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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID), through its Uganda Mission, established a Regional Coordination Initiative (RCI) that engages local governments, local universities, researchers, civil society, the private sector, and cultural and religious institutions as partners in development. The RCI is implemented through regional platforms that are formed by clusters of districts within a region in Uganda. The Steering Committees for the Karamoja and southwestern Uganda regional development platforms raised deep concerns over what they perceive as violations of the rights of indigenous peoples, particularly the Batwa in southwestern Uganda, and the Ik and Tepeth in the Karamoja subregion. The Karamoja Regional Steering Committee also identified a chronic issue of trafficking children from the region to various urban centers including Kampala, the capital city where they are destitute and/or living in conditions that can be described as a form of modern-day slavery. As such, in 2019, USAID/Uganda commissioned studies aimed at strengthening the voices of Uganda’s indigenous peoples (the Batwa, the Ik, and the Tepeth) and combating child trafficking in Karamoja. The research studies are funded by USAID’s Higher Education Solutions Network mechanism called the Long-Term Assistance and Services for Research (LASER) Partners for University-Led Solutions Engine (PULSE). It is part of an initiative to undertake development research using locally available expertise aimed at informing subsequent interventions to strengthen the voices of Uganda’s indigenous peoples who are faced with historical and continuing marginalization, as well as vulnerabilities associated with child trafficking in Karamoja. By working through higher education institutions, USAID/Uganda Mission seeks to encourage sustainable partnerships with local universities positioned to conduct robust development research and build local ownership and capacity around these issues.

This report presents research results from two studies: 1) the voices and vulnerabilities of the Ik and Tepeth indigenous peoples; and 2) child trafficking in the Karamoja region, which were conducted by Gulu University Constituent College (GUCC) and Makerere University School of Public Health-ResilientAfrica Network (RAN). The report is an extension of a 2020 publication titled "A Desk Review Report of the Voices and Rights of the Batwa, the Ik, and the Tepeth Indigenous Peoples and Trafficking in Persons in Karamoja." This report is divided into two parts; A and B. Part A presents the voices and vulnerabilities of the Ik and Tepeth, while Part B looks at child trafficking in Karamoja.

Part A: The Voices of the Indigenous Peoples of Karamoja; the Rights and Vulnerabilities of the Ik and Tepeth

This first component of the study aims to better understand the voices of the Ik and Tepeth indigenous peoples relating to their marginalization and vulnerabilities, as well as to identify existing capacities and opportunities to inform development interventions. Specifically, the study answers the following questions: What is the level of marginalization among the Ik and Tepeth? How does marginalization
manifest among the Ik and Tepeth? What are the underlying drivers of marginalization? What capacities and opportunities exist to address vulnerability and marginalization, and what are the barriers?

I. Methodology

The study used both qualitative and quantitative techniques to collect and gather relevant information. Primary data was collected in September 2020, through interviews at the household level, among the Tepeth (in Tapac and Katikekile sub-counties in Moroto district) and the Ik (in Timu, Kamion, and Morungole sub-counties in Kaabong district). The two districts (Moroto and Kaabong) and the sub-counties were purposely selected since they host the indigenous groups while the parishes, villages, and households were selected randomly. Quantitative data was collected using a survey questionnaire that was designed, piloted, and uploaded into Open Data Kit (ODK), an online open-source software installed on Android tablets. Respondents from the selected households were either household heads or other adult household members. Quantitative data analysis put into consideration categorical/classed variables, which represent independent attributes of the respondents, for instance, sex or ranked attributes, such as educational attainment. The nature of these variables called for the use of frequencies and cross-tabulations for comparison within and across the two ethnic groups. Qualitative data collection involved in-depth interviews (IDIs) with opinion leaders and community elders, key informant interviews (KII)s with district officials and NGOs, as well as focus group discussions (FGDs) with community members. To ensure gender representation, FGDs were conducted separately for women, men, and the youth. A total of 20 IDIs and 16 FGDs were conducted. Thematic analysis was used on the data.

II. Results

The total number of households surveyed was 455, with 120 households from the Ik, 304 from the Tepeth, and 31 from other ethnic groups i.e. the Karimojong, Ethur, Ankole, Pokot, and Turkana. The majority of the respondents (64 percent) were female, and 62 percent had no formal education.

Manifestation of marginalization among the Ik and Tepeth

Survey results show that the two ethnic groups do face marginalization. This marginalization manifests itself in a number of ways, including poor quality of living conditions, limited ownership of household assets, limited sources of livelihood, limited access to amenities and social services (health, education, and clean water), limited access to public goods and infrastructure (transport, communication, and energy), erosion of culture and, limited political participation and representation.

Poor Living Conditions and Limited Assets: The majority of respondents, 90 percent of the Ik and 77 percent of the Tepeth live in grass thatched houses made of mud and wattle walls. Twenty-seven percent of the Ik and 90 percent of the Tepeth surveyed did not have toilet facilities. Survey results also show that both the Ik and Tepeth are asset-poor, owning only a few household assets. Poor living conditions
and the possession of relatively few household assets point to high incidences of poverty among the two ethnic groups.

**Limited Sources of Livelihood and Income:** The majority of the respondents surveyed within the two ethnic groups’ communities were employed in subsistence agriculture with over ninety percent reporting farming as their main source of livelihood. Only 54 percent of the Ik and 58 percent of the Tepeth reported having earned income in the month preceding the survey, with the majority earning the income by selling produce from their gardens.

**Limited Access to Health Services:** Seventy-four percent of the Ik and 55 percent of the Tepeth respondents reported having a household member who had suffered an illness or injury in the 30 days preceding the survey. This is a significantly high rate of illness or injury among the two communities when compared to the Uganda National Household Survey (UNHS) 2019/20 nation-wide figure of 28 percent and 35.1 percent for the entire Karamoja subregion. This high incidence of disease and injuries is a result of a number of factors including poor living conditions, as well as limited access to health services. Key barriers to accessing health services reported by the respondents include the long distances to health centers, high costs, poor quality of services, the limited number of health facilities, drug stockouts, understaffed health facilities and absenteeism of staff.

**Limited Access to Safe Water and Sanitation:** Survey findings revealed that the Ik and Tepeth communities have little or no access to tap/piped water, with slightly more than half of the households interviewed accessing water from boreholes. A significant proportion (25 percent of the Ik and 37 percent of the Tepeth) source water from rivers. In addition, a significant number of respondents, 73 percent among the Ik, reported having no toilet facilities compared to only 10 percent among the Tepeth. The proportion of Ik respondents lacking toilet facilities is higher than the national (7.4 percent) and Karamoja averages (69.5 percent), based on the UNHS report of 2019/20.

**Limited Access to Education Services:** Survey results showed that 62 percent of the respondents from the two ethnic groups had no formal education. Adult literacy among the respondents within the two ethnic groups was very low, at 40 percent, compared to the national adult literacy rate of 74 percent. Low levels of literacy and lack of formal education are partly due to limited access to education services and infrastructure, like the dearth of nearby schools. Findings also show that a significant number of children from the Ik and the Tepeth communities dropout of school, with the majority of children dropping out at the primary school level. The main reasons given for children dropping out of school include schools being expensive, child labor (children dropping out to help on the farm, at home, or running businesses), unwillingness of the children to attend school, distance from school, loss of parents, and insecurity.

**Discrimination Based on Language, Culture, and Identity:** Survey results showed that 42 percent of the Ik and Tepeth respondents experienced discrimination because of their ethnicity. A significant proportion
of respondents from the two ethnic groups reported failing to access public services (health care, education, water, and transport), because of their ethnicity or language. Furthermore, participants in the qualitative interviews indicated that the culture and languages of the Ik and Tepeth are gradually being forgotten, especially among the young generations. For example, the early school years the children are being taught in ḥa’karimojong (the dominant language in the region) and not Ik or Tepeth. This deters the children from learning their language and culture.

Inadequate Leadership and Political Representation: Twenty-eight percent of the respondents from the Ik community and 16 percent from the Tepeth reported having a family member holding a leadership position in the community at the time of the survey. The majority of the leadership positions held (83 percent for the Ik and 66 percent for the Tepeth), are at the local council level with less than 10 percent at the sub-county, district, and parliamentary/central government levels for both ethnic groups. One in four (28 percent) of the Ik and Tepeth felt that leaders’ decisions in local government (district and sub-county) didn’t reflect their priorities at all. That number is higher when it comes to the national level (31 percent for the Ik and 50 percent for the Tepeth). On the other hand, 47 percent of the respondents from the Ik communities felt that the local government (district and sub-county) cared about them and their opinions. That number is much smaller for the Tepeth (21 percent). Results further reveal that more than half of the respondents from the two ethnic groups didn’t feel confident enough to participate in public decision making in the community.

Underlying drivers of marginalization among the Ik and Tepeth communities

Interviews and survey findings revealed the underlying drivers of marginalization to include displacement resulting from conservation, insecure land tenure, insecurity, and poor infrastructure.

Insecure Land Tenure: Results from the survey show that land tenure in this region is not clearly defined nor secure. A significant number of the respondents, 72 percent for the Ik and 54 percent for the Tepeth, reported land disputes as being common in their communities. Indeed, 33 percent and 12 percent among the Ik and Tepeth respectively reported their households as having been involved in land disputes in the past.

Insecurity in the Karamoja subregion: The Ik and Tepeth live in a region characterized by insecurity due to cattle raids among the pastoral ethnic groups within Uganda and across the borders from Kenya and South Sudan who possess firearms. Respondents during FGDs reported that during the cattle raids pastoral groups steal, rape women and girls and sometimes commit murder. Insecurity stemming from cattle raids leads to poverty due to reduced productivity, loss of property, displacement, homelessness, loss of life, hunger; and low retention of children in school.

Poor infrastructure: Discussions with key informants and community members revealed that both the Ik and Tepeth communities are faced with poor infrastructure in terms of bad roads and limited access to communication networks. The poor infrastructure is exacerbated by the mountainous terrain occupied
by the two ethnic groups. The mountainous ranges not only hinder both local government and development partners but also the communities themselves. Poor infrastructure reduces the ability of these indigenous groups to fully participate in the mainstream economic activities and governance, as well as limits their access to public goods and services, such as access to electricity and social services like health and education, and access to information, resulting in their marginalization.

**Existing capacities, opportunities, and barriers to address marginalization**

Existing capacities and opportunities to address marginalization of the Ik and the Tepeth include the presence of natural resources including minerals and tourist attractions, which if developed could provide alternative employment and incomes to the communities, the presence of NGOs and development partners devoted to the development of the two communities, infrastructure development efforts by the government, and government policies on universal primary and secondary education. Barriers to addressing marginalization include continuing insecurity in the region, low human capital development, and limited access to health services and safe water.

**III. Conclusions and Recommendations**

Study results show that indeed the two ethnic groups face marginalization, manifested through exclusion or limited participation in mainstream economic activities, limited participation in governance, and limited access to public goods and services such as access to safe water and social services like health and education among others. Resulting from marginalization, the Ik and Tepeth lag behind other ethnic groups nationwide regarding a number of development indicators. The majority of respondents surveyed within the Ik and Tepeth communities live in relatively poor conditions, are asset poor, have poor health and have lower literacy rates. The two groups have relatively less leadership and political representation and face hostilities from their dominant neighbors. The key recommendations to address the Ik and Tepeth issues of marginalization include:

1) **Protection of land rights:** The government should put in place a land tenure system in the Karamoja subregion that protects individual and community rights of use and ownership of land. The majority of land in this subregion is under customary tenure whereby the rights, rules and responsibilities to possess, occupy and use it are based on community customs. Measures to reduce illegal evictions and land grabbing should be implemented especially when it comes to land occupied by the indigenous communities.

2) **Increased provision of education services:** There is a need for affirmative action regarding the provision of education services. The government and development partners should increase efforts to ensure that marginalized groups have access to quality education by constructing schools within the Ik and Tepeth communities, equipping the existing schools with the right tools; this includes recruiting competent staff, improving education infrastructure, improving security around schools,
increasing numbers of teachers, and supplying schools with the appropriate teaching and learning materials.

3) **Increased provision of health services:** The government and development partners should increase efforts to ensure that marginalized groups have access to quality health care services. This will require constructing healthcare facilities within the communities and equipping the existing healthcare centers with the right tools, including recruiting competent staff and machinery to deliver quality services as well as stocking health centers with the right drugs and in the right quantities to reduce stock outs.

4) **Provision of alternative income generating activities:** As the population continues to grow, communities like the Ik and Tepeth can no longer afford to rely solely on natural resources and subsistence agriculture, which is prone to climate variability and weather shocks, for their livelihoods. Alternative activities need to be introduced to the communities in order to diversify their income sources. This will require training individuals, especially the youth, to enable them to acquire new skills required for alternative employment.

5) **Affirmative action in leadership and governance:** While there have been efforts to boost indigenous people’s representation in parliament through the creation of two constituencies in the Ik and the Tepeth communities, more needs to be done to increase representation at the sub-county and district levels. Since indigenous people have smaller numbers compared to their dominant neighbors, special political positions at the sub-county and district levels need to be created for the Ik and Tepeth to ensure that the voices of the two minority groups are heard.

6) **Peace and security:** The government should increase strategic deployment of security forces to protect the lives and property of local communities and to deter attacks from armed groups from both within and across borders. The government should also fast-track the process of disarming the dominant neighboring tribes, including discussions with the Kenyan and South Sudan governments to disarm their communities to abate cross-border cattle rustling.

7) **Infrastructure development:** The government should step up its infrastructure development efforts in the subsectors of transport and communications, electricity, and telecommunications among others within the Karamoja subregion. In order to fight marginalization, prioritizing the extension of these critical infrastructure to the indigenous communities will be a step in the right direction.

8) **Ensure community participation in mining contracts/negotiations:** The presence of minerals in Karamoja can be a source of alternative income and livelihood for the communities if well-managed. The government and development partners should therefore institute strategies to ensure that the local communities benefit from these natural resources. Communities should be empowered, consulted, and allowed to participate in the negotiations and contracting process with the mining companies to ensure that their rights and interests are fairly represented and protected.

9) **Increase climate change adaptation strategies/support:** Development partners and the government should increase support efforts and actions that are aimed at combating climate change which is affecting agricultural production and productivity within the communities. Such efforts could include...
strategies to reduce deforestation, adoption of better agricultural methods and actions to support
the reduction of the heavy reliance on natural resources by the communities.

10) **Culture, language and identity**: Culture, language and identity are a big concern among not only the
Ik and Tepeth indigenous communities, but also among the Kadama of Nakapiripirit, Ngikuliak of
Kotido, and Ngangia of Karenga. Efforts to revive and maintain the indigenous peoples’ cultures
should be encouraged. Such efforts include promoting the teaching of indigenous languages in
schools especially in kindergarten and lower primary.

**Part B: Child Trafficking in Karamoja**

This second component of the study was undertaken in September 2020 in Napak district. Napak
district was selected after being identified as a top hotspot for child trafficking in Karamoja. In this
report, unless otherwise stated, child trafficking will mean the recruitment, transportation, transfer,
harboring, or receipt of a person under the age of 18 years for the purpose of exploitation as defined in
the Prevention of Trafficking in Persons Act, 2009. The Act defines “exploitation” to include at a
minimum, sexual exploitation, forced marriage, child marriage, forced labor, harmful child labor, use of a
child in armed conflict, use of a person in illegal activities, debt bondage, slavery or practices similar to
slavery or servitude, human sacrifice, the removal of organs or body parts for sale or for purposes of
witchcraft, harmful rituals or practices. This study also recognizes that children do not necessarily have
to be transported across national borders for trafficking to take place, it can take place within the
country, across regions or districts, or even within the communities where the children reside.

This study aims to better understand the prevalence of child trafficking, the underlying drivers and
effects of child trafficking in Napak district, as well as to identify existing capacities and opportunities to
inform development interventions. Specifically, the study answers the following questions: What is the
prevalence of child trafficking in Napak district?; What are the manifestations and the underlying drivers
of child trafficking?; and what are the existing capacities, opportunities, and barriers to address child
trafficking in Karamoja?

**I. Methodology**

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to capture relevant data for the study. A household
survey and qualitative interviews were conducted in Lopeei, Lokopo and Lorengecora sub counties in
Napak district. The sub counties were purposely selected since they are the epicenters of child
trafficking. Within these sub counties, parishes, villages, and households were randomly selected.

For quantitative data collection, a survey questionnaire was designed, pretested and uploaded into ODK,
an online open-source software installed on Android tablets. Data were collected at the household level
by trained research assistants in the local language, Ngakarimjong. Respondents from the selected
households were either household heads, or other adult household members. Quantitative data analysis
made use of frequencies to calculate proportions and cross tabulations for the calculation of proportions across the different variables for comparison.

Qualitative data were collected using IDIs with opinion leaders at the community level and adults who had been victims of child trafficking; KII with district officials, representatives from NGOs, civil society and other development partners; and FGDs with community members from Lopeei, Lokopo and Lolognechora sub counties. FGDs were conducted separately for women, men and the youth to ensure gender representation and to allow for unbiased discourse. A total of six IDIs, six KII and nine FGDs were carried out. Thematic analysis was adopted to analyze the data, with focus given to identifying emerging issues and insights from the interviews to determine the socioeconomic and structural factors related to child trafficking in Napak district.

II. Results

A total of 397 households were surveyed of which 378 had children below the age of 18 years. The surveyed households had a total number of 1,432 children with the majority (70.8 percent) being below nine years old. Two percent of children had disabilities and six percent were orphaned. Sixty-five percent of school age children (five years and above), were not enrolled in school. Three percent of the children were living away from their parents’ home at the time of the survey. The majority of children (59 percent) who were away from home were engaged in work (including grazing animals, casual labor and charcoal burning), while seven percent had gone into child marriage and six percent were at school.

Prevalence and Manifestation of Child Trafficking in Napak District

Survey findings show that 321 out of 1,432 children (22 percent) from the surveyed households had experienced exploitation that qualifies them as having been victims of child trafficking. These exploitations included forced child labor, harmful child labor, debt bondage, children forced to perform immoral and illegal activities (stealing and prostitution) and child marriages.

**Forced child labor:** Survey results show that among the children aged five years and above, three percent of the boys and three percent of the girls were forced to work for someone who is not a relative, six percent of the boys and eight percent of the girls had worked for little or no wages, and nearly two percent of the children (both girls and boys) performed work that they had not agreed upon.

**Harmful child labor:** Survey results show that a significant number of children, while working away from home, had been involved in some form of harmful labor in the year preceding the survey. Twenty-seven percent of the boys and 26 percent of the girls aged five and above had engaged in work that required carrying heavy loads. Nearly 28 percent of the boys and 25 percent of the girls had worked in extreme weather conditions, while a small percentage had been exposed to dust/fumes/gas or loud noises and vibrations at work. Results from the survey also revealed that a large number of children
were subjected to long working hours with 46 percent working more than 43 hours in the week preceding the survey.

**Illegal/immoral activities:** Results from the household survey revealed that among the children surveyed aged five years and above, 0.5 percent of the boys and one percent of the girls were forced to beg for money while 0.5 percent of the boys were engaged in work that was illegal or immoral such as stealing and prostitution. Although the quantitative results found no evidence of prostitution, KII and IDI interviews reveal that some of the girls trafficked end up as sex workers. Prostitution not only affects the mental wellness of the children, it also puts them at risk of contracting sexually transmitted diseases including HIV/AIDS.

**Child marriages:** Survey results show that 0.7 percent of the boys and two percent of the girls, aged five years and above, were married. Results from qualitative interviews revealed that child marriages are sometimes orchestrated by parents who marry off their children in order to get dowry while in some incidences, unbearable circumstances at home force children to run away from home to get married without the consent or knowledge of their parents.

**Underlying Drivers of Child Trafficking in Napak**

The underlying drivers of child trafficking include high incidences of poverty, food insecurity and hunger, limited access to education, peer influence, inadequate family support and poor parenting skills, trafficking networks, and insecurity.

**Poverty:** The majority of respondents from the household survey (96 percent) live in temporary housing structures made of mud and wattle with grass thatched roofs. Only three percent of the household surveyed owned radios, 12 percent owned mobile phones and only nine percent owned bicycles. A small percentage of the households owned productive assets like gardens (25 percent), livestock (15 percent) and poultry (18 percent). Residing in temporary structures and owning few household assets points to high levels of poverty within the surveyed households.

The high incidence of poverty among the households surveyed is partly due to limited sources of income and livelihood opportunities. In the household survey, 67 percent of respondents reported farming as their main source of livelihood, 18 percent were involved in petty trade while 13 percent depended on humanitarian support. Only 23 percent of the respondents reported having earned an income in the month preceding the survey. The majority (65 percent) had earned the income as payment for casual labor. Poverty is further exacerbated by insecurity due to cattle raids (cattle rustling). Karimojong mainly depend on livestock as a source of livelihood and in the recent past, there have been several cattle raids, which has eroded their livelihoods, driving families further into poverty.

Qualitative results from KII s and FGDs revealed that high levels of poverty at the household and community level forces children to seek work in order to contribute to household expenses and meet
basic personal needs. Seeking work at an early age increases the risk of children becoming victims of exploitation and consequently child trafficking.

**Food insecurity and hunger:** Nearly all household survey respondents (99 percent) reported having insufficient food or money to buy food or provide medicine.

**Limited access to education:** Results from the survey revealed that the majority (65 percent) of school age children (five years and above) were not enrolled in school. The main reasons given for children not attending school include schools being expensive, insecurity, peer influence, hunger, long distance to schools, child labor (children dropping out to help on the farm/garden, at home or running businesses), unwillingness of the children to attend school, and loss of a parent. Indeed, children out of school are vulnerable to various forms of exploitation and can easily be lured into trafficking.

**Peer influence:** Peer influence plays a big role in tempting children to leave their homes; many end up being exploited or trafficked. Notwithstanding the bad experiences, including mental and physical abuse and poor living and working conditions, shared by trafficked returnees, qualitative results revealed that parents and children are enticed by the items (such as smartphones, beads, suitcases, clothes, Vaseline, saucepans, and jerry cans among other) that returnees come back with. The returnees are admired by children in the communities because of their ‘healthy appearance,’ such as healthy skin and good clothing.

**Inadequate family support and poor parenting skills:** Respondents reported that poor parenting is contributing to child trafficking. For instance, study participants mentioned that due to the high levels of alcoholism, the functioning of families and households has been disrupted. There are several reports of drunkenness and domestic violence (with harsh punishments to children) which sometimes force children to run away from home ending up exploited or trafficked. Furthermore, some cultural practices directly or indirectly contribute to child trafficking. For example, parents marry off young girls to obtain dowry.

**Network of traffickers and the various tactics used:** Qualitative results revealed that there are a number of people engaged in or facilitating trafficking activities including relatives of victims, transporters and employers. Participants in the qualitative interviews reported that there are several and sometimes complex tactics that perpetrators (who sometimes are relatives to the victims) use to lure their victims and families into trafficking. They sometimes use money or the promise of better education/good schools for the victims, which are more readily available in big towns and cities. This entices the families to permit their children to leave home.

**Existing Capacities, Opportunities, and Barriers to Address Child Trafficking in Karamoja**

**Presence of NGOs and development partners devoted to fighting child trafficking in Karamoja:** There are a number of NGOs working on various programs focused on development initiatives aimed at abating child trafficking. Survey findings show that 13 percent of the households had received some form
of humanitarian relief in the month before the survey. The majority (79 percent) had received aid in the form of food items while 13 percent received cash donations. The main source of this relief was from international NGOs (69 percent) followed by local NGOs at 21 percent. The presence of development partners and NGOs committed to tackling underlying drivers of child trafficking like hunger, offers a great opportunity to fight this scourge.

**Local government efforts to stop child trafficking:** There are efforts by the Napak district local government working together with NGOs to combat child trafficking in the district. Interviews with district officials revealed that with support from Save the Children International in 2018, Napak district passed two ordinances, the Child Protection Ordinance and the Education Ordinance. The district is also working through the local leaders, elders and drama groups to denounce child trafficking.

**Central government efforts:** The central government through the Ministry of Gender, Labor and Social Development (MoGLSD) and the Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA) have designed strategies aimed at the rehabilitation and resettlement of street children. For example, in 2019, KCCA passed the Child Protection Ordinance, which the government, through the MoGLSD, plans to use in the relocation, resettlement, and rehabilitation of street children including those from Karamoja.

Barriers to fighting child trafficking include insecurity due to cattle raids, climate variability and food insecurity, and poor infrastructure. If these are not addressed, efforts to combat child trafficking will be hampered.

### III. Conclusions and Recommendations

Findings from this study show a high prevalence of child trafficking in Napak district. Child trafficking manifests itself in a number of ways including forced child labor, harmful child labor, debt bondage, sexual exploitation and child marriage. The key underlying drivers of child trafficking identified include the high incidence of poverty which is partially driven by limited livelihood opportunities and insecurity from cattle raids, food insecurity and hunger, limited access to education, peer influence, inadequate family support and poor parenting skills, as well as by the networks and tactics used by traffickers. The key recommendations for addressing child trafficking within Napak district include;

1) **Peace and security:** The government should increase strategic deployment of security forces to protect the lives and property of local communities and to deter attacks from armed cattle rustlers from both within and across borders. Strengthening peace and security within Karamoja will help to safeguard the livelihoods, property and assets which are often lost, keeping households and communities in abject poverty. The government should also engage local communities and work towards establishing and supporting community-based security systems as a sustainable mechanism for dealing with insecurity and conflict.
2) **Provision of education:** The government and development partners should increase efforts to ensure that the people of Karamoja have access to quality education services. This will entail constructing more boarding schools within the communities, equipping schools with the appropriate tools including teaching and learning materials, recruiting competent staff, as well as bringing down the cost of education incurred by parents.

3) **Combating child marriages:** The government and development partners should devise strategies to curb child marriages in Karamoja. These should involve actions and efforts to curb the underlying causes of child marriages including ignorance and cultural practices that condone child marriage. This can be achieved through community sensitization and dialogue on the dangers of child marriages and its unlawful nature as per the 2016 Children Act.

4) **Provision of alternative income generating activities:** In order to fight poverty, the government and development partners should come up with strategies and actions that reduce communities’ heavy reliance on subsistence farming, which is prone to climate variability and weather shocks, for their livelihoods. Alternative activities need to be introduced to the communities in order to diversify their income sources. This will require training individuals, especially the youth, to enable them to acquire new skills required for the alternative employment.

5) **Combating hunger and food insecurity:** In addition to alternative income generating activities, the government should step up its efforts to encourage improvement in agricultural production and productivity. This requires the adoption of better farming methods and technologies, including irrigation schemes to fight droughts, mechanization, and improved crop and livestock breeds.

6) **Resettlement and rehabilitation of returnees/victims:** The government and development partners should step up efforts to rehabilitate and resettle victims of child trafficking. This could be done by building more rehabilitation centers and equipping them with qualified personnel to help prepare victims for reintegration into their communities.

7) **Combating domestic violence and improving parenting support:** The government and development partners should devise strategies to combat domestic violence within families, an issue which is motivating children to run away from home. Efforts to fight alcoholism and substance abuse as well as educating parents on their roles and responsibilities should be encouraged through community engagements and sensitization.
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

This report presents research results from two studies: 1) the voices and vulnerabilities of the Ik and Tepeth indigenous peoples; and 2) the scourge of child trafficking in the Karamoja region, which were conducted by GUCC and Makerere University School of Public Health-RAN. The report is an extension of a 2020 publication titled "A Desk Review Report of the Voices and Rights of the Batwa, the Ik, and the Tepeth Indigenous Peoples and Trafficking in Persons in Karamoja". This research project is funded by the USAID Higher Education Solutions Network mechanism called the LASERPULSE. It is part of an initiative to undertake development research using locally-available expertise aimed at informing subsequent interventions to strengthen the voices of Uganda’s indigenous peoples who are faced with historical and continuing marginalization, as well as vulnerabilities associated with child trafficking in Karamoja. By working through higher education institutions, USAID/Uganda Mission seeks to encourage sustainable partnerships with local universities positioned to conduct robust development research and build local ownership and capacity around these issues.

This research study, which is in line with USAID Uganda’s move towards the regionalization of program implementations, and consistent with USAID’s RCI, seeks not only a better understanding of local problems and their contexts, generating local evidence and information on how these problems should be addressed, but also a nuanced appreciation of how local contextual factors would impact the implementation of preferred interventions to address these problems. This increases ownership and enhances effectiveness of development interventions. Through the RCI, USAID/Uganda has established a Karamoja Regional Steering Committee to guide the development journey for Karamoja. It is in line with the above, that this research study was undertaken to further inform the Steering Committee’s efforts to develop a strategic development and investment plan for the Karamoja region.

1.1 About Karamoja

The Karimojong are a group of semi-nomadic pastoralists that occupy the northeastern part of Uganda. They are part of the Ateker cluster and thus, are closely related to the Turkana of Kenya, the Toposa of South Sudan, the Nyangatom of Ethiopia and the Iteso of Uganda. The Karamoja region borders South Sudan in the north and Kenya in the east. The region currently comprises ten districts and eleven ethnic groups. These include the Matheniko and the Tepeth of Moroto district, the Bokora of Napak district, the Pian of Nabilatuk, the Checkwi and the Kadama of Nakapiripirit district, the Jie of Kotido district, the Pokot of Amudat district, the Ethur (sometimes called the Labwor) of Abim district, the Dodoth of Kaabong district, the Nyangia (sometimes called the Napore) of Karenga district, and the Ik (sometimes called the Teuso) of Kaabong district.
Despite several development initiatives by the Ugandan Government and development partners, findings from the 2019/2020 Uganda National Household Survey show that Karamoja remains one of the least socially and economically developed subregions in Uganda with the majority of the population (65.7 percent) living in poverty (UBOS, 2021). The region is semi-arid and the population relies heavily on natural resources which renders livelihoods sensitive to climate dynamics. The limited resources, coupled with climate variability and change, manifesting through recurring droughts, floods and prolonged dry spells, often lead to chronic food insecurity, and a high prevalence of hunger and stunting.

Figures from UNHS 2019/20, show that the proportion of food poor households in Karamoja increased from 70 percent to 75 percent between 2016/17 and 2019/20 (Figure A2). In addition to limited resources, the development of Karamoja is constrained by other factors stemming from historical dynamics that affect governance and social development. These include insecurity caused by private
ownership of firearms and cattle raiding. Furthermore, the Karamoja subregion is grappling with severe environmental degradation, poor infrastructure, and limited access to basic education and health services.

Figure A2: Proportion of Food Poor Households in Uganda (%)
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Source: UNHS 2019/20

Statistics show that Karamoja ranks lowest in a number of development indicators compared to other parts of the country. For example, human capital development has remained low in Karamoja. The region has the highest proportion of people with no formal schooling (66 percent), the lowest adult literacy rates (literate persons aged 18 years and above) at 25 percent compared to the highest rates in Kampala (92 percent), Buganda South (83 percent) and Ankole (79 percent) (UBOS, 2021). Only 16.4 percent of children aged three years to five years were attending school in 2019/20 compared to the national average of 37.12 percent. The region has the lowest Primary School Net Enrollment Ratio at 42 percent compared to 88 percent in Kampala and 85 percent in Kigezi and Elgon regions. Karamoja has the second lowest Secondary School Net Enrollment Ratio at 12 percent, after Acholi at seven percent, compared to a national ratio of 27 percent. Additionally, the subregion has the least proportion of literate persons (30.4 percent) in the age group of 10 years and above compared to 76.1 nationwide (UBOS, 2021).

Looking at economic activity, in 2019/20, Acholi and Karamoja subregions reported the largest proportion of households that were part of the subsistence economy. The distribution of poor persons in the subregion follows a similar trend to that of households in the subsistence economy (UBOS, 2021). Across subregions, Karamoja has the highest dependency ratio at 124 per 100 working-age population.
compared to the lowest in Kampala of 53 per 100 working-age population. Therefore, the burden of caring for dependents is highest in Karamoja (UBOS, 2021).

Karamoja is lagging behind other subregions when it comes to access to, and use of, health services. This subregion has the lowest population proportion that can access health facilities in the radius of less than three kms (58 percent), followed by Acholi and Lango at 68 percent and 69 percent respectively compared to 77 percent nationwide. Nearly seven in every ten households in this subregion (65 percent) use bushes/do not use toilets, the highest among subregions in Uganda. Karamoja also has the lowest percentage of communities with improved availability of safe water at eight percent compared to Kampala at 59 percent and the national average of 42 percent. Karamoja has the highest percentage of current tobacco users at 17 percent (almost six-fold the national estimate) and stands out with the highest percentage of alcohol consumption at 48 percent compared to a national average of 11.9 percent (UBOS, 2021).

Other development indicators show that the Karamoja subregion has the highest percentage of households with thatched roof dwellings (83 percent), followed by Acholi (78 percent). The subregion has the lowest percentage of households that use grid electricity for lighting (one percent) compared to the highest Kampala (93 percent) and the national average of 19 percent; a huge proportion (44 percent) of Karamoja households use firewood/cow dung/grass as sources of energy for lighting (UBOS, 2021).

However, while Karamoja as a subregion has been historically marginalized as evidenced by the poor development indicators highlighted above, minority ethnic groups within this region are worse off. They face more marginalization which erodes their culture and threatens their existence. The marginalized, minority ethnic groups commonly referred to as “the mountain tribes of Karamoja” include: the Ik of Mount Morungole, Timu, and Kamion; the Tepeth of Mount Moroto and Napak; the Kadam of Mount Kadam; and the Nyangia of the Nyangea Mountains. Mountain tribes experience two forms of marginalization: first, for being Karimojong (who are marginalized vis-à-vis the rest of Uganda), and second, for being linguistically and culturally distinct minorities within the mainstream Karimojong society (USAID, 2020).

This report presents results on the voices and vulnerabilities of two of these tribes: the Ik and Tepeth ethnic groups. This report also presents results of a study on child trafficking in Napak district which is becoming a scourge within the Karamoja region. The report is divided into two parts: A and B. Part A presents the voices and vulnerabilities of the Ik and Tepeth, while Part B looks at the scourge of child trafficking.

A1.0 The Ik and the Tepeth

The National Population and Housing Census of 2014 reported the population of the Ik and Tepeth to be 4,023 and 23,422 respectively (UBOS, 2016). The two ethnic groups are considered to be indigenous mainly because they have remained a relatively closely knit community with a language distinct from mainstream Karimojong (USAID, 2020).

The Ik inhabit a stretch of land that extends from Mt. Lopokok and Timu forest where they occupy a narrow 50 km long and 1 km wide swath of ground along the frontier between Uganda and Kenya in Kamion sub-county to Mt. Morungole and Kidepo National Park in Morungole sub-county, Kaabong district (USAID, 2020). On the other hand, the Tepeth live on three mountains: Kadam, Moroto, and Napak in Nakapiripirit, Moroto and Napak districts respectively (Figure A3). The Tepeth, like the Ik, are predominantly settled crop farmers, although they are more likely than the Ik to keep some livestock (USAID, 2020).

Figure A3: Map of Karamoja subregion
A1.2 Objectives of this study

This study aims to better understand the voices of the Ik and Tepeth indigenous peoples related to marginalization and vulnerabilities, as well as identify existing capacities and opportunities to inform development interventions. Specifically, the study answers the following questions;

1. What is the level of marginalization among the Ik and Tepeth?
2. How does marginalization manifest among the Ik and Tepeth?
3. What are the underlying drivers of marginalization among the Ik and Tepeth?
4. What capacities and opportunities exist to address vulnerability and marginalization of the Ik and Tepeth in Karamoja?
5. What are the barriers to addressing vulnerability and marginalization of the Ik and Tepeth?

A2.0 Study Methodology

The study used mixed approaches to collect and gather the relevant information. These involved primary data collection through qualitative and quantitative techniques. Primary data was collected in September 2020, from two districts (Moroto and Kaabong) that host the two ethnic groups of interest. Specifically, interviews were conducted among the Tepeth (in Tapac and Katikekile sub-counties in Moroto district) and the Ik (in Timu, Kamion and Morungole sub-counties in Kaabong district). The sub-counties were purposely selected since they host the indigenous groups. Thereafter, the research team randomly selected parishes, villages, and households.

Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis: Qualitative data collection involved IDIs with opinion leaders and community elders, KIIIs with district officials and NGOs, as well as FGDs with community members. To ensure gender representation, FGDs were conducted separately for women, men and the youth. A total of 20 interviews and 16 FGDs were conducted. Qualitative analysis focused on identifying emerging issues and insights from the interviews and FGDs to determine the social and structural factors of vulnerability and marginalization that affect the Ik and Tepeth. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the data.

Quantitative Data Collection and Analysis: A survey questionnaire was designed and piloted prior to actual data collection. The questionnaire was uploaded into ODK, an online open-source software installed on Android tablets. Data were collected at the household level by trained research assistants who were familiar with the local languages in the two districts. Respondents from the selected households were either household heads or other adult household members. Quantitative data analysis put into consideration categorical/classed variables, which represent respondents’ independent attributes, for instance sex or ranked attributes, such as the education attainment. The nature of these
variables called for the use of frequencies and cross tabulations for comparison within and across the two ethnic groups.

**A3. Findings and Discussion**

In this section, both qualitative and quantitative survey results are presented and discussed. The section is divided into four subsections. Subsection A3.1 presents the background characteristics of the household survey respondents. A3.2 discusses the levels and manifestations of marginalization. A3.3 presents the underlying drivers of marginalization. A3.4 provides the existing capacities, opportunities, and barriers to addressing marginalization.

**A3.1 Background Characteristics of the Respondents from the Household Survey**

The total number of households surveyed was 455 with 120 households from the Ik, 304 from the Tepeth and 31 from other ethnic groups i.e. the Karimojong, Ethur, Pokot and Turkana. Table A1 presents the background characteristics of the respondents and the households that were surveyed. Sixty-seven percent of the respondents were Tepeth, 26 percent Ik and seven percent from other ethnic groups. The majority of the respondents (64 percent) were female, and 62 percent had no formal education. The majority (68 percent) of the households had a range of five to nine members, and 76 percent of the respondents had resided in the surveyed community for over 20 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>Ik</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tepeth</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>&lt;24 years</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54 years</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55+ years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A1: Background characteristics of the respondents and households
A3.2 Level and Manifestations of Marginalization of the Ik and Tepeth Ethnic Groups

This subsection presents results and discussions on the level and manifestations of marginalization among the Ik and Tepeth. Marginalization manifests itself in a number of ways including the quality of living conditions and ownership of household assets, limited sources of livelihood, limited access to amenities and social services (health, education and clean water), limited access to public goods and infrastructure (transport, communication and energy), erosion of culture, and limited political participation and representation.

A3.2.1 Households’ Living Conditions and Assets

The majority of the respondents, 90 percent of the Ik and 77 percent of the Tepeth, live in grass thatched houses made of mud and wattle walls. The majority of houses have floors made of earth and cow dung (Table A2). Twenty-seven percent of the Ik and 90 percent of the Tepeth surveyed did not have toilet facilities. Inadequate or unsanitary living conditions can contribute to the spread of diseases. Disease has an effect on the households’ health care costs and prevents individuals from working, limiting their earning potential.

Table A2: Housing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Type</th>
<th>Ik Number of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Tepeth Number of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent (Iron roof with burnt brick walls)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent (Iron roof with unburnt brick walls)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-permanent (Iron roof with mud and wattle walls)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-permanent (grass thatched with stone walls)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey results also show that both the Ik and Tepeth are asset poor, owning only a few household assets. Among the respondents, only 18 percent of the Ik and 14 percent of the Tepeth own a radio and only a small percentage own vehicles like bicycles, motorcycles or cars. The Ik own a relatively smaller number of large animals like cattle, goats, sheep and swine which stood at 11 percent compared to 75 percent for the Tepeth. However, Ik respondents had more solar panels (27 percent) compared to the Tepeth (10 percent). Ownership of mobile phones was relatively high within both groups standing at 42 percent and 37 percent for the Ik and Tepeth respectively (Table A3).

Poor living conditions and possession of relatively few household assets points to high incidences of poverty among the two groups.

Table A3: Household Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ik</th>
<th>Tepeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of Respondents</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile telephone</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured bed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattress</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar panel</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A3.2.2 Source of Livelihood and Income

The majority of the respondents surveyed, 72 percent of the Ik and 67 percent of the Tepeth, were employed in subsistence agriculture. Sixty-six percent of the Ik and 62 percent of the Tepeth reported farming as their main source of livelihood. Twenty-nine percent of the Ik and 35 percent of the Tepeth reported petty trade as their main source of livelihood, while three percent of the Ik and one percent of the Tepeth depended on humanitarian support. Only 54 percent of the Ik and 58 percent of the Tepeth reported having earned income in the month preceding the survey, with the majority earning the income from the selling produce from their gardens (Table A4).

Table A4: Household’s main source of livelihood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Activity/Option</th>
<th>Ik No. Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Tepeth No. Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family’s source of livelihood</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petty trade</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salaried job</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanitarian support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent has earned any</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income in the last month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent’s source of income</td>
<td>Payment for casual labor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly salaries for a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regular job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sale of produce from my</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sale of livestock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current employment status</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>farming/domestic work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retailer/shopkeeper</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casual temporary laborer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole-sale Trader</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial farmer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A3.2.3 Access to Health Services

Respondents were asked if a household member had suffered any illness or injury in the 30 days preceding the date of the survey. Information was also sought on the number of days suffered as well as the number of days lost due to the illness or injury. Seventy-four percent of the Ik and 55 percent of the Tepeth respondents reported having a household member who had suffered an illness or injury (Table A5). This is a significantly high percentage of illness or injury among the two communities when compared to the UNHS 2019/20 nationwide figure of 28 percent (UBOS, 2021). Indeed, the incidence of illness or injury among the two ethnic groups is higher than that of the entire Karamoja region which stands at 35.1 percent (UBOS, 2021). The high incidence of disease and injuries is attributed to a number of factors including the poor living conditions discussed above, as well as limited access to health services. Limited access to health care contributes to poor results in health sector performance indicators (UBOS, 2021).

Table A5: Household member that suffered illness/injury

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Measure/Option</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ik</td>
<td>Tepeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household Member</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suffered from any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>illness or injury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time lost due to</td>
<td>&lt;1 week</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illness/Injury</td>
<td>1-2 weeks</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;2 weeks</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anyone consulted for</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the major illness/injury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who was Consulted</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pharmacist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the respondents (over 90 percent) from both ethnic groups reported seeking medical care after suffering a major illness or injury. Half of the Ik respondents sought medical care from a doctor and half from a nurse. The Tepeth sought medical care from either a nurse or pharmacist (Table A5). When it comes to health service providers, the majority of respondents (61 percent of the Ik and 89 percent of the Tepeth), reported seeking medical care from government facilities (Figure A4).
Barriers to accessing health services

The long distances to health centers was reported as a major barrier to accessing health services by the majority of respondents (61 percent of the Ik and 60 percent of the Tepeth). Other major barriers to accessing health services faced by the two ethnic groups include, lack of transportation, high costs and poor services (Figure A5).

Figure A5: Major concerns regarding access to health services (%)
Distance to a health facility is one of the access to healthcare measures. Survey results show that 49 percent of the Ik and 45 percent of the Tepeth households interviewed accessed health facilities within a distance of three kilometers (Table A6). This is a significantly low percentage compared to the national average of 76.7 percent and the Karamoja average of 57.8 percent reported in the UNHS 2019/20 report (UBOS, 2021).

**Table A6: Access to and Use of Health Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Measure/Option</th>
<th>Ik</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Tepeth</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance to the nearest Health Center</td>
<td>&lt;3km</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-6km</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;6km</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common transport means</td>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boda-boda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Long distances to health centers was indeed emphasized as a major hindrance to accessing healthcare services during the qualitative interviews from both KIIIs and FGDs conducted in the two ethnic groups' communities.

“Some Ik community members have to travel 7 km to access it,” **Female FGD participants, Timu sub-county.**

“The hospitals are far from here, and whenever someone falls sick they just die halfway to the hospital. Kosiroi Health Centre is far, Tapac is Far, Lopelipel because the Tepeth stay on the slopes of the mountain, but there is no hospital near here. If there was a way, the government should bring health centers near here,” **Youth FGD participants, Loyaraboth sub-county.**

**Limited Transportation:** Survey results revealed that over 40 percent of the Ik and Tepeth respondents considered means of transportation as a major obstacle to accessing healthcare services (Figure A5). Indeed 100 percent of the Ik and 93 percent of the Tepeth reported walking as the only means of transportation to health centers (Table A6). Access to health services by the two ethnic groups is further constrained by the mountainous terrain where the communities are located. Participants in FGDs reported that patients who cannot walk have to be carried down the mountains on improvised stretchers made out of poles and vines as vehicles including ambulances cannot reach the communities.

“Sick people are carried using these improvised stretchers down the slope to the nearest health
Limited number of health facilities: Consultations with community members, revealed that there are a limited number of healthcare facilities accessed by the two ethnic groups. For example, participants in FGDs reported that the Ik communities have only two health facilities, one located in Kamion sub-county and another in Timu. Worse still, participants in the FGDs reported that health facilities lack the required infrastructure such as admission wards for expectant mothers, laboratories, and staff housing. This was cited as one of the factors contributing to the high mortality rates of pregnant mothers within the indigenous peoples’ communities.

“The health facilities lack wards or admission rooms for expectant mothers,” Female leader IDI, Morungole sub-county.

“The Ik health centers do not have staff quarters or maternity wards. Health workers are forced to reside in the same places that they use as drug stores,” Female FGD participants, Morungole sub-county.

“Due to the absence of sufficient accommodation facilities at some of the health centers, sometimes pregnant, sick women are mixed up with men in the same ward,” Youth FGD participants, Kamion sub-county.

“Lack of lack wards/admission rooms partly explains the high mortality rates of pregnant mothers,” KII, Community Development Officer, Kaabong District.

Understaffed health facilities: Participants in FGDs and KIIIs also reported inadequate staffing at health facilities as a barrier to the delivery of services to the Ik and Tepeth communities. Many of the facilities were reported as having very few qualified medical personnel. For example, in the Ik community, respondents reported that the only two available health facilities have only two qualified health workers. Inadequate staffing negatively affects the quality of services provided, leading to poor health care performance indicators.

“We have lost so many mothers and babies in the process of trying to help in the absence of qualified midwives … in case of referrals, there is usually no one at health centers to help. There is no stand-by ambulance in the whole of Ik territory,” Female FGD participant, Morungole sub-county.

“with two key staff members. Whenever one goes on leave, the facilities are manned by one staff member,” Youth FGD participants, Youth, Timu sub-county.

“Many of the medical workers in health facilities in Ik territories are poorly motivated and largely
Drug stock outs: Results from the survey revealed that over 40 percent of the Ik and Tepeth respondents considered lack of drugs as a major constraint to accessing health care services (Figure 5). Indeed, the lack of drugs in health centers featured highly during FGDs and KIIIs. Respondents blamed drug stock outs on the inadequate supply of drugs by the government. In addition, respondents claimed that medical personnel misappropriate the drugs out of the public health facilities to private clinics.

“Whoever goes to the health center is given Panadol and Coartem irrespective of the condition one is in,” Youth FGD participants, Kamion sub-county.

“The Ik health centers are under-stocked with drugs. The medical workers even take away the little that is brought. They take medicine from public health facilities to their private clinics where they direct patients to go and buy the prescribed drugs,” Female FGD participants, Kamion sub-county.

Quality of Services: Quality of services was reported by 10 percent of the Ik and 12 percent of the Tepeth respondents as a key barrier to accessing health care. The quality of service can be partially explained by understaffing and the lack of adequate facilities highlighted in above. FGDs with community members reported poor attitudes and the mishandling of patients by medical personnel.

“They do not handle the local people well. The health personnel do not attend to patients in a timely manner, a sign of either a bad attitude towards the people they serve or outright incompetence. If you are a patient, sometimes you wait from morning till the afternoon before being attended to. Even when patients and their handlers plead with the health staff to attend to them, they remain unresponsive. Most of the health staff reside within the compounds of health facilities, and often see the patients coming to get assistance at the health facility, but pay no attention. It is as if Ik patients who visit health facilities in Ik communities are invisible to health center staff,” Female FGD participants, Kamion sub-county.

“If we had a way, we would write to request the transfer of these medical workers,” Youth FGD participants, Kamion sub-county.

Furthermore, FGDs revealed that healthcare workers are sometimes absent from the health centers. Due to absenteeism of healthcare workers, a number of patients resort to seeking medical care from traditional healers. This puts patients’ lives at risk, especially when it comes to child birth. Discussions with women in the communities revealed that maternal mortality rates were very high when mothers deliver at home.
“The health workers in the Ik health centers refuse to attend to patient emergencies when it is outside the normal working hours,” Female FGD participants, Kamion sub-county.

“a girl gave birth the previous night from home because there was no nurse at the hospital, if we had brought her down the mountain going back would be a challenge,” Female FGD participants, Morungole sub-county.

“It is not only the Karimojong who despise the Ik, but also other health facility staff from outside. They see us as nothing … they ignore us … they say we are not humans … even if we die, it is not important to them … we are ‘ngikulyak’ … they tell us that we are illiterates, and ask us who told us not to educate our children so as they too become medics,” Female FGD participants, Morungole sub-county.

A3.2.4 Access to Safe Water and Sanitation

The source of water and proper sanitation plays an important role in determining the health status of household and community members (UBOS, 2021). Safe and clean water and proper sanitation are key to reducing many common diseases that can kill both adults and children that are associated with fecal contamination, such as diarrhea, dysentery and cholera (UBOS, 2021). The importance of access to safe drinking water is underlined by the fact that it is the UN’s Sustainable Development Goal Number 6. Also, the Ugandan Government through the water and sanitation sub-sector of the 3rd National Development Plan (NDP III), has committed to focusing on improving sanitation and hygiene levels in both rural and urban areas. NDP III targets increasing access to safe water from 65 percent to 79 percent in rural areas and from 77 percent to 100 percent in urban areas (UBOS, 2021).

Despite the government’s commitment to improving access to safe water and sanitation, the two communities surveyed have little or no access to tap/piped water, with slightly more than half of the households interviewed accessing water from bore holes. A significant proportion (25 percent of the Ik and 37 percent of the Tepeth) source water from rivers (Table A7).

In addition, a significant number of Ik respondents reported having no toilet facilities (73 percent), compared to only 10 percent among the Tepeth. The proportion of Ik respondents who lack toilet facilities is high compared to the national figure of 7.4 percent and the Karamoja average of 69.5 percent report in the 2019/20 UNHS report. When it comes to toilet facilities, one of the barriers to use is a lack of sensitization. For example, during fieldwork at Kamion, the study team discovered communities had constructed toilets, which were not being used. Instead, the paths leading to the pit latrines, and all around the latrines were littered with fecal matter. The study team noted high levels of jigger infestations afflicting mainly young children, but also adults, an issue which was confirmed during FGDs.
“In Timu, there is only one borehole for the whole sub-county. Communities largely depend on open water sources from unprotected springs and permanent small water streams flowing from the mountain in several places. As a consequence of this lack of access to clean water by the majority of the population in the communities in Timu, vulnerability to water-borne diseases is very high,” Youth FGD participants, Timu sub-county.

“Vulnerability to water-borne diseases is exacerbated by the poor sanitation and hygiene throughout Ik territories characterized by high levels of open defecation,” KII, CDO, Kaabong district.

Table A7: Sanitation and Access to Safe Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Ik</th>
<th>Tepeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main source of drinking water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional, unprotected spring well</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boreholes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River sources</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap/piped water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time taken to fetch water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30mins</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-60mins</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1hr</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is responsible for your source of drinking water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with toilets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A3.2.5 Access to Education Services

Education and literacy are key factors that empower individuals and communities to participate in mainstream economic activities and participate in political and civic activities. Limited access to education is detrimental to the development of communities. Low levels of education can lead to lack of representation and unemployment, as well as promote exploitation, poor health and difficulties in raising children, trapping communities and households in poverty. Survey results show that 62 percent of respondents from the two ethnic groups had no education. Respondents’ literacy levels were low at 38 percent. Nationally, adult literacy stood at 74 percent in 2020 with the lowest level being observed in the Karamoja subregion at 25 percent compared to Kampala (92 percent), Buganda South (83 percent) and Ankole (79 percent) (UBOS, 2021). Low levels of literacy and the lack of formal education is partially due to limited access to education services and infrastructure, like a lack of schools.

Barriers to accessing education
Survey findings show that a significant number of children from the Ik and Tepeth communities dropout of school. Forty-six percent of respondents among the Ik and 15 percent among the Tepeth reported having children within their households that have dropped out of school. The majority of children are reported to drop out at primary school level (84 percent in the Ik communities and 67 percent among the Tepeth) (Figure A6).

*Figure A 6: Level at which Children dropout of school (%)*

The main reasons given for children dropping out of school include schools being expensive, child labor (children dropping out to help on the farm, at home or running businesses), unwillingness of the children to attend school, distance from school, loss of parents and insecurity (Figure A7).
Respondents from the household survey revealed that only 57 percent and 58 percent of the Ik and Tepeth respectively, have access to a primary school within a distance of less than three kilometers (Figure A8) compared to the national average of over 80 percent for rural areas (UBOS, 2021).

Qualitative results from KII, IDI, and FGDs from both ethnic groups point towards other factors like pregnancies and early marriages, absence of school facilities and structures, and lack of teachers as key drivers of school dropouts.
“You see that group of girls over there, they were all in school but they all came back home and got married, they all have children now, do not see them like that,” **Female participants, Morungole sub-county.**

“The schools are there, but they are few; the only government schools we have here are the ones in Kosiroi, Tapac, Lopelipel, Loyeraborh and the one being built in Katikekile. Despite the few schools, the Tepeth people are still ignorant. When children go to school, they impregnate themselves before they even reach primary five and they drop out of school. Then other people start fearing going to school because if you take them to school, they will become pregnant. That is another weakness we have,” **Female participants, Tapac sub-county.**

“Children are made to go to different classes like P3 or P1 just by looking at their physical appearance. Among the Ik, some children who are made to skip classes struggle to pass and it is only those who are bright who succeed,” **Youth FGD participants Timu sub-county.**

“The two community schools are too far apart for all school-going aged children to access. In addition, community schools do not have government teachers and therefore it is up to the community to find and procure teachers. As a result, the communities rely on senior four leavers and secondary school dropouts for teachers,” **Youth FGD participants, Timu sub-county.**

**A3.2.6 Discrimination Based on Language, Culture and Identity**

Survey results revealed that the majority of the respondents in the two ethnic groups’ communities spoke Ik or Tepeth languages (Table A8). Ninety-eight percent of the Ik identified with Ik as their native language while 97 percent of the Tepeth reported Tepeth as their native language. On the other hand, survey results show that 42 percent of the Ik and Tepeth respondents reported having experienced discrimination because of their ethnicity. A significant proportion of respondents from the two ethnic groups reported failing to access public services due to their ethnicity or language. Eighteen percent of the Ik and 25 percent of the Tepeth reported having failed to access health care while 13 percent of the Ik and 29 percent of the Tepeth failed to access education as a result of discrimination based on language or ethnicity. Similar trends are observed when it comes to access to water and transportation (Table A8).

**Table A8: Languages Spoken by Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Measure/Option</th>
<th>Ik</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Tepeth</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken</td>
<td>Ik</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tepeth</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ngakarimojong</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite a high proportion of the household survey respondents speaking and identifying with the native languages of the two ethnic groups, participants in the qualitative interviews indicated that the culture and languages of the Ik and Tepeth are gradually disappearing especially among the young generations. For example, in their early school years, children are taught in ŋa’karimojong; this deters the children from learning their language and culture. Respondents also revealed that the young children and the youth are shying away from their language and culture because they may not want to be identified as Ik or Tepeth and face the resulting discrimination. In situations when there is an intermarriage between an Ik or Tepeth and another ethnic group, the language of the other partner is prioritized and this has led to an erosion of the indigenous groups’ language and culture with a fear of possible extinction. The respondents believe this erosion of culture is caused by the mixing of other cultures through intermarriages with neighboring tribes and interactions at social service places such as schools where the children mingle with the non-indigenous children.

“Our prayer is that we get an organization that will give that school which will mainly be teaching in the Tepeth language so that they first have to start with recruiting teachers who are going to be teaching in the local language but the ones who know how to read and write Tepeth. These should be permanent teachers who could translate to English,” Youth FGD participants, Lia sub-county, Moroto district.

A3.2.7 Governance, Leadership and Political Representation
Twenty-eight percent of the respondents from the Ik community and 16 percent from the Tepeth reported having a family member currently holding a leadership position in the community. The majority of the leadership positions held (83 percent for the Ik and 66 percent for the Tepeth), are at local
council level with less than 10 percent at the sub-county, district, and parliamentary/central government levels for both ethnic groups (Table A9).

Table A9: Respondent or any family member holding any leadership position in the community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ik</th>
<th>Tepeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent or any family member holding any leadership position in the community</td>
<td>34 28</td>
<td>48 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local council member</td>
<td>24 83</td>
<td>21 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-county council member</td>
<td>2 7</td>
<td>3 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District council member</td>
<td>2 7</td>
<td>1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the leadership of a community initiative group such as a Saving Group</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>7 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Local Government’s Act Cap 243 Laws of Uganda, 2000, provides for the representation of marginalized groups at all local government levels. In the past, emphasis has been put on marginalized groups like the youth, disabled, and women, leaving out ethnic minorities. To remedy this, towards the 2016 general elections, two constituencies were created for the Ik and Tepeth. This enabled the two ethnic groups to vote for members of parliament to directly represent their areas for the first time. Results from FGDs suggested there was improved access to social services that arose from improved political representation. The Ik and Tepeth can now raise their local concerns through their elected representatives at the district and national levels. For example, discussions with the Ik communities revealed that their representative in parliament has been instrumental in improving access to goods and services provided by the central government.

“The Ik have accessed services which they were denied when they had no representative at the national level,” **Female FGD participants, Morungole sub-county.**

“Through their representative in parliament, the Ik were able to receive iron sheets from the government which were distributed by the Office of the Prime Minister in Karamoja. Previously, the iron sheets for the Ik would be retained in Kaabong by Dodoth politicians who would distribute them to their campaign agents,” **Youth FGD participant, Timu sub-county.**

“The Government of Uganda through the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) has been providing hoes through the Ik Member of Parliament,” **Female FGD participants, Morungole sub-county.**

Opinions regarding respondents’ satisfaction
Opinions regarding respondents’ satisfaction with leadership at both the local and national level were sought. One in four (28 percent) of the Ik and Tepeth felt that leaders’ decisions at the local government (district and sub-county) didn’t reflect their priorities at all. That number is higher when it comes to the national level (31 percent for the Ik and 50 percent for the Tepeth). On the other hand, 47 percent of the respondents from the Ik communities felt that the local government (district and sub-county) cared about them and their opinions. That number is much smaller for the Tepeth (21 percent). Results further reveal that more than half of the respondents from the two ethnic groups didn’t feel confident enough participating in public decision making in the community (Table A10).

Table A10: Opinions Regarding Satisfaction with Local and National Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Ik</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Tepeth</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents who felt that leaders’ decisions at the district and sub-county reflected their priorities</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only in some areas</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very much, to a large extent</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutely, always</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which Respondents felt that the central government’s decisions reflect your priorities</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only in some areas</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very much, to a large extent</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutely, always</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents who agreed that local government/district/sub-county cared about them and their opinions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents’ level of confidence about participating in public decision making in the community</td>
<td>Not confident at all</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A little confident</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very confident</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A3.3 Underlying drivers of marginalization

This subsection presents the underlying drivers and effects of marginalization of the Ik and Tepeth ethnic groups. The underlying drivers include displacement resulting from conservation, insecure land tenure, insecurity and poor infrastructure.
A3.3.1 Insecure Land Tenure

A majority of the respondents’ houses are built on family land, 91 percent for the Ik and 82 percent for the Tepeth. The majority of respondents reported having access to land which is owned under customary tenure. Competing forms of land use, especially where land is not registered, are a cause of tensions over ownership, hence an increase in land tenure insecurity in the region. Insecure land tenure is a constraint to individuals’ rights to use, control, and transfer land. In addition, land disputes within and between communities are widespread. A significant number of the respondents, 72 percent for the Ik and 54 percent for the Tepeth reported land disputes being common in their communities. Indeed, 33 percent and 12 percent among the Ik and Tepeth respectively reported their households having been involved in land disputes in the past. Among the Ik, the most mentioned causes of land disputes are land grabbing by outsiders/other tribes (73 percent) followed by unclear boundaries (48 percent). Among the Tepeth, family related disputes and land grabbing by outsiders/other tribes were the two most reported causes at 48 and 25 percent respectively. Land disputes are mainly settled through cultural institutions (elders and leaders) and community land committees. For example, among the Tepeth community, the Kensans who are referred to as the 'High Priests of the Mountain' (mainly elders representing the main valleys on the mountain), are highly trained and respected and form the main traditional institution that settles social, economic and environmental concerns, including land disputes. Involvement of government courts of law by members of the two ethnic groups is relatively limited, four percent for the Ik and 11 percent for the Tepeth, (Table A11).

*Table A11: Land Use, ownership and rights*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ik</th>
<th>Tepeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land ownership status where your house is built</td>
<td>House built on family land</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House built on communal land</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are land disputes common in this community?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has this household ever been involved in any land dispute?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common causes of these land disputes</td>
<td>Not locating boundaries for land after a disaster/conflict</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land grabbing by outsiders</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eviction by cultural leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eviction by government</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family related disputes</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative results from FGDs also reveal that land disputes do exist in the two communities and that there is land grabbing and evictions from outsiders and neighboring dominant ethnic groups like the Karimojong.

“The government, some Religious Missions, Tororo cement and some neighboring sub-counties are grabbing the Tepeth land and wealth under the disguise of building schools, churches, charity homes and factories,” Male FGD participants, Kakingol sub-county.

In addition to land disputes, history has accounts of the Ik and Tepeth being disposed of their land to establish protected areas including Kidepo National Park and Timu Central Forest Reserve (USAID, 2020). This state-induced landlessness and historical injustices played a pivotal role in the marginalization of indigenous groups. Such conservation efforts led to a loss of livelihoods and a loss of culture due to exclusion from ancestral, cultural and religious sites. This weakened the Ik and Tepeth communities, leading to continued impoverishment, as well as social and political exclusion.

A3.3.2 Insecurity in the Karamoja Region

The Ik and Tepeth live in a region characterized by insecurity due to cattle raids among the pastoral ethnic groups within Uganda and across the borders from Kenya and South Sudan who possess firearms. For example, the geographical location of the Ik makes them vulnerable to frequent attacks since they are enclosed in between the pastoral groups of the Dodoth in Uganda, the Turkana in Kenya, and the Didinga in South Sudan. The Tepeth, on the other hand, are victims of the raiding from the Matheniko in Uganda and the Turkana in Kenya. Using FGDs, respondents reported that during the cattle raids pastoral groups steal, rape women and girls, and sometimes commit murder. The fear brought to the Ik and Tepeth due to the cattle raids has forced these ethnic groups to settle further up in high-altitude areas, which are densely forested, inaccessible and lack social services such as health facilities as discussed in the previous sections.

“The Tepeth have challenges of insecurity caused by other tribes like the Matheniko and Turkana most especially during the animal raids,” Youth FGD participants, Kakingol sub-county.

“We no longer go for fruit gathering in the bushes because of fear of being raped by the cattle rustlers of Turkana and Karamojong, they have raped several women before. Our men are also murdered while looking for survival in the forests,” Female FGD, Morungole sub-county.
Insecurity stemming from cattle raids leads to poverty due to reduced productivity, displacement, homelessness, loss of life, hunger, and low retention of children in school. On a good note, qualitative interviews revealed that despite being victims of insecurity, the indigenous groups seek peaceful co-existence and dialogue with their neighbors.

“"To create harmony and peaceful co-existence, Ik local leaders always seek dialogues with the leaders of the neighboring tribes that terrorize the Ik," Youth FGD participants, Kamion sub-county.

“The government should introduce peace talks and exchange visits so that we visit them and they also come to visit here” Youth FGD participants, Timu sub-county.

“The Ik elect their own leaders, whom they expect to stand up for the rights of the Ik, and make themselves available to address the challenges which the Ik communities encounter in their survival,” KII interview, Women Leader, Morungole sub-county.

“The Ik local communities mobilize to arrest suspected thieves who are thereafter handed over to the army. There are no police posts or stations in the entire Ik territory. There is however a barracks near Kamion and another in Usake as well as in Timu. Many Ik have been recruited into the army to protect their people,” Youth FGD participant, Kamion sub-county.

A3.3.3 Poor infrastructure
Discussions with key informants and community members revealed that the infrastructure in both the Ik and Tepeth communities is poor, providing limited access to telecommunication networks. Where they exist, the roads are poorly constructed and thus become impassable during the rainy season. The poor infrastructure is exacerbated by the mountainous terrain inhabited by the two ethnic groups. The mountainous ranges not only hinder interventions by both local governments and development partners but also the communities themselves. The existing murram roads are poorly maintained, constraining outreach activities and making the establishment of service provision units like schools and health centers expensive. During heavy rains, such roads are washed away as rivers wash away bridges and impede access. Poor infrastructure reduces the ability of the indigenous groups to fully participate in the mainstream economic activities and governance, and also limits their access to public goods and services such as access to electricity and social services like health, education and information, resulting in their marginalization.

“The communities are inaccessible, there are no roads to some places. Where there are roads, they are not well maintained. This deters most of the development partners from reaching the communities especially during rainy seasons,” KII CARITAS, Moroto district.

“Poor telecommunication networks are a barrier that makes the coordination of interventions difficult. For example, if you have a field staff in Tapac, sometimes to access them or to meet them is a challenge due to the poor telecommunication network,” KII CARITAS, Moroto district.
A3.4 Existing capacities, opportunities, and barriers to address marginalization

In this subsection, the existing capacities, opportunities, and barriers to address Ik and Tepeth marginalization are discussed. Existing capacities and opportunities include the presence of natural resources including minerals and tourist attractions, the presence of NGOs and development partners devoted to community development, infrastructure development effort by the government, government policies on universal primary and secondary education, as well as increasing access to communication technology. Barriers include continuing insecurity in the region, low human capital development, limited political representation, climate variability, and land rights and the cost of land registration.

A3.4.1 Existing Capacities and Opportunities

**Presence of natural resources including minerals and tourist attractions**

A 2011 survey found that the Karamoja region contains over 50 minerals including gold, limestone, uranium, marble, graphite, gypsum, iron, wolfram, nickel, copper, cobalt, lithium, and tin (The Guardian, 2014). The discovery of minerals in the region can be a blessing to the indigenous communities by offering alternative employment and incomes, hence reducing reliance on subsistence agriculture. However, the availability of these minerals, if not well managed, can be a curse and lead to further marginalization. Mining activities can lead to environmental hazards and contamination of water sources as well as displacement of communities and land grabbing. As mining takes root in the region, the government should put in place safeguards to ensure that communities, especially the indigenous peoples, are not disadvantaged but instead benefit fully from the proceeds accrued from these resources. KIIIs reveal that local communities are often left out of negotiations and preparations between the central government and mining companies, leading to a loss of revenues from surface rights and loyalties.

“In these communities, we have a lot of minerals. There are minerals in Tapac and Katikekile. However, there are mining companies that have acquired licenses from the central government before they came to the community. They know the communities are not organized, they don’t consult or include them in their preparations. Once they are given leases from the central government they just come and start their work. People get surprised and say ‘now what are you doing here’ they say we have our licenses from the government so you find local people miss out on a lot of things like surface rights, the royalties and compensation. The challenge they are facing now is that people are now starting to wake up, to understand that they really needed to have negotiated with these investors before they came,” *KII CARITAS, Moroto district.*

“There are a lot of gaps in government policies, many are not tailored to the needs of the people. They look a bit more dictatorial the way they are crafted; they don’t support the needs of the community. For example, the mining act has a lot of loopholes like the central government is the one...
that has authority to issue this license yet in actual sense it should have been that the investors come to the people first, the owners of where the minerals are”, KII CARITAS, Moroto district.

Presence of NGOs and development partners devoted to development of the two communities

Twenty percent of the Ik and 16 percent of the Tepeth surveyed reported receiving support a month before the survey. The majority, 42 percent of the Ik and 20 percent of the Tepeth, reported receiving aid in the form of cash donations followed by food items at 38 and 18 percent for the Ik and Tepeth respectively. Other forms of aid received included clothing, healthcare and education (Table A12). For the Ik, the government was the main source of support (at 67 percent), followed by local NGOs and CBOs (56 percent) and international NGOs at 46 percent. On the other hand, international NGOs were the main source of support for the Tepeth (86 percent) followed by local NGOs/CBOs and the government at 61 and 57 percent respectively.

Table A12: Humanitarian Support to the Ik and Tepeth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ik</th>
<th>Tepeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HHS that received</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>Number of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support a month before</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Respondents.</td>
<td>Respondents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food items</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash donation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Support</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local NGOs/CBOs</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International NGOs</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative results revealed that there are a number of NGOs working on various programs focused on different initiatives aimed at supporting the indigenous communities and reducing marginalization. Such
organizations include the Catholic Church through its development arm CARITAS. CARITAS works on issues of land and land protection by promoting and supporting the formation of communal land associations. This is aimed at resolving land-related conflicts. CARITAS also has a program that focuses on poverty eradication and offers scholarships to children. To mitigate against land disputes and land grabbing, development partners and NGOs like CARITAS are building the capacity of the Ik and Tepeth leaders as it relates to land laws and how to protect their land at the community level. This involves identifying land boundaries for all types of land ownership.

“We try to also make them (the indigenous people) identify their land boundaries, especially categorized land terms of which field is the communal lands, the individual lands, family lands and then how they use these different categories of land. We sensitize them on how they should be organized to handle all land disputes at community and the sub county leadership levels.” KII CARITAS, Moroto districts.

Other organizations working with the indigenous people on issues like land, natural resources, education, health, livelihoods, and access to water, include the German Corporation for International Cooperation, Land and Equity Movement, ECO, and Welt Hunger Hilfe.

The local government provides support through centralized government programs like the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF) phase III, Operation Wealth Creation that mainly target women’s groups (the only component of female inclusion) in a bid to deal with vulnerability. In addition, capacity building is provided to the local government structures so that they can ensure transparency and accountability.

Tourism potential

As a region, Karamoja has a high potential to become a major tourist destination. The region has a number of attractions including mountains, wildlife and culture that, if well-developed, can be beneficial to the local economy. Community based tourism can be a source of alternative employment to the communities including the indigenous groups. However, if not well managed, tourism as a resource can be a curse and lead to further marginalization in the form of displacing marginalized groups and a resulting loss of cultural heritage. Therefore, to realize benefits from tourism, the government needs to invest in the improvement of essential infrastructure such as roads, water and electricity supply. In addition, the indigenous communities have to be trained and equipped with the requisite skills to enable them to take advantage of the new employment opportunities that might arise from tourism development.

Universal Primary and Secondary Education
As discussed in the sections before, the indigenous peoples of Karamoja have limited educational opportunities and attainment, owing largely to poverty and the insecurity, cost and limited access to schools. However, if existing bottlenecks within the Ugandan government’s universal primary and secondary school education policies are addressed, it should play a key role in extending education services to all households in indigenous communities. Improved access to education will reduce education inequality and reduce the marginalization of these communities. Key interventions should include improving education infrastructure and security around schools, as well as increasing the amount of teachers and appropriate teaching and learning materials supplies, and bringing education services closer to communities.

A3.4.2 Barriers to Addressing Marginalization

**Continuing insecurity in the region:** The government’s efforts to combat insecurity in Karamoja through the disarmament carried out between 2006 and 2011 brought relative peace to the region over the past decade. However, as recently as 2019, insecurity and armed raids have increased. As discussed in the sections before, insecurity is a key driver of marginalization and hence the renewed conflicts; if not addressed permanently, they are likely to undermine any efforts to address Ik and Tepeth marginalization.

**Low human capital development:** As discussed before, the two communities have low levels of formal education. If this is not addressed, a number of efforts to address marginalization might not bear fruit. For example, discussions with some NGOs revealed that sensitization and capacity building efforts are constrained by illiteracy due to low levels of formal education among community members.

> “Illiteracy is another barrier when it comes to sensitization and capacity building. Most members in the communities are illiterate, and the rate at which they take in the information that we pass on is slow leading to low information retention,” KII CARITAS, Moroto district.

**Limited access to health services and safe water:** As discussed before, the two communities have limited access to health services as well as limited access to safe water and sanitation, which is negatively affecting their health and wellbeing. This is evidenced by the relatively high incidences of diseases observed with the communities that if this is not addressed, a number of efforts to address marginalization might not bear fruit.
A4 Conclusions and Recommendations

A4.1 Conclusions

The study sought to better understand the voices of Uganda’s indigenous peoples related to their rights and vulnerabilities. The study investigated the level of marginalization, its manifestations and its effects on the Ik and Tepeth, as well as the underlying drivers of marginalization. The study also explored the existing capacities, opportunities, and barriers to addressing Ik and Tepeth vulnerability and marginalization.

Study results show that indeed the two ethnic groups face marginalization, manifested through exclusion or limited participation in mainstream economic activities, governance and cultural practices, as well as limited access to public goods and services such as access to safe water and social services like health and education. As a result of this marginalization, the Ik and Tepeth lag behind other ethnic groups nationwide in terms of a number of development indicators. The majority of the respondents surveyed within the Ik and Tepeth communities live in relatively poor conditions, are asset poor, are more likely to fall ill and have lower literacy rates. The two groups have less leadership and political representation and face hostilities from their dominant neighbors.

Key drivers of marginalization identified include historical factors such as the displacement of indigenous communities as a result of conservation efforts, land tenure insecurity, lack of peace and security in the region, and poor infrastructure. These factors continue to constrain the economic and social development of the Ik and Tepeth communities.

However, despite the marginalization faced by the two groups, the study identified available capacities and opportunities that can be harnessed to tackle marginalization. These include the availability of natural resources, including minerals and tourist attractions, the presence of NGOs and development partners devoted to community development, infrastructure development efforts by the government as well as government policies on universal primary and secondary education.

On the other hand, the study also identified barriers to tackling marginalization. These include continuing insecurity in the region, low education levels and limited skills among the Ik and Tepeth. These barriers, if not tackled, can derail other efforts to fight marginalization.

A4.2 Recommendations

Fighting the marginalization of indigenous ethnic groups calls for coordination and collaboration among various stakeholders including the Ugandan government, policy makers both at the central and regional level, neighboring countries’ governments (Kenya and South Sudan), development partners, and community and civil society organizations (CSOs).
Recommendations to the Government of Uganda

1. **Protection of Land Rights:** The government should put in place a land tenure system in the Karamoja that protects individuals’ and communities’ rights of use and ownership. The majority of land in this region is under customary tenure whereby the rights, rules and responsibilities to possess, occupy and use it are based on community customs. However, this system is not adequately protected under national laws; any legal mechanisms to uphold land rights may easily be circumvented. Measures to reduce land disputes, illegal evictions and land grabbing should be implemented especially when it comes to land occupied by indigenous communities. Where governments need to move people for purposes of conservation or infrastructure development, the exercise should be done lawfully with adequate compensation and resettlement plans.

2. **Increased Provision of Education Services:** There is a need for affirmative action regarding the provision of social services like education. The government should increase efforts to ensure that marginalized groups have access to quality education. This will entail constructing schools within the Ik and Tepeth communities, equipping the existing schools with the right tools including recruiting competent staff, improving educational infrastructure, developing security around schools, increasing teacher numbers, and supplying schools with the appropriate teaching and learning materials. In addition, the government should extend early childhood education services like constructing nursery schools/kindergartens to ensure that the children from the Ik and Tepeth communities are introduced to education and schooling at an early stage as children are in other parts of the country. In addition, the government should recruit teachers who speak the local language to ensure that indigenous peoples’ languages and culture are not eroded.

3. **Combating School Dropouts:** As observed in the discussion section, a number of children drop out of school before completing their primary level. This is detrimental to the development of human capital in the indigenous communities. Government should therefore devise means of ensuring that children who join schools stay and complete their education. Key factors leading to school dropouts include the high cost of education, early marriages, teenage pregnancies and child labor. Programs to reduce the cost of education, incidences of early marriages, teenage pregnancies and child labor should be implemented.

4. **Increased Provision of Health Services:** The government should increase efforts to ensure that marginalized groups have access to quality health care services. This will require constructing health care facilities within the Ik and Tepeth communities and equipping the existing health care centers with the right tools, including recruiting competent staff and machinery to deliver quality services as well as stocking health centers with the right drugs and in the right quantities to reduce stock outs.
5. **Peace and Security:** The government should increase strategic deployment of security forces to protect the lives and property of local communities and to deter attacks from armed groups from both within and across borders. In addition, the government should resume the disarmament efforts while coordinating with neighboring governments to prevent armed groups from crossing borders and to stop arms and light weapons from entering the country. The government should engage local communities and work towards establishing and supporting community-based security systems as sustainable mechanisms for dealing with conflict.

6. **Infrastructure Development:** The government should step up its infrastructure development efforts in the Karamoja region. Extension of the road network, electricity transmission and construction of safe water sources are key to fostering development in the Karamoja region. In order to fight marginalization, prioritizing the extension of this critical infrastructure to the indigenous communities will be a step in the right direction. Indeed, infrastructure development is key to unlocking the tourism potential of the region, which if well managed, has the potential to provide alternative employment and incomes to the indigenous peoples.

7. **Provision of Alternative Income Generating Activities:** As the population continues to grow, communities like the Ik and Tepeth can no longer afford to rely solely on natural resources and subsistence agriculture, which is prone to climate variability and weather shocks, for their livelihoods. Alternative activities need to be introduced to the communities in order to diversify their income sources. This will require training individuals, especially the youth, to acquire new skills required for the alternative employment.

8. **Affirmative Action in Leadership and Governance:** While there have been efforts to boost indigenous peoples’ representation in parliament through the creation of two constituencies in the Ik and the Tepeth communities, more needs to be done to increase representation at the sub-county and district levels. Since the indigenous people have smaller numbers compared to their dominant neighbors, special positions at the sub-county and district levels need to be created for the Ik and Tepeth to ensure that the voices of these two minority groups are heard.

9. **Ensure Community Participation in Mining Contracts/Negotiations:** As discussed in the previous section, the presence of minerals in Karamoja can be a source of alternative income and livelihood to the communities if well managed. The government should therefore put in place strategies to ensure that local communities benefit from these natural resources. Communities should be empowered, consulted and allowed to participate during the negotiations and contracting process with the mining companies to ensure that their rights and interests are fairly represented and protected.
10. **Increase Climate Change Adaptation Strategies/Support:** The government should increase support to efforts geared at combating climate change which is affecting agricultural production and productivity within the communities. Such efforts could include strategies to reduce deforestation, adoption of better agriculture methods and actions to support the reduction of heavy reliance on natural resources by the communities.

**Recommendations to Development Partners and Civil Society Organizations**

11. **Alternative Sources of Livelihood:** Development partners should work with the government to create alternative income generating activities for the Ik and Tepeth. Such programs would require new skills in carpentry, building and construction, mining, metal works, etc. for the individuals in the communities to help them diversify and reduce dependence on national resources and subsistence agriculture. This calls for the construction and equipment of technical schools in the communities.

12. **Combating School Dropouts:** Development partners and CSOs should work with the government on programs designed to curb early marriages, teenage pregnancies and child labor which are some of the root causes of school dropouts. Sensitization efforts by CSOs on early marriage and the prevention of teenage pregnancies should be conducted throughout the Ik and Tepeth communities. The International Labour Organization should work the government and other development partners to create a special program for the indigenous communities to combat child labor.

13. **Culture, Language and Identity:** Culture, language and identity are big concerns among not only the Ik and Tepeth indigenous communities, but also among the Kadama of Nakapiripirit, Ngikuliak of Kotido and Nyangia of Karenga. Efforts to revive and maintain indigenous peoples’ cultures should be encouraged. Such efforts include promoting the teaching of indigenous languages in school especially in kindergartens and primary schools.

14. **Conflict Resolution Efforts:** Development partners and CSOs should work with the government and other stakeholders on programs designed to achieve sustainable peace and security in the Karamoja region. For example, sensitization efforts by CSOs to facilitate meetings between and among conflicting communities should be encouraged.
This part of the report presents results from the study undertaken in September 2020 on child trafficking in Napak district. Napak district was selected after being identified as a top hotspot for child trafficking in Karamoja. Napak district is bordered by the Abim district in the northwest, Kotido district in the north, Moroto district in the northeast and east, Nabilatuk district in the East, Katakwi district in the south, Amuria district in the southwest and in the west by the Otuke district (Figure A3 in Part A of the report).

**B1.0 Child Trafficking in Karamoja**

There has been increasing concern about the number of children being trafficked out of Karamoja ending up on the streets of Kampala and other urban centers both within and outside Uganda. In the literature, it is not clear when child trafficking started in Karamoja. However, it is postulated that incidences of child trafficking became more pronounced after the return of relative peace to Karamoja, in the aftermath of a successful forceful disarmament campaign by the Ugandan government that ended in July
2010 (USAID, 2020). After the disarmament campaign, sightings of Karimojong children and teenagers along the streets of major towns and cities in Uganda including Kampala, Jinja, Soroti, Busia, Moroto and Mbale became common. Child trafficking in Karamoja is sometimes aided by the families of victims who are offered money or conned by traffickers with false promises of offering the children scholarships for education or opportunities for lucrative employment within Uganda or abroad (USAID, 2020). Child trafficking prevails as a result of poverty, parental ignorance, and the absence or breakdown of social institutions in the communities (USAID, 2020).

The Ugandan Government has taken steps towards addressing trafficking in persons; for example, a law to criminalize trafficking was enacted in 2009. The act defines trafficking in persons as the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harboring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force or other forms of coercion, of abduction, fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of the giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation (Government of Uganda, 2009).

Thus, in this report, unless otherwise stated, child trafficking will mean the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harboring, or receipt of a person under the age of 18 years for the purpose of exploitation even if this does not involve any of the means mentioned above (Government of Uganda, 2009). The act defines “exploitation” to include at a minimum, sexual exploitation, forced marriage, child marriage, forced labor, harmful child labor, use of a child in armed conflict, use of a person in illegal activities, debt bondage, slavery or practices similar to slavery or servitude, human sacrifice, the removal of organs or body parts for sale or for purposes of witchcraft, harmful rituals or practices (Government of Uganda, 2009). Since children cannot give consent, if they face exploitation in any way while away from home, it is considered trafficking for the purpose of this report. This report also recognizes that children do not necessarily have to be transported across national borders for trafficking to take place, it can take place within the country, across regions or districts, or even within the communities where the children reside. The report also recognizes that exploitation can take place during recruitment, transportation, transfer, harboring or at the final destination.

This study aims to better understand the prevalence of child trafficking, the underlying drivers and effects of child trafficking in Napak district, as well as identifying existing capacities and opportunities to inform development interventions. Specifically, the study answers the following questions:

1. What is the prevalence of child trafficking in Napak district?
2. What are the manifestations of child trafficking in Napak district?
3. What are the underlying drivers of child trafficking in Karamoja?
4. What are the existing capacities, opportunities, and barriers to address child trafficking in Karamoja?
B2.0 Methodology

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to capture relevant data for the study. A household survey and qualitative interviews were conducted in Lopeei, Lokopo and Lorengecora sub-counties in Napak district. The sub-counties were purposely selected since they are the worst affected by child trafficking. Thereafter, the research team randomly selected parishes, villages, and households for the surveys.

Quantitative Data Collection and Analysis: A survey questionnaire was designed and pretested prior to the actual data collection. The questionnaire was uploaded into ODK, an online open-source software installed on Android tablets. Data were collected at the household level by trained research assistants who were familiar with the local language, Ngakarimojong. Respondents from the selected households were either household heads, or other adult household members. Quantitative data analysis put into consideration categorical variables, which represent independent attributes of the respondents, for instance sex; or ranked attributes, such as the age. The nature of these variables called for the use of frequencies and cross tabulations across the different variables for comparison. The prevalence of child trafficking was computed using variables that define the exploitation of children that takes place away from home including forced labor (which could be characterized by any of the following: forced to work for someone, forced to work to repay a debt with an employer or recruiter, worked for little or no wages, performed work that was not agreed upon, forced or made to beg for alms, forced to work to pay for their school fees), harmful child labor, participation in illegal or immoral activities, child marriages as well as child not being allowed to leave or contact their parents. Presence of any of these experiences was considered child trafficking in this study and the results were summarized in frequencies and proportions.

Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis: Qualitative data were collected using individual IDIs with opinion leaders at the community level and adults who had been victims of child trafficking; KIIIs with district officials, representatives from NGOs, civil society and other development partners, and fFGDs with community members from Lopei, Lokopo and Loengecora sub counties. FGDs were conducted separately for women, men, and the youth to ensure gender representation. A total of six IDIs, six KIIIs, and nine FGDs were carried out. Thematic analysis was adopted to understand the data, with focus given to identifying emerging issues and insights from the interviews to determine the socioeconomic and structural factors related to child trafficking in Napak district.

B3.0 Results and Discussion

Both the qualitative and quantitative survey results are presented and discussed in this section. The section is divided into four subsections. Subsection B3.1 presents the background characteristics of the children in the surveyed households, B3.2 discusses the prevalence and manifestations of child trafficking,
B3.3 presents the underlying drivers of child trafficking, while the existing capacities, opportunities, and barriers to addressing child trafficking are presented in subsection B3.4.

### B3.1 Background Characteristics of the Children in the Surveyed Household Survey

A total of 397 households were surveyed within which 378 households had children below the age of 18. The surveyed households had a total number of 1,432 children with the majority (70.8 percent) being below nine years old. Children with disabilities were two percent and six percent were orphaned. Most of the children of school going age (five and above years), 65 percent, were not enrolled in school. The majority of the children (82 percent) in the surveyed households were direct offsprings (son or daughter) of the heads of the households while 13 percent were grandchildren (Table B1).

#### Table B1: Background characteristics of the children in the surveyed households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under five years</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-9 Years</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-14 Years</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-17 Years</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship of the child with the household head</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Son/Daughter</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brother/Sister</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nephew/Niece</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grandchild</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-law</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education</td>
<td>No schooling at all</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school, not completed</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school, completed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary school, O’level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical/vocational/Diploma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a disability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphan hood status</td>
<td>Single orphan</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double orphan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the household survey results, three percent of the children were living away from their parents’ home at the time of the survey. Sixty-eight percent of the three percent mentioned, had been away from home for less than six months while 13 percent had been away for more than a year. The majority of the children (59 percent) away from home were engaged in work (including grazing animals, casual labor, and charcoal burning), seven percent had gone into marriage and six percent were at school. Furthermore, a large proportion of children that were away from home were living with a
relative or extended family member, 10 percent were with a family friend/acquaintance, seven percent had moved to live with their biological parents, while five percent were living with a complete stranger to the family (Table B2).

**Table B2: Children Living Away from their homes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child not currently living at home</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration over which the child has been away from home</td>
<td>0-6 months</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-12 months</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12+ months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for leaving home</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work (grazing, casual labor, charcoal burning, etc.)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person that the child went to live with</td>
<td>Biological parent(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative or extended family member</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Someone who is not a relative but who is known to the family (family friend/acquaintance)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Someone who at the time was a complete stranger to the family</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B3.2 Prevalence and Manifestation of Child Trafficking in Napak District**

This subsection presents results and discussions on the prevalence and manifestations of child trafficking in Napak district. Survey findings show that 321 out of the 1,432 children (22 percent) had experienced exploitation that qualifies them as child trafficking victims. This exploitation included forced child labor, harmful child labor, debt bondage, being forced to perform immoral and illegal activities (stealing and prostitution), and child marriages.

**Table B3: Manifestation of Child Trafficking in Napak District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Exploitation</th>
<th>Activity/Measure</th>
<th>Males(n=440)</th>
<th>Females (n=506)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced Child Labor</td>
<td>Forced to work for someone who is not a household member</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forced to work to repay a debt with an employer or recruiter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worked outside the home for little or no wages</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performed work that was not agreed upon 7 1.6 10 2.0
Forced or made to work to pay for their school fees 4 0.9 3 0.6
Child not allowed to leave or contact their parents 1 6.3 0 0.0

Harmful Child Labor
Carrying heavy loads 119 27.1 130 25.7
Using dangerous tools e.g. operating heavy or rotating machinery 2 0.5 6 1.2
Exposure to dust/fumes/gas 2 0.5 5 1.0
Exposure to extreme cold/heat/humidity 122 27.7 125 24.7
Exposure to loud noise or vibration 3 0.7 6 1.2

Number of Hours Worked Away From Home in the Last 7 days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 hours</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7 hours</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-13 hours</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-42 hours</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=43 hours</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illegal/Immoral activities
Performed work that was illegal or immoral (such as stealing, prostitution) 2 0.5 0 0.0
Forced or made to beg for alms 2 0.5 5 1.0

Child Marriage
Child Marriage 2 0.7 7 2.0

**Forced Child Labor:** Forced labor refers to all work or service which is exacted from any person under the threat of any penalty and for which said person has not offered him/herself voluntarily (Government of Uganda, 2009). Survey results show that among the children aged five years and above from the households surveyed, three percent of the boys and three percent of the girls were forced to work for someone who is not a relative, six percent of the boys and eight percent of the girls had worked for little or no wages, and nearly two percent of the children (both girls and boys) performed work that was not agreed upon (Table B3).

**Harmful Child Labor:** Survey results show that a significant number of children, while working away from home, had been involved in some form of harmful labor in the year preceding the survey. Twenty-seven percent of the boys and 26 percent of the girls aged five and above had engaged in work that required carrying heavy loads. Nearly 28 percent of the boys and 25 percent of the girls had worked in extreme weather conditions while a small percentage had been exposed to dust/fumes/gas or loud noises and vibrations at work. Results from the survey also revealed that a large number of children were subjected to long working hours with 46 percent working more than 43 hours in the week preceding the survey (Table B3).
Illegal/Immoral activities: Respondents revealed that among the children aged five years and above in the surveyed households, 0.5 percent of the boys and one percent of the girls had been forced to beg for alms while 0.5 percent of the boys had engaged in work that was illegal or immoral such as stealing and prostitution (Table B3). Although the quantitative results found no evidence of prostitution, KII and IDI interviews revealed that some of the girls trafficked ended up as sex workers. Prostitution not only affects the mental wellness of the children, it also puts them at risk of contracting sexually transmitted diseases including HIV/AIDS.

“The girls are mostly involved in prostitution as they are considered virgins and not affected by HIV/AIDS. In the process, they come back infected instead and married into polygamous families, so HIV infection increases,” KII, Deputy CAO, Napak District.

“Some girls become prostitutes through becoming sex workers for others. Some girls, for instance, have gone as far as Nairobi, Saudi Arabia, Italy, etc. For example, the daughter of my sister is right now in Saudi Arabia,” IDI Opinion Leader, Lorencecora sub-county.

Child Marriages: Child marriage refers to any formal marriage or informal union between a child under the age of 18 and an adult or another child (UNICEF, 2020). Survey results show that 0.7 percent of the boys and two percent of the girls among the children surveyed, aged five years and above, were married (Table B3). Results from qualitative interviews revealed that child marriages are sometimes orchestrated by parents who marry off their children in order to get a dowry, while in some incidences, children run away from home to get married without the consent or knowledge of their parents. Child marriages have a number of negative consequences on the victims and their families including a high risk of teenage pregnancies and difficulties giving birth, contracting sexually transmitted diseases such as HIV/AIDS, and becoming a victim of domestic violence.

“We are not the ones giving them out, children give themselves out. The boys here get girlfriends. How can you be able to know that they are dating your daughter? These days, mobile phones are fueling boy-girl interactions. The children get themselves into trouble without the knowledge of the parents, you think your child is still young until you hear that they have a child (pregnant) and you get surprised. When a mother says "I don't want you to marry that man," the girl disrespectfully says "it is not your life". When you insist the child threatens to commit suicide or escapes and elopes with the husband." Female FGD participants, Lokopo sub-county.

“Another challenge that the girls of ages 6-17 face among our people here is the girl is forced to be with a man that she doesn’t want to be with and when she is brought back it is realized that the man had HIV, thus the girl is also infected. So, this is the reason why some girls decide to move to other areas,” Male FGD Participants. Lorencecora sub-county.
B3.3 Underlying drivers of child trafficking in Napak

This subsection presents the underlying drivers and effects of child trafficking in the Napak district. The underlying drivers of child trafficking include high incidences of poverty, food insecurity and hunger, limited access to education, peer influence, inadequate family support and poor parenting skills, a network of traffickers, and insecurity.

B3.3.1 Poverty

The majority of respondents from the household survey (96 percent) live in temporary housing structures made of mud and wattle with grass thatched roofs. Only three percent of the household surveyed owned radios, 12 percent owned mobile phones and only nine percent owned bicycles. A small percentage of the households owned productive assets like gardens, livestock, and poultry (Table B4). Residing in temporary structures and owning few household assets points to high levels of poverty within the surveyed households.

### Table B4: Housing Conditions & Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House type</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent (Iron roof with burnt brick walls)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-permanent (Iron roof with mad and wattle walls)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-permanent (grass thatched with stone walls)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporally (grass-thatched roof with mud and wattle)</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Household assets**

- Radio: 47 (3%)
- Mobile telephone: 167 (12%)
- Bicycle: 125 (9%)
- Motorcycle: 5 (0%)
- Manufactured bed: 3 (0%)
- Mattress: 46 (3%)
- Solar panel: 44 (3%)
- Garden/field for production: 352 (25%)
- Large animals (e.g. Cattle, goats, sheep, pigs): 222 (15%)
- Small animals (Poultry, rabbits): 263 (18%)
- Animal skin: 163 (11%)

The high incidence of poverty among households surveyed is partially due to limited income sources and livelihood opportunities. The household survey results show that 67 percent of the respondents reported farming as their main source of livelihood, 18 percent were involved in petty trade while 13 percent depended on humanitarian support. Only 23 percent of the respondents reported having earned an income in the month preceding the survey. The majority, 65 percent, had earned the income as payment for casual labor (Table B5).
Table B5: Household’s Source of Livelihood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household’s source of livelihood</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty trade</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried job</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian support</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you earned any income in the last month?</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of income in the last month</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payment for casual labor</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly salaries for a regular job</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of produce from my garden</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of livestock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poverty is further exacerbated by *insecurity due to cattle raids (cattle rustling)*. Karimojongs mainly depend on livestock as a source of livelihood and in the recent past, there have been several cattle raids, which has eroded their livelihoods, driving families further into poverty. Traditionally, Karimojong boys are raised as livestock herders and therefore the loss of livestock leaves the boys and the youth without work, which forces them to look for work elsewhere. In addition to the loss of livestock, communities often suffer catastrophic consequences due to cattle rustling including the disruption of economic activity, death, rape of women and girls, and abduction of boys to carry the raiders’ loot.

“Now because of these raids one cannot go to fetch firewood. If you take a risk and you fall into the trap of these raiders, they will move with you, beat you, or worse kill you. Don’t joke with the Matheniko (one of the warrior tribes),” **Female FGD participants, Lokopo sub-county.**

Qualitative results from KIIs and FGDs revealed that high levels of poverty at the household and community level force the children to seek work in order to contribute to household expenses and meet personal basic needs. Seeking work at an early age increases the risk of children becoming victims of exploitation and consequently, child trafficking.

“The reason why our people here keep going to other areas is because of poverty. A child looks at the entire household and no one is educated, they realize the only way to better the family is by going somewhere to look for a job not knowing that the suffering on the other side is more than what you are going through at home.” **FGD, Women, Lorengecora sub-county**

“... as a girl, I have some personal needs that I myself have to meet, so I need to work and get that money, even if someone tries to stop me, I have to go.” **Youth FGD participants, Lokopo sub-county.**
B3.3.2 Food insecurity and hunger

More than half of the respondents from the households surveyed reported having difficulty living on their current incomes. Indeed, nearly all respondents (99 percent) reported not having enough food or money to buy enough food for all household members (Figure B1).

Figure B1: Perceptions on Welfare by Households (%)

Most FGD participants also reported that hunger, due to lack of food in most households, drives children into trafficking. As a region, Karamoja experiences frequent food insecurity caused by poor harvests due to the poor soils and climatic variabilities characterized by long dry seasons and floods. For example, sub-counties such as Lopeei have sandy soils which require sustained rains to grow any food crops. As a result of food insecurity, children, especially the girls, move far away from their homes in search of work to earn a living and to provide for their families.

“Sometimes people go to sleep hungry. When they try other economic activities like charcoal burning, they are restricted by the government, so we lack what to do. When a child realizes that there is no way out, he/she will decide to go away and look for survival elsewhere; when they get something, they send it back home,” Female FGD participants, Lorencorera sub-county

“What is hindering us from stopping these children from leaving is hunger. When we try growing crops, the yield turns out to be poor. How will you stop children from really going away?” Female FGD participants, Lokopo sub-county

B3.3.3 Limited Access to Education

Results from the survey revealed that the majority of the children of school-going age (five years and above), 65 percent, were not enrolled in school. The main reasons given for children not attending school include schools being expensive, insecurity, peer influence, hunger, long distance from schools,
child labor (children dropping out to help on the farm/garden, at home or running businesses), unwillingness of the children to attend school and loss of parents (Figure B2).

**Figure B2: Reasons for not attending school as reported by survey respondents (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunger</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too expensive</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer influence</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child too young</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools too far away</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphaned</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor school quality</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child had to help at home</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child not willing to attend</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents did not want</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child had to help with farm work</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child displaced</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents from the household survey also revealed that only 67 percent of the households surveyed have access to a primary school within a distance of less than three kilometers (Figure B3) compared to the national average of over 80 percent for rural areas (UBOS, 2021).

**Figure B3: Distance to the nearest primary School (%)**

Limited education can lead to unemployment, promote exploitation, poor health and difficulties in raising children as well as trap communities and households in poverty. Indeed, children out of school are vulnerable to various forms of exploitation and can more easily be lured into trafficking. Qualitative
results revealed that, due to a failure to attend school, some children decide to leave home in search of work, many of whom wound up being exploited or trafficked. Participants in FGDs also revealed that sometimes parents are conned by traffickers into giving away their children, with false promises of offering the children scholarships for education.

“Another thing that brings the giving away of children, is these people who say they want to sponsor the child. A person comes and sweet talks to you, saying they are looking for children to sponsor. I have come to pay for school for children, they take children and spread them all over Kampala. For example, some time back, people came claiming that they were taking children to study, and when things failed to work out, the children had to come back home,” Female FGD participants, Lokopo sub-county.

Box 1: The Story of Nachap Gloria (not real name), a 31-year-old woman from Lorengchora, who was trafficked at 16.

At the age of 16, Nachap Gloria, who is now 31 years old, was taken to Busia town by her own mother to look for money for survival. This was after her father refused to take her to school because he claimed he didn’t have money for school. Her father would tear her books to pieces and beat her up every morning whenever she wanted to go to school. Besides beating Gloria, her father would beat her mother for insisting that Gloria should go to school. Consequently, as a last resort, her mother had to take her away from home to escape the beatings. She felt she could go and work as a housemaid somewhere else. In Busia, she met friends and luckily she also found an uncle of hers. Gloria said, “I liked the welcome my uncle gave me after the stressful situation at home with my father beating my mother on a daily basis and stopping me from going to school.” In Busia, she worked as a babysitter alongside washing clothes for other households during the day, returning every evening to stay at the uncle’s house. Gloria was working for UGX 500 from 7am to 6 pm each day. In two months, Gloria had saved UGX 30,000, but her uncle took it all away from her: Gloria wanted to use the money to buy herself clothes because she had only one piece of cloth, but she could not buy them since the little saved was taken away. Her friends who had linked her up with the families she worked for bought her some clothes.

Having lost her savings and with a frustrated experience in Busia, she returned home to her mother and father. Unfortunately, the father started questioning her about why she had come back home. The father started beating her up again and that is when she decided to marry at the age of 16 years. “My wish was to go to school and if I had gone to school, I would have not been trafficked to Busia by my own mother,” said Gloria.

Her mother used to come to visit her in Busia from time to time to find out how she was fairing. She sometimes used to get in touch with her using telephone calls with friends and relatives both in Busia and back at home. Gloria returned to Lorengchora but her two brothers are still in Busia as working hawkers. “My original need when I arrived in Busia was to look for money to get myself personal land to build my own house and get a better life,” said Gloria.

Gloria narrated the challenges she is currently experiencing in Lorengchora town, including a lack of money to pay medical bills and send her children to school because there is no support from any
person. She is currently staying with her sister since she lacks land to construct her own house. Gloria is also a victim of domestic violence subjected to her by her husband. Although she is not currently staying with her husband, sometimes she is called back by the husband. Whenever there is domestic violence, she returns to her sister’s home. She is often denied by her husband to call her relatives to inform them whenever she is sick.

Gloria’s advice to girls in Lorengecora thinking about leaving Karamoja, “I would strongly advise the girls intending to go for trafficking against doing so, but encourage them to stay home and help their parents because life on the other side (away from home) is not good at all. I would tell them that we are shaming our people because of begging. The humanitarian organizations can help us to develop right here in Karamoja,” narrated Gloria

B3.3.4 Peer influence

Peer influence plays a big role in tempting children to leave their homes, many ending up being exploited, or trafficked. Notwithstanding the bad experiences, including mental and physical abuse and poor living and working conditions, shared by trafficked returnees, qualitative results revealed that parents and children are enticed by the items (such as smartphones, beads, suitcases, clothes, Vaseline, saucepans, and jerry cans among other) that returnees come back with. The returnees are admired by children in the communities because of their ‘health appearance’ such as healthy skin and good clothing. Qualitative results show that most children and parents who give up their children are unaware of the conditions or circumstances that await them at their destinations.

“… Returnees bring with them handouts and money… their parents celebrate. Other parents say if the daughter of so and so has returned with these things why are you still here? Why don’t you go and return with something.” KII, Napak.

“We have really been defeated by these children through their escape plans, because they can escape before you know it. For example, when you ask your daughter to go to the grinding mill, unfortunately their plan is already set. She sends maize floor from the grinding mill through another person, then later when you ask where she is, you only hear that she was with another girl and she told me to take the floor home. Then the following morning you just get a phone call. It’s only children who go by themselves just after admiring the way the others have come with a lot of property. They get motivated when those who have come back tell them, you can also come and get things like this, there is some work. That means getting attracted to trafficking is what takes children there.” Female FGD participants, Lokopo sub-county.

“The children these days are very tactful and knowledgeable as well. They can walk through Apeitolim and Katakwi to Soroti, they can dodge main roads which have police checkpoints that identifies children being taken for trafficking and they can decide to move at daytime while deceiving people that they are going for casual works to the neighboring district of
Katakwi, but end up in trafficking business,” IDI, Opinion Leader, Lorengecora sub-county.

Box 2: The Story of Nakiru Maria (not real name), a 15-Year-old Girl of Lokopo

Nakiru is a young girl who decided to leave Karamoja and head to Kampala city to seek a better life. Before leaving Karamoja, she was a pupil at Lokodokodio primary school, where she studied until 2019. Nobody was involved in trafficking her out of Karamoja. She decided on her own. Nakiru narrates that she went to Kampala because she saw many girls coming back very beautiful. “I said to myself, I should also go and come back beautiful.” In her community, she would see many girls coming back (from Kampala) with big saucepans, basins, sacks of beans, 20 liter jerry cans of cooking oil, nice clothes, big frying pans for roasting fermented posho for making local brew, etc. All this enticed her to go to Kampala. “I picked money for the bus fare from the proceeds my mother got from brewing and selling local beer. I didn’t ask my mother for it, but I just picked it”, narrated Nakiru. She went to Matany and boarded a bus destined for Kampala. On reaching Kampala, she went straight to Kisenyi, at a place where many Karamojong stay popularly known as “Kikaramoja.” Nakiru lived in Kampala from July to August 2020. In Kisenyi, she would go every morning to do casual work sorting beans and groundnuts for the business people in Owino Market. Nakiru worked for only one month and was being paid UGXs 1,000 for each day’s work. Nakiru’s immediate need was to buy herself clothes. When she got some money from working in Kampala, she bought two pieces of clothes.

Living in Kampala, Nakiru faced a number of challenges. The first challenge she remembers was the harassment she received from the boys and girls in Kisenyi. She narrated that, “These bad guys would just kick you, abuse you and slap you for no reason.” The other challenge, she remembers, was the issue of accommodation. “Before you enter the small room for sleeping, you have to pay UGXs 1,000 every day. For instance, 40 girls would squeeze into a small room for accommodation every night,” said Nakiru. After work, the girls would contribute money in a pool to buy food and collectively cook their dinner.

While in Kisenyi, with no more work to do in Kampala, her mother sent her money via mobile money for transport back home. Nakiru does not communicate at all with the girls she stayed with in Kisenyi because she does not have a phone, but also mentioned that she doesn’t want that life again in Kisenyi. She didn’t like anything in Kisenyi, including the form of accommodation. “My parents should have bought me clothes so that I didn’t need to go to Kampala,” said Nakiru.

Nakiru indicated that if she was to talk to girls in Lokopo, she would tell them that they should not go to Kampala. If there is opportunity for business, the girls should do it here at home. For the case of parents, she would tell them not to give girls money to go to Kampala, instead parents should give girls money to do business here at home. IDI with Child Trafficking Survivor.
B3.3.4 Inadequate family support and poor parenting skills
Respondents reported that poor parenting skills contribute to child trafficking. For instance, study participants mentioned that due to the high levels of alcoholism, the functioning of families and households has been disrupted. There are several reports of drunkenness and domestic violence (with harsh punishments on children) which sometimes force children to run away from home.

Furthermore, some cultural practices directly or indirectly contribute to child trafficking. For example, parents marry off young girls to obtain dowry. In addition, in Karamoja, there is a cultural expectation that children, especially girls, will contribute towards household expenses. This forces the children to leave homes in order to look for work, where many end up exploited or trafficked.

“Alcoholism makes parents insult children, who end up running away from home,” Female FGD participants, Lopeei sub-county.

B3.3.5 Network of traffickers and the various tactics used
Qualitative results revealed that there are a number of people engaged in or facilitating trafficking activities including relatives of victims, transporters and employers. Participants in the qualitative interviews reported that there are several and sometimes complex tactics that perpetrators (who sometimes are relatives to the victims) use to lure their victims and families into trafficking. They sometimes use money or the promise of a better education for the victims in good schools which are more readily available in towns and big cities. This entices the families to permit their children to leave home. During transit, perpetrators use different tactics to ensure children get away with ease, such as splitting the victims into smaller groups instead of moving in big numbers that may easily raise the suspicion of local authorities and police. In addition, the bus drivers and operators also abate trafficking by alerting perpetrators and fellow drivers who are transporting trafficked children about the presence of police checkpoints along the transit routes. Consequently, the drivers either divert their routes or offload the children who use smaller, dusty paths to later reunite with the drivers and traffickers after the roadblocks.

Qualitative results further reveal that sometimes relatives staying in larger towns and cities pick children from the village under the guise of needing household help, but the children end up on the streets as beggars. These relatives falsely communicate over the phone with the parents of the victims about how well the children are. The parents are made to believe that their children are with them and doing well and yet the children may be with someone else.

B3.4 Existing Capacities, Opportunities, and Barriers to Address Child Trafficking
B3.4.1 Existing Capacities and Opportunities
Presence of NGOs and development partners devoted to fighting child trafficking in Karamoja
There are a number of NGOs working on various programs focused on different development initiatives aimed at fighting child trafficking. Survey findings show that 13 percent of the households had received some form of humanitarian relief in the month before the survey. The majority, 79 percent, had received aid in the form of food items while 13 percent received cash donations. The main source of this relief was from international NGOs (69 percent), followed by local NGOs at 21 percent (Table B6). The presence of development partners and NGOs committed to tackling the underlying drivers of child trafficking, like hunger, offers a great opportunity to fight this scourge. However, the presence of many NGOs can become a curse if their operations are not carefully monitored by the government and other relevant bodies. As discussed in the previous section, traffickers lure victims or their family members into consenting to trafficking under the pretense of offering humanitarian support such as scholarship opportunities. The government should therefore be in position to screen out fraudsters and monitor the activities of NGOs to avoid exacerbating the child trafficking problem. The NGOs involved in supporting communities in Napak include the Dwelling Places, Save the Children, Cooperation and Development, and Karamoja Integrated Development Program of the Pentecostal Assembly of God.

*Table B6: Humanitarian Support to Households in Napak District*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the last month, did you or your family receive any support to meet your needs from a humanitarian agency?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What in-kind support did you receive?</td>
<td>Food items</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cash donation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the main source of humanitarian support for your community?</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local NGOs and Community Based Organizations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International NGOs</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local District Efforts to Stop Child Trafficking

There are efforts by the local government working together with NGOs to combat child trafficking in Napak district. Interviews with district officials revealed that with support from Save the Children International, in 2018 Napak district passed two ordinances, the Child Protection Ordinance and the Education Ordinance. Both ordinances were, at the time of the survey, under review by the office of the attorney general. In addition, the local government has set up rehabilitation centers where returnees are hosted, rehabilitated, and taught life skills before returning to their families and reintegrating into the communities. The district has also supported the formation of girl groups to support victims of child trafficking. Through these groups, victims are encouraged to engage in income generating activities to support their families as well as share testimonies regarding the bad experiences they faced during trafficking. Furthermore, the district council is also involved in community awareness and sensitization efforts against child trafficking in Lopeei, Lokopo, Matany, Iriri and Lorengechora sub-counties. The district is working through local leaders, elders, and drama groups to denounce child trafficking. Interviews with the district officials also revealed that leaders at the districts have had discussions with bus operators to reduce transporting children out of Karamoja. The district is also working with NGOs like Dwelling Places, Save the Children, Cooperation and Development and the KCCA to return the trafficked children back to Napak district and reintegrate them into their communities.

Central Government Efforts

The central government, through the MoGLSD and the KCCA have designed strategies aimed at the rehabilitation and resettlement of street children. For example, in 2019, KCCA passed the Child Protection Ordinance, which the government, through the MoGLSD, plans to use in the relocation, resettlement, and rehabilitation of street children, including those from Karamoja.

B3.4.2 Barriers to Fighting Child Trafficking

Insecurity due to Cattle Raids

Survey findings show that insecurity due to cattle raids was reported as the number one shock or stressor faced by the households surveyed (18 percent) (Table B7). As discussed in the previous section, insecurity not only leads to death, displacement, and loss of property, but also prevents members of the community from engaging in productive activities like agriculture. This makes households vulnerable, contributing to poverty, hunger and consequently child trafficking.

*Table B7: Shocks and stressors faced by the households*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate or irregular rains or drought</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floods</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslides/Erosions</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunderstorms/lightning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Climate Variability and Food Insecurity

As discussed in the previous section, food insecurity and hunger are major drivers of child trafficking. Respondents in the household survey reported weather variability in the form of inadequate or irregular rains or drought as one of the major shocks experienced by households (Table B7). Weather variability affects agricultural production, leading to low yields and consequently contributing to food insecurity and famine.

Poor infrastructure

Poor infrastructure, in terms of bad roads, was reported by 12 percent of the respondents as a shock or stressor (Table B7). Bad roads are detrimental to the economic development of Karamoja as a whole and thus one of the key factors contributing to the high levels of poverty observed in this region. As discussed in the previous sections, poverty is an underlying driver of child trafficking. Therefore, if factors contributing to poverty are not tackled, child trafficking is likely to continue.

B4.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

B4.1 Conclusions

The study sought to better understand the scourge of child trafficking in Napak district. The study investigated the prevalence and manifestations, as well as the underlying drivers, of child trafficking. The study also explored the existing capacities, opportunities, and barriers to addressing child trafficking.

Findings from this study show a high prevalence of child trafficking in Napak district. Twenty-two percent of children in the surveyed households had experienced some form of exploitation that qualifies as child trafficking. Child trafficking manifests itself in a number of ways including forced child labor, harmful child labor, debt bondage, sexual exploitation and child marriage.

The key underlying drivers of child trafficking identified include the high incidence of poverty, which is partially driven by limited livelihood opportunities, and insecurity from cattle raids, climate variability,
poor infrastructure, food insecurity and hunger, limited access to education, peer influence, inadequate family support and poor parenting skills as well as networks and tactics used by traffickers.

The study identified available capacities and opportunities that can be harnessed to tackle child trafficking in Napak. Such capacities include the presence of NGOs and development partners devoted to fighting child labor, as well as local and central government efforts. On the other hand, the study also identified barriers to fighting child trafficking including the continuing insecurity in the region, climate variability and food insecurity, and poor infrastructure.

**B4.2 Recommendations**

Fighting child trafficking requires coordination and collaboration efforts among various stakeholders including the Ugandan government, policy makers both at the central and regional level, development partners, community and CSOs.

**Recommendations to the Ugandan Government**

1. **Peace and Security:** The government should increase strategic deployment of security forces to protect the lives and property of local communities and to deter attacks from armed cattle rustlers from both within and across borders. The government should also engage local communities and work towards establishing and supporting community-based security systems as a sustainable mechanism for dealing with insecurity and conflict.

2. **Provision of Education:** The government should increase efforts to ensure that the people of Karamoja have access to quality education services. This will entail constructing more schools within the communities and equipping them with the right tools, including recruiting competent staff as well as bringing down the cost of education incurred by parents.

3. **Combating Child Labor:** The government should increase efforts to fight child labor with particular effort on combating harmful child labor which is a form of exploitation and contributes to child trafficking. This can be done by improving the productivity of households by encouraging the adoption and use of modern technologies and equipment for production. The government should also step up efforts to sensitize the communities on the dangers and consequences of child labor.

4. **Combating Child Marriages:** Child marriage by definition is a form of child trafficking. Although the proportion of children in marriages is relatively small, victims of child marriages face a number of challenges including high risk of teenage pregnancies and difficulties giving birth, contracting sexually transmitted diseases such as HIV/AIDS and becoming a victim of domestic violence. Therefore, the government should devise strategies to curb this crime. These
strategies should involve actions and efforts to curb the underlying causes of child marriages, including ignorance and cultural practices that condone child marriage.

5. **Provision of Alternative Income Generating Activities**: In order to fight poverty, the government should come up with strategies and actions that reduce the heavy reliance of communities on agriculture, which is prone to climate variability and weather shocks, for their livelihoods. Alternative activities need to be introduced to the communities in order to diversify their income sources. This will require training individuals, especially the youth, to enable them acquire new skills required for the alternative employment.

6. **Combating hunger and food insecurity**: In addition to alternative income generating activities, the government should step up its efforts to encourage improvement in agricultural production and productivity. This requires the adoption of better farming methods and technologies including irrigation schemes to fight droughts, mechanization, improved crop varieties, and livestock breeds.

7. **Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Returnees/Victims**: The government should step up efforts to rehabilitate and resettle victims of child trafficking. This could be done by building more rehabilitation centers and equipping them with qualified personnel to help prepare victims for reintegration into their communities.

8. **Combating Domestic Violence and Parenting Support**: The government should devise strategies to combat domestic violence within families which is forcing children to run away from their homes. Efforts to fight alcoholism and substance abuse, as well as educating parents on their roles and responsibilities, should be encouraged through community engagements and sensitization.

**Recommendations to Development Partners and CSOs**

9. **Conflict Resolution Efforts**: Development partners and CSOs should work with the government and other stakeholders on programs designed to achieve sustainable peace and security in the Karamoja region. For example, sensitization efforts by CSOs to facilitate meetings between and among conflicting communities should be encouraged.

10. **Alternative Sources of Livelihood**: Development partners should work with the government to create alternative income generating activities. Such programs would require new skills in carpentry, building and construction, mining, metal works, etc. for the individuals in the communities to diversify away from dependence on subsistence agriculture. This calls for the construction and equipping of technical schools in the communities.
11. **Combating Child Marriages**: NGO and development partners should work with the government to devise strategies to curb child marriages. Such efforts could include community mobilization and sensitization on the dangers of child marriages.

12. **Combating Hunger and Food Insecurity**: Development partners also should work with the government to devise strategies to combat food insecurity and hunger. Such efforts should aim at increasing households’ incomes and agricultural production and productivity.

13. **Combating Domestic Violence and Poor Parenting**: NGOs and development partners should support initiatives that are geared towards combating domestic and gender-based violence as well as programs to improve parenting skills within communities. Such efforts could include community mobilization and sensitization of parents on their roles and responsibilities. In addition, innovative approaches to foster positive parent-child interactions as well as programs to reduce alcohol and substance abuse should be encouraged. Ideas such as identifying role models or champions within these communities should also be adopted and supported.
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**Annexes**
Annex AI: Focus Group Discussion Interview Guide for the Indigenous Peoples’ Survey

FGD GUIDE FOR IK AND TEPETH INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

Gulu University Constituent College – Moroto is conducting research that will inform subsequent interventions by USAID/Uganda to strengthen the voices of Uganda’s indigenous peoples and thus appreciates your participation in providing responses on the rights and vulnerabilities of the Ik and the Tepeth. The output of the study will be used for purposes of facilitating formulation of better policies/programming in this area.

Please feel free to express your opinions as all responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

District: …………………

1. Tell us about your ethnic group, and how it is structured in the Karamoja
   Probe for: Origin, cultural structure and practices,

2. What makes your ethnic group unique within Karamoja?
   Probe for:
   a) Leadership and administrative structures
   b) Marriage and family structures
   c) e) economic activities, livelihood activities
   d) f) Indigenous/special knowledge skills etc.

3. What is the nature of marginalization of indigenous people (open or disguised)?
   Probe for:
   a) Which actors/people/groups are responsible for marginalizing your ethnic group?
   b) How is your ethnic group marginalized?
   c) What aspects of your ethnic group (e.g. culture and language) have been affected as a consequence of the continuing marginalization?
   d) What interventions have been implemented to address marginalization of your ethnic group?
   e) What actions are you undertaking to reduce marginalization of your ethnic group?
   f) What needs to be done differently to reduce marginalization of your ethnic group?

4. What challenges does your ethnic group face?
   Probe for:
   a) drivers and manifestations of marginalization/vulnerability
   b) access and utilization of social services (e.g. education, health etc.)
   c) how they are perceived by other ethnic groups within karamoja (stigma and discrimination)

5. How have you been supported to address these challenges?
   Probe for:
   a) Who is supporting the Ik (or Tepeth)-names of implementing partners supporting their ethnic group?
b) interventions to address the challenges mentioned above

6. What solutions would you suggest to solve the challenges related to marginalization and vulnerabilities within your ethnic group.

General inquiry into the implications of COVID 19

a) What do you know about COVID 19?
b) How has COVID-19 affected you and your livelihoods (probe for positive and negative effects)
c) What has been your experience of the covid-19 restrictions and the lockdown?

Thank you for taking off time to be part of this interview.

Annex All: Key Informant Interview Guide for Community Leaders

IDI GUIDE WITH IK AND TEPETH COMMUNITY LEADERS

Gulu University Constituent College – Moroto is conducting research that will inform subsequent interventions by USAID/Uganda to strengthen the voices of Uganda’s indigenous peoples and thus appreciates your participation in providing responses on the rights and vulnerabilities of the Ik, the Tepeth and trafficking in people in Karamoja. The output of the study will be used for purposes of facilitating formulation of better policies/programming in this area.

Please feel free to express your opinions as all responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

District: ..........................

1. Tell us about yourself, your role, your ethnic group, and how it is structured in the Karamoja
   Probe for: Origin, cultural structure and practices,

2. In your opinion, what makes your ethnic group unique within Karamoja?
   Probe for:
   a) Leadership and administrative structures
   b) Marriage and family structures
   c) Economic activities, livelihood activities
   d) Indigenous/special knowledge skills etc.

3. In your opinion, tell us the key challenges that your ethnic group faces
   Probe for:
   a) drivers and manifestations of marginalization/vulnerability
   b) access and utilization of social services (e.g. education, health etc.)
   c) how they are perceived by other ethnic groups within karamoja (stigma and discrimination)

4. Please share with us how you have been supported to address these challenges in the communities?
   Probe for:
a) Who is supporting the Ik (or Tepeth)-names of implementing partners supporting their ethnic group?
b) Interventions to address the challenges mentioned above

5. Based on your experience, what solutions would you suggest to solve the challenges related to marginalization and vulnerabilities within your ethnic group.

General inquiry into the implications of COVID 19 lockdown

a) What do you know about COVID 19?
b) How has COVID-19 affected you and your livelihoods (probe for positive and negative effects)
c) What has been your experience of the covid-19 restrictions and the lockdown?

Thank you for taking off time to be part of this interview.

Annex AllI: Key Informant Interview Guide _Indigenous Peoples

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE: Indigenous Peoples

Gulu University Constituent College – Moroto is conducting research that will inform subsequent interventions by USAID/Uganda to strengthen the voices of Uganda’s indigenous peoples and thus appreciates your participation in providing responses on the rights and vulnerabilities of the Ik, the Tepeth and trafficking in people in Karamoja. The output of the study will be used for purposes of facilitating formulation of better policies/programming in this area.

Please feel free to express your opinions as all responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Name of the respondent: -…………………… District: -………………

Sub-county: -…………………… Age: -……………………

Part 1: Indigenous people and their vulnerability
1. What do you know about indigenous people? Who are they in this region and what are their common characteristics?
   Probe for:
   a) the Ik and Tepeth as an indigenous group.
   b) What makes the Ik and Tepeth indigenous groups? (characteristics of the Ik and Tepeth, their identity and livelihoods)

2. How vulnerable are indigenous people? What makes them vulnerable and why?
   c) Probe for: how these vulnerabilities are associated with development initiatives such as conservation, tourism, land laws, environment protection, etc.

3. In what ways are these vulnerabilities being addressed by different stakeholders
   d) Probe for: solutions/interventions from government, NGOs, CBOs, other stakeholders)

Part 2: Marginalization of the indigenous people
4. What is the nature of marginalization of indigenous people (open or disguised)?
Probe for:

a) Of indigenous people (Ik and Tepeth), which actors are responsible for marginalizing indigenous people?
b) How can we understand the different dynamics of internal and external marginalization?
c) Are there social categories among the indigenous people who face more marginalization than others (double marginalization)?
d) How does marginalization manifest itself differently among Ik and Tepeth?
e) What aspects of the Ik and Tepeth cultures and languages have been affected as a consequence of the continuing marginalization?
f) In what ways have these cultures and languages been negatively or positively affected?
g) What interventions have been implemented to address marginalization of the Ik and the Tepeth?
h) How have interventions undertaken to address marginalization changed over time?
i) Which investment projects have exacerbated marginalization in your community?
j) How have development interventions triggered/ perpetuated the marginalization of indigenous communities in Karamoja?
k) What role do you play in reducing marginalization among the Ik and Tepeth?
l) What needs to be done differently to reduce marginalization among the Ik and Tepeth communities?

Part 3: Indigenous people and participation in decision making

5. What formal and informal governance structures exist within the Ik and Tepeth?

Probe for:

a) What are the existing leadership structures?
b) What is the level of participation of these marginalized groups in decision making in the formal and informal governance structures?
c) What is the level of participation of the different social categories among the Ik and Tepeth in the national programs such as ID project, NUSAIF programs, KIDP programs, Operation Wealth Creation (OWC) and others?

6. What are the most common sources of livelihood for the Ik and Tepeth?
   a) Probe for how the Ik and Tepeth community livelihood sources differ from others

Part 4: Community interventions

7. Which community development activities are you implementing that are targeted towards the Ik and Tepeth?

Probe for:

a) How do these groups receive and perceive these development activities?
b) What are the successes of these development activities?
c) What are the barriers to access and use of the development activities among the Ik and Tepeth?
d) What are the challenges that you face while implementing these development activities?
e) Which other stakeholders are working with the Ik and Tepeth?
f) Probe for the development activities that are implemented by these stakeholders.

5. Policy and rights of the indigenous people

8. What policies, frameworks and guidelines are available while working with indigenous people like the Ik and Tepeth?

Probe for

a) Policies, frameworks and guidelines that are relevant for and are used by your institution while working with the Ik and Tepeth?
b) How have these policies, frameworks and guidelines translated into development programs for the Ik and Tepeth?
c) What gaps do you find in these policies, frameworks and guidelines?
d) What policy recommendations would you propose for the Ik, Tepeth and other indigenous peoples and why?

6. General inquiry into the implications of COVID 19 lockdown?

a) What do you know about COVID 19?
b) How has COVID-19 affected you and your livelihoods (probe for positive and negative effects)
c) What has been your experience of the covid-19 restrictions and the lockdown?

Annex B1: Focus Group Discussion Interview Guide for Child Trafficking

FGD Guide _ Child Trafficking

Gulu University Constituent College – Moroto is conducting research that will inform subsequent interventions by USAID/Uganda to strengthen the voices of Uganda’s indigenous peoples and thus appreciates your participation in providing responses on the rights and vulnerabilities of the Ik, the Tepeth and trafficking in people in Karamoja. The output of the study will be used for purposes of facilitating formulation of better policies/programming in this area.

Please feel free to express your opinions as all responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

No of FGDs: -………………….. District: -…………………..

Sub-county: -………………….. Average age: -…………………..

Vignette 1:
Emojung is a 9-year-old girl staying with her single mother and her uncle Logiro. One morning, two women come to their home and they engage in an intense conversation with her mother for about 30 minutes. The woman then gave her mother something that looked like money. Emojung has never seen these women but her uncle knows what they do and he believes many locals know this too. After their conversation, Emojung was asked to pack her bag immediately. Her mother told her she had no money to pay for her school fees and that they were taking her to study from the city of Kampala. The women took Emojung to the bus park where she was handed over to another
woman who accompanied her. Upon arrival in Kampala, Emojung never joined any school but was taken to work for a well-to-do family in the suburbs. She works every day from 5.00am to midnight without any rest. She cleans the house and compound, washes clothes, cooks, and looks after four children, two of whom are older than her. Since coming to the city, Emojung has never communicated with her mother. She is forbidden from making phone calls. She tried to escape one day but her employers beat her severely and warned her never to go more than 100 meters away from the house. Despite working for close to a year now, she has never received any pay. Her employers scold her every day for being lazy, yet she feels she works her heart out. Sometimes she is denied the food she has prepared herself.

1. Do you think what is happening in this scenario is morally correct? Why or why not
2. Does this scenario describe something that commonly occurs in this community? If so, in what ways does this occur?
3. Does this scenario describe forced labor or child trafficking?
4. Tell me about similar challenges/problems faced by children and young people (6-17 years) in your community.
   Probe for:
   a) Family, cultural and social related challenges
   b) Challenges specific to boys
   c) Challenges specific to girls
5. What are the causes of scenarios such as the one described in above?
6. What has happened to the Karamojong family institution that led to child trafficking?
7. When did it start? When did it aggravate?
8. How did we get to this point of buying and selling children in open markets? What went wrong?
9. What are the most commonly occurring forms of internal child trafficking in this community?
   Probe for:
   a) What are the most common sectors where children are trafficked (e.g. agriculture, mining, fishing, etc.)?
   b) What are the working conditions of the trafficked children?
   c) What forms of trafficking that boys are mainly involved in?
   d) What forms of trafficking that girls are mainly involved in?
10. How does the process of internal child trafficking usually occur in this community?
   Probe for:
   a) Most common hotspots of origin and destination for trafficking and why?
   b) Common tactics used for recruitment of children?
   c) Who are in the recruitment networks for the children?
   d) Common modes of transport used and the different places of origin and destinations for internal (in-country) trafficking.
   e) Actions undertaken to address trafficking activities at known recruitment, transit and destination sites.
11. What are the causes/facilitates child trafficking in this community?
   Probe for:
   a) What are specific factors that place populations at risk for trafficking (structural/system)?
   b) What are factors that enable perpetrators to get away with trafficking (structural/system)?
   c) What are the cultural practices or attitudes that facilitate and sustain child trafficking?
   d) How does child trafficking go unnoticed by many people?
12. What are the gaps and barriers in response that have facilitated and sustained child trafficking?
   Probe for:
   a) Barriers and gaps to protection at community institutional and national-level
   b) Barriers and gaps to prevention at community institutional and national-level
   c) Barriers and gaps to prosecution at community institutional and national-level
13. What are the challenges involved in addressing internal child trafficking in this community?
Probe for:
a) Family challenges, community challenges and child related challenges.
b) How are the identified challenges being addressed?

14. In your opinion, how does child trafficking affect the wellbeing of child victims/their families and the communities?
15. What recommendations (solutions) would you give to address internal child trafficking?

Probe for
a) Solutions at household level, community level, district and at National government level

General inquiry into the implications of COVID 19 lockdown?
a) What do you know about COVID 19?
b) How has COVID-19 affected you and your livelihoods (probe for positive and negative effects)
c) What has been your experience of the covid-19 restrictions and the lockdown?

Thank you for taking off time to be part of this interview

Annex BII: In-depth Interview Guide for Child Trafficking

IDI GUIDE: Child Trafficking (Survivors)
Gulu University Constituent College – Moroto is conducting research that will inform subsequent interventions by USAID/Uganda to strengthen the voices of Uganda’s indigenous peoples and thus appreciates your participation in providing responses on the rights and vulnerabilities of the Ik, the Tepeth and trafficking in people in Karamoja. The output of the study will be used for purposes of facilitating formulation of better policies/programming in this area.

Please feel free to express your opinions as all responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Name of respondent: - ..........................  District: - ........................
Sub-county: - ...........................  Age: - ..............................

1. Tell us yourself and your story regarding trafficking (before, during and after)

Probe for:
a) Age at the time it happened
b) Schooling status before and after
c) Activities you were engaged in during trafficking

2. What led to your trafficking?

Probe for:
a) Individual, family and community experiences
b) What were your immediate needs during this experience? Were there any challenges (including financial, or otherwise) that the family had to deal with during the trafficking process?

3. Where did this trafficking experience take place AND how?

4. Tell us more about the kind of people who were involved (don’t tell us their names)?

Probe for:
a) Were you related to them in any way?
b) What did they do to keep you there?

5. What do you wish would have been done to prevent this trafficking experience from happening?
6. How did you cope during the trafficking period?

7. How have you kept in touch with the agency/people that recruited you into trafficking?
   **Probe for:**
   a) How did you maintain communication with your family during the period of trafficking?
   b) How do you communicate with the agency/people that trafficked you?

8. When did this trafficking experience stop and how?
   **Probe for:**
   a) Other people in similar situations who are still there
   b) Tell us about the help you needed, received, and from whom. What did you **like and dislike** about the help you received?
   c) How was help availed to you?

9. What were your immediate needs after having come out of this experience?
   **a) Probe for:** How did you cope after the trafficking period?

10. What challenges do you encounter now being back?

11. What recommendations would you give to individuals that have faced child trafficking?

12. Is there anything more about this experience you want to tell us?

**General inquiry into the implications of COVID 19**
   a) What do you know about COVID 19?
   b) How has COVID-19 affected you and your livelihoods (probe for positive and negative effects)
   c) What has been your experience of the covid-19 restrictions and the lockdown?

---

**Annex BII: Key Informant Interview Guide for Child Trafficking**

**KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE: Child Trafficking**

Gulu University Constituent College – Moroto is conducting research that will inform subsequent interventions by USAID/Uganda to strengthen the voices of Uganda’s indigenous peoples and thus appreciates your participation in providing responses on the rights and vulnerabilities of the Ik, the Tepeth and trafficking in people in Karamoja. The output of the study will be used for purposes of facilitating formulation of better policies/programming in this area.

Please feel free to express your opinions as all responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Name of respondent: -.....................................  District: -..........................
Designation: -..............................................  Age: -..............................................

1. Tell me about yourself, your organisation/department, and your role in child protection?
   **Probe for:**
   a) Specific role of your office in combating internal child trafficking
   b) What are the forms/types of internal child trafficking handled by your office/ department/organisation?

2. What is your organisation/department’s **understanding** of child trafficking?
   **Probe for:**
   a) Challenges faced by your organisation/department in fighting child trafficking

---
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b) What are the top three priorities for this organisation/department in child protection?

c) How are cases of child trafficking managed (referral mechanisms, re-integration and additional services offered)?

d) What preventative measures (sensitization, among others) are done in vulnerable communities or populations?

e) How do you identify and track the number of victims served and the services provided to the trafficked victims?

3. What are the most commonly occurring forms of internal child trafficking in this district?

Probe for:

| a) | What are the most common sectors where children are trafficked (e.g. agriculture, mining, fishing, etc.)? |
| b) | What forms of trafficking that boys are mainly involved in? |
| c) | What forms of trafficking that girls are mainly involved in? |

4. What other organizations/departments are involved in combating internal child trafficking?

Probe for:

| a) | How is your organization/department working with other partners, if at all? |
| b) | What is the nature of coordination of efforts and activities of the various Child Protection agencies geared toward addressing internal child trafficking? |

5. How does the process of internal child trafficking usually occur in this district?

Probe for:

| a) | Most common hotspots of origin and destination for trafficking and why? |
| b) | Common modes of transport used and routes for internal trafficking |
| c) | Common tactics used by traffickers to recruit children? |
| d) | Who are in the recruitment networks for the children? |
| e) | Actions undertaken to address trafficking activities at known recruitment, transit and destination sites |
| f) | How is the current child trafficking different from that which happened in the past? |

6. What are the causes/facilitators of child trafficking in your district?

Probe for:

| a) | What factors place populations at risk for trafficking (individual, household, community and system)? |
| b) | What factors enable perpetrators to get away with trafficking (individual, household, community and system)? |
| c) | How does child trafficking go unnoticed by many people? |
| d) | What are the gaps and barriers in response that facilitate and sustain child trafficking (related to protection, prevention and prosecution) at community, institutional, and national-level? |

7. Tell us about specific laws, policies, or guidelines in Uganda that are meant to protect children against trafficking, either directly or indirectly?

Probe for:

| a) | What is your opinion on the laws, policies, and guidelines currently in place to reduce the practice of internal child trafficking and the implementation of them? |
| b) | What are the entities involved in prosecution of traffickers? |
| c) | Opinion about the effectiveness of the prosecution efforts |

8. What recommendations would you give to address internal child trafficking?

Probe for:

| a) | What can be done (needs to be done) to address the vice at the source, transit points and destination (prevention, prosecution and protection/rehabilitation/ reinsertion/resettlement)? |
| b) | Who can take the lead in initiatives to address child trafficking in communities in Karamoja? |
| c) | What needs to be done differently to reduce or in the least eradicate trafficking in persons in Napak? |