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# Development Challenge

Many parts of Karamoja are chronically food insecure, with 36.9 % of children stunted due to insufficient food (WFP & UNICEF, 2014) and 56% facing some form of food insecurity at one point or another during the year. In 2014 and only 13 % of households were able to meet their needs for cereals, tubers and vegetables from their own cultivation (Ibid). The proportion of those who could only afford one meal per day declined from 40 % in 2012 to 27 % in 2013 (DDG 2014). Out of the 47% who were supported to earn some income, 41% were able to use their income to meet their basic needs and 50% were able to save a proportion of their income. Seventy % of the typical household’s expenditures were spent on food. In addition, 49% of households reported debts, and that 70 % of these debts arose because of the need to meet food requirements.[[1]](#footnote-1)

A household survey taken during the project preparation phase measured the food insecurity situation through the *Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)*[[2]](#footnote-2). Results indicate that 92% of interviewed households are in moderate to extreme food insecure situations.[[3]](#footnote-3) While male-headed HHs are slightly more food secure (10% of male-headed HHs do not experience food insecurity) than female-headed households (only 4% of the relative sub-sample does not experience food insecurity), 93% of female-headed HHs are under extreme food insecurity situation, compared to 80% of male-headed HHs. These results clearly show that there is a relationship between gender of household head and extreme food insecurity, which this project will address in its gender-specific focus.

**Figure 1: Food insecurity situation in Kaabong, Kotido, Moroto, Napak and Nakapiripit Districts (male and female-headed households), measured by the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES***)*

**Resilience to Food Insecurity:**

Resilience, in this project, is understood both as the capacity of a system or part of a system to overcome stresses and shocks occurring due to climate change and variability as well as the ability of local communities to survive, recover from food-related shocks that can be brought on by other factors (e.g. prices, conflict), and even thrives in changing climatic conditions

A baseline resilience assessment was undertaken during the PPG phase using the SHARP[[4]](#footnote-4) tool. The assessment of resilience, strengths and weaknesses of the households was conducted according to four subsets of resilience questions/indicators namely:

* **The production system and practices** section focuses on the resilience of agricultural production systems, and more specifically: type of production, crops and livestock practices; animal/livestock breeding and nutrition, tree planting, agroforestry, record keeping, utilisation of new varieties and breeds; access to information on climate change, farming practices; pest management practices; synthetic pesticide use.
* **The Environmental resilience section** addresses issues of use and management of natural resources and sustainable management practices including: water access, water conservation techniques and practices, water quality, land access, soil quality and land degradation, land management practices, leguminous plants, buffer zones, fertilizers usage, and weeds and management.
* **The Social resilience section** looks at determinants of social resilience among the households, in particular: the degree of social interaction, as assessed by group membership behaviour, food security and nutrition level, involuntary resettlement and displacement, impacts from shocks and disasters.
* **The Economic resilience** is concerned with the major productive assets, decision-making, market prices and access, income sources, and general financial status. Questions related to economic resilience give an outline of the financial status of agricultural households, gathering information on sources of income, savings and markets.

The results show very low overall resilience levels, on average below 15 out of 30. Within the agricultural production systems section, the households surveyed registered even lower resilience levels, with an average score of 10.45, which shows the important contribution of the agriculture sector to overall resilience to food security. Gender disaggregated data showed female-headed households as less resilient in almost all indicators, with the exception of the environmental indicators. Women scored highest in the environment probably because they are responsible for water collection whose quality and quantity has improved over time. Women’s relative advantage for accessing land may be explained by the fact that women like men have access to community land. Male-headed households, on the other hand, showed more resilience in context of economic, social and agricultural practices. *Summary results are presented in Table 3 below, with the detailed report available in Annex 8.*

**Table 1: Resilience levels per four subsets of questions per male and female-headed households[[5]](#footnote-5)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Kotido | | | | | |
|  | Agriculture  Practice | Environment | Social | Economic | Average |
| Male | 10.55 | 11.80 | 10.53 | 12.14 | 11.25 |
| Female | 9.80 | 11.25 | 8.91 | 11.10 | 10.27 |
| Nakapiripit | | | | | |
| Male | 10.13 | 11.96 | 9.32 | 12.98 | 11.10 |
| Female | 8.99 | 11.34 | 8.54 | 10.89 | 9.94 |
| Napak | | | | | |
| Male | 10.89 | 12.20 | 9.98 | 11.24 | 11.20 |
| Female | 12.347 | 12.34 | 8.96 | 11.54 | 10.65 |
| Kaboong | | | | | |
| Male | 10.32 | 11.85 | 9.61 | 12.69 | 11.12 |
| Female | 10.03 | 11.89 | 8.76 | 11.79 | 10.622 |
| Moroto | | | | | |
| Male | 11.22 | 12.09 | 9.85 | 12.76 | 11.48 |
| Female | 10.41 | 12.47 | 9.50 | 12.52 | 12.23 |

**Drivers of Food Insecurity**

*Land Degradation*: Land degradation in Karamoja is due to poor cultivation practices, overgrazing around kraals and watering points, and high levels of deforestation to meet insufficient fuel wood and fencing materials. The loss of traditional grazing grounds, brought about by political insecurity, drought, and restrictions on cattle movement (e.g. from conservation areas), has increased the concentration of cattle, and contributed to encroachment onto lands more suitable for cropping, during the wet season. As grazing grounds have decreased, forests on mountain slopes are burned to convert them into grazing ground. This reduces the forest cover’s contribution to rainfall regimes. Furthermore, the cessation of annual burnings during the conflict period resulted in an accelerated growth of termite and harvester ant populations. Harvester ants destroyed the plant cover and, with exposure to the sun, the loss of soil moisture followed. The cumulative result of this was a complete change in the land cover, as grass savannah changed into huge expanses of barren soil punctuated with shrubs. This had led to widespread sheet erosion of the biologically active top soil and the loss of much potential soil moisture.

*Climate Change***:**Future predictions of the impacts of climate change in Karamoja are fraught with inaccuracies, due to the very sparse availability of data. Communities in Karamoja used to know their local weather and climate relatively well and indeed relied on this knowledge for planning of their farming activities. Knowledge of local weather patterns was augmented by indigenous knowledge such as appearances of specific bird species, sprouting of particular plants and flowers to assist land users in planning when / whether to sow crops – and where to move livestock to ensure good grazing. However, increased weather variability and evolving climate change has rendered these mechanisms less effective – in some parts of Karamoja, for example, the unimodal rainfall pattern is reportedly becoming increasingly bimodal – attributed to climate change. The increasing frequency and intensity /duration of droughts remain the dominant and most widespread risk factor attributed to climate change in Karamoja. Since 2001, there has been an increase in extreme weather patterns in the region resulting in a higher frequency of extended dry spells. For example from 2001, there have been extended dry spells every second year (2002 & 2004) and also during the three consecutive years (2007 – 2009), resulting in repeated crop failures and low livestock productivity. There was also a serious drought across most of the region in 2015 – with total crop failure reported. Drought most severely affects land users, causing widespread food insecurity, malnutrition and low productivity of crops and livestock, particularly imposing severe losses and hardships on the poorest communities, whose livelihoods are more sensitive to the adverse impacts of climate change. Across the sub-region, formerly perennial rivers and streams are now seasonal, riverbeds that traditionally were reliable dry season sources of water often now yield no water. In addition, the magnitude, frequency and severity of floods have also increased over the past decades, with deleterious impacts on productive assets and traditional coping capacities that support livelihoods. *A detailed problem tree can be found in Annex 4.*

**Barriers to Addressing the Drivers of Food Insecurity** **in Karamoja**

As discussed above, the main root causes of food insecurity in Karamoja include among others, low agricultural yields, which are exacerbated by climate change and land degradation. In order to address these root causes, the sub region needs to overcome a host of barriers including: lack of access to agricultural inputs, low levels of capital for investment into production, uncertainties related to prices; low government capacity to manage natural resources, inadequate NRM and unsustainable practices, which lead to low agricultural yield, livestock loss, soil erosion and soil loss. These barriers can be traced back to the lack of technical and financial capacity to manage natural resources and lack of appropriate decentralised governance mechanisms**.** A more detailed barrier analysis follows below:

1. Insufficient policy and legal guidance on the management and sustainable use of natural resources: The Rangeland Management and Pastoralism Policy (Jan 2014) and the Pastoral Code (Jan 2007) both remain in draft form. Policies and laws of the various sector ministries, such as agriculture, wildlife, minerals, lands, transport, are not aligned and therefore result in piecemeal approaches to management of natural resources. Furthermore, the area of land available for pastoralists, agro-pastoralists and crop farmers is gradually declining due to former communal land being procured for other private uses (*inter alia* for national parks or wildlife reserves, mining, quarrying), hence reducing food security and increasing vulnerability to food shocks. There is a poor understanding by local land users of their land rights and on how development actors can support responsible land and water governance and strengthen capacities at community and local levels. While communal rights are formally recognized in the Land policy, there have yet to be instances where Certificates of Customary Ownership (CCO) have been granted – whereas private ownership is easier to formalize.

In an attempt to address recurrent food crises in the sub region, the Government has introduced crop cultivation in what was a predominantly nomadic pastoral system. As more pastoralists engage in crop production, pressures on grazing land and conflicts among land users are increasing, particularly in the absence of any real community participation in land use planning at the sub-county or district level. There is also a strong push towards sedentarization of pastoral populations including through the increased supply of perennial water sources – which risks exacerbating land degradation as herds graze continuously in the areas around these supplies. Trust levels in the area are generally low, and mechanisms for conflict prevention or arbitration are weak or non existent. The role of local leaders in land attribution and distribution is also being overlooked in the efforts made by the government to formalize land tenure arrangements.

2) Fragmented technical capacity at district and household levels to support food production: At the district level, there is fragmented technical knowledge on sustainable land management and on the various integrated approaches that can be taken to promote resilient food security. While district technical staff are trained in some traditional areas of expertise, such as crop production, livestock production or soil and water management, they are not trained on ecosystem-based or integrated approaches. It is worth noting that among 70 technical officers who attended the SLM workshop held in Moroto in Jan 2016 as part of this project’s preparation, none claimed to have knowledge of rangeland management – yet the whole sub-region is mainly rangeland with limited areas of cropland.

Furthermore, most of the districts of Karamoja are new, with few personnel or financial resources to support activities, which limits the district resource base and constrains the rate of development. The agricultural extension service, which had been weak during the NAADS[[6]](#footnote-6) years, is gradually being recreated, with the recruitment of extension officers for each district and sub-county. Technical staff and decision makers are not fully aware of how integrated natural resource management (INRM) approaches can contribute to increasing the resilience of the fragile, degraded ecosystems and the associated livelihoods of the local people. Lastly, during the PPG phase, many stakeholders expressed the need for a much improved weather forecasting service, recounting that the current weather forecasts from the Meteorology Department are not made widely available, and are often unreliable for this sub-region. Although early warning systems in the sub-region are under implementation through UNDP’s early warning system project[[7]](#footnote-7), effects of such systems are yet to be seen in Karamoja.

Many land users are also facing challenges, beyond the scope of their local knowledge, *inter alia*:

* pastoralists and agropastoralists are re-establishing transhumance – which was disrupted during the recent period of insecurity, when livestock were kept in kraals guarded by the army to reduce cattle raiding;
* in some areas pastoralists are becoming sedentary and trying to manage their reduced livestock numbers without transhumance;
* sedentarized former pastoralists are struggling to grow crops, without the requisite knowledge of how to maintain their soil’s health and productivity (i.e. physical, chemical and biological properties to produce yields);
* There is progressive degradation of the rangelands due to massive removal of trees for charcoal production and fencing of manyattas (homesteads).

**c)** Inadequate coordination between stakeholders and among projects**:** Stakeholder groups, such as the *Karamoja Development Partner Group*, NGOs, CSOs, exist in Karamoja, but they are not necessarily connected or promote an integrated approach, as they do not involve local communities directly in their decision making processes. The absence of a multi-stakeholder platform at the local district level but also at the sub-regional level creates a barrier to adopting an integrated approach in the management of natural resources which would improve food security and enhance livelihood diversification.

**d)** Weak evidence base to support decision-making**:** The long history of conflict in the region has created a setup where local, development-relevant data, is scarce and dispersed. Information on climate, crop-yields, and land productivity is not readily available, and despite a number of household surveys, there does not exist a framework that can enable all sectors to adequately monitor development progress. As a result, development policies for the sub-region are often based on outdated or fragmented information, which does not allow for the kind of paradigm shift that would be required to lift Karamoja from the dire conditions it currently faces. Information that supports integrated planning and policy making is not yet making its way into the development programs of major donors and the government continues to adopt sector-based, siloed approaches to programming. Furthermore, most development-related data and information systems make abstraction of the degradation of environment, for which there is no systematic monitoring in the region. As a result of this, decisions on land use could be based on erroneous information, leading to poor choices in land management, and aggravating the pre-existing fragility of the natural resource base. Finally, communities are not typically involved in the monitoring and assessment of their own development programs, which – combined with the prevalence of food aid in the area – contributes to creating a climate of disempowerment and dependency.

**The Long Term Solution**

**The** barrier analysis above shows that fostering sustainability and resilience for food insecurity in Karamoja will requires engagement action and tracking. Outcome 1 focuses on the enabling institutional frameworks, through the development and strengthening of multi-stakeholder platforms that will enable better planning, including landscape-based planning.

Outcome 2 channels investments into the food production systems and value chains using a Farmer Field School approach adapted to the realities of the agro-pastoral societies of Karamoja. The project will seek to increase production through sound and resilient production techniques, and will also support efforts to diversify production to increase income and reduce vulnerability to climate shocks. A strong emphasis will be placed on rehabilitating ecosystem services, particularly land-based services, through agro-forestry, natural regeneration and sound pasture management. The project will also target specific activities towards women and youth, who are among the most vulnerable, to ensure equality of participation and underlying vulnerabilities are removed. Finally, Outcome 3, will support the development of monitoring and assessment of global environmental benefits, and socio-economic benefits.

# Strategy

The project strategy is to unlock the aforementioned barriers to fostering sustainability and resilience for food insecurity in Karamoja. The project’s overall objective is to **contribute to enhancing long-term environmental sustainability and resilience of food production systems in the Karamoja Sub-Region**.

In order to achieve this objective, the project will support three components:

**Component 1** focuses on the establishment of stronger district and landscape based planning frameworks that support community-based land use planning.

**Component 2** focuses on the scaling up of improved production technologies with a few to increase yields, diversify food production and increase incomes, while conserving natural resources.

**Component 3** focuses on monitoring and assessment as a tool to inform upscaling and policy change.

***Gender-Specific Strategy***

In Karamoja, although women and men play complementary roles in guaranteeing food security, women tend to play a greater role in natural resource management and ensuring nutrition. Women often grow, process, manage and market food and other natural resources, and are responsible for raising small livestock, managing home gardens and collecting fuel and water over long distances. Men, by contrast, are generally responsible for cash cropping and larger livestock. Women’s involvement in an agricultural production is adversely affected by the impacts of climate change, particularly drought-induced crop and livestock failure. In this context, responsibility for adaptation is likely to fall on their shoulders – including finding alternative ways to feed their family. However, statutory and/or customary laws often restrict women’s property and land rights and make it difficult for them to access credit and agricultural extension services, while also reducing their incentive to engage in environmentally sustainable farming practices and make long-term investments in land rehabilitation, seed multiplication technologies, cereal storage systems and soil quality. Therefore improving seed and food security in Karamoja, will require greater participation of women, in for example local seed technology development that is built on farmers’ knowledge to increase yields through improved quality of the farmers’ seed and diffusion of the improved practices and seeds. Because of the formal seed system constraints and to ensure sustainability for the target beneficiaries to participate in the strengthened value chains, focus will be given to the informal seed multiplication process. This will ensure that women famer group members continue to produce and disseminate seeds on their own - selling some, reinvesting some for the next season, and training other interested farmers in quality production methods. In addition, the production expansion of the new, climate resilient, higher yielding seed will strengthen women’s role in household food security and nutrition

District gender and food production profiles with analytical data on women’s relative to men’s needs in project implementation and coordination are unavailable, yet necessary for planning and project design by district local governments and CSOs. The reality is that district planners and NGO project officers with no gender-lens in their approach to food security and sustainable natural resource management, often make project decisions that often treat gender issues as simply cross-cutting or requiring unavailable resources. If gender concerns are not identified at project design, implementation and coordination usually puts the rights and privileges of women at risk. It will be necessary, therefore, to equip District Coordination Committees and the Sub-County Boards with a deeper level of gender analysis on what works, how and why, in ways that blend with the economic and environmental factors used to guide the design of projects, so that gender and community development officers are positioned to broaden opportunities for influencing the decisions made.

Interventions to address food insecurity by this project will deliberately prioritize female-headed households in APFS/FFS, by:

* + Raising awareness of communities and particularly women, on their rights of access, use and control of land resources (Output 1.2),
  + Encouraging the uptake of drought resilient crops and product processing and marketing for value addition (Output 2.2),
  + Promoting the use of rotations, cover crops, organic matter and precision use of inorganic fertilisers to restore soil fertility (Output 2.2),
  + Improving access to quality seed of local varieties through seed multiplication and improved seed/germplasm, farm tools and equipment (pedal pumps, hoses, watering cans, grain silos, among others) to increase yields, in order to improve food availability, access and affordability (Output 2.3).
  + Providing training through baseline programming and the establishment of APFS/FFS in order to sensitise women, who are responsible for food production at the household level, on the need to improve dietary diversity and healthy eating habits, in order to improve climate resilience and food security (Output 2.2).
  + Identifying and supporting existing and/or facilitate formation of VSLAs, women farmers associations and groups to access start-up capital to undertake various income generating activities (Output 2.3),
  + Implementing rainwater harvesting techniques (within APFS/FFS), for enhanced productivity and resilience to drought in fields, as well as sand dams for crops, livestock and household use (Output 2.2),

Such interventions will reduce women’s workload and will leave more time for child caring practices, thus improving nutrition and health status of women and their household. An estimated 60% of the project budget (excluding PMC) is dedicated to activities targeting women’s empowerment and the reduction of their specific vulnerabilities.

**The Theory of Change**

Fostering sustainability and resilience for food insecurity in Karamoja will require engagement, action on the ground and tracking of the environmental and development benefits of the interventions. **Engagement** will necessitate *s*trengthening of the enabling environment through coherent institutional frameworks and policies; **Action** will be achieved through adoption and scaling up of gender-sensitive integrated natural resource management best practices that increase food production yields, reverse land degradation and adapt to climate change; and last but not least, **Tracking** will require strengthening of monitoring and assessment capabilities to improve evidence-based policy and decision making and to promote replication. Component 1 is designed to address the institutional barriers, including supporting the alignment of the incomplete or inconsistent legal frameworks governing resource use and allocation; support efforts underway to address insecurity of land tenure, which is a key obstacle to investment in INRM practices; and development of multi-stakeholder platforms at district and regional levels, which will support the participatory identification of development priorities and opportunities and strengthen public-private partnerships. Component 2 is designed to increase and diversify food production at the household level through better INRM and SLM practices and stronger food value chains which will in turn lead to increased household food security. Last but not least, Component 3 is designed to measure and monitor the environmental and developmental benefits and create a feedback loop to policy frameworks. (*Figure 2 on page 14 below provides an illustration of this theory of Change )*

*Assumptions*

The theory of change is based on a number of key assumptions. The first assumption is that resilience to food security[[8]](#footnote-8)can be achieved through increased and diversified food production at the household level through INRM and SLM practices and food value chains (and their requisite markets), which will in the long-term, lead to resilient communities.

A second assumption is that the national and local governments will be willing and able to develop and implement policies that create true incentives for INRM and SLM and food value chains, while not being overly disruptive to traditional livelihood patterns. One of those being provision, formalization and recognition of collective and individual right to land.

The third assumption is that local communities, even despite the dire and risk prone conditions in which they are currently living, will be willing to take some measured risks in adopting new practices.

**Key Principles behind the Project Design**

Integrated natural resources management and sustainable land management practices **:**The integrated management of natural resources aims at strengthening soil health, improving access to drought-tolerant seeds, adjusting planting periods and cropping portfolios and enhancing on-farm agro-biodiversity, while implementing sustainable land management practices to minimize land degradation, rehabilitate degraded areas and ensure the optimal use of land resources for the benefit of the present and future generations. Within this project, the INRM and SLM concepts will build technical capacity needed at the institutional level but also at the community level to sustainably manage land and promote a more productive landscape in Karamoja, through the APFS and FFS approach (see below). Throughout the intervention sites, the project will seek to promote the identification, conservation and sustainable use of significant agro-biodiversity, focusing immediately available species and varieties.

The Value chain approach **:**The value chain approach aims at driving economic growth with poverty reduction by integrating all actors from input suppliers to end market and buyers, thus creating new opportunities for smallholder farmers to connect with private sector firms dealing products locally and regionally. Within this project, the value chain approach will be promoted not only for livestock and crop production systems, but also through the introduction of alternative income-generating activities, such as beekeeping with honey and wax making or Aloe vera processing of soap, ensuring smallholder farmers a predictable all-season income. In all activities aiming to promote an increase in production, attention will be paid in developing linkages with the private sector and markets to ensure long-term economic viability of any increase in production.

Farmer-based extension (Agro-pastoral / Farmer Field School Approach)**:** This project will use a farmer-based approach to complement the traditional extensions services. This will be done by using the “farmer-field school” methodology to promote the use of local (trained) facilitators to accelerate the dissemination of appropriate production practices. The aim of APFS/FFS approach is to provide capacity building and support smallholder farmers (males females and youth), and rural communities in the adoption of resilient agricultural technologies and livelihoods practices. The APFS will provide a platform for validating and up-scaling of already identified crop, livestock and natural resources management practices/technologies in an integrated way and supporting diversified and resilient production systems and disaster risk reduction and preparedness as well as other measures farmers are interested in to promote sustainable agriculture, livelihood security and diversification.

The FFS approach is particularly valuable for integrating the learning about various topics in a local agro-ecosystem specific context, and for mobilising farmers and pastoralists in the dissemination of new technologies and practices across the FFS groups and networks. APFS are flexible in that they can respond to local demands or problems as they are identified. They are based on an “experiential learning cycle” (with a minimum duration of one and half years or more, during which farmers’ groups are followed and supported on a weekly basis), where groups of farmers are encouraged to assemble at regular intervals to go through a pre-determined number of FFS sessions in the fields /grazing lands to identify a problem, consider different options for problem solving and implement the best option. The method of interaction is non-formal and based on field observations and group discussions, as well as simple experiments, drawings, models, fables and other tools. The experimental, learning-by-doing approach facilitates the adaptation of the technologies to local agro ecological contexts, including climate risks and production practices and the adoption by farmers in the wider area. Farmers participating in FFS gain organizational skills, knowledge and practical skills that carry over beyond the end of the project. Moreover, due to the comprehensive planning processes, they are able to define the critical broader challenges faced in their livelihoods, as well as strategies to mitigate the challenges. The FFS process is guided by a dual systematic problem –solution identification process that guides consequent actions, thus setting a solid base for sustainability. The APFS will thus be vital entry points for the upscaling of actions as well as reinforcing the watershed management approach defined below.

Watershed management Approach**:** The increasing risk of droughts resulting from the changing rainfall patterns is putting at the risks the food and livelihood security of farming and pastoral communities in the target districts. In many areas the rainy season either starts early or start late and generally have become of shorter duration and heavier than in previous years. The combination of these distortions have led to water deficits during planting time, and in some areas heavy rainfall are creating erosion and landslides, resulting in soil erosion and degradation of agricultural and pastoral lands in the watershed.

The most efficient way to improve resilience of the agro-ecosystems and the associated human vulnerabilities is to plan and implement natural resources management interventions on a whole catchment basis (ecosystem basis). A resilient ecosystem can increase the resilience of vulnerable communities as well as address the externalities associated with the applications and use of certain NRM practices. The project will support the district local government to promote the use of watersheds as the *basic unit for planning*, implementing, monitoring and evaluation of natural resources management practices. A sound watershed management approach would provide the frame for harmonizing local economic development and environmental protection. It would also integrate social, cultural and institutional issues into natural resources protection and conservation in order to attain sustainable development and adaptive capacity to changing climate. The project will build upon existing experiences and outcomes of on-going and past Agro-Pastoral Field School interventions and pilot micro watershed initiatives in Karamoja, such as the ones conducted through the FAO and DFID project on Enhancing resilience in Karamoja programme (2015-2016). This will involve reviewing existing assessments, catchment and adaptation plans, technologies and replicating or expanding successful practices where possible.

Mainstreaming Gender: Uganda is a party to the C*onvention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women* (CEDAW) and commendable progress has been made in terms of formulation of gender responsive regulatory and institutional framework. This has resulted in institutionalization of gender planning with a critical mass of women in political governance structures. Women Councils have been established from grassroots to national level to enhance women’s confidence and to provide women at all levels with opportunities to raise into leadership positions. The law also establishes Women’s Councils and Committees from the district, county, sub-county, parish or ward, up to the village level. The Land Act also makes provisions intended to enhance the socio-economic welfare of women, especially married women. The Act prohibits the dispossession of land on which a person resides with his or her spouse and from which they derive sustenance without the prior written consent of the spouse.

The Gender Inequality Index (GII)[[9]](#footnote-9) for Karamoja was 0.604 in 2013 (compared to the rest of Uganda at 0.570). Traditions such as child marriage which is preceded by female genital mutilation affecting women and girls reduces their access to education and therefore development and productive contribution to society. Tackling the practice is a challenge, because early marriage is a means of increasing family and community assets. A national survey found that 45 % of women in Karamoja compared to the national average of 19% had experienced sexual, physical or emotional violence. This violence is linked to alcoholism and changing gender roles, in particular men’s alienation from the economic opportunities being taken up by women. Food insecurity and malnutrition is also linked to alcoholism and negative cultural beliefs. For instance, the practice of selling food to buy alcohol; or prioritizing food for men’s consumption and ceremonies.

The number of female-headed households in Karamoja is increasing due to HIV/AIDS and cattle raids. Female headed households and young women face various social restrictions and find it extremely difficult to secure gainful employment. Approximately 16% of female household heads are either disabled or chronically ill and therefore vulnerable and need appropriate support to ensure their food. To sustain themselves and their children, female headed women resort to sending their children to work, sell their labour in agriculture, restaurants, hotels and water collection for sell in towns, some are exploited as cheap labour. According to the FSNA ( UNICEF, 2014), female headed households are highly vulnerable as they are worse off on several measures compared to their male counterparts with; lower access to land, fewer households with at least one income earner, and poorer food consumption scores, among others. According to this assessment, approximately 16% of female household heads are either disabled or chronically ill and therefore vulnerable.

A higher proportion of women especially mother experience severe anaemia since they tend to eat least and last. Pregnant and lactating women require special enhanced nutritional requirements to facilitate the growth and development of the foetus and the infant, as well as for maternal metabolism and tissue development specific to reproduction. Therefore pregnant and lactating women are particularly vulnerable to malnutrition. Nutritional deficiencies among pregnant women may cause of maternal and child mortality and can also cause irreversible damage in the development of foetuses and infants. Among mothers, prevalence of anaemia was above 40% in most districts except Kotido 30.1%, Kaabong 36.1% and Moroto 37.5%. Likewise, the proportion of underweight mothers in Karamoja has constantly remained high at 24.7%.

Climate change has increased the occurrence of illnesses, namely malaria, which was not common in Karamoja and increases women health and nutrition issues. Children are most vulnerable because of their low immunity and poor nutrition and playing in dirty or dusty environments. Food shortage is reported to increase women’s burden, as they are the ones expected to ensure that there is sufficient food supply for the family. Consequently, they suffer increased nutritional deficiencies which lead to problems of anaemia and other health risks. Anaemia is reported to be responsible for a quarter of maternal mortality in Karamoja.

*Shifting Gender Roles*

The effects of climate change and improved security have led to changes in gender roles, consequently making some men and women take on non-traditionally prescribed roles. These include women’s engagement in income generating activities to provide for their families and men’s involvement in house construction and crop production, which was formally a domain of women.

Women are more engaged in crop production than livestock and the more active are organised in groups such as Village Savings and Loans Associations that provide loans for undertaking agriculture and non-agriculture activities. Women are most vulnerable to impacts of climate change, notably food insecurity, water shortage and fuel wood scarcity given their role in availing food as well as needing nutritious foods themselves due to pregnancy-related demands and for the children they take care of.

South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTrC**):** This project includes a significant component dedicated to strengthening South-South and Triangular cooperation, particularly trough Outcome 4, which dedicates resources to the project’s linkages to the broader IAP program. As part of this component, project beneficiaries and partners will be able to engage through regional workshops with countries implementing similar projects. In particular, linkages will be sought with neighbouring countries, to potentially integrate cross-border issues, in the context of agropastoral transhumance. The potential for South South cooperation will also be strengthened by sharing methodologies and assessment frameworks, which will allow for comparability of results across border, both in terms of environmental benefits as well as in terms of economic benefits.

**Objective:**

To contribute to enhancing long-term environmental sustainability and resilience of food production systems in the Karamoja Sub-Region

**PROJECT GOAL: To foster sustainability and resilience for food security in Karamoja**

OUTCOME 1 (UNDP):

Supportive policies and incentives in place to support improved crop and livestock production, food value-chains and INRM

OUTCOME 2 (FAO):

Increased land area and agro-ecosystems under integrated natural resources management (INRM) and SLM practices for a more productive Karamoja landscape

Output 1.1:

Operational multi-stakeholder platforms are supporting INRM at district and regional levels

Output 1.2:

Adequate legal instruments enabling INRM, land use planning and enforcement in place

Output 2.1:

Technical capacity to implement INRM/SLM is increased

Output 2.2:

Increase in the number of community members trained in INRM / SLM techniques

OUTCOME 3 (UNDP):

Framework in place for multi-scale assessment, monitoring and integration of resilience in production landscape and monitoring of GEBs

Output 4.1:

Assessment and Monitoring of GEBs

Output 4.2:

Capacity in place to apply appropriate tools and practices for monitoring resilience at multiple scales

Output 4.3:

Project is linked to regional program

Output 2.3:

Community groups are benefiting from income-generating activities (IGAs) introduced by the project

Output 2.4:

Small Grants Program (UNDP)

# Results and Partnerships

Expected Results

***Development objective, project objective, outcomes and outputs***

The overall goal or **development objective** of this project is to improve food security by addressing the environmental, economic and social drivers of food insecurity and their root causes. The **Project objective** is to contribute to enhancing long-term environmental sustainability and resilience of food production systems in the Karamoja Sub-Region. Resilience is understood both as the ability of local communities to survive, recover from food-related shocks and even thrive in changing climatic conditions.[[10]](#footnote-10)

The project will work in four districts in the Karamoja sub-region, in order to demonstrate the potential for upscaling SLM under different climatic conditions, agro-ecological zones and livelihoods. The districts were selected using a matrix of indicators of vulnerability, as well as consultations through the National SLM Committee.[[11]](#footnote-11) The districts are as follows:

**Table 2: Profile of the four selected districts**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **District** | **Agro-ecological zone** | **Livelihood system** |
| Kaabong | Sub-humid /Semi-arid | A/AP |
| Kotido | Semi-arid/Arid | AP/P |
| Moroto | Semi-Arid | AP |
| Nakapiriprit | Semi-Arid | A/AP |

**LS: Livelihood System** A=Agricultural; AP=Agro-pastoral; and P=pastoral

The project will seek to achieve its objective through three interlinked outcomes and eight outputs. These GEF funded interventions will complement the baseline interventions deployed by KALIP’s second phase and the World Bank Pastoralist Resilience Program in the targeted sites by addressing the threats and barriers detailed earlier.

**Figure 3: Map showing the IAP intervention districts in Karamoja and their land use**

****

Component 1: Strengthened Institutional Frameworks for Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security

***Outcome 1: Supportive policies and incentives in place at district level to support smallholder agriculture, food value-chains and INRM***

The component will address overcome the shortcomings present in the current institutional and legal framework governing natural resource use, land tenure, and land use planning in Karamoja. These shortcomings have led to a fragmented system of land use planning that does not foster an integrated approach to addressing food insecurity. The component will mitigate this by putting in place collaborative planning frameworks. This outcome will be achieved by strengthening or creating multi-stakeholder platforms at the district level, which will be linked to a sub-regional level platform coordinated by the Ministry of Karamoja Affairs, to support integrated natural resources management (INRM) (Output 1.1). The purpose of multi-stakeholder platforms is to encourage consultation and collaboration among government organisations and communities around issues related to land use planning, land tenure, and SLM. The platforms will enable communities to establish collaboration with the private sector that can gradually strengthen local markets. They are also crucial in promoting the integrated approach as they ensure that planning moves from “business as usual” siloed approaches towards more collaborative, ecologically sustainable and multisectoral approaches.

Support will also be provided to implement existing legal instruments enabling INRM through enforcement of ordinances and participatory land use planning (Output 1.2), working with local governments and district administrations.

**Output 1.1: Operational multi-stakeholder platforms are supporting INRM at district and regional levels**

As discussed above, there is a need to create forums where all stakeholders can participate in policy decision-making, agenda setting, land use planning, multi-stakeholder INRM plans and knowledge sharing around food security and INRM priorities. There is also a need to help restore trust and to encourage the emergence of private sector enterprise in the agricultural sector through creating an enabling environment (linking land planning, extension, research, producers organisations, inputs supply, markets, quality control, information systems). This will help support SLM practices, create improved market opportunities and all-season income for households, and ensure that the priorities and capacities of local communities are taken into consideration when making development and land use planning decisions, including their role as key players in local territorial planning and management and the application of community rights of ownership. At present, there is no multi-stakeholder platform or coordination mechanism at the district level that can bring all relevant actors together around issues related to INRM and sustainable development strategies. There are however a few regional stakeholder platforms, such as the Karamoja Development Partner Group, a donor coordination group spearheaded by the Ministry of Karamoja Affairs, a few ad hoc local NGO coordinating groups, and some private sector associations, but none of these provide the integrated multi-sectoral approaches needed to transform the rural sector in Karamoja.

The project will support putting in place a coordination mechanism between existing platforms involving governments, private sector, local communities and traditional leaders. Support will ensure that these platforms convene together to create one multi-stakeholder platform at the district level as a a space where all stakeholders can be involved in dialogue and decision making in regard to land and water governance, land use planning, legal frameworks, access to information (SLM and INRM options, value chains, food security and nutrition), and development planning priorities with sustainability and resilience as the overarching goals (see Component 2). Where necessary, appropriate landscape-level platforms (e.g. catchment/watershed) will also convene. Participants will include representatives of local government, local communities, women’s groups, youth groups, NGOs, CBOs, private sector enterprises, and other development partners.

The project will also support district planners and budget holders to ensure that priorities identified through district platforms are integrated in planning and budgeting, and more specifically to increase budget lines dedicated to support capacity development and SLM and INRM activities that will lead to sustainability and resilience for food and livelihood security. At the district level, existing and a cadre of newly recruited extension service officers will play a major role in acting as liaison between community members and district level government. It is expected that the district-level platforms will be maintained through the regular district activities and budgets after the project is over.

In order to have a further transformative effect, these district level multi-stakeholder platforms will then be linked to a sub-regional level platform in Karamoja that will facilitate knowledge exchange and collaboration on INRM for resilience and sustainability and build on ongoing efforts to coordinate among development actors. The Ministry of Karamoja Affairs (MKA) will guide this sub-regional multi-stakeholder platform and will relay and share knowledge and lessons learned with other national regional or international platforms such as NEPAD-CAADP, TerrAfrica, and the Pastoralists Knowledge Hub of the World Initiative on Sustainable Pastoralism. Linkages will also be drawn with the regional hub project under the global IAP program. It is expected that this will form part of the MKA’s regular attributions after project completion.

The project will also support the use of these platforms as relays in an awareness raising campaign. This will include awareness-raising on the project objectives and principles in regard to SLM and INRM, food security and nutrition, resilience and sustainable development, and will allow for sharing relevant case studies, lessons learned and other materials. Documents published by the Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Institute (ZARDI) and resources available on the internet will be translated to local languages and used to tailor material to the range of groups targeted by the project (APFS and FFS members; wider communities, school pupils, school teachers, local governments, private sector) with the contribution of local NGOs, artists, and media.

**Output 1.2: Adequate legal instruments enabling INRM, land use planning and enforcement in place**

In addition to supporting local coordination and consultation, there is a need to strengthen the legal and institutional framework governing natural resources management at the local level. Whereas national laws and regulations are in force, or are about to be approved, their translation into local regulatory and rights based frameworks is weak. Conflicting or missing legal texts, lack of clarity regarding the regulatory framework, and lack of enforcement capacity are all contributing to a lack of control regarding natural resource use, and therefore contributing to food insecurity. Some districts of Karamoja have drafted ordinances and by-laws on sustainable development and environment, however in many cases, these have either not been adopted or they are not being applied, due to a lack of implementation support. Therefore, under this output, the project will support the districts in their efforts to finalize, revise (where necessary), approve and enforce their own bylaws. The project will also provide support to districts in cooperation with the Ministry of Justice for the final approval and gazetting of relevant legal texts. This will contribute to creating an enabling environment that will allow local communities to regain control on their natural resources, while also creating a favourable legal context for collaborative management of productive landscapes.

In Uganda, the National Land Policy (2013)[[12]](#footnote-12) provides means to secure customary tenure by issuing Certificates of Customary Ownership (CCOs) and FAO has recently supported the Ministry of Land, Housing and Urban Development (MLHUD) through its *Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National of Food Security* (VGGT)[[13]](#footnote-13) in developing a digital low-cost system to implement such measures, which has been tested in Kasese District in 2015. Visits in Kasese Districts will be organized to learn from their experience in implementing the digital low-cost system in the selected districts of Karamoja.[[14]](#footnote-14) The district land officers, local councils, NGOs and CBOs will receive training on the application of the relevant guidelines and approaches on the responsible governance of tenure of land and forests in the context of food security. This will support the formalization of customary collective rights and collaborative rangeland management approaches, which will contribute to food security by enhancing sustainable stewardship of shared resources. Lessons from the Kasese project will also be transferred to the four project districts, through the multi-stakeholder platforms strengthened under output 1.1. It is expected that as a result of the project, communities in the selected districts will benefit from more secure land tenure arrangements, enhanced conflict resolution measures, which will support an integrated and sustainable land use planning perspective.[[15]](#footnote-15) It is also expected that this output will help address the barrier on land tenure identified earlier, and therefore contribute to creating an enabling environment for food security.

Furthermore, district level multi-stakeholder platforms established in Output 1.1 will also be used to gather stakeholders to conduct participatory and community-based land use planning supporting INRM activities as part of Component 2. The combination of community-based land use planning, training on land tenure guidelines, amendments of ordinances and by-laws and awareness raising will foster better enforcement of INRM and SLM guidance at the community level and contribute to support smallholder agriculture and to the recovery of cattle corridors.

Finally, the project will also support the exploration of incentive schemes for long-term sustainability of project outcomes. This will include for example the exploration of the possibility of setting up payment for ecosystem-services (PES) in project sites where communities can be encouraged to collaborate on joint environmental management. The project will also explore linking communities with voluntary carbon funds, in order to create long-term financial incentives for the maintenance of soil and forest cover. This activity will be supported through a partnership with experienced NGOs such as ECOTRUST and Uganda Carbon Bureau that have successfully piloted similar initiatives in Uganda.

**Table 3: Component 1 outcomes, outputs, activities**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Outcome 1: Supportive policies and incentives in place at district level to support smallholder agriculture, food value-chains and INRM* | |
| **Output** | **Activities** |
| Output 1.1: Operational multi-stakeholder platforms are supporting INRM at district and regional levels | 1.1.1. Assessment of existing sectoral, interest-based and stakeholder-based platforms in Karamoja and needs assessment.  1.1.2 Create/strengthen multi-stakeholder platforms at the local (district) level with CBOs, NGOs and private sector and government, working through extension services and focused on value chain development, SLM and INRM.  1.1.3 Work with Ministry of Karamoja Affairs and other relevant ministries/stakeholders (such as the Ministry of Land and Ministry of Trade) to bring together platforms at the regional level to facilitate knowledge exchange and collaboration on INRM (exchange and harmonization of approaches, joint awareness and capacity development events, including linkages with regional platforms such as the Pastoralists Knowledge Hub or the World Initiative Sustainable Pastoralism – WISP)  1.1.4 Facilitate the integration of the priorities expressed by local multi-stakeholder platforms into district planning and budgeting and to increase budget lines for SLM and INRM in line with the various national action plans for food security, SLM strategic investment plan, for climate resilience and preventing land degradation and biodiversity loss.  1.1.5. Produce and disseminate a wide range of awareness raising materials on the project, SLM and INRM (pictorial, in local languages for print, radio, dramas etc.) and relevant case studies. |
| Output 1.2: Adequate legal instruments enabling INRM, land use planning and enforcement in place | 1.2.1 Facilitate the review / amendment / drafting of by-laws & ordinances to ensure the integration of INRM and diversified production systems on the basis of a legal framework assessment for each district and training of local council personnel, and work with MoJ to support LGs in securing final approval and gazetting legal instruments.  1.2.2 Support local councils, including all relevant department, through multi-stakeholder platforms in the review or establishment of community-based land use plans supporting INRM / SLM and land use conflict prevention/reduction, linked to the national and district level physical development plans, and inclusive of cattle corridors, conservation and migration routes/cattle corridors.  1.2.3 Train local councils, local NGOs and CBOs, on the application of appropriate guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests for resolving land tenure issues, within the framework of the established Land Act, Land and Land Use Policies and regulations, and provide support for the formalization of customary collective rights to support collaborative rangeland management.  1.2.4 Awareness raising of communities of their rights of access and use and control of land resources, in particular elders/or elderly and women.  1.2.5 Explore the potential for, and set up, incentive schemes for continued sustainability, including PES and carbon funds. |

Component 2: Scaling-up Integrated Approaches at National and Landscape Level

***Outcome 2: Increased land area under integrated natural resources management (INRM) and SLM practices for a more productive Karamoja landscape***

According to the latest household survey conducted in February 2016 in Napak, Kotido and Nakapiripirit districts, 92% of households in the targeted areas suffer from moderate or severe hunger, which was exacerbated by the serious drought in 2015 (see Annex 8 for a full report of the Survey).[[16]](#footnote-16) The root causes of food insecurity in Karamoja include among others, the lack of water for production and for livestock, low government capacity to manage natural resources, inadequate NRM and unsustainable practices, which lead to low agricultural yield, livestock loss, soil erosion and soil loss. These specific problems can be traced back to the lack of technical capacity and financial capital to manage natural resources and lack of appropriate decentralised governance mechanisms. The overall goal of this outcome is therefore to work on strengthening technical capacity of all relevant stakeholders on INRM and SLM practices in order to increase the number of community members using these sustainable management use practices (crop, livestock, forest, soil and water resources) to ensure food security and to increase the resilience of targeted farm households and “integrated” production systems. To achieve this outcome, the project will employ the approach of watershed management, delivered through Agro-Pastoral Field Schools (APFS) / farmer field schools (FFS).

**Output 2.1: Institutional technical capacities to implement INRM/SLM are strengthened**

Local decision makers in Karamoja are not fully aware of how sustainable land management practices can contribute to increasing ecosystems’ resilience. Opportunities to strengthen this institutional capacity are however arising, with the ongoing rebuilding of the extension service, starting with the recruitment of district and sub-country extension officers. To ensure the best chances of success for the project activities, it is important that the technical capacity of district staff, existing and newly recruited extension staff as well as community members is enhanced on rangeland management, INRM, SLM practices/technologies, climate-smart agriculture, agro-ecological approaches and the APFS/FFS methodology. Members of these stakeholder groups will become leaders and key resource persons (“master trainers”) for future community-level awareness raising, training and advocacy with policy makers (including those under Output 2.2).

The project will also train volunteer community members so that they can act as trainers within their communities, transferring SLM and INRM knowledge to their network through future FFS or APFS and catchment/watershed committees, and as appropriate other water users associations or local natural resources environmental management bodies. It is expected that the demonstration of benefits accrued through FFS and APFS approaches will contribute to the further dissemination of sustainable techniques. Awareness raising and training material on the benefits of improved approaches such as livestock keeping will also be disseminated through the district multi-stakeholder platform and will result in more farmers trained and supported to implement SLM practices, hence increasing the number of hectares under SLM (Output 1.1).

There is also a gap in terms of the transmission of relevant agro-meteorological information to the local land users. This creates a situation whereby farmers are not able to deal with climate uncertainty and risks, perpetuating a situation that leads to low productivity, erratic yields and risk avoidance strategies, such as overstocking. While Uganda is working towards a strengthening of its meteorological services, including through a GEF project[[17]](#footnote-17), the Karamoja region not been fully included in these efforts. According to the HH-BAT results, only 59% of the respondents had access to weather forecasts in February 2016.

The project will build on the ERKP (**Enhancing Resilience in Karamoja Program –** DFID), ending in 2016 and which has produced in collaboration with district local government, monthly-based drought advisories. These advisories are integrated within the national early warning system managed by the National Emergency Coordination and Operation Centre (NECOC) and are already disseminated across all districts. In addition, the FAO has engaged Radio Kotido (covering all districts of Karamoja and a part of Pokot region in Kenya) for the dissemination of technical messages related to crop and livestock husbandry practices and likely to extend under the current project, to early warning messages through radio broadcasting and meteorological information.

Under this output, the IAP project will build on the achievements of the ERKP and provide training to MAAIF decentralized staff, district administrations and APFS trainers on how to communicate agro-meteorological information to communities, which is not currently done effectively. This will include drought and flood warnings, and approaches on how to manage climate risks on a day-to-day basis. The project will support the integration of Karamoja’s systems, including the Drought Early Warning System, in the national early warning system (EWS) managed by NECOC. APFS/FFS members will be encouraged to establish simple rain gauges and observations to monitor themselves the rainfall and other climatic effects and understand the changes and the implications.

**Output 2.2: Increase in the number of community members trained in INRM / SLM techniques**

It has become evident that traditional knowledge and coping mechanisms are no longer adequate to deal with the current state of environmental degradation, also weather and climate variability. While traditional and indigenous knowledge are still being relied upon, new approaches have been demonstrated to be effective in drylands that could be applied to Karamoja ecosystems and livelihoods systems. Under this output, the project will seek to identify, assess and upscale relevant successful approaches in order to support a sustainable increase in production through more resilient and diversified systems.

Activities will focus on strengthening the capacity of communities on integrated crop-livestock farming, horticulture, CSA and conservation agriculture, focusing on existing food and fodder value chains to support increased productivity (and therefore food security). Through all the APFS and FFS, the project will build the capacity of communities to identify, conserve, and sustainably manage their agricultural biodiversity. The project will adopt a watershed management approach and will work with watershed / sub-catchment committees to promote an integrated approach to food production systems.

The project will also support pasture improvement and rangeland rehabilitation, including reseeding degraded grasslands areas, restoring the tree component of systems and resuming grazing on under-grazed areas – all of which will enhance livestock productivity. This will be achieved through the deployment of APFS and FFS as a learning-by-doing mechanism focused on groups and wider networks in order to out and upscale APFS and FFS. The baseline study and the HH-BAT results will serve to inform the APFS/FFS curricula development in the first year of the project.

In addition, the collaborative land use plans (LUPs) developed in Component 1 through the multi-stakeholder platforms will help communities in land use/resources planning and making protection, conservation/ sustainable use or regeneration-oriented decisions. For example, LUPs will determine areas where the project will pilot temporary exclosure areas to promote natural regeneration of vegetation, or where to rehabilitate hotspots of degradation using indigenous species. Assisted natural regeneration will be encouraged to restore the tree cover in these silvopastoral systems. This will be complemented by awareness raising among land users of the many benefits of trees in the landscape (ecosystem services, food and medical products). The project will also support targeted reforestation in areas identified as opportune in the Land use plans, but will avoid where possible, the risky option of planting seedlings, which have very poor survival rates in drylands. Areas designated for targeted rehabilitation could include river banks, watering points, steep slopes, gullies, with a focus on increasing biodiversity, using indigenous tree species such as Acacia, Tamarind, Shea nut, and palatable grasses and shrubs and agroforestry approches.

Lastly, with prolonged droughts severely affecting livestock and crops, the project will support the implementation of rainwater harvesting or conservation techniques, within a APFS or FFS setting (Activity 2.2.1). Crop farmers in Karamoja will learn about the range of sustainable land management technologies that could be used to provide more water for production and retain more water within soils after rainfall with relatively little effort, such as stone lines, tied ridges, zai and half-moons, which are widely used in other drylands, such as in the Sahel (see [www.wocat.net](http://www.wocat.net) for full list and details).

**Output 2.3: Community groups are benefiting from income generating activities introduced by the project**

In order to expand the existing production basis for crops and livestock and therefore make a lasting contribution to food security, the project will work in collaboration with the Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Institute (ZARDI) to organize youth and women in producer groups or in village savings and loans associations (VSLAs) to develop seed multiplication skills to increase the availability of local seed varieties that are drought resistant and cereal banking systems and to reduce post-harvest losses as well as improved animal husbandry practices. The project will support members of APFS and FFS to develop into networks to enhance linkages with the local private sector and to gain technical capacity to process and organize sale of produce, fostering knowledge exchange and transfer among smallholder farmers. In addition, the project will work with local NGOs and small industries to develop practical skills of community members and particularly of women and youth to learn how to make better use of grassland, such as fodder harvesting, storage and sale under a value chain approach.

The project will support the dissemination of the APFS/FFS approach as a basis for developing capacity at the household and community level on sustainable production techniques (linked to activity 2.2.1 above). This will include support in making linkages to the community decision making systems and to the private sector and markets, as well as the provision of technical and physical assets for value addition and sustainable production in traditional and innovative value chains, in improving post-harvest management, quality processing or marketing among other value chain activities.

Secondly, a key aspect of resilience to climate and food-related shocks is the diversification of livelihoods options. Currently, very few communities are involved in alternative income-generating activities that could better sustain income and maintain food security in times of drought, crop failure or livestock loss. Some sporadic examples can however be found in the Karamoja region, which could be replicated to the project sites. However, each of these avenues need to be undertaken carefully in order to avoid placing undue risk on already impoverished households. Under this output, GEF funds will be used to first perform viability and feasibility assessments, including economic and market studies, on preselected value chains in order to introduce alternative income-generating activities that are sustainable. The project preparation phase identified the following potential value chains as warranting further exploration and demonstration:

* Sustainable charcoal production, including dissemination of retort kilns and improved cookstoves for energy savings, the establishment of woodlots for fuel and exploration of alternative sources of energy[[18]](#footnote-18);
* Beekeeping, honey making and wax products;
* Small Stock raising, including ducks, pigs, chicken and egg products;
* Livestock transformation activities: hides, milk and dairy, meat;
* Alternative animal raising: camels
* Transformation of local indigenous species with food security and ecological importance: aloe vera (soap), sisal (fabric), gum Arabic, fonio, Tamarind, spices, Acacia, etc.

Once analysis of feasibility and economic viability is complete, the project will work through volunteer APFS/FFS groups to build local production and transformation capacity. The project will learn from examples and pilot projects in other areas in order to identify and support promising alternative livelihoods options.

**Table 4: Component 2 outcome, outputs, activities.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Outcome 2: Increased land area and agro-ecosystems under integrated natural resources management and SLM for a more productive Karamoja landscape*** | |
| Output | Activities |
| Output 2.1:  Technical capacity to implement INRM/SLM is increased | 2.1.1. Train district technical staff / extension staff and volunteer community members in participatory SLM and INRM approaches including pastoral/rangeland management, catchment /watershed management, agro-ecological approaches, climate smart agriculture and the APFS / FFS methodology and energy savings/efficiency approaches.  2.1.2 Provide training for decentralized MAAIF, DLG and APFS trainers on agro-meteorological information dissemination (with MAAIF and UMA).  2.1.3 Integrate Karamoja Drought Early Warning System into the national Early Warning System through the dissemination of agro-met info and advisories to local government and to the general public through radio and other venues such as local elders forums. |
| Increase in the number of people applying INRM / SLM techniques | 2.2.1. Build capacity of men, women, youth, elders and newly sedentary former pastoralists on integrated crop-livestock farming and horticulture / catchment and territorial management / SLM technologies conservation agriculture / and climate smart agriculture (CSA) through the establishment of and technical support to new and existing APFS and FFS.  2.2.2 Demonstrate the benefits of pasture improvement and controlled grazing of livestock for rangeland rehabilitation and sustainable management (linked to 1.2.3), using resilient species of grass/shrubs, including the demonstration of holistic grazing management.  2.2.3 Establish temporary enclosure areas for farmer assisted natural regeneration of vegetation in line with a land use plan agreed in Outcome 1 (1.2.2).  2.2.4 Undertake reforestation and rehabilitation in hotspots identified in community land use plans (1.2.2.) (e.g. riverine areas, watering points, steep slopes, gullies) with a focus on increasing biodiversity, productivity and climate resilience using beneficial indigenous tree species such as Acacia gum, tamarind, shea nut and palatable grasses and shrubs  2.2.5. Implement rainwater harvesting techniques for enhanced productivity and resilience to drought in fields (e.g. tied ridges, retention ditches, zai, half-moons, stone lines) and sand dams (where feasible) for crop, livestock and household use (e.g. roof where feasible or below ground collection tanks). |
| Output 2.3: Community groups are benefiting from income-generating activities (IGAs) introduced by the project | 2.3.1 In cooperation with Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Institute (ZARDI), organize youth and women in producer groups or in VSLAs, to develop seed multiplication skills to increase supplies of local seed varieties, especially those with drought coping mechanisms and / or a high % recovery post-drought and cereal banking systems to reduce post-harvest losses among crop farmers.  2.3.2 Work through existing or new APFS/FFS to disseminate improved crop/livestock production techniques (linked to 2.2.1) for increased household income, including through linkages with the private sector and provision of technical and physical capacity for value addition in traditional and innovative value chains.  2.3.3 Perform viability and feasibility assessments for preselected value chains, including detailed economic and market studies  2.3.4 Develop resilient value chains for increased income:  2.3.4a Explore the potential for sustainable charcoal production working with the NFA, youth and women groups, promote the introduction of retort kilns and establish dedicated woodlots of soft wood species for wood fuel at household and manyatta level to produce charcoal more efficiently (with GHG mitigation benefits) and explore alternative sources of energy.  2.3.4b Work with local NGOs and small industries to develop practical skills and encourage youth and women to set-up businesses that make better use of grassland such as fodder harvesting, storage and sale under a value-chain approach; basket making, thatching, seed multiplication (link to 2.3.3) of fodder crops etc  2.3.4c Work with local NGOs to train farmer groups in processing and transforming indigenous plants that have a food security and global ecological importance (e.g. Aloe, Tamaring, Acacia, Spices, Amarula, etc.)  2.3.4d Work with local NGOs to organize farmers in beekeeping production groups and provide support based on a cost sharing arrangement (equipment and storage facility) and training in bee-keeping, also processing of honey and related products (learn from APFS networks in Amudat District and the Tepeth Community in Moroto District)  2.3.4e Organize women and youth in producer groups to establish small stock rearing facilities (chickens for egg production, pigs, goats, ducks) in communities and in landscapes where it is appropriate |

**Output 2.4: Community level small grant projects in the Karamoja region that enhance ecosystem services, sustainable land management, innovate alternative livelihood options, are implemented (led by the Small Grants Program)**

In addition to working directly with communities, the project will channel a portion of the GEF funds through the already-established Small Grants Program (SGP). The SGP will provide support to local NGOs, CBOs and CSOs to deploy small community projects that respond to one or both of the following objectives:

* Restoration of ecosystem services or reduction of negative environmental trends (land degradation and deforestation, biodiversity loss, climate change emissions)
* Promote diversification and increase of livelihoods and livelihoods approach (water harvesting, post harvest management, business skills development, etc.).

Recipients will be required to deploy their activities in the Karamoja sub-region, with a strong priority on the project’s targeted districts. An estimated US$ 800,000 will be earmarked for the SGP’s activities in the Land Degradation, Sustainable Forest Management, Climate mitigation and Biodiversity focal areas.

Pursuant to the operational guidelines for the SGP, the sub-project will operate in a decentralized and country-driven manner through a National Coordinator (NC) and National Steering Committee (NSC), with financial and administrative support provided by the UNDP Country Office (CO). The NSC will provide overall guidance and direction to the country programme, and will contribute to developing and implementing strategies for country programme sustainability. The NSC membership already include experts in the relevant GEF focal areas of biodiversity; climate change mitigation; sustainable land management; sustainable forest management and REDD; persistent and capacity development. The NSC will be responsible for the review, selection and approval of projects, and for ensuring their technical and substantive quality as regards the strategic objectives of the SGP.

During the inception period, guidance and programming documents for the SGP will be prepared, including criteria for eligibility, calls for proposals and project review criteria. The SGP will also develop its own M&E plan and results framework, which will be aligned to this overall project’s results framework. It will also be included in the Monitoring and Assessment activities under this project. As with previous operational phases of the SGP, efforts will be deployed to ensure adequate priority is given to projects led by women’s and youth organizations, as well as those targeting indigenous peoples.

Component 3: Monitoring and Assessment

***Outcome 3: Framework in place for multi-scale assessment, monitoring and integration of resilience in production landscape and monitoring of GEBs***

It is well proven that the impacts of projects are enhanced if a wide range of people can be involved in the monitoring and impact assessment, particularly if beneficiaries are involved in participatory monitoring as this enhances local ownership of project results and processes. There are however limited comprehensive monitoring and assessment frameworks for resilience and GEBs in place in Karamoja, and this prevents evidence-based policy making in the sub-region. Partial data on land degradation and SLM practices using the *LADA QM* methodology was collected during the district-level SLM workshop conducted during the project preparation phase. There is also existing and on going data collection and analysis by *Vital Signs (www.vitalsigns.org),* funded by the *Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation*, on local landscape diagnostics to assess land degradation such as soil organic carbon, land cover and landscape structure, crop and livestock productivity and above ground carbon stocks. The World Bank Living upcoming work by the World Bank on However, there is need to ensure this data links the health of ecosystems to the health of food systems, so that policy makers are able to understand the need to address environmental drivers of food insecurity during their programming. Decisions on land use taken by local users as well as local government authorities need to take into consideration the limits of the ecosystem base to avoid over-exploitation of natural resources, which in turn undermines the productive base and leads to continued food shortages.

Finally, there is limited baseline data on resilience, except from the HH-BAT SHARP baseline survey and analysis, which was conducted specifically for this project (see Annex 8). This means that many projects and programs implemented in Karamoja are not considering the impacts of climate variability and climate change, and can be based on inaccurate assumptions regarding the ability of the food systems and communities to recover from shocks. This leads to short-term planning rather than long-term planning, which does not create a suitable enabling environment for achieving food security. Importantly, there is no single framework that allows policy makers to grasp the links between local, district, and national environment and socioeconomic benefits and global environmental benefits.

**Output 3.1: Monitoring and Assessment of GEBs**

Under Output 3.1, the project team will be introduced to existing methodologies and frameworks including the HH-BAT SHARP tool developed by FAO for this project, the Resilience Atlas ([www.resilienceatlas.org](http://www.resilienceatlas.org)) developed by Vital Signs Uganda (<http://uganda.vitalsigns.org/explore-atlas-uganda>) the RAPTA tool developed by GEF STAP ([http://www.stapgef.org/the-resilience-adaptation-and-transformation-assessment-framework](http://www.stapgef.org/the-resilience-adaptation-and-transformation-assessment-framework/)), and others. The tools will inform the M and A framework for the project.

Once the M and A framework is developed, the project coordination unit and project beneficiaries, including the project M&A officer will be trained in the M&A methodologies and tools including participatory monitoring at household level. Technical and extension staff and representatives of APFS/FFS will be trained on the job in the use of LADA-WOCAT tools to perform assessments of local land resources status and trends (soil, water, vegetation, biodiversity), the drivers, causes and impacts and to document and assess the effectiveness of SLM practices during and after the project (on natural resources and livelihoods at farm level). These different trainings will enable both beneficiaries and government staff in the target districts to conduct regular assessments of the extent and effectiveness of the various SLM practices and the INRM approach.

Using the selected methodology or methodologies, the project will conduct a baseline survey for each selected site. The objective the baseline survey will be to collect household information to assess food security as well as to perform local landscape diagnostics, to assess land degradation, including soil organic carbon, land cover and landscape structure, including crop and livestock productivity and above ground carbon stocks and agro-biodiversity. The baseline study will also confirm project indicators and targets.

**Table 5: Different methodologies and tools to measure climate resilience at the household level**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SHARP (HH-BAT) | Vital Signs | RIMA |
| The Self-evaluation Holistic Assessment of climate Resilience of farmers and Pastoralists (SHARP) is a participatory self-assessment tool that aims at better identifying and understanding the situations, concerns and interests of pastoralists and farmers in regards to their climate resilience. The HH-BAT (Household Baseline Assessment Tool) is a version of SHARP, which has been developed by FAO to assess climate resilience with particular reference to food security, nutrition and displacement issues.  The HH-BAT (SHARP) served as the baseline assessment tool for this project. | Vital Signs Uganda (*funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation*) collects and integrates data on agricultural management and productivity, ecosystems and human well-being and provides tools and decision making capabilities for farmers, policy makers, businesses and other national leaders in Uganda and worldwide to assess and manage risk and to support policy..  Vital Signs has a formal partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture to provide data, indicators, knowledge and decision support tools to support an evidence-based approach to agricultural and environmental decision making, including indicators of resilience and food security. These arrangements enable Vital Signs to work at scales ranging from individual farm households, to landscapes, districts or regions and the national scale.  Vital Signs collects data using plot sampling (for soils and biomass), household surveys, fixed sensors (climate, water quality), and using panoramic photographs (land use and cover). Vital Signs also integrates data from other sources, such as from remote sensing and existing household survey datasets such as the Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS).  Vital signs has already collected data on the neighbouring districts using protocols that can be replicated for the target sites. See Vital Signs atlas for Uganda which can be a useful source of some baseline datasets – see <http://uganda.vitalsigns.org/explore-atlas-uganda>.  Vital Signs is also participating in the regional component of the IAP where they will lead the component on Monitoring and Assessment. More details will be provided during the inception workshop. | The Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA) is led by FAO in partnership with the EU. The RIMA model is an econometric approach, building on the Resilience Index, and weighs six dimensions contributing to household resilience:  - Income and food access  - Assets,  - Adaptive capacity  - Social safety nets  - Sensitivity to shocks |

This project will also be able to leverage funding through collaboration with the related GEF MSP, led by Vital Signs, on *Enabling the use of global data sources to assess and monitor land degradation at multiple scales* which is developing a multi-scale indicator of land degradation for the UNCCD and the GEF and for which Uganda was selected as a pilot country. This collaboration will enable a more detailed assessment of land degradation and land degradation trends, including mapping of degradation hotspots and will provide training to project and government personnel on land degradation monitoring and assessment using data products derived from remote sensing. Vital Signs will also conduct ongoing monitoring of project sites for Food Security and Global Environmental Benefits.

**Output 3.2: Capacity in place to apply appropriate tools and practices for monitoring resilience at multiple scales**

Under this output, the capacity built from training in Output 4.1 will be applied at the district or landscape level. Each district level multi-stakeholder platform will use M&E tools and methods selected in Output 4.1, for monitoring resilience in Karamoja’s food production systems.[[19]](#footnote-19) Activities will include the implementation of participatory M&A, monitoring of GEBs, documentation and dissemination of project results. It is expected that this will contribute to making a link between project benefits and lessons and development planning, to support evidence-based policy-making. The project M&A focal point and project beneficiaries will be trained on participatory monitoring using the Vital Signs framework, while technical and extension staff will be trained in the use of LADA-WOCAT tools, HH BAT Resilience assessment tool, and the multi-scale indicator of land degradation to perform assessments of local land resources and to monitor and assess the success of INRM and SLM practices during and after the project’s duration. These different trainings will enable both beneficiaries and government staff to conduct regular assessments of food security and global environmental benefits at the project level, hence monitoring the impacts from the project’s activities on food security and global environmental benefits

**Output 3.3: Project is linked to regional program**

Under this output, the GEF funds will support participation in regional program activities in order to exchange knowledge and lessons learned from continuous monitoring and assessment of GEBs of the 11 other child projects. The project will also dedicate resources to ensure that the project is in line with the IAP regional approach throughout its implementation, and to maintain effective programmatic linkages throughout the duration of the project. This will be achieved through participation in the Regional Hub Sub-project, whose objective is “to establish and operate governance structures and process for coordination, knowledge management, scaling up, and monitoring and assessment of the IAP on Food Security”.

Activities supported by the regional program will include:

* Data integration, including global monitoring of a set of key environmental indicators (land cover, land under sustainable management, conservation of genetic diversity, Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions avoided, etc.)
* Data integration using the Resilience Atlas, the development of scientific products and technical studies, study tours and visits.
* Supporting regional institutional frameworks: the establishment of a science-policy interface (SPI)
* Sharing information on best approaches- support on the development of a greening of value chain approach, regional conferences, training at national and regional level, the development of scientific products and technical studies, study tours and visits, from which this project will benefit.

**Table 6: Component 3 outcomes, outputs, activities**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome 3: Framework in place for multi-scale assessment, monitoring and integration of resilience in production landscape and monitoring of GEBs** | |
| Output 3.1: Assessment and monitoring of GEBs | 3.1.1. Select assessment methodology and tools and conduct baseline survey for selected sites including household survey and local landscape diagnostics (Land degradation types, severity and causes, effectiveness of SLM measures and impacts on ecosystems and livelihoods)  3.1.2. Provide training to PCU and project beneficiaries in methods and tools for rigorous Monitoring and evaluation of project indicators and participatory monitoring  3.1.3 Regular assessment of agro-biodiversity at the district level including varieties/breeds, species and habitat diversity and associated functions (e.g. pollination, pest and disease control) and impacts in terms of resilience  3.1.4 Train technical and extension staff (GO and NGOs) in the use of selected methodology and tools to perform assessments of local land resources (LD and SLM) and livelihoods diagnostics and to assess and document INRM best practices  3.1.5 In collaboration with the Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Vital Signs and the World Bank Living Standards Measurement Survey, conduct baseline surveys, to evaluate food security and link this with the existing local landscape diagnostics (land cover, soil organic carbon, vegetation structure and composition, crop and livestock productivity, above ground carbon stocks, land degradation types, severity and causes). |
| Output 3.2: Capacity in place to apply appropriate tools and practices for monitoring resilience at multiple scales | 3.2.1 Within multi-stakeholder platforms created at the district level in Component 1, conduct participatory M&A using the selected methodology and tools and hold annual workshops to learn from M&A and disseminate the use of appropriate tools and practices for monitoring resilience  3.2.2 In partnership with relevant projects and partners in the region, exchange on monitoring and assessment of multiple benefits of INRM from farm-household to landscape level (ecosystem services, food and livelihood security, climate resilience) and train local NGOs and private sector actors (data collection and analysis of costs, benefits and impacts towards SDG targets) |
| Output 3.3: Project is linked to regional program. This will be achieved through participation in the Regional Hub Sub-project, whose objective is “to establish and operate governance structures and process for coordination, knowledge management, south-south and triangular cooperation for scaling up, and monitoring and assessment of the IAP on Food Security”. | 3.3.1. Participation in regional program activities including study tours, research and knowledge sharing. |

1. Partnerships and Stakeholder engagement:

The beneficiaries and stakeholders described in the table below have participated in the design stage of the project and will continue to do so during project implementation.

| **Stakeholders** | **Details** | **Contributions to the project** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Government** | District local governments in the Karamoja sub-region – technical staff | - Part of the district multi-stakeholder platforms and linking to the regionally established platform  - Recipient of training on INRM and SLM  - Recipient of training on the application of the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests (VGGT) for resolving land tenure issues  - Providing technical advice on rangeland management / SLM etc  - Support enforcement environmental management regulations / by-laws / EIA regulations etc.  - Support for the main-streaming/ institutionalisation of APFS/FFS through district plans and budgets  - Recipient of training on the use of LADA-WOCAT tools to perform assessments of local land resources and livelihoods diagnostic to assess best practices |
| District local governments in the Karamoja sub-region – extension staff | - Part of the district multi-stakeholder platforms and linking to the regionally established platform  - Recipient of training on INRM and SLM  - Recipient of training on the application of the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests (VGGT) for resolving land tenure issues  - Master Trainers for APFSs and FFSs  - Recipient of training on the use of LADA-WOCAT tools to perform assessments of local land resources and livelihoods diagnostic to assess best practices |
| Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries (MAAIF) | - Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform  - Project Executing Partner  - Recipient of training on INRM and SLM  - Recipient of training on the application of the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests (VGGT) for resolving land tenure issues  - Contributor to the introduction of INRM and SLM into public policy and practice as an adaptation strategy  - Recipient of training on the use of LADA-WOCAT tools to perform assessments of local land resources and livelihoods diagnostic to assess best practices |
| Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries – Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Institute (ZARDI) | - Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform  - Guidance and training for farmers (e.g. hay making, seed multiplication, SWC, AF, woodlots, root crops)  - Support to the training on INRM, SLM and seed multiplication  - Recipient of training on the use of LADA-WOCAT tools to perform assessments of local land resources and livelihoods diagnostic to assess best practices |
| National SLM committee | - Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform  - Part of the PSC, through a designated focal point  - Responsible for project coordination and monitoring of project activities |
| National Environmental Management Agency | - Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform  - Participate in monitoring environmental benefits of activities, including biodiversity and land rehabilitation |
| Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) | - Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform  - Recipient of training on INRM and SLM  - IWRM for agriculture, livestock and human consumption, sustained surface and ground water supply and watershed management |
| Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD) | - Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform  - Recipient of training on INRM and SLM  - Support to Sustainable charcoal production/value chain development  - Support to the awareness raising on Energy saving stoves, biogas, solar energy or other energy saving measures e.g. for agro-processing |
| Ministry of Lands and Urban Development (MLUD) | - Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform  - Support to the establishment of community-based land use plans supporting INRM and SLM.  - Providing information on community land tenure and access rights including forest and fisheries to support project activities  - Recipient of training on the application of the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests (VGGT) for resolving land tenure issues |
| Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) | - Support the regional multi-stakeholder platform during and after the project’s implementation  - Support for coordination and links to numerous existing projects and programmes (e.g. DFID Resilience Programme, World Bank Africa Pastoral Livelihood Resilience Project, Strengthening capacities for DRM and resilience) |
| National Forestry Authority (NFA) | - Work with the project coordination unit and support the potential for sustainable charcoal production among youth and women groups.  - Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform  - Providing information on choice of tree species choices, also tree management  - Liaise with project on interventions in forest reserves (e.g. Mt Moroto) |
| Office of Karamoja Affairs | - Contribute to the assessment of existing sub-regional platforms and to the needs assessment for a sub-regional multi-stakeholder platform  - Coordinate the regional multi-stakeholder platform gathering all relevant stakeholders  - Part of the regional and district levels multi-stakeholder platforms |
| Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives | - Provide vital inputs and links to value chains to develop markets for produce from Karamoja (initially, local markets – longer-term consider wider markets)  - Part of the regional multi-stakeholder platform |
| **Land Users, their groups and leaders** | Pastoralists | Beneficiaries[[20]](#footnote-20) |
| Agro-pastoralists | Beneficiaries |
| Rainfed cropping farmers (including traditional and recently settled pastoralists); | Beneficiaries |
| Small-scale irrigated horticulturalists – mainly but not exclusively women – usually part of APFSs; | Beneficiaries |
| Woodland- and forest-dependent communities. | Beneficiaries |
| Women and youth associations/groups in Karamoja (active in agriculture and other non-farm activities) | Beneficiaries |
| Representatives of local NRM mechanisms (i.e. water user associations, catchment committees, basin organizations, pasture committees, etc.) | Beneficiaries |
| Traditional leaders/Elders of various ethnic groups in Karamoja | Beneficiaries |
| **International development agency** | UNDP | GEF Implementing Agency, responsible for Outcomes 1 and 3, contributing partner to outcomes 2 and 4. Member of the Project Board, quality assurance. |
| FAO | GEF Implementing Agency, responsible for Outcomes 2 and 4, contributing partner to outcomes 1 and 3. Member of the project board, quality assurance. |
| **Other** | Academic and Research Institutions | - Research support to sustainable rangeland and integrated crop-livestock management and activities to enhance food and livelihood security |
|  | World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) | - Providing information on choice of tree species choices, also tree management – and advice / germplasm of appropriate domesticated fruit trees |
| **Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) &**  **Civil Society Organization (CSO)** | NGOs such as:  - Community Integrated Development Initiative (CIDI)  - Hope for Humanity Karamoja (HHK)  - Concern Worldwide  - Bicycles for Humanity (B4H)  A lit of relevant CSOs can be found in Annex 6 | - Part of the regional and district levels multi-stakeholder platforms  - Recipient of training on the application of the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests (VGGT) for resolving land tenure issues  - Contribute to reforestation and rehabilitation activities  - Participate in the implementation of SLM practices and INRM  - Support farmer groups in developing resilient value chains for increased income  - Recipient of training on the use of LADA-WOCAT tools to perform assessments of local land resources and livelihoods diagnostic to assess best practices  - Recipient of training on methods and tools on monitoring and assessment of multiple benefits of INRM from farm-household to landscape level (Output 4.2)  - Strengthen capacity of CSOs/CBOs to become effective service providers for:   * developing and implementing community /catchment action plans   facilitating/supporting APFS and FFS |
| Existing APFS and APFS networks | - as above also exchange visits, participatory evaluation etc. |
| **Private sector** | Traders in inputs supply, agricultural food produce, charcoal and other value chains in Karamoja and other parts of Uganda | - Part of the regional and district levels multi-stakeholder platforms  - Provide vital inputs and links to value chains to develop markets for produce from Karamoja (initially, local markets – longer-term consider wider markets)  - Establish linkages with communities to provide value addition in traditional and innovative value chains through existing and new APFS/FFS.  - Recipient of training on methods and tools on monitoring and assessment of multiple benefits of INRM from farm-household to landscape level (Output 4.2) |

In order to ensure buy-in and ownership of project activities, the communities, institutions and partners in this project have been involved from the start in the project’s design, during the project preparation phase. The project preparation phase included a Project Preparation Inception Workshop (held in November 2015) and brought together all stakeholders and potential partners, and other prospective stakeholders that were identified during the course of project preparation. A second design and consultation mission took place in January 2016, during which the preparation team visited potential project sites and conducted focus groups and discussions with communities and with district technical officials on food security, environmental degradation, and climate change impacts on local livelihoods.

During the focus groups, vulnerable groups such as women, youth and the elderly were particularly targeted in order for them to be able to voice their concerns (for more detail on vulnerable groups, please refer to Section 2.3 of the Project Document). They will be specifically targeted in this project, in particular through Component 2, which will provide activities designed around their specific needs, capacities, knowledge and social roles with the objective to increase the land area under INRM and SLM and enhance productivity to contribute to food security. Furthermore, district technical officials will all also be particularly targeted in order to enhance and build up their institutional and technical capacity in terms of implementing integrated natural resources management and sustainable land management.

The validation workshop took place on 18th May 2016 and brought together all relevant stakeholders, including representatives from NGOs and specific sectors to discuss the final list of project activities and expected results. Detailed report of the inception, consultation and validation missions are provided in Annex 12.

To ensure effective and informed participation of stakeholders in the formulation and implementation of this project, the inception and consultation missions engaged community stakeholders and district officials through focus groups, which involved two stages. In district government, the consultation first held a meeting with all the district’s employees and then divided into thematic groups, such as agriculture, livestock, land management and alternative livelihoods to focus on certain issues. Within communities, large community meeting involved everyone in a community, then, the smaller focus groups included groups of women, youth and elders. This allowed for fair and representative participation of all affected populations, especially the most vulnerable and marginalized. Questions to communities allowed the design preparation team to understand the current and past issues in the sub-region as well as to identify needs of communities in order for them to reach resilient livelihoods and food security. In addition, mapping of land use systems was conducted by national experts, and a stakeholder workshop was held in Moroto in January 2016 to conduct a participatory assessment of land degradation and existing SLM practices in the seven districts in Karamoja sub-region, however, more information is required from the districts to complete the database and mapping.

Through the large set of activities, this project design strives to respond to all concerns expressed by communities and will be in line with what the communities need to enhance their food security in the long term.

# Feasibility

1. Cost efficiency and effectiveness: Cost efficiency was considered during the design of this project’s interventions. Specifically, it was decided that since the project is based on a significant baseline of infrastructure-based interventions (e.g. KALIP, NUSAF), the project would focus on addressing the technical capacity gaps faced by communities in their attempts to increase food production. The project will therefore only implement infrastructure-related components as far as they are related to water harvesting to support an increase in productivity and therefore a directly visible increase in food security.

Under Outcome 1, for cost efficiency, it was decided to first undertake a more thorough and participatory assessment of existing and available stakeholder coordination mechanisms, which will then inform a low-cost option to strengthning or, where relevant, creating, multi-stakeholder platforms based on existing structures. Similarly, the project opted for a design that supports local district administrations in their ongoing efforts to develop enabling legislation that supports INRM and SLM, rather than attempting to divert resources towards national processes which are already being supported by other projects, and for which more significant resources would be needed in order to effect influence. This project is therefore based on the existing national policy context, while creating a feedback loop that will – through district administrations – help inform national policy making in the long term (through outcome 3).

Component 2, which is channeled through FAO, is also designed to use the most cost-efficient means of reaching communities. The APFS and FFS approach is one that has been used at low cost in Uganda; it is estimated that annual costs of animating a single FFS approach 2,500 USD. Each FFS can reach up to 15 people on average, and have an impact on approximately 5 ha. With the project’s available resources, the project expects to implement over 1000 APFS/FFS, reaching up to 5,000 ha. The integrated approach allows for each APFS/FFS to determine its own learning objectives and to learn through practice, which is the most effective way to build local capacity. Finally, the 3rd component was also designed to allow for the most cost-effective methods and monitoring tools to be designed in line with current needs and feasibility in the region.

1. Risk Management:

As per standard UNDP requirements, the Project Manager will monitor risks quarterly and report on the status of risks to the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP Country Office will record progress in the UNDP ATLAS risk log. Risks will be reported as critical when the impact and probablity are high (i.e. when impact is rated as 5, and when impact is rated as 4 and probability is rated at 3 or higher). Management responses to critical risks will also be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Description** | **Date identified** | **Type** | **Probability & Impact (1**–**5)** | **Mitigation measures / Countermeasures** | **Owner** |
| 1 | Current climate and seasonal variability and/or hazard events prevent implementation of planned activities. | May 5th 2016 | Economic, Environmental | Economic loss or physical damage to project activities; the implementation timing of the project is delayed  P = 3  I = 5 | * Consider current climatic variability during the implementation process. * Focus on climate-resilient species and techniques to: i) assist plant growth particularly in the seedling/sapling phase; and ii) reduce risk of damage from hazard events. * Take meteorological predictions and seasonal variability into account to reduce the risk of damage to plants. | UNDP  FAO  MAAIF |
| 2 | Karamoja development priorities are undermined by national emergencies | May 5th 2016 | Social, environmental | Project activities are interrupted. Natural and financial capital is lost.  P = 3  I = 5 | * The project manager and coordination committee will keep abreast of national events and politics to plan contingency activities when/if necessary. | UNDP  FAO  MAAIF |
| 3 | Lack of funds after project may reduce sustainability of project outcomes | May 5th 2016 | Economic | Financial instability may undermine the efforts established during the project implementation, leading back to maladaptive practices (institutional and social) due to lack of funding.  P = 2  I = 2 | * The project will pay particular attention to the key factors of success in the implementation of SLM and INRM as a strategy for adaptation in the rest of Uganda. * The project will support the development of multi-stakeholder platforms to discuss project implementation exchange knowledge and lessons learned, assess the potential for replication, develop an up-scaling strategy, a mainstreaming strategy, and a financing strategy that will consider all possible future sources. * The project will also work with district administrations to leverage an increase in budgetary allocations for NRM. The project will also explore alternative and innovative sources of financing, such as payments for ecosystem services. | UNDP  FAO  MAAIF |
| 4 | Poverty and other social factors prevent local communities from adopting food production techniques for the long-term, instead opting for maladaptive activities for short-term benefits | May 5th 2016 | Social, environmental | If local communities do not fully get involved in the project due to social factors, they will perpetuate maladaptive practices that will result in a spiralling of the root causes underlying what the project seeks to address – i.e. unsustainable use of natural resources, which will then lead to further degradation of ecosystems. Consequently, the community will continue to be vulnerable.  P = 2  I = 4 | * During project preparation, stakeholders have been engaged since the design to make sure they own the project and that the project implements “no-regrets” options. * The project will carry out information dissemination activities at the local level ensuring that communities are aware of the benefits of ecosystems and adaptation. * Inclusive interventions such as building participatory and community-based land use plans and the establishment of APFS/FFS will ensure that individuals have a role and stake in the project. | UNDP  FAO  MAAIF |
| 5 | Weak institutions and government capacity cause delays and logistical challenges to support project implementation | May 5th 2016 | Institutional | Given that the institutional capacities are generally low and coordination between different government agencies is not optimal, this could impede the implementation of the project and reduce the number of activities that could be delivered.  P = 4  I = 4 | * Government officials have been engaged since the preparation stage to promote ownership of the project. * Government officials will coordinate the activities of all the partners and stakeholders ensuring that the civil service has a central role in the project’s success, maintaining their interest and accountability of the project. * The project will promote inter-ministerial collaboration so as to ensure cross-departmental accountability and cooperation. * Training and capacity building will also be provided, which will allow this project to provide learning incentives. | UNDP  FAO  MAAIF |
| 6 | Communities do not support interventions and do not adopt ecosystem management activities during or after the term of the proposed project because of limited immediate benefits of SLM/INRM | May 5th 2016 | Social, environmental | Unsustainable use of natural resources continues, leading to further degradation of ecosystems. SLM and INRM techniques are not implemented in the long term. Consequently, the community continues to be vulnerable.  P=1  I=4 | * Community stakeholders have been engaged since the PPG phase to strengthen their buy-in into the proposed project. * Actively involve local communities in project implementation. * Foster a bottom-up, grassroots approach throughout the project’s development and implementation phases. * Implement alternative livelihoods that have proved to be financially, technically and socially viable/feasible to reduce reliance on intensive land use. * Raise public awareness on the capacity of the restored ecosystems to increase community resilience to climate change. * Improve capacity building and training of the communities to improve their understanding of the adaptation benefits of the SLM and INRM activities. * Implement activities that have direct benefits to local communities which will be ensured through the APFS/FFS structure.. | UNDP  FAO  MAAIF |
| 7 | Loss of government support may result in poor prioritisation of proposed project activities. | May 5th 2016 | Institutional | Project activities are delayed.  P=1  I=3 | * Engage with the government to maintain its commitment to the proposed project. * Integrate the objectives of national development policy in decision making throughout the project to maintain government commitment. | UNDP  FAO  MAAIF |
| 8 | Institutional capacity and relationships between line ministries are not sufficient to provide effective solutions to food security problems that are complex and multi-sectoral. | May 5th 2016 | Institutional | Multi-sectoral adaptation interventions are compromised and interventions are confined to those sectors willing to engage in cross-sectoral dialogue. The vulnerability of certain sectors and Uganda as a whole is not fully addressed.  P=2  I=3 | * Promote the development of institutional capacity and the enforcement or set up of cross-sectoral and cross- ministerial exchange platforms throughout the project implementation. This will ultimately lead to the development of an appropriate institutional framework for analysing food security dynamics, amending policy and implementing SLM and INRM interventions for climate change adaptation. | UNDP  FAO  MAAIF |
| 9 | Limited technical capacity to conduct preliminary studies and design the implementation of activities. | May 5th 2016 | Technical | Preliminary studies do not take place resulting in delayed implementation of project activities.  Interventions are not designed appropriately.  P=2  I=2 | * Identify and develop human resource capacity as required. * Include funds in the project budget for preliminary studies to hire international consultants to complement the research team. * Engage field officers to work closely with the project manager of the proposed project to ensure timely delivery of project outputs. | UNDP  FAO  MAAIF |
| 10 | Priority interventions implemented are not found to be cost-effective. | May 5th 2016 | Economic | Project interventions are not upscaled for large-scale SLM and INRM programmes  P=2  I=4 | * Conduct baseline studies on cost-effectiveness and pilot each proposed alternative livelihoods in demonstration sites. * Record detailed information on cost-effectiveness. Such information will be widely disseminated to allow future projects to use them * Use cost-effectiveness as a core principle in the implementation of adaptation measures. | UNDP  FAO  MAAIF |
| 11 | Indigenous peoples participating in project activities and living outside direct project intervention areas block the project | May 2016 | Social | Project interventions cannot go ahead or are unsustainable due to the lack of buy-in from indigenous peoples.  P = 2  I = 4 | * Indigenous people that reside in the project area will be duly consulted in PY1 before starting project operations. According to FAO Policy on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples[[21]](#footnote-21) and the Environmental and Social Management Guidelines[[22]](#footnote-22) , a Free, Prior and Informed Consent process should be conducted, and a Grievance Mechanism will be made available | FAO  MAAIF |

1. Social and environmental safeguards:

An Environmental and Social Screening was conducted on the project. The project is rated as a category 1. Details can be found in Annex A, section 3.3.1. Environmental and social grievances will be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR.

iv. Sustainability and Scaling Up:

To further strengthen the sustainability of the IAP project, interventions will be implemented in a phased approach. This includes the development of technical capacity, which will be pre-requisite to working with communities. Government staff (extension agents) will be trained in the farmer field school approach, so that they may adopt this methodology in all their work – and continue doing so beyond the project life-span. Additionally agreements will be established with individuals trained to ensure that they remain in the relevant government departments for the minimum period after receiving the training.

Ultimately, the sustainability of the project will largely depend on the willingness of stakeholders to adopt the interventions and continue to pursue them beyond the duration of the project. Suitable technical, legal and institutional capacity is necessary at both local and sub-regional level for sustainability to be achieved. Although restoring the degraded landscape will be a long-term result of the project, a range of activities have been include in the project which link the land users to value chains, to ensure they can see returns for their investments (of time, energy – and in some instances money) - “quick-wins”.

Through the use of the APFS and FFS and other participatory approaches, inclusion of exchange visits and activities to share information on project achievements are designed to ensure that post-project other land users in Karamoja may learn of and emulate the achievements of the project.

The sustainability of IAP project interventions will be strengthened through a range of activities. It is expected that the multi-stakeholder platforms established under Component 1 will be maintained after project completion, using local and regional governments’ own resources. The project will work to demonstrate the clear development benefits of these platforms to encourage their continued use. Component 2 includes a wide range of awareness raising and training activities to ensure that the project beneficiaries, wider communities in the sub-region and technical staff will be supported to better conserve, protect and enhance the natural and ago-ecosystems of Karamoja, also how these actions can improve their livelihoods through increasing the efficiency of their resource use. This will build on their indigenous knowledge.

The project is expected to lead to significant environmental benefits, namely through the reversal of land degradation trends and through the restoration of key ecosystem services. This will include restoration of vegetative cover, sustainable management of soils and water, sustainable harvesting of biomass and biodiversity. The project does not anticipate any negative environmental impacts.

***Tenure Security***

The lack of tenure security has proven to have a detrimental impact long-term sustainability of any intervention and to undermine development efforts. Karamoja is an area of high interest for both Government and development partners, and there is a shared understanding that development will not be achieved unless tenure issues and grievances are addressed.

The project will include capacity development for local governments in the application of the Voluntary Guidelines on Land tenure, as well as other sustainable approaches to preventing and resolving land conflicts. The project will also work with local governments to recognize and formalize collective land ownership rights in using a methodology successfully piloted by FAO in Kasese district. This will provide a way to ensure long-term sustainability of GEF intervention and will help ensure that the targeted communities are investing on the basis of tenure security.

# Project Results Framework

This project contributes to the achievement of the SDGs, in particular SDG 2 on the reduction of hunger, SDG 13 on climate change, SDG 15 on biodiversity, land degradation and deforestation, and their related targets, as follows:

* By 2030, end hunger and ensure access by all people, in particular the poor and people in vulnerable situations, including infants, to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round
* By 2030, end all forms of malnutrition, including achieving, by 2025, the internationally agreed targets on stunting and wasting in children under 5 years of age, and address the nutritional needs of adolescent girls, pregnant and lactating women and older persons
* By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment
* By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality
* Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries
* By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and dry lands, in line with obligations under international agreements
* By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally
* By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation-neutral world
* By 2030, ensure the conservation of mountain ecosystems, including their biodiversity, in order to enhance their capacity to provide benefits that are essential for sustainable development
* Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species

The project also makes indirect contributions to other SDG targets, incuding conservation of agricultural biodiversity (seed banks - Component 2), improving water use efficiency and increasing access to water (Component 2), and Goal 5 on gender.

| **COMPONENT / OUTCOME / Output** | **INDICATOR** | **BASELINE** | **Mid term target** | **End Term TARGET** | **Means of Verification** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal: to improve food security by addressing the environmental drivers of food insecurity and their root causes in Karamoja sub-region** | **Percentage of households suffering from hunger in Karamoja** | **92% of households suffer from moderate or severe hunger in Karamoja (preliminary results from HH-BAT, January 2016)** | **A 15% reduction in the number of households suffering from moderate or severe hunger, among which 35% are female-headed households, at mid-project.** | **A 25% reduction in the number of households suffering from moderate or severe hunger, among which 35% are female-headed households, by end of project.** | **Household Surveys/HH-BAT (FIES)** |
| **Objective: to contribute to enhancing long-term environmental sustainability and resilience of food production systems in the Karamoja Sub-Region** | **Increase in intra and inter-seasonal livestock and crop productivity arising from SLM and INRM practices** | **At present, the only available data is the average district level yield. During the baseline study, the project will strive to collect household level data. Maize 1.2  Sorghum: 0.65 Beans: 0.35 Cassava: 8.0 Sweet Potato:8.0** | **A 20% increase in productivity of cereals, pulses and vegetables, in all seasons, in 2000 hectares by mid-project.   A 10% increase in cattle and small stock in all seasons productivity (milk/meat/eggs) by mid-project.** | **A 20% increase in productivity of maize, sorghum, cassava and sweet potato, vegetables and beans, in 5000 hectares by end of project.   A 15% increase in cattle and small stock productivity (milk/meat/eggs), by end of project.** | **HH-BAT (SLM) - Food security and livelihood surveys - Seasonal crop production reports by District production Departments and MAAIF - Market surveys - Systematic data collection and analysis by FFS/APFS through links with ZARDI / University** |
| OUTCOME 1: Supportive policies and incentives in place at district level to support improved crop and livestock production, food value-chains and INRM | Number of supportive policies and incentives in place at district level to support viable SLM/INRM approaches | While some enabling policies are adopted at the national level, their local implementation and application is weak. For example, the land policy is not fully implemented and customary rights are not formally recognized. The pastoral policy remains a draft at national level, and cattle corridors are not formally re-established. | Mechanisms for enhancing the application of SLM/ INRM polices identified, by mid-project | At least 1 policy or 1 incentive in force to support viable SLM/INRM approaches and related food value-chains at landscape level in each selected site, by end of project | Progress report, Policy briefs |
| *Output 1.1: Operational multi-stakeholder platforms are supporting INRM at district and regional levels* | *Number of multi-stakeholder platforms established supporting INRM per district, within which a percentage of women, men, youth, and indigenous people are represented* | *At the moment, there are a few regional stakeholder platforms, such as the donor coordination group spearheaded by the Ministry of Karamoja Affairs, a few ad hoc local NGO coordinating groups, and some private sector associations. There is no single multi-stakeholder platform for the region and collaboration is unequal from site to site. There is no platform for coordination at district level that brings together all relevant stakeholders.* | *An analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities related to multi-stakeholder platforms at the district and regional levels is complete by mid-project.* | *At least 1 multi-stakeholder platform per district, supporting INRM, within which at least 30% are women, 30% are men, 20% are youth, and as appropriate 10% are indigenous people to represent communities, by end of project. One operational and comprehensive regional multi-stakeholder platform that includes meaningful participation by NGOs, private sector, CBOs, CSOs, government and development partners and that is linked to district level platforms, by end of project.* | *Meeting reports, outlining participating actors, institutions, NGOs, CBOs, private sector organization and meeting agenda* |
| 1.1.1. Assessment of existing sectoral, interest-based and stakeholder-based platforms in Karamoja and needs assessment. | | | | | | |
| 1.1.2 Create/strengthen multi-stakeholder platforms at the local (district) level with CBOs, NGOs and private sector and government, working through extension services and focused on value chain development, SLM and INRM. | | | | | | |
|
| 1.1.3 Work with Ministry of Karamoja Affairs and other relevant ministries/stakeholders (such as the Ministry of Land and Ministry of Trade) to bring together platforms at the regional level to facilitate knowledge exchange and collaboration on INRM (exchange and harmonization of approaches, joint awareness and capacity development events, including linkages with regional platforms such as the Pastoralists Knowledge Hub or the World Initiative Sustainable Pastoralism – WISP) | | | | | | |
|
| 1.1.4 Facilitate the integration of the priorities expressed by local multi-stakeholder platforms into district planning and budgeting and to increase budget lines for SLM and INRM in line with the various national action plans for food security, SLM strategic investment plan, for climate resilience and preventing land degradation and biodiversity loss. | | | | | | |
| 1.1.5. Produce and disseminate a wide range of awareness raising materials on the project, SLM and INRM (pictorial, in local languages for print, radio, dramas etc.) as well as relevant case studies. | | | | | | |
|
|
| *Output 1.2: Adequate legal instruments enabling INRM, land use planning and enforcement in place* | *Number of legal instruments, policies, by-laws applied in Karamoja sub-region enabling INRM, land use planning and enforcement* | *0* | *A thorough assessment of legal gaps and needs for each district is completed by mid-project.* | *At least one INRM-enabling legal instrument, policy or by-law under implementation in each district by end of project.* | *Reports on best practices , Policy briefs, legal documents, council documents* |
| 1.2.1 Facilitate the review / amendment / drafting of by-laws & ordinances to ensure the integration of INRM and diversified production systems on the basis of a legal framework assessment for each district and training of local council personnel, and work with MoJ to support LGs in securing final approval and gazetting legal instruments. | | | | | | |
|
| 1.2.2 Support local councils, including all relevant departments, through multi-stakeholder platforms in the review or establishment of community-based land use plans supporting INRM / SLM and land use conflict prevention/reduction, linked to the national and district level physical development plans, and inclusive of cattle corridors, conservation and migration routes/cattle corridors. | | | | | | |
|
|
|
| 1.2.3 Train local councils, NGOs and CBOs on the application of appropriate guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests for resolving land tenure issues, within the framework of the established Land Act, Land and Land Use Policies and regulations, and provide support for the formalization of customary collective rights to support collaborative rangeland management. | | | | | | |
|
|
| 1.2.4 Facilitate the formalization of land ownership rights particularly for women, elderly and the youth | | | | | | |
|
| OUTCOME 2: Increased land area under integrated natural resources management (INRM) and SLM practices for a more productive Karamoja landscape | Number of hectares of cropland/rangeland/forest under integrated natural resources management and SLM per district | 0 | 225 ha of cropland, 90 ha of rangeland and 300 ha of forests per district are under INRM / SLM systems, by mid-project | 450 ha of cropland, 180 ha of rangeland and 600 ha of forests per district are under INRM / SLM systems, by end of project | Annual technical reports, Visual observations, Annual reports on production numbers per district or per landscape, Annual APFS/FFS reports |
| *Output 2.1: Institutional technical capacities are strengthened to implement INRM/SLM* | *Number of people trained on INRM, among which a percentage are women* | *0* | *At least 25 people per district, trained on INRM, among which half are women, by mid-project* | *N/A* | *List of participants to training (by gender), Training reports, training manuals* |
| 2.1.1. Train district technical staff / extension staff and volunteer community members in participatory SLM and INRM approaches including pastoral/rangeland management, catchment /watershed management, agro-ecological approaches, climate smart agriculture and the APFS/FFS methodology and energy savings approaches | | | | | | |
|
|
|
| 2.1.2 Provide training for decentralized MAAIF, DLG and APFS trainers on agro-meteorological information dissemination (with MAAIF and UMA) | | | | | | |
|
| 2.1.3 Integrate Karamoja Drought Early Warning System into the national EWS through the dissemination of agro-met info and advisories to local government and to the general public through radio and other fora such as local elders forums, etc.. | | | | | | |
|
| *Output 2.2: Increase in the number of community members trained in INRM / SLM techniques* | *Number of community members trained in INRM and SLM practices, 50% of which are women* | *0* | 6,000 community members trained in INRM/SLM (soil, water, biodiversity) by mid-project, among which half are women | 12,000 community members trained in integrated natural resources management and SLM, among which half are women by end of project | *Visual observations, yield data, Annual reports on production numbers per district or per landscape, HH-BAT* |
| 2.2.1. Build capacity of men, women, youth, elders and newly sedentary former pastoralists on integrated crop-livestock farming and horticulture / catchment and territorial management / SLM technologies conservation agriculture / and climate smart agriculture (CSA) through the establishment of and technical support to new and existing APFS and FFS (including field demonstration and other training events). | | | | | | |
| 2.2.1b Build capacity of implementing partners, service providers and farmers on relevant approaches for SLM/INRM | | | | | | |
| 2.2.2 Demonstrate the benefits of pasture improvement for rangeland rehabilitation and sustainable management (linked to 1.2.3), using resilient species of grass/shrubs, including the demonstration of holistic grazing management. | | | | | | |
|
|
| 2.2.3 Establish temporary enclosure areas for farmer assisted natural regeneration of vegetation in line with a land use plan agreed in Outcome 1 (1.2.2). | | | | | | |
|
| 2.2.4 Undertake reforestation and rehabilitation in hotspots identified in community land use plans (1.2.2.) (e.g. riverine areas, watering points, steep slopes, gullies) with a focus on increasing biodiversity, productivity and climate resilience using beneficial indigenous tree species such as Acacia gum, tamarind, shea nut and palatable grasses and shrubs. | | | | | | |
| 2.2.5. Implement rainwater harvesting techniques for enhanced productivity and resilience to drought in fields (e.g. tied ridges, retention ditches, zai, half-moons, stone lines) and sand dams (where feasible) for crop, livestock and household use (e.g. roof where feasible or below ground collection tanks). | | | | | | |
| *Output 2.3: Community groups are benefiting from income-generating activities (IGAs) introduced by the project* | *Number of people participating in alternative livelihoods schemes addressing SLM/INRM in the broader Karamoja landscape, 60% of which are women* | *0* | *At least 1000 community members, of which at least 60% are women, participate in alternative livelihoods schemes and small grant projects addressing SLM/INRM in the broader Karamoja landscape by mid-term* | *At least 2500 community members, of which at least 60% are women, participate in alternative livelihoods schemes and small grant projects addressing SLM/INRM in the broader Karamoja landscape by end of project* | *Annual reports on production numbers for each value chain, per district, HHBAT, producer surveys* |
| 2.3.1 In cooperation with Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Institute (ZARDI), organize youth and women in producer groups or in VSLAs, to develop seed multiplication skills and cereal banking systems among crop farmers to improve supplies of local seed varieties, especially those with drought coping mechanisms and / or a high % recovery post-drought. | | | | | | |
| 2.3.2 Work through existing or new APFS/FFS to disseminate improved crop/livestock production techniques (linked to 2.2.1) for increased household income, including through linkages with the private sector and provision of technical and physical capacity for value addition in traditional and innovative value chains. | | | | | | |
| 2.3.3. Perform viability and feasibility assessments for preselected value chains, including detailed economic and market studies | | | | | | |
|
| 2.3.4 Develop resilient value chains for increased income: | | | | | | |
| 2.3.4a Explore the potential for sustainable charcoal production working with the NFA and Ministry of Energy, youth and women groups, to promote the introduction of retort kilns and improved cookstoves for energy savings and establish dedicated woodlots for wood fuel at household and manyatta level to produce charcoal more efficiently (with GHG mitigation benefits) under a value-chain approach, and to explore other sources of energy. | | | | | | |
| 2.3.4b Work with local NGOs and small industries to develop practical skills and encourage youth and women to set-up businesses that make better use of grassland such as fodder harvesting, storage and sale under a value-chain approach; basket making, thatching, seed multiplication (link to 2.3.3) of fodder crops etc | | | | | | |
| 2.3.4c Work with local NGOs to train farmer groups in processing and transforming indigenous plants which have food security and global ecological importance (Local, National and International benefits)E.g: Aloes, Tamarind, Acacia Spices,Amarula, among others | | | | | | |
| 2.3.4d Work with local NGOs to organize farmers in beekeeping production groups and provide support based on a cost sharing arrangement (equipment and storage facility) and training in bee-keeping, also processing of honey and related products (learn from APFS networks in Amudat District and the Tepeth Community in Moroto District) | | | | | | |
| 2.3.4e Organize women and youth in producer groups to establish piggeries and small stock rearing facilities (chickens for egg production, goats, ducks) in communities and in landscapes where it is appropriate | | | | | | |
| 2.3.5 Conduct FPIC assessment and consultation | | | | | | |
| Output 2.4 Community level small grant projects in the Karamoja region that enhance ecosystem services, sustainable land management, innovate alternative livelihood options, are implemented | Number of Civil Society practising SLM / INRM issues in Karamoja through the Small Grants Program | 0 | 25% of grant amount disbursed by mid-term, of which at least 50% is allocated to women and youth groups | 100% of grant amount disbursed by end of project, at least 50% of which is disbursed to women and youth groups. | project reoprts, SGP reports |
| 2.4.1 Deliver small grant projects focusing on a set of agreed themes including: restoration of ecosystem services, forest cover and biodiversity, water harvesting and conservation, implementation of erosion control techniques, innovative sustainable livelihoods and livelihoods approaches, post harvest management, business skills development, with particular attention to gender-based strategies | | | | | | |
| OUTCOME 3. Framework in place for multi-scale assessment, monitoring and integration of resilience in production landscape and monitoring of GEBs | Level of available data on resilience and GEBs | There is little available data on resilience and no data on GEBs, including biodiversity | Low level of available data on resilience and GEBs by mid-project | At least, medium level of available data on resilience and GEBs by the end of the project | Annual technical reports and specific survey results |
| *Output 3.1: Assessment and Monitoring of GEBs* | *Number of monitoring and assessment exercises conducted during the project, within multi-stakeholder platform* | *There are no monitoring and assessment exercises* | *Two M&E exercises by mid-project (baseline, MTR)* | *Three statistically representative M&E exercises conducted and changes analysed (baseline, mid term and end of project assessment and monitoring) over the duration of the project per selected landscape, by end of project* | *Maps, technical reports* |
| 3.1.1. Select assessment methodology and tools and conduct baseline survey for selected sites including household survey and local landscape diagnostics (Land degradation types, severity and causes, effectiveness of SLM measures and impacts on ecosystems and livelihoods) | | | | | | |
| 3.1.2. Provide training to PCU and project beneficiaries in methods and tools for rigorous Monitoring and evaluation of project indicators and participatory monitoring | | | | | | |
|
| 3.1.3 Regular assessment of agro-biodiversity at the district level including varieties/breeds, species and habitat diversity and associated functions (e.g. pollination, pest and disease control) and impacts in terms of resilience | | | | | | |
|
| 3.1.4 Train technical and extension staff (GO and NGOs) in the use of selected methodology and tools to perform assessments of local land resources (LD and SLM) and livelihoods diagnostics and to assess and document INRM best practices | | | | | | |
|
| *Output 3.2: Capacity in place to apply appropriate tools and practices for monitoring resilience at multiple scales* | *Number of workshops held on monitoring resilience within multi-stakeholder platforms (created in Component 1)* | *0* | *2 workshops by mid-term on monitoring resilience and building capacity for M&E, within the multi-stakeholder platforms, to which 50% of participants are women* | *At least 1 workshop held per year on monitoring resilience and building capacity for M&E, within the multi-stakeholder platform, among which 50% of participants are women* | *List of participants of workshops* |
| 3.2.1. Within multi-stakeholder platforms created at the district level in Component 1, conduct participatory M&A using the selected methodology and tools and hold annual workshops to learn from M&A and disseminate the use of appropriate tools and practices for monitoring resilience | | | | | | |
| 3.2.2.In partnership with relevant projects and partners in the region, exchange on monitoring and assessment of multiple benefits of INRM from farm-household to landscape level (ecosystem services, food and livelihood security, climate resilience) and train local NGOs and private sector actors (data collection and analysis of costs, benefits and impacts towards SDG targets) | | | | | | |
| *Output 3.3 .Project is linked to regional program* | *Extent to which the project is participating in the regional programme* | *N-A* | *The project is participating in meetings at least once a year and there is an effective programmatic linkage* | *The project is participating in meetings at least once a year and there is an effective programmatic linkage* | *Program meeting agendas and list of participants, MTR and final evaluation* |
| 3.3.1. Participation in regional program activities including study tours, research, knowledge sharing | | | | | | |

# Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan

The project results as outlined in the project results framework will be monitored annually and evaluated periodically during project implementation to ensure the project effectively achieves these results.

Project-level monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken in compliance with UNDP requirements as outlined in the [UNDP POPP](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/accountability/programme_and_operationspoliciesandprocedures.html) and [UNDP Evaluation Policy](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/accountability/evaluation/evaluation_policyofundp.html). While these UNDP requirements are not outlined in this project document, the UNDP Country Office will work with the relevant project stakeholders to ensure UNDP M&E requirements are met in a timely fashion and to high quality standards. Additional mandatory GEF-specific M&E requirements (as outlined below) will be undertaken in accordance with the [GEF M&E policy](http://www.thegef.org/gef/Evaluation%20Policy%202010) and other relevant GEF policies.

In addition to these mandatory UNDP and GEF M&E requirements, other M&E activities deemed necessary to support project-level adaptive management will be agreed during the Project Inception Workshop and will be detailed in the Inception Report. This will include the exact role of project target groups and other stakeholders in project M&E activities including the GEF Operational Focal Point and national/regional institutes assigned to undertake project monitoring. The GEF Operational Focal Point will strive to ensure consistency in the approach taken to the GEF-specific M&E requirements (notably the GEF Tracking Tools) across all GEF-financed projects in the country. This could be achieved for example by using one national institute to complete the GEF Tracking Tools for all GEF-financed projects in the country, including projects supported by other GEF Agencies.

**M&E Oversight and monitoring responsibilities:**

Project Manager: The Project Manager is responsible for day-to-day project management and regular monitoring of project results and risks, including social and environmental risks. The Project Manager will ensure that all project staff maintain a high level of transparency, responsibility and accountability in M&E and reporting of project results. The Project Manager will inform the Project Board, the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF RTA of any delays or difficulties as they arise during implementation so that appropriate support and corrective measures can be adopted.

The Project Manager will develop annual work plans based on the multi-year work plan included in Annex A, including annual output targets to support the efficient implementation of the project. The Project Manager will ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring the results framework indicators are monitored annually in time for evidence-based reporting in the GEF PIR, and that the monitoring of risks and the various plans/strategies developed to support project implementation (e.g. gender strategy, KM strategy etc..) occur on a regular basis.

Project Board: The Project Board will take corrective action as needed to ensure the project achieves the desired results. The Project Board will hold project reviews to assess the performance of the project and appraise the Annual Work Plan for the following year. In the project’s final year, the Project Board will hold an end-of-project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up and to highlight project results and lessons learned with relevant audiences. This final review meeting will also discuss the findings outlined in the project terminal evaluation report and the management response.

Project Implementing Partner: The Implementing Partner is responsible for providing any and all required information and data necessary for timely, comprehensive and evidence-based project reporting, including results and financial data, as necessary and appropriate. The Implementing Partner will strive to ensure project-level M&E is undertaken by national institutes, and is aligned with national systems so that the data used by and generated by the project supports national systems.

UNDP Country Office: The UNDP Country Office will support the Project Manager as needed, including through annual supervision missions. The annual supervision missions will take place according to the schedule outlined in the annual work plan. Supervision mission reports will be circulated to the project team and Project Board within one month of the mission. The UNDP Country Office will initiate and organize key GEF M&E activities including the annual GEF PIR, the *independent mid-term review* and the independent terminal evaluation. The UNDP Country Office will also ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality.

The UNDP Country Office is responsible for complying with all UNDP project-level M&E requirements as outlined in the [UNDP POPP](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/accountability/programme_and_operationspoliciesandprocedures.html). This includes ensuring the UNDP Quality Assurance Assessment during implementation is undertaken annually; that annual targets at the output level are developed, and monitored and reported using UNDP corporate systems; the regular updating of the ATLAS risk log; and, the updating of the UNDP gender marker on an annual basis based on gender mainstreaming progress reported in the GEF PIR and the UNDP ROAR. Any quality concerns flagged during these M&E activities (e.g. annual GEF PIR quality assessment ratings) must be addressed by the UNDP Country Office and the Project Manager.

The UNDP Country Office will retain all M&E records for this project for up to seven years after project financial closure in order to support ex-post evaluations undertaken by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) and/or the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO).

UNDP-GEF Unit: Additional M&E and implementation quality assurance and troubleshooting support will be provided by the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor and the UNDP-GEF Directorate as needed.

**Audit**: The project will be audited according to UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies on NIM implemented projects.[[23]](#footnote-23)

**Additional GEF monitoring and reporting requirements:**

Inception Workshop and Report: A project inception workshop will be held within two months after the project document has been signed by all relevant parties to, amongst others:

a) Re-orient project stakeholders to the project strategy and discuss any changes in the overall context that influence project implementation;

b) Discuss the roles and responsibilities of the project team, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms;

c) Review the results framework and finalize the indicators, means of verification and monitoring plan;

d) Discuss reporting, monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities and finalize the M&E budget; identify national/regional institutes to be involved in project-level M&E; discuss the role of the GEF OFP in M&E;

e) Update and review responsibilities for monitoring the various project plans and strategies, including the risk log; Environmental and Social Management Plan and other safeguard requirements; the gender strategy; the knowledge management strategy, and other relevant strategies;

f) Review financial reporting procedures and mandatory requirements, and agree on the arrangements for the annual audit; and

g) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings and finalize the first year annual work plan.

The Project Manager will prepare the inception report no later than one month after the inception workshop. The inception report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and will be approved by the Project Board.

GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR): The Project Manager, the UNDP Country Office, and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor will provide objective input to the annual GEF PIR covering the reporting period July (previous year) to June (current year) for each year of project implementation. The Project Manager will ensure that the indicators included in the project results framework are monitored annually in advance of the PIR submission deadline so that progress can be reported in the PIR. Any environmental and social risks and related management plans will be monitored regularly, and progress will be reported in the PIR.

The PIR submitted to the GEF will be shared with the Project Board. The UNDP Country Office will coordinate the input of the GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders to the PIR as appropriate. The quality rating of the previous year’s PIR will be used to inform the preparation of the subsequent PIR.

Lessons learned and knowledge generation: Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to the project. The project will identify, analyse and share lessons learned that might be beneficial to the design and implementation of similar projects and disseminate these lessons widely. There will be continuous information exchange between this project and other projects of similar focus in the same country, region and globally.

GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools: The following GEF Tracking Tool(s) will be used to monitor global environmental benefit results:

The baseline/CEO Endorsement GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool(s) – submitted in Annex D to this project document – will be updated by the Project Manager/Team and shared with *the* mid-term review consultants and terminal evaluation consultants (not the evaluation consultants hired to undertake the *MTR* or the TE) before the required review/evaluation missions take place. The updated GEF Tracking Tool(s) will be submitted to the GEF along with the completed Mid-term Review report and Terminal Evaluation report.

Independent Mid-term Review (MTR): An independent mid-term review process will begin after the second PIR has been submitted to the GEF, and the MTR report will be submitted to the GEF in the same year as the 3rd PIR. The MTR findings and responses outlined in the management response will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project’s duration. The terms of reference, the review process and the MTR report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Center](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#gef) (ERC). As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be ‘independent, impartial and rigorous’. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be involved and consulted during the terminal evaluation process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP-GEF Directorate. The final MTR report will be available in English and will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and approved by the Project Board.

Terminal Evaluation (TE): An independent terminal evaluation (TE) will take place upon completion of all major project outputs and activities. The terminal evaluation process will begin three months before operational closure of the project allowing the evaluation mission to proceed while the project team is still in place, yet ensuring the project is close enough to completion for the evaluation team to reach conclusions on key aspects such as project sustainability. The Project Manager will remain on contract until the TE report and management response have been finalized. The terms of reference, the evaluation process and the final TE report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Center](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guidance.shtml#gef). As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be ‘independent, impartial and rigorous’. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be involved and consulted during the terminal evaluation process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP-GEF Directorate. The final TE report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and will be approved by the Project Board. The TE report will be publically available in English on the UNDP ERC.

The UNDP Country Office will include the planned project terminal evaluation in the UNDP Country Office evaluation plan, and will upload the final terminal evaluation report in English and the corresponding management response to the UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). Once uploaded to the ERC, the UNDP IEO will undertake a quality assessment and validate the findings and ratings in the TE report, and rate the quality of the TE report. The UNDP IEO assessment report will be sent to the GEF IEO along with the project terminal evaluation report.

Final Report: The project’s terminal PIR along with the terminal evaluation (TE) report and corresponding management response will serve as the final project report package. The final project report package shall be discussed with the Project Board during an end-of-project review meeting to discuss lesson learned and opportunities for scaling up.

**Mandatory GEF M&E Requirements and M&E Budget:**

| **GEF M&E requirements** | **Primary responsibility** | **Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget[[24]](#footnote-24) (US$)** | | **Time frame** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF grant** | **Co-financing** |
| **Inception Workshop** | UNDP Country Office | USD 8,000 |  | Within two months of project document signature |
| **Inception Report** | Project Manager | None | None | Within two weeks of inception workshop |
| **Standard UNDP/FAO monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP and joint ProDoc** | UNDP/FAO Country Office | None | None | Quarterly, six montly, annually |
| **Monitoring of indicators in project results framework** | M&E officer  Project Manager | None | *None* | Annually |
| **GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)** | Project Manager and UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF team | None | None | Annually |
| **NIM/OPIM Audit as per UNDP/FAO audit policies** | UNDP Country Office  FAO Country Office | Per year: USD 5,000 |  | Annually or other frequency as per UNDP/FAO Audit policies |
| **Lessons learned and knowledge generation** | Project Manager |  |  | Annually |
| **Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant** | Project Manager  UNDP/FAO CO | None |  | On-going |
| **Addressing environmental and social grievances** | Project Manager  UNDP/FAO Country Office  BPPS as needed | None for time of project manager, and UNDP CO |  |  |
| **Project Board meetings** | Project Board  UNDP/FAO Country Office  Project Manager | *23,000* |  | At minimum annually |
| **Supervision missions** | UNDP Country Office  FAO Country Office | None**[[25]](#footnote-25)** |  | Annually |
| **Oversight missions** | UNDP-GEF team  FAO GEF Team | None25 |  | Troubleshooting as needed |
| **Knowledge management as outlined in Outcome 3** | Project Manager |  |  | On-going |
| **GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits** | UNDP Country Office and Project Manager and UNDP-GEF team | None |  | To be determined. |
| **Mid-term GEF Tracking Tool to be updated by (add name of national/regional institute if relevant)** | Project Manager | NONE |  | Before mid-term review mission takes place. |
| **Independent Mid-term Review (MTR) and management response** | UNDP/FAO Country Office and Project team and UNDP/FAO-GEF team | USD 30,000 |  | Between 2nd and 3rd PIR. |
| **Terminal GEF Tracking Tool to be updated by (add name of national/regional institute if relevant)** | Project Manager | NONE |  | Before terminal evaluation mission takes place |
| **Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) included in UNDP evaluation plan, and management response** | UNDP/FAO Country Office and Project team and UNDP/FAO-GEF team | USD 30,000 - |  | At least three months before operational closure |
| **TOTAL indicative COST**  Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses | | 111,000 |  |  |

# Governance and Management Arrangements

Roles and responsibilities of the project’s governance mechanism: The project will be implemented following UNDP’s national implementation modality, according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of Uganda*,* and the Country Programme*.*

The **Implementing Partner** for this project is Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF)*.* The Implementing Partner is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources.

The project organisation structure is as follows:

**Project Manager**

**Project Board**

**Senior Beneficiary:**

**MAAIF**

**Executive:**

**MAAIF**

**Senior Supplier:**

GEF

**Project Assurance**

**UNDP**

**FAO**

**Project Support**

M&E Officer, Finance Officer

**Project Organization Structure**

**TEAM A**

**TEAM C**

**TEAM B**

The **Project Board** (also called Project Steering Committee) is responsible for making by consensus, management decisions when guidance is required by the Project Manager, including recommendation for UNDP/Implementing Partner approval of project plans and revisions. In order to ensure UNDP’s ultimate accountability, Project Board decisions should be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. In case a consensus cannot be reached within the Board, final decision shall rest with the UNDP Programme Manager. The terms of reference for the Project Board are contained in Annex*.* The Project Board is comprised of the following individuals:

* MAAIF (SLM Team),
* FAO,
* UNDP,
* MAAIF directorates (production, livestock, water, etc)
* Ministry of Water
* Ministry of Environment
* Office of Karamoja Affairs
* PMO-RALG
* Representatives of local governments
* Representatives of NGOs and CBOs
* Representatives from the private sector

The members of the PSC will each assure the role of a Focal Point for the project in their respective agencies. Hence the project will have a Focal Point in each concerned institution. As Focal Points in their agency, the concerned PSC members will (i) technically oversee activities in their sector, (ii) ensure a fluid two-way exchange of information and knowledge between their agency and the project, (iii) facilitate coordination and links between the project activities and the work plan of their agency, and (iv) facilitate the provision of co-financing to the project.

The **Project Manager** will run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Implementing Partner within the constraints laid down by the Board. The Project Manager function will end when the final project terminal evaluation report, and other documentation required by the GEF and UNDP, has been completed and submitted to UNDP (including operational closure of the project).

The **project assurance** role will be ensured by the UNDP Country Office and the FAO Country Office jointly. Additional quality assurance will be provided by the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor and FAO Technical Advisors as needed.

UNDP Direct Project Services as requested by Government :

UNDP and FAO will provide the following services. Based on initial budgets, the total amount of Direct Project Service Costs shall not exceed USD 6,296 for FAO. Please refer to Annex X for agreement letters

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DPC Calculation sheet (as per UNDP 2016 UPL) - Uganda Mid-High cost** | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Service provided** | **Unit cost** | **Nb of units** | **Total** | **Notes** |
| Payment process | 36.1 | 3 | 108.3 | Applied to grants and sub-contracts only, not inclusive of SGP |
| Staff selection and recruitment | 586.14 | 3 | 1758.42 | for PMU staff (PM, FA, M&E) |
| Staff HR benefits administration | 396.88 | 3 | 1190.64 | for three staff, twice |
| Consultant recruitment | 228.29 | 12 | 2739.48 | based on 12 consultancies for the entire duration of the project, single call for candidates |
| Procurement involving local CAP | 524.49 | 2 | 1048.98 | applies to all sub-contracts and procurement of goods |
| Procurement not involving local CAP | 206.76 |  | 0 |  |
|  |  |  | **6845.82** | Costs will be spread out evenly throughout the 5 years of the project. |

Agreement on intellectual property rights and use of logo on the project’s deliverables and disclosure of information**:** In order to accord proper acknowledgement to the GEF for providing grant funding, the GEF logo will appear together with the UNDP logo on all promotional materials, other written materials like publications developed by the project, and project hardware. Any citation on publications regarding projects funded by the GEF will also accord proper acknowledgement to the GEF. Information will be disclosed in accordance with relevant policies notably the UNDP Disclosure Policy[[26]](#footnote-26) and the GEF policy on public involvement[[27]](#footnote-27).

Project management: A Project Management Unit (PMU) will be established within the MAAIF, and will be hosted in a MAAIF District office, preferably in Moroto to ensure proximity to all project sites. All PMU staff will be jointly recruited by MAAIF, UNDP and FAO. The PMU will include:

* a full time National Project Coordinator (NPC);
* a full time monitoring and evaluation expert;
* a full time operation and administration officer.

The ToRs of the PMU staff are provided in Annex 7. The PMU staff will be recruited by the project and will report (through the NPC) to the Project Steering Committee and budget holders. Some key functions of the PMU will be:

* Technically identify, plan, design and support all activities;
* Liaise with government agencies and regularly advocate on behalf of the project;
* Prepare the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B) and monitoring plan;
* Be responsible for day-to-day implementation of the project in line with the AWP;
* Ensure a results-based approach to project implementation, including maintaining a focus on project results and impacts as defined by the results framework indicators;
* Coordinate project interventions with other ongoing activities;
* Monitor project progress;
* Be responsible for the elaboration of FAO Project Progress Reports (PPR) and the annual Project Implementation Review (PIR); and
* Facilitate and support the mid-term evaluation/review and final evaluation of the project

PMU staff will be supported by national and international consultants who will be recruited during project implementation as needed. The preliminary list and ToRs of required consultants are presented in Annex 7.

# Financial Planning and Management

The total cost of the project is USD 58,139,450. This is financed through a GEF grant of USD 7,139,450 , of which 3,589,426 USD is channeled through UNDP for Outcomes 1 and 3 and output 2.4 (SGP), and 3,550,024 USD is channeled through FAO in support of Outcome 2; and USD 51,000,000 in parallel co-financing from the Government of Uganda. UNDP and FAO, as the GEF Implementing Agencies, are responsible for the execution of the GEF resources.

Parallel co-financing: The actual realization of project co-financing will be monitored during the mid-term review and terminal evaluation process and will be reported to the GEF. The planned parallel co-financing will be used as follows:.

Parallel co-financing: The actual realization of project co-financing will be monitored during the mid-term review and terminal evaluation process and will be reported to the GEF. The planned parallel co-financing will be used as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Co-financing source** | **Co-financing type** | **Co-financing amount** | **Planned Activities/Outputs** | **Risks** | **Risk Mitigation Measures** |
| *MAAIF* | *Grant* | 10,000,000 | All | *None* | *N-A* |
| MAAIF | In-Kind | 1,000,000 | All | None | *N-A* |
| Ministry of Karamoja Affairs | Grant | 40,000,000 | All | None | *N-A* |
| Total |  | 51,000,000 |  |  |  |

Budget Revision and Tolerance: As per UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP POPP, the project board will agree on a budget tolerance level for each plan under the overall annual work plan allowing the project manager to expend up to the tolerance level beyond the approved project budget amount for the year without requiring a revision from the Project Board. Should the following deviations occur, the Project Manager and UNDP Country Office will seek the approval of the UNDP-GEF team as these are considered major amendments by the GEF:

a) Budget re-allocations among components in the project with amounts involving 10% of the total project grant or more;

b) Introduction of new budget items/or components that exceed 5% of original GEF allocation.

Any over expenditure incurred beyond the available GEF grant amount will be absorbed by non-GEF resources (e.g. UNDP TRAC or cash co-financing).

Refund to Donor: Should a refund of unspent funds to the GEF be necessary, this will be managed directly by the UNDP-GEF Unit in New York.

Project Closure: Project closure will be conducted as per UNDP requirements outlined in the UNDP POPP. On an exceptional basis only, a no-cost extension beyond the initial duration of the project will be sought from in-country UNDP colleagues and then the UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator.

Operational completion: The project will be operationally completed when the last UNDP-financed inputs have been provided and the related activities have been completed. This includes the final clearance of the Terminal Evaluation Report (that will be available in English) and the corresponding management response, and the end-of-project review Project Board meeting. The Implementing Partner through a Project Board decision will notify the UNDP Country Office when operational closure has been completed. At this time, the relevant parties will have already agreed and confirmed in writing on the arrangements for the disposal of any equipment that is still the property of UNDP.

Financial completion: The project will be financially closed when the following conditions have been met:

a) The project is operationally completed or has been cancelled;

b) The Implementing Partner has reported all financial transactions to UNDP;

c) UNDP has closed the accounts for the project;

d) UNDP and the Implementing Partner have certified a final Combined Delivery Report (which serves as final budget revision).

The project will be financially completed within 12 months of operational closure or after the date of cancellation. Between operational and financial closure, the implementing partner will identify and settle all financial obligations and prepare a final expenditure report. The UNDP Country Office will send the final signed closure documents including confirmation of final cumulative expenditure and unspent balance to the UNDP-GEF Unit for confirmation before the project will be financially closed in Atlas by the UNDP Country Office.

# Total Budget and Work Plan

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Budget and Work Plan** | | | |
| Atlas Proposal or Award ID: | 00096870 | Atlas Primary Output Project ID: | 00100758 |
| Atlas Proposal or Award Title: | Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Karamoja sub region | | |
| Atlas Business Unit | UGA10 | | |
| Atlas Primary Output Project Title | Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Karamoja sub region | | |
| UNDP-GEF PIMS No. | 5577 | | |
| Implementing Partner | Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry & Fisheries (MAAIF) | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF Component/Atlas Activity** | [Responsible Party/[1]](#RANGE!_ftn1) | **Fund ID** | **Donor Name** | **Atlas Budgetary Account Code** | **ATLAS Budget Description** | **Amount Year 1 (USD)** | **Amount Year 2 (USD)** | **Amount Year 3 (USD)** | **Amount Year 4 (USD)** | **Amount Year 5 (USD)** | **Total (USD)** | ***See Budget Note:*** |
| **(Atlas Implementing Agent)** |  |
| **Output 1.1: Operational multi-stakeholder platforms are supporting INRM at district and regional levels** | **MAAIF** | **62200** | **GEF TF** | 71300 | NC - Institutional specialist | 40,000 | 20,000 | 25,000 | - | - | 85,000 | 1 |
| 71300 | NC - Communications specialist | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 37,500 | 2 |
| 74200 | Media, printing and communications costs | 10,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 70,000 | 3 |
| 75700 | Meetings and workshops | 130,000 | 140,000 | 140,000 | 140,000 | 140,000 | 690,000 | 4 |
| **Output 1.2: Adequate legal instruments enabling INRM, land use planning and enforcement in place** | **MAAIF** | **62200** | **GEF TF** | 71200 | IC - Land tenure expert | - | 24,750 | 24,750 | 24,750 | 24,750 | 99,000 | 5 |
| 71300 | NC - Legal experts (x4) | 25,000 | 45,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | 130,000 | 6 |
| 71300 | NC - Land use planning expert | - | 20,000 | - | - | - | 20,000 | 7 |
| 71300 | NC - SLM and biodiversity expert | - | 20,000 | - | - | - | 20,000 | 8 |
| 71300 | NC - Communications specialist | - | 5,000 | 5,000 | - | - | 10,000 | 9 |
| 71300 | NC - PES and carbon fund specialist | 50,000 | - | - | - | - | 50,000 | 10 |
| 71400 | Project Manager | 17,500 | 17,500 | 17,500 | 17,500 | 17,500 | 87,500 | 11 |
| 74200 | Media, printing and communications costs | - | 10,000 | 5,000 | - | - | 15,000 | 12 |
| 74200 | Sub-contract to NGO | - | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 200,000 | 13 |
| 75700 | Training workshops on legal instruments | 15,000 | 15,000 | - | - | - | 30,000 | 14 |
| 75700 | Meetings and workshops on community-based land use plans | - | 11,000 | - | - | - | 11,000 | 15 |
| 75700 | Training workshops on responsible land tenure | - | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 40,000 | 16 |
| 99999 | UNDP DPCs | 685 | 685 | 685 | 685 | 685 | 3,423 | 17 |
|  |  |  |  |  | **SUB-TOTAL OUTCOME 1** | **310,685** | **434,385** | **330,385** | **294,385** | **294,385** | **1,664,223** |  |
| **Output 2.4 Community level small grant projects in the Karamoja region that enhance ecosystem services, sustainable land management, innovate alternative livelihood options, are implemented** | **SGP** | **62200** | **GEF TF** | 72600 | SGP | - | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | **800,000** | 18 |
|  | **Sub-Total Outcome 2** | **-** | **200,000** | **200,000** | **200,000** | **200,000** | **800,000** |  |
| **Output 3.1: Assessment and Monitoring of GEBs** | **MAAIF** | **62200** | **GEF TF** | 71200 | IC - M&E specialist | 22,000 | - | - | - | - | 22,000 | 19 |
| 71200 | IC - LADA WOCAT specialist | 11,000 | - | - | - | - | 11,000 | 20 |
| 71300 | NC - Enumerators (x8) | 100,000 | - | - | 35,000 | - | 135,000 | 21 |
| 71300 | NC - SLM and biodiversity expert | 7,500 | 6,250 | 6,250 | 6,250 | 6,250 | 32,500 | 22 |
| 71400 | M&E officer | 12,500 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 72,500 | 23 |
| 75700 | Training workshops | 25,000 | - | - | - | - | 25,000 | 32 |
| **Output 3.2: Capacity in place to apply appropriate tools and practices for monitoring resilience at multiple scales** | **MAAIF** | **62200** | **GEF TF** | 71400 | M&E officer | 12,500 | 12,500 | 12,500 | 12,500 | 12,500 | 62,500 | 33 |
| 75700 | Workshops | 20,000 | - | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 35,000 | 34 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 3.3 .Project is linked to regional program** | **MAAIF** | **62200** | **GEF TF** | 71400 | Project Manager | 17,500 | 17,500 | 17,500 | 17,500 | 17,500 | 87,500 | 35 |
| 71600 | Travel to regional meetings | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 250,000 | 36 |
| 71600 | Travel costs for consultants | 30,600 | 3,750 | 3,750 | 10,750 | 3,750 | 52,600 | 37 |
| 99999 | UNDP DPCs | 685 | 685 | 685 | 685 | 685 | 3,423 | 38 |
|  |  |  |  |  | **SUB-TOTAL OUTCOME 3** | **309,285** | **105,685** | **110,685** | **152,685** | **110,685** | **789,023** |  |
| **Project Management, Monitoring and evaluation (UNDP)** | **MAAIF** | **62200** | **GEF TF** | 71400 | Finance and Administrative Officer | 25000 | 25000 | 25000 | 25000 | 25000 | 125000 | 39 |
| 71400 | Mid-term evaluation | 0 | 0 | 30000 | 0 | 0 | 30000 | 40 |
| 71400 | Final Evaluation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30000 | 30000 | 41 |
| 71600 | Travel for PM | 10000 | 10000 | 10000 | 10000 | 10181 | 50181 | 42 |
| 72200 | Materials and premises | 10000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10000 | 43 |
| 75700 | Inception meeting and SC meetings | 8000 | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 | 8000 | 31000 | 44 |
| 99999 | Annual Audits or HACTs | 0 | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 | 20000 | 45 |
| 99999 | Vehicle | 40000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40000 | 46 |
|  | **Sub-total PMC** | **93000** | **45000** | **75000** | **45000** | **78181** | **336181** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Grand TOTAL | **712,969** | **785,069** | **716,069** | **692,069** | **683,250** | **3,589,426** |  |

**FAO BUDGET**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Fund** |
| **SUBTOTAL Comp 1** | 0 |
| **SUBTOTAL Comp 2** | 3,550,024 |
| **SUBTOTAL Comp 3** | 0 |
| **Project Management Cost (PMC)** | 0 |
| **TOTAL GEF** | 3,550,024 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | **Expenditures by year** | | | | | |  |
| **Oracle code and description** | **Unit** | **No. of units** | **Unit cost** | **TOTAL GEF** | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Year 4** | **Year 5** | **NOTE** |
| **OUTCOME 2** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5300 Salaries professionals** | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5300 Sub-total salaries professionals** | | | | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** |  |
| **5570 Consultants** | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NC - Agro-pastoral expert |  |  |  | **18750** | 0 | 18750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| NC - Agro-meteorologist |  |  |  | **10000** | 0 | 0 | 10000 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| NC - Value chain development specialists (1 livestock; 1 crops; 1 alternatives) |  |  |  | **30000** | 0 | 30000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| NC - Agro-economist |  |  |  | **12500** | 0 | 12500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| *Sub-total national Consultants* | | | | ***71,250*** | ***0*** | ***61,250*** | ***10,000*** | ***0*** | ***0*** |  |
| IC - SLM and INRM specialist |  |  |  | **24750** | 0 | 24750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| IC - APFS and FFS expert |  |  |  | **24750** | 0 | 24750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| IC - Rangeland rehabilitation specialist |  |  |  | **55000** | 0 | 0 | 27500 | 0 | 27500 | 7 |
| *Sub-tot international Consultants* | | | | ***104500*** | ***0*** | ***49500*** | ***27500*** | ***0*** | ***27500*** |  |
| **5570 Sub-total consultants** | | | | **175,750** | **0** | **110,750** | **37,500** | **0** | **27,500** |  |
| **5650 Contracts** | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LoAs with IPs for promotion of catchment based INRM/SLM practices thru at least 250 APFS |  |  |  | **995,600** | - | 100,000 | 330,000 | 330,000 | 235,600 | 8 |
| Sub-contract to specialized institution for livestock |  |  |  | **220,000** | 0 | 0 | 80000 | 80000 | 60000 | 9 |
| Sub-contract to NGO for FNR |  |  |  | **300,000** | 0 | 0 | 100000 | 100000 | 100000 | 10 |
| Sub-contract to NGO for reforestation |  |  |  | **260,000** | 0 | 0 | 130000 | 130000 | 0 | 11 |
| MoU with ZARDI on seed multiplication |  |  |  | **300,000** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100000 | 200000 | 12 |
| Sub contract relevant institutions for VCD thru APFS |  |  |  | **900,000** | 0 | 0 | 300000 | 300000 | 300000 | 13 |
| Contractual Services for FPIC |  |  |  | **35,000** | 35,000 | **-** | **-** | **-** | **-** | 14 |
| **5650 Sub-total Contracts** | | | | **3,010,600** | **35,000** | **100,000** | **940,000** | **1,040,000** | **895,600** |  |
| **5900 Travel** | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Travel costs for international consultants |  |  |  | **35,545** | 0 | 23280 | 6205 | 0 | 6060 | 14 |
| Travel costs for national consultants |  |  |  | **35,205** | 0 | 21,600 | 13,605 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| **5900 Sub-total travel** | | | | **70,750** | **0** | **44,880** | **19,810** | **0** | **6,060** |  |
| **5023 Training** | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Training workshops for district/extension staff |  |  |  | **30,000** | - | 30,000 | - | - | - | 16 |
| Training workshops on agrometeorology |  |  |  | **30,000** | - | - | 30,000 | - | - | 17 |
| Demonstration workshops (rangelands) |  |  |  | **40,000** | - | - | 20,000 | - | 20,000 | 18 |
| Tailored training workshops for IPs and farmers |  |  |  | **146,410** | 146,410 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6000 Sub-total expendable procurement** | | | | **246,410** | **146,410** | **30,000** | **50,000** | **0** | **20,000** |  |
| **6100 Non-expendable procurement** | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Media, printing and communications costs |  |  |  | **15000** | 0 | 0 | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 | 20 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6100 Sub-total non-expendable procurement** | | | | **15000** | **0** | **0** | **5000** | **5000** | **5000** |  |
| **6300 GOE budget** | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FAO Direct Project Service Costs |  |  |  | **4014** | 802.8 | 802.8 | 802.8 | 802.8 | 802.8 | 21 |
| Audits and assessments for partners, service providers and IPs |  |  |  | **27500** | 9500 | 4500 | 4500 | 4500 | 4500 |  |
| **6300 Sub-total GOE budget** | | | | **31,514** | **10,303** | **5,303** | **5,303** | **5,303** | **5,303** |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |  | **3,550,024** | **191,713** | **290,933** | **1,057,613** | **1,050,303** | **959,463** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SUBTOTAL Comp 1** | **0** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SUBTOTAL Comp 2** | **3,550,024** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SUBTOTAL Comp 3** | **0** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SUBTOTAL Comp 4** | **N-A** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SUBTOTAL Comp 5** | **N\_A** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Subtotal** | **3,550,024** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **FAO Direct Project Service Costs**  **(Project Management Cost (PMC))** | **4,014** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL GEF** | **3,554,038** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**SUMMARY OF FUNDS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Donor** | **Amount Year 1** | **Amount Year 2** | **Amount Year 3** | **Amount Year 4** | **Amount Year 5** | **Total** |
| **GEF (UNDP)** | 712,969 | 785,069 | 716,069 | 692,069 | 683,250 | **3,589,426** |
| **GEF (FAO)** | 191,713 | 290,933 | 1,057,613 | 1,050,303 | 959,463 | **3,550,024** |
| **Co-finance (cash and in-kind) e.g. Government** | 10,200,000 | 10,200,000 | 10,200,000 | 10,200,000 | 10,200,000 | **51,000,000** |
| **TOTAL** | **9,412,739** | **12,350,904** | **12,534,929** | **11,795,706** | **12,045,172** | **58,139,450** |

**BUDGET NOTES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Consultant to participate in activities related to land tenure, including to train local councils, NGOs and CBOs on the application of appropriate guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests for resolving land tenure issues (activity 1.2.1) and to support the formalization of collective tenure rights (1.2.4). |
| 2 | Consultant to perform assessment of existing sectoral, interest-based and stakeholder-based platforms in Karamoja and needs assessment (activity 1.1.1), to support the establishment of multi stakeholder platforms (activity 1.1.2) and to facilitate the integration of the priorities expressed by local multi-stakeholder platforms into district planning and budgeting and to increase budget lines for SLM and INRM (activity 1.1.4) |
| Consultant to support activity 1.1.5." Produce and disseminate a wide range of awareness raising materials on the project, SLM and INRM (pictorial, in local languages for print, radio, dramas etc.) as well as relevant case studies. |
| Consultants to facilitate the review / amendment / drafting of by-laws & ordinances to ensure the integration of INRM and diversified production systems on the basis of a legal framework assessment for each district and training of local council personnel, and work with MoJ to support LGs in securing final approval and gazetting legal instruments (activity 1.2.1). Consultants will also deliver activity 1.2.3 on the training of local councils, NGOs and CBOs on the application of appropriate guidelines on responsible tenure of land, fisheries and forests for resolving land tenure issues, within the framework of the established Land Act, Land and Land Use Policies and regulations, and provide support for the formalization of customary collective rights to support collaborative rangeland management. |
| Consultant to work as part of a team under activity 1.2.1 to support local councils, including all relevant departments, through multi-stakeholder platforms in the review or establishment of community-based land use plans supporting INRM / SLM and land use conflict prevention/reduction, linked to the national and district level physical development plans, and inclusive of cattle corridors, conservation and migration routes/cattle corridors. |
| Consultant to support a team towards delivery of activity 1.2.2 .Support local councils, including all relevant departments, through multi-stakeholder platforms in the review or establishment of community-based land use plans supporting INRM / SLM and land use conflict prevention/reduction, linked to the national and district level physical development plans, and inclusive of cattle corridors, conservation and migration routes/cattle corridors" |
| Consultant to work as part of a team under activity 1.2.4 Facilitate the formalization of land ownership rights particularly for women, elderly and the youth |
| Consultant to support activity 1.2.5 to explore the potential for, and set up incentive schemes for continued sustainability, including PES and carbon funds |
| 3 | Portion of the project manager's salary (50%) |
| 4 | Costs of media and communications to support the establishment of multi stakeholder platforms (activity 1.1,2) and public awareness (activity 1.1.4) |
| Media, printing and communications costs involved in delivering output 1.2 on land tenure and collective rights |
| 5 | Sub-contract to an NGO to set up payment for ecosystem services schemes and to explore the potential for tapping into carbon funds under activity 1.2.5 |
| Costs of a HACT and procurement assessment in year 1, and annual joint audits every subsequent year. |
| 6 | Costs of workshops and meetings to support the delivery of outcome 1 on the development of multi-stakeholder platforms, awareness raising. |
| Training workshops to support activity 1.2.1 on the development of appropriate legal instruments to facilitate INRM/SLM |
| Community meetings on land use planning |
| Training workshops on responsible land tenure |
| 7 | This budget is earmarked for the UNDP Small Grants Program which will be administered separately. Detailed expenditures and items will be developed at a later date. |
| 8 | Consultant to provide training to PCU and project beneficiaries in methods and tools for rigorous Monitoring and evaluation of project indicators and participatory monitoring |
| Consultant to provide training to district staff and other stakeholders in the multi-stakeholder platform on LADA and WOCAT methodologies and to participate in the regular assessment of agro-biodiversity at the district level including varieties/breeds, species and habitat diversity and associated functions (e.g. pollination, pest and disease control) and impacts in terms of resilience |
| 9 | Consultants to perform baseline studies and household surveys during the project's M&A plan (8 individuals, 2 per district) |
| Consultants to perform regular assessment of agro-biodiversity at the district level including varieties/breeds, species and habitat diversity and associated functions (e.g. pollination, pest and disease control) and impacts in terms of resilience |
| 10 | Part of the salary for a full-time Monitoring and Evaluation officer who will be part of the Project Management Unit. |
| Part of the salary for a full-time Monitoring and Evaluation officer who will be part of the Project Management Unit. |
| Portion of the salary of the project manager |
| 11 | Participation of project staff and partners in regional program activities including study tours, research, learning and knowledge sharing and travel costs for consultants and M & E Officer |
| 12 | Purchase of a vehicle for the PMU. |
| 13 | For Miscellaneous expenses e.g bank charge etc |
| 14 | Training workshops for technical and extension staff (GO and NGOs) in the use of selected methodology and tools to perform assessments of local land resources (LD and SLM) and livelihoods diagnostics and to assess and document INRM best practices, |
| training at national and regional level, regional conferences, south-south cooperation and technical studies, study tours and visits, from which this project will benefit |
| Costs of workshops to exchange on monitoring and assessment of multiple benefits of INRM from farm-household to landscape level (ecosystem services, food and livelihood security, climate resilience) and train local NGOs and private sector actors (data collection and analysis of costs, benefits and impacts towards SDG targets) (activity 3.2.1 and 3.2.2) |
| Cost of board and other meetings etc |
| 15 | Costs of a consultancy to perform the Mid-Term Review |
| Costs of a consultancy to perform the final evaluation |
| 16 | Costs of a Finance and Administrative officer to support the PMU |
| 17 | Travel costs for the Project Management Unit |
| 18 | Costs of initial materials purchased for the PMU |
| 19 | Miscellaneous Expenses |
| 20 | DPC – for hiring of International consultants, procurement etc. |
| 21 | Costs of inception meetings |

# Legal Context

Any designations on maps or other references employed in this project document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNDP concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

# Annexes

*The following annexes can be found in PIMS 5577 – Uganda Food Security IAP Joint Project Document*

1. Multi year Workplan (*Joint Project document: Annex 2)*
2. Monitoring Plan
3. Evaluation Plan
4. GEF Tracking Tool (s) at baseline
5. Terms of Reference for Project Board, Project Manager, Chief Technical Advisor and other positions as appropriate
6. UNDP Social and Environmental and Social Screening Template (SESP)
7. Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) for moderate and high risk projects only
8. UNDP Project Quality Assurance Report
9. UNDP Risk Log
10. Results of the capacity assessment of the project implementing partner and HACT micro assessment
11. Additional agreements

**A. MONITORING PLAN**

The Project Manager will collect results data according to the following monitoring plan.

| **Monitoring** | **Indicators** | **Description** | **Data source/Collection Methods** | **Frequency** | **Responsible for data collection** | **Means of verification** | **Assumptions and Risks** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project objective from the results framework** | ***Indicator 1*** |  |  | Annually  Reported in DO tab of the GEF PIR |  |  |  |
| ***Indicator 2*** |  |  | Annually  Reported in DO tab of the GEF PIR |  |  |  |
| ***Indicator 3*** |  |  | Annually  Reported in DO tab of the GEF PIR |  |  |  |
| **Project Outcome 1** | ***Indicator 1*** |  |  | Annually  Reported in DO tab of the GEF PIR |  |  |  |
| ***Indicator 2*** |  |  | Annually |  |  |  |
| ***Indicator 3*** |  |  | Reported in DO tab of the GEF PIR |  |  |  |
| **Project Outcome 2** | ***Indicator 1*** |  |  | Annually |  |  |  |
| ***Indicator 2*** |  |  | Reported in DO tab of the GEF PIR |  |  |  |
| ***Indicator 3*** |  |  | Annually |  |  |  |
| **Project Outcome 3** | ***Indicator 1*** |  |  | Reported in DO tab of the GEF PIR |  |  |  |
| ***Indicator 2*** |  |  | Annually |  |  |  |
| ***Indicator 3*** |  |  | Reported in DO tab of the GEF PIR |  |  |  |
| **Project Outcome 4** | ***Indicator 1*** |  |  | Annually  Reported in DO tab of the GEF PIR |  |  |  |
| ***Indicator 2*** |  |  | Annually |  |  |  |
| ***Indicator 3*** |  |  | Reported in DO tab of the GEF PIR |  |  |  |
| ***Mid-term GEF Tracking Tool (if FSP project only)*** | N/A | N/A | Standard GEF Tracking Tool available at [www.thegef.org](http://www.thegef.org) Baseline GEF Tracking Tool included in Annex. | After 2nd PIR submitted to GEF |  | Completed GEF Tracking Tool |  |
| **Terminal GEF Tracking Tool** | N/A | N/A | Standard GEF Tracking Tool available at [www.thegef.org](http://www.thegef.org) Baseline GEF Tracking Tool included in Annex. | After final PIR submitted to GEF |  | Completed GEF Tracking Tool |  |
| ***Mid-term Review (if FSP project only)*** | N/A | N/A | To be outlined in MTR inception report | Submitted to GEF same year as 3rd PIR | *Independent evaluator* | Completed MTR |  |
| **Environmental and Social risks and management plans, as relevant.** | N/A | N/A | Updated SESP and management plans | Annually | Project Manager  UNDP CO | Updated SESP |  |

**B. EVALUATION PLAN**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Title** | **Planned start date**  **Month/year** | **Planned end date**  **Month/year** | **Included in the Country Office Evaluation Plan** | **Budget for consultants** | **Other budget (i.e. travel, site visits etc…)** | **Budget for translation** |
| **Mid-term review** | 3rd year |  | Yes | USD 30,000 |  | N-A |
| **Terminal Evaluation** | 5th year |  | Yes | USD 30,000 |  | N-A |
| **Total evaluation budget** | | | | USD 60,000 | | |

1. These statistics come from the Food Security and Nutrition Assessment conducted by WFP & UNICEF in 2014, in all the seven district of Karamoja sub-region with a sample of 4,105 households. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES), developed by the Voices of the Hungry (VoH) project, is an experience-based metric of severity of food insecurity that relies on people’s direct responses. These responses are collected through eight questions regarding people's access to adequate food in the last twelve months plus two questions on the frequency of most severe situations of lack of access to sufficient food. Scale: <4: no food insecurity; ≥4: moderate+severe food insecurity; ≥7 severe food insecurity [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Sample size: 384 households Kaabong, Kotido, Moroto, Napak and Nakapiripit Districts, 277 male-headed households and 107 female-headed households [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. SHARP uses a holistic approach to resilience, allowing farmers and pastoralists to express their perceptions on adequacy of and importance of different aspects of their livelihood, Each survey question cluster is used to assess the relative resilience of a specific aspect of the farm system. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The average resilience level for each question/indicator, (production; environment; social; and economic) was calculated through the sum of the quantitative assessment of resilience - academic score (10); and the qualitative assessment - self-assessed importance (10) and the self-assessed adequacy of any given farm system component (10), being 30 the maximum resilience score any respondent can reach. The resilience level is considered low when the indicator is rated below 15/30, i.e. at the middle of the scale; while resilience is assessed as high when such an indicator is scored above the threshold. Additionally, the maximum value of importance an individual can provide to an indicator is 10; therefore, a score below or above 5, would signal low or high importance respectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The National Agricultural Advisory Services program was launched in 2001 as a semi - autonomous public agency within the Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), responsible for public agricultural advisory/extension services. Following the recent reform of the Agricultural extension system, the Government restructured NAADS, refocusing its mandate to supporting management of the agricultural input distribution chains and strategic interventions for value chain development focusing on the upper end of the commodity chains. Traditional extension services will be provided by the MAAIF through decentralized government structures. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Africa for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change (4.5 million – GEF/LDCF; 2013 – 2017). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. ACCCRN, online acccrn.net/ [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The Gender inequality index measures gender inequalities in reproductive health, measured by maternal mortality ratio and adolescent birth rates; empowerment, measured by proportion of parliamentary seats occupied by females and proportion of adult females and males aged 25 years and older with at least some secondary education; and economic status, expressed as labour market participation and measured by labour force participation rate of female and male populations aged 15 years and older. It measures the human development costs of gender inequality, thus the higher the GII value the more disparities between females and males and the more loss to human development [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. ACCCRN, online acccrn.net/ [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Should circumstances dictate a change in districts or sub-counties, changes can be made under the leadership of the MAAIF and the project steering committee during the inception period. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. One of the key issues outlined in the policy is the creation of a customary register to facilitate registration of customary rights. http://www.focusonland.com/fola/en/resources/ugandas-national-land-policy-background-key-highlights-and-next-steps/ [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The FAO VGGT represent the first global consensus on universally applicable standards for the recognition, recording and protection of tenure rights. They promote secure tenure rights and equitable access to land, fisheries and forests. They were officially endorsed by the Committee on World Food Security in May 2012, and all member states made a strong commitment to implement them. FAO has been supporting the Government of Uganda on VGGT implementation since 2014, facilitating a national dialogue driven by the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development (MLHUD) and through pilot projects for securing tenure in land and forest areas. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Plans are under way in discussion with EU to expand this initiative to the broader region. Should this materialize, coordination may be pursued. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Households were selected on the basis of co-occurrence of the following criteria: level of food insecurity, agro-ecological zone and main livelihoods. A total of 384 households were interviewed: 277 male-headed households and 107 female-headed households in Kaabong, Kotido, Moroto, Napak and Nakapiripirit districts. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Africa for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change (4.5 million – GEF/LDCF; 2013 – 2017) [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. The development of a sustainable charcoal production value chain will also contribute to the government’s objective in the rangeland and pastoralism policy to “regulate the charcoal production industry and link it to strategies that reduce demand, promote reforestation and conservation or increase the use of more efficient charcoal conversion technologies”. The project will also be able to use the IUCN on-going mapping of charcoal producers aimed at identifying a process of engaging them into sustainable production. Training and awareness raising will be enhanced in communities on harvesting trees sustainably for charcoal (coppicing) and energy saving stoves will be promoted as part of the sustainable production method. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. It is expected that the methodology selected for the baseline study will be used for the continuous monitoring and assessment of the project’s activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Please refer to the social context (Section 1) for more information on beneficiaries, including: different roles and responsibilities of women and men (of different age, ethnicity and socioeconomic group), and their access to resources and services. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1857e/i1857e00.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4413e.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. See guidance here: <https://info.undp.org/global/popp/frm/pages/financial-management-and-execution-modalities.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit’s participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. See http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/transparency/information\_disclosurepolicy/ [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. See https://www.thegef.org/gef/policies\_guidelines [↑](#footnote-ref-27)