



## **Country Specific Information: Uganda**

United States Agency for International Development  
Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance  
Office of Food for Peace

### **Fiscal Year 2012: Title II Request for Applications Title II Development Programs**

*Subject to the availability of funds and commodities, under this Request for Applications (RFA), the Office of Food for Peace (FFP) plans to enter into one or more awards for the following countries: Guatemala, Niger and Uganda. Applications are submitted at the risk of the applicant, and all preparation and submission costs are at the applicant's expense.*

**Background:** The Office of Food for Peace (FFP) anticipates that funds and commodities will be available for Title II development programming in Uganda in fiscal year (FY) 2012. The anticipated FFP funding for this program is approximately \$15-20 million annually for five years in support of up to two awards, subject to the availability of funds and commodities. This document supplements the Title II Request for Applications (RFA) with information on the United States Agency for International Development in Uganda (USAID/Uganda) and FFP's food security programming priorities.

**Food Security Situation:** Over the last decade Uganda has made significant economic strides and is seen as one of the emerging key agricultural producers in Eastern and Central Africa. Despite this, chronic food in-security persists particularly in the Northern and North Eastern (Karamoja) parts of the country. The World Food Program (WFP) has named Karamoja the most food insecure region of Uganda, based on consumption data,<sup>1</sup> with stunting rates among children under five years of age at 54 percent.<sup>2</sup> Infrastructure is poor and road access is limited. An impoverished region whose population includes pastoralists and agro-pastoralists as well as agriculturalists, Karamoja suffers frequent drought and is characterized by insecurity and violence (cattle-raiding/banditry), a challenging climate and less fertile land than in the central and southwest portions of the country.<sup>3</sup>

**Policy Environment:** The Title II development program will be USAID's principal tool to

---

<sup>1</sup> World Food Program (2009), Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Assessment (CFSVA) (<http://home.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/ena/wfp202495.pdf>)

<sup>2</sup> Government of Uganda, 2006, Demographic Health Survey

<sup>3</sup> UBOS and Macro, p.1

support the Government of Uganda's Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Program (KIDDP). Accordingly, applications must specify how the proposed activities complement the KIDDP and the KIDDP Action Plan for Food Security in particular, the Peace and Recovery Development Plan (PRDP) for Northern Uganda, and the efforts of the World Bank-funded Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF-2). Applicants should articulate how proposed activities complement and link with other U.S. Government investments -- including where possible, Feed the Future (FtF) -- and Government of Uganda national, regional and district level development priorities.

Applicants should also articulate how the proposed activities complement the aims, activities and investments of other development actors, including the WFP, other United Nations agencies and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), civil society, the private sector and communities themselves. Applications should describe the means through which the development program will contribute to and encourage an enabling environment for promoting gender equity. Applications should also indicate how the program will work with and through district government systems to build the capacity of local government to address the root causes of food insecurity.

**Geographic Priorities:** FFP will focus Title II development program resources in the Karamoja region, currently consisting of seven districts in northeast Uganda (Kaabong, Kotido, Abim, Moroto, Napak, Amudat and Nakapiripirit). Karamoja suffers frequent drought, and is characterized by insecurity, violence and under-development. Waiting for the conditions necessary for development to be fully present before investing there would virtually ensure the region remains in a state of protracted livelihood crisis for the next 20-plus years. Conversely, investing in efforts to create these conditions and address the underlying causes of the protracted livelihood crisis in Karamoja will reduce the need to perpetually respond to its symptoms with humanitarian relief.

As is programmatically appropriate, development program resources may also be focused in the districts that border Karamoja, such as Katakwi, Amuria and Kitgum<sup>4</sup>. Food security in these districts continues to be hampered by conflict spilling over from Karamoja such that development (and underdevelopment) in Karamoja and these districts are inextricably linked. These districts have significant potential for increased crop and livestock production, and realizing this potential can contribute to food security in Karamoja because of the close linkages between the two regions.

There are no pre-determined target areas within the geographic focus area identified above. However, applications must substantiate with evidence the proposed target areas among and within the geographic focus area identified on the basis of comparative need and potential return on investment. Need should be defined on the basis of comparative food security and nutritional status of households and communities. Potential return on investment should be defined in relation to the sector priorities and areas for intervention outlined below, as well the complementarities between the proposed activities, peace-building efforts and other development investments (see **Policy Environment** section). Any proposed activities in a district bordering

---

<sup>4</sup> This list is not exhaustive.

Karamoja should be justified based on its connection to Karamoja, not solely on the food security needs in the district.

**Program Length:** Subject to the availability of funds and commodities, FFP is considering up to two five-year awards for the upcoming development program in Uganda.

**USAID/Uganda and FFP Programming Priorities:** The overall strategic objective for the Title II development program in Uganda *is to reduce food insecurity among chronically food insecure households*. Under this objective, two broadly-defined sector priorities have been identified: strengthening livelihoods and improving nutrition among children under five. In line with the principles behind USAID Uganda's FtF strategy, which include addressing underlying causes of hunger and under nutrition, this dual track effort is intended to yield compounding returns in food security status by simultaneously addressing its three underlying causes - food availability, access and utilization. Furthermore, this development program aligns with the USAID/Uganda Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) Special Objective 1, "*Peace and security improved in Karamoja.*"<sup>5</sup>

For the development program priority component I, *strengthening livelihoods*, interventions should include, but not be limited to: 1) diversifying livelihood assets and opportunities; 2) promoting improved technologies and practices; 3) increasing market access, information and orientation; 4) enhancing resiliency and risk management; and 5) improving natural resource management. Of particular note is that while improving the quantity and quality of production is important, considerable attention should be directed at the market for any products as this will lead to more sustainable improvements in income and food security. Therefore, proposed interventions should be guided by a thorough market analysis to ensure sufficient demand exists to sustainably support the increased production of any livestock or agricultural-related products.

For the development program priority component II, *improving nutrition among children under five*, interventions should be based on a community-based preventive approach (focusing on pregnant and lactating women and children under the age of two) and should include, but not be limited to: 1) improving infant and young child feeding practices; 2) preventing and treating childhood illnesses; 3) improving maternal health and nutrition in pregnant and lactating women; 4) enhancing access to clean water/sanitation, and improving hygiene practices; 5) improving adoption of improved health practices through effective Behavior Change Communication (BCC) and interventions; and 6) promoting access to local health care including growth monitoring by local health authorities with screening and referral for children under five with severe acute malnutrition. For further information on this sector priority, *improving nutrition among children under five*, please see the standard language on prevention of malnutrition in the RFA. Food rations need to support and complement the proposed interventions for priority components I and II. Applicants are responsible for determining the most appropriate food aid ration and distribution method based on their knowledge of the local context, nutritional needs

---

<sup>5</sup> See the USAID/Uganda CDCS for additional details on SpO1 for Karamoja.

[https://www.fbo.gov/index?s=opportunity&mode=form&id=f573abb95a1080cb1ccc621fc4108ca1&tab=core&\\_cvi\\_ew=0](https://www.fbo.gov/index?s=opportunity&mode=form&id=f573abb95a1080cb1ccc621fc4108ca1&tab=core&_cvi_ew=0)

and other food security factors.

It is important to note that the conflict and instability found in Karamoja impede the government from providing most basic social services, constrain the region's food security and economic development by disrupting livestock rearing, crop production and market access, and have interfered with health campaigns. It is USAID's experience in Uganda and other contexts that when working to promote food security and improve livelihoods in resource scarce and volatile areas, like Karamoja, there is potential to do harm, therefore conflict sensitive approaches are critical.

**Target Livelihood Groups, Households and Individuals:** The focus of the program will be to strengthen livelihoods and improve nutrition among food insecure pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, and farming households within the geographic focus area identified in the section on **Geographic Priorities**. Within these broad parameters, applications must substantiate (with evidence) the choice of livelihood groups to be targeted. Applicants should also define and substantiate (with evidence) the choice of sub-groups to be targeted within these broadly defined livelihood groups. In both cases, this should be based on the same criteria used to select target areas with the identified geographic focus area – that is, comparative need and potential for return on investment.

In order to achieve compounding returns in food security status, nutrition and health interventions should target the same communities and households targeted by interventions aimed at strengthening livelihoods. Applications should also specify how activities designed to address each of these sector priorities will be integrated for maximum impact. Given that transhumant mobility and 'splitting the herd' are key features of pastoralist and agro-pastoralist livelihoods in the areas targeted, this may entail targeting households and communities that are geographically distant, but socially and economically linked.

### **Additional Key Considerations**

**Conflict Sensitive Approaches:** Applications must articulate how the program will adopt a conflict sensitive approach, and incorporate community-level peace building strategies in order to create more sustainable livelihood development. Proposed livelihood strengthening activities should complement - and are complemented by - conflict resolution and peace-building efforts supported by the Government of Uganda, USAID and others in the proposed target area(s). As noted in the **Geographic Priorities** section, these complementarities should also constitute part of the justification for the areas targeted and activities proposed, particularly as they relate to the potential return on investment. This return on investment should be conceived in two ways: (1) how peace and security can contribute to livelihood strengthening and (2) how strengthening livelihoods can contribute to peace, security and transformative change.

**Response to Predictable Shocks:** Given USAID/Uganda and FFP's choice to invest multi-year resources in areas that are highly vulnerable to drought, significant forethought regarding emergency response is required. Indeed, recurrent drought every few years, coupled with conflict and other aggravating factors, virtually ensures that such a response will be required within the program's lifecycle.

To address this, applications must contain a response strategy for dealing with predictable shocks relevant to the proposed target area(s) and livelihood group(s). This strategy should include activities that contribute to building local and state level early warning and response capacity. It should also be embedded in the proposed program's strategy - meaning it should align with and support development goals and preserve development gains made in intervening (non-shock) years.

How food is distributed is critical in this regard. General food distributions, for example, can undermine livelihoods and coping strategies by introducing disincentives to production, and nomadic and transhumant mobility. Timing is also critical as intervening too early or too late may well undermine development goals and gains. Accordingly, applications must identify and define trigger indicators and response activities that take these 'how' and 'when' factors into account. Destocking programs timed to prevent a downward spiral of divestment and destitution among pastoralist populations offer an illustrative, livelihood-specific example.

The application is free to present this information in any format (in the technical narrative, separate annex or another format) that they feel best demonstrates proper planning for shocks that require an emergency response.