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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document reflects the findings, conclusions and lessons learned of both the evaluation of the Community Agro-Enterprise Development Programme (CAEDP), and the additional study into alternative livelihoods for communities affected by Tullow operations in the programme area. Findings of both the evaluation and the study serve as input for the design of the next phase of the CAEDP.

The CAEDP is funded by Tullow Oil Uganda and implemented by Trias Uganda and its partners Hofokam (financial institution), Hodfa and Madfa (both farmer associations) in Hoima and Buliisa districts, Uganda. As the programme was approaching the end of its first phase (running from 2010-2012), Tullow Oil requested for an evaluation of the CAEDP covering the same period.

During the CAEDP evaluation that took place in October-November 2012, Tullow placed a request for an additional study into the identification of alternative livelihoods and/or livelihood restoration for fishing communities and/or for communities impacted by Tullow operations -gas and oil exploration- in the Kaiso-Tonya and Buliisa valley. This study took place right after the fieldwork of the evaluation was completed.

The ultimate goal of the CAEDP is to increase the food- and income security of smallholder farmer households in Hoima and Buliisa districts. To contribute to this ultimate goal the programme has several specific objectives: Enhanced adoption of practices for good and balanced nutrition (Specific objective 1), increased access to and participation of smallholders in remunerative markets (Specific objective 2) and increased investment in farming (Specific objective 3). A fourth specific objective focuses on enhancing the capacities of Trias, Hofokam, Hodfa and Madfa to coordinate and implement programme activities.

For specific objective 2 the programme uses the so-called Participatory Agricultural Enterprise Development (currently renamed into 'Enabling Rural Innovation' (ERI)) approach.

The evaluation focussed on assessing early signs of impact (increased food and income security), and on results in terms of increased access to remunerative markets (SO2) and increased investment by farmers in their farming practices (SO3). For the evaluation use was made of both qualitative (Most significant change stories method and focus group discussions) and quantitative methods (questionnaire).

The focus of the study into alternative livelihoods for communities affected by Tullow operations, was on exploring the possible (negative) impact of Tullow operations on the livelihood of communities and on exploring alternative livelihoods.

Main findings of the evaluation

The evaluation team concluded that the CAED programme shows early signs of impact indeed and has contributed to improved food and income security of the participating smallholder farmers in Hoima and Buliisa districts. Almost all households interviewed show increased food and income security indices.

Non-participating households have increased their food and income security indices as well but show significantly fewer positive changes in the various elements of the indices than participating households.

Almost all households show increased income security, even those households that do not embark on collective marketing and continue to sell at individual levels.
All interviewed households have increased access to remunerative markets. They not only have higher yields, they cultivate more acres and sell larger percentages of their yields at (mainly local) markets.

Although the programme indicators includes all groups that make profit with their 'enterprises', the levels of profitability vary considerably between groups. There are:

a) CAEDP groups that made the change from subsistence driven to 'more market driven' farmers already;

b) Groups that are in the process of transformation but mainly lack access to good markets (either due to remoteness and/or lack of self-organisation), and

c) Groups that do not have the potential to make the move towards market driven farmers since they either lack the tradition of cultivating crops, lack motivation and/or enabling conditions for crop cultivation.

In general the participating households and groups are rather strong in saving money, also thanks to other programmes in the region. In some groups they have amassed rather important volumes of savings. The CAED programme has benefited from this saving culture and has added, especially in Buliisa, an intensified use of the savings for investment in agricultural production.

The number and volume of loans provided by Hofokam to farmer groups has increased since the start of the programme, with a draw back in 2012 due to staffing problems. Many groups are eagerly anticipating towards future loans, although the credit fund was almost nearly fully in use as outstanding loans during the time of the evaluation.

One of the objectives of the programme is to support farmers to obtain better prices for their produce. As prices are low at the time of harvest, it often means that the produce needs to be stored for some time after harvest. However, the loans given out by Hofokam in general need to be paid back after 6 months. For some crops this may mean during harvest time, when prices are at their lowest. This seems to be a contradiction within the programme.

**Main findings of the alternative livelihood study**

The main areas of Tullow operation for the foreseeable future will be limited to the land area and the mid section exploration areas spreading from Bugoma up to Ngwedo Wanseko area in the Murchison Falls National park area of Buliisa district. Operations will be confined to the rift valley bottom areas, and no or hardly any offshore operations (in Lake Albert) are foreseen. Tullow has no clear view (yet) on how and to what extent communities may be affected by their operations.

In general three types of communities will be affected by Tullow operations:

- Communities mainly relying on fishing (Kiryambogo, Sebagoro, and Bugoigo landing sites);
- Communities relying on fishing and agriculture (Wanseko COU site), and
- Communities mainly relying on agriculture (Ngwedo trading centre).

Many communities depend partly on trading as well.

Although Tullow requested the researchers to pay extra attention to fishing communities, the main threat for fishing communities is coming from within and not directly from Tullow
operations. Unsustainable fishing practices are quickly diminishing certain fish stocks and if no law enforcement is followed, hardly any fish will be fished out of Lake Albert in the near future. Many households depending on fishing need to embark on alternative livelihoods soon, despite the development of a new fish-landing site.

There is no one-approach-fits-all for affected communities. The team is proposing tailor-made alternative livelihoods (as a guideline not as a blueprint) for the different groups:

- Crop cultivation for those with experience (e.g. cotton, cassava, maize, beans, peas, citrus and vegetables);
- Alternative livelihoods for those mainly depending on fishing: Sustainable fish farming, sustainable fishing, livestock and trading.

This may indicate a re-direction of the programme, including additional partners that are experienced in fishing, livestock and trading. Trias' new strategic choices for supporting Small Scale Entrepreneurs could play a role in diversifying livelihoods as well.
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1. INTRODUCTION
This document reflects the findings, conclusions and lessons learned of both the evaluation of the Community Agro-Enterprise Development Programme (CAEDP), and the additional study into alternative livelihoods for communities affected by Tullow operations in the programme area.

The CAEDP is funded by Tullow Oil Uganda and implemented by Trias Uganda and its partners Hofokam (financial institution), Hodfa and Madfa (both farmer associations) in Hoima and Buliisa districts, Uganda. As the programme was approaching the end of its first phase (running from 2010-2012), Tullow Oil requested for an evaluation of the CAEDP covering the same period.
During the CAEDP evaluation that took place in October-November 2012, Tullow placed a request for an additional study into the identification of alternative livelihoods and/or livelihood restoration for fishing communities and/or for communities impacted by Tullow operations - gas and oil exploration in the Kaiso-Tonya and Buliisa valley. This study took place right after the field work of the evaluation itself was completed in November-December 2012.
Findings of both the evaluation and the study serve as input for the design of the next phase of the CAEDP.

The ultimate goal of the CAEDP is to increase the food- and income security of smallholder farmer households in Hoima and Buliisa districts. To contribute to this ultimate goal the programme has several specific objectives: Enhanced adoption of practices for good and balanced nutrition (Specific objective 1), increased access to and participation of smallholders in remunerative markets (Specific objective 2) and increased investment in farming (Specific objective 3). A fourth specific objective focuses on enhancing the capacities of Trias, Hofokam, Hodfa and Madfa to coordinate and implement programme activities. For specific objective 2 the programme uses the so-called Participatory Agricultural Enterprise Development (currently renamed into 'Enabling Rural Innovation' (ERI)) approach.

During the evaluation early signs of increased food and income security were assessed, as well as results in terms of increased access to remunerative markets (SO2) and increased investment by farmers in their farming practices (SO3).

In this document the evaluation team presents in chapter 1 the objectives of the evaluation and the additional study, the main questions and the evaluation and study methodology. In chapter 2 a short summary of the CAED programme and its context is provided, while in chapter 3 the main findings of both the evaluation and the study are shared. In chapter 4 the main conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations are presented.

1.1 Objective of the evaluation and the livelihood study
The **objective of the CAEDP-evaluation** was to assess the most critical results, outcomes, and potential impact of the programme during the period 2010-2012, and to generate lessons-learned and recommendations to improve the intervention of Trias and its partners Hofokam, Hodfa and Madfa during a follow-up phase of the CAEDP.

During the evaluation special attention was given to early signs of increased food and income security of smallholder farmer households that participate in the CAEDP. Besides these early signs of impact, the evaluation focussed on the two specific objectives 'increased access to and participation in remunerative markets' (SO2) and 'increased investment in farming' (SO3).
The objective of the livelihood study was to identify alternative livelihoods and/or livelihood restoration for fishing communities and/or for communities impacted by Tullow operations - gas and oil exploration - in the Kaiso-Tonya and Buliisa valley. Recommendations on these alternative livelihoods and/or livelihood restoration are intended to guide the design of the follow-up programme of the current phase of the CAEDP.

1.2 Evaluation and study questions

a. Evaluation questions related to the overall objective

Q1. Food and income security
Are there any early signs of impact wrt sustainable improvement of the food and income security of smallholder farm households in Hoima and Buliisa Districts - bordering Lake Albert?

Sub-questions:
Q1.1 To what extent has the programme contributed to the development of a business and self-reliance attitude in the farming community?
Q1.2 To what extent has the programme contributed to an empowered and knowledgeable farming community, engaged in “farming as a business”.
Q1.3 To what extent has the programme contributed to strengthen the target group’s capabilities to voice their opinions and concerns at the sub-county- and district level?

b. Evaluation questions related to specific objective 2

Q2. Increased access to- and participation in remunerative markets
To what extent have smallholder farm households increased access to- and participation in remunerative markets?

Sub-questions:
Q2.1 To what extent has the programme contributed to an increased access to markets?
Q2.2 To what extent has the programme contributed to an increase in competences and improved participation of the target group in markets?
Q2.3 To what extent has the programme contributed to improved market functioning?
Q2.4 To what extent has the programme contributed to an increased profit from agriculture at household level?
Q2.5 To what extent has the programme contributed to increased productivity and quality of agricultural produce?
Q2.6 To what extent has the programme contributed to an improved service delivery of Hodfa and Madfa to the target group?

c. Evaluation questions related to specific objective 3

Q3. Increased investment in farming business
To what extent have smallholder farm households increased investment in their farming business?

Sub-questions:
Q3.1 To what extent has the programme contributed to an increased access to financial services for the target group?
Q3.2 To what extend has the programme contributed to an increased saving culture of the target group?
Q3.3 To what extent has the programme contributed to an increase in financial and production capital for the target group?
Q3.4 To what extent has the programme contributed to an increase in investment in farming business?
Q3.5 To what extend has the programme contributed to an improved service delivery of Hofokam to the target group?

Besides answering these evaluation questions, the team had a short assessment of specific objective 4 'Enhancing capacities of partners for programme coordination and implementation'.

d. Evaluation questions related to the DACT evaluation criteria
Next to the specific evaluation questions, the DAC evaluation criteria\(^1\) were part of the evaluation as well:

Q4.1 **Relevance**: To what extent is the objective still valid (in terms of consistency with requirements and needs of the target group)?
Q4.2 **Effectiveness**: To what extent has the objective been achieved?
Q4.3 **Efficiency**: Was the objective implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
Q4.4 **Impact**: What is the potential contribution of the objective towards long-term impact (contribution to general objective of the program after 6 years)?
Q4.5 **Sustainability**: What is the probability of (i) long term effects of the objective, (ii) financial sustainability, and (iii) environmental sustainability?

e. Research questions to identify alternative livelihoods
Q5.1 How and to what extent will Tullow operations affect communities and the livelihoods of communities in the Kaiso-Tonya and Buliisa valley?
The assumption is that e.g. resettlement requires different approaches for the restoration or identification for alternative livelihoods than the loss of one or two resources (land, water, fish grounds etc).
Q5.2 What types of communities will be affected by Tullow operations and how?
The assumption here is that the type of communities and their livelihood may influence the choice for alternative livelihoods (e.g. affected fishing communities may need different approaches than farmer communities).
Q5.3 Given the various scenarios of negative impact by Tullow operations, the types of affected communities and their geographical locations: What are possible alternative livelihoods or restored livelihoods of affected communities?

1.3 Composition of the evaluation and study team
The evaluation team consisted of two consultants: Boniface Mugisa (Ugandan national, expert in agricultural enterprise development and micro finance) and Marlèn Arkesteijn (Netherlands national, expert in (visual) evaluation methodology and rural development).

Marlèn Arkesteijn was the lead consultant and responsible for the design of the evaluation and the study, its workshops, field visits and partner interviews and assessments, data collection and analysis, and writing of the report. She did this in close cooperation with

\(^1\) [http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en_2649_34435_2086550_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en_2649_34435_2086550_1_1_1_1,00.html)
Boniface Mugisa. Boniface was mainly responsible for the quantitative data collection during the evaluation, while Marlèn focussed on the (visual) qualitative data collection. The data gathering in the field for the additional study (including the analyses) was done by Boniface Mugisa, while coaching and reporting was done by Marlèn Arkesteijn.

During the evaluation, the team was strengthened by Richard Nsamba (field advisor of Trias in Masindi, Hoima and Buliisa). He arranged all visits to training centres and communities and created all enabling conditions (as far as in his control, ranging from logistics, background information and harmony within the extended evaluation team) for the team to do its work. Francis Kiwanuka, the driver of Trias, Uganda made sure the team reached the communities safely, despite mud, rain and rivers. In Hoima the team was accompanied during the field visits by field advisors from Hodfa, respectively Bob George Sunday (Runga), Godfrey Aganyira (Kabanda), and Mucwa Elisha (Kaseeta). Andronzi Gadi translated in Hoima.

In Buliisa the (evaluation) team worked, besides Richard and Francis, with David Wanzala, field advisor from Madfa. David served as a multi-talent, not only facilitating the community meetings, but also doing most of the translations as he was the only one of the team who spoke and understood all local languages (from Lugungu, Alur, Bunyoro to Swahili).

1.4 Evaluation and study process and methodology

a. Evaluation process and methodology

For the evaluation, the team used a combination of qualitative and quantitative research, based on the CORT (Collaborative Outcome Reporting Technique) method (Dart, 2010) that includes the Most Significant Change method (Davies and Dart, 2005) and focus group discussions combined with quantitative secondary and primary data collection (including the use of a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews). This CORT method enables farmers and partners to participate as far as possible in data collection and analysis.

The evaluation took place at three (embedded) levels: Programme level, partner/district level and community level. At each level the evaluation started with a kick-off meeting or workshop after which data collection commenced, and closed with a validation and reflection meeting or workshop to present and discuss the first findings.

At programme and partner/district level the team held semi-structured interviews with Trias staff, Tullow, various stakeholders, like other NGOs and district officers. With the partners the team held workshops and semi-structured interviews, capacity self-assessments and a Most Significant Change exercise on capacity strengthening.

At community level the team held group discussions, did the Most Significant Change exercise on impact and outcomes, and did face to face interviews with the help of a questionnaire.

The Most Significant Change method was targeting at harvesting early signs of (expected and unexpected) outcomes and impact at households and community level, and qualitative argumentation on how the programme contributed to these changes. Through a questionnaire quantitative data was gathered on food and income security (at community level) of both before the programme started (2009) and current levels, and data on market access. Some of the Most Significant Change stories were recorded on video since using
visuals were part and parcel of the evaluation to facilitate direct representation of farmers, and to facilitate reflection.

While designing the evaluation approach the team aimed at including non-CAEDP farmers as well, to get a better understanding of the contribution of the CAEDP to improved food and income security. Due to the rather short visits to the communities (from 10.00-16.00), the team only interviewed a very limited number of non-CAEDP farmers (11 out of 83 total respondents).

For the fieldwork three communities (training centres) per district were selected. The evaluation team requested for representative centres with groups that were considered strong adopters (good CAEDP results), middle adopters (average CAEDP results) and weak adopters (hardly or no CAEDP results (yet)). This resulted in the following selection of communities/training centres and groups (see table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Number of groups/ participants in evaluation</th>
<th>Number (percentage) of women participating in evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoima</td>
<td>41 people (10 groups)</td>
<td>13 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kigorobya/ Runga (middle)</td>
<td>16 people (4 groups)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buseruka/ Kabanda (weak)</td>
<td>10 people (3 groups)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabwoya/ Kaseeta (strong)</td>
<td>15 people (3 groups)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullisa</td>
<td>52 people (14 groups)</td>
<td>22 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biiso/ Biiso (strong-middle)</td>
<td>20 people (5 groups)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngwedo/ Avogera (middle-weak)</td>
<td>16 people (5 groups)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisyabi/ Uribo (middle-weak)</td>
<td>16 people (4 groups)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93 people (24 groups)</td>
<td>35 (38%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Training centres, groups and (women) farmers involved in the evaluation

In total the programme works with 130 groups in Hoima and around 110 in Buliisa. The team was able to visit 24 groups of the 240 in total (10%). The number of women participants in the evaluation is rather low (38%), especially when knowing that half (50%) of the members of the groups the team visited were women. It is unclear to the evaluation team why the number of women that participated in the evaluation did not represent their participation in the groups.

**On selection of the Most Significant Change stories**

Since not all readers may be versed in the use of MSC, a short summary of the MSC method and selection of stories is presented here: In every community the team worked with members of different farmer groups in two small evaluation groups (of around 8 farmers per group) to harvest and select Most Significant Change Stories. The question asked to the farmers was: *From your point of view, what is for you the most significant change that has taken place in your life over the last 2-3 years after you joined your farmers group?*

After telling the stories, a discussion would follow on the stories and based on argumentation one of the stories would be selected as the story that represents the results of the programme best. In every community the team would capture these two stories (sometimes three when the group found two stories best) on video. At the end of the day, the videos would be presented on a video-screen to the whole community to share the stories and to facilitate discussion on why these stories were considered important and how representative they were for the community. After visiting three communities, the 6-8 videos would be shown to the partners in the district to share the stories and to facilitate discussion and reflection on results of the programme from their point of view.
Based on discussions, the partners would select two stories—that in their views represent the results of the programme best-to be shared and discussed at programme level.

b. Study process and methodology

For the additional livelihood study, the following methods were used:

a. In-depth interviews with Tullow staff on how, where and when Tullow operations will affect livelihoods of communities, and identify the possible level of impact (from loss of some resources to resettlement).

b. Field work using focus group discussions in 5 communities and a one-page questionnaire for household interviews in 4 possibly affected communities (with different levels of impact) to identify current livelihoods and levels of income, and possible alternative livelihoods that fit the agricultural and trading zone, culture of the communities and (at least) levels of current income and food security levels.

c. In-depth interviews with district officers to identify possible alternative livelihoods to be included in the follow-up proposal for the CAED programme.

In consultation with Tullow and the CAEDP partners the following communities were selected for the study. These communities more or less represent those communities affected or likely to be affected by Tullow operations (see table 2):

**Hoima district**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-county</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buseruka</td>
<td>Kiyambogo Landing site</td>
<td>Down escarpment, remote and difficult to access by vehicles, fishing community, limited crop cultivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabwoya</td>
<td>Sebagooro Landing site</td>
<td>Down escarpment, very remote, poor road, fishing community, limited crop cultivation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Buliisa district**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-county</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kigwera</td>
<td>Wanseko COU site</td>
<td>Near ferry crossing, fishing/ farming community, oil found in vicinity, no exploitation yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngwedo</td>
<td>Ngwedo Trading centre</td>
<td>Remote, mainly farming community, more than 5 oil wells detected, no exploitation yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butiaba</td>
<td>Bugoigo Landing site</td>
<td>Fishing community, surrounded by oil wells, no exploitation yet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2 Communities visited during the livelihood study*
1.5 Main evaluation and study activities
The main evaluation activities included the following:
- Desk review.
- Collection of 80 Most Significant Change stories told by farmers.
- In total 13 MSC stories were videotaped, 6 in Hoima and 7 in Buliisa. In both Hoima and Buliisa districts, 2 MSC stories were selected by respectively Hodfa and Madfa/Hofokam as representing the results of the CAEDP best. During the validation workshop in Kampala these four MSC stories were shown and discussed by representatives of Tullow, Trias and Hofokam, Hodfa and Madfa.
- Collection of 83 questionnaires (72 CAEDP and 11 non CAEDP farmers).
- Group discussions with 24 groups on functioning of farmer groups (at community level).
- Group discussion in fishing community to understand fishing issues.
- Kick-off and validation workshops & discussions with partners & Trias.
- Capacity self-assessments by 10 staff members of the partners Hofokam, Hodfa and Madfa.
- Collection of 8 MSC on capacity development by partners, of which 3 were recorded on videotape.
- Interviews with 13 stakeholders (district officers, Tullow, Traidlinks).
- Analyses (during validation workshops and within the evaluation team).

The main study activities included:
- Desk review.
- Collection of 68 questionnaires (of whom 46 CAEDP participants and 22 non-CAEDP participants)
- Group discussions with 5 groups on livelihoods and alternatives
- Interviews with 11 stakeholders (district officers, Tullow).
- Analyses

1.6 Factors contributing or influencing the evaluation and study exercises
Factors contributing to the evaluation and study exercises
From all three partners (Hofokam, Hodfa and Madfa), Trias and Tullow the team received full cooperation and motivation to participate in the evaluation and the study. Especially the time and efforts provided by the field advisors of Madfa, Hodfa and Trias were very conducive for conducting both researches.

The translations of Andronzi Gadi (the translator in Hoima) and David Wanzala (field advisor Madfa) during the evaluation were indispensable in a world of tribes and local languages.

Most of the farmers participating in the evaluation and study were highly motivated to share their experiences, and to show the team tangible results, either at group or household level. Some of them insisted on showing their fields and houses with limitless energy.

The use of video during the evaluation for recording the Most Significant Change stories worked very well in terms of direct representation, and contributed to lively and inspiring discussions at both community, partner and programme level.

Factors negatively influencing the evaluation and study exercises
Unfortunately data on food and income security and some outcome indicators were not - as planned- available before the team’s departure to the field. Income and food security
indices, and some of the outcome indicators could not be verified during the evaluation as planned in the field. This is one of the reasons why the team decided to get the food and income security data through their own questionnaire.

Both the evaluation and study took place in the middle of the rainy season when farmers are busy in their fields. Many times there was rather limited time in the communities for all the evaluation and study activities (usually from 11.30 AM -16.00 PM). As a result a very limited number of non-CAEDP farmers could be interviewed, and sometimes even a limited number of participating farmers.

Although there was -during the evaluation- always a person that translated in the team, many times, especially in Buliisa, only one person of the team could speak all the local languages. This meant that sometimes 2 cycles of translation had to be done. Therefore the evaluation activities took longer than anticipated, especially the questionnaires since both the international and national evaluator did not master the local languages.

Again the rainy season can be partly blamed for not being able to reach one of the communities in time during the evaluation. Two cars got stuck in the mud, and eventually could not cross the temporary rivers when going to Kabanda, Hoima. When Kabanda was reached around 13.30 PM most of the farmers had left the meeting place. For Kabanda only 2 effective working hours were available to conduct the interviews, group session, and MSC story collection.
2. PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION AND INTERVENTION CONTEXT

2.1 Design of the CAED programme
The Community Agriculture Enterprise Development programme is geared at improving the food and income security of smallholder farm households and to support them to move from subsistence to more 'commercial' farming (through first 'marketing part of their yield' and eventually to more 'commercial' farming). This path to more commercial farming is to ensure that farmers get more cash income (without losing food security) and can cater for the growing demand for food in the region and Uganda.²

The programme uses the Participatory Agriculture Enterprise Development (PAED or ERI) approach to enable farmers to become more market oriented. The core of the PAED lies in the formation of farmer groups through which the farmers choose profitable agricultural enterprises, research the market, do cost-benefit analyses, get training on agriculture and post-harvest storage techniques, and in the end, market their (individual) produce collectively. The idea behind selling collectively is among others that farmers can negotiate better prices when they sell as a group.

Next to the production and marketing aspect the programme pays attention to food crops and food security, and tries to facilitate an increase of investments in agriculture through saving schemes and loans (both internal and external). These three aspects of increasing production and marketing, food security and investment in farming form the pillars of the programme (see figure 2 Goals and objectives of the CAED programme, page 10). Working in groups runs through other elements of the programme as well: The group selects an enterprise, makes a business plan, saves together, takes (if feasible/needed) a loan as a group (but divide it over the households) and market as a group.

The programme is implemented by 3 local partner organisations: 2 district farmer organisations (Hoima District Farmers’ Association (Hodfa) and Masindi District Farmers’ Association (Madfa), both established in 1992) and one micro-finance institution (Hoima, Fort Portal, Kasese Micro Finance (HOFOKAM) founded in 2003). They at their turn are supported by Trias Uganda.

2.2 Context description
The CAED programme aimed to target approximately 3,640 smallholder farm households between 2010-2012 in four sub-counties in Hoima (Kabwoya, Buseruka, Kigoroba & Kyangwali) and (all) 3 sub-counties in Buliisa district (Biiso, Buliisa and Buliisa Town Council). Both districts are bordering Lake Albert in western Uganda.

Buliisa district is a new district in western Uganda, created in 2006. Prior to that, the district used to be part of Masindi District. The district is primarily rural and most people in the district are pastoralists, fishermen or subsistence smallholder farmers. The 'main town' in the district is Buliisa-town, located 80 kilometres (50 miles) by (rough) road northwest of Masindi and bordering Lake Albert. Buliisa town is 'lands-end' and therefore rather isolated and remote. In 2010 the population of Buliisa district was estimated to be approximately 88,700. The major tribes found in Buliisa include the Bagungu, the Alur, the Luo and Banyoro.

Hoima district is a typical rural district with up to 91% of the population living in the rural areas and engaged in agriculture. They mainly cultivate coffee, maize, cassava, banana, beans, vegetables, millet, groundnuts, cocoa, Irish potatoes, tea, tobacco, soya beans and

² The 'Comprehensive Food Security & Vulnerability Analysis on Uganda' (WFP, 2009) shows that while the population is increasing at the rate of 3.2 per cent annually; food production is growing at less than 3 per cent.
### Farmer households & groups

**Ultimate goal**

Food and Income security of smallholder farm households is improved in a sustainable way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SO1 HH have adopted practices of ensuring good and balanced nutrition throughout year</strong></th>
<th><strong>SO2 HH have increased access to- and participate in remunerative markets</strong></th>
<th><strong>SO3 HH have increased investment in their farming business</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HH: Aware of importance food security and income</td>
<td>Farmer AE groups strengthened</td>
<td>Agricultural friendly financial services availed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware need joint planning, decision, and sharing responsibilities in hh</td>
<td>Groups: knowledge &amp; skills to assess and select profitable AE</td>
<td>Groups: Strengthened on savings and credit management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; skills improved production staple food crops</td>
<td>Groups: skills to assess value chains of selected AE</td>
<td>Savings culture promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; skills improvement backyard garden</td>
<td>Groups: knowledge &amp; skills to forge remunerative market linkages</td>
<td>Outreach services increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; skills post harvest, preservation and preparation</td>
<td>Groups: knowledge &amp; skills in improving production and post harvest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups: facilitated with collective marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups: skills in PME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HODFA, MADFA, HOFOKAM

- Partners equipped with staff & capacity to provide appr. services to members
- Partners: Agriculture friendly financial services availed
- Capacity to PME and report improved
- Capacity to manage resources transparently and accountable strengthened
- Programme plans and activities partners well coordinated
- Info sharing and collaboration with major stakeholders enhanced

**TRIAS**

TRIAS: Capacity Trias staff to provide capacity building support to local partners & to coordinate programme activities enhanced

---

*Figure 2 Goals and objectives of the CAED programme*
upland rice. The district had (in 2006) a population of about 383,500 people, with an annual population growth rate of 4.7%. The district has a fairly young population with 46% of the people being below 15 years of age (57% below 18 years of age). The largest ethnic group are the Banyoro, followed by the Bagungu, Banyankole, the Bakiga, Lugbara, Langi, Acholi, Bagisu and the Baganda.

The CAEDP baseline study conducted in 2009 quotes that more than 75% of the population of these two districts are smallholder farmers that are mainly subsistence oriented with land holdings ranging from 0.25-5 hectares. They are income and food insecure, market illiterate, face a lack of capital and/or access to external capital and are usually unorganised with limited collective marketing. In general, smallholder farm households constitute the most vulnerable and poorest segment of Hoima and Buliisa districts.

While approximately 55% of the households asserted in 2009 to having sufficient food throughout the year, diets are one-sided and based on ‘what is available on the farm’. Farm households generally lacked skills and knowledge on food nutrition, appropriate food storage and preservation (including processing) and food preparation.

The number of HIV/Aids affected families varied from 25% to 65%. Of these households an estimated 30-35% are female-headed and approximately 7-10% are orphan-headed households. Estimations on HIV/Aids infected heads of households (husband / wife) ranged from 10-15% (see Trias, 2010).

An important development in the region is the discovery of oil: During the first 10 years of the 2000s, a considerable amount of crude oil deposits have been discovered in both Hoima and Buliisa districts. The Ugandan Government is in the final stages of preparing to extract the oil discovered in the districts. The discovery of oil is already attracting the influx of people from other sides of Uganda and Congo. In some place this has created tension between various tribes and their livelihood strategies (farmers versus pastoralists).

**Institutional surroundings of the programme**

In the past 10 years the policy environment for the agriculture sector in Uganda has been shaped by both the National Development Plan (NDP, launched in 2010) and the Plan for Modernization of Agriculture (PMA). The NDP identified a long list of limitations affecting agricultural production and food security: Inadequate production and post-harvest facilities; limited extension support; inadequate disease and pest controls; weak standards in food security and quality assurance infrastructure; weak value chain linkages; etc. Consequently, the NDP incorporates specific strategic objectives aiming at enhancing agriculture production and productivity; increasing the number of functioning and sustainable agriculture farmers organizations involved in collective marketing; improving access and sustainability of markets; supporting the hunger prevention initiatives; improving access to high quality inputs, planting and stocking materials; enhance productivity of land and water resources; etc. The PMA complements the NDP with providing national agriculture advisory services, rural financing, agro-processing, and marketing, agriculture education, etc.

In many communities in both Hoima and Buliisa districts, the National Agricultural Advisory Services programme (NAADS) gives shape to the above-mentioned policies by (among others) actively stimulating the formation of farmer groups. The approach of the NAADS is to work with model farmers who are being trained, and get (in practice ‘free’) inputs. The model farmers at their turn are supposed to extend their knowledge, skills and sometimes inputs to the other group members (Esfim, 2011). In some communities and groups this approach seems to work, in other communities not at all.
Facilitating practices of micro-finance is one of the approaches that have been adopted by government to achieve the MDGs. The preferred form of financial intermediation in the rural sector is through Savings and Credit Co-operatives (SACCOs). Communities in all sub-counties in Uganda are encouraged and assisted by the government to establish functional and viable SACCOs. This entails in theory supporting communities to start up SACCOs where none exist, while weak SACCOs are supposed to be strengthened into safe and sound institutions. Each of the SACCOs strengthened should further be linked to a formal financial institution, usually a commercial bank. In 2005, a micro-finance policy and regulatory framework for Uganda (2005 – 2015) was launched with the theme to support an integrated micro finance sector in the country. In Hoima and Buliisa these SACCOs were not existing and farmers did not have access to micro-finance institutions when the programme started.

In both Hoima and Buliisa many other NGOs and GO programmes are active to contribute to poverty eradication and food and income security. Build Africa Uganda is active in setting up saving groups, Uganda Wildlife Association handed out beehives as an income generating activity, NAAADS did the same and also provided inputs for cropping and goats, Farm Income Enhancement and Forest Conservation (FIEFOC) programme supported communities, the District Livelihood Support Programme (DLSP) is active, etc.
3. EVALUATION & STUDY FINDINGS

PART 1 EVALUATION FINDINGS

3.1 Introduction

In order to understand the findings and the differences in results of the programme, the team considers it helpful to first present the differences between the communities the team visited. Impact and outcomes are definitely not only influenced by the programme, but by many other factors and actors that either facilitate and/or hinder results to emerge (see figure 3).

The agricultural zone, (micro-) climates, the vicinity of a trading centre, good roads, a stable population, stable groups, culture and social structures in a community, presence of other NGO and GO programmes, experience with the cultivation of crops for example may enable and facilitate agricultural production and collective marketing. Semi-arid places with poor soils, remoteness of a community, an unstable population (in-and out flux) are factors that are less enabling for increased agricultural production, and food and income security improvements. To make change happen in such communities may take more effort and time, or may even require different approaches than the promotion of cultivating crops.

In the districts the team observed great differences in enabling and hindering factors that definitely influenced the level of success of the programme (see table 3, page 14).
Table 3 Enabling and hindering factors in the communities visited, as observed by the team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoima district</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-county/ parish</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kigoroby</td>
<td>Runga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buseruka</td>
<td>Kabanda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buliisa district</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buliisa/Ngwedo</td>
<td>Avogera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buliisa/Kisyabi</td>
<td>Uribo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Overall findings
As will be shown in the following paragraphs the results of the CAED programme are positive:

- Almost all smallholder farm households participating in the CAEDP show increased food and income security indices;
- Almost all farmers have increased access to and participate in remunerative markets;
- A large group of farmers make use of loans and savings for investment in their agricultural production.

When exploring a bit deeper into the results and how the programme has contributed to the results, the evaluation team found the following patterns:

- Some households benefit more from the programme than others: Between the communities large differences can be seen when probing beyond the programme indicators;
- A majority of the households has increased their income and food security, but have done so through individual marketing and not, as intended by the programme, through collective marketing;
- While the programme and its partners intend to deliver an overall approach for increasing production (food and cash crops), marketing, saving, loaning etc, most farmers regard the programme as a programme to increase production and/or as a saving programme.

3.3 Findings based on the MSC stories
These patterns mentioned above became clear through the group discussions in the community and were confirmed by the Most Significant Change stories. During the Most Significant Change exercises, although farmers were requested to talk about 'changes in their livelihood situations', the majority of farmers referred to outcomes of the CAEDP programme as most significant changes. Most of the stories were about the use of new methods for farming like spacing, improved seed, planting in rows, for both food and cash crops (39 of the 80 stories), or about 'saving' (20/80) (see figure 3).
Only 7 out of the 80 stories had improved income and food security as main topic. This does not mean that households did not improve their income and/or food security situation (58 farmers indicated in their stories that their income and food security had improved through e.g. improved farming methods) but for them the change in farming methods was more significant (and likely more tangible) than the change in income and food security. This could also be explained by the reasoning that the improved farming methods could be easily connected to the CAEDP, while other factors than the programme also contributed to improved food and income security.

Farmers associated the CAEDP more with improved agricultural practices and saving practices (both practices were widely used) than with marketing, marketing in groups, cost-benefits analyses (attributes of 'farming as a business'). Again an explanation could be possibly found in the tangibility of agricultural practices and saving, and possibly in the fact that for many groups the programme just started.
Partners Hodfa, Madfa and Hofokam selected those stories (4) that were about increased income, investment for a stable income and working in groups since they found these stories representing the results of the programme best (see the stories at page 16 and 17).

**Most significant change story selected by Hodfa 1: The importance of belonging to a group (in Alur)**

I am Ocuna Yotam, from Runga village, Kibiro parish, Kigorobya sub-county, Hoima. It is good to be in a group (Tekwako group) because it has brought change. I used to be a fisherman but I did not get much profit out of it any longer. The group gives me a lot of profit: With my group I can cultivate my land easily since they help me. I do not have much labour, but with the help of the group I can till the land. Through the group I know how to save money, and how to get loans. We get training from Hodfa on agricultural methods in a group only. So it is important to be in a group. We realise the benefits of being in a group and if we continue we may see changes in 2-3 years’ time. I am happy to be in a group. If we register with Hodfa I am sure that we will profit in the future. I have already seen some differences. All benefits will come through the efforts of the group. Staying in a group means that we look for a market of the crops that we are going to plant. So that when we sell, we will get profit out of it. If we join hands with micro-finance, we shall get even more profit. That is why I am grateful of being in a group.

**Most significant change story selected by Hodfa 2: Improved production and income (English)**

I am Adriko Leti Sustain, from Kaseeta parish, Kabwoya sub-county, Hoima. In fact there is a very big change since the programme started and taught us new methods of agricultural production. The change I have seen is real. Formerly we used to plant our crops without knowing anything about spacing and lining. When Hodfa introduced and trained us in modern methods of farming, we manage to increase our yields. Before we produced and planted zigzag; now we plant in line and use spacing of 30x 70 cm. That spacing changed our yields. Before I produced 600 kg/acre, currently I am producing 1500 kg/acre. These are the benefits I have seen from the programme. We also use improved seeds and this also increases our yield. Through these high yields, our income has increased as well. As a result I constructed a permanent house with four rooms. I managed to start businesses like a saloon, and a phone charging business. The video hall where we are sitting now is also a result of the programme. Most important to me is that I have acquired knowledge and skills and that I could abandon the old methods. That is the little story I can tell. I request the programme to continue supporting us.

**Most significant change story selected by Madfa & Hofokam-Buliisa 1: Improved production and income (Alur)**

I am Onen Jackson, Dikiriberic Kutego group, from Avogera village, Ngwedo parish, Buliisa sub-county. I am going to talk about the change we have seen, and the hardship we got. Before we did not have good practices in farming. When Madfa came they provided many types of training: We were trained on cultivating soybean, e.g. spacing of 50x25 cm. Through this practice I get very good yields. We also learned about the spacing for cotton. From one acre of cotton I can get 1000 kg now. We were also taught how to cultivate cassava: From one acre I can get now UGX 1 million per acre if I sell. So I have noticed big changes between previous and current yields. These high yields have helped me to increase my income and I can pay school fees now for my children. I thank
Madfa and Hofokam for having trained us. Hofokam is even going to get us a loan to boost my production further and to expand my cassava garden. I thank Madfa very much.

Most significant change story selected by Madfa & Hofokam-Buliisa 2: Investment for stable income (Alur)

I am Pacudaka Jeanette, from Chan Ponjo jo group, Avogera, Ngwedo parish, Buliisa sub-county. There was an announcement from Madfa on Radio Masindi and so my chairperson encouraged to go for training. Madfa trained us on various methods for agricultural production and I started cultivating 1 acre of cassava. Then Tullow came and during their seismic survey they destroyed my field and thus my cassava. As a consequence they had to compensate me. Tullow paid me UGX 600.000. From this money I bought a grinding mill for cassava flour. From the rest of the money I rented more land to produce cassava. Now I have 2 acres with cassava. With the grinding mill I have a stable income, sometimes I even earn UGX 10.000/ day! I thank Madfa for training me in the skills and knowledge that enabled me to do this, and I really hope Madfa continues to support me.

3.4 Findings on the overall objective

3.4.1 Q1 Food and income security

Are there any early signs of impact wrt sustainable improvement of the food and income security of smallholder farm households in Hoima and Buliisa Districts - bordering Lake Albert?

a. Claims (positive results)

As indicated in the Most Significant Change stories, the evaluation team has noted and seen various signs of impact, and improvements of food and income security. The questionnaires confirm the early signs of impact in terms of improved food and income security. During the baseline of the programme food and income security indices were developed (see Trias, 2010, and annex VI for explanation on calculation of indices). The evaluation team followed the same method and collected data on food and income security as well. For the year 2009 the farmers were asked to estimate food and income data, while they were asked to provide current data on their food and income situation as well.

In table 4 the various baselines (Trias, 2010; and evaluation team 2009 estimates), 3-year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Food security index</th>
<th></th>
<th>Income security index</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoima</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Runga</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kabanda</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kaseeta</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buliisa</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Biiso</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avogera</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uribo</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Overview Food & Income security indices 2009 and 2012
prognoses as given in the programme document, and the current indices as gathered by the evaluation team are presented.

What the table shows is that **most households in the visited communities have improved food-and income security indices**, with income security indices that even surpass the 3-year prognoses done in 2009 during the baseline and programme document development. In almost all villages visited both income and food security indices have increased, showing that -in general- selling more produce does not harm food security, except for households in Uribo (see concern).

What the table also shows is that the 2009 estimates of the evaluation are rather consistent with the baseline data gathered in 2009.

**b. Concern (space for improvement)**

In Uribo, Buliisa the food security index goes down. This is rather surprising since in the MSC stories and group discussions, the farmers indicated they sold surplus from their food crops, and had increased incomes. What could partly explain this lower food security is that some of the cash crops did not -or hardly- yield over the last few years (soy bean, some of the cotton). Farmers may have been inclined to sell a larger part of their food crops to compensate the loss of their cash crops. Besides the new variety of cassava that was introduced did not grow very well in the village, which may have caused decreasing food security as well.

Although the evaluation team cannot fully explain this lower food security, the situation requests for close monitoring of introducing new varieties of both cash and food crops.

**c. Issue (for discussion)**

Almost all households show an increase of income and income security, including the farmers that did not embark on group marketing. What the evaluation team has found is that in general only groups in Kaseeta and some in Biiso do actual group marketing, while the others still sell their produce individually. Farmers in both Kaseeta and Biiso show higher income security indices than farmers in other communities. However, the evaluation team cannot substantiate to what extent 'group marketing' is contributing to higher income security indices. To compare the benefits of group marketing versus individual marketing, the incomes of groups with identical circumstances -except for the variable collective versus individual marketing- need to be compared in detail. The team did unfortunately not have the time to do so.

**d. Can the improved food and income security indices be related to the CAEDP?**

Despite the limited number of questionnaires with non-CAEDP households (11 out of 83 households), the evaluation team concludes that the non-CAEDP households show significant fewer positive changes in food and income indicators than the CAEDP households. These differences, as shown in Charts 1 and 2, give strong indications that the CAED programme contributed to these positive changes.
The most significant change stories support the positive contribution of the CAEDP to increased food and income security. Many stories indicated that new farming methods increased their yields (39 of the 80 stories), and that these increased yields contributed to their food and income security.

3.4.2 Sub-questions:
Q1.1: To what extent has the programme contributed to the development of a business and self-reliance attitude in the farming community?
Q1.2 To what extend has the programme contributed to an empowered and knowledgeable farming community, engaged in “farming as a business”.

The evaluation team has noted that the programme has contributed indeed to the development of a business and self-reliance attitude in the farming communities. However, the level of these business and self-reliance attitude differs significantly between communities. As is reflected under Specific Objective 2 a limited number of groups, mainly in Kaseeta and to some extent in Biiso, show mature business attitudes: These groups treat their farming as a business. They invest in their farming business (including building a storage and an office), and are active in marketing in their produce. Other groups like groups in Uribo show at their turn a somewhat dependent attitude, waiting for NGOs and others to help them. A limited number of groups (like in Kabanda) are very much involved in other business than ‘farming’ (fishing, livestock, trade in general) but not in the cultivation of crops. The majority of groups is embarking on the path towards ‘farming as a business’. In e.g. Runga, Avogera and some groups in Biiso farmers have the attitude and are working hard on improving their yields, but still face limitations in finding suitable markets and buyers to market their produce collectively (either due to the distance to the market and/or a lack of guidance on how to approach the market). The CAED programme actually trains farmers in finding markets first and then start production, but in practice this does not always take place in that order.

Q1.3: To what extent has the programme contributed to strengthen the target group’s capabilities to voice their opinions and concerns at the sub-county- and district level?

The evaluation team has seen groups that are very active in their production and marketing activities. They have seen no signs or indications of farmers or farmer groups voicing their opinions and concerns at the sub-county and districts levels.

3.5 Evaluation questions related to specific objective 2
Q2 Increased access to- and participation in remunerative markets
To what extent have smallholder farm households increased access to- and participation in remunerative markets?
Sub-questions:
Q2.1: To what extent has the programme contributed to an increased access to markets?
Q2.2: To what extent has the programme contributed to an increase in competences and improved participation of the target group in markets?
Q2.3: To what extent has the programme contributed to improved market functioning?
Q2.4: To what extent has the programme contributed to an increased profit from agriculture at household level?
Q2.5: To what extent has the programme contributed to increased productivity and quality of agricultural produce?
Q2.6: To what extent has the programme contributed to an improved service delivery of Hodfa and Madfa to the target group?

These questions are so interwoven and interconnected that the evaluation team has chosen to answer them integrally.

a. Claims
To put the questions in perspective, first the number of groups involved in the CAEDP is presented: The number of groups the CAEDP has established and/or is working with has grown considerably since the beginning of the programme and has surpassed the targeted number of groups. This is quite an achievement, especially given the rough terrain and the remoteness of some of the communities in Buliisa and Hoima (see Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of groups</th>
<th>Actuals 2010</th>
<th>Actuals 2011</th>
<th>Actuals 2012</th>
<th>Target end programme 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoima</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buliisa</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CAEDP</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Number of groups involved in CAEDP, per year, total and targeted for end of programme

When looking at the indicators that are collected by the CAEDP itself for indicating improved access to and participation in remunerative markets (see charts 3 and 4), it could be stated that over the last three years the number of groups with a profitable enterprise AND the number of enterprise groups that increased their produce sold have increased considerably (based on data collected by the CAED programme for their monitoring reports).
Also the MSC stories and the questionnaires confirm that most farmers have increased their production/acre, increased their acreage of cultivation, and sell a larger part of their crops than in 2009 before the CAEDP started (see table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acres owned (average of hh visited)</th>
<th>Acres cultivated (either on own or leased land) in acres and as percentage of land owned</th>
<th>Increased yields scale 1-10*</th>
<th>% of yield sold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoima</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Runga</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kabanda</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kaseeta</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buliisa</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Biso</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avogera</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uribo</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Acres owned and cultivated, yields and % of yield sold 2009-2012

*Farmers were requested to rank their yield per acre in 2009 and 2012 with 1-10, 1 indicating low yield, 10 indicating very high yield. The scale mentioned in this table is the average difference in ranking between 2009-2012.

This table also reveals that there are quite some differences in areas cultivated and produce sold between the communities visited.

Some more probing on variations in groups
Combining the charts and table 6, the evaluation team concludes that most households and groups have increased access to markets, but some households and groups definitely profit more from this market access than others. In charts 3 and 4 (based on information gathered by the programme itself) all groups that make profit have been included, including probably groups in Kabanda that hardly cultivate but sell a few things on the local market. In table 6 we have seen quite some differences among communities, not all communities benefit equally.
The evaluation team has basically seen three types of groups:

- Groups that have taken up farming as a business and sell collectively to a buyer (group A in table 7);
- Groups that just started cultivating more and are getting better yields and are still looking for markets (group B) and,
- Groups that hardly cultivate and sell a part of their limited yields (group C).

The groups not only differ in their results, but also show - in general - rather different characteristics (see table 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A ‘Commercial farmers’</th>
<th>Group B ‘Subsistence-commercial’</th>
<th>Group C Farmers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stable groups</td>
<td>Some stability (limited)</td>
<td>Hardly stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature enterprises</td>
<td>Emerging enterprises</td>
<td>Some crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market linkages/buyer</td>
<td>Market linkages weak/ local markets</td>
<td>Local market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings (internal &amp; external)</td>
<td>Savings (mainly internal)</td>
<td>Weak saving culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans (internal &amp; external)</td>
<td>Loans (mainly internal)</td>
<td>Limited internal loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group selling</td>
<td>Some group selling</td>
<td>Mainly individual selling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial profit</td>
<td>Some profits</td>
<td>Very limited profits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various types of spin-off</td>
<td>Some spin-off</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation: 5 out of 24 groups</td>
<td>16 out of 24</td>
<td>3/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimates partners</td>
<td>25-40% of groups</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 7 Types of farmer groups and their characteristics |

The programme aims to facilitate the transformation from subsistence farmers to more commercial farmers.

For group A (5 of the 24 groups the evaluation team visited) this transformation is quite successful. Groups in Kaseeta and some in Biiso have defined profitable enterprises, are selling collectively, and are making quite substantial profit. One of the groups in Kaseeta bought a piece of land to build an office and storage for the group. They make use of loans, save etc. Part of the explanation why the CAEDP works so well in these communities is that the enabling conditions for production are favourable; and even more so the vicinity of a market and rather good infrastructure.

The majority of groups that participated in the evaluation (16/24) is still trying to come to grips with marketing and especially collective marketing (despite the fact that the market should have been explored before choosing an enterprise/crop within the sequence of the programme). In general production and yields are increasing, but finding markets and selling in bulk as a group is a challenge especially in remote areas like Avogera, Uribo and Runga. Agricultural conditions in Avogera and Uribo are good, while in Runga the farmers are facing harsher climates (semi-arid). In both Avogera and Uribo there are very strong saving cultures (initiated at the beginning of the 2000s by organisations like Build Africa Uganda). Despite these strengths and increased investments in agriculture, the groups make rather marginal profit due to the challenging market situation. They usually sell their produce individually at local markets, not knowing how to access the market otherwise.
Then there is a third type of groups that in general show unstable groups, people entering and exiting the groups (and the community), hardly saving (as a result of unstable groups), with members that are hardly engaged in the cultivation of crops. These groups, mainly found in Kabanda, usually include fishermen, and people active in fish trading without a tradition of cultivating crops (in contrast, in Runga many households are traditionally engaging in both fishing and agriculture). Some of the households started vegetable growing and selling, but it is at a very small scale and seemingly without strong motivation. These groups do not have much potential for becoming commercial crop farmers. They are however many times involved in animal husbandry and trade.

When looking at the number of groups met during the evaluation and the estimates of the partners on what percentage of the groups belong to a certain category, the evaluation figures give a rather different (and more in-depth) picture of 'access to markets' than the CAEDP indicators as used in the CAEDP reporting.

b. Concerns
Despite increased market access as indicated above, many of the groups have not embarked on collective marketing while this is one of the key issues of the CAED programme. The evaluation team has seen some groups in Kaseeta and Biiso that are bulking their (individually produced) produce for selling to a (specific) buyer. In places like Avogera and Uribo farmers in general do not bulk their individually produced harvest. They sell the harvest of their group demonstration field (which many groups have) as a group and call this collective marketing. They usually sell this harvest at the local market since the volumes are small and other markets are far away. In Runga collective marketing is exceptional as well.

Farmers explain this lack of collective farming through various argumentations: ‘The yields are low’, ‘there is no market’, ‘the market is too far away’, ‘buyers do not want to come all the way to our village (except for Olam, the cotton buyer)’, ‘we are just starting and intend to start collective marketing next year’ etc.

Although group marketing is part of the training curriculum of the CAED programme, also field advisors of the partners admit that marketing is a weak point in the programme. The field advisors are usually very good at agricultural production and farming techniques, but less well versed in marketing issues.

Even so: The farmers may be empowered to look for markets, more is needed to really make a connection between producers and buyers: Investments in infrastructure, storage, collection and distribution centres, packaging, buyers knowing where to get produce etc. When conditions are favourable like in Kaseeta, farmers may find their own way. When communities are situated in remote areas, and face less favourable agricultural and infrastructural conditions, more (in the sense of organisation and investment) is needed to make collective marketing work.

c. Issues
Regarding access to and participation in remunerative markets there are two important questions to be asked:
1. Given the typology of the various farmer groups, the fact that field advisors are covering huge areas to coach and mentor their groups, and the observation that especially the middle type of groups easily loose their motivation when not well monitored and coached, the
question arises whether the programme should keep on targeting all 'farmers', even those that do not have much potential for cultivating crops. Trias, Hodfa, Madfa and Hofokam are targeting the 'active' poor, those farmers that have the potential to alter their situations and could transform their 'subsistence' farming towards more commercial farming. This seemingly does not include type C 'farmers'. Tullow though sees these groups, as long as they may be negatively affected by their operations, as an important target group. Alternative livelihoods may be looked for to cater for the needs of these communities (see paragraph 3.11 on alternative livelihoods, pages 35-36).

2. Given the weak collective marketing within many of the communities, a lot of work is to be done on this issue. This does not only entail working on empowering of farmers, but on other stakeholders in the value chains; and on physical infrastructure (storage, distribution) and transportation as well. It could also mean a re-orientation on the concept of 'collective' marketing. What does the programme envision with 'collective' marketing, and how should it work exactly? Is it physical bulking mainly, or is making agreements on prices by individual members sufficient (selling individually but at group level agreed prices)?

3.6 Evaluation questions related to specific objective 3

Q3 Increased investment in their farming business

To what extent have smallholder farm households increased investment in their farming business?

Sub-questions:

Q3.1: To what extent has the programme contributed to an increased access to financial services for the target group?

Q3.2: To what extent has the programme contributed to an increased saving culture of the target group?

Q3.3: To what extent has the programme contributed to an increase in financial and production capital for the target group?

Q3.4: To what extent has the programme contributed to an increase in investment in farming business?

Q3.5: To what extent has the programme contributed to an improved service delivery of Hofokam to the target group?

These questions are -again- so interwoven and interconnected that the evaluation team has chosen to answer them integrally.

The main indicators that are used in the programme to indicate progress on this objective and its outcomes include indicators on savings (increased amounts), loans (increased loan volume), loan repayments and the graduation of groups towards bigger amounts. Unfortunately the programme did not gather information on actual 'increased investment' of loans and/or saving of households in their farming practices, and also the evaluation team could not get proper data on the 'levels of investment'. The team got mixed messages on using loans and savings for buying agricultural inputs, land, combined with using the money for building permanent houses, school fees, motorcycles, medical bills etc. A study conducted by the Mountains of the Moon University provides more information on cash flows within households but at the time of the evaluation study the findings of this study were not available yet to the evaluators.
3.6.1 Internal saving and loaning

a. Claims

Internal saving refers to saving by groups themselves without putting the savings on a bank account with a formal institution. Many times groups use saving boxes that can only be opened when at least three members of the group are present. From these savings individual members can get a loan.

When looking at the CAEDP indicators and data gathered by the programme itself, great improvement in numbers and volume of internal saving and loaning can be seen. In the communities visited the evaluation team encountered many groups with a rather strong internal saving culture: All groups visited saved money in their groups, although the amounts vary considerably. Especially in Avogera and Uribo the team encountered strong saving cultures. In Avogera groups saved between 1 and 8 million UGX!

One of the reasons the internal saving in Avogera is so high is that they anticipate to obtain loans from Hofokam, and in Avogera no external saving (using a formal bank account) is undertaken although several groups mentioned they are in the process of getting a bank account. In Kaseeta, Biiso and Uribo also substantial external saving with formal institutions is done.

All groups visited claim they give out internal loans to group members, based on their needs, with an interest rate of 10% per month (loaners are supposed to repay within a month’s time).

Especially in Buliisa district the internal saving culture is strong (18 of the 49 MSC stories had saving as their main topic, against 2 of the 31 in Hoima). This cannot be attributed to the CAEDP programme only since Build Africa Uganda started in the 2000s savings groups in the villages visited. Some groups claim though that their saving discipline has been revitalised after the CAED programme entered the community. The groups also say that after the CAEDP came in they started using the savings in a different way. While before they mainly used the savings for medical bills, bridging gaps and school fees, they now started using it for agricultural inputs like seeds and planting material. The evaluation team cannot substantiate the % of savings invested in agricultural inputs. For more information on the use of savings the team would like to refer to the Mountains of the Moon University study (2012).

b. Issue

If the internal saving culture is so strong in some of the communities, why are the groups still trying to obtain loans from external sources? Why aren’t they using the internal savings

---

---
instead? Instead of being dependent on loans from external sources, would it not be more profitable for communities to start using their own capital as a micro-finance fund? What factors prevent the groups from using their own internal savings as a micro-finance fund?

### 3.6.2 External loans

#### a. Claims

The programme indicators show quite a number of groups that have access to external loans (with Hofokam): Currently 37 groups have in total UGX 119 million outstanding loan.

![Chart 7 Number of groups with external loan](chart7.png)

In Hoima 2012 shows a reduced number of loans. This is due -according to Hofokam- to their staff turnover in Hoima. Also recovery rates decreased in 2012, due to local droughts, combined with staff turnover.

The evaluation team met 8 groups (out of the 24) that acquired loans from Hofokam. One of them is already in its 4th cycle (Kaseeta), others are in their 3rd (1), second (5 groups) or first loan cycle (1). Only groups in Kaseeta, Biiso and Uribo are engaged in external loans. In Runga, Kabanda and Avogera no external loans were given out, despite the fact that Avogera has enormous internal savings.

#### b. Concerns

- In Buliisa, in Biiso and Uribo groups were able to attract loans for their 'enterprise' but did in the end not get sufficient profit due to low yields caused by droughts. The groups repaid the loan through other sources of income.
- Currently 37 groups receive a loan with an outstanding amount of 119M. Many new groups want to enter the loan scheme (especially groups in Avogera), while almost all the money from the Tullow Fund is currently outstanding as loans already.
- Loans given out by Hofokam to farmer-groups, need to be repaid within 6 months. For many crops this timeframe means that farmers need to repay their loan when prices of the crops are lowest, during or right after harvest time. This is going against the objective of the programme to support farmers in obtaining better prices for their produce.

### 3.6.3 Investments

No reliable data was found on the level of investments in agricultural production, not within the CAEDP indicator set, not during the evaluation. The team got many mixed messages on investments, but has seen various signs of increased investment, especially in Kaseeta where
farmers buy inputs, and good planting materials. The study conducted by Mountains of the Moon University may contain some more information on this issue.

### 3.7 Capacity strengthening

Although not included as an evaluation question, the team spent some time to assess the capacities of the partners. The team did a capacity self-assessment with the partners, based on the 5-capabilities model, and invited partners to tell Most Significant Change Stories on Capacity strengthening.

![Figure 3 Five capabilities model (IOB (2011), based on Baser and Morgan, 2008)](image)

**Figure 3** Five capabilities model (IOB (2011), based on Baser and Morgan, 2008)

**Five capabilities:**

A. Capacities to act and commit. This means the partners are equipped with sufficient staff, capacities and resources to deliver services.

B. Capacities to deliver development results and create outcomes and impact in the communities.

C. Capacities to adopt and renew, finding new customers, adjust services and products.

D. Capacities to relate to external and internal actors

E. Capacities to maintain, sustain and create internal and external (with policies of others, rules, regulations) coherence.
Partner staff involved in the CAEDP was requested to score on various questions with scores from 1-5. When looking at the self-assessments, the following results can be detected:

Both Hodfa, Madfa and Hofokam feel major progress in capacities to deliver development results, to adopt and renew, to relate to external and internal actors and to maintain coherence. A difference between the two Farmers’ Associations and Hofokam lies in the capacity to adopt and renew, and to relate to external and internal actors. Hofokam deems itself stronger in adoption and renewal, while the two FAs feel stronger in relating to external and internal actors.

Hofokam sees itself as rather strong in adjusting their loan products and services to their relatively new group of clientele, smallholder farm households. Hodfa and Madfa have always been targeting that clientele so for them the change in adoption and renewal is less obvious.

For all three partners, the capacities to commit and act were already quite strong at the start of the programme and did not changed much.

For all three partners, MSC stories on capacity development were harvested, and for each partner one story was selected as the most significant one. Both stories of the farmers associations Hodfa and Madfa dealt with the PAED approach and increased visibility in the districts. The MSC story of Hofokam dealt with the new group of clients, smallholder farm households. Some of these MSC stories have been captured on video as well.

**Most significant change story on capacities selected by Madfa: Capabilities to facilitate farmers to move from subsistence to commercial farming**

I am David Wanzala, 42 and married with children. I graduated from Bullalasa Agricultural College with a diploma in crop science and production. I am a farmer by occupation as well (practising crop production and agro forestry). I joined Madfa in 2006.

Madfa identified Trias Uganda, a Belgium based NGO that supports developing countries. Through the regular support Trias provided technical training to all the field staff of Madfa to capacitate them to serve and support farmers in developing their farming business. As an individual I have benefited a lot since the training has improved my facilitation skills, communication skills, I acquired more knowledge and skills in farming, and it has enabled me to reach out to many farmer groups. My challenges are harsh working conditions.
conditions. For me the most significant change is that I am able to contribute to smallholder farmers’ transformation from subsistence to commercial farming.

**Most significant change story on capacities from Hodfa: From handouts to empowerment**

I am Bob George Sunday, Agricultural Field advisor for Hodfa. I joined Hodfa in 2010. One thing I am very proud of is the PAED approach. I used to work with an organisation that provided handouts to farmers. They gave livestock, planting materials, bicycles and so it was very easy to mobilise farmers. When I started working with Hodfa I thought ‘Uhh, if we are not giving handouts, how are we going to mobilise farmers?’ But actually, the PAED approach was so self-empowering! It uses participatory diagnoses through which the farmers analyse their own current situation and that stimulates them to design a strategy on how they can become better off. So I am really proud that this approach works. It has shaped me, not only in working with farmers but also in my family. At home I am sitting down and plan my future as well. I need to practice what I am telling others. That is all!

**Story from Hofokam: The programme as platform to reach active poor**

I am Rosie-Marie Kaddu, and I work for Hofokam as a programme accountant. Working with the CAED programme I have seen several significant changes. First of all the programme has helped us to meet our target and our mission, namely to reach and empower the ‘active poor.’ Basically the programme’s mission is to improve the food and income security of smallholder farmers and we aim at the active poor. These groups fall under the same category. We believe that this programme has provided us with a platform to reach these active poor. Through working with the farmers associations, the number of groups of smallholder farmers we are working with is increasing. The programme has helped us to increase our portfolio, we have seen a growth in the portfolio and outreach.

**3.8 Appreciation along the DAC Criteria**

**a. Relevance:** *To what extent is the objective still valid (in terms of consistency with requirements and needs of the target group)?*

The evaluation team assesses the relevance of the CAED programme very high for several reasons. Currently still 96% of the farmers in Uganda are smallholder farmers who are basically producing for their own survival, without much access to financial institutions. At the same time the population is growing at a rate of 3.2% annually while food production is growing at a rate of 3% only. This low production can be mainly attributed to poor technology, reduced soil fertility, poverty and limited knowledge and skills.

The discovery of oil in Uganda has contributed to an intensified debate on the possibly negative consequences for the agricultural sector and added to the urgency of increased food production. Various authors (Rwakakamba, 2012; IFPRI, 2011; Tumusiine-Mutebile, 2012)) refer to the Dutch disease. The theory of Dutch disease is that an increase in revenues from oil will adversely affect the tradables (manufacturing and agriculture) of a nation’s economy by appreciating the local currency, which in turn makes manufacturing and agriculture less competitive. Rwakakamba gives the situation of Gabon as example, where since initiating the export of
Oil has seen its agriculture sector collapse; it is now entirely dependent on imported food.

Despite the risks, the IFPRI (2011) also refers to the positive impact of oil on agricultural production if the Dutch disease will be handled properly. Domestic demand for staples and higher value products like horticulture and livestock products will increase as incomes rise.

In recent discussions on the effect of oil on agricultural production, voices in Uganda (Tumusiine Mutebile, 2012) state, "Unless there are radical changes in our approach to agriculture, our agricultural performance will weaken further, with very deleterious consequences for rural poverty, employment, inequality, geographically balanced growth and food security." These same voices state that the agricultural sector needs to be modernized by raising productivity and promoting commercialization, with a focus on smallholder farmers, better policies and investments, and increased access to financial institutions. Precisely those issues the CAEDP is working on and is successful at.

Also a recent study of the Rabobank (Rabobank Group, 2012) emphasizes the importance of involving smallholder farmers in food production for the market, improving their access to financial services and forming cooperatives for inputs and marketing. Also in this respect is the CAED programme relevant as ever.

Another issue at a totally different level—but very important for the empowerment of the smallholder farmers in Uganda—is the 'no-hand-outs' principle of the approach. The evaluation team has seen how handouts of other programmes have corrupted the entrepreneurial spirit of smallholders in some of the communities.

Empowering farmers and especially smallholders, as has been shown in other parts of Africa where land grabbing is taking place, is extremely important, especially given developments in the region (oil and influx of other people), and the increasing pressure on land and hence the value of land for settlements, food and cash crops.

b. Effectiveness: To what extent has the objective been achieved?
In paragraphs 3.4-3.6 the evaluation team has shown that the programme is very well on its way in reaching its objectives of ensuring good and balanced nutrition throughout the year, increased access to- and participation in remunerative markets for smallholder farmers and increased investment in their farming businesses. At all three specific objectives the programme has made good contributions.
Areas of improvement concern mainly the marketing components of the programme in general, collective marketing, the loan repayment terms and the focus on 'external' loans versus internal loans.

c. Efficiency: Was the objective implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
As far as the evaluation team could see, the objectives were implemented rather efficiently. The programme worked as much as possible with existing groups (set up by other GO and NGO programmes), and trained the farmer groups in a pragmatic and efficient way in food security, increased production methods, saving and credit and to a lesser extent on marketing. Where possible the programme trained farmer facilitators that took over part of the work of the agricultural advisors, and field visits by agricultural advisors to active groups are usually combined with other visits and/or activities. For the evaluators it was not possible to compare efficiency of the programme with efficiency of other programmes due to time limitations.
The programme has grown very rapidly in a short period of time. A concern here is to consolidate the successes of the existing groups, rather than continuing with rapid growth of the number of groups. The team has seen that groups easily lose their motivation and courage if the mentoring and coaching of programmes stops too early.

d. Impact: What is the potential contribution of the objective towards long-term impact (contribution to general objective of the program after 6 years)?
In paragraph 3.4 the evaluation team has discussed the early signs of impact of the programme. The team is convinced that in the coming years more signs of impact will appear, especially when more attention will be paid to the collective marketing aspects of the programme, and when working with those groups that show potential (see typology of farmer groups in table 7, page 22).

e. Sustainability: What is the probability of (i) long term effects of the objective, (ii) financial sustainability, and (iii) environmental sustainability?
Regarding long term effects of the ultimate goal: The evaluation team finds it very likely that if the programme continues, the effect of the ultimate goal may sustain in the long term, especially since the farmers not only learn technical and marketing skills, but life-skills in general as well.

Financial sustainability at the level of the farmer groups is well covered. The groups that survive the first years, will very likely be able to sustain themselves since although saving and loaning is done at group level, the farmers are accountable at individual level and till date are in general capable to repay loans and save money.

Financial sustainability of the partners is a different story. At the moment of writing both Madfa and Hodfa are mainly depending on funds provided by donors and programmes: Madfa depends for 70% of their income on donors, 15% on membership fees and 15% on their business wing. Hodfa depended in 2011 for 5% of their income on membership fees, 2% from business and 93% from donors. The question here is whether Madfa and Hodfa can continue their CAEDP work in both Hoima and Buliisa if the CAEDP funding stops. The work in both districts consumes a lot of time of the field advisors and although mainly the first year requires a significant time investment of the advisors, coaching and mentoring of the groups requires (travel) time as well.

Hodfa and Madfa have received training in fundraising and resource mobilisation and for example Madfa was capable of attracting funding over the years from Abl Trust. However both Farmers’ Associations need to pay urgent attention to the development of their business wing to be able to survive when donors are either withdrawing or reducing the budgets. Hodfa made a good start in 2012 by setting up a hub for agro-business and delivery of crops to Tullow camps through Traidlinks.

Hofokam is a micro-finance institution and has drilled into a new reservoir of clients. Currently they claim that the crop loans are not sufficiently profitable yet to work without the Tullow fund. Very likely Hofokam will be able to independently serve farmer clients in a few years time.

Regarding environmental sustainability the team has noticed that the environment may be affected over time if the programme does not pay specific attention to sustainable agricultural practices. The data show that almost all households interviewed, are cultivating more acres than before. Although the evaluation team cannot substantiate to what extent this has affected the environment, it is likely that land has been cleared of trees and bushes.
The evaluation team has also noted that more and more farmers started using fertilizers and pesticides. Combined with heavy rainfall, this could possibly cause pollution of surface and ground water.

Other issues that may need attention in the near future: With the influx of people into the districts, the demand for fuel (for cooking) will increase as well, threatening the vegetation in the districts. Some first signs of encroaching of forest and game reserves were noted by district officers interviewed.

PART 2 FINDINGS ON ALTERNATIVE LIVELIHOODS

3.9 How and to what extent will Tullow operations affect communities and the livelihoods of communities in the Kaiso-Tonya and Buliisa valley?

At present the impact of Tullow's operations in the Kaiso-Tonya and Buliisa valley is still rather limited since the exploration phase is still going on. Oil wells have been identified and first camps have been established, but oil exploitation itself has not started yet. During the seismic surveys crops and other assets placed on the fields have been damaged and farmers have been compensated for their loss through compensation schemes. Some land has been fenced off to protect oil wells. This land is not compensated since according to Tullow staff, the government is expected to do this part of the compensation.

Other effects mentioned by district people, include a reported increase in traffic accidents, especially affecting children and livestock. Some of the cases have been reported to the police and taken to court to be settled.

Another effect, but mainly in anticipation of the oil exploitation: Although the researcher cannot substantiate it, the influx of people into the area in anticipation on the oil industry has started, especially in the rift valley communities.

Some positive effects can be seen in the following: Improvements of roads, and the emergence of demand for local content and local produce for the oil camps. Groups of farmers (connected to Hodfa) have, in cooperation with Hodfa, Traidlinks, Trias and Tullow, started to deliver local produce to the camp caterer Equator.

In the future though, especially when oil exploitation will commence, the impact on local communities and their livelihoods is likely to increase. How the communities will be affected exactly is largely unknown by all interviewees, but Tullow staff states that 'all options are open- from social and economic effects to environmental effects'.

The land where the refinery and some of the secondary industries will be located will in 5 years’ time or so displace many people. The government is expected to deal with this resettlement. The refinery will be located up the escarpment. Tullow will mainly restrict its operations in the Albertine valley area. The main areas of operation for the foreseeable future will be limited to the land area and the mid section exploration areas spreading from Bugoma up to Ngwedo Wanseko area in the Murchison Falls National park area of Buliisa district (see map 1). Operations will be confined to the rift valley bottom areas, and no or hardly any offshore operations (in Lake Albert) are foreseen till date.

Positive effects anticipated in the future include increased business opportunities, increased demand for agricultural produce, further improvement and extensions of roads especially to the villages where wells are located, some places will get electricity and get connected to the national grid, increased employment etc.
Since it is still unknown how and which the communities will be affected in the future, there is quite some uncertainty and concern in the communities. People anticipate an increase in traffic accidents (due to big trucks running up and down, while livestock and children are playing and walking along the road); an increased influx of people from outside; loss of land, crops and other assets; increase of crime, prostitution, spread of HIV/AIDS; increase of pollution (air, water and land) from exhaust and leaking oil pipes. And in case of resettlement or displacement of communities there is likely to be loss of livelihoods from the land, the communal firewood gathering woodlands and forests, the fishing villages and grazing areas.

3.10 What types of communities will be affected by Tullow operations and how?
As is shown in paragraph 3.9 mainly communities in the rift bottom areas in Hoima and Buliisa will be directly affected by Tullow operations, and no major activities are expected to take place offshore. In this sense Tullow is not expected to directly influence the water quality of the lake, nor of the fish stocks themselves. It are mainly unsustainable fishing practices that are affecting the fish stocks and threatening the livelihood of fishery communities. What might happen in the future though is the resettlement of some of the fishing communities since Tullow may need more space for their camps and may continue their exploration for oil, like for example in Kiryambogo, Hoima.
To get a better view on what types of communities may be affected, 5 communities in the rift bottom areas in Hoima and Buliisa were visited (see table 2, page 6), and their current and possible alternative livelihoods were examined. In general these communities represent:

- Communities mainly relying on fishing (Kiryambogo, Sebagoro, and Bugoigo landing sites);
- Communities relying on fishing and agriculture (Wanseko COU site), and
- Communities mainly relying on agriculture (Ngwedo trading centre).

Households in **Sebagoro landing site, Hoima** are mainly depending on fishing. Although Tullow is not directly impacting this community, this community is facing another threat of their livelihood: Due to unsustainable fishing practices, the fish stocks have been to a large extent depleted. Fishing by now is rather strictly regulated (at least by law, and to a lesser extent by law enforcement). Their income from fishery is still high but slowly diminishing. Not all households in Sebagoro have land (67%), and not all landowners cultivate the land, although over the last few years these percentages are growing (see table 8, page 35). Although the study team cannot substantiate this, the trend of increased landholding and cultivation may be partly due to the CAED programme interventions.

**The Kiryambogo Fishing Community, Hoima** is still predominantly a fishing community as well, with some crops and some livestock with lots of pastures. The fishing households face the same reduction of fish stock and government regulations as in Sebagoro. Just like in Sebagoro not all households have land (only 60% of interviewed households) and not even half of the landowners is cultivating the land, although also here these percentage are growing (see table 8) as well. The community is located closely to the Buseruka mini-hydro power station (under construction). It is possible that this community may be resettled since Tullow may expand their oil exploration to this area. One of Tullow's largest camps is in this area as well.

**Bugoigo Fishing Community, Hoima** is bordering Bugungu Game Reserve and is surrounded by oil wells. These features plus the fact that fishing is now an unreliable venture put Bugoigo in a vulnerable position. In neighbouring Butiaba, the Ministry of Agriculture is constructing a modern fish-landing site. This development could mean that all fishery-related activities will be moved to Butiaba, leaving Bugoigo empty-handed.

In **Ngwedo Trading Centre Community, Buliisa** there are more than 5 oil wells. Further exploration is still going on. The community is excited but at the same time anxious as to what will happen to their current livelihoods sources – mainly derived from farming. In Ngwedo all households own and cultivate their land. The average household income is very high when compared to other communities. Here the community or households are likely to lose land. This enhances the need to increase productivity, as land becomes a limiting factor.

**The Kigwera Community near Wanseko Landing/Ferry crossing point, Buliisa** is depending on both farming and fishing. Many fishermen invest money from fishing into agriculture it is said. Land is rather fertile, and traditionally farmers grow cassava and lately citrus has been introduced. Also pastures are available and households keep cattle, sheep and goats. The Ngwedo and Buliisa oil fields are close which makes Kigwera vulnerable to Tullow operations. Kigwera is at the intersection of the Tullow and Total concessions. Kigwera represents a very diverse and active community. There are many tribes including tribes from Congo. It is also a transit point for people and commerce.
In table 8 some more details on the current situation and livelihoods of 4 of the 5 visited communities. In 4 communities household interviews were conducted, as represented in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>HOIMA DISTRICT</th>
<th>BULIISA DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kiryambogo Fish Landing Site (Sample size, N=26)</td>
<td>Sebagoro Fish Landing Site (N=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. % of hh with land</td>
<td>54 60 50 67</td>
<td>93 100 94 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Average land holding (acres) / land owner</td>
<td>8.5 7.65 6.4 6.0</td>
<td>4.8 6.5 2 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. % of hh with land that cultivate crops</td>
<td>20 46 42 67</td>
<td>57 100 94 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Average acres of land cultivated /cultivators</td>
<td>2.0 1.85 3.0 2.69</td>
<td>3.2 5.1 1.5 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. % of hhs with grass houses</td>
<td>85 58 42 33</td>
<td>64 21 50 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. % of hhs with bicycles</td>
<td>23 27 42 50</td>
<td>79 93 50 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. % of hhs with livestock</td>
<td>34 77 83 100</td>
<td>79 100 75 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. % of hhs with phones</td>
<td>23 62 92 100</td>
<td>50 64 25 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Average annual income (UGX in millions)/ household interviewed</td>
<td>1.60m 1.72m 9.7m 7.8m</td>
<td>5.8m 11m 1.4m 1.52m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Current main sources of income of the community</td>
<td>Fishing and Trading</td>
<td>Fishing and some cropping / livestock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Current livelihoods in 4 visited communities

3.11 Given the various scenarios of negative impact by Tullow operations, the types of affected communities and their geographical locations: What are possible alternative livelihoods or restored livelihoods of affected communities?

To get good views on alternative livelihoods farmers and district leaders were asked for their opinion. Also use was made of the researcher’s own expertise while formulating the findings on this research question.

If fishing is no longer an option for fishing households in Kiryambogo Community the households state they would opt for commercial tomato growing, and large scale rearing of local chicken and ducks. The conditions are quite favourable for these activities and some of the households have some experience already.

The district officers and the researcher observe that Kiryambogo community also has access to pastures and there is water all year round for livestock. The community has quite some experience with livestock already (sheep, goats, cattle). A point of attention here is uncontrolled grazing of livestock. If livestock is to be an important alternative for fishing, then something needs to be done on protecting crops, and demarcation of land.
Another alternative is growing vegetables. For growing vegetables the water that flows from the hydro power plant could be a reliable source of irrigation if water is needed in dry periods.

Its location and proximity to Buseruka mini hydro power station creates a lot of opportunities for small-scale industry development as well. This is especially important for those households without any land (still 40% of the households do not have land).

Fish farming is mentioned by the district officers as alternative for the current fishing practices. Again, this livelihood may be of great importance to those households without land.

In case of reallocation of the community, alternative livelihoods entirely depend on the conditions of the new locations. What is important to keep in mind as well as is that many households are not traditional crop cultivators.

Households in Sebagoro Community involved in fishing activities, and owning land, state that they are ready to go back to the land and grow cassava, maize and beans for both food and cash. Many of them have dual homes and land up the escarpment in Kabwoya/Kaseeta areas. However, still 33% of the households is without land. For households without land fish farming may be an option as well.

In Ngwedo Community most households are involved in cultivation of crops and in livestock. Here households state that if they will loose land due to Tullow's operations they would intensify cassava and cotton cultivation and the rearing of goats. Some of the households have land further in-land and say they would start cultivating over there. For those who do not have land (although all households interviewed do have land), they said that there is still the option of renting currently at about 50,000 UGX per acre per season. The Ngwedo community has some enterprising individuals involved in providing services like carpentry, building and repair mechanics in addition to vending fuel for motorcycles among other trades.

While households in Kigwera Community are currently engaged in livestock rearing, crop farming and fishing, they state that in case of loss of land or loss of fishery income, they would still concentrate on their traditional livelihoods like cassava growing, goat rearing and fish trading since these enterprises are low risk. On fish trading, they state that the fact that a new landing site is being developed, means that fishing will still be relevant in the near future. Cassava is a major crop for the region and across the lake in DRC. Cassava has in their eyes a lot of market and value addition opportunities like making local and modern/bottled brew and industrial starch.

From the district officers' point of view, the agricultural hinterland is favourable for citrus growing, and Kigwera is a transit point for both people and commerce and has a lot of scope for trade of any kind, especially since it is also at the cross roads of the areas of two major oil companies, Tullow and Total.

Currently Bugoigo Community is a major fishing community. People state that if fishing activities were affected, they would concentrate on general trading. If land would be still available those who have land, would grow cassava and rear goats as their new sources of income. The households claim that cassava has market and is a good food security crop while goats are easy to produce and can be sold at short notice if needed.
4. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED & RECOMMENDATIONS

PART 1. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED & RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON THE EVALUATION

4.1 Conclusions
1. The CAED programme has -next to other actors and factors- contributed to improved food and income security of the participating smallholder farmers in Hoima and Buliisa districts. Almost all households interviewed show increased food and income security indices. Exceptions are the households in Uribo where lower food security indices are found for 2012 than for 2009. Causes for these lower indices in Uribo are not clear to the evaluation team but could be partly due to bad harvests in the last 2 years. Non-participating households have increased their food and income security indices as well but show significantly fewer positive changes in the various elements of the indices than participating households.

2. Almost all households show increased income security, even those households that do not embark on collective marketing and continue to sell at individual levels. If the partners, Tullow and Trias regard collective marketing as an important approach of the programme, this part needs more attention.

3. All interviewed households have increased access to remunerative markets. They not only have higher yields, they cultivate more acres and sell larger percentages of their yields at (mainly local) markets.

4. Although the programme includes all groups that make profit with their 'enterprises', the levels of profitability vary considerably between groups. There are a) CAEDP groups that made the change from subsistence driven to 'more market driven' farmers already (see figure 2.1.1 Farm production pyramid), b) those that are in the process of transformation but mainly lack access to good markets (either due to remoteness and/or lack of self-organisation), and c) groups that do not have the potential to make the move towards market driven farmers since they either lack the motivation and/or enabling conditions for marketing and crop cultivation.

![Figure 2.1.1: Farm production pyramid](image-url)
5. The CAED programme is valued by the smallholder farmers mainly because of the services related to skills and knowledge for improving food and cash crop production, and the savings and loan elements (especially in Buliisa). Although this is laudable, this does not reflect the full scope of the PAED approach. Marketing, post harvest measures, storage, collective marketing, enterprise selection, working in groups and making a fist (those elements that would actually empower farmers) are hardly mentioned as important elements of the programme.

6. In general the participating households and groups are rather strong in saving money, also thanks to other programmes in the region. In some groups they have amassed rather important volumes of savings. The CAED programme has benefited from this saving culture and has added, especially in Buliisa, an intensified use of the savings for investment in agricultural production. The evaluation team could not substantiate how much of the savings is used for investment in agricultural production. The study conducted by the Mountains of the Moon University (MMU) (not available at the time of writing) may provide more details on this issue.

7. The number and volume of loans provided by Hofokam to farmer groups has increased since the start of the programme, with a draw back in 2012 due to staffing problems. Many groups are eagerly anticipating towards future loans, although the credit fund was almost nearly fully in use as outstanding loans during the time of the evaluation.

8. Some groups have obtained loans for their enterprise but had to repay the loans through other sources since either the harvest failed and/or the loan was used for another purpose than the enterprise. Although it seems this mechanism is not widespread, it is important to keep on monitoring these cases to avoid loan-traps.

9. One of the objectives of the programme is to support farmers to obtain better prices for their produce. As prices are low at the time of harvest, it often means that the produce needs to be stored for some time after harvest. However, the loans given out by Hofokam in general need to be paid back after 6 months. For some crops this may mean during harvest time, when prices are at their lowest. This seems to be a contradiction within the programme.

4.2 Lessons learned

10. The CAEDP works well especially in communities that have stable groups, that have enabling agricultural conditions, and access to markets that is facilitated by infrastructure like roads and store-houses as seen in Kaseeta and Biiso. Some more efforts are needed in remote communities where agricultural conditions are enabling, but where access to markets is difficult. The programme hardly succeeds in communities that are unstable (great in-and out flux of people) and where people have no cultivation tradition, like the fishing community in Kabanda. This is especially so since crop production is the core focus in the CAED programme (see for more lessons and recommendations part 2 on alternative livelihoods).

11. The CAEDP programme contributed to increased income security even when groups are not marketing collectively.

12. Marketing in its broad facets is an area in need for development, and especially collective marketing. Most staff (of both Trias and the partners Madfa and Hodfa) is well-
versed in agricultural crop cultivation but have less knowledge and skills to offer on marketing.

13. Empowering farmers to produce for the market is a successful though one-sided approach that needs to be accompanied by changes in behaviour of the other actors in the market chain, and adjustments in policies, infrastructure (storages and roads) as well.

14. In general the PAED approach is very powerful but not used to its full potential yet. Especially the mobilization of farmers without providing handouts sets an example for other programmes in the area.

4.3 Recommendations
15. The team recommends the CAEDP to continue with those farmers that have potential for the cultivation of crops (types A and B) since the programme has shown good first results in terms of income and food security.

16. It is recommended to further diversify the CAEDP approach, based on the presence or absence of other enabling conditions, like fertility, climate, infrastructure, access to markets etc. The programme could develop different approaches for communities that benefit from enabling conditions and for those communities that do not benefit from enabling conditions (agricultural zone, stable groups, remoteness, infrastructure etc).

17. The marketing aspects (including cost-benefit analyses, enterprise selection, storage, collective marketing, packaging, transportation, distribution etc) need far more attention than was given during the first phase of the programme. This means the programme needs to seek additional expertise to strengthen the marketing aspects.

18. The programme’s vision on ‘collective marketing’ (what is it supposed to be, and how should it work) needs to be further defined. Is it really necessary to physically bulk produce and sell it to one buyer or are price agreements among individual group members sufficient as well?

19. The partners Madfa, Hodfa and Hofokam, Trias and Tullow are advised to reconsider how they wish to proceed with those groups that do not have much potential for cultivating crops (type C). Are these the groups of farmers they want to represent as Farmer Associations, are these the groups Trias wants to target? Are these the group Tullow wants to target? Do the needs of these groups need to be catered during the next phase by the CAEDP? If the answer is yes, recommendations for alternative livelihoods are presented in the next part of conclusions and recommendations. This may entail a search for additional partners for the CAEDP that are well versed in fishing (wild and farming), livestock and trading (see for further details page 41-43).

20. With regard to loans and saving: If there is a considerable volume of savings in groups and households, the programme should research how farmers could be encouraged to use this money for agricultural investments instead of loaning from Hofokam or other micro-finance institutions.

21. Within the programme many different indicators are being used to track progress. The team recommends to reduce the number of indicators, and to start using among others for specific objective 2, the typologies of groups A, B, and C. The team also recommends to
further define these categories so that at the end of the programme, the programme is able to show percentages of groups that made the move towards market driven farming, those that made first steps and those that failed to do so, and/or fell back. Also for the specific objective 3 it is recommended to start using volumes/percentages of money that are used for investment instead of using savings and loans as indicators.

22. It is recommended that Hofokam reviews their loan product terms to match with better cash flow needs of the target group.

PART 2. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON THE ALTERNATIVE LIVELIHOOD STUDY

On affecting communities and uncertainty
23. The main areas of Tullow operation for the foreseeable future will be limited to the land area and the mid section exploration areas spreading from Bugoma up to Ngwedo Wanseko area in the Murchison Falls National park area of Buliisa district (see map 1). Operations will be confined to the rift valley bottom areas, and no or hardly any offshore operations (in Lake Albert) are foreseen. Tullow has no clear view (yet) on how and to what extent communities may be affected by their operations.

Nevertheless, within the communities visited there is a lot of uncertainty whether and how their communities may be affected by Tullow operations. This is causing speculation about resettlements, and degradation of water, land and air, especially among the fishing communities, although they are likely least affected by Tullow operations.

➔ Tullow is recommended to map out which communities will be affected to what extent, and communicate this to the related communities as soon as possible. Tullow is also recommended to map out the path of transition towards re-allocation and/or alternative livelihoods if needed, collectively with the communities & households concerned and CAEDP partners, and prepare the communities well in advance.

On affecting fishing communities
24. Although Tullow requested the researcher to pay extra attention to fishing communities, the main threat for fishing communities is coming from within and not directly from Tullow operations. Unsustainable fishing practices are quickly diminishing certain fish stocks and if no law enforcement is followed, soon no fish will be fished out of Lake Albert. Many households depending on fishing need to embark on alternative livelihoods soon, despite the development of a new fish-landing site.

➔ The CAEDP is recommended to play a role in this transition towards alternative livelihoods as elaborated in conclusions 26 and 27.

On affecting communities in general
25. In general three types of communities will be affected by Tullow operations:

- Communities mainly relying on fishing (Kiryambogo, Sebagoro, and Bugoigo landing sites);
- Communities relying on fishing and agriculture (Wanseko COU site), and
- Communities mainly relying on agriculture (Ngwedo trading centre).

Many communities depend partly on trading as well.
It is recommended when and if Tullow is affecting communities to closely scrutinize and distinguish current livelihoods and consult households on their needs and skills for possible alternative livelihoods. The CAEDP evaluation has shown that not all households are fit for cultivating crops, especially when they do not have any tradition in cultivation (like some households in Kiryambogo, Sebagoro and Bugoigo). Some households may be better at livestock rearing, trading or fish farming instead.

There is no one fits all approach for affected communities. The following recommendations for possible alternative livelihoods serve as a guideline not as a blueprint.

**Crop cultivation for those with experience**

26. Communities in the rift valley areas that have access to land and are already well engaged in cultivating crops (like households in Ngwedo, Wanseko and also some households in the other communities) should be encouraged to continue crop farming as a top priority, even in case of re-allocation. Crops prioritised by the communities include cotton, cassava, maize, beans, peas, and citrus. Vegetables especially those that are tolerant to drought like watermelon and pumpkins are good options as well. Other vegetables like tomatoes and cabbages may need the support of irrigation in order to be viable. When planning for irrigation (either lake or river water or harvesting rainwater) it also important to plan for drainage as well as the same areas are usually prone to floods and droughts.

In order to improve on crop cultivation (both food and cash) there is a lot to learn from the current CAED programme and their advisors. To further develop crop cultivation CAEDP is encouraged to promote value addition. An example of this is the cultivation and processing of cassava for industrial starch and local beer.

To ensure investment in crop cultivation and protect crops from grazing livestock, and to avoid other land conflicts and land grabbing in the future, CAEDP partners are encouraged to lobby within the communities for formal registration of land, also of communal lands.

**Alternative livelihoods for those mainly depending on fishing**

27. For those households that do not have access to land (especially in Hoima district) and had/have fishing as their main source of livelihood there are three main options of alternative livelihoods: Sustainable fish farming, sustainable fishing, livestock and trading. In general households depending on fishing, have experience in rearing livestock and do trading as well.

**Sustainable fish farming**

Although only a select number of households can embark on fish farming, the CAEDP is recommended to explore affordable ways for fish farming, either cage or lagoon fishing. The demand for fish is large and instead of catching fish, fish farming -as long as it is done in a sustainable way- could be a good alternative. For this, expertise from outside may need to be involved in the programme.

**Sustainable fishing**

Currently fishing practices are unsustainable and law enforcement is limited. There is need for examples of sustainable fishing. The CAEDP is recommended to explore how they can guide a part of the fisher households to be champions of sustainable fishing practices. For this, expertise from outside may need to be involved in the programme.
Livestock rearing
In areas where pastures are available, many households already have some small livestock like goats and sheep. It is recommended to guide households towards better grazing practices and good breeds of goats and sheep (better a few good goats than many weak ones). This can only be recommended if no conflicts between crop cultivators and goat keepers are expected, and land rights (especially on communal land) have been clarified. Here the CAEDP could make use of Hodfa’s expertise on guiding fishing households towards goat keepers (in for example Runga, Hoima). Also raising ducks and poultry could serve as alternative livelihoods.

Trade
Especially in trading centres and some of the landing site (especially Wanseko) a lot of trading is going on: Traders and shop owners/keepers, produce dealers, market vendors of all kinds, transporters, small scale processors, small grain millers, restaurant owners and operators, various service providers like repair shops, builders, carpenters etc. These professions offer good alternatives for fishers without land, living close by to these centres.

In the design of the next phase of the CEAD Programme strengthening of these small (trade) enterprises through -among others- vocational training is highly recommended.
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B. PEOPLE CONSULTED FOR THE ALTERNATIVE LIVELIHOOD STUDY

a) In-depth interviews were conducted with the following:
   Tullow Oil staff
   Ms Nahya Nkinzi, Social Investments Manager, Kampala

Local government leaders of Hoima district
Ms Jean Kaliba, Resident District Commissioner
Mr Kakoraki Fred, Deputy LCV
Mr Abenaitwe Robert, Deputy CAO
Mr Kennet Ebong, District Community Development Officer
Ms Joyce Kabatalya, Asst DCDO, Buseruka Sub county
Ms Joyce Kyamulesire, ACDO, Kabwoya Sub county

Local government leaders of Buliisa district
Mr Ferd Lukumu, Chairman
Mr Robert Kaahwa, District Production Officer
Mr Bernard Barugahara, District Community Development Officer
Dr Mubiru Rashid, District Veterinary Officer

b) Household interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ngwedo Community</th>
<th>Kigwera Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Anerwoth Gertrude (F)</td>
<td>i) Manyireki Julius (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kiryambogo Community</strong></td>
<td>i) Androme Gadi (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Oikan Joyce (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Chotun Gasto (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) Acen Santa(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v) Daikan Pecudia (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi) Mungurwiyo Evelyne (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii) Amigo Joseph (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii) Owachi Beatrice (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ix) Owachi Didan (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x) Onim Japot (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xi) Tekwoo Emmanuel (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xii) Onenchan Alfred (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiii) Okwam Felimina (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiv) Onenchan Mugwiek (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xv) Ofod Anjeli (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xvi) Drichiru Joyce (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xvii) Batambara Vasta (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xviii) Beriu Grace(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xix) Avutia Manuel (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xx) Amitho Justin (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxi) Faling Janet (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxii) Berochan Chitum (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxiii) Bidong Jetufin (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxiv) Onenchan Jombe (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxv) Kyarukibu Molly (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xxvi) Mzee Thomas (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NB: 7 members are from Odokomit CAEDP Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sebagoro Community</strong></td>
<td>i) Muchwa Elsha (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j) Tumwesige Langton (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Kyomuhendo Alice(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Ngando Ben (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) Tumi Hadija (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v) Aliyo Stephen (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi) Dorothy Twesige (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii) Kisaho Joseph (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii) Katusiime Muhereza (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ix) Mawa Sadiq (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x) Olam Gilbert (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xi) Kwonka Rehema (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xii) Mama Sadiq (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>All members are from Sebagoro lakeside CEADP group</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Field Support Team**
- Mr Charles Kasangaki, Coordinator, Hodfa
- Mr Godfrey Aganyira, Hodfa Field Advisor, Buseruka Sub county

**NB:** There are 15 members from Balyesiima CEADP group.
• Mr Mucwa Elisha, Hodfa Field Advisor, Kabwoya Sub county
• Mr David Mutyaba Katende, Coordinator, Madfa
• Mr Richard Nsamba, Ag-Enterprise Dev Advisor, Masindi/Hoima
• Mr Aliganyira Nezaphoro, Prog Officer CEAD Program, Masindi
• Mr David Wanzala, Madfa Field Advisor, Buliisa District

Overall Coordination
• Paul Allertz, Regional Coordinator Trias Uganda, Kampala
ANNEX III. TERMS OF REFERENCE (INCLUDING THE EXTRA ASSIGNMENT)

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Evaluation Community Agro-Enterprise Development Programme
CAEDP 2010 – 2012, Tullow & Trias Uganda

1. Introduction

The Community Agro-Enterprise Development Programme – CAEDP – is a programme that in its current phase is running from 2010 – 2012. It’s a programme funded by Tullow Oil Uganda and implemented by Trias Uganda and its partners Hofokam, Hodfa and Madfa. As the programme is approaching the end of the current phase, Tullow Oil requested for an evaluation of the CAEDP covering the period 2010 – 2012.

The aim of this ToR is to provide the framework for the evaluation of the CAEDP. This framework was jointly elaborated by Tullow Oil Uganda and Trias Uganda.

2. Evaluation objectives

2.1. The general objective

The general objective for the evaluation is:

To generate a focussed in-depth assessment of the most critical results, outcomes, and potential impact of the CAED Programme during the period 2010-2012; to generate lessons-learned and recommendations. If a second phase for the CAEDP is agreed and approved by Tullow Oil, the report of the evaluation also serves to improve the intervention of Trias and its partners during a follow-up phase of the CAEDP.

This general objective refers to the following complementary evaluation elements:
- Assess progress towards the achievements of the main program objectives (the Overall Objective and SO2 + SO3)
- Assess early signs of program success or failure (outcomes/impact)
- Identify lessons learned and recommendations
- Identify necessary adjustments to achieve program objectives
- Identify necessary adjustments to be included in a follow-up project; which include identification of alternative livelihoods for communities impacted by Tullow operations and a greater focus on communities in the valley (Kaiso-Tonya and Buliisa) and livelihood restoration for resettled communities.

The evaluation has to explore what worked and what did not, what led to success, and what did not, what are unexpected/emerging outcomes and impacts? How did the context influence the programme, etc? The CAEDP is a complex multi-stakeholder programme in which A did not automatically lead to B, many emerging results, and probably some activities that were planned did not take place and vice versa, the context changed direction of the programme etc. For that reason the evaluation should focus on the most critical objectives, viz. SO2 and SO3. These objectives are ‘the heart’ of the CAEDP. Focussing on those objectives allows for a more in-depth assessment and making space for the different perspectives on what success is and what not, what issues are at stake, and exploring underlying causes and views. The assessment should also consider how successes can be built on for a follow-up programme which will have a greater focus in the valley and will
include activities to support alternative livelihoods for fishing and other impacted communities and livelihood restoration for resettled communities. Considering this context identify what other livelihood activities take place and how the programme can be adjusted to include livelihood alternatives and restoration.

Outcomes and impact are defined as following:

**Outcomes** can be described as changes in behaviour – at the level of partners and the target group. If the strategy is effective and correct, then these changes in behaviour will eventually contribute towards impact, i.e. improved food and income security of the target group.

**Impact** can be described as changes in the socio-economic or institutional ‘status’ of the target group

### 2.2 Evaluation questions

The objectives of the CAED Programme are presented in annex 1. In developing the objectives of the CAEDP, output and outcome indicators were developed at the specific objective and expected results’ level, as well as income and food security indices at the general objective level. As mentioned under 2.1, the evaluation will mainly focus on the SO2 and SO3 and their contribution to the Overall Objective.

Through the regular Planning, Monitoring and Reporting (PMR) system, quantitative information was gathered for the output and outcome indicators at the end of 2010 and 2011. The progress on the income and food security indices is planned to be measured at the end of the programme’s 3-year period. It’s important that progress with the income and food security indices and the measurement of the output and outcome indicators as of August 2012 will be done first (see 3.1).

For the qualitative information, a list of evaluation questions is elaborated for the Specific Objectives 2 and 3 of the CAEDP. These questions aim to assess outcomes/impact on the general and those 2 specific objectives of the CAEDP, while referring to the outcome indicators where possible. As such, the qualitative evaluation adds to and qualifies the quantitative information from the regular PMR system.

The list of evaluation questions is based on the CAEDP objectives:

**Overall Objective**  
_The food and income security of smallholder farm households in Hoima and Buliisa Districts - bordering Lake Albert, is improved in a sustainable way_

- **Question O.1:** To what extent has the programme contributed to the development of a business and self-reliance attitude in the farming community?
- **Question O.2:** To what extent has the programme contributed to an empowered and knowledgeable farming community, engaged in “farming as a business”.
- **Question O.3:** To what extent has the programme contributed to strengthen the target group’s capabilities to voice their opinions and concerns at the sub-county- and district level?
Specific Objective 2  
Smallholder farm households have increased access to- and participation in remunerative markets

Question 1.1: To what extent has the programme contributed to an increased access to markets?
Question 1.2: To what extent has the programme contributed to an increase in competences and improved participation of the target group in markets?
Question 1.3: To what extent has the programme contributed to improved market functioning?
Question 1.4: To what extent has the programme contributed to an increased profit from agriculture at household level?
Question 1.5: To what extent has the programme contributed to increased productivity and quality of agricultural produce?
Question 1.6: To what extent has the programme contributed to an improved service delivery of Hodfa and Madfa to the target group?

Specific Objective 3  
Smallholder farm households have increased investment in their farming business

Question 1.1: To what extent has the programme contributed to an increased access to financial services for the target group?
Question 1.2: To what extent has the programme contributed to an increased saving culture of the target group?
Question 1.3: To what extent has the programme contributed to an increase in financial and production capital for the target group?
Question 1.4: To what extent has the programme contributed to an increase in investment in farming business?
Question 1.5: To what extent has the programme contributed to an improved service delivery of Hofokam to the target group?

2.3 Evaluation criteria
The following DAC evaluation criteria\(^3\) need to be used, when answering the evaluation questions for each specific objective:

- **Relevance:** To what extent is the objective still valid (in terms of consistency with requirements and needs of the target group)?
- **Effectiveness:** To what extent has the objective been achieved?
- **Efficiency:** Was the objective implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
- **Impact:** What is the potential contribution of the objective towards long-term impact (contribution to general objective of the program after 6 years)?
- **Sustainability:** What is the probability of (i) long term effects of the objective, (ii) financial sustainability, and (iii) environmental sustainability?

Appreciation along these DAC evaluation criteria have to be reported in a separate chapter in the report (see 6. Report).

\(^3\) [http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en_2649_34435_2086550_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en_2649_34435_2086550_1_1_1_1,00.html)
2.4 Evaluation conclusions
Based on the evaluation questions, and according to the evaluation criteria, the evaluation report should result in conclusions for each specific objective, covering:
- Strengths and/or good practices (+ principle reasons/causes)
- Weaknesses, challenges and/or pitfalls (+ principle reasons/causes)
- Lessons learned with focus on innovation
- Lessons learned with focus on extension/follow-up programme of two years (plus three); preliminary findings of what alternatives are possible and relevant to impacted communities, which can be further explored during programme design
- Recommendations; including recommendations for alternative livelihoods for fishing and other communities, restoration of livelihoods required as a consequence of resettlement due to Tullow operations, and a greater focus of activities down the escarpment (Kaiso-Tonya and Buliisa).

3. Evaluation process/approach

3.1 Evaluation process
3.1.1. Income and food security indices and output and outcome indicators as of August 2012
It is important that the qualitative information wrt the income and food security indices and the output and outcome indicators is collected first. This is not part of the evaluation exercise, but will be covered separately. With the support of the 3 partners and a local consultant this quantitative data will be compiled latest by August 2012. The report will be used as inputs for the evaluation.

3.1.2 Evaluation
The evaluation methodology should also include the use of multimedia tools such as video, photography and social media that are integrated into quantitative and qualitative methods. Gathering of data should not only be done through secondary data, but also through collection of stories e.g. Most Significant Change and other methods. Those stories should be recorded on video, validated, discussed, quantified and transcribed for the written evaluation report. Visuals should complement the written evaluation report and provide extra information.

3.2 Scope of the evaluation
The CAED programme 2010 - 2012 is implemented with 3 partners in 2 districts of Uganda. In Hoima, it concerns Hoima District Farmer Association (Hodfa) and in Buliisa, it concerns Masindi District Farmer Association (Madfa). For both districts Hofokam is engaged as the Finance Institution.

The evaluation covers the activities undertaking with these 3 partners in the 2 districts as well as the activities coordinated from the Trias Regional Office in Kampala.

3.3 Evaluation team
An external evaluator will lead the evaluation and heads an evaluation team, which consists of the team leader (i.e. the external evaluator) and a local evaluator.

To enhance the ‘process use’ of the evaluation, Tullow & TRIAS staff and respective partner staff are, as far as possible, actively involved in the preparation, implementation and final stages of the evaluation process. To safeguard this, at least a joint session at the beginning of the evaluation is foreseen to have those staff members at the same level of information and understanding.
To safeguard the quality of the process and its result, the Programme Officer and the Regional Coordinator of Trias Uganda will closely monitor the evaluation progress. Meetings with the evaluation team will be organised in which progress of the evaluation process is discussed, and possible constraints addressed. First results and experiences derived from the evaluation in one of the two intervention areas will be discussed, before engaging the process in the second intervention area. A draft report will be presented and discussed, before a final version is submitted to Tullow & Trias.

Profile external evaluator
Besides the fact that the evaluator should be familiar with the field of participatory agro-enterprise development and/or micro-finance, the context of Uganda, the realities of international development and the concepts/practice of organisational learning, it is crucial that that the external evaluator is able to lead/facilitate a participatory evaluation process with a variety of stakeholders. The external evaluator has also experience and knowledge on PME – and more in particular evaluations (DAC criteria etc) – and M&E of complex programmes, as that of Trias.

Methods of inquiry
Possible methods of inquiry: field trips, focus group discussions, stories, interviews, peer-to-peer discussions (with e.g. actors in the field), feedback sessions, round table discussion, guided self-assessment, document analysis, and others.

As the evaluation touches on effects/outcomes at target group level, it is mandatory that the methods of inquiry include tools and approaches that are going to be used with representatives of the target groups. The consultant’s proposal has to clearly indicate how this involvement of the target group in the evaluation process is going to be taken up and organised.

It’s also important that the various stakeholders involved in and/or related to the programme are included in the evaluation. This also includes (some) other development partners engaged in the intervention area of the programme.

In light of the above, activities will probably include the following:
- Desk study of relevant programme documentation (annual plans, reports);
- Design of evaluation methodology
- Introductory meeting with partners to present and discuss purpose and scope of evaluation
- Prepare evaluation (questionnaires, sampling frames, audiovisuals, tools for analysis)
- Joint session with evaluation team
- Facilitate and implement evaluation
- Analyse and report on findings evaluation
- Prepare draft evaluation report
- Facilitate 1-day stakeholders’ workshop
- Prepare final evaluation report
Timeframe
It is suggested that the evaluation takes place in September 2012; with the evaluation report to be finalised latest by 15 October 2012.

The proposed duration of the assignment is approximately 25 working days, including (international/local) travel, broken down as follows:
• Desk study of documentation, incl. preparation of scope, methodology, tools: 2 days
• Kick-off meetings: 1 day
• Facilitation & implementation of evaluation (field days): 10 days (5/district)
• Analysis & interpretation of data: 4 days
• Report writing: 4 days
• Preparation & facilitation of stakeholders’ restitution workshop: 2 days
• International travel: 2 days (only for team leader)

4. Intended use of evaluation findings

The intended uses of the evaluation findings are:
• The evaluation report will directly be the Tullow requested evaluation report for the period 2010 - 2012;
• The evaluation findings will be used to improve TRIAS’ strategies, partnerships and interventions for its programmes and will be directly used to further fine-tune and adjust a follow-up to the CAEDP 2010-2012 programme;
• The evaluation findings are used for the Trias overall report;
• The evaluation findings will be shared with other co-financing donors and discussed during the donor visits/meetings;
• Illustrative stories, pictures and other documentation resulting from the evaluation process can be used for publications and external communication.

5. Budget

A tentative budget for the evaluation entails the following budget lines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>USD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 International consultant air ticket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Fees int. consultant fr 27 days</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Fees national consultant fr 32 days</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Operational costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Field transport</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16,950</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Report

As a guideline for the evaluation report, the following format will be used. There is a maximum of 30 pages (excl. annexes).

1 Introduction

1.1 Objective of the evaluation
1.2 Composition evaluation team
1.3 Evaluation process and methodology
1.4 Main evaluation activities
1.5 Factors contributing or disturbing the evaluation exercise

2 Intervention context and project description
   2.1 Concise context description
   2.2 Design of CAED programme
   2.3 Description of beneficiaries (partners and target group)

3 Assessment
   3.1 Overall Objective 2
      3.1.1 Question 1
      3.1.2 Question 2
      3.1.3 Question 3
   3.2 Specific Objective 3
      3.2.1 Question 1
      3.2.2 Question 2, etc.
   3.3 Appreciation along the DAC Criteria
      3.3.1 Relevance
      3.3.2 Effectiveness
      3.3.3 Efficiency
      3.3.4 Impact
      3.3.5 Sustainability

4 Overall conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations
   4.1 Conclusions
   4.2 Lessons learned
   4.3 Recommendations

Annexes
ANNEX IV. LOGFRAME AND OBJECTIVES OF CAED PROGRAMME

Overall Objective: “the food and income security of smallholder farm households in Hoima and Buliisa Districts - bordering Lake Albert, is improved in a sustainable way”

Specific Objective 1: Smallholder farm households have adopted practices of ensuring good and balanced nutrition throughout the year

Expected Results:
1.1 Farm households aware of the importance of food security and nutrition
1.2 Farm households aware of the need for joint planning, decision making and sharing of responsibilities within households
1.3 Farm households equipped with appropriate knowledge and skills on production of staple food crops
1.4 Farm households equipped with appropriate knowledge and skills to improve their backyard gardens
1.5 Farm households equipped with knowledge and skills in post-harvest handling, preservation and preparation of nutritious foods.

Specific Objective 2: Smallholder farm households have increased access to- and participation in remunerative markets

Expected Results:
2.1 Farmer groups mobilised and strengthened
2.2 Farmer groups equipped with knowledge and skills to assess and select profitable agro-enterprises
2.3 Farmer groups equipped with skills to assess the value chains of selected agro-enterprises
2.4 Farmer groups equipped with appropriate entrepreneur skills & knowledge to forge remunerative markets and linkages (incl. linkages with other service providers)
2.5 Farmer groups imparted with knowledge and skills in improving their production and post-harvest handling
2.6 Farmer groups facilitated with collective marketing (including quality assurance, use of market information and intelligence, other relevant skills)
2.7 Farmer groups equipped with skills to self-evaluate their performance and make necessary improvements (PM&E)
2.8 Partner organisations equipped with staff and capacity to provide appropriate services to her members – the smallholder farmer households of Hoima and Buliisa Districts

Specific Objective 3: Smallholder farm households have increased investment in their farming business

Expected Results:
3.1 Agriculture friendly financial services availed
3.2 Farmer groups strengthened on savings and credit management
3.3 Savings culture promoted
3.4 Farmer groups imparted with financial business management skills
3.5 Outreach services to farm households increased
Specific Objective 4: The programme is effectively managed and coordinated in a results-oriented way

Expected Results:
4.1 The capacity of Trias Uganda staff to provide capacity building support to local partner organizations and to coordinate programme activities, enhanced
4.2 The capacity of local partner organizations to effectively plan, monitor/evaluate and report on programme inputs, outputs, outcomes and impact (including cross-cutting issues), improved
4.3 The capacity of local partner organizations to manage their resources in a transparent and accountable way, strengthened
4.4 Programme plans and activities of local partner organizations are well-coordinated
4.5 Information sharing and collaboration with other major stakeholders (government, domestic and international donors), enhanced
ANNEX V. QUESTIONNAIRE

Sub County………………………………………………………………………………………… Sample # …………………

CAEDP HOUSE HOLD QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name of Respondent/Farmer ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
2. Village/LC1………………………………………………………………Parish ………………………………………
3. Position in the Household…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

ASSET OWNERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>2009 Level</th>
<th>Current (2012) Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Household Land ownership in Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. House Characteristics (Roof) - Grass/Iron Sheets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. House Characteristics (wall) - Mud/burnt bricks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. House characteristics (Floor) - Bare ground/Cemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ownership of means of transport (None/Bicycle/M'cycle/car)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ownership of Cows/Small Livestock Units (SLUs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Others – (Specified) e.g. Radio/Phones/Solar Panels etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOOD PRODUCTIVITY AND SECURITY STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>2009 Level</th>
<th>Current (2012) levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of months of food shortage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cultivation of food security crops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Level of yields per acre (on a scale of 1 to 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality of diet (Proteins(1)Carbohydrates(2) Vitamins(3) Fats Oils (4))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perceived quality of produce (on a scale of 1 to 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACCESS TO VIABLE MARKETS AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>2009 Level</th>
<th>Current (2012) levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How much of the production was marketed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level of demand (on a scale of 1 to 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Level of profitability (on a scale of 1 to 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Level of Business devel. services (on a scale of 1 to 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Savings levels per month (in shillings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Level of access to credit/loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Average loan amounts (in Shillings or $ equivalents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX VI. FOOD AND INCOME INDICES CALCULATION

For calculation of the food and income indices the evaluation team used the indices as developed during the baseline of the programme. Below the chapter from the baseline study with the explanations on the indices has been reproduced (Trias (2010) 'Raising the food and income security of poor farm households bordering Lake Albert (Hoima and Buliisa districts), Uganda. Baseline Survey report Buliisa District').

DEVELOPMENT OF IMPACT INDICATORS (from Baseline study)

As the programme focuses on income and food security of rural farm households, it is important to understand and define these concepts from the target group’s point of view; their perspective would help the study in determining a set of proxy indicators that suits each concept in the given locality. Aggregating the collection of selected proxies in their order of priority per concept would then enable the study team to construct a composite index for each concept. It is the composite indices that the study will then use in assessing the income security and food security status of the farm households - at baseline and later on at end of the programme.

The study team held focus group discussions with two groups of farm households in Ngwedo trading centre, Ngwedo parish, Buliisa sub-county with 21 farm households (13 men and 8 women) and the second meetings was in Busiisa village, Western parish, Buliisa Town Council sub-county, with 12 farmers (8 men and 5 women). These groups identified proxies for income security and food security according to their perspective. To ensure full and free contributions during preliminary discussions, the men were separated from the women. Afterwards, both men and women were brought together in a plenary, to develop a common understanding of the issues/ideas and to build consensus on the final results. The exercise proceeded very well.

Three income and food security categories were distinguished during the focus group discussions: the better off, the medium income and the poor. A list of items and their associated measures, size and/or attributes was then generated for each category. This list was used to define proxy indicators for constructing composite indices for income and food security amongst households within this intervention area.

Income security index

Income security is here defined as the ability to sustain sufficient income to cover family needs throughout the year (albeit minor calamities such as adverse weather conditions).

Focus group discussions first centred on the definition of wealth (or put negatively, poverty): which wealth categories can be discerned at rural village level, which attributes they reveal and how these attributes can be qualified / quantified when moving from one category to the next.

Participants distinguished 3 categories of wealth: the poor, the medium and better-off. Then they identified main attributes that show differentiation between categories. Finally, participants ranked these attributes according to priority, from most important to least important.
The following characteristics or attributes of household wealth or poverty status - in order of priority - were identified:

1. Acreage of land owned;
2. Quality of housing unit;
3. Means of transport;
4. Number of cows owned; and
5. Saving income in formal financial institutions,

Attributes 1 - 4 relate to the ‘fixed’ assets of a specific household – land, cattle, housing and transport means. The last attribute, on the other hand, is more concerned with the ‘expenditure’ pattern of households: saving at formal financial institutions (which is also usually a prerequisite for obtaining loans or credit).

While the general wealth status of a given household is an important determining factor for income security, it is not the only one. Participants of the focus group discussions agreed upon three further three factors that they feel also determine income security, being:

1. Acreage of crops cultivated (with specific reference to cassava);
2. Diversification of main sources of income; and
3. Number of small stock (primarily goats, but also other small stock like pigs & poultry).

These additional factors were justified as follows:
1. Farm households with a larger area under cultivation (usually in different locations) can better cope with risks of adverse weather condition. Moreover, a larger area under cultivation usually implies a larger mix of crops under cultivation, crops that are affected differently by weather conditions.
2. Farm households with more than one main source of income can better cope and withstand downfalls / threats to one of them.
3. Small stock – goats, pigs and poultry – with which a farm household has less emotional attachment, can easily be bought and sold, and can therefore easily compensate shortcomings in income for whatever reason.

In order to develop a composite index for income security, each factor was given a weight conform their priority ranking. In addition, each factor was given a score from 0 to 3 (from worst to best, respectively) to value the different characteristics ascribed to each attribute according to income security class. As illustration, for type of house owned: a house with a grass thatched roof, mud walls and a soil floor is regarded as worst quality of housing and is given score 0; on the other hand, a house with iron sheet roof, burnt brick walls and good concrete or cemented floor is seen as the best and is thus scored 3. The results are presented in table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item categories</th>
<th>Relative weight / score</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Household Wealth</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acreage of land owned</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No land owned</td>
<td>&lt; 2 acres</td>
<td>2 - &lt;10 acres</td>
<td>&gt; 10 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- **Type of house owned**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grass thatched roof, mud walls, soil floor</th>
<th>Rusted iron sheets, mud walls, soil floor</th>
<th>Iron sheet roof, mud walls, concrete floor</th>
<th>Iron sheet roof, burnt brick walls &amp; concrete floor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Number of cattle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No cattle</th>
<th>1 - 2 cows</th>
<th>3 - 9 cows</th>
<th>10 cows &amp; above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Ownership of means of transport**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1 bicycle</th>
<th>&gt; 1 bicycle</th>
<th>1 m/cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Ability to save money with formal financial institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>SACCOs</th>
<th>Commercial Banks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item categories</th>
<th>Relative weight / score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Cultivated area (acres)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Diversified sources of income</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of small livestock units (SLU)*</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When all the minimum and maximum assigned weights for attributes of income security are added together, it becomes clear that the composite score starts at 0.0 (sum of all the minimum weights) and goes to 3.0 (sum of all the maximum weights). In line with the categorisation made by participants during the group discussions, the three relative income security categories can be distinguished:

**Category 1:** Households with sums of weights 0.0 – 1.5 have ............Poor income security

**Category 2:** Households with sum of weights 1.6 – 2.5 have ...............Fair income security

**Category 3:** Households with sums of weights 2.5 – 3.0 have ............Good income security

In order to develop the income security index with maximum value of 1, the individual household sum of weights were divided by the maximum sum of weights (3.0). This resulted in the following weights per income security category:

**Category 1:** Households with an index from 0.00–0.50 have poor income insecurity

**Category 2:** Households with an index from 0.51 – 0.83 have fair income security

**Category 3:** Households with an index from 0.84 – 1.00 have good income security

### Food security index
Food security is here defined as the ability of farm households to provide sufficient food to cover family needs throughout the year (albeit minor calamities such as adverse weather conditions). Food security here covers both quantitative (sufficient food in quantity) and qualitative (nutritious balanced meals) aspects. In order to develop a composite index, both quantitative and qualitative aspects were given equal weight.

Two proxies were identified for the quantitative aspect: (a) number of months of food shortage, and (b) cultivation of selected categories of food security crops. Participants of focus group discussions identified three categories of food security crops: (i) staple food crops (bananas, beans, sweet potatoes); (ii) drought resistant food crops (millet and sorghum); and (iii) crops that can be stored for longer periods of time (cassava, maize, groundnuts). The extent to which farm households cultivate crops from each category determines the extent to which they are food secure. For example, if a farm household grows bananas (category i), millet (category ii) and cassava (category iii), this farm household is categorised as more food secure than one who cultivates crops of 2 categories only.

The proxy “consumption of sufficient sources of carbohydrates, protein, fat and vitamins during a normal meal” was identified as the only proxy for the qualitative aspect of food security. Here, food has been subdivided into 4 categories, according to their main source of nutrition: (i) starchy - carbohydrate food stuffs (bananas, tubers + grains); (ii) vegetative protein rich food stuffs (legumes such as groundnuts and beans); (iii) vitamin rich food stuffs (fruits & vegetables); and (iv) animal protein and fats (e.g. meat, eggs, milk, cheese). The extent to which households eat food of each of these four categories determines the nutritional balance of their meals. If for example, a household commonly eats foods from all 4 categories, the household is rated as ‘good’ in terms of qualitative nutritional practises; a household that commonly eats food of only 3 categories is given a lower rating; and so forth.

The weights and scores assigned to each attribute and its respective characteristics are presented in table 3 below.

Table 2: Weighting of attributes that signify household food security status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Relative weight / score</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No of months of food shortage</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>&gt; 4 months food shortage</td>
<td>3-4 months food shortage</td>
<td>1-2 months of food shortage</td>
<td>No food shortage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cultivation of ‘food security’ categories of crops</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>None of food security categories are cultivated</td>
<td>Only one category of food security crops is cultivated</td>
<td>Two categories of food security crops are cultivated</td>
<td>All 3 categories of food security crops are cultivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality / balance of diet</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Only foods from 1 out 4 categories are commonly eaten</td>
<td>Only foods from 2 out 4 categories are commonly eaten</td>
<td>Only foods from 3 out 4 categories are commonly eaten</td>
<td>Foods from all 4 categories are commonly eaten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total scores vary from 0 to 3. After conversion to uniform food security indices (with maximum value of 1), the following relative categories and rates were determined:

Category 1: Households with sums of weights 0.00 – 0.50 have............. poor food security
Category 2: Households with sums of weights 0.51 – 0.83 have............. fair food security
Category 3: Households with sums of weights 0.84 – 1.00 have............. good food security