

Formative Evaluation of Uganda Land Management Project

**Jan Erikson
James Reinier Scheele
Sebina Nalwanga**

**Department for Natural
Resources and the
Environment**

Formative Evaluation of Uganda Land Management Project

Jan Erikson
James Reinier Scheele
Sebina Nalwanga

Sida Evaluation 01/24

**Department for Natural
Resources and the
Environment**

This report is part of *Sida Evaluation*, a series comprising evaluations of Swedish development assistance. Sida's other series concerned with evaluations, *Sida Studies in Evaluation*, concerns methodologically oriented studies commissioned by Sida. Both series are administered by the Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit, an independent department reporting directly to Sida's Board of Directors.

Reports may be *ordered* from:

Infocenter, Sida
S-105 25 Stockholm
Telephone: (+46) (0)8 690 93 80
Telefax: (+46) (0)8 690 92 66
E-mail: info@sida.se,

Reports are also available to *download* at:

<http://www.sida.se/evaluation>

Authors: Jan Erikson, James Reinier Scheele, Sebina Nalwanga.

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Evaluation 01/24

Commissioned by Sida, Department for Natural Resources and the Environment

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Registration No.: 1997-0002

Date of Final Report: May 2001

Printed in Stockholm, Sweden 2001

ISBN 91-586-8821-8

ISSN 1401-0402

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Sveavägen 20, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

Telegram: sida stockholm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-9

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of Contents

Summary	1
Abbreviations & Acronyms Used in this Report	
1 The Context and Main Features of ULAMP	3
1.1 Sida Policies and Strategies	3
1.2 Policies, Strategies and Recent Developments in the Agricultural Sector in Uganda	4
1.3 The Chief Characteristics of ULAMP	7
2 The Evaluation Assignment	14
3 Findings on the Design, Relevance, Implementation Progress & Impact of ULAMP	16
3.1 Project Design and Relevance	16
3.2 Implementation Performance and Impact	18
4 Conclusions and Recommendations	29
4.1 Main Conclusions	29
4.2 Recommendations	34
4.3 Lessons Learned	37
Appendix A Terms of Reference	38
Appendix B Mission Work Schedule, March/April 2001	44
Appendix C List of Persons Interviewed	45
Appendix D List of Consulted Documents	47
Annex	
Details on Project Implementation Progress 1999–2000	49

Abbreviations & Acronyms Used in this Report

ARM	Annual Review Meeting
CBOs	Community Based Organisations
CIGs	Common Interest Groups
DCC	District Co-ordination Committee
DDP	District Development programme
FEWs	Field Extension Workers
GoU	Government of Uganda
HASP	Household Agricultural Support Programme
ICRAF	Intentional Centre for Research in Agroforestry
LC	Local Council (I. Village; II. Parish; III. Sub-county; IV. County; V. District)
MAAIF	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
MSC	Management Services Consultant
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory Services Programme
NARO	National Agricultural Research Organisation
NUCC	National ULAMP Co-ordination Committee
NGOs	Non-government Organisations
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action plan
PCC	Parish Co-ordination Committee
PMA	Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture
QRM	Quarterly Review Meeting
RELMA	Regional Land Management Unit, Nairobi
RSCU	Regional Soil Conservation Unit (now RELMA)
SC	Sub-county
SEK	Swedish Kronor
Sida	Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency
SMS	Subject Matter Specialist
SWCS	Soil and Water Conservation Section
UDC	ULAMP District Co-ordinator
ULAMP	Uganda Land Management Project
UNC	ULAMP National Co-ordinator
UNF	ULAMP National Facilitator
UNFA	Uganda National Farmers Union
USCAPP	Uganda Soil Conservation and Agroforestry Pilot Project

Fiscal Years	Currency Equivalents
Government of Uganda 1 July to 30 June	Ushs (UGS) 170 = SEK 1.00 = US\$ 0.10
Government of Sweden 1 January to 31 December	

Project Characteristics

ULAMP provides technical advisory services on land, crop and animal husbandry to farmers in one sub-county each in four geographically dispersed districts in Uganda: Arua in the northwest, Kabarole in the west, Mbarara (12 sub-counties) in the southwest and Kapchorwa in the east. The project support is provided in a participatory manner within a well defined implementation sequence to Common Interest Groups (typically formed with project support around a particular crop or livestock enterprise) who jointly plan co-operation with the project and also monitor the implementation progress and the impact of the technical advice.

Project operations began in May 1999, following a pilot phase in Mbarara District, and the current Sida support period ends in June 2002. The budget for the financial support by Sida for the two years 1999/2000–2000/01 amounts to SEK 14 million while the Government of Uganda funds staff salaries and office facilities.

Implementation Progress and Impact

The ULAMP management structure has by now been established in all four districts and the initial training of staff associated with the project has been completed. It has documented its approach well in an extension manual, menu of offers to farmers and an administrative manual. More than 400 Common Interest Groups have been formed and about 250 groups are currently receiving technical advice by ULAMP. Implementation of some project activities, including training, demonstrations and field studies, has fallen behind schedule and disbursements so far are considerably lower than budgeted. The impact of the project's advisory services on food security and incomes is visible for some permanent crops such as bananas but is more difficult to ascertain for other enterprises at this early stage.

Relevance of ULAMP Activities

The ULAMP concepts are well compatible with Ugandan national policies on poverty alleviation, modernisation of agriculture, decentralisation and environmental protection. In the agricultural sector, an initiative with many features similar to ULAMP (NAADS) is being launched on a pilot basis in other districts with the aim to facilitate contracting by farmers of advisory services from both public and private sources.

However, not least in the context of national policies, it is also becoming evident that ULAMP needs to further develop its strategies and to strengthen its operational aspects. In particular, it needs to: (1) find effective ways to reach poorer families and women farmers; (2) evolve a strategy that would encourage self-reliance among the Common Interest Groups rather than create increased dependence on public sector support; (3) combine its support measures (training sessions, on-farm visits, demonstrations, study tours) in more cost-effective ways; and (iv) develop a strategy for rapid and cost-effective expansion of the project support to new sub-counties by engaging institutional and financial support by the local authorities.

Operationally, ULAMP needs to intensify co-operation with organisations outside the public sector, facilitate more effective planning and monitoring through disaggregation of data on poverty and gender basis and through reconciliation of output, component and budget structures, and arrange for fund disbursements to the district and sub-district levels without the use of intermediaries.

Recommendations

The sound elements of ULAMP, its good compatibility with Ugandan policies and the potential value of ULAMP for future Sida co-operation in the natural resources sector in Uganda and in other countries in the region, prompts the mission to propose that Swedish support be extended beyond June 2002. Its recommendations include:

- *Amendment of project objectives:* should explicitly reflect ambition to build confidence among farmers groups, including poorer families, leading to increased self-reliance;
- *Development of strategy elements:* effective mechanism for supporting poorer families and women farmers, approach for determined confidence building among farmers' groups, streamlining of extension methodology for individual farm enterprises, sub-county participation in project expansion, and mechanisms for expanded research co-operation within the implementation areas;
- *Strengthened project design and operational features:* more training on business aspects of farming, more training of farmer trainers, more support to non-public organisations at district level, including encouragement to participate in co-ordinating committees, streamlined and transparent financial management, expanded central project management capacity and engagement of long term consultant to assist in methodological development.

Provided that the recommendations are accepted, the evaluation mission recommends that Sida support should be made available for an additional three years 2002/03–2004/05 when its achievements should be reviewed in the context of Ugandan and Swedish policies and priorities. For reasons of cost-effectiveness, project activities should be expanded to reach a satisfactory coverage within the current four districts before they are extended to other districts. It is projected that the required Swedish support may amount to SEK 15-20 million for the three-year period.

The proposed strengthening of ULAMP design and operations should commence already in the new fiscal year 2001/02 and be reflected in the annual work plan and budget.

1 The Context and Main Features of ULAMP

1.1 Sida Policies and Strategies

Policies, Strategies and Programmes in the Natural Resources Sector

Poverty Reduction. Sida's Poverty Reduction Programme dates back to 1962 when the Swedish Parliament established as the overall aim of its development co-operation "to improve the quality of life of poor peoples". Sida views poverty as a complex, multidimensional and context-specific phenomenon. Lack of income is identified as a basic characteristic of poverty. Other dimensions include lack of reliable sources of livelihood (land and other assets, labour, social safety nets) and hence poor food security, and few possibilities to make use of expanding economic opportunities in the society at large due to low status and lack of power.

Equality Between Women and Men. In May 1996, the Swedish Parliament endorsed the promotion of equality between women and men in partner countries as one of the overall goals of Swedish development co-operation. Sida's *Policy and Action Plan for Promoting Equality between Women and Men in Partner Countries* (April 1997) emphasises the importance of a shift from a specific focus on and special efforts for women towards a mainstreaming gender strategy (i.e. making it an integral part of the project), taking social and cultural variations into account. The policy underlines the interrelationships between the goal of gender equality and the specific goals of different sectors as well as the linkages between gender equality and other priority areas within Sida— poverty reduction, human rights and democracy and environmentally sustainable development.

Based on the agency-wide initiative, the Department for Natural Resources and the Environment has developed its own *Action Plan for Gender Equality* (April 1997). The Action Plan identifies the need for participatory approaches, gender analyses and gender reporting in the preparation, follow-up and evaluation of projects, production of sex-disaggregated statistics and gender sensitive impact indicators, continued support to the adaptation of extension systems to the needs of small producers of both sexes, gender sensitive adapted research and methods development and financial services to poor women and men in rural areas.

Sustainable Development. Sida's *Policy on Sustainable Development* (January 1996) presents sustainable development as a multidimensional concept that integrates ecological and environmental issues with economic, social, cultural and political dimensions of development.

Support to Land Management. The Sida assistance to this sector originated in Kenya in 1974 with the forerunner project to the current National Soil and Water Conservation Programme which promoted soil conservation through establishment of physical structures within and around erodable croplands. The programme gradually evolved complementary biological and cultural practices for soil and water conservation as farmers outside the initial implementation areas tended to favour less labour intensive technology; this widening of the subject matter scope became manifested by adoption of the term land husbandry to replace the older concept of soil and water conservation. Since the Kenyan institutional approach (a specialised soil and water conservation extension service working on the basis of natural "mini"-catchments) was regarded as interesting to other countries in the region – particularly Ethiopia, Uganda, Tanzania and Zambia – the Regional Soil Conservation Unit (RSCU) was established in Nairobi in 1981 to disseminate policies, strategies and approaches within this sector in the region.

The model of a specialised land husbandry extension service operating within the general agricultural extension service has only been adopted in Zambia. In Tanzania, a pilot project on land husbandry

that was launched in two districts in Arusha Region in 1991 came to an end in 2000 without any expansion into other districts. In Uganda, the Uganda Soil Conservation and Agroforestry Pilot Project (USCAPP) was implemented in a few parishes in Mbarara District 1992–1998. This project lay the foundation for Uganda Land Management Project (ULAMP) as a broader project, geographically and subject matter wise, in 1999.

In 1998, the focus of RSCU was widened to include additional subject matters such as food security, domestic water supply, livestock husbandry and marketing while the name was changed to Regional Land Management¹ Unit (RELMA).

The New Sida Country Strategy for Co-operation with Uganda 2001–2005

The Swedish Embassy in Kampala made the official version of the *Country Strategy for Development Co-operation with Uganda, January 2001–December 2005* (January 2001) available to the Formative Evaluation Mission in Uganda. The Country Strategy, that is based on a comprehensive exercise involving Embassy staff as well as staff at Sida headquarters and at the Foreign Office, favours/promotes, *inter alia*:

- that future co-operation between Uganda and Sweden should focus on alleviation of poverty through support to social sectors as well as to the private sector to facilitate high and sustained growth;
- incorporation of support to rights of women and youth and contribute to strengthen democracy;
- possible support to sub-sector developments for the private sector (small enterprises and export businesses and legislation);
- contribution to sustained utilisation of natural resources and reduce environmental degradation;
- capacity building at local level through increased capabilities, transparency and follow-up; and
- gradual change to longer term bilateral support that may evolve into sector programme support and budgetary support.

It is expected that Sida involvement in support programmes and co-operation with other donors will increase and, if events do not deviate from official policies, that the financial support may also expand.

1.2 Policies, Strategies and Recent Developments in the Agricultural Sector in Uganda

It is estimated that 40% of the rural population of Uganda experience intermittent food shortages. More than quarter of the population live in absolute poverty without resources to satisfy the recommended food intake of 300 calories per day.

Strategic Initiatives

The Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP). This is a multi-pronged policy supporting sound macroeconomic policies that underwrites a conducive environment to support business, private sector promotion, provision of basic social services in a more transparent and accountable manner. The policies demand more community involvement in these processes, reducing the size of the public service, increasing decentralised functions and promoting greater involvement by the private sector.

¹ The term “land management” appears to lack a widely accepted definition. In relation to its parent disciplines soil conservation and land husbandry, its meaning may be interpreted as wider than land husbandry by also including soil fertility aspects. In the context of RELMA and ULAMP, the term land management is used as encompassing also crop and livestock husbandry, supplementary rural income-generating activities and marketing of produce and products.

The Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA). This is a policy-guiding document that is the result of a process that critically looked at the changing policy environment in Uganda, together with a critical review of the shortcomings of agricultural extension and research over the past decade².

The PMA, in reviewing the past functions of the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries, and Fisheries (MAAIF), recognised that too much money was spent on recurrent expenditures, too many resources were spent at the centre, too little impact was visible at the district and farm levels, too few research findings were disseminated and adopted at the farm level, and that the impact of extension services was frequently marginal. The PMA aims to address these shortcomings, bridging the gap between farmers, extension providers and researchers; it aims for a more market-orientated, farmer needs-oriented approach to extension support with financial and administrative controls brought down closer to the client – the farmer. The PMA sees modernisation of agriculture evolving as farmers begin to focus on production in a more economic way, tuned to the market and the opportunities that it may provide. Once this is achieved, it is expected that farmers will look at technical opportunities that provide better returns to their land and labour and will address sustainability in this context as well.

The PMA takes a number of fundamental administrative and social reform processes into account, including the Local Government Act and the Civil Service Reform.

The Local Government Act (1997). This Act codifies an ongoing process of devolving administrative functions to lower levels of government; firstly to the district, and increasingly to the sub-county, where planning and execution of government services will increasingly occur in an effort to put beneficiaries in control of resource allocation, thus enhancing transparency and accountability of public funds³. UNDP is assisting in building up the administrative capacity in the districts.

Civil Service Reform. There has been a process of reforming government ministries that has proved ineffective in providing services to the rural areas. Streamlining of staff, deployment of supervisory functions at District Levels with autonomous control, and increased efforts to involve and contract the private sector are underlying principles.

Extension Services

The Agricultural Extension Programme. Extension services in Uganda had failed to attain the desired impact in the late nineties when a national programme, the Agricultural Extension Programme (AEP), attempted to restructure the service delivery to make it more relevant and effective with farmers. AEP found the extension structure problematic in a number of areas: poorly trained extension staff, many of whom had had no refresher training for many years; poor co-ordination and monitoring; inconsequential contact with the farming population⁴; poor links with researchers, and poor transfer of available technologies to farmers.

AEP launched a significant drive to re-train and upgrade staff, instituting a regular training programme for extension staff, together with monthly and seasonal planning workshops to integrate all levels of staff. AEP also trained frontline extension staff in different areas of production, placing them in a position to assist farmers in an interdisciplinary manner under a new “unified” extension system. Initial trainings were undertaken by frontline staff who would draw on technical backstopping by district level subject matter specialists. A full training programme was drawn up monthly to interact

² A Secretariat for PMA was established in February 2001.

³ Currently, 60% of the revenue accruing from the graduated tax that is collected at the sub-county level is retained within the area under the control of Local Council III.

⁴ The average ratio between extension staff and farm families is 1: 1,800.

with farmers groups and facilitation funds (safari day allowances and fuel allowances) were recurrently released to enable the frontline extension workers to undertake their work.

However, poor monitoring and supervision resulted in much of the planned work not being done: administrative bottlenecks occurred and government matching-funds also created delays. Technical messages were not always timely: often farmers were “fed” messages that extension agents drew up from recently concluded workshops that they had attended with the topics being of little interest to farmers at that time. This “unified” extension approach became “top-down” biased, based on a Training and Visit methodology that was too prescriptive and based on technical messages that often required external inputs that farmers found difficult to afford.

The National Agricultural Advisory Services Programme (NAADS). This programme is the outcome of a re-thinking of many of the features that were sub-optimal in the previous extension efforts. The foundations are built on the PMA, wide consultations with stakeholders, and considerations about the policy changes within decentralised governance that provide opportunities for greater privatisation and empowerment for the farmer in the process. The principles embodied in NAADS include:

- direct flow of funds through the local government to farmers;
- farmer participation in contracting of services;
- developing and promoting demand for technologies;
- private sector supervision of publicly funded services;
- farmer driven planning, monitoring and evaluation;
- commercial orientation;
- sub-county centred programme implementation;
- farmer controlled institutions governing the services; and
- basket funding by several donor agencies.

Programme implementation is commencing in 2001 with a five-year pilot phase budgeted at \$80 million.

Research Services

The research institutions in Uganda have also undergone structural changes to make them more responsive to the production systems in Uganda and to enhance technology-transfer effectiveness. The National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO) is in the process of establishing regional research centres named Agricultural Research and Development Centres (ARDC) where technologies will be tested and adapted and some bulking of planting material will be undertaken. The centres will also be linkages for supporting farmers and districts on adaptive research. They will be assisted by the former District Farm Institutes to undertake these functions.

Other Government Capacity Building Initiatives

Uganda Local Authorities Association (ULAA) is supporting staff training at sub-county levels with support by Danida together with the district administrations.

The Decentralisation Secretariat supports planning and financial management training at sub-county level with support by UNDP, Danida and UNICEF.

Initiatives in the Private Sector

Uganda National Farmers Association (UNFA). This apex organisation supports other farmers’ organisations, special interest groups in the production sector and smaller district-based farmers’ organisations. It assists them by lobbying on government policy, offering specialised studies and information and by

support to capacity building. UNFA, which has existed for seven years, has been supported by Danida. Previously, UNFA had a network of branch offices in the majority of the districts but these have recently become independent legal entities. The members of the district associations pay a nominal annual fee to obtain access to training services and to employ one or two persons to co-ordinate the agricultural advisory services to the members. The district associations frequently use Extension Link Farmers (parish-level co-ordinators) to assist in mobilising groups for on-farm activities, services and training. Training programmes frequently rely on inputs by the district agricultural extension staff.

Investing in Developing Export Agriculture (IDEA). This project, which has been operating for several years, has one section focusing on high value crops and another section promoting low value crops, including maize and beans. The programme is client-oriented and opportunity-driven and its support is vertically integrated. It may encompass research, seed multiplication schemes, agricultural extension and demonstrations. IDEA also offers market information and marketing contacts to its clients. It frequently works together with district production and extension staff, particularly on low value crops.

District Promotion Centres (DPC). There are 11 planned DPCs under the UNDP supported Private Sector Development Programme that will serve one or several districts. The centres will act as links in up-country areas for market information, business development training and advisory services. The DPCs also co-operates with the Post Harvest Programme that is linked to NARO. This programme will offer advice on improved seeds and on profitable produce markets together with information on post-harvest technologies for common agricultural produce.

Medium Term Competitive Strategy for the Private Sector. This initiative emphasises business law, institutional reforms, support to small businesses, international trade.

Private Sector Foundation (PSF). About 35 Business Associations jointly control this foundation which seeks to influence policy-makers and donor organisations. It also offers training and other forms of capacity building to its member organisations.

1.3 The Chief Characteristics of ULAMP

Project Origin and Evolution

ULAMP has its roots in the USCAPP pilot project on soil and water conservation that was implemented in four parishes in one sub-county in Mbarara District 1992–1996 where banana (*matoke*) production is the most important agricultural activity. From its early stage, USCAPP has emphasised biological and cultural practices alongside the establishment of soil structures together with integration of live-stock into the local farming systems. Its participatory approach for working with farmers was developed with assistance by RSCU and by Agrisystems EA as implementation consultant.

In 1997, a decision was taken to expand the pilot activities of USCAPP to about 25 sub-counties (approximately 40 parishes) in Mbarara District and to one sub-county each in three other districts: Arua, Kabarole and Kapchorwa⁵. The expansion areas were selected based on explicit and transparent criteria.

Project Objectives and Outputs

The overall objective of ULAMP is to achieve improved food security and incomes to small-scale farmers through better land management. A main aim is to develop strategies and technologies for land management programs nation-wide and to assist in capacity building through training and in-

⁵ Until 1999, the total number of districts in Uganda was 44 but after the recent sub-divisions the number of districts now exceeds 60.

volvement of extension staff, civic leaders and farmers in preparation for handling such programs. It is further stated that ULAMP should be contributing to the development of an effective extension service based on a participatory approach aiming at becoming demand driven. It should also facilitate farmer-based research and development of technical options for farmer use.

The project outputs [Workplan and Budget 2000/01] are:

Participatory and Collaborative Extension System

1. Participatory and collaborative extension system strengthened;

Land Management Skills

2. Community self-organisation enhanced;
3. Technical skills in land management adopted;
4. Management and marketing skills improved;

Extension Materials

5. Extension materials developed and distributed;

Project Management

6. Project management in place and strengthened;

Stakeholder Collaboration

7. Collaboration between agencies strengthened;

Participatory Research and Development

8. Participatory research and technology development facilitated;

Co-ordination

9. Co-ordination and monitoring and evaluation systems improved.

[The heading for the set of activities called “Land Management Skills” is not congruent with outputs 2,3 and 4].

Key Concepts

Project Approach at Farm Level. The ULAMP approach is built on an activity sequence that evolves through the following stages:

- (1) *reconnaissance visit* undertaken as a joint effort by the ULAMP district and sub-county core staff⁶ with assistance by other available staff in the sub-county;
- (2) *community mobilisation* effort to make farmers, civic leaders, NGO representatives and commercial sector agents aware of the existence and features of ULAMP and to gain more information about village characteristics, production parameters and the aspirations of the participating farm families;
- (3) *baseline survey* conducted by the core ULAMP staff and other sub-county staff together with local enumerators to establish a reliable socio-economic data base;
- (4) *analysis* of the collected information as a basis for the design of the subsequent steps;
- (5) *needs assessments* within the realms of farm management, traditional home economics and off-season income generating activities to establish farmers’ preferences on farming improvements and the corresponding demands on technical advisory services;

⁶ Core staff in the context of ULAMP implies managerial and technical staff at sub-county, district and headquarters levels who work more than half of their time on ULAMP activities (and who may draw Safari Day Allowances up to 16 working days per month).

- (6) *formation of Common Interest Groups (CIGs)* on the basis of on-farm enterprises⁷ – e.g. permanent crops, annual crops, livestock production and land management as a specific undertaking – as well as off-farm activities⁸. The groups would eventually adopt their own statutes defining the purpose of the activities, membership fees, and frequency and proceedings of meetings (the group members commonly share technical advice provided by the project⁹ and may also occasionally pool family labour for timely farm work);
- (7) *training in group management* by the ULAMP core staff together with local trainers;
- (8) assistance to the Common Interest Groups in *work planning* of joint and individual activities (setting of targets, defining the main activities and the responsibilities for their execution together with scheduling and costing);
- (9) *dissemination of technical knowledge* on better farm practices through a variety of means – farm visits, demonstrations, pamphlets/manuals and study tours – in conjunction with *adaptive trials* (particularly on improved planting material); and
- (10) *participatory monitoring* of project activities, outputs and impact.

The Institutional Approach. ULAMP constitutes a sub-programme within the extension services provided by the district local authority on agriculture, community development and forestry, making use of capable staff at both district and sub-county levels by providing mobility (procurement and operational costs for motorcycles and bicycles), daily allowances for work outside the offices, basic office equipment and supplies/equipment for undertaking field visits (e.g. line and spirit levels for contour demarcation), classroom training sessions, demonstrations (could include investments for demonstration purposes such as water tanks and fish ponds on farmers' premises). In addition, ULAMP makes available funds for farmers and staff to go on tours to study promising farm technologies or farm inputs.

⁷ Support by ULAMP does not normally cover community activities such as construction of water supply points, feeder road maintenance or repairs or rehabilitation of cattle dips but is limited to activities within the group members' individual farms.

⁸ Thus a long way from the overall goal to achieve improved food security and incomes through improved land management.

⁹ Groups frequently commence co-operation around a particular farm enterprise, e.g. banana production, but may soon add other activities that receive support in the form of technical advisory services by ULAMP, such as beekeeping or construction of water tanks.

The relationships are illustrated in the following matrix:

<i>CIG</i>	<i>Advisory services</i>	<i>Research services</i>	<i>Other services</i>	<i>ULAMP Parish Co-ordinating Committee</i>
Organise	Technical training		Technical training	Create forum
Prioritise	Planning and management training		Planning and management training	Education/training on: ULAMP approach Gender aspects Roles, mobilisation techniques, supervision, linking
Plan	Participatory techniques (planning, supervision, monitoring) training	Participatory techniques (planning, supervision, monitoring) training	Participatory techniques (planning, supervision, monitoring) training	
Empower	Equipment			
Capacity building, technical Production practices	Develop extension material			Exchange information
Capacity building, management Farm management practices CIG interaction practices (leadership, planning, dynamics)	Capacity building, through Formal training sessions Interaction during farm visits Demonstrations Pamphlets Study tours Videos Radio programmes			
Technical development	Technical development	Technical development	Technical development	
Monitor				

There are few subsidies for farm inputs or equipment (limited to materials, equipment and structures for demonstration purposes). Implementation is decentralised to sub-county level as regards group formation/mobilisation, planning of project activities, training and organisation of study tours. There are limited contacts with staff outside the Government services in the districts or with commercial sector agents but the project maintains close links with elected and informal local leaders through co-ordination committees at district, sub-county and parish levels.

The development of skills among the supporting agricultural, veterinary, home economics, forestry and community development staff is facilitated through:

- (a) training of district staff in participatory planning methods, facilitation techniques, extension methodologies and group building processes (this training programme also facilitates initial identification of project core staff members);

- (b) training of district staff in technical skills within “land management”; and
- (c) study tours to other ULAMP areas, including Mbarara District, and to research stations where staff can update their knowledge on ongoing research activities and recent research findings.

The Project Components

The ULAMP activities are arranged within four components:

- I. Training of Extension Staff and Farmers
- II. Development of Technological Innovations
- III. Project Management, Co-ordination and Networking
- IV. Purchase of Working Equipment

Unfortunately, the component structure [from the Project Document] is not congruent with the set of outputs specified in the Workplan and Budget 2000/01.

Budgeted Costs

The total budget for the two-year period 1999/2000–2000/2001 is SEK 16.8 million.

The budget items are arranged in the following way [Workplan and Budget 2000/01]:

- Training and Extension
- Capital Costs
- Running costs
- Field Equipment and Extension
- Consultancy and Linkages
- Co-ordination
- Cassava Improvement

It is not clear how all budget items relate to the project outputs or the project components.

Brief Characteristics of the Four ULAMP Districts

Mbarara District. The district is characterised by flat-topped hills with steep sides and long flat valleys. While the valley bottoms hold the most fertile soils, hilltops and slopes are becoming increasingly cultivated with banana and to some extent coffee while the non-arable land is used by livestock. Farm sizes range from 0.5 to 2.5 ha. Households are categorised as 15% food secure, 75% sometimes secure and 20% insecure.

The district, with a population of 930,000, is sub-divided into 50 sub-counties and 230 parishes. ULAMP activities have been introduced in 41 parishes in 12 sub-counties (2001) and support to another 24 sub-counties is planned. Sub-counties where the project support has been particularly well received include Bisheshe, Bugamba, Buremba, Rugaaga and Rikiri.

The district employs 14 agricultural subject matter specialists, 8 community (CEC), 52 Field Extension Workers and 30 Community Development Workers, 5 forest officers and 4 water department officers.

The farmer–extension staff ratio is 1,800:1. The project has facilitated establishment of about 370 CIGs with 6,000 members (average 20 members per group), equivalent to about 9 CIGs per parish. Group interests include perennial crops (banana and coffee), livestock, soil and water conservation and horticulture.

Other actors in the district include UNFA.

Arua District. The topography is gently undulating. Maize and cassava are important food crops while tobacco, cotton and coffee are purchased by commercial companies. Both large and small livestock are important although land preparation is rarely done by oxen. Farm sizes range from 1 to 5 ha.

The district, with a population of 640,000, is sub-divided into 31 sub-counties. ULAMP activities have been introduced in 4 parishes in Pajulu Sub-county from 1999/2000.

Other actors include Technoserve (seed), SEFORD (facilitation services) and BAT (tobacco).

Kabarole District. The topography is characterised by steep hillsides with interspersed crater lakes. Bananas and coffee are the two dominant permanent crops while maize and beans are frequently intercropped. Farm sizes range from 0.5 to 2 ha.

The district, with a population of 750,000, has recently been sub-divided and now encompasses 29 sub-counties. ULAMP activities have been introduced in 4 parishes in Ruteete Sub-county from 1999/2000.

Other actors include Sesakawa 2000, UNFA and a stockist programme.

Kapchorwa District. The topography is characterised by gentle slopes along the north side of Mt. Elgon with rocky hilltops. Rainfall is limited to one season. Farmers have experienced encroachment by Karamojong (cattle rustling) from the north and from an expansion of the national park in the south. Maize is the most important food and cash crop together with Irish potatoes and bananas while coffee is the dominant permanent crop. Land preparation is commonly done by oxen but animal traction is limited by the availability of grazing land.

Typical interests of CIGs are maize, banana production, nursery operations, horticulture and aquaculture.

The district, with a population of 120,000, encompasses 10 sub-counties. ULAMP activities were introduced in 2 parishes in Kaptanya Sub-county in May 2000.

There are 5 ULAMP core staff (10 days ULAMP work per month) at the district level: Production Co-ordinator, Veterinary Officer, Forestry Officer, Community Development Officer and Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. In the sub-county, there are 5 frontline ULAMP staff (16 days of ULAMP work per month): 2 agricultural officers, one veterinary officer, one forestry officer and one community development officer.

Other actors in the sub-county include Appropriate Technology (AT) Uganda, Action Aid, IUCN, IDEA (demonstrations) and Sukura (input supply).

Project Management

Central Level. Project activities are controlled by the ULAMP National Co-ordinator in the Soil and Water Conservation Section at MAAIF headquarters (nominally absorbing 1/3 of his working time). Technical and methodological responsibilities are shared with the ULAMP National Facilitator stationed at Mbarara (working half time on national matters and the other half in Mbarara District). Only two administrative staff at Entebbe are working full time for ULAMP.

The project is guided by the National ULAMP Co-ordination Committee that aims to meet quarterly. The Committee is chaired by the Permanent Secretary in MAAIF and include nominated members from the technical departments of the Ministry, the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, NARO, the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), the Soil Science Department at Makerere University and the Soil and Water Conservation Society of Uganda (SWCSU).

District Level. There are designated ULAMP offices in all four project districts. Project activities are controlled by the ULAMP District Co-ordinator who leads the core team, one of whom is typically responsible for monitoring and evaluation issues. The Production Committee is formally overseeing the activities undertaken within ULAMP. An Accounts Assistant is assigned to manage the project accounts and together with the core team he or she constitute the ULAMP Secretariat. (Mbarara has an Accounts Assistant who works full time for the project together with the secretary to the ULAMP National Facilitator, making a total of five full time employed project staff).

The project is guided by the ULAMP District Co-ordinating Committee that should meet quarterly. Nominated members include representatives from the technical departments, the LC V Production Committee, the District Treasury, other related projects, NGOs and private sector bodies.

Sub-district Levels. Agricultural officers at sub-county level are frequently university graduates while community development officers may be certificate or diploma holders.

There are designated ULAMP offices in the majority of the designated sub-counties. Project activities in the sub-counties are typically carried out by the agricultural, veterinary, forestry and community development officers.

At the *sub-county* level, the project is guided by the ULAMP Sub-county Co-ordinating Committee that should meet quarterly. Nominated members (about 10) may include representatives from the technical departments, LC III, the Sub-County Chief, NGOs, CBOs and private sector bodies.

At the *parish* level, the project is guided by the ULAMP Parish Co-ordinating Committee that should meet monthly. Nominated members (about 15) may include representatives from LC IV, the Parish Chief, leaders of CIGs, NGOs, CBOs and private sector bodies.

Administrative Procedures. Project budgeting is activity based. ULAMP budget allocations should be reflected in the district and sub-county budgets.

Fund disbursements are channelled through the Management Services Consultant to accounts held at Entebbe and in the four districts. The Mbarara ULAMP office also maintains a joint account for all four districts.

Tender procedures are required for local purchases above Shs 100,000.

The Management Services Consultant. In addition to fund disbursement and the associated financial accounting, the MSC is responsible for hiring of national and regional consultants (including two full-time local experts, the ULAMP National Facilitator and the Accounts Assistant at Mbarara) and for national and international procurement. The Management Services Consultant is also requested to advise on land management issues, establish linkages with relevant institutions to develop project concepts and technical solutions and to introduce an effective system for monitoring ULAMP activities.

2 The Evaluation Assignment

Rationale for a Formative Evaluation of ULAMP. The present period for Sida support to ULAMP extends from May 1999 to June 2001¹⁰. At a joint Sida/MAAIF review of ULAMP in October 2000, an agreement was reached to extend the Swedish support by one more year to June 2002.

The purpose of the Formative Evaluation is to advise Sida on possible support beyond June 2002 within the context of: (a) the new Sida strategy for co-operation with Uganda 2001–2005; (b) the impending transformation of agricultural extension services in Uganda (NAADS); and (c) recent initiatives to promote private sector activities, as an input into the joint annual review of ULAMP scheduled to take place during April–May this year. It is the first independent evaluation to be undertaken of ULAMP.

The Terms of Reference. The specific objectives of the formative evaluation of ULAMP are to (the complete Terms of Reference are attached as APPENDIX A):

- assess the consistency of project overall goals with national goals;
- review and report on the project performance to date;
- assess the appropriateness of the project's components, implementation approach and the formulation of its goals and expected outputs;
- draw lessons from the experiences gained, which could be useful for future intervention formulations; especially areas where reorientation or change of approaches is required;
- recommendations to Sida on the future of the project, and if positive;
- make preliminary proposals on project design, duration, and the total cost for project extension.

In the evaluation, the following issues shall be taken into account:

- The relevance of ULAMP in improving husbandry practices in Uganda and in relation to the overall goal of poverty eradication;
- The strengths and weaknesses in the design of the project and lessons for design of future support;
- The cost-efficiency of the individual support activities – for instance, visits to the farms of the Common Interest Group members, demonstrations or study tours – in relation to their effects on farmers' practices with a view to suggesting alternative mixes of support that could achieve the same results at a lower cost;
- The effectiveness of the project outputs – e.g. adoption of improved land management technologies – in attaining the purpose of the project, i.e. improved land productivity;
- The sustainability of the project: (i) is it supported by current and expected sector policies, strategies and approaches?; (ii) is it in line with the priorities and interests of the contributing institutions and organisations at the sub-district, district and national levels?; (iii) can the funding responsibility be assumed by sub-district, district and national authorities if the support by Sida is withdrawn?; (iv) is it compatible with social and cultural factors in its various implementation locations; (v) are the offered technologies likely to be sustained by the members of the Common Interest Groups after the project support has come to an end?; and (vi) are the offered technologies environmentally sustainable?;

¹⁰ The current Swedish development co-operation with Uganda (total SEK 450 million) is regulated by a three-year agreement 2001–2003 while the present specific agreement on support to ULAMP covers the period 1999/2000 up to December 2001.

- The replicability of the project approach and activities in other parts of Uganda; and
- The implications for continued support by Sida with respect to pre-conditions, organisational and operational aspects.

The Work Schedule for The Mission. The Evaluation Team fielded by HJP International comprised Mr. Jan Erikson (Institutional Specialist/Team Leader), Mr. James Reinier Scheele (Agriculturalist) and Dr. Abby Sebina-Zziwa (Social Anthropologist). It commenced its work by meeting representatives of Agrisystems EA (the Management Services Consultant) and RELMA in Nairobi on 16 March (Erikson and Scheele). It worked in Uganda between 19 March and 6 April. In Kampala and Entebbe, the team met with the ULAMP National Co-ordinating Committee, MAAIF staff, the Counsellor at the Swedish Embassy, SNV, HASP, NAADS, DDP and Makerere University.

It visited all four ULAMP districts during three field trips, spending about two days in each district. The evaluation team met with representatives of the project, staff of government extension, research and training services, district officials, elected and nominated leaders, representatives of NGO, other projects, Sida and other donors together with a large number of farmers and farmer representatives (a selective list of the people met by the evaluation team is provided in APPENDIX B).

A round-up meeting was held in Entebbe on 6 April to discuss the team's Inception Report with follow-up discussions with RELMA and the Management Services Consultant in Nairobi. The findings and recommendations were discussed with Sida on 18 April. The comments received in Entebbe and Stockholm were taken into account in the preparation of this report (the detailed work schedule for the mission is included as APPENDIX C).

In addition, the evaluation team reviewed agreements, policy and guideline documents, annual work plans and budgets, management manuals, progress reports, minutes from committee meetings and technical reports (APPENDIX D).

The observations, issues and proposals presented in this report solely reflect the opinions of the Evaluation Team.

3 Findings on the Design, Relevance, Implementation Progress & Impact of ULAMP

3.1 Project Design and Relevance

Project Design

The Scope of Project Support. ULAMP offers only advisory services while provision of farm inputs, production and investment finance, farm traction services and marketing services are left to other service providers in the private sector. This allows ULAMP to focus on its core responsibility while not detracting the attention of its Common Interest Group members towards expected free material inputs or grants.

The Focus on Land Management. The technical definition of land management within the field of land husbandry is unclear but may entail a fairly wide scope with particular prominence of soil fertility aspects. In ULAMP, the interpretation appears to be even wider, encompassing virtually all kinds of farm management (land husbandry, crop husbandry and livestock husbandry) together with a number of other income generating activities (in this way, land management as the major means of the project to achieve improved food security and incomes is misleading). The wide subject matter scope is probably the outcome of the process for inter-acting with farmers: instead of making a two-step survey say within a district to initially identify farmers who are prepared to work together while thereafter selecting those with a prime interest in land management, the project is prepared to work with all potential interest groups within the small geographical area of a parish.

The Implementation Approach Adopted by the Project. There is a well defined approach for extension methodology and well defined “menu” of practices to be offered to farmers. The positive aspects of the extension methodology include the Common Interest Group¹¹ concept, the participatory manner for interaction with group members and attempts towards a demand driven farmer–staff partnership. Other positive aspects are promotion of record-keeping practices among group members, participatory monitoring of project impact by the group members, and attempts towards supporting selected farmers as trainers of other farmers. The methodology is well documented in a handbook (available in draft version).

The adopted approach may lead to ULAMP working initially with the more resourceful farmers¹² who are adept at organising themselves in groups rather than with the poorer farmers.

The lack of a defined support period for Common Interest Groups and the lack of specification of the resources available to the group members may lead to a psychological dependence on ULAMP as a provider of services indefinitely.

¹¹ While the group is a cost-effective body/mechanism for interaction between farmers and extension staff/commercial sector agents/facilitation or service agents such as NGOs and CBOs, it should be recognised that the group approach has limitations in relation to a one-to-one relationship between the farmers and the service provider. These include: weak social cohesion among the group members, vague common interests, poor internal leadership. Poorer farmers may find themselves unwelcome into some groups and women may be excluded from participating by their husbands.

¹² It is not uncommon for members of the current Common Interest Groups to employ outside labour to undertake demanding farm practices.

The approach does not yet include a plan of operation for how expansion into other sub-counties in the three new implementation districts will be achieved, leaving also aspects of financing responsibilities of farmers and local authorities undefined.

The extension methodology, although explicit in its description of processes and procedures, does not yet attempt to link the methodology to the menu of offers by providing guidelines on the most effective means – training, demonstrations, study tours – to make improved husbandry practices available to farmers.

The extension methodology and the offered practices do not reflect explicit recognition of women as producers and primary providers of food.

Management Aspects. ULAMP has instituted co-ordination committees at the parish, sub-county, district and national levels which provide the mechanism for liaising with other actors in the sector. The guidelines for the establishment of the committees reflect recognition of the role of public sector representatives while less recognition is evident of the role of private organisations in the farming sector. The relationship between the ULAMP co-ordinating committees and the existing Production Committees at district and sub-district levels is not fully defined.

The project employs only five full time staff (of which three perform administrative duties) but relies on the regular staff within the MAAIF service to perform its duties. Currently, capacity at the central level for supervision and managerial and technical backstopping is limited to approximately one person-year while the role of the Management Services Consultant has been reduced from 38 person-weeks in 1999/2000 to 22 personweeks in 2000/01.

Staff mobility has been achieved at a modest expense by rehabilitating existing motorcycles for use in the project. Disbursement routines are decentralised with funds being channelled directly from Sida (via the Management Services Consultant) to Special Accounts held by the responsible ULAMP Co-ordinator in the districts.

The value of the progress reports is affected by a lack of consistency between planned target and reported output categories. Gender disaggregation is not always “built into” work plans and progress reports.

Organisational Locus and Representation. ULAMP is well centrally anchored at MAAIF within the Soil and Water Conservation Section. The National Co-ordinating Committee is primarily made up by representatives of the soil and water conservation sector with little specialised expertise on crop and livestock husbandry or on input supply, micro-finance and marketing services.

The Relevance of the Project

Consistency with National Goals and Strategies. According to the Project Document, the overall goal of ULAMP is to achieve improved food security and incomes to small-scale farmers through improved land management. A main aim is to develop strategies and technologies for land management programs nation-wide and assist in capacity building through training and involvement of extension staff, civic leaders and farmers in preparation for handling such programs. ULAMP should be contributing to the development of an effective extension service based on participatory approach aiming at becoming demand driven. It should also facilitate farmer-based research and development of technical options for farmer use.

The overall goal of improving food security and incomes of rural farmers is in line with the PMA, where improved and integrated production strategies will offer a springboard for farmers to better address market demands and opportunities, supporting a momentum on which farmers will refine

production strategies in a modernised and market oriented fashion. While the PMA is fundamentally geared to enhance conditions and institutions which will allow market forces to drive the production orientation of farmers, it is also cogniscent of the land management issues which have to be addressed. The PMA recognises that a changing market-oriented environment will demand more efficient and sustainable practices for the long term.

Transformation of Agricultural Extension/Advisory Services. ULAMP has set itself up within the current District Production structure that is in a state of transformation as the NAADS programme takes root. ULAMP does carry with it some of the same characteristics, namely that of participatory needs assessment, participatory planning, and common interest group formation. ULAMP differs in that it does not contract out to private sector service providers, nor does it give financial control to the CIGs in paying for advisory services; however, both these characteristics are only in the planning stage, with current legal limitations pending enactment of the Farmers' Organisation Bill (FOB), due to be passed within the next 3 months. The FOB implication at the grassroots level will be to legally institutionalise a partnership between local government and farmers' representatives in managing and determining allocation of NAADS resources and in contracting of service providers.

While NAADS is in its formative stages in the next two years, it will become operational in 12 districts by the start of financial year 2003/2004, continuing to learn from different experiences of the various ongoing extension activities in the country. ULAMP is consistent with most of the NAADS guiding principles and may over time make important methodological contributions to the larger national programme.

Technology Development. ULAMP aims to facilitate farmer-based research and development of technological options. Under NARO, institutional changes are taking place to promote a greater level of interaction with farmers. There are many technological results and products that have come out of NARO over the last decade, but uptake at the farm level is still lagging behind. NARO hopes to improve upon this by increasing stakeholder involvement in planning and implementation, increasing its use of the private sector and decentralised structures, and improving links with socio-economic research. ULAMP's approach will become increasingly relevant as institutional linkages are established or strengthened in the designated districts.

Poverty Eradication. Only the farmers themselves can manage to escape poverty while Government creates a facilitating environment. Decisive efforts by farmers require the desire to improve farm management and a belief in their own capabilities to effect change.

Consistency with the Sida Strategy for Co-operation with Uganda. The agricultural sector is becoming more prominent in new strategy for co-operation ("sustained use of natural resource and arrest of environmental degradation") together with social sectors. This is in line with the current ULAMP goals.

ULAMP's ambition to *train civic leaders* in awareness is compatible with the Sida Country Strategy.

The *private sector* is recognised as important for high and sustained growth. However, currently ULAMP is seen as having a bias towards government institutions rather than private sector organisations.

3.2 Implementation Performance and Impact

The project's implementation success among farming communities depends on: (a) the expectations among farm families (acceptance of ULAMP only providing advisory support); (b) involvement by core staff, agricultural subject matter specialists and other officers (including community development and forest officers) at district and sub-county levels; and (c) the involvement of local leaders during the

initial mobilisation stage and in the proceedings of the co-ordinating committees at sub-county and parish levels.

Initiated and planned studies:

Farmers and Staff Training:

- Marketing system and cost-benefit analysis;
- Implications of ULAMP promoted technologies on gender balance and cultural practices;

Development of Technology Innovations:

- Neem production;
- Avocado processing;
- Crop–livestock integration study;
- Soil fertility management study;
- Soil nutrient study;
- Appropriate technologies for rain water harvesting for domestic use and for production (Arua and Mbarara districts);

Management, Co-ordination and Networking:

- Financial management at sub-county levels.

Planned and Achieved Objectives and Outputs on Staff & Farmer Training

Training of Staff: The project operations took off slower than expected in the first year when considerable time was spent on staff training and mobilisation of communities. In the initial year, almost 90% of the targets for staff training were realised, while close to 60% of the target was achieved in the training of farmers. In the second year, the number of farmer trainings increased in Mbarara and Kabarole while training in Arua experienced a decline (ANNEX, Table 2).

The training of extension agents in the districts generally extended beyond those involved in the geographical target areas. This approach served to create awareness in the various departments in each district and engaged other staff as resource persons for training later in the project cycle. It also assisted in establishing cross-fertilisation to other non-ULAMP areas as to the techniques used in the extension service delivery. Extension workers at various levels in the districts are discussing issues and processes in a manner that embodies the principles of demand-driven extension, one of the critical areas where the current extension system was weak. Technical messages are largely sensitive to the existing production systems and the improvements that could be incorporated into them, primarily in improving crop husbandry practices. These characteristics in the field suggest that the training of extension staff was correctly targeted at making them “facilitators” rather than top-down “teachers”.

Further training may be required for the following staff categories: (a) Field Extension Workers at sub-county level (agriculture, veterinary, home economics, forestry) on: (i) technical subject matters (a vast field if the ambition is to cover crop husbandry, animal husbandry and land husbandry as well as other income-generating activities such as handicrafts); (ii) facilitation/participatory techniques together with communicative skills in interacting with farmers on technical and managerial matters; and (iii) farm management skills, including techniques for planning production and marketing activities within a group context and techniques for recording and interpreting technical and economic data; (b) government organisations (including research centres)/business organisations/NGOs/community based organisations on particularly facilitation/participatory techniques together with communicative skills in interacting with farmers; and (c) members of co-ordinating committees on: (i) awareness of ULAMP

objectives and mode of operation; (ii) role of ULAMP co-ordinating committees; (iii) “meeting techniques”; (iv) “participatory leadership”; and (v) techniques for joint planning, backstopping, monitoring and evaluating farm management activities.

Farmer Training The farmers in the project districts have been trained in a variety of production aspects¹³. The initial implementation stage incorporates a number of basic trainings, firstly in production constraints and problem identification, then on prioritising interests and action planning. This process is followed by a number of theoretical and practical trainings in improved crop husbandry which encompasses themes of timely planting, row planting and spacing, rotations, composting, soil and water retention techniques. These foundational trainings may seem to transcend the boundaries of the identified “common interest” i.e. vegetable and other crop production, fish pond development, apiary or livestock production around which groups formed.

The district of *Mbarara* was the original area where ULAMP operated (through USCAPP) and the coverage and the trainings are at a more advanced stage. There are 268 CIGs currently active, with about 4,000 members, spread over 42 parishes. This represents roughly 24,000 persons or about 2.6% of the total population in the entire district. The programme has trained over 5,800 farmers in 2000/01 (over 70% of its target) while about 2,100 farmers participated in trainings in the first half of second year. Despite the fact that Mbarara has a significantly larger project penetration in its district, it does not have significantly more study tours or field trips for farmers. The discussions with district extension staff acknowledged limits of effectiveness in attending to the groups and the growing demand for farmer training; this has resulted in more efforts geared to training farmers leaders to become trainers of fellow farmers. So far, 60 farmers from four different sub-counties have become volunteer trainers.

In *Arua*, it is estimated that there are 285 active farmers in the existing CIGs under ULAMP, as opposed to the vast numbers who partook in the early mobilisations and trainings since the start-up in July 1999. The main reasons cited for the initial fall in numbers include: credit expectations of participants; prospects of free lunches that attracted disinterested participants; general expectations of hand-outs, including seed and other inputs. These initial start-up problems point to the importance of carefully planned and executed reconnaissance and community mobilisation efforts. The quarterly reports for 2000/01 indicate that 1,480 farmers attended training sessions, suggesting that the active farmers have participated on average 5 trainings in the 6 months ending December 2000. The overall target is to have about 2,000 farmers trained in 1999/2000; while the number of actual farmers trained on various issues is high, the numbers suggest much focus under the programme is given to the same farmers. The programme is operating in an expanded area of four parishes out of 8 in the Sub-county of Pajulu, with Pajulu having a total population of 27,000. The 285 farmers would only represent approximately 1, 700 persons or 6% of the sub-county population.

In *Kabarole*, training in the first year focused on staff in the extension service, followed by community mobilisation activities in the parishes. Poor group formation was experienced due to misunderstanding about the project approach and aims, together with the refocus on participatory methodologies. It has been noted that the groups that have rooted themselves in the programme and undergone trainings, have progressed well and have served as an inspiration to staff in the programme and staff in other non-ULAMP areas who visited these farmers. The Kabarole ULAMP team sees the currently active CIGs as model farmers and, with visible results that are now starting to emerge, they hope

¹³ ULAMP is offering technical advisory services on individual farm enterprises such as banana production and raising of improved goats but has not yet developed a conceptual approach to integrated farm management where the farm enterprises interaction and interdependence is recognised and operationalised into technical advice.

others will develop interest to join. Of the 21 CIGs formed, only 9 are currently active and thus only about 200 farmers have undergone specialised training. The targeted number of farmers under the programme was about 2,500 for 2000/01, thus revealing a low level of participation. The pilot project areas in Kabarole cover an area encompassing 1,600 households out of a total number of 60,000 households in the newly reduced district or 2.7% of the entire geographic area. Within this area of operations, ULAMP has trained approximately 200 farmers, representing 12% of the farming population within the targeted parishes.

Planned and Achieved Objectives for Technology Development

The focus of technological interventions has largely been one of disseminating tested technologies from the base of the experience of district staff (multidisciplinary), and from the initial work of USCAPP, the precursor to ULAMP which was based in Mbarara. The initial years in Mbarara focused on soil and water management, particularly through the use of soil erosion barriers of various forms, both physical and vegetative. These practices have built up a base of experience that is drawn upon in the institutional structure and staff of ULAMP.

Apart from the above technological interventions, USCAPP in the later years and ULAMP through its implementation period have been focusing more on dissemination of technologies available from resource personnel in the field and in various institutions. The focus has been on processes and particularly those of community needs identification, prioritisation, articulation of plans and embarking on fulfilling and facilitating those needs based on the available resources found in the respective districts.

In terms of technological adoptions of various extension messages or innovations to the farm production unit, the results vary among the districts.

Mbarara District. While the other districts have some aggregated quantitative data on the adoption rates of various technologies and messages by farmers, Mbarara has descriptive summaries in the two quarterly reviews for 2000/01. Adoption rates are difficult to ascertain but it has been estimated by staff that well over half have adopted the most widely spread husbandry practices on bananas regarding spacing, thinning, mulch management and some level of soil and water conservation. This translates into over 3,000 farmers having adopted these practices. In 1999/2000, the Annual Report outlines that over 435 farmers have various innovations in place in their fields, along with 5 CIG nurseries established in various places, while the number trained in the various training sessions amounted to about 5,800 farmers.

Arua District. The total number of farmers having adopted the various messages by the end of December 2000 is about 250. There are thought to be 285 active farmers in these groups, which suggests that many of these 'active' farmers have not put into practice things they have learned from their group trainings. Two reasons cited for low participation and adoption rates are the proximity to town (other more lucrative avenues to generate income/ lack of time to invest into farms), and the overriding demand of farmers to see visible results before they embark on such efforts.

Kabarole District. The results of technology adoption for Kabarole in 2001/02, 2nd Quarter, were not quantified in the Progress Report due to claims of rebel insurgency in the area and untimely releases of funds. In the first quarter of 2000/01, 35 farmers had adopted various techniques learned in their training sessions out of a targeted 157. Given the fact that attendance records show that about 1,230 participants attended trainings in the first quarter, it reveals a very low uptake rate. However, given the fact that World Food Day celebrations were held in the project area to view ULAMP beneficiaries, it suggests that those who are operating under the programme are doing so quite successfully.

Due to the focus on mobilisation, community planning, and developing demand-driven linkages, little work has been done so far on developing new technological interventions or on promoting the processes of on-farm trials or adaptive research. It appears the staff in the districts have become engulfed by this process despite the fact that many of them are technically oriented in soil and water conservation, livestock or agronomy.

In addition to the mobilisation and planning processes which are slow to gain momentum, the first phase also generated extension manuals together with the identification and prioritisation of researchable subjects. These processes seem to have an external focus where researchers and specialists would undertake the studies and involve only a few select farmers in the research process.

Studies. Specialised studies¹⁴ in the project area include:

1. A study on neem and avocado potentials (propagation, comparative advantages, processing alternatives, and marketing opportunities); this is currently at the field work stage;
2. Integrating livestock into farming systems (a draft report has been completed);
3. A study on marketing systems and cost benefit analyses for various alternatives. Field work has been done but a draft has not yet been completed;
4. A study on financial management at sub-county levels (draft not yet ready);
5. Implications of ULAMP promoted technology on gender balance and cultural practices. Started but draft not completed.

Expected and Attained Impact at Farm Level

The ULAMP areas of operation mainly encompass farmer holdings which have a diverse nature of activities, including the production of many varied crops and vegetables, generally both annual and perennial crops, and some livestock. The baseline study (ULAMP 1999) indicated the average household landholdings and diversity/importance of various crop and animal activities but it did not give the consequent average yield or production figures. A general improvement of yield had been claimed in all districts upon the adoption of various crop husbandry practices and instituting soil and water control measures on the farms.

Production Impact in Mbarara District. Mbarara has been the longest served district under USCAPP/ULAMP support and thus has the greatest penetration of activities, both in number and in scope. The areas of impact include:

- Improvement of *banana* bunch size, and increases of bunch numbers up to double previously cultivated due to better thinning, better soil and water retention, and other husbandry practices like mulching and manure application.
- *Honey*: improvement of hive construction enables collections of honey without destruction of the brood, enhancing production, and improving quality of collected honey.
- Improvement of *Irish potato* yields, up to four times the yield of previous seed stock. Husbandry problems still persist with future danger of soil fertility decline and build-up of pests and disease where rotations are not observed.
- *Livestock* improvements: both milk and meat carcass gains with various groups utilising zero grazing management strategies and local breeding programmes set up with exotic breeds to cross with local animals.

¹⁴ Consultants for studies are recruited on a regional basis.

- *Agroforestry* species including *Grevillea*, *Lueceana*, *Acacia abessinica*, neem, and other fruit trees integrated into homesteads. More than 10 nurseries have been set up.
- *Other household improvement* strategies: includes efficient cookstoves, water harvesting for home use and increased vegetable garden cultivation.

Impact on Production in Arua District. The impacts at farm level are few in absolute numbers, partially due to the fact that many farmers are incorporated into various groups, and thus training resources are presumably concentrated on this base of farmers. Staff also outlined a strong ‘wait-and-see’ attitude to the success of group projects and innovations, especially after realisation that project support did not include a lot of free gifts, hardware, or loans. Impact at the farm level was often multifaceted, with increases in income from diversifying or improving current activities (e.g. beekeeping, fish pond management, zero grazing animals) or adopting improved land management practices such as planting density control and row planting, introducing water and soil conservation measures, or trying new varieties. As these activities in the field were quite recently undertaken, determining impact is difficult.

Impact on Production in Kabarole District. Impacts in Kabarole are similar to those of Mbarara since Kabarole is also a major banana growing district with similar topographical characteristics, although much of the district is slightly higher in elevation.

It was noted that under improved management in bananas bunch size and yield has started to be realised; fish pond rehabilitation has begun, some work on improved husbandry practices in maize and beans, agroforestry species planted, and various on-farm income generating and home improvement activities have also been noted.

While success was noted at farm in the areas of farm productivity, it also appeared that ULAMP operations sustained the notion of ‘dependency’ that CIGs had with regards to long-term project support. There was no clear feeling that a finite goal to be independent of programme support existed. ULAMP was seen as one project in a succession of projects which abound, and which appear in order to solve problems for the farmer. The notion of empowering the farmers to be experimenters in their own right, and building their capacity and confidence to do so, and having the extension support be collaborative and partners in this process was lacking. Only modest encouragement of these principals was noted in the field.

Impact of Farm Resources. As a result of these changes in farm enterprise activities, and changes in production practices and productivity, the impact on farm resources is positive in a number of ways:

Expanded diversity: Households seen under the programme have expanded or rehabilitated their production strategies to incorporate more crop, livestock, or fisheries activities which has served to expand both the consumption and marketing frontiers. Measures have started to offset future supply problems in fuelwood availability by planting various agroforestry species;

Household resource utilisation & improvement: Areas addressed include better use of fuelwood (better stoves), fireless cookers (combination of food insulator and steamer for last stage of cooking), increased on-farm production of necessities like soap, mats, baskets, etc., rainwater catchment device improvements, utilisation of household wastes for composting, and therefore improved vegetable gardens.

Impact on Farm Family Members. Farmers’ adaptation of new technologies is the outstanding indicator for participation. The team received summaries of group activities from CIG leaders and it reviewed a few of the quarterly reports from chairpersons of some successful CIGs indicating activities accomplished, weaknesses and wish lists. The process of assessing group accomplishments serves as an evaluation process that enables members to see their success and failures.

The Evaluation Team heard from farmers repeated appreciation of ULAMP's approach of letting them identify their needs and problems, getting involved in the planning of how to meet these needs and overcoming some of the problems they faced although this was always followed with more problems yet to be solved.

However, verifiable indicators at the farm level are yet to be concretised. With the common interest groups, the team found high rate of multiple membership, particularly among men. Although this helps farmers to acquire knowledge for farm diversification, it negatively impacts on the women (wives) who are left home and are unable to join interest groups. This was particularly pronounced in Arua district.

Because of the participatory approach and the wider definition that ULAMP has adopted, farmers, through the needs assessment exercises, identify a wide range of problems areas which are then prioritised to form activities of the programme. This approach has produced a wide *menu of offers* from the technical part and SMS and also opened types of activities that farmers get trained in as well as take on to increase their incomes. These include: agroforestry, home economics, handicraft, water conservation for home use, trenching, bunds construction and mulching for soil conservation, apiary, poultry, horticulture, animal husbandry in general, dairy, rabbit and fish farming. Also included is the mobilisation of self-help community services. The training for this variety of menu offering is effected through the CIGs and farmers declared to belong to several.

Farmers are expected to become partners in on-the-farm research which necessitates literacy and ability to keep consistent *records* at the farm level. The Team accessed CIG group records but little evidence of individual record keeping apart from those involved in farm demonstrations. To this extent ambition of farmers' participation in research needs to be backed up with regular supervision and encouragement. Emphasis on the utility of record keeping needs further emphasis in the training. This will have the double purpose of gauging the production increments and stimulating research.

Participatory *monitoring* is expected to take place as the different CIGs review their workplans at the end of each month when CIG members convene to appraise their activities. The records pertaining to these meetings were available in many of the communities visited. However, they focus more on the problems encountered than attempts to find solutions.

Gender Aspects. Women's participation in the project activities has been assessed by examining attendance records, their numbers on the CIGs, positions of leadership and observations by the Team during the interactions at the visits. The CIG concept has been hailed by the project staff to traverse the boundary lines between sexes in that both women and men get to meet regularly and discuss matters that concern them as a group. Through the group, they share labour and also gain by exchanging knowledge and experiences, and change of attitudes towards women owning small assets such as goats, rabbits and planting trees on their husband's claimed land. There were some women CBOs whom ULAMP has helped to strengthen and build confidence.

During the teams interaction with groups of farmers, it was evident that women still lacked confidence and held the background position in most groups but there at least two mixed CIGs lead by women. There were, however, some outstanding characteristics such as being heads of households implying that they regulated their time. The members of the co-ordination committees were predominantly men except in Arua; however, more women in Arua seemed to be invisible than in other districts.

In *Kabarole*, the women group revealed a mismatch between their desires and the activities they were engaged in. A substantial number indicated that if they were to get capital, they would invest it in retail

shops or some other merchandise in the markets. However, the majority affirmed that joining and working in groups has helped them.

In order to keep the groups going and to undertake some investments as a group, some groups have membership fees that ranged from Shs 500 to Shs 50,000 in the different areas. Funds collected have been used to acquire dairy animals and goats which reinforces integrated animal husbandry. Other groups have not fully understood ULAMP's enabling goals for them to be self-sustaining.

ULAMP's goal was to reach at least 40% women farmers; given the brief time spent in the field, it was not possible to gauge the proportion so far covered. But it can be said that quite a number know about and have perhaps benefited from project activities indirectly through their husbands.

Social and cultural factors are impediments to women's full participation, adaptation and continuity in community projects. The variation of needs and problems further impact on the project direction, planning and fulfilling the objectives. From the project's quarterly reports, the menu of activities and from the Teams' observation, it is evident that the needs and problems are constantly changing thus necessitating incorporation of new activities. Weakness in some CIGs, low attendance of women in awareness seminars and training sessions and the non-participation of wives in the visiting sessions we had with the husband farmers are indicative of some of the gender inequity. Most wives were not even aware of the Team's impending visits while the husbands were well prepared. The Team interacted with only one wife of the farmers visited. In other instances, wives who were leading the CIGs met with Team without their husbands.

Few reports and documents had disaggregated data on the type of farmers, sex, full time farmers or existence of other Income Generating Activities in households both at the baseline surveys, needs assessment stages which makes quantitative evaluation difficult.

Given this profile, food security at the household level is impacted by a number of factors which may be different from lack of appropriate technologies. Food security may not stand alone; it is part of the overall household structure, gender relations, other transactions and social relations, context of activities, and the overall household strategies and goals. ULAMP's training manual addresses the gender aspects but the field staff appear to be still weak on this aspect. Concrete indicators for these objectives need to be developed.

Fund Disbursements

Budgeted and actual project expenditure is shown in the following table (mill. SEK):

Location	1999/2000	2000/2001 Budget	Actual	Percent of Budget	Budget	Actual Jul-Dec	Percent of Budget
Mbarara District, sub-counties		1.5	0.3		2.1		
Mbarara District, headquarters		1.1	0.9		0.9		
Arua District		0.8	0.5		1.3		
Kabarole District		0.5	0.3		0.8		
Kapchorwa District		0.5	0.1		0.9		
MAAIF, Entebbe		0.6	0.4		2.2		
Subtotal, exp. in Uganda		5.0	2.5	50%	8.2	1.2	15%
MSC: studies & linkages		1.2	0.4				
MSC: administration		1.3	1.3				
Sida monitoring		0.2	0.0				
Total expenditure		7.8	4.0	51%	9.0	2.5	28%

In 1999/2000, actual expenditure amounted to only 51% of the budgeted expenditure. The low disbursement rate has been attributed to a slow implementation start since much of the time during the first six months (July–December 1999) was spent on mobilisation activities. In addition, a cumbersome tendering process in Mbarara District and depreciation of the Uganda shilling in relation to the Swedish krona tended to retard disbursement rates.

Disbursements for the first two quarters amount to 28% of the budgeted amount for the whole fiscal year.

Management

Criteria for Parish Selection. Within the socio-economic baseline surveys and needs assessments, the criteria for selecting the districts for ULAMP activities were not made explicit in the Project Document. The team reviewed several documents with baseline information of the socio-economic profiles of the parishes and communities/farmers involved in the ULAMP project areas. The major characteristics of the parishes in the four districts are:

- 79% are poor farmers with incomes of Shs. 250,000 to Shs. 100,000 per year;
- Small landholdings of 1–2 acres with soil degradation and serious deforestation;
- Poor extension services;
- High population density;
- Mixed farming though more crop growing than cattle; water scarcity;

The criteria used for selecting the parishes in Kabarole District were:

- The potential threat to soil degradation as evidenced by the terrain of the area, the population pressure and the level of agronomic practices;
- The receptivity and the readiness of the clients to adopt new technologies;
- Existence of other stakeholders e.g. input stockists and NGOs;
- Availability of extension staff; and
- The political and civic will of the leaders.

The priority problems identified varied from parish to parish and the solutions suggested were requiring intervention of either of two kinds: (a) Government and others outside the community; and (b) internal or communities responsibility.

The former entailed forging linkages with the various government departments and NGO while the later required communities to take action through deliberate efforts to increasing household incomes, contribution of funds for community projects and pooling of labour for individual or communal projects.

*Financial Management*¹⁵. Special Accounts are used to channel funds from Sida, Stockholm via the Management Services Consultant to the four districts. Withdrawals from the Special Accounts require the signatures of the ULAMP District Co-ordinator together with designated officers in the District Treasury and the Chief Administrator's Office. One Account Assistant is assigned to work with District Co-ordinators in Mbarara, Arua and Kabarole districts.

Expenditure is not accounted for on the same basis as the components that the project activities are arranged within (e.g. Staff and Farmer Training; Development of Technological Innovations; Manage-

¹⁵ The prescribed procedures for financial management are described in *ULAMP Administrative Guidelines* (Chapter 5).

ment, Co-ordination and Networking; and Purchase of Working Equipment) but is currently grouped into seven different categories: Operational Costs; Capital Equipment; Training; Field Equipment and Demonstration; Linkages and Research; Cassava Improvement, and Co-ordination.

Co-ordination

Co-ordination of ULAMP's activities is both vertical and horizontal. The vertical level is from MAAIF as the project co-ordination centre down to the districts. Within districts, the process begins with a project co-ordinator who collaborates with all the technical personnel that fall under MAAIF. District civil and political leaders are also part of the co-ordination committees at the sub-county and parish levels. The technical personnel under MAAIF form the core extension team at each level.

There are no incentives for intensified co-operation between ULAMP and other bodies.

At the horizontal level, the as technical core team collaborates with the civil and political leaders who are also part of the co-ordination committees. They serve as support supervision team as well mobilisation of farmers (organogram). The Evaluation Team met and discussed the project activities with various officials.

Vertical Co-ordination of ULAMP Activities. Co-ordination at the vertical level involves the production co-ordinator, District Agricultural Officer (DAO) District Veterinary Officer (DVO) District Forest Officer (DFO), District Community Development Officer (DCDO), Fisheries Officer all of whom with District ULAMP Co-ordinator. Similar specialisation cadres operate at the sub-county level. The training and mobilisation of farmers begin at the sub-county. It is also the spring Board of extension activities.

At the parish levels, there are executive officers of the various Common Interest Groups composed of the Chairperson, Treasurer and Secretary.

Horizontal Co-ordination. Horizontal co-ordination for project activities is between the extension personnel and subject matter specialists including agencies (NARO, NEMA and the University) NGOs and farmers' representatives. All actors to plan together and facilitate in the training of lower cadres and farmers.

Co-ordination also takes place between the technical staff and the political and civic leaders. To this extent the parish chiefs (as civic leaders) were found to be secretaries to ULAMP co-ordination committees while the LC III chairpersons took on supportive supervision in addition to mobilisation of communities to adopt ULAMP technologies and methods.

Co-ordinating committee performance depends on commitment and competence. The performance has not always been satisfactory, partly because of lack of experience and skills in interacting at meetings.

An external evaluation of ULAMP District Co-ordination Committee in Mbarara revealed that co-ordination is sometimes hindered by inadequate mobilisation and support from field extension workers (non-adherence to the programmes or poor back stopping), project dependency syndrome by some clients, poor planning, divided loyalties and personal interests of the civic and political leaders at the different levels and personality of the head of the committees. Collaboration with other NGOs was particularly weak while that with local CBOs was evident in some parishes. The project was perceived to be entirely agricultural related. This called for transparency by having the executive committees access the project document to internalise the design and operations of the project. Regular follow-ups by the core staff and visits to the project would help to mitigate some of the current problems. This will necessitate increased time for project activities by the facilitator and other core staff.

Networking with Other Stakeholders

Intra-district networking was not clearly seen, given the various actors in similar and complementary fields. Some overlap was noted with other NGOs and programmes, but not visibly integrated in the work plans and activity structure of the CIGs or District programmes. There was some networking with the leadership (parish/sub-county) and co-ordinating staff of ULAMP offices with work being done in other districts which proved successful and generated a lot of interest. Further to this, there were some field trips of key mobilisers and staff to Kenya, which also generated a lot of enthusiasm and request for expansion.

It was expected that ULAMP would promote networking in the planning processes of the district but this did not materialise. In Mbarara, where ULAMP is positioned as a significant and widely spread programme, one would expect more of a district co-ordination role; in the other ULAMP districts, the programme is too geographically insignificant to have any clout (or interest) for such a role.

4 Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Main Conclusions

Implementation Performance

Positive Achievements. The project achievements include: project core staff¹⁶ have been identified, appointed and are functioning; training of core staff and other public sector staff at district and sub-district levels is well underway; several studies on suitable farm technologies are initiated or underway; capacity building or habilitation efforts among Common Interest Groups have been initiated (including baseline surveys in identified parishes, needs assessments among farmer family members, mobilisation of members of Common Interest Groups with involvement by local elected and other leaders, formulation of goals and workplans, and implementation activities specified in the workplan); co-ordination committees have been appointed and frequently formulated and adopted their own rules and regulations; planning, budgeting and reporting procedures have been established through initial training of the project staff; and procurement of basic equipment and material in the new project districts has been initiated or completed. The above achievements represent major accomplishments of the project.

Deviations from Plans. Training of personnel in other sectors has not yet reached the intended level. Common Interest Groups have not yet been systematically encouraged to become self-reliant. Members of co-ordination committees do not always include representatives of other sectors. Project expenditure is not yet always incorporated in district and sub-district budgets.

Fund Disbursements. Financial spending has been considerably less than expected both in 1999/2000 and so far in 2000/01 (up to 31 December 2000). The low disbursement rate partly reflects implementation delays in training, demonstrations and other learning activities that have had longer lead time than expected. It is also possible, however, that some costs, including various operational costs, have been overbudgeted.

The Impact of Project Activities

Positive Effects. At the farmers' level, a considerable number of members of Common Interest Groups have increased production and also improved their food security and incomes, particularly for permanent crops (such as bananas), as a result of technical advice received through ULAMP. Many members have also become more adept at co-operating with fellow group members.

At the institutional level, the majority of the local council staff who support Common Interest Groups have become more skilled at working with farmers in a participatory way. Also, systems for financial and fiscal monitoring have been introduced.

Other Aspects. The ambition to reorient farmers' thinking towards increased *self-reliance* initially through weaning away from expectations of external grants and handouts and subsequently through building up their confidence as skilled farmers and farm managers, has not yet been realised. Although the project has generally succeeded in making farmers accept that ULAMP only provides technical advisory services, in reality many group members have come to expect the project to also assist in locating and bringing planting materials and identifying potential sources of credit and suitable agents to purchase their produce in both adjacent and distant markets. A future ambition must be to build up the

¹⁶ Project core staff are managerial and technical staff at sub-county, district and headquarters levels who work more than half of their time on ULAMP activities (and who may draw Safari Day Allowances up to 16 working days per month).

confidence and the ability of the group members to locate sources of goods or services and to arrange for procurement or selling agreements.

The dimensions of *poverty* include lack of reliable sources of livelihood – land and other assets, labour and social safety nets – as well as few possibilities to make use of economic opportunities due to low status or lack of power. It has also dimensions of risk and vulnerability. It is clear that the districts where ULAMP has been introduced have been selected based on poverty considerations. It is also evident that the best-off farmers in the four project districts are less likely to join the Common Interest Groups but instead prefer to operate individually. However, the project has not yet developed a strategy for reaching the poorer families within a parish or an approach for offering special support to the poorest members of a CIG.

The *quality of structures* such as *fanya juu* and *fanya chini* at the farms of Common Interest Group members is not always satisfactory.

Common Interest Groups working together around *permanent* crops, such as bananas, or livestock or aquaculture appear to have better prospects for sustained co-operation than groups where the members produce annual crops which provide fewer natural opportunities for co-operation.

The project has so far offered little support on capacity building among organisations or projects *outside the public sector*. It has been less successful than expected in engaging representatives for other organisations or projects to participate in the work of the ULAMP co-ordinating committees at national and district levels.

Project Strategy and Design

The absence in the Project Document of a strategy for assisting the members of the Common Interest Groups to rapidly become *self-reliant* has not yet triggered efforts by the project management to formulate and test such alternative approaches¹⁷.

In Mbarara District, the expansion of project activities from only a few sub-counties during the US-CAPP pilot phase to 12 sub-counties in 1999/2000 has relied heavily on available staff capabilities at district headquarters while the potential *capability in the original sub-counties* for disseminating their experience to additional sub-counties has been less utilised. Further, the expansion of project activities has not been *financially supported by the new sub-counties* but has been funded almost entirely by ULAMP.

Project Management

The organisational set-up of the project is basically sound and ULAMP has been successful in establishing its intended organisational structure in accordance with the plans in the original Project Document and in the Annual Workplan and Budget 2000/01. In general, the management has also been successful in launching the major project activities (cf. para. 401) although the implementation of training, demonstration and technology development activities has fallen behind schedule.

Inconsistencies in Project Output, Component and Budget Structures. These inconsistencies (cf. Ch. 1.3, above), which may have contributed to the lack of initiative on the two issues above by disguising their importance, have not yet been redressed by the project management.

Limited Contacts with Other Organisations and Projects. The project management has not fully succeeded in linking up with related projects and organisations with ULAMP. This shortcoming may partly be seen as an undesired effect of the linguistic confusion around the term “land management”: while in the

¹⁷ The MAAIF Position Paper on the Future of ULAMP pays little attention to this fundamental issue.

context of farming activities, land management for the project has become synonymous with land husbandry+crop husbandry+animal husbandry, it has retained its restricted meaning (=land husbandry) in its institutional context. Few linkages have been established to organisations or projects in the input supply, micro-finance or marketing sub-sectors or with organisations that specialise in facilitation techniques; the representation on the National Co-ordinating Committee is largely limited to soil and water conservation interests in the public sector and the representation on the District Co-ordinating Committees includes few private sector interests.

Overlapping Committee Mandates. Although, the project management is aware of the risk of overlapping interests between the standing Production Committees and the ULAMP co-ordinating committees at district and sub-county levels, few attempts have been made to rationalise their responsibilities in writing in the Administrative Guidelines.

Gender Aspects in Planning and Reporting. The fact that report statistics are insufficiently gender disaggregated has not yet been addressed by the project management.

Cost-efficiency and Cost-effectiveness

The project management has not yet developed a conceptual model for the project's intervention/support activities with regard to sequencing or causality; neither have any data been collected by the project on the economic ratio between cost of support activities – e.g. farm visits, demonstrations or study tours – and their impact on farm incomes. It is not yet clear which is the most cost-effective way to introduce improved farming practices for economically important enterprises such as banana production and what kind of project support might be justified for enterprises of more marginal economic potential such as soya bean or rabbit production.

Under the Development of Technological Innovations component, relatively expensive structures for demonstrating the benefits of practices such as roof water catchment or aquaculture are established on selected group members' farms. Although absorbing more funds than the common training activities, the impact of these demonstrations on other farmers' practices is unclear, as is their cost-effectiveness in relation to other project activities.

Sustainability and Replicability of Project Activities

Project Consistency with Ugandan Policies. The chief concepts of ULAMP may be summarised as: (a) group approach in working with farmers; (b) participatory planning, implementation and monitoring procedures; (c) support limited to advisory services and excluding investment or credits that tend to detract farmers' attention from what they can achieve themselves; (d) decentralised implementation through personnel at district and sub-county levels; and (e) organisational mechanisms for linkages with related bodies in the form of co-ordinating committees.

The project concepts and principles do essentially agree with the policies formulated in the Poverty Eradication Action Plan, the Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture, the policies for decentralisation of Government responsibilities and the environmental policy enforced by NEMA and ministerial departments.

In line with *PEAP* and the *decentralisation policies*, ULAMP promotes community involvement in planning and decision-making, contributes to a smaller public service, actively promotes further decentralisation and facilitates greater involvement by the private sector.

The *PMA* goal of poverty eradication through adaptation of agriculture to the demands of the market and through adoption of improved practices is well compatible with the overall ULAMP goal of improving food security and farmers' incomes through improved land management. The attention to

land management¹⁸ issues conforms well to the intentions and the foci of the national *environmental* policy.

A “main aim” of ULAMP is to develop nation-wide strategies and technologies for land management and to assist in capacity building through training and involvement of extension staff, civic leaders and farmers in preparation for handling of such programmes. Development of nation-wide strategies for land management may have become obsolete with the decision to reduce Government involvement in agricultural advisory services as manifested by the advent of **NAADS**. Similarly, an ambition to develop on-farm land management technologies for nation-wide application may have become overtaken by events already some time ago: a whole arsenal of structural, cultural and biological practices is by now accepted as a basic *common standard* while local adaptations may take place as the need arises.

Preferences of Farmers in the Four ULAMP Districts. After occasional initial uncertainty about the scope of project support, the farming communities in the selected parishes have come to accept and understand that the support of ULAMP is limited to technical advisory services and does include neither credit nor subsidies on inputs or implements. Common Interest Group members appreciate the advisory services provided by ULAMP through farm visits, demonstrations and not least study tours on technical and managerial subject matters. They also value the efforts by the project to facilitate technology adaptation through studies and on-farm trials. However, the term “land management” may create confusion among farmers since the project also supports crop and livestock husbandry and promotes income generation through other activities than farm production, processing or marketing of farm produce.

Expectations about Farmers’ Preferences in Other Districts. The prospects for replicating the ULAMP support activities among other districts will be influenced by several factors, including the prevalence of permanent crops, livestock production and interest in artisanal opportunities that provide good opportunities for regular co-operation among members of farmers’ groups; the marketing prospects for produce emanating from enterprises supported by the project; and the interest of government staff, NGOs and commercial agents in supporting and adding to the project’s activities.

Although it is expected that farmers in other districts would welcome the assistance provided by ULAMP, it is clear that its effectiveness would be significantly enhanced after the four strategy elements identified have been developed – (i) a strategy for encouraging and supporting poorer families to join Common Interest Groups; (ii) an effective strategy for gradually weaning Common Interest Groups away from support by the project and instead seek services and supplies on their own initiative; (iii) economically effective approaches for conveying technical advice on farm enterprises by combining different support measures – e.g. person-to-person training, pamphlet distribution and study tours – in “packages” that are congruent with the economic importance of the supported enterprise, and (iv) an effective strategy for expanding the project activities from their initial base in one sub-county to the other sub-counties in the district by engaging staff in the original sub-counties and by pooling project resources with the existing institutional resources of the new sub-counties.

Institutional Capabilities and Financial Resources. An ULAMP operating at maturity level in a district would not be a particularly expensive operation since the cost for local training, demonstrations and study tours for farmers groups is relatively modest (much of the expenditure during the build-up phase is required for other purposes, i.e. for capacity building among staff and for procurement of equipment and facilities). In the future, it is conceivable that the cost for technical advisory services would become the joint financing responsibility of farmers, local authorities, research centres and commercial and

¹⁸ Attention to land management may be a necessary condition for improving food security and incomes but it is clearly not sufficient as is already well demonstrated by the widening of the ULAMP farmer focus into crop husbandry, animal husbandry and other income generating activities of artisanal nature.

non-governmental organisations, with only a minimum of external support, if at all. Linkages to research bodies such as the Makerere University may also benefit from intensified institutional co-operation with Swedish research organisations. During the expansion stage following the initial build-up phase, when the project extends from its first base of one sub-county into several other sub-counties, it should also be feasible for the local authorities to assume a larger portion of the financing responsibility that has hitherto been the case. This would be particularly realistic when the project has developed a more cost-effective approach to intra-district expansion that relies on personnel in the initial sub-county to take on a large portion of responsibility for training of staff in the expansion sub-counties.

Compatibility with Swedish Policies and Focal Areas. The ULAMP concepts and principles conform with many of the elements of the new *strategy for co-operation* with Uganda, including contribution to sustained utilisation of natural resources, reduced environmental degradation, and capacity building at local level through increased capabilities, transparency and follow-up. The project also is concerned with poverty alleviation and gender equality although more can be done to enhance its impact within these two areas. In addition, Sida involvement with ULAMP may provide the right experience for subsequent Swedish support to NAADS, which displays many similar features after the newly initiated pilot phase has been completed.

The project also provides the possibility of increased institutional *research co-operation* between Uganda and Sweden in the field of land management within a policy and financial framework provided by SAREC.

In a more narrow perspective, ULAMP is likely to become a relatively *cost-effective* project since the potential for improved food security and higher farm incomes from better farming practices is particularly high in Uganda compared to many other countries in Africa. A good production potential facilitated by ample rainfall and naturally fertile soils in many areas is not fully utilised since the turmoil in the 1970s and 1980s seriously disrupted the development and introduction of improved planting materials and farming practices. In addition, Uganda has better prospects of practising successful *integrated soil fertility management* using recycled green matter than most other countries in Africa thanks to its natural production conditions.

Finally, the development of a cost-effective, demand driven extension approach with good prospects of sustainability without massive external support within the natural resources sector should be of interest also to other Sida supported programmes in the region. A strengthened ULAMP would have natural conceptual and design linkages to NSWCP in Kenya (land management), LMNRP in Tanzania (demand-driven extension service and joint public-private sector influence on services at district and sub-district levels), and EEOA in Zambia (linkages farmers–service providers and cost-effective dissemination approach).

Component Structure. Although the project component structure is clear, the aggregation of *farmer and staff training* complicates assessments of the relative weight of these two sub-components and thus the construction of a conceptual model that would clarify how the different project activities interact with each other. Further, activities under the *purchase of working equipment* component may well be reallocated under the training, technology development and management components.

4.2 Recommendations

Rationale for Continued Swedish Support to ULAMP

The positive aspects of the project summarised above together with the good prospects for effectuating the required strengthening, prompt the evaluation team to recommend that support by Sida be extended beyond June 2002. Provided that the following recommendations are accepted, it is proposed that Swedish assistance be provided for three years 2002/03–2004/05 to allow for the proposed improvements to be developed, tested and implemented. The end of a three-year support period would also roughly coincide with the end of the NAADS pilot phase, thus creating additional options for future Swedish support to the natural resources sector in Uganda.

The recommendations below have been influenced by the preceding findings and conclusions and by the proposals contained in *MAAIF Position Paper on the Future of ULAMP*, which in many ways coincide with the views of the evaluation mission¹⁹.

Project Objectives

The future project objectives should reflect the ambition to build confidence and capabilities among farm family members as producers and managers as a means to alleviate poverty (defined not only in terms of income but also in relation to quality of land resources, power and status). They should also reflect an ambition to reach the poorer families in the implementation areas, while the present aim to develop strategies and technologies for land management programs nation-wide may well be deleted.

Strategy and Design Aspects

Scope of Support Services. The scope of the ULAMP support should be retained as advisory services on land, crop and animal husbandry and marketing (=farm management) and continue to exclude ancillary support such as input supply, micro-finance or marketing services. The farm management focus should be reflected in the name of the project since the current interpretation of land management is misleading.

Development of Weak Strategy Elements. The project needs to further develop and implement the following five strategy elements:

- (1) An effective approach for assisting also poorer families to join and participate in Common Interest Groups while allowing more recognition of the specific situation of women group members;
- (2) Approaches for rapidly instilling confidence among CIG members in order to reduce the dependence on ULAMP within a reasonable time after group formation (ways to achieve this may include voucher or contract arrangements for farmers' procurement of project services, introduction of certificates to indicate technical group proficiency and increased use of incentives such as study tours/exchange visits). Project support may be provided to "habilitation activities" (capacity building for improved knowledge and skills) for a defined period of time but may not cover group

¹⁹ The most important comments by the evaluation team on the Position Paper may be summarised as: (a) it is premature to stipulate a total support period for the project ("10–15 years") at this stage before strategies have been developed to make CIGs self-reliant and for rapid dissemination of support to new CIGs; (b) the Position Paper in its present version makes no references to the absent strategy elements – (i) an effective approach for supporting group formation and operations by poorer families; (ii) how to build capacity for self-reliance within groups within a finite support period of, say, 2–3 years; and (iii) a strategy for rapid transfer of project support to new groups by involving already trained farmers, sub-county staff and co-ordinating committee members, including representatives of commercial sector, NGOs and CBOs; (c) there should be more emphasis on initiatives and leadership by bona fide farmers rather than by community leaders; and (d) the ULAMP National Co-ordinating Committee may do well in strengthening its links to research bodies although the priority should be to include representatives of NAADS, MAAIF crop and livestock sections, the commercial sector and related NGOs.

operations. Capacity building support should be provided not only by the local council departments but be complemented by other local actors;

- (3) Closer linking of the extension methodology with the menu of offers on farm practices through guidelines on application of project support – training, demonstrations, pamphlets, study tours – for different kinds of interests/farm enterprises. This may entail developing and testing models for cost-effective transfer of technical knowledge and skills on individual crop, livestock and land related enterprises by means of pamphlets, videos, study tours, demonstrations, training sessions or on-farm interaction, individually or in combination;
- (4) Model/routines for encouraging university students to undertake research for Masters or PhD thesis within the sub-counties benefiting from ULAMP support as well as a routine to facilitate local research by personnel and farmers associated with ULAMP under supervision by staff at Makerere University;
- (5) A strategy for rapid project expansion to other sub-counties in the districts, encompassing training aspects (use of already trained staff and farmers in the initial sub-counties) as well as supervision/mobility aspects. The strategy should address the possible contributions by farmers and the sub-county councils (LC III) to finance this expansion.

Improving Important Design Features. The project needs to strengthen the following aspects:

- (6) More training on the business aspects of farming, e.g. buying inputs in bulk to benefit from quantity discounts and favourable transport rates, and joint marketing of agricultural produce to access distant but profitable markets and to reduce transport costs;
- (7) More effective approach for training and supporting group members as trainers for other farmers; and
- (8) Rationalisation of the output, component and budget categories to make them fully congruent in order to facilitate internal and external follow-up. A rationalised component structure may be limited to three elements: I. Habilitation (or Capacity Building) of Farmers' Groups; II. Capacity Building among Supporting organisations; and III. Management and Networking (the activities under the present technology development and procurement components may advantageously be distributed within the above three components).

Implementation Strategy and Geographical Coverage

Priority should be given to expansion of the ULAMP activities in the current four districts after the strategy and design issues above have been addressed. Within the four project districts, it may be realistic to aim for 30–50% coverage in terms of sub-counties by 2005 based on the experience gained in Mbarara District.

The above strategy and design issues should be addressed already during the 2001/02 implementation year since deferral to the proposed new phase 2002/03–2004/05 would only preserve inefficiencies that would complicate future efforts of rectification.

Project Operations

More attention should be paid to training of staff engaged in ULAMP activities on technical, facilitation and management matters on the basis of individual needs.

The project management should be prepared to provide assistance to capacity building (e.g. training, demonstrations or study tours) on technical and managerial subject matters among NGOs/CBOs and commercial organisations.

The project should consider engaging local specialist facilitators to complement capabilities among the technical staff of the local councils.

The Menu of Offers (technical packages) should be translated into local languages (this is already under consideration).

The project should improve the effectiveness of its co-ordinating committees by closer attention to membership composition – reflecting farming as a private sector enterprise – and training needs among less experienced members. In ULAMP Co-ordinating Committees at the district level, representatives of commercial sector organisations and NGOs active in technical advisory and credit services should be included. At the parish and sub-county levels, attempts may be made to test the practice of rotating chair-personship.

The project should improve the effectiveness of the ULAMP National Co-ordinating Committee by including representatives of NAADS, MAAIF crop and livestock sections, commercial sector organisations and NGOs active in technical advisory and credit services.

The supervision and backstopping capacity at the central level needs to be strengthened. This may be achieved by assigning the National ULAMP Co-ordinator to work full time (instead of 1/3) for the project and by assigning the National Facilitator to work full time for all four districts (instead of allocating half his time to matters in Mbarara District).

The methodological capacity of the project needs to be strengthened on strategy and design aspects in view of the outlined challenges ahead by engaging qualified consultant support that should probably be recruited from an international base.

The project should maintain its cost-effective model for staff transport by continuing to rely on bicycles and motorcycles.

The project should facilitate financial management and control at sub-county level through official agreement on sub-county financing responsibilities (already under consideration) and by increased transparency for benefit of the local councils.

The project management should facilitate direct disbursement of funds from Sida to project accounts at the LC V and LC III levels by developing reliable and swift procedures without having to rely on an external consultant firm.

The effectiveness of planning and reporting should be improved by: (a) more relevant categorisation of farmers (disaggregation of data to reflect poverty and gender aspects); (b) better use of baseline survey data and needs assessment data; (c) improving on the choice of verifiable indicators for output targets; and (d) better compatibility between target and achievement categories.

The management should increase its attention to quality aspects in view of the complex and ambitious nature of ULAMP and its potential value as a source of experience for other programmes in Uganda, including group work planning, budgeting and reporting, performed training activities, activities in farmers' fields, including land husbandry and demonstration structures, and farmers' record-keeping.

Projected Costs and Sida Support

It is estimated the Sida funded part of a three year extension period would amount to SEK 15–20 million. This is based on the assumption that the number of served sub-counties by 2004/05 increase to 40 in Mbarara, 10 in Arua and Kabarole and 5 in Kapchorwa. The external technical

consultancy is projected at 20 personweeks annually. Expenditure would be fairly evenly distributed over the three years since local training costs are low and ULAMP mobility is inexpensive.

Perceived Risks

There are risks that the introduction of improved farming practices will increase the demands on women family labour unless special efforts are made to achieve an equal balance within the family.

It may be difficult to maintain the quality of project concepts, strategy/approach, activities, outputs and impact during an expansion of the envisaged magnitude.

Staff engagement is a crucial factor for project success but there is risk that the initial enthusiasm will wear off as time passes.

4.3 Lessons Learned

The following lessons may be derived for Sida policies and projects from the planning and implementation experiences of ULAMP:

- *Introduction of novel concepts:* it is difficult but possible to introduce demanding new project concepts also in remote locations if the policy environment is conducive and the project management is committed to the project approach;
- *Maintaining and developing pioneering project concepts and implementation strategies:* a dynamic improvement of difficult development concepts and strategies requires a recurrent constructive dialogue between implementers and planners. If the fora provided by co-ordinating committees are inadequate, regular retreats and inputs by outside experts may provide the necessary impetus;
- *Creation of unwanted dependency:* project support may create increased dependency rather than independence;
- *Public and private sector:* the former tend to dominate even if efforts are made by the planners to engage non-government entities; and
- *Incentives for intensified co-operation/networking and for cost savings:* few projects offer any.

Appendix A

Terms of Reference²⁰:

Formative evaluation for ULAMP extension beyond June 2002

1. INTRODUCTION

Uganda Land Management Project is an interdisciplinary project implemented by Uganda's Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries (MAAIF) with financial assistance provided by the Swedish International Development Cooperation (Sida) since July 1999. The support is a continuation of a precursor project- Uganda Soil and Conservation and Agro-forestry Project (USCAPP), which operated on pilot basis in a few parishes in Mbarara district from November 1992 to June 1999. The project operates in Mbarara, Kabarole, Arua and Kapchorwa. Districts.

It was agreed that the first phase of ULAMP was to take two years starting May 1999 and ending in June 2001. A joint Sida/MAAIF Annual Project conducted in October 2000 recommended that the initial phase of the project should be extended by an additional year up to June 2002. The transition period shall be used to make the necessary assessments and preparations for possible long-term extension of the project. It was further agreed that a formative evaluation should be conducted before the next Sida/MAAIF Review Mission scheduled in April/May 2001.

The Purpose of the Formative Evaluation (FE) Mission is to give some indicative guidance to project formulation for a possible ULAMP extension beyond June 2002. The budget item under ULAMP for Sida Monitoring shall be used for financing the cost for undertaking the FE. It was agreed that the evaluation should be undertaken and its report prepared before the end of March 2001. It is therefore expected that this evaluation shall be done between February and March 2001.

2. BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT

Project Goals

The overall ULAMP goal is to achieve improved food security and incomes to small-scale farmers through improved land management. A main aim is to develop strategies and technologies for land management programs nation-wide and assist in capacity building through training and involvement of extension staff, civic leaders and farmers in preparation for handling such programs.

ULAMP is contributing to the development of an effective extension service based on participatory approach aiming at becoming demand driven. It is also facilitating farmer-based research and development of technical options for farmer use.

Expected Project Outputs

The main outputs expected from the project are:

- (i) An established management system for the project.
- (ii) A strengthened participatory and collaborative extension system.
- (iii) A strengthened collaboration between stakeholders and other agents.

²⁰ The criteria for evaluation are based on "Guidelines for Drawing Up Terms of Reference for Evaluations: Evaluation Methodology, Criteria and Suggested Layout for Evaluation Report" by the European Commission, Joint Relex Service for the Management of Community Aid to Non-Member Countries (SCR). Brussels, February 1999. SCR/F/5D(98).

- (iv) An enhanced adoption rate of technologies on land management.
- (v) An enhanced community self-organisation at local levels.
- (vi) An established system for participatory research and development.
- (vii) Developed and distributed extension materials for use by FEWs and Farmers.
- (viii) Improved farm enterprise management and marketing skills.
- (ix) Improved coordination and evaluation of the project activities.

Project Design

The project is anchored on the principle that the farmers are the owners of development and will encourage self-reliance and sustainable use of local resources. It promotes the formation of Common Interest Groups (CIGs) according to different needs and interests. Action plans are drawn with CIGs and monitoring and evaluation of achievements are supposed to be carried out jointly with stakeholders.

In addition to MAAIF staff, ULAMP involves other stakeholders such as the Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO), Directorate for Water Development, Community Development, Forestry Department, Universities, NGOs/CBOs and other projects having components of relevance for improved land management

The strategy for expanding the pilot activities was based on the intention to support activities at three different geographical levels:

- Up-scaling of activities initiated by USCAPP in Mbarara District by covering more sub-counties and parishes.
- Introducing pilot activities by starting with Arua and Kabarole districts in the first year and extending to Kapchorwa district in the second year.
- Support to MAAIF Soil and Water Conservation Section at National level.

Project Components

There are four main components supported by the project as part of strengthening district extension delivery system:

1. Training of extension staff and farmers as part of strengthening of agricultural extension system. This is undertaken through activities geared towards:

- Building the capacity of extension staff and the overall extension services delivery system. This involves training of extension workers through workshops, seminars, courses and study tours.
- Technology transfer to farmers (in groups and as individuals) through group courses, workshops/seminars, demonstrations and study tours.

2. Development of technological innovations, gathering and screening appropriate existing knowledge and dissemination to farmers. This is done through:

- Supporting on-farm trials and demonstration settings (plots and materials).
- Development of technical materials (literature, posters, design of radio programmes, etc).
- Dissemination of tested technologies to other areas not directly covered by ULAMP through publications (booklets, pamphlets and posters) and news media (radio and newspapers).
- Specialised studies and consultancy undertaken by local, national and regional experts.

3. Project Management, Co-ordination and Networking: This includes:

- Co-ordination and administration of the project activities.
- Networking and collaborating with other stakeholders as part of information exchange.
- Managerial support services.

4. Purchase of Working Equipment: This includes the provision of working equipment (office and transport equipment) and demonstration materials to the extension staff and farmers.

Status of Implementation (Refer to Year 1 Ulamp Report)

Actual implementation of the project started in July 1999. By the end of the first year there were some successes in achieving the expected outputs as a result of planned activities financed by the project.

One of the key underlying factors for success in activity implementation was the collaboration of local leaders in the planning and mobilisation of villagers.

The main outputs accomplished in Year 1 include, but not limited to:

- (i) An established and functioning project management system, with a Co-ordination Offices at National and District levels.
- (ii) An established and improved system for project and field coordination and evaluation based on grassroots participation. Almost all of the CIGs keep some basic records and information on their members and the activities they perform.
- (iii) A series of needs assessments by groups and a socio-economic baseline survey for the 3 districts were conducted and reports prepared.
- (iv) Some significant progress towards a strengthened participatory and collaborative extension system; as exemplified by the number of trained extension staff and the exchange of information through study tours.
- (v) Some encouraging success in building capacity for enhancing the adoption of technologies on land management. A number of farmers had started practising the promoted technologies in less than a year after receiving training or attending demonstrations. The foundation for more successful adoption rates has been established.
- (vi) A tested approach for enhancing community self-organisation in place. This has resulted to the formation of about 500 CIGs, involving more than 5000 farmers in all the districts.
- (vii) Facilitated participatory research and development in improved cassava management and production; and soil fertility management and monitoring.
- (viii) Extension technical materials were developed and distributed, including Extension Guides and Menu of Technical Offers, which were developed and prepared in-house by district staff.
- (ix) Collaboration between the project and other stakeholders in land management fields was initiated.

Unfulfilled activities and outputs in Year 1:

The project could not adequately undertake some activities as planned, and therefore failed to adequately deliver the planned outputs in the following areas:

- *Technical studies* were limited to improved cassava and fertility management. Reason: Project staff were preoccupied with planning and mobilisation of farmers, and therefore could not effectively participate directly or indirectly as counterparts in undertaking more studies.
- *Networking meetings* Only one stakeholders meeting was conducted (in May 1999), which was the first forum convened to agree on the need for stakeholder networking in land management.

- *Procurement of goods and services at district-level:* The slow pace of approval of expenditure at the district level result to undertaking less study tours for the farmers and extension agents; and under-procurement demo material and equipment.

Opportunities for further improvements in Year 2, include but not limited to:

- *Technical studies:* To identify district-based fellows to work with national and regional experts in undertaking specialised technical studies.
- *Training of villagers as extension agents:* To identify innovative and able farmers to be trained as village-based voluntary extension agents so as to supplement efforts by the FEWs.
- *More stakeholder linkages* effectively at district level: To put effort in identifying areas of collaboration between Ulamp and other stakeholders at the district level.
- *Decentralise financial administration:* To decentralise financial management from the district to the sub-county level after studying the potential and implications of such a move.
- *Study tours by farmers:* Plan for more study tours and exchange visits by farmers.
- *Training of local leaders in good governance principles:* Plan to train local (village, parish and sub-county levels) leaders on principles and practicing good governance.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE FORMATIVE EVALUATION

The main objectives of the formative evaluation is to:

- Assess the consistency of project overall goals with national goals.
- Review and report on the project performance to date
- Assess the appropriateness of the project's components, implementation approach and the formulation of its goals and expected outputs.
- Draw lessons from the experiences gained, which could be useful for future intervention formulations; especially areas where reorientation or change of approaches is required.
- Recommendations to Sida on the future of the project, and if positive;
- Make preliminary proposals on project design, duration, and the total cost for project extension.

4. ISSUES TO BE EXAMINED

The evaluation should aim at assessing and giving some light on the following (but limited to) key issues related to the current and future implementation of ULAMP:

1. *Project Design:* Strengths and weaknesses of the current project design and lessons for continued support based on the logical framework used in the preparation of the project.
2. *Project Relevance:* Review of the relevance of the project in improving land husbandry practices in Uganda, and contributing to the overall goal of poverty eradication plan of the country; and the extent to which the project has set itself to contribute towards that overall goal.
3. *Efficiency:* Indicative assessment of cost-effectiveness or project efficiency by relating the activities (and costs) (e.g. training of extension staff; study tours for farmers; and on-farm demonstrations) compared to the outputs obtained (e.g. number of farmer-adopters for different technologies) as a result of the supported activities; with a view of recommending alternative intervention methods which could bring the same level of outputs or results at a lower cost.
4. *Effectiveness:* Assessment of how effective the project's immediate outputs (results e.g. extend of adoption of land management technologies) have contributed in achieving the project's purposes (e.g. improved land productivity) as stipulated in the logical framework of Ulamp.

5. *Sustainability and Replicability*: Assess the sustainability of the project of the project by looking at, *inter alia*, policy support measures in place; financial/budgetary implications to the local and central authorities; social-cultural factors; appropriateness of the promoted technological packages, environmental protection; and institutional/managerial capacity. An equally important aspect should be some judgment as to whether the project design and approach could be replicated in other parts of Uganda.
6. *Lessons learned*: Draw some lessons with respect to organisational and operational aspects; and pre-conditions, if any, for continued support.

5. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation findings shall be based on discussions with stakeholders and studying various documents prepared before and during the project implementation period. It is expected that the consultant shall undertake the following:

1. Briefing by Sida Officials in Stockholm and/or Kampala.
2. Briefing and discussion with MSC and Relma in Nairobi.
3. Briefing and discussions with MAAIF Officials in Entebbe.
4. Review of different literature such as the Project Formulation Report; Project Appraisal Report; MSC Proposal for Managerial Services to Ulamp; Ulamp Quarterly, Semi-Annual and Year 1 Annual Report; Ulamp Baseline Survey; Ulamp Needs Assessment Report; Consultancy reports, MAAIF Position Paper on ULAMP, etc.
5. Briefing and discussions with Ulamp Management Staff in Entebbe (National Project Coordinator), the National Project Facilitator and District Coordinators and M&E Officers in all the 4 districts.
6. Discussions and interviews with:
 - farmers and leaders at different levels.
 - other stakeholders in land management within the established network, e.g. NARO, NGOs, Makerere and NEMA.
 - National Steering Committee members

Expertise

The work shall be carried by three people, one of who shall be an external consultant with international experience in project evaluation, especially Sida funded projects. He/She will work with at least 2 regional-based experts, with local knowledge of East Africa, and especially Uganda. The combined team shall possess some skills or specialisation in natural resources/land management; natural resource/livestock/agricultural economics and institutional/project management/M&E skills.

Timing

Consultancy input from the team is estimated not exceed 55 man-days (Team Leader:25 person-days; other two experts (15 person-days each, total 30 days) undertaken over a period of 2 calendar months starting around first March 2001 and ending by end of April 2001.

6. EXPECTED OUTPUTS

The main output from the formulation review exercise should be a report with concrete recommendations on:

- The status of the current phase of the project with respect to implementation performance; and the reasons for the underlying performance.

- Review of the relevance/potential of the project to:
 - o Contribute towards Poverty Eradication Plan and Modernisation of Agriculture initiatives by Government of Uganda
 - o Contribute towards decentralisation efforts by Government of Uganda.
 - o Identifying gray areas in development and contributing towards common solutions (eg. water supply, health improvement, marketing of crops and inputs).
 - o Contributing towards conservation of the environment.
 - o Promoting the role of private sector in the provision of services and technologies.
 - o Identifying research needs and linking with appropriate institutions.
 - o Promoting linkages with other stakeholders.
- Sustainability of the project with respect to post-project carrying on the gains attained or expected to be gained as a result of Ulamp interventions.
- Recommendations on alternative approaches of achieving the intended outputs by rationalisation of activities and/or approaches to implementation.
- Main components, geographical coverage, managerial arrangement, funding mechanism/budget and extension approaches in the extended project.
- Revised and/or new Logical Framework matrices.
- Other information in Annexes (as deemed appropriate).
- Literature and documentations used.

7. REPORT OUTLINE

- The report's outline shall be prepared by the consultant and agreed upon by the client.
- An inception report shall be produced 10 days after commencement of the assignment. A first draft report shall be submitted on the 6th calendar week after commencement.
- All reports shall be produced in English.
- 15 original copies of the reports shall be sent to Sida (3 nos), MAAIF (10 nos), Uganda Ministry of Finance (1 nos) and Relma (1 nos).

Appendix B

Mission Work Schedule, March/April 2001

Day	Date	Time	Location	Activity/Event
Thursday	15 March			Departure Jan Erikson, Sweden
Friday	16 March	13.00	Nairobi	Arrival J. Erikson, Reinier Scheele Meetings with RELMA and MSC (Agrisystems)
Monday	19 March		Entebbe/ Kampala	Meetings with MAAIF/ULAMP and Swedish Embassy (Erikson/Abby Sebina-Zziwa, Scheele)
Tuesday	20 March		Kampala/ Entebbe	Meetings with ULAMP National Co-ordinating Committee (whole team), SNV, HASP
Wednesday	21 March	14.00	Kampala- Mbarara	Travel by road (whole team)ULAMP officers and district officials
Thursday	22 March		Mbarara Dstrct	Farmers/CIG members and other stakeholders in Rugaga sub-county
Friday	23 March	14.00	Mbarara-Kabarole	Travel by road (whole team)ULAMP officers and district officials
Saturday	24 March		Kabarole Dstrct	Farmers/CIG members and other stakeholders in Ruteete sub-county
Sunday	25 March		Kabarole-Kampala	Travel by road (whole team)
Monday	26 March	08.00 11.00 14.00	Kampala-Arua	Travel by air ULAMP officers and district officials Farmers/CIG members and other stakeholders
Tuesday	27 March		Arua District	Farmers/CIG members and other stakeholders
Wednesday	28 March	10.30	Arua-Kampala	Travel by air (whole team)
Thursday	29 March		Kampala	Report drafting
Friday	30 March	09.30 11.00 14.30	Entebbe Entebbe Kampala	Meeting with NAADS Meeting with DDP Meeting with Makerere University
			Kampala	Meeting with Forest Department
Monday	2 April		Kampala- Kapochochorwa	Travel by road (whole team) ULAMP officers and district officials
Tuesday	3 April		Kapochochorwa Dt	Farmers/CIG members & other stakeholders
			Kapochochorwa- (Mbale)-Kampala	Travel by road
Wednesday	4 April		Kampala	Report drafting
Thursday	5 April		Kampala	Report drafting
Friday	6 April	09.00	Kampala	Round-up meeting/presentation of Inception Report
Wednesday	18 April		Stockholm	Meeting with Sida to discuss findings and recommendations (Erikson)
				Submission of evaluation report to Sida

Appendix C

List of Persons Interviewed

Sweden

Bengt Johansson, Natural Resources Div., Sida
Lennart Bondesson, Natural Resources Div., Sida
Carol Bäckman, Natural Resources Div., Sida

Kenya

H. Bohela Lunogelo, Agrisystems (EA)
Joseph Kariuki, Agrisystems (EA)
Gedion Shone, RELMA
Åke Barklund, RELMA
Arne Eriksson, Min. of Agric. & Rur. Devlpt
Alan King, Livestock & Extension Consultant
David N. Ngugi, Relay Consultants

Uganda

Kampala/Entebbe

Charles G.A. Rusoke, ULAMP Co-ord., MAIFF
J.B. Kalule-Sewali, Dep.Comm, MAAIF
Dr. M.K. Magunda, NARO-Kawanda
Dr. Jacob Aniku, Makerere University
Dr. Moses Tenywa, S & W Conserv. Assn
Peter Ochodommuo, S & W C Section, MAAIF
Alex Lwakuba, S & W C Section, MAAIF
Dr. Festus Bagura, NEMA
Rolf Eriksson, Swedish Embassy

Mbarara District

Augustine Atwijukye, Asst. CAO
Edward Beringa, Distr. Prod. Co-ord.
Beartrice Byaruhanga, Distr. Agr. Officer
Emma Bona,
Anthony Nyakuni, Nat. Fac., ULAMP/
Joshua Himbisa, M&E Off., ULAMP
Emmanuel Kigale, Vet. Off., Rugaga
Patrick Tumuesigwe, Agric. Off., Rugaga
Betty Kemirembe, Comm. Dev. Off., Rugaga

Arua District

Monica Edemach Odada, S-C Chief
S.E. Fendu, DUC
Sacomina Inzikuru, SDUC, Pajulu
Solomon Onyiru, Yivu
Stephen Asiku, Agroforester
Michael Dramadri, M&EO, Arua

Kabarole District

B. Muguruwe, DAO

Chris Karumba, DVO

Thomas Nseminewe, DPC

Patrick Rwamigisa, M&EO

Grace Nuaruhuma, ACDO

Grace Kyonya, SUC

George Sabiti, Ag. DFO

Frank Kyaligonza, CDA

K.J. Kuginza, ADO

Cyril Kwemasa, UNFA

A. Kawanyire, AFO

Aston Kamba, AAO

Kapchorwa District

M. Arapkisa, DUC

B. Bikwi, M&EO

M. Keptui, Livestock Officer

K. Cheptegei, Agroforestry Off.

Freddy Toko, S-C ULAMP Co-ord.

J. Laibich, Agriculture

J. Chekwel, Agroforestry

G. Chelangat, Vet.Off.

Mary Cheline, Comm. Devlpt.

Appendix D

List of Consulted Documents

Policy and Strategy Guidelines

Country Strategy Sweden–Uganda 2001 – 2005, draft ??, 2000

Sida. *Action Programme for Poverty Reduction*.1977

Republic of Uganda. *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*

Uganda Poverty Status Report 2001 (PRSP Progress Report 2001), Summary, March 2, 2001, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development

Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Report: *Learning from the Poor*, A Summary of Key Findings and Policy Messages

Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment, Participatory Planning for Poverty Reduction: *Capacity Needs Assessment Synthesised National Report*

Partnership for the Participatory Poverty Assessment Process, Policy Briefing Paper No. 1: *Taxation and Economic Growth*

Partnership for the Participatory Poverty Assessment Process, Policy Briefing Paper No. 2: *Water, Sanitation and Health*

Partnership for the Participatory Poverty Assessment Process, Policy Briefing Paper No. 3: *Health and Poverty in Uganda*

Partnership for the Participatory Poverty Assessment Process, Policy Briefing Paper No. 4: *Conflict, Insecurity and Poverty*

GoU Reform Strategies and Progress Indicators: *Policy matrix*

Poverty Reduction Support Credit, Aide-Memoire, January 2001

Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture: Eradicating Poverty in Uganda, October 2001

Project Planning

ULAMP: *Project Request to Sida for Sida Finance*, July 1997

ULAMP: *Appraisal Mission Report on Project Request to Sida*, June 1998

Socio-Economic Baseline Survey Report

Technical Proposal to Provide Managerial Services to ULAMP, Agrisystems (Eastern Africa), March 1999

Needs Assessment Report

Stakeholders Logical Framework Workshop Report

ULAMP: *Technical and Financial Proposal 2000–2001*, Agrisystems (Eastern Africa), June 2000

ULAMP: *Plan and Budget for Year 1 1999/2000*, MAIFF, 1999

ULAMP: *Plan and Budget for Year 2 2000/2001*, MAIFF, 2000

MAIFF position paper

Project Management

Administrative Guidelines

Minutes and Agreements

ULAMP Agreed Minutes from Annual Review, Kampala, October 2000

Sida. Amendment to the Specific Agreement between Sweden and Tanzania on National Resources Sector Support, 1997–2000, August 2000

Follow-up Reporting

Quarterly Report for June to September, 2000 – Quarter 1 Year 1

Quarterly Report for January to March, 2000 – Quarter 3 Year 1

Quarterly Report for July to September, 2000 – Quarter 1 Year 2

Quarterly Report for October to December, 2000 Quarter 2 Year 2

Semi Annual Progress Report June to December 2000

Special ULAMP Reports

Proposed Studies – Draft Terms of Reference

ULAMP A guide for field extension agents, Anthony Nyakuni, Published by Sida's Regional Land Management Unit, 2000

Study on Livestock – Crop Integration (Potential Alternatives for Adoption in the Project Areas of Mbarara, Kabarole, Arua and Kapchorwa

Promoting Farmer Innovation, W. Critchley (edit.), RELMA/UNDP, 1999

Other Reports

Household Agricultural Support Programme, Final Draft, January 1998

Community Action Programme (CAP), West Nile, Completion Report Phase II 1997–2000, August 2000

Annex – Details on Implementation Progress, Table 1

June-December 2000											
1999/2000											
Development of Technological Innovations	Management, Co-ordination & Networking	Purchase of Working Equipment	Total			Farmers and Staff Training	Development of Technological Innovations		Management, Co-ordination & Networking	Purchase of Working Equipment	
			Budget	Actual			Budget	Actual		Budget	Actual
			1 113	916							920
				82%							
			1 533	269							2 104
				18%							
			771	461							1 321
				60%							
			515	277							782
				54%							
			548	13							842
				2%							
			561	421							2 257
			100%	75%							
			5 041	627							8 226

Annex – Details on Implementation Progress, Table 2

		1999/2000		July-December 2000			Total 1999-2000
Component/ Output/ Activity	Unit of Quantity	Programme Document	Annual Progress Report 1999/2000	Programme Document	Annual Plan 2000/01	Quarterly Progress Reports 2000	Progress Reports
FARMERS & STAFF TRAINING							
Mbarara District							
Staff training	Number	562	385		400	60	445
Training of famers	Number	7 443	5 830			2 076	7 906
Farmer training sessions	Number	N.A	N.A		400	158	158
Study tour participants	Number	400	67			60	127
Study tours	Number	14	2		N.A	2	4
Arua District							
Staff training	Number	700	339			20	359
Training of famers	Number	1 684	N.A		2 038	8 729	8 729
Farmer training sessions	Number	70	62			40	40
Study tour participants	Number	N.A	95		N.A		95
Study tours	Number	4	4				4
Kabarole District							
Staff training	Number	N.A	N.A		180		
Training of famers	Number	2 463	1 388			2 289	2 289
Farmer training sessions	Number	118	79			195	195
Study tour participants	Number	N.A	43		30		43
Study tours	Number	N.A	N.A			13	13
DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS							
Mbarara District							
Technical demonstrations	Number						
On-farm trials	Number						
Adaptive research experiments	Number						
Staff tours to research stations	Number						
Farmer tours to research stations	Number						
Farmer training in research methods	Number						
Staff training in research methods	Number						
Completed special studies	Number						
Arua District							
Technical demonstrations	Number	23	12			4	16
On-farm trials	Number						
Adaptive research experiments	Number						
Staff tours to research stations	Number						
Farmer tours to research stations	Number						
Farmer training in research methods	Number						
Staff training in research methods	Number						
Completed special studies	Number						

		1999/2000		July-December 2000			Total 1999-2000
Component/ Output/ Activity	Unit of Quantity	Programme Document	Annual Progress Report 1999/2000	Programme Document	Annual Plan 2000/01	Quarterly Progress Reports 2000	Progress Reports
Kabarole District							
Technical demonstrations	Number						
On-farm trials	Number						
Adaptive research experiments	Number						
Staff tours to research stations	Number					29	29
Farmer tours to research stations	Number						
Farmer training in research methods	Number						
Staff training in research methods	Number						
Completed special studies	Number						
PROJECT MANAGEMENT, CO-ORDINATION AND NETWORKING							
Mbarara District							
Meetings ULAMP District Co-ordinating Comm	Number						
Networking sessions	Number						
Arua District							
Meetings ULAMP District Co-ordinating Comm	Number						
Networking sessions	Number						
Kabarole District							
Meetings ULAMP District Co-ordinating Comm	Number						
Networking sessions	Number						
Kapchorwa District							
Meetings ULAMP District Co-ordinating Comm	Number						
Networking sessions	Number						
PROCUREMENT OF WORKING EQUIPMENT							

*) Annual Report 1999/2000 generally good; however, inconsistent data makes it difficult to cross-compare districts

**) The quality of the Quarterly Reports varies; some districts specify activities per month but do not aggregate them per sub-county or district.

***) The Annual Work Plan for 2000/01 does not offer consistent data on training numbers

Recent Sida Evaluations

- 01/09** **Active Labour Market Policy in Russia. An evaluation of the Swedish technical assistance to the Russian Employment Services 1997–2000.** Henrik Huitfeldt.
- 01/10** **Svenska bataljonens humanitära insatser i Kosovo.** Maria Broberg Wulff, Karin Ströberg.
Avdelningen för Samverkan med Enskilda Organisationer och Humanitärt Bistånd
- 01/11** **Democracy and Human Rights. An evaluation of Sida's support to five projects in Georgia.**
Birgitta Berggren, Patrik Jotun.
Department for central and Eastern Europe
- 01/12** **Sida's Support to the University of Asmara, Eritrea; College of Science and Faculty of Engineering.** Eva Selin Lindgren.
Department for Research Cooperation
- 01/13** **Strengthening Local Democracy in North West Russia 1995–2000.**
Ilari Karppi, Kaisa Lähtenmäki-Smith.
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/14** **Approach and Organisation of Sida Support to Private Sector Development.** Sunil Sinha,
Julia Hawkins, Anja Beijer och Åsa Teglund
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 01/15** **Follow-up to Social Sector Support to Moldova.** Nils Öström.
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/16** **Human Rights Training in Vietnam.** Carl-Johan Groth, Simia Ahmadi-Thosten, Clifford Wang,
Tran van Nam
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 01/17** **Swedish-Danish Fund for the Promotion of Gender Equality in Vietnam.** Shashi R. Pandey,
Darunee Tantiwiranmanond, Ngo Thi Tuan Dung
Asia Department
- 01/18** **Flood Relief Assistance to the Water and Wastewater Services in Raciborz, Nysa and Klodzko, Southern Poland.** Olle Colling
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/19** **Sewer Pipe Network Renovation Project in Sopot, Poland.** Olle Colling
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/20** **Sida Supported Municipal Twinning Cooperation with Central and Eastern Europe, 1996–2001.**
Gunnar Olesen, Peter Rekve, Henrik Permin
Department for Central and Eastern Europe
- 01/21** **Swedish Support to the Power Sector in Mozambique.** Arne Disch, Trond Westernen, Anders
Ellegård, Alexandra Silfverstolpe
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Cooperation
- 01/22** **Expanded Support to the International Sciences Programme (ISP) in Uppsala University.**
David Wield
Department for Research Cooperation
- 01/23** **Sida Support County Twinning Programme in the Baltic Countries 1996–2001.** Gunnar Olesen,
Peter Rekve, Henrik Permin
Department for Central and Eastern Europe

Sida Evaluations may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
S-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0) 8 690 93 80
Fax: +46 (0) 8 690 92 66
info@sida.se

A complete backlist of earlier evaluation reports may be ordered from:

Sida, UTV, S-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0) 8 698 51 63
Fax: +46 (0) 8 698 56 10
Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>



SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden

Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

Telegram: sida stockholm. Postgiro: 1 56 34-9

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>