among supported farmers. There is ample evidence that economic security projects are benefiting farmers and their households. Benefiting farmers have purchased assorted household equipment, paid fees for their children and provided food to their family members. The success of the component transcends beyond the improved incomes at farmer level but rather entails established functional farmer structures that can secure or protect the realized immediate benefit to a sustainable benefit. At the moment marketing committees who are vested with the aspect of sustaining farmer benefits are starting to play their roles albeit need close mentoring and support.

Although farmers seem to have appreciated and practice VSLA concepts, the same concern is not observed at recovery of seeds. This may relate with the attitude as well as the past which were characterized by hand outs during the moment of relief.

What worked?

To date the economic security and social inclusion component has delivered and continues to contribute to the following benefits:

- Promotion of growing, bulking and marketing of high value crops, specifically chilli.
- Improved farmers scale of crop production through training and distribution of improved seeds
- The concept of marketing committees and warehouses has not fully taken-off as most stores have just been completed and farmers together with community members are yet to use the warehouses.
- Improved farmers’ access to markets and market information. Marketing committees are umbrella structures that draw together several farmer groups to work together to market agro produce.
- Farmer groups’ members are growing to trust each other and operate village savings and loan associations.
- NECPA Farmer groups are growing in influence leading to the formation of other farmer groups in the neighboring sub counties where SPRING project has not mapped her operations. This positively though indirectly, impacts on households and child care co-operatives over time.
- Instilling sustainability concepts and resilience to farmer groups. The VSLA concept has been embraced by farmers and enabled them to meet urgent needs through withdrawal and use of savings and accessing loans to address different needs and challenges. A comparison

of level of savings and loans shows that loans are hedged against savings as loans are less than 50 percent of average savings for the sample.

What hasn't worked?

- The seed loan concept has not worked out well as the recovery process is extremely poor due to the negative attitude of the communities who have been accustomed to free hand-outs during the emergency period.
- Store constructions did not work out well as it has dragged on for a long time and there were no minimum standards for construction of stores.

Recommendations

SPRING should improve the quality of delivery of the project through institution of minimum standards and operational guidelines for the following

- Generic training manuals – all training curricula undertaken by SPRING implementing partners should be screened and endorsed in reference to a generic manual developed and approved by SPRING. The standardization of the manual would entail professional development of a draft to which implementing partners provide an input
- Promote horizontal learning through peer support visits at institutional [implementing partners] and beneficiary level. It is evident that different implementing partners have unique strengths demonstrated through various areas of excellence in the project implementation. For example, KSWVO has excelled in VSLAS and ADFA /NECPA excelled in collective marketing.
- Marketing committees: Guidelines should be explicit on term of office, leadership trainings the committee has to undergo in a stipulated time line. A leaf could be borrowed from IRC guideline for management of collection points.

All future projects with civil works activities should recruit a civil engineer or hire a civil engineering firm to oversee the design, procurement and execution of civil works. Outputs of such works should conform to minimum standards to avoid discrepancies in project products.

3.1.3 Access to Justice

Conclusion

The evaluation in this component sought to assess progress towards attainment of component objectives and the evaluation findings lead to the following conclusions.

- a) The Land tenure Security has been a great success in provision of security of tenure to the SPRING farmer groups. This model of working will greatly prevent future land disputes and can be used as a model for other development projects in Northern Uganda. It should however be noted that the provision of Legal Advice and Alternative Dispute Resolution by the project has been limited and carried out on a small scale. This could be attributed to the fact that the farmers are not aware of other services being offered by SPRING or CRR apart from the signing of Land Agreements.
- b) SPRING's activities on the access to Justice Component are biased towards the informal courts. The PRDP does not look at the L.C Courts as formal courts of justice but categorizes them as informal courts of Judicature.

- c) The Access to Justice Implementing Partners are not aware of what activities the other co-implementers are carrying out and there is no mechanism for proper coordination amongst them.

Lessons Learnt

- Land agreements are a source of security because of the broad based and inclusiveness of all relevant parties. This model prevents future land disputes and can be used as a model for other development projects in Northern Uganda.
- Pure legal aid projects are not feasible for short term projects. Providing legal aid services requires a project with reasonable time such as five years and above as litigation process takes long in a country such as Uganda.
- Training few representatives of beneficiaries on issues of human rights does not necessarily translate into increased awareness on human right issues for their parent groups. You need to train either the entire group or select a critical mass of representatives.

Recommendations

For SPRING:

- a) The mobilization for mobile legal clinics that is coordinated by SPRING should be modified. The Implementing Partners should be strengthened to carry out the mobilization amongst themselves, then a report can be forwarded to SPRING.
- b) Furthermore, farmers should be sensitized about the services that CRR offers and encouraged to notify their leaders in case of a dispute such that outreach to a particular location is motivated by the number of cases that are reported to the Implementing Partner through their Leaders in the farmer group.
- c) The legal mobile Clinics should be taken closer to the people at parish level to enable people access them and the frequency of outreach should be increased.
- d) A mechanism for follow up referrals to some institutions that CRR has partnered with should be formulated and implemented.
- e) Horizontal partnerships and linkages between the implementing partners should be encouraged by SPRING.

For Future Interventions

- SPRING needs to work towards strengthening the cooperation between the formal and informal Justice systems such as with the current work that it is doing with the Acholi Religious Peace Leaders Initiative (ARLPI). This will entail provision of support to the formal justice system.
- SPRING needs to increase the scope of its beneficiaries to the Legal Advice and Alternative Dispute resolution from farmer groups to the community.
- SPRING should establish a mechanism that will enable it to sensitize the development projects about ways of obtaining security of tenure for their projects before implementation so as to mitigate future conflict.

3.2 Cross Cutting Issues

3.2.1 Special Considerations and Crosscutting Issues

SPRING projects are positively impacting on lives of children. Using proceeds from supported farming activities and small enterprises, farmers have been able to take their children back to school, provide food to them and in some instances meet medical treatment costs for sick children.

Furthermore, EMG has put in place different measures to prevent or tackle occurrence of corruption and mismanagement of project resources. The measures developed seem to be ad-hoc and not well planned given the context within which the project operates. In addition, there has not been regular submission of environmental compliance reports by SPRING/EMG to USAID.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that EMG extends special attention to other expenditure aspects such as construction of warehouses, procurement of inputs for IPs and general services to ascertain level of prudence exhibited in use of project resources. This could be carried out within the framework of project annual financial audit.

Further follow-up should be done to ensure vocational training students and micro-enterprises are well on their way to self-sustainability.

SPRING/EMG should file periodic environmental compliance reports in line with USAID policy requirements.

Future: An elaborate anti-corruption strategy ought to be developed to address any corruption issues with USAID funded projects.

3.3 Communication

The findings presented above on SPRING communication activities indicate that the choice of radios for hosting SPRING programs was good. Findings also show that farmers listened more to economic recovery related radio programs compared to other categories of radio programs. Farmers also attach lots of importance to radio programs promoting economic security compared to peace and reconciliation. Economic security benefits of radio programs are highly rated among SPRING farmers. This is an indicator that households are in the phase of economic recovery.

Recommendation

It is recommended that SPRING and future projects dedicate significant amount of air time to economic security issues in their communication strategy. Households seem to have moved on and are seriously involved in economic recovery activities. Communication efforts should be geared towards addressing issues of economic development of households along the value chain approach used by SPRING in empowering farmers.

3.3 SPRING Model

Conclusion

Integrating components and activities is taking place on a small scale. Even with limited integration, the model is innovative and has potential to bear different benefits such as strengthening sustainability of projects through stabilization and promoting stability of different project benefits. Key limiting factors in integrating project activities were; absence of a strategy for integrating different program components and lack of shared understanding of integration approach across different stakeholders involved in the project. Due to these hindrances, all potential benefits of integration were not fully observable during the MTE. More time will be needed to see the full benefits of an integrated approach.

Lessons Learnt

- Leadership support is critical to successful integration. Monolithic approaches to programming are not conducive to having meaningful impact.
- Integration is a deliberate and intentional process that needs to be well thought through from project conception
- Transition from recovery to development provides a framework for integration
- Tension and pain in management may slow down integration
- Integration needs to be institutionalized so that there are support systems and structures to support the process
- Integration is not a pain-free process and takes time. Poverty can overshadow all the other integration needs so that economic development becomes the sole focus.
- Competent skills are needed in the integration process because attitude change takes time. If not managed well, integration can cause a “burn-out” among staff.
- Not every aspect of an integrated project must be integrated. Some activities/projects need to be implemented independent of other components as long as they contribute to the goal and outcome of the component.

Key Recommendations for Management Commitments

- ✓ Quality and Impact: Programs should be designed to address the three critical components as well as the cross-cutting themes in order to reinforce integration. This should include joint assessments at sub-counties and in identifying IPs who will be able give holistic programming. Just like there was joint training in conflict sensitive training for all IPs, there should be joint capacity building workshops for the integration of the model
- ✓ Intentional Learning and Sharing of Knowledge: The Chief of Party should provide leadership that is clear, committed, and demonstrates models of integration. He should use all meeting opportunities to verbalize his support for integration. He needs to institute open, regular, efficient communication, including opportunities for face-to-face engagement. The proposed action research by PINCER should address the integration of the sectors.
- ✓ Build relationships and promote positive attitudes like humility, transparency, respect, trust and flexibility to change.
- ✓ Value people, specialization, diversity, interdependence. This will require understanding the nature, contribution, roles, and responsibility of sectors, project support functions, and Implementing partners.

- ✓ Management should recognize that integration is a means to an end hence all of the sectors are important and none on its own can provide full stability to the community. They all need to be mutually accountable for quality of work, relationships, behaviors, independent actions, and results rather than focusing on individual sectors.
- ✓ Joint Planning, Meetings and Monitoring: Each sector should invite the other sector heads to one planning/ strategy meeting per quarter although each of them may already be having an excessive workload. The sector heads are all specialized and strive for excellence in their field of expertise. There should be more deliberate team interaction in collaboration with the M&E Specialist to identify integration indicators. They should be specific so that they do not cause measurement overload on those collecting the data.
- ✓ Communication: Staff should have 360 degree performance. Such appraisals should include evaluations on how effectively the staff communicates outside their immediate functional teams. One of the biggest threats to the integration process has been poor communication within the team. In addition to formal meetings, there is a need to communicate on an on-going basis to manage tensions.

3.4 Project Management

3.4.1 Quality of Project Management

The evaluation sought to determine the extent to which SPRING management is effective and efficient in project implementation and grants management process. It also sought to establish the quality of the PMP in aiding progress tracking, communication with USAID and local development partners and addressing special considerations in project management. Evaluation findings lead to the following conclusions.

Project Capacity to Achieve Objectives

There is sufficient capacity to enable SPRING attain its objectives. SPRING implementation is fully underway as evidenced by completed process for award of micro-stability grants (quick impact projects). The current SPRING Team is fully dedicated to successfully oversee and implement project activities. The slow start of the project has deprived the management of the opportunity to observe, assess and improve different aspects of the project.

Recommendations

SPRING: The Chief of Party should develop clear job descriptions for project managers to help review and clarify roles and responsibilities of component heads and project managers.

Future Project: A position of human resource officer/manager should be added to critical project positions to improve performance of the human resource function. The HR manager should take charge of developing job descriptions, performance appraisal system and managing staff issues on the project.

3.4.2 Effectiveness and Efficiency Grants Management Process

The SPRING grants management process is effective and efficient as evidenced by different mechanisms used to identify, award and manage grants. The process is transparent and credible. A total of 28 micro-stability grants had been awarded by SPRING at the time of the project. However, the efficiency of the grant management process is hindered by limited capacity of local IPs. This has compelled management to provide capacity building to IPs outside the original grants making framework within SPRING

Lesson Learnt

Local Partners, especially CBOs do not have sufficient capacity to manage a USAID grant without serious capacity building as part of preparation process. Building capacity of local IPs enabled them to adhere to grants guidelines and successfully implement granted projects.

Recommendation

Future Project: It is recommended that capacity building is included as special strategy within the design and implementation of any new project that plans to work with community based organizations. The capacity building should focus on project designs, capacity assessments and building systems and human resource capacity.

3.4.3 Performance Monitoring Plan

The SPRING PMP is considered a key resource by the management team in aiding of tracking results and performance. This provides a clear framework for project performance management. However, some components of the PMP have been overtaken by change in project strategy. A good number of indicators for tracking progress towards attainment of SPRING goal, peace building and access to justice components are not relevant. In addition, the PMP does not give clear basis for setting targets for each indicator. Some of the targets are questionable and seem not to be engaging enough and worth pursuance.

Recommendations

SPRING: It is recommended that SPRING team develops a new set of indicators to reflect change in project strategy for peace building and access to justice component. Qualitative indicators should be embraced since the project goal is of a qualitative nature.

Future Projects: PMPs should be tested and adjusted before being embraced as official documents. There should be continued update or improvement of the PMP to reflect emerging changes and enhance its relevance in project management.

3.4.4 Communication to USAID and Local Development Partners

SPRING and her IPs should improve their communication to district local governments and USAID. The model of regular interaction with sub-counties during project implementation should be extended to the district level. SPRING officials, especially COP should regularly interact with districts and regularly provide information to USAID and districts on different issues concerning the project.

3.5 Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

Overall, SPRING results and targets will be achieved by the end of the project. Many of the targets would be significantly exceeded if there was a clear integration strategy at the beginning and early commencement of quick impact projects. While a six months extension could lead to greater impacts that are more widely felt by SPRING beneficiaries it is not tenable within the current contractual arrangements. In regards to a future USAID project, the design should focus on economic development of communities in Northern Uganda since there is ample evidence showing that communities have reached the point of embarking on comprehensive development. Communities are much inclined towards economic development activities to the extent that not much success can be registered by projects which are exclusively focusing on non-economic development issues.

Therefore, the new intervention should follow the same model of integration albeit economic security should be the fulcrum of integration as opposed to peace and reconciliation. Peace and reconciliation are critical for a community which is emerging from conflict as demonstrated by the current SPRING project. However, as communities embark on economic development, it is only logical that economic security takes centre stage. A key constraint in project implementation has been limited time frame. It is therefore recommended that reasonable timeframe (at least five years) should be dedicated to implementation of such projects to facilitate proper project implementation and overseeing of different changes attributed to the project. Additionally, a clear and comprehensive integration strategy should be developed to support deliberate and systematic integration of different project components.

Furthermore, the evaluation has shown that some of the projects within the current peace and justice components are worth replicating and scaling up with some adjustments. Therefore, the next phase of SPRING should address the following issues under each of these components:

Peace building and Reconciliation

- Emphasis should be placed on peace activities that target entire households (children, husband, wife) and the community.
- Capacity building of IPs in conflict resolution and peace building training (develop own materials and guidelines that show how to integrate the components). The trainings should be extended to lower local government officials to widen the multiplier effect of the training.
- Aligning economy with peace should be expanded to formal and informal business sectors as well as households. Large, small and medium scale enterprises should be targeted to bring on board the entire business sector in Northern Uganda and create a business sector critical mass for peace in Northern Uganda. Economic development interventions funded by USG should be aligned with peace as well since struggle over economic resources is a key source of domestic violence.
- Unpacking 'P' in PRDP activities should be expanded to Karamoja and Teso regions to address spillover effects of the LRA conflict to these regions. The recommendations from the research undertaken during the current and future phases should be reviewed and adopted to implement a peace project targeting different stakeholders beyond the PRDP timeframe.
- The peace education project should be reviewed and expanded to all education institutions in Northern Uganda. Better planning and supervision ought to be carried out to improve project efficiency and effectiveness.

- Conflict sensitive mainstreaming should be an on-going activity for USAID partners and should be tailor-made to different contexts of supported partners. Some partners should be trained in CSM, while others are supported in conflict assessment and some will need hands-on support in conflict sensitive mainstreaming.
- Local Governments should be supported in the same area since they (Local Government) oversee and directly carry out programming and development issues within the district.

Access to Justice

- The land tenure Security project should be scaled-up to reach individual farmers in more sub-counties and parishes in Northern Uganda. Mobile legal clinic should also be replicated and scaled-up to benefit more communities and individuals in Northern Uganda. This project will contribute to widespread land disputes in the post-war Northern Uganda. A systematic mechanism for follow-up of legal referrals should be included in the new project.
- Strengthening the cooperation between the formal and informal Justice systems. The current project strategy has focused on strengthening informal justice systems with limited support to formal system. The community oscillates between formal and informal justice systems and therefore a coherent strategy for strengthening and increasing cooperation between the two sectors will be handy in the transition process.

Lessons learnt from the current project, its achievements and recommendations from this evaluation should be reviewed to inform the design for the next phase.

Reference Materials

SPRING Documents

- Request for Proposals for Managing SPRING Project USAID (August 2007)
- Project Monitoring Plan (April 2004)
- Annual progress report for 2008/09
- Work plan for FY 2009/2010- December 2009
- Impact of SPRING On children (September 2009)
- Model for Land Tenure Security (February 2010) - Briefing paper
- Management plan for Potika Collection Point (IRC) – Not dated
- SPRING’S integrated approach to stabilization (Not dated)
- Communication Assessment Plan (Fe-March 2008)
- IP MTR Report (December 2009)
- Baseline survey Report (March 2009)
- SPRING Indicator Variance Analysis (Feb, 2010)

External Documents

- GOU (September 2007), Peace, Recovery and Development Plan for Northern Uganda (PRDP)
- EMG (October 2007), Technical proposal for Managing SPRING

Annexes

Annex 1: SPRING Stability Fund and AVSI Sub-grants

Grant #	GRANTEE	DISTRICT	BUDGET CEILING	Integration of SPRING Components
Economic Security Grants				
STA-001	MERCY CORPS (MC)	Pader	\$99,999	Conflict Mapping and Management Training
STA-002	International Rescue Committee (IRC)	Kitgum	\$99,948	Integrated Land Tenure and Conflict Resolution and Group Strengthening through Traditional Leadership
STA-003	North East Chili Producers Association (NECPA)	Lira, Oyam, Kitgum and Pader	\$99,317	Conflict sensitive training on land tenure issues, traditional justice, identification of peace promoters and Acholi-Langi Exchange Visits
STA-004	Ugandan Veterinary Association (UVA)	Gulu & Amuru	\$106,789	
STA-005	Arbeiter-Samariter Bund Deutschland (ASB)	Oyam and Pader	\$249,894	Integrated Conflict Resolution and Group Strengthening through Strengthening Traditional Leadership
STA-006	Canadian Physicians for Aid and Relief (CPAR)	Gulu	\$206,962	Integrated Land Tenure Security and Conflict Resolution and Group Strengthening through Strengthening Traditional Leadership
STA-007	Kisa Ber Support to War Victims Organization (KSWVO)	Amuru	\$249,288	Field Days, Peace Dramas and Speech Competitions on Peace & Reconciliation
STA-009	Lira District Farmers Association (LIDFA)	Lira	\$187,388	Integrated Land Tenure Security
STA-010	Apac District Farmers Association (ADFA)	Apac/Oyam	\$159,373	Integrated Land Tenure Security
AVSI-01	Kitgum Women Beekeepers Association(KITWOBEE)	Kitgum	\$20,646	
AVSI-02	Meeting Point Kitgum (MP)	Kitgum	\$37,578	
AVSI-03	Women and Children First Organisation(WACFO)	Amuru	\$26,444	Music, Dance and Drama to Promote Peace and Reconciliation
AVSI-04	Aids Clients and disabled orphans(ACADOS)	Gulu	\$33,904	
AVSI-05	Gulu Youth Development Association(GYDA) I - Internal Capacity Building	Gulu	\$1,369	

Grant #	GRANTEE	DISTRICT	BUDGET CEILING	Integration of SPRING Components
AVSI-06	Livelihoods, Education and Protection to End Child Labour (LEAP)	Gulu and Pader	\$46,264	
AVSI-07	Northern Ugandan Youth Development Center (NUYDC)	Gulu	\$60,493	Peace Education (activities under design)
AVSI-08	Gulu Youth Development Association (GYDA) II : Wheelchair Production & Nursery	Gulu	\$52,457	
AVSI-09	WACFO - Early Child Care and Development	Amuru	\$30,000	Early Child Care Support for Farmer Groups.
18	Sub-total		\$1,768,113	
Peace and Reconciliation Grants				
STA-011	International Alert (IA)	Gulu, Amuru, Kitgum and Pader	\$242,766	Building a Peace Economy - Conflict Sensitive Economic Development
STA-012	Athletes for Africa (A4A)	Gulu, Amuru, Kitgum and Oyam	\$151,157	Youth Reconciliation Activities through Sport, Culture and Agriculture
STA-014	Great Lakes Center for Conflict Resolution (GLACCR)	Gulu, Amuru, Kitgum, Oyam, Lira and Pader	\$99,493	Conflict Sensitive Programming for SPRING Ips across all three SPRING components.
STA-015	United Movement to End Child Soldiering (UMECS)	Gulu, Amuru, Kitgum and Pader	\$150,090	
STA-016	Gulu NGO Forum (GDNF)	Gulu, Amuru, Pader and Kitgum	\$114,702	Micro-stability projects across all three SPRING components.
STA-018	Concerned Parents Association (CPA)	Lira and Oyam	\$102,841	Support to Children and Parent Groups through IGAs, Peace and Child Rights.
STA-020	Pincer Group (PG)	Gulu, Amuru, Kitgum, Pader, Lira and Oyam	\$199,003	
7	Sub-total		\$1,060,052	
Access to Justice Grants				
STA-013	Center for Reparation and Reconciliation (CRR)	Lira, Oyam, Kitgum, and Pader	\$119,800	Land Tenure Security Support to SPRING Farmer Groups.
STA-017	Ker Kwaro Acholi (KKA)	Kitgum, Gulu, Amuru and Pader	\$104,823	Strengthening Traditional Leadership to Support SPRING Farmer Groups.

Grant #	GRANTEE	DISTRICT	BUDGET CEILING	Integration of SPRING Components
STA-019	Acholi Religious Leaders Peace Initiative (ARLPI)	Kitgum, Gulu	\$52,683	Integrating peace and justice through collaboration of informal and formal authorities in resolving land disputes.
3	Sub-total		\$277,306	
28	Grant Total		\$3,105,471	

Source: SPRING

Annex 2: Evaluation Data Collection Tools

A: Conflict Resolution and Peace Building Component Review Tools

A1: KII Guide for Director for Reconciliation and Peace Building

Name of respondent and designation in the project

1. What are some of the strengths and weaknesses in the current management structure
2. What, if any, needs to be changed in the management structure and for what reasons
3. Given the scope of the project and its general funding mechanism, has it met the interim needs of its primary stakeholders? Why do you think so?
4. Do you think the project will meet its ultimate needs by 2010? Why do you think so?
5. What informed the design of the current M & E plan of the project?
6. What do you see as the most useful elements in the area of peace-building (indicators, targets, routine data gathering tools, database, staff etc) of this M& E plan in tracking the project performance?
7. What changes need to be made in the current plan to achieve the peace-building milestones and for what reasons
8. To what extent has the project achieved its targets specifically in the area of peace-building as spelt out in the performance management plan? What indications are there that the project will meet its technical expectations at the end of the project?
9. What contributions have been made by the project activities to related on-going efforts to bring peace and harmony in targeted areas?
10. Overall, what difference is this project likely to bring in the area of peace building and conflict mitigation?
11. What role has the project played in building the capacity of peace committees and local governments assisting the implementing partners with program development and implementation? What adjustments, if any, are needed for the project to realize its intended targets?
12. What lessons and insights do we learn from what are perceived to be the project’s best practices?
13. Any other thoughts?

=====
A2: KII Guide for Grantees

Name of the respondent, designation and Organization:

1. How long has your organisation worked with SPRING?
2. In what areas(s) of capacity building has your organisation received from SPRING since you started working with SPRING project?
3. How has SPRING’s technical assistance or interventions contributed to the achievement of your organisational and programmatic goals? What adjustments can be taken by SPRING to get the best out of the technical assistance?
4. How different has the technical assistance helped your organization to better implement peace-building activities? Please cite some examples of these activities? In what areas does your organization need support to better implement peace-building programs in particular?
5. From your perspective, what contributions have been made by the project activities to related on-going efforts to bring about peace and stability in northern Uganda?
6. What difference is this project likely to bring in the area of peace-building by 2010?
7. In your opinion, how has SPRING addressed the specific needs of women and vulnerable children in northern Uganda? What specific interventions should SPRING undertake to address the needs of women and vulnerable children in northern Uganda?
8. What hurdles and challenges has your organisation experienced in the capacity building interventions of SPRING?
9. Based on your experience from SPRING grant implementation approach as well as your contextual knowledge of northern, what specific activities or programs are needed to bring about total peace and development in northern Uganda? How could these activities or programs be carried out?
10. Comment on the overall proposal development and grants award process you underwent with SPRING? Probe for quality of award and management process, proposals for improvement

Sustainability Issues

1. What is your current level of funding? Probe for current annual budget, source of funds and %Age contributed by SPRING
2. Besides SPRING supported project, what other interventions is your organisation implementing? What period do they cover?
3. Do you have a Board? How is it constituted? What is their role? Are they trained and active
4. What is the level of staffing? Indicate contract period and level of qualification
5. How do farmer groups and your organisation plan to use skills acquired from the project/support?
6. What sustainability strategies did the project adopt and promote to ensure continuity of different benefits and structures?
7. What strategies does your organisation have to continue with different activities funded and products/assets generated by SPRING?
8. How has SPRING helped you to become sustainable?

Sustainability of Benefits

9. What sustainability strategies have been designed and implemented among beneficiaries?
10. What has worked well which can be replicated elsewhere? What has not worked well and need to be improved or avoided.

Capacity Building

11. How has SPRING built the capacity of your organisation to become effective in programme delivery? In what are has SPRING build the capacity of your organisation? Probe for different areas such as M&E, conflict sensitive programming, financial management, fundraising etc
12. How has the capacity building helped your organisation to become effective and professional in its work? Give specific examples OR what are you able to do as a result of the capacity building intervention

A3: KII Guide for USAID Staff

Name of staff and designation:

1. Given the scope of the project and its general funding mechanism, has it met the interim needs of its primary stakeholders? Why do you think so?
2. From your perspective, what contributions have been made by the project activities to related on-going efforts to bring about peace and stability in northern Uganda?
3. Comment on the effectiveness of SPRING's integrated stabilization approach.
4. Do you think the project will meet its ultimate needs by 2010? Why do you think so?
5. What difference is this project likely to bring in the area of mitigating causes and consequences of the conflict by 2010?
6. In your opinion, what lessons and insights would you consider being the project's best practices so far?
7. What kind of support does the project needs to achieve its goals?
8. What project management areas could be improved?

A4: KII Guide for Local Government Leaders

Name and Designation of Respondent

1. How does your organisation work with SPRING project?
2. What do you consider to be main strengths of this collaboration with SPRING?
3. What adjustments, if any, are needed to strengthen the collaboration to help SPRING Uganda achieve its intended goals by 2010?
4. In your opinion, how has SPRING addressed the specific needs of women and vulnerable children in northern Uganda? What specific interventions should SPRING undertake to address the needs of women and vulnerable children in Uganda
5. From your perspective, what contributions have been made by the project activities to related on-going efforts to bring about peace and stability in northern Uganda?
6. What difference is this project likely to bring in the area of peace-building, economic recovery and access to justice by 2010?
7. How do you rate the performance of SPRING in terms of communication and grant management practices?
8. In your opinion, what lessons and insights would you consider to be the project's best practices so far?

9. What adjustments, if any, is needed for the project to realize its intended targets
10. Give the development challenges/priorities of your community, what else would you recommend to SPRING/USAID for support?
11. Any other thoughts

=====

A5: FGD Guide for Teachers

1. Describe the training you attended which was organised by UMECS? Probe for content, purpose, training methods
2. What skills did you acquire from the training? Probe for personal skills in peace building and skill for being a peace builder/facilitator
3. Comment on the quality and relevance of the training?
4. How are you applying acquired skills? Probe for application of skills at individual, school, family and community level
5. How have the skills acquired helped students/schools and community members?
6. What challenges do you face or likely to face in applying acquired skills?
7. What suggestions do you have concerning quality and relevance of training organised by UMECS?

B: Economic Security Component Data Collection Review Tool

Appendix B1: FGD Guide for Farmers Group: [sampled groups]

Appendix B1: FGD Guide for Farmers Group:

Date:
 District: Sub county:
 Venue of meeting: Name of Group:
 Attendance: Females; Males
 Names of Facilitators:
 Start time:
 End time:

Section 2: Economic Security

IR.3: ENHANCED SOCIALLY INCLUSIVE ECONOMIC SECURITY IN CONFLICT AFFECTED REGIONS PRODUCTION

1. When did you start interacting with SPRING or her implementing partners? *[Mention names of IPs that are assigned to the sub county if necessary] {probe for awareness about SPRING/IPs}*
2. Mention the trainings that you have undergone as a result of SPRING/Implementing partner support.
3. Mention the inputs that you have received from SPRING/Implementing partners
4. How have the trainings and inputs impacted your life and that of your household members

VALUE ADDITION

5. After harvest, what do you do to your harvested crops to earn better market prices?

SAVINGS

6. Describe the way your group operates savings
7. Describe the way your farmer group operates the loan scheme
8. Comment on how the seed loan were repaid back by your farmer group members
9. Comment on the adherence to the repayment period for members who take loans

10. How is the seed bank concept/initiative working in your farmer group
11. How have the farmer group savings helped the farmer group members
12. How have the farmer group loans helped the farmer group members
13. What challenges has your farmer group encountered in running the savings and loan scheme
14. What plans do you have for your group savings

COLLECTIVE MARKETING

15. Mention the arrangements through which you market your crops?
16. How has the marketing committee helped you to market your crops? Explain

RELATIONSHIPS

17. Do you enjoy working in a group?
18. Do conflicts happen within members, IF YES, how do they get resolved
19. What do you consider to be the key challenges (if any) as a farmer group in your engagements with SPRING/IPs
20. What are the lessons learned as a result of your relation with SPRING/IPs
21. What mechanisms are in place or have been attained to ensure that the project benefits are sustained beyond the SPRING/IPs resource support to the farmer group.
22. Suggest what could be done [if any] to improve the delivery of services by SPRING/IPs

IMPACT

23. How has your engagement with SPRING/IPs affected your household food security/availability *{probe for how many meals children do have per day as of present}*
24. Comment on your household capacity to meet the needs of children

Section 2: Resolution and Peace-Building

1. Tell me about the types of conflicts that you experience in
 - a. Your households
 - b. Your farmer groups
 - c. Your communities
 - d. How do you resolve them? To whom do you go for mediation
2. Have you ever experienced inter-community conflicts, maybe with a neighbouring village? If yes, what was it about?
3. Are traditional methods of conflict resolution still sufficient? Why?
4. Which radio do you listen to mostly?
5. What is your favourite radio programme? On which radio is it?
6. Have you ever listened to SPRING radio programme? Gauge if participants have listened to *Dongo Paco Karacel* (in Acholi) or *“Peacemaker”* (in Lango region)
7. What do you enjoy about it? What is the key message that you get?

8. How did the radio messages help you?
9. How has the SPRING promoted peace building in your relationships at individual, family, group and community level?
10. What else can SPRING do to strengthen peace in your community?

Section 3: Access to Justice

- a) What are the main issues affecting farmers in your area? (General)
- b) What is the nature of land related disputes that you encounter?
- c) Are you aware of a place where you can access justice in your Sub County?
- d) In your opinion, are these issues adequately addressed? Please justify your answer.
- e) Who are the different organisations/ CBO's addressing access to justice issues in your area? What interventions have they put in place to enable community members access Justice?
- f) Describe ways of how you have been enabled to obtain security of tenure and access Justice in case of Conflict?
- g) In your opinion has the intervention by SPRING /IP's enabled you to obtain justice / has the problem been resolved?
- h) What are the challenges or hindrances that are stopping people from accessing formal and informal Justice Systems?
- i) What can realistically be done to alleviate these challenges?
- j) What do you consider to be the key challenges in your engagements with SPRING/IP'S?
- k) What are the lessons learnt as a result of your relations with SPRING/IP's?
- l) What could be done to improve the delivery of services by SPRING/IP's?
- m) In your observation what has been done by the SPRING/IP's to ensure continuity of what you have benefited from the project?
- n) How can the security of Tenure for the farmers be enhanced?
- o) Do you know any human or basic property rights? if so state any 3
- p) What can be done differently by SPRING in implementing its activities/
- q) Any recommendations/ thoughts?

=====

B2: FGD Guide Implementing Partners: [sampled groups]

Date:
 Name of partner:
 Area of operation:
 Area of intervention:
 Venue of meeting:
 Attendance: Females; Males
 Names of Facilitators:
 Start time:
 End time:

IR.3: ENHANCED SOCIALLY INCLUSIVE ECONOMIC SECURITY IN CONFLICT AFFECTED REGIONS

1. When did you start interacting with SPRING. [*probe for formal period of engagement*]
2. Mention your target group and the interventions you are involved in with them.
3. Mention ways of how your interaction with SPRING has facilitated or constrained the delivery of your intended services.
4. What are key achievements of the project supported by SPRING?
5. What do you consider to be any other key challenges (if any) in your engagements with SPRING
6. What mechanisms are in place or have been attained to ensure that the project benefits are sustained beyond the SPRING resource support to your organization
7. Suggest what could be done [if any] to improve the delivery of services by SPRING

Sustainability Issues

13. What is your current level of funding? Probe for current annual budget, sources of funds and SPRING Contribution, other grants and interventions outside SPRING support
14. Do you have a Board? How is it constituted? What is their role? Are they trained and active

15. What is the level of staffing? Indicate contract period and level of qualification
16. What sustainability strategies did the project adopt and promote to ensure continuity of different benefits and structures?
17. What strategies does your organisation have to continue with different activities funded and products/assets generated by SPRING?
18. How has SPRING helped you to become sustainable?

Sustainability of Benefits

19. What sustainability strategies have been designed and implemented among beneficiaries?
20. How has SPRING IPs addressed capacity (leadership, management and technical) issues for farmer groups?
21. Do farmer groups have fully constituted and operational leadership structures?
22. How do farmer groups plan to use skills acquired from the project/support?
23. What has worked well which can be replicated elsewhere? What has not worked well and need to be improved or avoided.

Capacity Building

24. How has SPRING build the capacity of your organisation to become effective in programme delivery? In what are has SPRING build the capacity of your organisation? Probe for different areas such as M&E, conflict sensitive programming, financial management, fundraising etc
25. How has the capacity building helped your organisation to become effective and professional in its work? Give specific examples OR what are you able to do as a result of the capacity building intervention

B3: FGD Guide for Marketing Committee Group:

Date:

District:

Sub county:

Venue of meeting:

Name of Group:

Attendance: Females; Males

Names of Facilitators:

Start time:

End time:

IR.3: ENHANCED SOCIALLY INCLUSIVE ECONOMIC SECURITY IN CONFLICT AFFECTED REGIONS

1. When did you start interacting with SPRING or her implementing partners? *[Mention names of IPs that are assigned to the sub county if necessary] {probe for awareness about SPRING/IPs}*
2. How has your interaction with SPRING/IPs affected the value of your crops sales *[probe for Ground nuts, rice, maize, chilli, simsim, beans and “honey”]*
3. Describe ways of how you have been economically affected in relation to your engagements with SPRING or her Implementing partners (IPs)
4. How has your engagement with SPRING/IPs affected your support to farmer groups
5. Mention your key success as far as marketing farm produce
6. What do you consider to be the key challenges (if any) in your engagements with
 - a. SPRING/IPs (Specify IP)
 - b. Farmer groups
 - c. Local government
 - d. Buyers
7. What are the lessons learned as a result of your relation with SPRING/IPs
8. What mechanisms are in place or have been attained to ensure that the project benefits are sustained beyond the SPRING/IPs resource support to your committee group
9. Suggest what could be done [if any] to improve the delivery of services by SPRING/IPs

B4: FGD Guide VLSAs

Date:

District:

Sub county:

Venue of meeting:

Name of VSLA:

Attendance: Females; Males
Names of Facilitators:
Start time:
End time:

IR.3: ENHANCED SOCIALLY INCLUSIVE ECONOMIC SECURITY IN CONFLICT AFFECTED REGIONS

1. When did you start interacting with SPRING or her implementing partners? *[Mention names of IPs that are assigned to the sub county if necessary] {probe for awareness about SPRING/IPs}*
 2. How has your interaction with SPRING/IPs affected associations operations
 3. Describe ways of how you have been economically affected in relation to your engagements with SPRING or her Implementing partners (IPs)
 4. Mention your key success as an association
 5. As a Village Savings and Loan Association
 - a. Describe the trainings you have undergone {probe for when, duration and by who}
 - b. Describe the benefits realized as a result of being a member of VSLAs
 6. What do you consider to be the key challenges (if any) in your engagements with
 - a. SPRING/IPs
 - b. Association members
 - c. Local government
 7. What are the lessons learned as a result of being a VSLA
 8. What mechanisms are in place or have been attained to ensure that the project benefits are sustained beyond the SPRING/IPs resource support to your association
 9. Suggest what could be done [if any] to improve the delivery of services by SPRING/IPs to your association
-

B5: FGD Guide for Vulnerable Youths – Vocational Support

Date:
District:
Sub county:
Venue of meeting:
Name of CBO:
Attendance: Females; Males
Names of Facilitators:
Start time:
End time:

IR.3: ENHANCED SOCIALLY INCLUSIVE ECONOMIC SECURITY IN CONFLICT AFFECTED REGIONS

1. When did you start interacting with SPRING or her implementing partners?
2. In what ways has your interaction with SPRING/IPs affected your lives
3. Mention the key success as a result of SPRING/IPs support to you
4. What do you consider to be the key challenges (if any) in your engagements with
 - a. SPRING/IPs
5. What mechanisms are in place or have been attained to ensure that the project benefits are sustained beyond the SPRING/IPs resource support to you

Suggest what could be done [if any] to improve the delivery of services by SPRING/IPs

=====

B7: Project Evaluation Interview schedule for Individual Farmers

INTRODUCTION and INFORMED CONSENT

Good morning/afternoon. My name is _____. I am from KENWILL an independent research organization. I do not represent the government or any political party. We are conducting a Mid-Term Evaluation of SPRING project. With your permission, I would like to ask you some questions. Your answers will be confidential. They will be put together with those of other people we are talking to, to get an overall picture. It will be impossible to pick you out from what you say, so please feel free to tell us what you think. This interview will take about __20__ minutes. There is no penalty for refusing to participate. Do you wish to proceed?

Do you agree to participate? 1. Yes 2. No (if No. **Terminate the interview and thank the respondent**)

15	Do you receive agricultural related follow up support visits by _____ (SPRING/Implementing partner)	1. Yes 2. No
16	If yes to the above , are you satisfied with the follow up visits	1. Yes 2. No
17	If satisfied please mention why? 1..... 2..... 3.....	
18	If not satisfied please mention why? 1..... 2..... 3.....	
19	How has the training impacted your crop production and overall yields? 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5.....	
SEEDS		
20.	a. What type/variety of seeds did you receive from _____)SPRING/Implementing partner)	

	b. How have the seeds helped you 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5.....	
21	When did you first receive seeds from SPRING/Implementing partner <i>[NB: Probe for month and year]</i>	
22	Have you used the same seeds for the subsequent season?	1. Yes 2. No if no give reason.....
VILLAGE SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS		
23	Are you participating in a Village Savings and Loan Association	1. Yes 2.No
24	If yes, how much have you saved? State the amount in Uganda shillings	Ug. Shs.
25	How has your savings in the farmer group helped you?	
26	Have you ever borrowed from your farmers group?	1. Yes , how much 2. No, give reason [skip to question 28]
27	How did the loan help you?	
28	Did you pay back the seeds you received from SPRING/Implementing partner to the farmer group? [if applicable]	1. Yes 2. No, give reasons
VALUE ADDITION		
29	After harvest, what are you doing to your harvested crops to earn a better market price. 1..... 2..... 3.....	

36	
37	What types of messages are most helpful to you and your family? Why?
39	Have you listened to SPRING sponsored radio spots (30 second public message)? If so, which have been the most helpful to you?
MID -TERM RESULTS	
40	Explain how SPRING/implementing interventions have affected the lives of the children in your household 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....
41	Mention four ways how SPRING/IPs has affected your household quality of life 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....

SECTION D. PEACE –BUILDING AND RECONCILIATION

42	Were you affected by conflict?	Yes No	1 2	2→A
43	If yes, has membership in your farmer group helped you to overcome any challenges?			
44	a] .Do you have any conflicts within your farmer group?	Yes No	1 2	
	b.] Mention the types of conflicts you encounter in your group			
45	If yes, how does your farmer group resolve conflicts within the group			
INDICATOR DATA. RELATIONS WITHIN THE ACHOLI COMMUNITY IMPROVED				
46	How does the community presently feel about returnees?			
47	Do you have community members that express negative attitude towards returnees?	Yes No	1 2	

48	Are you providing assistance to extended family members?	Yes No	1 2	
49	Do you think the families of ex-combatants should be held responsible for the actions of their relatives?	Yes No	1 2	

INCREASED POSITIVE RELATIONS BETWEEN COMMUNITIES IN THE NORTH

50	Do you know of any families in which an Acholi has married a Langi or vice versa?	Yes No	1 2	
51	Would you elect a community leader who is not of your tribe?	Yes No	1 2	

PERCENT OF NORTHERN UGANDA POPULATION REPORTING IMPROVED PERCEPTIONS OF PERSONAL SECURITY

52	Do you feel that your property is safe?	Yes No	1 2	
53	Can you travel to any part of northern Uganda without any fear?	Yes No	1 2	
54	Do you fear that you and/your daughters will be victims of gender based violence?	Yes No	1 2	
55	Do you feel free to talk about the conflict issues in northern Uganda?	Yes No	1 2	
56	Do you feel that incidents of banditry have decreased in your community?	Yes No	1 2	
57	Have you heard about or participated in peace events in the past year? If yes mention them, and the institutions or individuals who organized them			
58	a. How do you solve conflicts?			
	b. Do you like farming in a group? Why?			
	c. Do disputes happen among members? Over what? How does the dispute get resolved?			

SECTION E LAND:

59	Have you had any land disputes?	Yes No
60	What is the nature of land disputes that you have encountered?	a. Boundary disputes b. Encroachment c. Retracted land gifts d. Others (specify).....
61	If yes, how was this dispute resolved?	a. Mediation with an Elder b. Mediation with a Rwot Kweri c. Local Council Court d. Magistrates Court

62	If not why wasn't it resolved?	
63	Has the problem gone away or re occurred? If so how was it resolved? If not, what has hindered the problem from being solved?	
64	Have the land Agreements for warehouses ensured farmer group land security?	
65	Who are the signatories to these farmer group Land Agreements?	
66	Have you had any dispute after the signing of the Agreements?	
67	If so what is the nature of the dispute?	
68	Has the dispute been resolved?	
69	Who helps you in your cultivation?	a. Husband b. In laws c. Children d. Others

70	If yes for Children, what is the age bracket of the children who help you in cultivation?	a. 3-6 b. 5-12 c. 12-18
71	For how long do they cultivate?	a. 1-2 hours b. 2-4 hours c. 4-6 hours d. 6-8 hours

NOTE FOR INTERVIEWERS: PLEASE THANK THE RESPONDENT AND NOTE

TIME INTERVIEW ENDED:

C: Access to Justice Review Tools

CI: Key Interview Guide for Implementing Partner

- a) For how long has your Organisation worked with SPRING?
- b) In what areas of capacity building has your organisation received from SPRING since you started working with SPRING project?
- c) How has SPRING's technical assistance or interventions contributed to the achievement of your goals as an organisation?
- d) What adjustments can be taken by you to get the best out of the technical assistance?
- e) What is the level of governance within your organisation?
- f) What is the level of staffing? Indicate contract period and level of qualification.
- g) What activities do you carry out with the support of SPRING?
- h) How do you carry out these activities?
- i) Have you carried out any training? Who were the beneficiaries and what was the content of the training? Politely request for the training modules used.
- j) In your opinion were the modules relevant? Justify your rating with reason and examples.
- k) How have you enhanced people's knowledge about where and how to access Justice?
- l) From your experience how have your interventions increased the cooperation between the formal and informal justice Systems?
- m) In your opinion and from your experience how have the Land Agreements contributed and ensured land security?
- n) How can it be done differently and more effectively?
- o) How effective is the referral mechanism in enabling community members access Justice? Do you follow up? If so how? Kindly request for a copy of the referral form.
- p) What are the unmet needs of your target group?
- q) In what areas does your organisation need support to better implement access to justice programmes in Particular?
- r) From your perspective, what contributions have been made by the project activities to enhancing conflict affected persons and communities accessing Justice?
- s) What difference is this project likely to bring in the area of access to justice by 2010?
- t) What challenges has your organisation experienced in implementing the activities?
- u) What monitoring system is in place to ensure effective delivery of services to the beneficiaries?
- v) What sustainability structures did the project adopt and promote to ensure continuity of the project activities/benefits?
- w) Based on your experience from SPRING grant implementation approach as well as your contextual knowledge of Northern Uganda, what specific activities or programmes are needed to enhance access to justice in Northern Uganda?
- x) How could these activities be carried out?
- y) How can the access to Justice be improved to increase the number of beneficiaries accessing them?

- z) In your Opinion has SPRING designed programmes that are sustainable? What could be done differently?
 aa) Any thoughts/ Recommendations?

=====

C2: KII Guide for SPRING Staff- Access to Justice

- a) What contributions have been made by the project activities to enable conflict affected persons access Justice?
- b) Has the project met the needs of its primary beneficiaries? If so to what extent has it achieved its targets? Please justify your rating with reason.
- c) What indications are there that the project will meet its technical expectations at the end of the project? Why do you think so?
- d) What difference is this project likely to bring in the area of access to justice?
- e) What are the Projects best practices so far?
- f) What kind of support does the project need to achieve its goals?
- g) What have been your challenges/ hindrances in achieving your goals?
- h) Have these challenges been overcome?
- i) If not what can be done to overcome them?
- j) How effective are SPRING's internal management structures on delivering effective project activities and meeting programme objectives?
- k) What are some of the strengths and weaknesses in the current management structure?
- l) What needs to be changed in the management structure? Please justify your answer.
- m) There has been a shift in the implementation of activities in the last two years. What inspired the shift?
- n) How can the access to Justice Component be improved to increase the number of beneficiaries accessing them?
- o) In your Opinion how has the M& E system enabled you to track partner's performance?
- p) What do you see as the most useful elements in the M & E system in tracking justice performance?
- q) What changes need to be made in the current M& E system to better track partner's performance?
- r) What means have you adopted to ensure IP's are informed on key issues pertaining to the project?
- s) How effective are these strategies/
- t) How can the communication be improved?
- u) Explain the nature of relationship with your IP's.
- v) What sustainability strategies did the project adopt and promote to ensure continuity of the different benefits and structures?

D: General Review Tools

D1: Interview Guide for COP, DCOP, Component Heads, M&E Specialist and Communication Manager

SPRING Model

- How is the SPRING Model working?
- What has worked in using the model?
- What has not worked in applying the model in project implementation?
- What challenges have you faced in getting the model implemented and working?
- What modifications or adaptations have you made to the original strategy to get the model working?
- What are the benefits of using the model?
- How can the model be further refined?

Project Management

How effective are SPRING's internal management structures in delivering effective project activities and meeting program objectives?

- What systems are in place and being used to aid effectively implementation of the project?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses in the current project management structure?
- What, if any, needs to be changed in the management structure and for what reasons
- Given the scope of the project and its general funding mechanism, has it met the interim needs of its primary stakeholders? Why do you think so?

How effective and efficient is SPRING's Grants Management process?

- What is your timeline for releases, approval of reports

- How many days it takes for applicants to be appraised and proposals to be assessed and feedback give to the applicants
- What systems are in place to ensure proper grant management and utilisation? How efficient are these systems.
 - Need to review financial and audit reports SPRING and IPs activities

PMP

- What informed the design of the current M & E plan of the project?
- How have you used the PMP in project implementation?
- Doe the PMP serve information needs of the project? What are the existing gaps in quality of indicators and definitions?
- How realistic are the PMP targets vis-à-vis the situation on the ground? How did you set performance targets for each indicator?
- What do you see as the most useful elements in different project components (indicators, targets, routine data gathering tools, database, staff etc) of this M& E plan in tracking the project performance?

Communication:

- Does the project have a communication strategy?
- What means have you adopted to ensure key stakeholders are informed on key issues pertaining to the project? How effective are these strategies? How can communication be improved?
- What have been key achievements for the communication component of the project?

Tracking Separate Funding Streams:

- What system are you using to track separate funding streams within SPRING? Give evidence (report). What challenges have you experienced in tracking and managing separate funding streams? Any possible suggestions on how to overcome these challenges

Environment

- How has SPRING mainstreamed environment mitigation issues in different activities and grants?

Progress towards Planned Targets (Output & Outcome)

- How do you rate performance of the project? Use the performance status as documented by FY 09 annual report.
- What factors explain the level of performance?
- Do you think the project will meet its ultimate needs by 2010? Why do you think so?
- What strategies have you adopted to catch-up with different forms of delays experienced since the start of the project? Please refer to entire project and each component, especially Peace building and reconciliation and access to justice components

Special Considerations:

- What has been the impact of integrated activities on vulnerable children thus far?
- How has EMG given special attention to community-based reintegration of LRA ex-combatants? What has been achieved thus far and will SPRING meet its targets and objectives by the end of the project?
- How has the project integrated gender and what is the degree of success?
- What measures have been adopted by the contractor to strengthen and implement anti-corruption measures?

=====

Annex 3: Progress towards Planned Targets for Economic Security Component*

	Performance Indicators	2008 & 2009 Baseline data	End of Project Target	Planned Target FY (Oct 08- Sept 09)	Total Achieved in FY 2008/09 (Q1+Q2+Q3+Q 4)	% achieved (FY- target)	Total Achievement in Quarter 1 (Oct 09-Dec 09)	%ge Achieveme nt in Quarter 1 (Oct 09-Dec 09)	Average ⁵ for two seasons**	Actual Change for two seasons over baseline**⁶
					<i>SEASON I DATA</i>			<i>SEASON II DATA</i>		
	Economic Security									
IR.3	Enhanced socially inclusive economic security in conflict affected regions									
20	% increase in values of sales (UGX)	189,531	25%	25%	537,730		215,456.2	114%	376593	98.7%
	<i>Groundnuts</i>	135,600		169,500	239,643	77%	266,418	196%	253031	86.6%
	<i>Rice</i>	293,000		366,250	1,270,639	334%	199,246	68%	734943	150.8%
	<i>Maize</i>	168386		210482	381,527	127%	279,612	166%	330570	96.3%
	<i>Chili</i>	358,900		448,625	755,738	111%	332,796	93%	544267	51.6%
	<i>Simsim</i>	123,000		153,750	500,000	307%	105,058	85%	302529	146.0%
	<i>Beans</i>	58,300		72,875	78,833	35%	109,607	188%	94220	61.6%
IR.3.2	Improved competitiveness of value-chain actors within targeted sub-sectors in conflict affected regions									
26	% Increase in productivity (Kg/Acre)	254	40%	25%	579		279		429	69.1%
	<i>Groundnuts (increase by 25%)</i>	202		253	243	20%	321	159%	282	39.6%
	<i>Rice (increase by 25%)</i>	510		638	1,272	149%	322	63%	797	56.3%
	<i>Maize (increase by 25%)</i>	256		320	620	142%	760	297%	690	169.5%
	<i>Chili (increase by 25%)</i>	152		190	335	120%	103	68%	219	44.1%

⁵ Average for two seasons is got dividing the sum of two season values by two

⁶ Average for two seasons divide by baseline value multiplied by 100

<i>Simsim (increase by 25%)</i>	206	258	200	-3%	100	49%	150	-27.2%
<i>Beans (increase by 25%)</i>	196	245	805	311%	67	34%	436	122.4%
* as end of December 2009. **Computed by the Consultant								

Source: SPRING with additional computations by the Consultant

Annex 4: SPRING's Contribution to PRDP

PRDP STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	PRDP Planned Actions	SPRING Contribution
<p>SO 1: Consolidation of State Authority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judicial Services Enhancement Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strengthen Provision and accessibility to Legal services by the General Public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support mechanisms that are established to solve land conflicts and other land access and tenure based problems. • Ensure due process is available to all citizens in the North 	<p>It has supported KKA, ARLPI, CRR to provide mechanism for land conflicts resolution</p> <p>ARLPI is being supported to create forums of both formal and informal justice systems stakeholders that will be accessible to the community at sub-county level. The forum will help in land conflict resolution and mitigation</p> <p>CRR makes legal referrals and provides legal advice to affected community members</p> <p>It has enhanced land tenure security through facilitating farmers to sign land agreements on which SPRING warehouses have been built.</p>
<p>So2: Rebuilding and empowering communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide support to vulnerable persons as a means of strengthening their capacity to sustain themselves 	<p>Economic security component strengthens capacity of individuals affected by conflict and vulnerable youths to sustain themselves. It provides trainings, gives inputs and advisory services as well as supports youth to acquire vocational skills.</p>
<p>SO 3: Revitalization of the economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production and Marketing Enhancement Program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancing land and labor Productivity. • Shift in Production Patterns from subsistence towards medium scale block farming to enhance incomes and food security. 	<p>Supporting farmer groups to engaged in commercial farming as part of economic security and social inclusion. SPRING has provided seeds, trained farmers, constructed warehouses and set-up marketing committees to enable farmers produce in large quantities and access markets.</p>
<p>SO4. Peace Building and Reconciliation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate all existing and planned efforts towards community reconciliation and strengthen mechanisms for political, cultural and socio economic recovery and rehabilitation of Northern Uganda. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support mechanisms for intra/inter communal conflict management • Support to reintegration of ex-combatants • Ensure that formal and non formal accountability and justice mechanisms are in place 	<p>Supporting collaborative projects for reconciling Acholi and Lango communities (NECPA)</p> <p>SPRING is funding 10 pilot projects for reconciliation and peace building</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in Information dissemination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of the media for talk shows, educative messages and other relevant programs to reach the beneficiaries. • Using cultural, local and community leaders to mediate reconciliation among the communities. 	<p>This being done through SPRING radio programmes (Dongo Paco Karacel and peacemaker) and a newspaper</p> <p>It has KKA to mediate between conflicting parties and communities</p>

Annex 5: MTE Information on SPRING Communication Activities

a. Radio Listenership among SPRING supported farmers in SPRING Atiak, Minakulu and Otwal

Radio	Frequency	Percent (n=294)
Mega FM	186	63.3
Unity FM	76	25.9
Radio Wa	67	19.4
Rupiny	35	11.9
Radio Lira	20	6.8
Choice FM	17	5.8
King FM	13	4.4
Radio Palwak	10	3.4
Radio Apac	6	2.0
Radio Pader	3	1.0
Radio Maria	1	0.3

b. Program Listened to by SPRING Supported Farmers

Program	Frequency	Percent (n=294)
Farmers Program	116	39.5
Program pa lupur (Program for Farmers)	79	26.9
Dongo Paco Karacel (Coming together to develop homes)	35	11.9
Peace maker	27	9.2
Human rights program	15	5.1
Announcements	14	4.8
Others (Wang'oo, drama, business)	25	8.5

c. Messages Received from Listening to Radio programs

Message	Frequency	Percent (n=294)
Lobo pa lupur (Farmer's world)	65	22.1
Marketing	30	10.2
Health issues (assorted)	23	7.8
Human rights	14	4.8
Dongo paco karacel	11	3.7
Program pa lupur	8	2.7
Politics	3	1.0

d. Most Helpful Radio Programs listened to by SPRING supported farmers

Program	Frequency	Percent (n=294)
Farmers world program	107	36.4
Peace and reconciliation	26	8.8
VSLA	9	3.1
Children's program	4	1.4

e. Reasons why Specific Radio programs are considered helpful by Farmers

Reason	Frequency	Percent (n=294)
Teaches good farming methods	91	31.0
Guide us on where to get good market (price discovery)	48	16.3
Know where to get seeds	28	9.5
Creates unity	22	7.5
Promote peace and harmony	21	7.1
Give knowledge on where to get loans	5	1.7
Respect for human rights	5	1.7
Other	13	4.4

Percentage of farmers that have ever listened to Dongo Paco Karacel = 19.4%

Most helpful messages

Peace and reconciliation 6.8% (n=20)

Agriculture program – 16.3% (n=48%)

Annex 6: Number of farmers by vulnerability

Name of IPS	# groups	Male	Female	Grand Total	As % of Total	Levels of Vulnerability						
						CH H	Ex-com	FHH	HIV/AIDS	None	PWD	Youth (18-25)
ASB	51	483	849	1332	16%	4	94	86	36	848	124	140
CPAR	40	458	742	1200	15%	7	177	195	24	542	50	205
IRC	13	474	284	758	9%	0	0	26	0	518	49	165
KICABER	40	486	714	1200	15%	4	179	115	16	412	149	325
LIDFA	30	398	502	900	11%	3	187	64	8	355	69	214
MP	26	90	286	376	5%	1	0	119	0	247	9	0
NECPA	21	456	408	864	10%	29	53	79	42	306	114	241
WACFO	10	55	256	311	4%	0	15	208	23	32	31	2
MC	5	81	114	195	2%	4	16	28	1	36	31	79
ADFA	30	462	438	900	11%	5	63	94	18	517	70	133
KITWO BEE	8	58	81	139	2%	0	21	19	2	85	10	2
ACADOS	2	73	27	100	1%	2	25	6	4	10	2	51
Grand Total	276	3,574	4,701	8,275	100%	59	830	1,039	174	3,908	708	1,557
As a % of the Total		43%	57%	100%		1%	10%	13%	2%	47%	9%	19%

Abbreviations: CHH :Child headed household; EX-com : Ex-combatant; FHH: Female headed household; HIV/AIDS: HIV/AIDS Infected person; None: No peculiar vulnerability; PWD: Person with Disability; Youth (18-25): Youth aged 18-25 years

Source: SPRING