

SEE <sup>THE</sup> **FUTURE**  
FEED  
CHANGE

---

# Uganda

Multi-year Strategy 2011-2015

February 16, 2011

## Table of Contents

Abbreviations .....	2
Executive Summary.....	4
1. Development Challenges and Opportunities.....	9
Nutrition.....	9
Economic Growth.....	10
Agriculture .....	11
Uganda’s Development Framework .....	12
USAID’s Comparative Advantage .....	13
2. Core Investment Areas.....	15
Nutrition.....	15
Agriculture .....	19
Connecting Nutrition to Agriculture .....	24
Strategic Partnerships.....	25
3. FtF Objective, Program Structure, and Implementation .....	28
4. Monitoring and Evaluation .....	33
5. Financial Planning .....	37
6. Management.....	39
ANNEX 1: USAID Forward and Uganda’s Feed the Future Strategy .....	41
ANNEX 2: Map of Focus Nutrition Districts.....	46
ANNEX 3: Map of Focus Community Connector Districts.....	47
ANNEX 4: Map of Focus Agriculture Value-Chain Districts.....	48
ANNEX 5: Strategy Review Questions.....	49
ANNEX 6: Uganda’s Feed the Future Strategy and FtF Principles.....	53
END NOTES:.....	56

## Abbreviations

<b>A2Z</b>	USAID Micronutrient and child-blindness Project (Vitamins A to Zinc)
<b>AgCLIR</b>	Agriculture Commercial, Legal and Institutional Reform
<b>ANC</b>	Antenatal Care
<b>AOTR</b>	Agreement Officer Technical Representative
<b>ASERECA</b>	Association for Strengthening Agriculture Research in Eastern and Central Africa
<b>BXW</b>	Banana Wilt Disease
<b>CAADP</b>	Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Plan
<b>CDCS</b>	Country Development and Cooperation Strategy
<b>CGIAR</b>	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
<b>CJTF-HOA</b>	Combined Joint Task Force – Horn of Africa (Department of Defense)
<b>CLA</b>	Collaboration, Learning and Adapting
<b>COMPETE</b>	USAID Regional Competitiveness and Trade Expansion Project
<b>COTR</b>	Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative
<b>CRSP</b>	Collaborative Research and Support Program
<b>CWD</b>	Coffee Wilt Disease
<b>DANIDA</b>	Danish International Development Agency
<b>DCA</b>	Development Credit Authority
<b>DFID</b>	U.K. Department for International Development
<b>DH</b>	Direct Hire American Employee
<b>DHS</b>	Uganda Demographic and Health Survey
<b>DLI</b>	Development Leadership Initiative – US Direct Hire Employee
<b>DO</b>	Development Objective
<b>DSIP</b>	Development Strategy and Investment Plan
<b>FDI</b>	Foreign Direct Investment
<b>FSN</b>	Foreign Service National Employee
<b>EA</b>	East Africa
<b>ENA</b>	Essential Nutrition Actions
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>FAO</b>	Food and Agriculture Organization
<b>FtF</b>	Feed the Future
<b>FY</b>	Fiscal Year
<b>GDA</b>	Global Development Alliance
<b>GDP</b>	Gross Domestic Product
<b>GHI</b>	Global Health Initiative
<b>GINA</b>	Gender Informed Nutrition and Agriculture Program
<b>GoU</b>	Government of Uganda
<b>Ha</b>	Hectare
<b>HIV/AIDS</b>	Human Immunodeficiency Virus / Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
<b>IDEA</b>	Investment in Developing Export Agriculture
<b>IDP</b>	Internally Displaced Person
<b>IFAD</b>	International Fund for Agriculture Development

<b>IMAM</b>	Integrated Management of Acute Malnutrition
<b>IR</b>	Intermediate Result
<b>JICA</b>	Japan International Cooperation Agency
<b>Kg</b>	Kilogram
<b>MAAIF</b>	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
<b>MCH</b>	Maternal and Child Health
<b>MDG</b>	Millennium Development Goal
<b>M&amp;E</b>	Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>MOH</b>	Ministry of Health
<b>MSME</b>	Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises
<b>MYAP</b>	Multi-Year Assistance Program
<b>NPA</b>	National Planning Authority
<b>NRM</b>	Natural Resource Management
<b>OAA</b>	Office of Acquisition and Assistance
<b>OFM</b>	Office of Financial Management
<b>OVC</b>	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
<b>P4P</b>	Purchase for Progress
<b>PEPFAR</b>	US President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief
<b>PLWHA</b>	People Living with HIV/AIDS
<b>RCT</b>	Randomize Control Trial
<b>RLA</b>	Regional Legal Advisor
<b>RUTF</b>	Ready-to-Use Therapeutic Food
<b>SAKSS</b>	Strategic Analysis and Support System
<b>SCORE</b>	Orphans and Vulnerable Children Project
<b>SME</b>	Small and Medium Enterprises
<b>STRIDES</b>	Strides for family health (family planning and reproductive health project)
<b>SUN</b>	Scaling Up Nutrition
<b>TA</b>	Technical Assistance
<b>UBOS</b>	Uganda Bureau of Statistics
<b>UCE</b>	Uganda Commodity Exchange
<b>UN</b>	United Nations
<b>UNADA</b>	Uganda National Agriculture Input Dealers Association
<b>USAID</b>	U.S. Agency for International Development
<b>USAID/W</b>	USAID Washington
<b>USDA</b>	U.S. Department of Agriculture
<b>USG</b>	United States Government
<b>VHT</b>	Village Health Team
<b>WFP</b>	World Food Program
<b>WHO</b>	World Health Organization

## Executive Summary

### Introduction

Uganda’s Feed the Future Strategy rests upon our analysis of the way poverty and nutritional status interact in Uganda. While a logical assumption might be that as families’ incomes increase, they have more money to spend on nutritious food and therefore nutritional status also increases, in fact there is only a loose correlation between higher income and improved nutrition. While there is 43.4% stunting in the lowest wealth quintile, stunting rises to 44% in the middle wealth quintile and only drops to 25% in the highest wealth quintile<sup>1</sup> This insight is illustrated by the fact that one of the regions with the highest rates of stunting (49.6%) is in the Southwest, known as the country’s bread basket. This unexpected insight is the basis for our strategy.

Uganda’s FtF Strategy is therefore built on three components. Two of the components, Agriculture and Nutrition, address head-on the twin objectives of the global FtF initiative. The third component, Connecting Nutrition to Agriculture, seeks to eliminate the disconnect between improved agriculture and improved nutrition. It will take an evidence based approach to understand and scale up what is necessary to make nutrition improve alongside agriculture, focusing on household, gender, and nutrition practices. The integration of two separate technical disciplines, agriculture and health/nutrition, is at the core of our strategy. The strategy leverages what we have learned over the past 15 years working in agriculture in Uganda—the text references earlier projects successes and failures as we made program decisions for this strategy.

**Figure 1: Activity-Component Relationships**



### Summary of Objectives, Beneficiaries, Geographic Targets

#### Nutrition

Who/Where/Why: This component will reach one million children in 47 districts in the Southwest and North of Uganda. These regions were chosen because they represent the worst stunting and wasting in the country; specific districts were chosen to complement the locations of similar programs that are not funded directly with FtF funding (see Table 2 for details).

What: Some key outputs of nutrition activities are: nutrition officers placed in a majority of districts; active Food and Nutrition Councils organized in districts; mandatory fortification of major manufactured foods; therapeutic food reconstituted from locally available foods developed and distributed to district and regional hospitals; and community behavior changes to prevent undernutrition.

Results: These outputs, supported by all USG health interventions, have the following objectives:

- Up to 20% reduction in child stunting
- Up to 25% reduction in underweight children
- Up to 25% reduction in maternal anemia
- Up to 30% reduction in child anemia
- Reduction of acute malnutrition rate from 6% to 3%

### *Agriculture*

Who/Where/Why: This component will reach 400,000 farmers (approximately 2.4 million people including household members) in 62 districts in the maize, coffee, and beans belt in Southwest and Central Uganda. We chose these value chains carefully in the light of the Uganda government priorities, division of donor labor, and what are the highest impact interventions for the expected scale of our FtF resources (see Core Investment Areas section for a full rationale).

What: The program will work in:

- **Enabling Environment:** improved statistics, data and M&E capacity; robust planning division at Ministry of Agriculture; harmonized policies, uniform enforcement of standards; and increased trade efficiency.
- **Research:** Overcome disease and pest threats; large-scale adoption of high nutritionally enhanced staples; and improved soil and water management.
- **Production:** Greater access to quality inputs; increased women's control of productive assets; and reduced farmer vulnerability to environmental shocks.
- **Market Linkages:** Improved market infrastructure, and post-harvest handling; effective farmer organizations leverage finance, broker trade deals and bulk and purchase inputs and equipment; functioning warehouse receipts system; accessible market information system; ability to trade via ICT; robust commodity exchange with a commodity trading floor.

Results: These outputs contribute to the following objectives:

- 50% average increase in incomes in target populations<sup>2</sup>
- 100% increase in value and volume of export (maize and coffee)
- Increase in exportable maize from 250,000MT to 600,000MT

### *Connecting Nutrition to Agriculture*

Who/Where/Why: This component will reach between 60,000 and 80,000 vulnerable households (approximately 400,000 people) in approximately 25 districts in the Southwest and North of Uganda. We chose these areas because they represent a combination of the highest poverty and worst stunting

and wasting in the country; specific districts were chosen to complement the locations of a similar PEPFAR program for orphans and vulnerable children.

What: Some key outputs of the program are:

- 75% of target household with access to household or community gardens;
- 50% of target households breeding small livestock;
- 75% of women in target households using labor-saving technologies.

Results: These outputs have the following objectives:

- 30% reduction in undernutrition among women and children
- 20% increase in incomes among target households
- Improved household equity in decision making and access to resources
- Improved community capacity to address challenges

### Summary of Interventions

**AGRICULTURE RESEARCH** (est. \$4M/year for five years): To support primarily public institutions performing research to protect banana and cassava from disease; breed maize, beans, coffee to increase stress tolerance (addressing climate change adaptation) and disease resistance; and scale up research and adoption of vitamin-enriched staples. Work takes place primarily with National Agriculture Research Organization (NARO) using their internal systems and research agenda.

**POLICY & ENABLING ENVIRONMENT** (est. \$2M/year for five years): Supporting selected policy and enabling environment initiatives to harmonize trade policies and standards and support the enactment of the Food and Nutrition Bill to create a National Nutrition Council.

**PARTNERSHIP INVESTMENT** (\$4.5M/year for five years): A Public/Private Partnership fund to leverage private sector resources, innovative ideas and technologies for replicable, sustainable and scalable sector-wide impact.

**CAPACITY BUILDING** (est. \$5M/year for five years): Strengthen key public and private sector institutions at the national and district level and linkages between the agencies in their monitoring and evaluation of progress in agriculture and nutrition through collection and analysis of statistics.

**VALUE CHAIN PRODUCTION & MARKET LINKAGES** (est. \$4M/year for four years): A partnership between USAID and a donor fund led by the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) that focuses on increasing production along strategic value chains (maize, beans, and coffee), improving market linkages, expanding financial services supporting the agriculture sector, and supporting trade related sanitary and phyto-sanitary standards and quality management systems.

**AGRO INPUT SUPPLIES** (est. \$1.5M/year for five years): Focus on developing the private sector agriculture inputs market in Uganda with the goal of increasing the quality, availability and use of inputs. The program will work closely with major stakeholders, including the Uganda National Agriculture Input Dealers Association (UNADA) and private-sector retailers.

PRODUCER ORGANIZATION - FARM LEVEL AGGREGATION (est. \$5M/year for five years): Working with smaller farmers and organizations to benefit from the wholesale purchase of inputs, access to finance and bulking, cleaning and processing farm products – emphasizing linkages to World Food Program and international buyers through the Uganda Commodity Exchange.

MARKET INFORMATION SYSTEMS (est. \$1M/year for five years): Using information and communications technology innovations to address a range of areas from enriching the agricultural information base and disseminating information to pilot testing agricultural finance applications.

COMMUNITY CONNECTOR (est. \$6M/year for five years): Targeting communities with the highest levels of malnutrition and poverty by increasing incomes, improving nutrition and empowering women and children/youth through community-based interventions.

NUTRITION PROGRAMS (est. \$11M/year for five years): Rely on proven, high-impact interventions through our health investments and existing country systems. Implementation will be through Individual Prevention Programs, Population-Based Nutrition Service Delivery and Nutrition Enabling Environment and Capacity Building.

### **How the Strategy Implements the USAID Forward Reforms**

USAID Forward includes seven reforms to revitalize and improve the way that USAID does its business. Four of these reforms—Procurement Reform, Strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation, Innovation, and Science and Technology—are focused on the way field Missions implement programs. Uganda’s FtF strategy implements the ideas in these four categories as follows:

***Procurement Reform:*** We will join a major multilateral effort by contributing to a donor fund led by DANIDA. We are expanding use of host country systems by contracting directly with the Uganda Bureau of Statistics for data collection and using host country systems in a related rural infrastructure project (NUDEIL). Finally, our flagship program under the Connecting Nutrition to Agriculture component will use a concept called “evolutionary acquisition” to adapt the instrument to the evidence generated by the project.

***Strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation:*** Our Country Development Cooperation Strategy (submitted December 2010 and pending approval) relies on an innovative concept known as “Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting” or CLA. This concept creates a “living strategy” by constantly examining the success of interventions and the accuracy of our development hypotheses, and then collaborating with other actors and stakeholders to adapt programming towards what works and away from what doesn’t. This methodology will be fully integrated into our FtF Strategy, especially in subtle areas, such as the Connecting Nutrition to Agriculture component.

***Science and Technology:*** Agriculture and nutrition are full of opportunities to leverage the latest science and technology to improve interventions. We will take new products with proven value to scale, such as Vitamin A enriched sweet potatoes and newly developed therapeutic food. We will fund research that will impact important crops for Uganda, such as cassava, bananas, coffee, and beans. Fortification—another proven nutrition intervention—will be further disseminated throughout Uganda.



**Innovation:** We will innovate by introducing new concepts—for instance, we will work to integrate cell phones with market information systems. We will also find innovative applications for old concepts—for instance, we will work with WFP and their Purchase for Progress program to leverage their expertise and buying power for quality maize to help improve the maize value chain. Or, to take another example, we will use a Global Development Alliance to work with the private sector manufacturer of therapeutic food and partner with one of our social marketing activities to scale up a therapeutic food product with great potential that can have an important impact on acute undernutrition throughout the country.

Annex 1 provides greater detail on how USAID Forward will be implemented by this strategy.

### **How the Strategy Relates to USAID/Uganda’s CDCS**

As this FtF Strategy was developed, USAID/Uganda was also developing its CDCS, which was submitted in December 2010 and is pending approval. The main ideas behind the FtF Strategy were known as the CDCS was being written and the CDCS results framework incorporates the principal IRs that contribute to FtF (see Figure 6 for details). This follows the CDCS guidance that requests that CDCS results frameworks incorporate FtF “at either the DO or Intermediate Result (IR) level.”

Programs that are not funded with FtF resources very often contribute to FtF objectives. For instance, orphan and vulnerable children programming funded by PEPFAR is very similar to interventions being planned for FtF. The CDCS’s focus on improving local government performance will assist our FtF nutrition interventions as well as agricultural extension work where we conduct FtF agriculture programs. The CDCS proposes that FFP resources be moved to Karamoja, an area of great food insecurity, but not the focus of FtF interventions. This strategy will integrate and learn from non-FtF funded programs, work in complementary locations to those programs, and have their success add to the objectives of FtF in Uganda.

We identified three “game-changing” trends in Uganda that will impact achievement of the CDCS: Uganda’s tremendously rapid population growth, the rapid expansion of its youth population, and the impact of oil exploration and production. These three trends are similarly important to the achievement of the FtF strategy. For instance, youth need employment and agriculture is the largest employer in the country; pregnant women contributing to population growth need special interventions to combat malnutrition for themselves and their children; oil can impact government revenues to pursue market infrastructure, make Uganda vulnerable to Dutch disease, and impact the environment for agriculture. More specifically with regard to oil production and government revenue, the success and sustainability of our investments under FtF rely on the GOU’s commitment to agriculture, notably the allocation of 10% of the national budget to agriculture, as stated in the CAADP Compact. We will track all of these trends as the FtF strategy is implemented and respond to them in program designs and decision making.

Finally, as outlined above, a key element to our CDCS is the CLA methodology. Given the suitability of measurement and evidence to interventions in the agriculture and nutrition areas, we expect to put the CLA method to excellent use under FtF. Our Connecting Nutrition to Agriculture component will be particularly designed around learning about the income-nutrition relationship and adapting designs accordingly.

## 1. Development Challenges and Opportunities

This section will summarize the Ugandan development context as it relates to the FtF objectives. It will look at the technical context for nutrition and agriculture, major cross-cutting issues affecting achievement of the FtF objectives, the GOU's country led development plans, and the donor landscape. It will set the groundwork for an explanation of interventions with the greatest potential impact in the section which follows, Core Investment Areas.

### Nutrition

Undernutrition is widespread in Uganda with 38% of children chronically undernourished or stunted (Uganda is the country with the fifth highest number of such children in the world - over 2 million). Six percent of children are acutely undernourished or wasted and 16% of children underweight.<sup>3</sup>

Undernutrition disproportionately affects the rural areas where rates of stunting are over 39% compared to rates of 25% in the urban areas. Regional variations are stark with stunting rates as high as 49.6% and 40% and wasting rates of 9% and 6.5% in the Southwest and Northern regions respectively.<sup>4</sup>

Though poverty is associated with higher levels of undernutrition, in Uganda, it affects all wealth quintiles. There is 44% stunting in the middle wealth quintile followed by 43.4% stunting in the lowest wealth quintile; however, even in the highest wealth quintile, 25% experience chronic undernutrition.<sup>5</sup> Micronutrient deficiencies are also common among Ugandan children with 28 % deficient in Vitamin A and 73% anemic, due primarily to iron deficiency; both of which increase the risk of blindness, disease, and death. Undernutrition is an underlying cause of 60% of under-five mortality in Uganda, which is currently 137 deaths per 1,000 live births.<sup>6</sup>

The largest window of opportunity to prevent undernutrition is during first 1,000 days of life - starting with pregnancy through the first 24 months of a child's life. This makes maternal nutrition another critical element of FtF. In Uganda, 12% of women of reproductive age are undernourished, with rates of 20.8% in the Northern region. Anemia, which can increase pregnancy complications, affects 35% of women of reproductive age. The maternal mortality ratio is 435 per 100,000 live births in 2005, and with a weak health system in which 6,000 women die every year due to pregnancy-related complications, Uganda is unlikely to meet the MDG target of 131/100,000 live births by 2015. International evidence also suggests that adequate birth spacing is a strong determinant of both mortality and nutritional status among infants and children.<sup>7</sup> In Uganda, where 41% of family planning needs are unmet, addressing healthy timing and spacing of pregnancy is not only a key intervention, it is also a strategy to prevent undernutrition.

The causes of undernutrition among women and children in Uganda vary depending on the region, but include availability of food, cultural and social traditions, and poverty levels. For example, in all of Uganda, only 10.2% of children 6 to 23 months of age consume a minimal acceptable diet<sup>8</sup>; however, at a regional level, there is a stark contrast between the North (7%) and East Central (36%). Childhood disease and undernutrition are also a vicious cycle where nearly 26% of children suffer from diarrhea, 41% from fever and 14.5% have symptoms of acute respiratory infections<sup>9</sup>. Disease rates also demonstrate significant regional variations with rates over 50% for fever in the North, over 30% for diarrhea in the North and Southwest and over 20% for acute respiratory infections in the North and

Southwest regions.<sup>10</sup> Care practices are often hindered by the consequences of gender inequities leaving women, and mothers, overburdened with both large workloads, high fertility rates, and the highest unmet need for family planning in sub-Saharan Africa. Water and sanitation conditions can also lead to increased risk of diarrhea and undernutrition. Over 90% of the rural population do not have access to improved sanitation and over 60% of households do not treat water appropriately; both increasing the risk to waterborne diseases and illnesses.

Access to food and lack of dietary diversity also contributes to poor nutrition among women and children. Producing more staple foods does not necessarily guarantee improved nutrition. For example, the Southwest is the “food basket” of Uganda, but in the past decade, it consistently has had one of the highest prevalence rates of childhood growth stunting. Similarly, increasing income does not guarantee improved nutrition. While the prevalence of anemia in adults declines as household income rise, anemia, vitamin A deficiency, and wasting in children are independent of wealth ranking. The Southwest had the largest decline in poverty, but it also saw only a minimal decline in malnutrition.<sup>11</sup> The World Bank estimates that to reduce malnutrition by 1%, poverty would have to decline by 4%. This suggests that a strong health sector response with an emphasis on undernutrition prevention must be complemented with addressing nutrition cross-sectorally through economic growth, agriculture, and gender programs in order to impact the multiple drivers of undernutrition and ultimately affect undernutrition rates.

## Economic Growth

Uganda is one of the fastest growing economies in Africa with sustained growth averaging 7.8% since 2000. However, this growth has to be maintained in order for per capita income to rise beyond the current \$370. The country has achieved macroeconomic stability characterized by single digit annual inflation rates and stable exchange rates, thanks to a sound financial sector with a stable and fully convertible currency. The economy is fully liberalized and open to foreign investment, with no restrictions on remittances of dividends. There are no restrictions on sectors as foreign investors are allowed to invest in economic activity with 100% foreign ownership, which allows government divestiture, creating opportunities in well-established enterprises. There is capital inflow and outflow (both current and capital accounts) and exchange is freely determined by the market. After more than a decade of fundamental political, economic, and social change, Uganda is prospering.

Despite this robust economic growth, 7.7 million Ugandans are living in poverty. Over 90% of the poor reside in rural areas. Uganda’s 3.2% population growth rate is the second highest in the world. Continued growth at this rate will hinder economic growth, negatively impact health outcomes, strain the environment, and threaten political stability. The high population growth rate is driven by Uganda’s total fertility of 6.7 births per woman—the third highest in the world.<sup>12</sup> Sustained high fertility over decades has created a disconcerting youth bulge—half of the population now is under the age of 15. Such explosive demographic trends threaten to erode and even reverse development progress as service delivery systems are stretched beyond capacity and even a growing economy will fail to produce sufficient jobs for the massive youth population.<sup>13</sup>

## Agriculture

Agriculture is essential to Uganda's economic growth, food and nutrition security, income and employment. It contributes more than 20% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), accounts for 48% of exports<sup>14</sup> and provides a large proportion of the raw materials for industry. Food processing alone accounts for 40% of total manufacturing.<sup>15</sup> The performance of agriculture has been mixed: between 1998 and 2002: the sector grew at an average rate of 5.4% yet deteriorated markedly to average growth of 1.1% from 2004 to 2008. Uganda's agriculture growth is primarily driven by increases in area planted rather than in productivity. Although the sector's share in total GDP has declined from 50% in early 1990s to 23.7% in 2008/09<sup>16</sup>, it remains an important sector because the majority of Ugandans derive their livelihoods from it—approximately 75% of all households are engaged in agriculture, and nearly 70% of all households derive their livelihoods from subsistence agriculture.<sup>17</sup> There are some large-scale commercial farmers but smallholder producers dominate Uganda's agriculture sector, comprising an estimated 70% of marketed produce, using low input/low output systems.

While Uganda benefits from having nearly half the arable land in East Africa, abundant rainfall, and two growing seasons, the country is plagued with issues of disease and pests, declining soil fertility, poor infrastructure, lack of access to finance, poor quality inputs, inadequate post harvest storage and processing. Limited market information and clear evidence of collusion by traders at local and national levels leaves small farmers with few options but to sell their produce for the lowest price possible.<sup>18</sup> Agricultural yields per hectare are significantly below potential, with the majority of Ugandan farmers not using improved agricultural practices. Post harvest losses are high, with estimates of maize losses varying from 10 to 25%.

Crop	On farmer's field	On Research Station	Yield Gap
Maize	551	5,000 – 8,000	807 – 1,352
Beans	358	2,000 – 4,000	458 – 1,017
Coffee	369	3,500	849
Banana	1872	4,500	140
Groundnuts	636	2,700 – 3,500	324 – 450

Source: DSIP

## Gender

Approximately 70% of all smallholder farmers are women, and women are responsible for 70% of overall agriculture GDP. Moreover, women are estimated to produce 90% of Uganda's total food output and 50% of the total cash crop production. Although there is crosscutting awareness of gender as an economic issue and a government commitment to address the issues of gender inequality, Uganda lacks the requisite data to identify the gaps, issues, and problems that require a remedy.

## Climate Change

Environment and climate change are also important factors in Uganda. Climate change models for Uganda point to increasing temperatures in the medium term and thus, increased potential for weather-related shocks to the poor.<sup>19</sup> It is predicted that a two degree centigrade temperature rise will reduce Uganda's coffee production by 80%.<sup>20</sup> This should be considered in light of a prediction by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that world temperatures will rise by 3.6 to 7.2 degrees centigrade in the next 20 years. Soil erosion and degradation reduce farmer productivity and require new farming practices to reduce the vulnerability of small-scale farmers. In 2003, the annual cost of soil nutrient loss due primarily to erosion was estimated at about \$625 million per year.<sup>21</sup>

Adaptation funding under the Global Climate Change initiative will be key to supporting our FtF strategy to address challenges related to climate change. Such funding has been included in the resource request for Uganda's recently submitted CDCS.

### *Youth*

Seventy-five percent of the population is comprised of children and youth below the age of thirty. These young people will dominate the future social and economic development of the country. It is essential that the USG and USAID understand how well Ugandan youth are prepared to address the challenges and responsibilities facing them, and to ensure that our development assistance is effectively structured to support them. To this end, USAID is currently conducting a youth assessment that will inform the Mission to effectively address this game-changing issue under this strategy as well as the entire CDCS. The USG increasingly recognizes that large numbers of youth, who are not productively engaged, either in earning a living or in gaining the skills and knowledge to do so, can pose a potential threat to national security and stability. In addition, while youth can play highly productive roles in their communities, economies, and government, they remain highly vulnerable to many of the broader problems facing society.

### *Peace Dividend*

There has been a tremendous peace dividend and concurrent opportunities with the end of the civil war in the North of Uganda. The conflict made nearly a third of farmland inaccessible in the North. A total of 1.2 million Ugandans were displaced into camps in the North and millions more displaced from the North. Access for all Ugandan products to the Sudanese market was restricted by insecurity and disrupted road infrastructure. Now, millions have returned to their homes and have access to more than adequate land for cultivation.

### **Uganda's Development Framework**

The government of Uganda launched its National Development Plan in 2010, which provides the framework for our strategic focus with nutrition and agriculture. As part of the broader national framework, Uganda's Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Plan (CAADP) Compact was signed in April 2010 along with the concurrent approval of the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry, and Fisheries (MAAIF) new five-year investment plan (MAAIF's Development Strategy and Investment Plan, or DSIP). At the same time, the GoU has also developed a cross-sectoral food and nutrition strategy and recommended the enactment of the Food and Nutrition Bill that will create a Food and Nutrition Council. From this framework, GoU priorities have been set and development partners and the private sector have aligned their efforts to address nutrition, agriculture, and food security.

The GoU has won acclaim for its macroeconomic management in recent years, and is currently revising a range of laws and regulations to create greater government accountability, open markets, develop infrastructure, and build a more attractive environment for foreign investment. Budgetary spending on roads doubled (to \$680 million in the 2008/2009 fiscal year) and the GoU scrapped taxes on a range of goods that affected schools, hotels, hospitals, agro-processors, and heavy truck transporters. In 2010, Uganda was ranked 112 out of 183 countries in the World Bank *Doing Business* survey. Yet, at the same time, official corruption persists in all aspects of doing business – particularly for micro and small

enterprises (MSMEs). Outdated laws, poor access to markets and tortured conditions for land ownership severely hamper the economic potential of that resource to face the global financial, commodity and capital markets. Business analysts believe Uganda has the potential for larger amounts of foreign direct investment (FDI), but emphasize the GoU must address challenges related to the country's weak infrastructure, largely uneducated workforce, political interference in the private sector and high levels of corruption. The dilapidated road infrastructure, meanwhile, increases transportation costs and leaves the entire country, which is landlocked, vulnerable to bottlenecks and disruptions. A major business challenge stems from the fact that a two-lane highway from Kenya remains the primary route for 80% of Uganda's trade.


## USAID's Comparative Advantage

### Health and Nutrition

USAID is the largest donor in the health sector and supports the Ministry of Health's (MOH) maternal and child nutrition programs including vitamin A and other micronutrient supplementation, management of severe malnutrition, technical support for the rollout of Infant and Young Child Feeding practices, food fortification, nutrition education, and capacity building. Donor support to these nutrition programs falls within the government's development framework as outlined in the National Development Plan (NDP), the Health Sector Strategic and Investment Plan for 2010-2015, the Child Survival Strategy, and other relevant inter-sectoral mechanisms. USAID is active in donor coordination through the Health Development Partners group and currently serves as chair of this body, acting as the liaison between donors and the MOH.

USAID has a long history of support to nutrition programs in Uganda. FtF gives the opportunity to capitalize on the success built by ongoing advocacy efforts and address key priorities at scale. Under FtF, increased focus on undernutrition within the health sector, and its linkages to agriculture and other efforts, aligns well within the division of labor already occurring among health sector donors. USAID past successes include leadership in micronutrient interventions through its pioneering work in food fortification and in micronutrient supplementation. Under the PEPFAR program, USAID has also supported the local production of ready to use therapeutic foods (RUTF) in the management of severe malnutrition, community-level assessment of undernutrition as part of comprehensive care for people living with HIV/AIDS, and support to orphans and vulnerable children. The opportunities to build on

Figure 2: Venn Diagram of Donor Relationships



previous efforts in MCH and PEPFAR programming are significant and these can be leveraged for greater impact.

UNICEF is another major donor to nutrition in the health sector, focusing primarily on therapeutic feeding and treatment, vitamin A supplementation, and nutrition surveillance in conflict areas. World Food Programme (WFP) focuses on food supplementation in food-insecure areas in Karamoja and technical assistance to MOH. The World Health Organization (WHO) provides technical and financial assistance in emergencies, infant and young child feeding, and growth monitoring. The Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria provides food and nutrition support to people living with HIV/AIDS through the MOH and selected NGOs.

### *Agriculture*


USAID has been working in agriculture in Uganda for over 15 years and has developed specialization as private sector champions, especially through our work on Global Development Alliances. We play an active role in the well-functioning Development Partners' Agriculture and Private Sector Working Groups. Donor efforts align to Uganda's Agriculture Development Strategy and Investment plan (DSIP), through both project-based and budget support mechanisms. Currently the World Bank, the European Union, the International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD), and DANIDA are the primary actors for budget support – mostly in support of Uganda's Agriculture Technology Development and Agriculture Advisory Services. The African Development Bank, DANIDA, and the World Bank have also focused on key infrastructure issues – especially roads, while the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) is working with livestock and food security issues. The UK Department for International Development (DFID) has focused on East Africa integration, trade, and transport issues.

Private sector engagement around value chain development has been limited to DANIDA and USAID, and to a lesser extent the EU (coffee) and the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA ) which is focused on rice. The World Food Program (WFP)'s Purchase for Progress pilot has developed a niche in supporting private-sector warehouses and drying/cleaning facilities as part of their initiative to connect smallholder farmers to markets. DANIDA has created a jointly funded donor program with the EU, Sweden, and Belgium focusing on farmer training and productivity, access to finance and phytosanitary standards. As part of USAID's consultative process in completing our strategy, donors highlighted areas where USAID might collaborate with existing programs or agree to a division of labor. For example, the high level of investment in infrastructure by other donors provides an opportunity for USAID to focus its resources in other areas related to value-chain development. Or, for example, in agriculture research, donors have worked with the government to divide the research agenda, where USAID is focused on biotech and specific research issues.

## 2. Core Investment Areas

The Uganda Feed the Future strategy builds on a foundation of proven prevention and treatment nutrition interventions, growth-oriented value chain activities, and smart integration of nutrition and agriculture interventions to improve the nutritional status and incomes of vulnerable populations.

**Figure 3: Relationship of Three Components in Uganda's FtF Strategy**



### Nutrition

USAID will build on previous strategic investments in nutrition and take them to scale in the areas and populations of greatest need to support the GoU and private sector to reduce chronic undernutrition in the country with a primary focus on prevention. Through these interventions, FtF will reach a million children and have a national impact by reducing stunting by 20%, reducing child underweight by 25%, maternal anemia by 25% child anemia by 30% and reducing rates of acute malnutrition from 6 per cent to 3 per cent through both enhanced prevention and better reach and capacity of RUTF. The core investments in nutrition will focus on community and facility based prevention and treatment, targeted nutrition service delivery, the enabling environment for nutrition and capacity building.

### Community and Facility-Base Prevention and Treatment

USAID Uganda will support the scale up of the Essential Nutrition Actions (ENA)<sup>22</sup> through key district-based programs to improve nutrition in facility and community settings in the areas of highest chronic undernutrition (North and Southwest Uganda). At the facility level, specific activities will include training on ENA with priority health cadres, including training on assessments, key messages, and follow-up. Antenatal care clinics (ANC) and postnatal care clinics, immunization sessions and sick child clinics will provide key platforms to improve nutrition prevention and assessment, as will leveraging current



assessment and treatment efforts supported by PEPFAR. At the community level, the Village Health Team (VHT) will be the main facilitator of ENA and assessment of undernutrition needing facility referrals; however, additional community based mechanisms including community outreach sessions, mother’s groups and schools can be included where feasible and appropriate. While the primary ENA messages focus on specific nutrition messages, additional emphasis will also be placed on key hygiene messages including water treatment, hand washing with soap and use of safe sanitation practices that all can drastically improve the overall nutritional status of children. In addition, with high fertility rates and a high unmet need for family planning, efforts to scale up and expand ENA in Uganda will additionally focus on healthy timing and spacing of pregnancies, which improves nutritional status.

By emphasizing prevention, FtF programs will help to reduce not only chronic undernutrition, but should also reduce the number of severely/ acutely malnourished children as well, resulting in fewer children outside HIV and emergency situations needing treatment for severe acute malnutrition. For the treatment of acute malnutrition, Uganda has adopted a national protocol for the Integrated Management of Acute Malnutrition (IMAM). Through a community and facility based approach to treating under nutrition, therapeutic and/or supplementary food is provided to severe or moderately malnourished children, with medical support, nutrition education, and at-home follow up through community based volunteers. FtF and PEPFAR’s partnership on the production, distribution, and management of RUTF support the larger national IMAM protocols.

### **Targeted Nutrition Service Delivery – Fortification, supplementation**

Targeted nutrition service delivery is focused primarily on approaches to reduce specific micronutrient deficiencies in Uganda. FtF will continue to support vitamin A supplementation and de-worming for children and iron folate supplementation and de-worming for pregnant women at the facility level, through district-level health programs in target geographical areas. In addition, food fortification activities will be supported to improve the necessary vitamin and mineral content of staple foods that

#### **Essential Nutrition Actions in Uganda**

The 2008 Lancet Series on Maternal and Child Undernutrition presented evidence for focusing on reducing undernutrition among women and children from pregnancy through 24 months post-delivery as a key strategy to reduce maternal and child mortality and morbidity. The efficaciousness of these interventions has been established – yet their effectiveness at scale through a combination of Health, HIV, and Agriculture led programs remains to be tested under FtF. USAID Uganda has developed a comprehensive strategy to address the nutritional needs of women and children in targeted geographic areas through the health sector from the facility level to the community level, and by integrating essential nutrition actions into agriculture and economic strengthening programs, ensuring that the interventions applied at every level are based on evidence. The essential actions are:

1. Promotion of optimal breastfeeding during the first six months
2. Promotion of optimal complementary feeding starting at 6 months with continued breastfeeding up to 2 years and beyond
3. Promotion of optimal nutrition care of sick and severely malnourished children, and targeting moderately undernourished children for prevention education
4. Prevention of vitamin A deficiency for women and children
5. Promotion of adequate intake of iron and folic acid, and prevention and control of anemia for women and children
6. Adequate intake of iodine by all members of the household
7. Optimal nutrition for women (especially during pregnancy and lactation period)
8. Promotion of child spacing and family planning for optimal health

will reach a larger target audience, primarily in urban and peri-urban areas where fortified foods are more accessible. This will build on previous work supported by USAID that has resulted in cooking oil fortification with vitamin A that now covers more than 85% of the country's market and the fortification of maize and wheat flour with vitamin A, iron, zinc, folic acid and vitamin B12 and. New food fortification vehicles will be added that include sugar fortification with vitamin A.

The agriculture team is also looking at improved seed varieties to increase micronutrient content such as the orange-fleshed sweet potato, which has increased levels of beta-carotene (Vitamin A). The introduction of fortification of foods will be combined with educational activities that promote dietary diversity through the community and facility based programs.

As previously mentioned, a key component to treatment of undernutrition in Uganda is the production of therapeutic and complementary foods. USAID's Feed the Future will expand on previous investments in local ready-to-use therapeutic food production to increase availability and distribution in health facilities across the country to treat acute undernutrition.

### **Enabling Environment**

Our program will work to leverage other sectors (agriculture, water, public/private, etc) to create demand for fortified foods, adopt good nutrition behaviors, and activities like exclusive breastfeeding and integrated nutrition/WASH/food hygiene. Advocacy efforts will continue to emphasize the importance of nutrition among key stakeholders. Uganda is one of the countries that is taking on the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) initiative spear headed globally by the Irish Government, US government and the UN. SUN focuses on integration of relevant sectors with a view to addressing the window of opportunity within the 1,000 days (from minus 9 months to 24 months). We will work to harmonize FtF and SUN activities to maximize efficiency and national coverage in close consultation with MoH, MAAIF and other stakeholders. Through the existing micronutrient fortification program that has successfully enriched common staples such as oil and flour, FtF will continue to advocate for mandatory fortification of manufactured foods.

### **Capacity Building**

Capacity building at the national and district level is critical. Nutrition has only recently become a priority in the health sector, and without strong nutrition champions and policies centrally, nutrition priorities will not be realized. USAID will continue to train health workers in new IMAM guidelines for use in health facilities and will expand technical assistance and capacity building at the national level beyond the health sector to include Agriculture and other ministries who can contribute to a national action plan on nutrition.

Table 2 summarizes planned activities in nutrition across the four nutrition program areas.

**Table 2: Planned Activities in Nutrition**

Program/Project	Geographical Area	Nutrition Activities	Program area
STRIDES for Family health – District-based program for integrated family planning/MCH services in public and private sector	15 districts in Central, East Central, West and Southwest Uganda (selected on a competitive basis at program start)	Addressing ENA from facility to community level in partnership with District Health Team and private sector providers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community and facility-based prevention and treatment</li> <li>Capacity building</li> <li>Micronutrient supplementation</li> </ul>
Northern Uganda District-Based Health Program (in design)	9 districts in Northern Uganda	Addressing ENA from facility to community level in partnership with District Health Team and private sector providers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community and facility-based prevention and treatment</li> <li>Capacity building</li> <li>Micronutrient supplementation</li> </ul>
District-Based Health Program in Southwest Uganda (under discussion)	Southwestern Districts	Addressing ENA from facility to community level in partnership with District Health Team and private sector providers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community and facility-based prevention and treatment</li> <li>Capacity building</li> <li>Micronutrient supplementation</li> </ul>
NuLife follow-on (in Design)	National	Scaling up community assessment of undernutrition; facility capacity to manage severe acute malnutrition through Ready to Use Therapeutic Foods, increased production of RUTF through a GDA mechanism for better coverage in facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community and facility-based prevention and treatment</li> <li>Capacity building</li> </ul>
Social Marketing of Complementary Foods	National/Targeted in FtF districts	Social marketing of an affordable weaning food through an indigenous health marketing firm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community and facility-based prevention and treatment</li> </ul>
Behavior Change Communication Campaign for improved nutrition	Northern and Southwestern Uganda	Harmonized nutrition communication and messaging campaigns targeting local behavior change needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community and facility-based prevention and treatment</li> </ul>
A2Z Micronutrient Fortification / Supplementation	National	Fortification of oil and flour; exploration of sugar fortification; support to Child Days Vitamin A and deworming efforts	Micronutrient interventions / supplementation
FANTA II	National	Capacity and technical assistance partner to GoU, MOH, MAAIF, and USAID implementing partners on nutrition; research and piloting of innovative approaches; policy advocacy and TA	Enabling environment
RUTF production	National	Production and marketing of RUTF targeting children and PLHA and complementary foods	Targeted nutrition service delivery/ supplementation
Strengthening University Nutrition	National	Increasing University capacity in nutrition training, education, and research	Enabling environment, capacity building

## Agriculture

### Priority Value Chains

Our investments will focus on value chains with the greatest market potential, the highest number of farmers, and the greatest income potential for farmers. Impact on nutrition and role of gender were also critical considerations in our value chain focus, as was the potential for sector-wide impact and maximum return on investment. Many of the value chain components have integrated nutrition and agriculture dimensions.


The starting point for this strategy is the Government of Uganda’s Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan (DSIP) where ten priority value chains were selected. In looking at each commodity, maize and coffee stood out as key drivers for economic growth in terms of number of farmers, market demand, and income potential. Most of the Ugandan staple diet is built around other staples like beans, cassava, and banana – leaving maize to function more as a cash crop that responds to regional food security and trade demands, rather than as a household staple. Fish, dairy and livestock were also considered. However all three present a number of challenges that would require substantially higher levels of investment to address and would deliver a much lower rate of return for dollar invested. An example is the fish sector, which represents the second highest foreign exchange earner after coffee. Over-fishing, declining stock and a lack of basic mechanisms to control and guide fishery resources create long-term challenges to investment and would require huge capital investments. This strategy has focused on the first two priorities set by the GoU (maize and coffee), and added a third value chain (beans) which is grown by the same farmers as maize, uses the same post-harvest infrastructure, and has benefits to both the farm and the farmer by increasing soil fertility and household nutrition.

### *Maize for Regional Food Security:*

Nearly 20 million people (or two-thirds of the population) are involved in the maize sector. Demand for maize in the region (Southern Sudan, Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Rwanda, and Tanzania) drives production in Uganda – despite its reputation for low quality and inconsistent production. Most of Uganda’s maize crosses the border informally and below East African standards<sup>23</sup>. In 2006, a study suggested that less than 17% of Uganda’s maize was traded formally at quality standards.<sup>24</sup>

This is reflective of the challenges in Uganda’s maize sector – characterized by low yield levels (typically between 1.0 and 2.5 metric tons per hectare), lack of farmer access to inputs, inadequate post-harvest infrastructure, weak market linkages, and a lack of formal organization in the sector to support small-scale farmers. Because maize is both a food and an export crop, there is some elasticity; if prices drop

**Figure 4: FtF Value Chains Versus DSIP**



too far, small farmers will begin eating their maize. That said, production and trading are largely price driven, and in recent years prices have been highly volatile.

Most Ugandan farmers lack access to post-harvest infrastructure. Prior to WFP's Purchase for Progress program, ninety percent of the cleaning, drying and storage facilities were located in Kampala – all within 50 meters of the main WFP warehouse. Currently, maize trading is dominated by small traders at farm-gate, who in turn supply a limited number of larger traders who dominate the export market. The trader provides a vital service but also exploits farmers by leveraging superior resources, greater market knowledge, access to transportation and storage, and time pressure. Evidence of collusion exists at both the local and national level. Large traders have also taken over most postharvest handling, including cleaning, drying and storage, depressing farm-gate prices even further.<sup>25</sup> Only the largest maize producers have significant market power – all others must take the price the local trader offers. The difference between the wet maize traded at farm-gate, and what farmers could sell their maize if they had access to post-harvest infrastructure is significant. A study that compared the two showed that organized farmers with access to post-harvest handling facilities could negotiate received nearly three hundred percent more for their EA Grade 1 maize over farm-gate prices for “wet” maize.<sup>26</sup>

In 2010, WFP launched its Purchase for Progress program. WFP is the largest buyer of East African (EA) Grade 1 maize in Uganda, using their expertise and purchasing power to strengthen private-sector links between small farmers and regional markets. USAID partnered with WFP and the Uganda Commodity Exchange to use their comparative advantage in post-harvest handling and storage, and unmet demand for quality maize to create both the incentive and the means for small-scale farmers to raise the quality of their maize and compete in the international market. This partnership is the foundation for the USG's Feed the Future efforts driving economic growth in Uganda's maize sector.


### *Coffee for Growth:*

Uganda's coffee sector, by comparison to the maize sector, is better organized and has a larger number of players. It is Uganda's most important export crop, earning \$285 million in 2010 (the figure was \$280 million in 2009) and directly benefitting 1.32 million households. Despite some early setbacks, if the share of freight-on-board price that goes to smallholders is any indication (around 70%) liberalization has helped smallholder producers.<sup>27</sup> Uganda's coffee production and exports are 85% Robusta and 15% Arabica. While Uganda's Arabica coffees have struggled to stand out in the specialty coffee market, Ugandan Robusta often receives a premium price over other Robusta coffees. Within its market, it is a standard setter.

The majority of Ugandan coffee producers do not follow good agricultural practices, and as a result, yields are low. Ugandan farmers produce about a half-ton per hectare. By comparison, Robusta farmers in Vietnam achieve 2 to 2.5 tons per hectare. By combining recommended husbandry practices and the use of inputs, Ugandan farmers could greatly increase yields per hectare. Why is this important? Farmers already receive 70% or more of the FOB price, which is the highest worldwide. This fact suggests then that there is little room to increase margins from the traders, processors, and exporters. As a result, increased farmer income will be driven by rising market prices, lower overall costs of

production, or deeper participation in the value chain. Farmers cannot control the first factor, but can control the second and the third.

**Figure 5: Summary of Rationale for Three Selected Value Chains**



While demand for coffee is rising worldwide, and is expected to outstrip production for the foreseeable future, Uganda faces a number of challenges in the sector. The country needs about 200 million Coffee-Wilt Disease (CWD) resistant seedlings to replace those that have died since 1992. Mass multiplication is a time consuming and expensive undertaking. The estimated loss of revenue from CWD in the last 10 years has been over \$800 million. If trees could be rehabilitated and become as productive as trees of current Robusta producers, Uganda could double its coffee exports.

In order to achieve a systemic impact USAID will need to partner with key players in the public and private sectors to leverage investment and resources to address these challenges.

***Beans for Nutrition:***

Beans are an important staple in the Ugandan diet – often referred to as “the protein for the poor.” A 2004 UBOS survey showed they were the country’s most extensively grown crop. The value of beans for household nutrition and soil nutrient replenishment in a low-input environment like Uganda cannot be overstated. Beans and maize are well paired. Both share the same post-harvest handling and storage mechanisms and play an important symbiotic role in the field.

At the same time, beans were chosen as part of our focused value chains for reasons completely different than for maize and coffee. Unlike the other two commodities, there is not a major export market for Ugandan-preferred varieties. In fact, USAID focused on beans in their IDEA Project, a ten-year agriculture development effort funded by USAID between 1995 and 2004, and ended up dropping beans as a value chain because of the low market potential and numerous challenges they face. Uganda has seen bean production levels decrease over the years – with yields dropping by 64% during an eight-

year period between 1999 and 2006.<sup>28</sup> The main factors are the challenging environmental conditions and diseases that affect beans in Uganda. Two of the main diseases that limit bean yield in Uganda are root rot and a fungus called anthracnose that thrives in the cool rainy highlands in the Southwest. The two diseases can destroy up to 70% of a crop.

So why include beans as an integral part of this strategy? In a value-chain strategy that strives to increase incomes through the sale of cash crops, there is also a prerogative to ensure adequate household nutrition. There is an economy of scale in including beans, given our work with maize and the previously mentioned complementarity of the two crops and similar post harvest infrastructure. While there are no illusions that the production of beans will drive household incomes, USAID support for research to stem production losses and encouraging farmers to grow beans to support household nutritional security should make an important contribution to improving nutrition. Our target for beans is to increase average national bean yield by 50% over 5 years.



## Value-chain Investments

**Policy** - USAID/Uganda will support a \$10 million, five-year policy reform initiative in agriculture, trade, health and gender equity. Some examples of policy priorities include the passage of Uganda’s *Bio-technology* and *Bio-safely bill*, effective implementation of the *Agricultural Chemicals Control Act* (1989, amended in 2006) which

establishes a licensing regime for insecticides, herbicides, fungicides and fertilizers, and controls and regulates the manufacture, storage, distribution, trade, import, and export of agricultural chemicals,

effective implementation of the *Agriculture Seeds and Plant Act* (1994) which regulates seed companies operating or importing plant material into Uganda, and passage of the *Food and Nutrition Bill* and related Health, Nutrition and Sanitation policies for a proposed National Food and Drug Authority. Review of Uganda’s marriage and family act lays out the ownership and control of assets for women. It is critical to address key gender components of legislation.


**Capacity Building** - Support to strengthen key public and private sector institutions at the national and district levels is essential to the overall success of our Feed the Future activities. This \$25 million, five-year set of activities will focus on building capacity within the Uganda Bureau of Statistics, and Ministries of Health and Agriculture to collect and analyze data, and to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of their programs. There will also be a short, medium, and long-term training and education component to develop the next generation of Uganda decision makers.





**Agriculture Research** – \$20 million over five years to support continued research in three areas: Biotechnology to protect food security crops from serious disease threat – specifically cassava (Cassava MOSAIC) and banana (Banana Wilt (BXW) and Black Sigatoka Disease); breeding to increase stress tolerance and disease resistance for Feed the Future focus crops (maize, coffee and beans); and a partnership with Harvest Plus to scale-up the production and mainstream marketing of bio-fortified /nutritionally enhanced crop varieties - specifically Orange-fleshed Sweet Potato and high zinc/iron beans.

**Increased Quality and Production** – USAID will contribute \$20 million to a \$50 million partnership with DANIDA, the EU, Belgium, and Sweden to address farm-level constraints to quality and production in maize, beans and coffee. The program will also focus on increasing farmer access to financial services and supporting trade-related sanitary and phytosanitary standards and quality management systems.



**Agro-Input Supply** - A five-year, \$7.5 million program to increase the quality, availability, and use of inputs. This program will build the capacity of the Uganda National Agriculture Input Dealers Association (UNADA) and private sector retailers.

**Farm-level Aggregation and Market Linkages** - This five-year, \$25 million program will work to build the capacity of farmer organizations to enter into agreements with major buyers, access finance, purchase inputs, bulk, clean, and process their commodities. The program will work in conjunction with the Abi-Trust Partnership (DANIDA) and emphasize linkages to the WFP’s Purchase for Progress efforts and the Uganda Commodity Exchange.

**Market-Information System** - This five-year, \$5 million program will work with local partners to utilize the latest in information and communications technology to address market information gaps for smallholder farmers.



**Ftf Partnership Investment Fund** - It is critical that the USG leverage our own resources with the resources and expertise of other stakeholders to increase the depth of penetration within sectors. This \$25 million fund investment fund will focus on creating strategic partnerships within the maize, coffee and nutrition sectors to leverage private-sector dollars and expertise. Earlier, we discussed the possibilities within the coffee sector and the impact it could have in doubling the export of coffee in five years. Another example is in the nutrition sector – where USAID will support the scale up of food fortification and manufacturing capacity of *Ready to Use Therapeutic Food (RUTF)* initiatives based on the Nutriset Plumpy nut recipe. A partnership is being developed would make RUTF available in every hospital across the country. Finally, we are working with the World Bank and Bank of Uganda to form a \$1 billion private equity infrastructure fund that will address some of the major infrastructure constraints the ag sector faces. USAID/Uganda has contributed \$350,000 to fund a feasibility study. Partnerships will be strategic and designed to leverage systemic impact.



## Connecting Nutrition to Agriculture

We know that increasing incomes, through enhanced agricultural productivity and efficiency, will not alone reduce food insecurity and may not have a significant impact on undernutrition. Household survey data across countries has regularly confirmed that income growth, even if uniformly distributed, has only modest impacts on undernutrition and Uganda-specific research has shown that “at a 5% rate of per capita income growth (substantially larger than the average for the last decade) it would take 33 years to reduce current underweight rates by half.”<sup>29</sup> Building on lessons learned from previous integrated programs, USAID will implement a flagship program called Community Connector (CC) under this component.

The Community Connector provides the opportunity to examine the interaction between nutrition, agriculture, and gender programming approaches, incorporating rigorous monitoring and evaluation to generate valuable learning. The transformation of economic growth into improved nutrition occurs most clearly at the household level.<sup>30</sup> Going beyond traditional interventions, CC will place increased focus on the role of women in the household decision-making processes, especially regarding the use and distribution of resources. The program will also aim to reduce household vulnerability and improve a community's capacity to absorb income, environmental and household shocks. Many Ugandan households face risks to their production, income, and consumption. This project will integrate vulnerable households into the market economy and transition them from subsistence to production. This effort will be multiplied by strategically implementing the Community Connector in geographic areas that allow for an overlay with other activities promoting improved production, health and nutrition in order to reinforce practice and behavior change.

The Gender Informed Nutrition and Agriculture (GINA) Program, funded by USAID Washington and implemented by the Food Science and Technology Department of Makerere University, demonstrated, in one sub-region that an integrated nutrition, education, and agricultural development initiative coupled with improved hygiene and food safety could reduce the prevalence of underweight children in a short time.<sup>31</sup> This was done at a very small scale, but it is one of several studies that demonstrate the benefit of an integrated approach. Creating a strong impact evaluation element in the Community Connector will allow our programs to contribute to the evidence base on integrated approaches and test different models and approaches to determine best practices. Lessons learned will inform other FtF and relevant programs across the Mission and we will scale up those interventions that work. The Community Connector will complement and inform efforts in nutrition, social protection, and linkages to key services for vulnerable populations, funded by PEPFAR Orphans and Vulnerable Children funding.

### Crosscutting Issues:

**Gender:** Gender plays a critical role in all of the proposed activities. Across the board, our strategy will strive to implement gender-sensitive programs – from joint asset planning with couples involved in the Community Connector, to supporting key policy issues around women, best methodologies to target women for technology transfer, women in key leadership positions in farmer organizations, and women researchers in agricultural science. By building a mechanism for impact evaluations around gender-based interventions we can begin to gather solid data on the value of certain types of interventions and

their impact on the role of women to direct, control, and share in decision-making around their agricultural pursuits.

**Climate Change:** Climate change adaptation features strongly in the strategy and is integrated throughout—from research into disease and drought resistant crops that would lessen the impact of changing rainfall and reduce farmers’ vulnerability to climate change, to working with farmers and communities at all levels to understand and mitigate the impact of soil degradation and erosion.

## Strategic Partnerships

A key component to this strategy is the ability to leverage agriculture resources and comparative advantages from other partners. Some of those partnerships are:

**World Food Programme – Purchase for Progress (P4P).** WFP is using its unique buying power in Uganda to connect small-scale maize farmers to the larger market for quality maize. As part of a partnership with USAID, WFP has privatized their warehousing and storage operations, supported the development of nine privately-owned warehouses<sup>32</sup>, and created mechanisms to allow farmer organizations to sell directly to WFP (and other buyers) through the Uganda Commodity Exchange (UCE).

**Agribusiness Initiative Trust.** DANIDA has developed an innovative model that creates a sustainable local institution to work with farmers along a limited number of strategic value chains. DANIDA, the European Union, Sweden and Belgium have provided core funding for a trust for agribusiness development. Interest from the Trust funds the long-term operations costs of a local Ugandan institution (ABi Trust) working in value-chain development (maize, beans and coffee), expanding access to agricultural finance and phytosanitary standards. Preliminary discussions with the Danes have shown that USAID could partner with ABi Trust and increase its programmatic impact. Resources can go directly to program activities, rather than the cost of setting up a separate entity to do similar work. A donor-to-donor mechanism to fund the Trust is currently being explored. Building on USAID’s donor-to-donor partnership with DANIDA’s ABi Trust Support, USAID will co-fund/support the U-Growth “Gender Equality for Rural Economic Growth for Poverty Reduction”.

**Key Private Sector Actors.** The Uganda FtF strategy creates *game-changing* impact by partnering with some of Uganda’s biggest stakeholders to leverage resources, expertise, and depth of penetration within the sector. An example will be the ability to bring the ten largest coffee exporters (who control 80% of the coffee sector) to leverage resources to support the replacement of more than 2 million affected coffee bushes with disease-resistant seedlings, and support better agronomic practices among small farmers. To have a comprehensive impact, this strategy will work with all the key actors in the value-chain – from small farmers to large traders and exporters.

**Food for Peace** – We will shift the focus of our Food for Peace development programs (Multi-Year Assistance Programs, or MYAPs) towards other areas of the country where poverty and malnutrition indicators are the highest in the county. Target areas will be determined by the MYAP design team, expected in FY 11 Quarter 3, but the Karamoja region is a probable focus area. Karamoja is a largely pastoralist region, which has been chronically food insufficient for over 40 years, suffering a series of

multi-year droughts and crop failures. Engagement in this region of Uganda gives the opportunity to address the first principle of FtF, addressing the underlying causes of hunger and under-nutrition. In an area of unique culture and diversity, MYAP programs must be unique and seek to support the diverse livelihoods of the region, making them distinct in focus from the core FtF programs. However, the linkage of MYAPs to FtF programs will be essential to success. FFP and its MYAP programs have a comparative advantage in the implementation of field based agriculture programs. However, in this region, marginalized by culture, remote location, unique economy, and livelihoods, and still mired in conflict, connection with policymakers in the national capital will be essential to the achievement of economic growth objectives. MYAP programs will link with policy and regulatory reform components of FtF programs at the national level. Although target value chains may differ from FtF, access to the expertise and connections of FtF implementing partners at the national level will facilitate the resolution of constraints similar to those being addressed within the three key value chains. FFP is currently straight lining support to development programs in Uganda at \$25 million per year.

***USAID East Africa Regional Programs*** – USAID’s integration of programming that works seamlessly with Regional Platform programs like the Market Linkages Initiative and COMPETE have been critical to laying the foundation for this strategy. The regional support to the Association for Strengthening Agriculture Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA) has supported Uganda’s national agriculture research priorities. Close coordination between USAID Uganda and the USAID Regional mission have created a synergy in efforts and maximized impact on a common agenda.

***Other USG partners*** – The US Department of Agriculture (USDA) supports food security efforts in Uganda through its support to school feeding, micro-finance, and agriculture research and training. Efforts are coordinated through the USDA regional officer in Nairobi to support the strategic priorities outlined in this document. In addition to USDA, Feed the Future incorporates efforts by the Peace Corps, US Department of Treasury, the Department of Defense (through its Civil Affairs Teams working in Karamoja), and the US African Development Foundation.

***Strategic Coordination with Non-state Actors*** – Broad stakeholder engagement and strengthening host country systems to ensure broad engagement is fundamental to this strategy. USAID has been actively engaged with a number of non-state actors. An example is our current support to a coffee-sector stakeholder group. The sector-specific group is comprised of major coffee grower organizations, coffee traders, ag-input providers, and coffee professional organizations. There are also representatives from the coffee research and scientific community. The meetings are chaired by a representative from the Ministry of Agriculture to ensure coordination and buy-in from the GoU. This group meets regularly to discuss their policy action plan and to ensure that research and coordination take place around key priorities. USAID has supported regular meetings of this group, as well as larger, sector-wide meetings where key issues can be shared and discussed. This group has played a key role in engaging with donors, like USAID around sector priorities. A similar group has existed in the past around maize, and will be part of future FtF strategic interventions. In addition to sector-specific coordination groups, USAID is working with other non-state actors, like the Uganda Commodity Exchange, Uganda National Agro- Input Dealers Association (UNADA), the East African Grain Council (EAGC), and groups around agro-inputs, market information, trade, policy and research. Although technically, local government at

the district and sub-district level would be not be considered a non-state actor, our engagement at these levels is critical for the success of our initiatives as well. Through USAID's CDCS, we show how Development Object 2 (governance) will target FtF focus districts to build local capacity.


***Diplomatic Strategy*** – The USAID Mission Director, under the direction of the US Ambassador, leads the USG Feed the Future initiative. However, the Department of State provides coordination and leadership in diplomatic engagements linked to Feed the Future that are a critical element to the strategies success. The priorities agreed to in Uganda's CAADP Compact set benchmarks for the Mission's diplomatic engagement – *actions leading to a six percent rate of agriculture s sector growth and a public sector investment in agriculture of 10 percent*. Key engagements include:

- Engaging with key ministries, Parliament, and Government of Uganda leaders to support passage of legislation to harmonize key policies on nutrition, trade, standards, and the rights of women
- Creation of a Trade Advisory Committee and the reduction of national and regional trade and transportation obstacles
- Track and report on corruption; communicate to the GoU the crippling effect on the agriculture sector of corruption in licensing, input provision, input and output standards certification, land usage, transportation, and public procurement
- Utilize the Public Affairs Office and communication officers from all agencies at post to deliver increased outreach and consistent messaging to further the FtF objectives
- Make stakeholder contacts to assess the needs and opportunities for further USG engagement
- Work closely with GoU counterparts and partners to adapt and prepare for country-specific events and context towards effective programming of FtF

### 3. FtF Objective, Program Structure, and Implementation

The framework for the US Mission development assistance in Uganda is the Country Development and Cooperation Strategy (CDCS). The overall goal for Uganda’s CDCS is ***Uganda’s transition to a modern and prosperous country accelerated***. The relationship between the FtF objective and the overall Mission Goal is straightforward: prosperity is derived from economic growth. A “prosperous country” implies however, that growth is broadly distributed as well. The FtF will pursue this broad-based growth by working comprehensively in specific agricultural value chains, on projects that address nutrition and the vulnerable, and on the environmental aspects of two additional drivers of growth, the oil industry and ecotourism. Increased nutrition, the focus of intermediate result (IR) 1.2, is both an element of prosperity and a driver of increased growth and productivity. Increased nutrition has less an effect of economic growth than is commonly expected. Our development hypothesis linking the FtF to the goal statement is that if we increase economic growth by working in targeted areas of the agriculture sector, improve nutrition and livelihoods for the vulnerable, and focus on the impact of natural resource management, we will accelerate prosperity in Uganda. The CDCS framework presented below, with the linkages to FtF in **RED**:

Figure 6: Uganda’s CDCS Results Framework (Pending Approval)



The overall objective of the FtF strategy is to reduce poverty, hunger, and undernutrition in Uganda. The following three IRs contribute to this objective:

### **CDCS IR 3.1.1: Health Seeking Behaviors Increased**

The USG's nutrition strategy in Uganda targets the vulnerable population during the development window of opportunity of minus 9 to 24 months with an approach tailored to local undernutrition drivers: behavior, access to health and education services, food diversity, availability and affordability, and gender roles, using proven nutrition interventions. Building on current investments in the public and private sector, the activities will include facility based prevention and treatment, targeted nutrition service delivery, the nutrition enabling environment and capacity building in the GoU at the national and district levels.

**Development hypothesis:** *Programs to prevent undernutrition at all levels of the health sector complemented by integrated approaches to nutrition at the community level will cause improvements in the nutritional status of individuals.*

The underlying principles of this hypothesis call for scaling up efficacious, evidence-based package of nutrition interventions to prevent and treat under-nutrition addressing the key result areas of the FtF, Global Health Initiative (GHI), and PEPFAR initiatives. Targeted nutrition interventions will be provided to children (including other vulnerable children (OVCs), pregnant and lactating women, and People Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA)), to help break the vicious cycle of malnutrition, disease, and mortality.

Family-centered nutrition service delivery will entail prevention and treatment of malnutrition through promotion of effective infant feeding practices, maternal nutrition, and therapeutic and supplementary feeding. This program will provide district-wide coverage of Integrated Management of Acute Malnutrition (IMAM) at all levels of the health system at facility and community level targeting districts with high levels of malnutrition and high HIV/AIDS prevalence.

Community level activities will focus on active case finding and referral of malnourished pregnant and lactating women, children, and adult PLWHAs. The program will use existing community structures e.g. village health team (VHT), opinion leaders, etc. to strengthen health facility to community linkages for follow-up, adherence and linkage to other food security interventions.

The program will also provide institutional capacity building of nutrition programming at district level through the establishment of coordination structures, strengthening nutrition monitoring and evaluation, and capacity building in target districts in Uganda.

**Geographic Focus** (see map in ANNEX 2): Northern and Southwestern Uganda. Based on the following criteria:

1. Areas of need: high levels of poverty and under-nutrition (stunting in children <5)
2. Population trends: large number of people at risk/vulnerable to under nutrition
3. Integration and linkage opportunities with other FtF programs
4. Opportunities to leverage/build upon existing health sector interventions at the district level.

**Lead Indicators:**

- Prevalence of stunted children under 5
- Prevalence of children underweight under 5
- Prevalence of children wasted under 5
- Prevalence of women underweight
- Prevalence of maternal anemia
- Household Hunger Scale
- Exclusive breastfeeding
- Percent of children 6-23 months that received a Minimum Acceptable Diet

**Impact**

- Up to 1 million **children reached** with nutrition programs in 47 districts in Northern and Southwest Uganda
- Up to 20% reduction in **child stunting**
- Up to 25% reduction in **child underweight**
- Up to 25% reduction in **maternal anemia**
- Up to 30% reduction in **child anemia**
- Reduction of acute malnutrition rate from 6% to 3%

**CDCS IR 1.2: Socio-Economic and Nutritional Status of Vulnerable Groups Improved**

This IR corresponds to the Connecting Agriculture to Nutrition component. Under this IR, USAID will implement a flagship program under this IR called Community Connector. Going beyond traditional interventions, it will place increased focus on the role of women in the household decision-making processes, especially regarding the use and distribution of resources. Both men and women will be the focus of core production-enhancing interventions when appropriate, such as increasing access to high-quality and appropriate agricultural inputs and incentivizing greater use of cost-effective agriculture practices and promoting linkages with effective and transparent producer organizations. The program will also aim to reduce household vulnerability and improve a community's capacity to absorb income, environmental and household shocks. The Community Connector will be strategically implemented in geographic areas to allow for an overlay with other activities promoting improved production and nutrition in order to reinforce practice and behavior change.

**Development hypothesis:** *Integrated programs which empower women at the household level will cause improvements in the socio-economic conditions of the household, particularly household incomes and nutrition.*

**Geographic Focus** (see map in ANNEX 3) : The Community Connector will be implemented in geographic areas selected based on the following criteria:

1. Districts with high level of undernutrition and poverty;
2. Areas that allow for an overlay with other USAID activities promoting improved production, health and nutrition in order to reinforce practice and behavior change;

3. Complementary districts to those where the SCORE project will work, as the two programs have similar objectives and target households. Each program will incorporate lessons learned from the other project.

Based on the identified criteria and availability of resources, Community Connector will focus in approximately 25 districts predominantly in Northern (excluding Karamoja and West Nile) and Southwest Uganda. Some districts in the western and Central parts of the country present opportunities for integration and linkages with other Mission and FtF programs. A PEPFAR program focusing on vulnerable children (the SCORE program) will be in many districts in the North and Southwest as well, so Community Connector will not duplicate efforts in those districts but rather work in complementary geographic areas.

**Lead Indicators:**

- Prevalence of wasted children under 5
- Prevalence of stunted children under 5
- Prevalence of underweight women
- Change in average score on Household Hunger Index

**Impact:**

- 60,000 - 80,000 households (approx. 400,000 people) in approx.. 25 districts in Northern and southwest Uganda
- 30% reduction in undernutrition
- 20% increase in incomes

**CDCS IR 1.1: Increased Income Led by Strategic Value Chains in Selected Population**

In the past, our agriculture programs supported interventions focused on productivity and marketing down to the grassroots level, striving to increase market efficiency. We built a strong client base, through farm demonstrations and organization strengthening. This led to effective working relationships with smallholder farmers, small- and medium-scale input suppliers, processors, traders, and policy makers. However, funding levels only allowed us to target specific links along the value chain, thus making the program's success dependent on areas outside of its scope. With increased funding and the benefit of lessons learned from previous programs, we have chosen to take a comprehensive value chain approach focused on a strategic set of agriculture commodities. The targeted commodities were chosen based on potential for impact on income, nutrition, and food security going deeper throughout the value chain.<sup>33</sup> It is an approach that links directly to GoU's DSIP. In contrast to our previous agriculture programs, FtF resources will enable us to have systemic impact on two or three vital commodities, by addressing key constraints throughout the chain. In terms of gender integration, we plan to support gender sensitization to foster intra-household cooperation, strengthen the organizational capacity of key women's business organizations, and engage in efforts to increase support to women agribusiness owners, and to connect women entrepreneurs to national, regional and international markets.



**Development hypothesis:** *Programs addressing constraints throughout the value chain of select commodities will result in increased incomes for farmers.*

**Geographic Focus** (see map in ANNEX 4): in aggregate, the selected strategic value chains of coffee, maize, and beans cover almost 100% of Uganda’s arable land. FtF activities are geared towards increasing trade (volumes and value) in these value chains and increasing benefits to farmers. Therefore, selection of geographic focus is based on the potential to overlay different interventions, achieve synergy, and cause a systemic change in the value chains.

Selection criteria include:

1. Existing major areas of production – high production potential
2. Potential for links with private sector service providers – principally, the multi-donor funded Agri-business Trust partners and coffee exporters.
3. Location of market infrastructure, particularly the location of Purchase 4 Progress-funded WFP warehouses and farmer-level aggregation centers funded by previous and on-going USAID programs
4. Building on previous involvements of USAID in supporting development of the production of these crops

Currently, these areas cover about 60 districts for the three value chains – mostly in the Southwest and North for coffee, and the Central /North for maize. As our programs are designed, these areas will be more specifically defined based on validated actual economic growth indicator baselines and their ability to impact more inclusively a significant proportion of the population.

Lead Indicators:

- Expenditures of rural households (proxy for income)
- Value of incremental sales (collected at farm/firm level) attributed to FtF implementation
- Post harvest losses as a percentage of overall harvest

Impact:

- 400,000 farmers using improved technology
- 50% average increase in incomes
- 100% increase in value and volume of exports (coffee and maize)
- Exportable maize increased from 250,000MT to 650,000MT
- Average national bean yield increases by 50% over 5 years

## 4. Monitoring and Evaluation

In its Country Development and Cooperation Strategy (CDCS), the Mission has committed to a Collaboration, Learning, Adapting (CLA) model that we believe creates the conditions for development success. This model will ensure that the CDCS works as a “living strategy,” providing guidance and reference points not only for implementation but also for learning and course correction as needed.

The Mission’s FtF strategy builds its M&E plan around increasing methodological rigor to increase accountability and testing concrete hypotheses. We will do this through a four-pronged approach: improved data quality, increased use of baselines, focused and sensible targeting, and use of impact evaluations to build a validated evidence base. Increased use of baselines, testing and impact assessments will allow us to account for our contribution towards improved outcomes. Where we have evidence of our contribution and whether or not development hypotheses were correct, the Mission’s CLA function will provide a means to make adjustments during implementation of individual programs and components of the CDCS.

### **FtF Development Hypotheses:**

The overarching development hypotheses that we will be testing in our FtF programs are:

- 1. Programs that prevent undernutrition at all levels of the health sector complemented by integrated approaches to nutrition at the community level will cause improvements in the nutritional status of individuals.*
- 2. Integrated programs which empower women at the household level will cause improvements in the socio-economic conditions of the household, particularly household incomes and nutrition.*
- 3. Programs addressing constraints throughout the value chain for a select number of commodities will result in increased incomes for farmers.*

As we design individual projects, we will define additional hypotheses to test.

### **Performance Monitoring**

Through an interactive approach across Mission teams and in collaboration with other donors and the GoU, USAID’s FtF effort will go beyond the status quo of performance monitoring. At the basic level, data will be collected by implementing partners and reported to USAID/Uganda through quarterly reports while quality will be assessed via Data Quality Assessment visits to the field. In our district-based programs, there are certain indicators for which data can be collected using Lot Quality Assurance Samples (LQAS), such as:

- Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger
- Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet
- Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months
- Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under nutrition
- Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months

At a more advanced level, structures will be in place within the Mission to coordinate data collection and analysis strategically, collect more data, minimize costs by efficient resource utilization, and use data to improve programs, not just evaluate them. The focus will be on continual assessment, not just at the end of the fiscal year in a portfolio review, and will be supported by Evidence Summits which will convoke all USG partners semi-annually to discuss evidence, changes needed, and coordination.

The following are indicators already identified at the goal-level and second-level objectives:

***Indicators to Monitor Changes in Country Context:***

- Prevalence of Poverty: Percent of people living on less than \$1.25/day
- Expenditures of rural households
- Prevalence of stunted children under five
- Change in average score on Household Hunger index
- Percent of children 6-23 months who received a Minimum Acceptable Diet

***Performance Indicators:***

- Percent growth in agricultural GDP of maize and coffee
- Percent change in value of intra-regional exports of targeted agricultural commodities as a result of USG assistance
- Post-harvest losses as a percentage of overall harvest, for selected commodities
- Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FtF implementation
- Capacity of relevant national statistical office to collect high-quality agricultural data

***Baseline Data***

The following are surveys that will be used for baseline data:

- Uganda National Household Survey, 2009/2010
- Demographic Health Survey, 2006. USAID/Uganda is currently providing focused technical and financial support to UBOS for the completion of the 2011 Uganda Demographic and Health Survey (DHS). Preliminary DHS data, expected by the end of 2011, will provide national and regional nutrition baselines.
- The 2008 Uganda Food Consumption Survey. Done in 3 regions of Uganda (one urban and two rural).
- 2007 Uganda Service Provision Survey. Covered the coverage of health facility based services that covers Maternal and Child Health and HIV/AIDS
- The Uganda National Household Survey 2008/2009. Done by Uganda Bureau of Statistics. This is a national survey.

Working with USAID Bureau of Food Security in the first half of 2011, we will work to identify additional program-level and whole-of-government indicators and create a plan for additional baseline data collection where necessary. Each individual FtF program will identify all performance indicators, a plan for collection of baseline data and clear project-level targets.

### ***Impact Evaluation***

To build an evidence base to adjust ongoing projects and inform future programs, we will design rigorous impact evaluations for select FtF programs. We have already identified such an opportunity with our Community Connector program, which fully integrates agriculture and nutrition activities at the household level. Discussions have been held with partners within the MIT Poverty Action Lab consortium on the use of Randomized Control Trial (RCT) experiments. We will use the results of these impact evaluations to test the hypotheses of our FtF strategy and make mid-stream adjustments to programs if necessary, or scale up programs that are working well. Using the learning component of FtF programs like Community Connector is in line with the Mission's continuing CLA component. We will also partner with other donors to disseminate and promote lessons learned. USAID/Uganda, through unbiased and independent impact evaluations, will identify interventions that work; we will be an active contributor to the greater discourse in testable development hypotheses and our programs will benefit from our increased understanding.

### ***Capacity Building/Support to Data Collection***

A key component of our Feed the Future program will be capacity building of the Government of Uganda in the collection, analysis, and use of agriculture and nutrition data for planning, monitoring, and evaluation. We will work with all relevant government agencies and ministries including the Uganda Bureau of Statistics, the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, and the Ministry of Health. We will work in partnership with the National Planning Authority as they attempt to convene the multisectoral Food and Nutrition Council as a cohesive and functional unit. We will seek to build local academic institutions' capacity in nutrition through improved pre-service and in-service training, and enhanced research capacity. In addition to training in data collection and assistance in improving data systems, we will build analytical capacity in the Ministry of Agriculture by establishing a Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (SAKSS) node.

### ***Nutrition Collaborative Research and Support Program (CRSP)***

We will use the Nutrition CRSP to assist us with specific research questions that tell us about the impact of our nutrition-related FtF programs. We have already had preliminary discussions with a Nutrition CRSP team. The Nutrition CRSP is intended to investigate effective ways of translating research results into widespread development practice. The CRSP anticipates the development of a well-balanced research strategy that is both innovative and problem solving, responds to the food and nutrition scientific needs, and to the capacity development requirements of Uganda. USAID/Uganda, through the CRSP, will be better positioned to build more effective strategies and programs, while establishing a research capacity within the Mission and the country as a whole. As programs continue to be developed and procured in the coming months, the CRSP will assist in collecting the relevant local and international knowledge base needed to better implement, evaluate, and learn from our programs. Within individual programs, the CRSP will be an active participant in identifying and rigorously measure testable hypotheses related to food security.

### ***Community of Practice***

To increase our capacity and effectiveness in the Mission to do rigorous impact evaluation, we have formed a Community of Practice around our CLA agenda. Representatives from each office within the

Mission meet regularly to discuss industry standards and best practices in the area of evaluation, and to track progress of our ongoing monitoring and evaluation efforts. The Community of Practice members will liaise with USAID/Washington and will periodically invite development professionals from other donor, international, and local organizations as well as host country agencies to participate in meaningful discussion about how to improve evaluation efforts. A longer-term goal will be to disseminate lessons learned from our evaluations, both within USAID and throughout the development community.

### *Staffing for M&E*

In addition to the support of a full-time M&E specialist in our Program and Policy Development office, and a Strategic Information Specialist in the Health Office, we plan to hire a full-time M&E specialist for the Economic Growth Office, whose position description includes coordinating the M&E for all Feed the Future programs.

## 5. Financial Planning

USAID/Uganda's FtF plan was developed in close consultation with GoU's CAADP and Development Strategy and Investment Plan (DSIP). The table below shows the proposed investment areas and levels identified in the Mission FtF Strategy. For USAID resources, we use the latest FtF budget levels, including actuals for FY2010 (shown in the Current Budget column), FY2011 CBJ levels, and FY2012 CBJ controls as of February 2012. Levels for FY13 through FY15 are an average of the FY11 and FY12 planning levels. For detailed result information based on these budget levels, please refer to the Core Investment Area section of the document.


USAID/Uganda: Multi-Year Feed the Future Strategic Plan						
Summary Level Financial Plan (millions USD)						
	Current Budget	Five Year Planning Period				
		FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015
<b>Proposed Sources of Support</b>						
<b>I. GoU Funding (per MTEF Budget, DSIP)</b>	<b>164.9</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>253.5</b>
<b>II. USAID Resources</b>						
USAID/Uganda Resources (Note 1)	36.75	36.75	47	42	42	42
USAID Regional/Washington Resources						
<b>III. Other USG Agency Resources</b>						
USDA Food for Education	18.9	18.9	18.9	18.9	18.9	18.9
Food for Peace	25	25	25	25	25	25
Other USG Assistance (USADF, PEPFAR, Peace Corps, CJTF-HoA) (Note 3)		1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
<b>IV. Donor Resources</b>						
African Development Bank	53.0	65.0	64.0	50.0	38.0	12.0
Danida	28.9	28.9	28.9	28.9	0.0	0.0
European Union	17.9	21.0	21.0	21.0	17.6	4.1
FAO	1.9	25.3	24.9	24.5	24.3	0.0
GIZ	1.0	1.0	1.0			
IFAD	6.1	6.1				
JICA	5.4	9.9	9.9	2.0	2.0	2.0
World Bank	34.8	38.8	34.8	31.5	0.0	0.0
World Food Program	9.3	9.3	9.3	9.3	9.3	0.0
<b>Total Indicative Support Levels</b>	<b>403.8</b>	<b>468.5</b>	<b>485.5</b>	<b>473.8</b>	<b>419.8</b>	<b>358.7</b>
<b>Proposed Expenditure Levels</b>						
<b>USG Core Investment Areas</b>	36.75 (see Note 2)					
Value Chain Production & Market Linkages		4	4	4	4	4
Agro-Input Supplies		1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Producer organizations & Farm-level Aggregation		5	5	5	5	5
Market Information Systems		1	1	1	1	1
Partnership Investment Fund		4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Agricultural Research		4	4	4	4	4
Policy & Enabling Environment		2	2	2	2	2
Capacity Building		5	5	5	5	5
Community Connector (Note 4)		4	4	4	4	4
Nutrition Program		11	11	11	11	11
Subtotal USG Core Investment Areas		42	42	42	42	42
<b>GoU Public Expenditure Focus (per "Ideal Budget", DSIP)</b>						
Production & Productivity	152.8	172.2	185.9	191.1	201.0	211.1
Market Access & value Addition	54.1	59.3	65.5	71.8	79.1	83.0
Enabling Environment	9.0	10.0	10.8	11.9	13.0	13.7
Institutional Strengthening	4.9	3.3	7.5	5.7	4.3	4.5
<b>Other Donor Investment Focus</b>						
Production & Productivity	77.9	92.5	91.0	65.6	37.6	6.1 **
Market Access & value Addition	53.4	70.4	63.9	62.9	41.4	12.0 **
Enabling Environment	0.4	9.6	6.3	6.1	6.1	0.0 **
Institutional Strengthening	26.5	32.8	32.6	32.6	6.1	0.0 **
<b>Total Proposed Expense Levels</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>534.1</b>	<b>547.5</b>	<b>531.6</b>	<b>472.6</b>	<b>414.4</b>
<b>Net = Surplus/(Gap)</b>	<b>\$ 24.81</b>	<b>\$ (65.61)</b>	<b>\$ (62.06)</b>	<b>\$ (57.85)</b>	<b>\$ (52.75)</b>	<b>\$ (55.69)</b>
Note 1: Represents FY2010 actual FTF level ("Current Budget"), FY2011 CBJ level for FTF and FY2012 CBJ control for FTF as of February 2011						
Note 2: Current budget (FY 2010 FTF resources) will pay mortgage on existing LEAD program, seed fund donor trust with DANIDA and the GDA Incentive Fund.						
**note that 2015 figures have yet to be programmed by many donors						
Note 3: USADF provides small grants of \$1.2 million/year; Peace Corps Volunteers will contribute greatly, but specifics are TBD.						
Note 4: Community Connector will receive approx. \$2M in non-FTF resources for a total of \$6 million/year.						

## 6. Management

Implementing the FtF Strategy and the sharp increase in resources it represents will require more staff in an expanded organizational chart. It will also require new management structures to coordinate effectively across technical teams and across agencies.

Figure 7 shows the proposed expanded organizational chart for DO1 (under the new CDCS), which will implement the Agriculture component. New positions are highlighted in yellow. The Connecting Nutrition to Agriculture component will be co-managed by DO1 (Economic Growth) and DO3 (Health), with support from the Program Office as needed. The Primary COTR for that component's flagship activity, Community Connector, will be a member of DO1 and the Alternate COTR will be in DO3. The Nutrition component will be managed by DO3 and one new FSN nutrition professional will be hired.

**Figure 7: Proposed DO1 Organizational Chart**



However, given the cross-sectoral nature of this FtF strategy and the emphasis on CLA in our approach, more emphasis on coordination and communication across technical teams will be needed. Strong program integration is emphasized in Uganda's CDCS, which will require tight coordination in the field of district-level programs. To accomplish this, ideas under consideration include common indicators for districts to be used by all DOs operating there and innovative management structures such as additional



field offices (USAID/Uganda currently has a field office in Gulu for this purpose). The CLA approach is being implemented by a Community of Practice of Mission M&E specialists that will coordinate cross-sectoral CLA investigation and evaluation, develop common standards and best practices, and ensure high quality, coordinated M&E activities are continually informing management decisionmaking. The Community of Practice will be supported by an M&E contractor managed by the Program Office.

At the level of the USG, stronger coordination will also be needed. We propose to host every six months “Evidence Summits” convoking all USG agencies involved in the FtF strategy, including Peace Corps Volunteers, USDA officers from the regional office in Nairobi, and State Department, among others. The purpose of these summits will be to assess progress in the districts, share information, and inform the CLA decisionmaking process if our activities are leading to our goals and should be expanded or if programmatic or management changes are needed.

## **ANNEX 1: USAID Forward and Uganda’s Feed the Future Strategy**

USAID Forward includes seven reforms to revitalize and improve the way that USAID does its business. Four of these reforms—Procurement Reform, Strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation, Innovation, and Science and Technology—are focused on the way field Missions implement programs. Uganda’s FtF strategy implements the ideas in these four categories as follows:

### **Procurement Reform**

In the USAID Uganda Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) we outlined the USAID Uganda’s Procurement Improvement Plan , which consists of implementing and complementing the objectives of USAID’s Agency-wide Implementation and Procurement Reform (IPR) agenda. USAID Uganda’s Procurement Improvement Plan includes current achievements with respect to Agency goals and our mission-level goals and targets for the future. Many of the innovations and improvements articulated in that plan apply directly to the USAID Uganda Feed the Future Strategy.

One of the central themes of the USAID Uganda Procurement Improvement Plan is to support our CDCS tenet of Collaboration, Learning and Adapting (CLA) through Evolutionary Acquisition. CLA is a great idea—enlisting USAID staff, partners and other stakeholders in collaborating and learning to continuously evaluate and adapt their programs in order to improve progress toward the outcome—but it puts special demands on procurement that need to be addressed for CLA to work.

In the past we have used flexible approaches in designing instruments – Cost Plus Fixed Fee contracts and Cooperative Agreements with wide scopes, malleable budgets and reimbursable cost structures. Even in our contracts, results are often “illustrative” at time of award. This is because we can’t design a five-year activity with sufficient fidelity to take into account the myriad of factors that affect our development programs over the course of time. So over the years our instruments have become more and more flexible to avoid entangling modifications and bureaucratic justification that derail performance. “Flexible” is like a wide open plane, we can travel anywhere on that plane that we may need to go.

We are looking at making our instruments more agile – targeted for very specific outcomes, but with the ability to modify and redirect continuously based on the feedback we receive from the CLA process. “Agile” is like a vector – an arrow with specific direction and magnitude. But the magnitude is short and we deliberately plan to set a new vector to change direction during the course of performance. This concept is known as Evolutionary Acquisition, a performance-based construct, and is all about adapting procurement to the strategic feedback CLA is designed to provide. Evolutionary Acquisition allows the Mission to adapt the instrument to changes in the program at deliberate milestones. In traditional acquisition planning, the planning phase ends at award. In Evolutionary Acquisition, acquisition planning continues throughout performance and ends at closeout, giving us more precision, specific adaptability, and better focus throughout the entire program life. We’ll be embedding substantial portions of CLA in most of our new FtF procurements, and will be using Evolutionary Acquisition methodology for several strategic programs, including the Community Connector project, where rigorous CLA is required.

Our USAID Uganda Procurement Improvement Plan includes several other targets that will be applied directly to the FtF procurements. This Plan is structured parallel to the Agency’s Procurement Improvement Objectives: there are five Agency objectives, with a total of nine targets. The Uganda plan establishes a Procurement Improvement Initiative to meet each target, and adds three additional initiatives with associated targets. All twelve initiatives support FtF at least indirectly, but five of the initiatives will directly affect FtF procurements and we intend to accomplish in the next two fiscal years: (1) 20% of FtF funding is being considered for non-project assistance and direct funding to Government organizations, which will contribute to the target of 17% of all mission funding being obligated through partner country systems; (2) the target for FtF funding to local NGOs is 17% , greatly exceeding the Agency goal of 4%; (3) at least one major award will be a type of Fixed Price contract – none will be Cost Plus Fixed Fee; (4) at least one major award will use Evolutionary Contracting methodology, and (5) at least one action will be a Donor-to-Donor instrument. Procurement Improvement will be a core component of the USAID Uganda FtF program.

### **Strengthening Monitoring and Evaluation**

The Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA) approach that will be used in implementing the FtF Strategy creates a “living strategy” by constantly examining the success of interventions and the accuracy of our development hypotheses, and then collaborating with other actors and stakeholders to adapt programming towards what works and away from what doesn’t. The CLA approach will be fully integrated into Mission’s programming, including FtF programs. While CLA is broader than just M&E, it will rely on strengthened M&E to function. Specifically, we will strengthen M&E in the following areas:

***Improve data collection to inform decision making:*** USAID/Uganda recognizes that there are gaps in data collection and management in Uganda that impede FtF program planning, monitoring, and evaluation. Outdated sources and systems can make strategic planning within Ministries and the Mission difficult. Our contribution to the Uganda Bureau of Statistics to carry out the 2011 Demographic and Health Survey using host country systems, as well as work to increase the capacity of Ministries to use and interpret data will be a sustainable approach to address these gaps.

***Knowledge to improve program impact:*** USAID/Uganda is building an M&E team in the Program Office and Technical teams, including the teams implementing FtF activities. These individuals will be linked by a “community of practice” in order to ensure consistency and coordination. This community will be the focal point for implementing the CLA methodology. They will be supported by the Mission’s M&E contractor UMEMS (Uganda Monitoring and Evaluation Managements Services) managed by the Program Office. This community will use multiple USG-supported data sets and project collected data to establish clear baselines; we will then employ rigorous methodologies to test the FtF hypotheses and inform projects as they evolve. As activity design proceeds, the cross-sectoral FtF team is incorporating procurement methods to allow instruments to adapt to what is learned.

***Openness to fulfill obligations to stakeholders, in-country, with the U.S. and globally:*** Our FtF Strategy is a result of extensive stakeholder and host country consultations. Through these consultations, the Mission has identified its comparative advantages in the area of food security. The result is a set of concepts, analysis and, ultimately, programs that align more closely with government

priorities, avoid duplication of donors' efforts and present a clear transparent vision for what we think we can accomplish. This transparent modus operandi is essential to implement CLA successfully, as it requires a heightened sense of transparency and frankness in order to learn together what works and what does not and adapt together to this knowledge.

## **Innovation**

Innovative approaches will be used across the FtF portfolio:

***Innovation in M&E:*** The flagship program under the “Connecting Nutrition to Agriculture” component is the Community Connector (CC) program. Such an integrated approach uses innovative methods to reducing undernutrition and improving livelihoods through community-level interventions. As prescribed by USAID’s new Evaluation Policy, “proof of concept” activities must undergo an impact evaluation.<sup>34</sup> We have held discussions with the MIT Poverty Action Lab consortium regarding use Randomized Control Trial (RCT) experiments in order to conduct rigorous impact evaluation for select pilot components and geographic areas of CC.. Following the CLA approach, we will use the results of these impact evaluations to test the hypotheses of our FtF strategy and make mid-stream adjustments to program components if necessary, or scale up components that are working well. We will also partner with other donors to disseminate and promote lessons learned. CC is fertile ground for testing the core hypothesis of USAID’s FtF Initiative. The Mission will choose the implementing partner for CC based on its willingness to employ innovation that drives change within a community, but also contributes to dispelling myths about the quick fixes that do not yield long-term impact. Both the implementation and the management will incorporate innovative concepts in M&E.

***Health Product:*** In partnership with PEPFAR, FtF will build on this success and expand Ready-to-Use Therapeutic Food (RUTF) for national reach, improve the capacity of facilities to administer and monitor RUTF, and further strengthen community assessment of undernutrition. FtF will also work with the local producer of RUTF through a GDA to increase production of affordable, locally-made complementary foods to prevent undernutrition in the first place.

***Orange-fleshed-Sweet-Potato:*** USAID will scale up and disseminate research of provitamin A-rich orange-fleshed sweet potatoes and beans with iron and zinc. Activities are designed to encourage farmers to plant the crops by making seeds available to farmers, strengthening extension, and supporting market-linkages. The project targets four districts in Northern Uganda and four in the Southwest that have high incidences of undernutrition and have conducive climatic and soil factors suited to the germplasm. The activities will be closely coordinated with other USG supported nutrition and agriculture activities (like the Community Connector) to ensure maximum impact. USAID’s partner, HarvestPlus, will introduce these crops to at least 75,000 households in Uganda over a five year period - with anticipated spillover of benefits from each target household to two non-targeted households, a minimum of 225,000 farm households will be reached by the project.

***Uganda Infrastructure Fund—An Innovative GDA:*** USAID and the GoU have co-funded a study to determine the feasibility of establishing an \$1 billion Infrastructure Equity Fund. The Fund would issue infrastructure bonds through the Uganda Securities Exchange to support key infrastructure projects

related to power, transport and telecommunications. There is a direct linkage to this initiative and agriculture-led economic growth and better access for Ugandans to health and education services. The Infrastructure fund will support the rural market access, investment, information and transport needs that are linked to the Feed the Future Strategy.

***World Food Programme – Purchase for Progress (P4P):*** WFP is using its unique buying power in Uganda to connect small-scale maize farmers to the larger market for quality maize. As part of a partnership with USAID, WFP has privatized their warehousing and storage operations, started development of nine privately-owned warehouses, and created mechanisms to allow farmer organizations to sell directly to WFP (and other buyers) through the Uganda Commodity Exchange (UCE). USAID is drawing on WFP’s comparative advantage in this area and building our value-chain work in maize and beans around this initiative. By supporting other components of the value chain that link to the warehouses (working with farmer organizations, smaller scale aggregation, quality inputs, market information, and trade-related issues) FtF will leverage the efforts of P4P for sustainable and systemic impact.

***Communication Technology:*** FtF will draw on recent technological gains through local partners in cell phone technology and applications. One concept being explored is the use of rural-based individuals who are trained and given access to GPS/cell phone technology that allows for two-way exchange of information. For example, a local cell phone company has developed applications for gathering statistical data from a group of “community knowledge workers” (CKWs). The phones also have menus that allow individuals to access technical support for health and agriculture issues. By pairing this technology with key private sector partners, FtF plans to create sustainable platforms for market information, data gathering, contracting and banking, and technical assistance in health and agriculture.

### **Science and Technology**

Agriculture and nutrition are full of opportunities to leverage the latest science and technology to improve interventions. In the agriculture sector, FtF funds will be used to support the Ugandan National Agriculture Research System by supporting the National Agriculture Research Organization (NARO) and its partners to develop a range of technologies in key staple food commodities. The proposed agricultural research program will include typical breeding activities (conventional breeding and genetic engineering research) and socio-economic marketing of existing or newly developed technologies. Conventional breeding activities will focus mainly on FtF focus crops (maize, beans, and coffee) and aim at incorporating traits for increased environment and climate change (abiotic) stress tolerance and increased disease and insect resistance. Specifically, we will support NARO’s variety research to increased availability of improved germplasm.

Biotechnology research activities will focus on critical food security staple crops such as cassava and banana that are not the focus crops of the FtF program. Support will be directed at developing increased resistance to a range of fungal and viral diseases in cassava and banana that, if left unchecked, could result in total crop failures. Particularly, banana biotechnology research scope will be expanded to include the Black Sigatoka disease; Banana Bacterial Wilt (BBW) and Fusarium Wilt diseases; and the

nematode pest. The cassava biotechnology research will focus mainly on developing transgenic plants with dual resistance the Cassava Mosaic Virus (CMV) and Cassava Brown Streak Virus (CBSV) diseases.



In the agriculture sector, FtF funds will be used to build on previous work supported by USAID that has resulted in cooking oil fortification with vitamin A that now covers more than 85% of the market in Uganda. We will now turn to the fortification of maize and wheat flour with vitamin A, iron, zinc, folic acid and vitamin B12. New food fortification vehicles will be added that include sugar fortification with vitamin A.

Science and technology will be used across the portfolio through the use of Geographic Information Systems to inform program decisionmaking. USAID/Uganda, through the support of the CIO's Office has entered into a PASA agreement with experts at the US Geological Survey to help answer research questions in the design of FtF Programs. USAID/Uganda employs a FSN GIS Specialist who will learn from this work and provide ongoing support to the FtF team in program design and targeting and integrating monitoring and evaluation data to improve programs.

# ANNEX 2: Map of Focus Nutrition Districts



## NUTRITION GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS AREAS- FEBRUARY 2011



Legend		Nutrition Focus Areas	
	International Border		NUMAT (15 in Nos)
	District Border		STRIDES (19 in Nos.)
	Water Bodies		STAR-SW (13 in Nos)
			None (65 in Nos.)

Data Sources:  
 Uganda Admin Boundaries - UBOS 2006/2010  
 Projects Information - USAID/Uganda - 2011

Map Disclaimer:  
 The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United States Government.

**Draft**


Map Prepare Date: February, 2011 (USAID/Uganda)  
 File: UG-08-34\_A3\_FF\_Nutrition Geographic Focus\_Feb2011.mxd

# ANNEX 3: Map of Focus Community Connector Districts



UGANDA

COMMUNITY CONNECTOR DISTRICT COVERAGE- MARCH 2011



**Legend**

- National Border
- District Border
- Water Bodies
- Community Connector

Data Sources:  
 Uganda Admin Boundaries - UBOS 2006/2010  
 Projects Information - USAID/Uganda- 2010

Map Disclaimer:  
 The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United States Government.

**Draft**


Map Prepare Date: March 10, 2011 (USAID/Uganda)  
 File: UG-01\_A3\_Community Connector District Coverage\_Mar2011.mxd



# ANNEX 4: Map of Focus Agriculture Value-Chain Districts



## AGRICULTURE VALUECHAINS BY DISTRICT- MARCH 2011



**Legend**

	International Border		Maize/Beans
	District Border		Coffee
	Water Bodies		Maize/Beans and Coffee

**Data Sources:**  
 Uganda Admin Boundaries - UBOS 2006/2010  
 Projects Information - USAID/Uganda - 2011

**Map Disclaimer:**  
 The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United States Government.

**Note:**  
 \* Community Connector will be jointly funded and managed by DOI + D03

Map Prepared Date: 07 March, 2011 (USAID/Uganda)  
 File: US-CDCS\_01\_A3\_Agric ValueChains District\_07Mar2011.mxd

## ANNEX 5: Strategy Review Questions

### Comments from Washington Review:

*“The final strategy should provide more details on how results will be achieved. In particular, the strategy should specify what change agents will be the focus of the strategy. What specific package of interventions will catalyze the transformation the strategy aims to achieve? What is the analysis that is leading the mission to make these choices?”*

### Response:

The strategy is comprised of three components:

- **Nutrition:** This component will reach 1 million children in 47 districts in the Southwest and North of Uganda.
- **Agriculture :** This component will reach 400,000 farmers (approximately 2.4 million people including household members) in 62 districts in the Southwest and Northern/Central Uganda. The focus is on three core value chains – maize, beans, and coffee.
- **Connecting Nutrition to Agriculture :** This component will reach between 60,000 and 80,000 vulnerable households (approximately 400,000 people) in approximately 25 districts in the Southwest and North of Uganda.

The major categories of interventions are as follows:

- **Agriculture Research** - Change agents: The Uganda National Research Organization through CGIAR partners and mechanisms.
- **Policy and enabling environment** - Change agents: GoU, local and international partners.
- **Partnership Investment Fund** - Change agents: Key private sector actors who have capacity for large-scale impact (for example major coffee traders, major manufacturers, etc...)
- **Capacity Building** - Change agents: Public sector focus, Universities, local and international partners.
- **Value chain production and market linkages** - Change agents: Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) through a local Ugandan entity working with farmer organizations.
- **Agro Input Supplies** - Change agent: private sector and national agro-input dealers association.
- **Producer Organization and Farm-level aggregation** - Change agents: local and international organizations working with local farmer organizations.
- **Market Information Systems** - Change agents: local private sector, ICT companies and foundations.
- **Community Connector** - Change agents: local and international partners working with local and district government.
- **Nutrition Programs** - Change agents: Local and district Government, private sector, local and international partners.

Details on the analysis behind the choices for the Nutrition, Agriculture (including selection of value chains), and Connecting Agriculture to Nutrition components is primarily explained in the Core Investment Areas section of the document.

***“The strategy should provide clarity on which actor is participating in the implementation of each activity. For example, what role will USAID, NGOs, contractors, private sector and the Ugandan Government play in the construction, maintenance and operation of warehouses? “***

### **Response:**

Our proposed FtF activities have a targeted role for each actor. Throughout our partnership with the GoU in developing the priorities outlined in the GoU Development Strategy and Investment Plan, we agreed upon the central GoU role, and divided labor between USAID and other Development Partners based on our comparative advantages to support both the GoU and private sector.

An example is the program for maize aggregation and trade. WFP’s Purchase for Progress program is supporting a private-sector led initiative to scale up the quality and capacity of large warehouses (2,000 MT and above) in the country by providing technical assistance, matched grants and some loans to procure cleaning and drying equipment. These warehouses are privately owned. Once owners have upgraded their warehouses, the Uganda Commodity Exchange (a public/private entity) will provide additional training and licensing of the warehouses, as well as link them to Uganda’s Warehouse Receipts System (WRS). The WRS are linked to private sector banks for financing. The UCE will also facilitate trading through the UCE trading floor.

USAID’s regional programs (Market Linkage Initiative and COMPETE) are supporting the development of smaller scale aggregation centers with farmer organizations. USAID’s partnership with DANIDA and our proposed Farm Level Aggregation Program will work with farmer organizations to strengthen their capacity to link into the warehouses. Local government can choose (through USAID’s NUDEIL Infrastructure program) to scale up infrastructure (farm to market roads) around warehouses. By working closely with local and national government priorities in a coordinated effort with private sector, farmer groups and development partners, each actor is working where they have a comparative advantage on a common goal to bring about a systemic change that will result in increased trade of high quality maize, and provide an direct market linkage to small scale farmers that has not existed previously.


We could give a similar example with coffee. The coffee sector is better organized and led by a consortium of private sector actors – primarily ten major traders that account for 80 percent of Uganda’s coffee exports. An illustrative intervention would be to pull together these major traders with a Global Development Alliance matching grant through our Partnership Investment Fund to work through NARO and the GoU to replace 200 million diseased coffee bushes with disease resistant seedlings. This private sector partnership, in tandem with DANIDA partnership and our cooperative development programs would work to train and support farmers and farmer organizations in good agronomic practices which includes pruning, mulching and use of fertilizers. These efforts would have a

sector-wide impact by doubling per hectare yields of Uganda’s coffee growers in the short-term, and over the longer term (more than three years), dramatically increase production potential to meet projected international market demand.

*“The geographic area of focus for the strategy should be clearly stated in the final strategy, accompanied by an explanation of why this area has the greatest potential for impact. The strategy should state the number of people, level of malnutrition and poverty, and forecasted impact.”*


**Response:**

Uganda’s FtF strategy proposes to work in 84 districts within the southwest and northern Uganda. The targeted districts were selected based on key factors related to poverty, malnutrition, population density, the prevalence of strategic crops and synergy with other initiatives. The maps below lay out the levels of malnutrition and poverty:



**Impact:**

- Up to 20% reduction in child stunting
- Up to 25% reduction in child underweight
- Up to 25% reduction in maternal anemia
- Up to 30% reduction in child anemia
- Reduction of acute malnutrition rate from 6% to 3%
- 50% average increase in incomes in target populations
- 100% increase in value and volume of export (maize and coffee)
- Increase in exportable maize from 250,000MT to 600,000MT
- 30% reduction in undernutrition among women and children
- 20% increase in incomes among target households
- Improved household equity in decision making and access to resources
- Improved community capacity to address challenges



*“The impact targets outlined in the strategic review should be validated before the final strategy is submitted. Impacts should relate to the recently developed standard FtF indicators.”*

**Response:**

The targets contained in this strategy are based on our best estimates from previous and current programming. The Mission will validate these targets after the completion of the next Demographic and Health Survey (June 2011). The Government of Uganda is currently conducting its first Agriculture Survey in 40 years. The survey will be completed in December 2011. Both of these surveys will contribute the baseline data required to validate FtF targets. The annual National Household Survey does have poverty data collected at the regional level. We want to note that Uganda has doubled (by subdivision) the number of its districts over the last eight years (from 56 districts in 2002 to 112 districts as of February 2011). This has created a gap in district-level data that will be addressed through the DHS, Agriculture Survey and planned baseline surveys.

The Mission is using FtF indicators – as reflected in the Mission’s recent PPR. The Mission has provided input on these indicators through a 2011 IEHA evaluation and through exchanges with Bureau of Food Security. The following impact targets (\*) relate to the FtF indicators:

**Nutrition:**

- Up to 20% reduction in child stunting\*
- Up to 25% reduction in child underweight\*
- Up to 25% reduction in maternal anemia\*
- Up to 30% reduction in child anemia

**Agriculture:**

- 50% average increase in incomes in targeted populations\*
- 100% increase in value and volume of export (maize and coffee)\*
- Increase in exportable maize from 250,000MT to 600,000MT\*

**Linking Nutrition to Agriculture:**

- 30% reduction in undernutrition among women and children\*
- 20% increase in incomes among target households\*
- Improved household equity in decision making and access to resources
- Improved community capacity to address challenges

## ANNEX 6: Uganda's Feed the Future Strategy and FtF Principles

This annex demonstrates how Uganda's FtF Strategy will implement the tenets and principles of the Feed the Future initiative.

**FtF Principle: Invest in country owned plans that support results-based programs and partnerships so that assistance is tailored to the needs of individual countries through consultative processes and plans that are developed and led by country governments.**

The GoU has shown significant initiative and capacity for guiding their future development in recent years. In just two years, GoU has drafted and signed the National Development Plan (NDP), Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan (DSIP), Health Strategic Sector Investment Plan (HSSIP), and Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP). USAID/Uganda used the DSIP as a guide in developing the FtF Strategy, focusing on three of the top four value chains (maize, beans, and coffee) identified by the GoU. The GoU also recognizes and is focused on the link between agriculture and nutrition, recently forming a Food and Nutrition Council and adopting a Nutrition Action Plan. This new focus on integration of agriculture and nutrition has been embraced in the FtF Strategy and will be implemented through the Community Connector Program, and across all FtF activities.

**FtF Principle: Strengthen strategic coordination through the participation of key stakeholders to mobilize and align the resources of the diverse partners and stakeholders – including the private sector and civil society – that are needed to achieve our common objectives.**

USAID/Uganda has developed close relationships with DoS, USDA & USAID Regional Offices, Peace Corps, DoD, CDC, and African Development Fund, with the goal of coordinating USG assistance and using the comparative advantage of each agency. We are taking advantage of policy discussions conducted by DoS, research being carried out by USDA, and community level integration through Peace Corps. The potential for integration of Peace Corps into all FtF programs will be added to the program design checklist, in the hopes of leveraging this powerful community-based network. USAID/Uganda also plans to host a bi-yearly "Evidence Summit" of all USG actors in Uganda to build relationships, coordinate efforts, and share lessons learned.

Involvement of the private sector is the most important aspect of turning short term program results into long term sustainability. This will be achieved through a number of initiatives, including support to a locally-based private equity infrastructure fund. This trust, established by local investors, is an important step in creating sustainable infrastructure around the country. Our partnership with World Food Program and their Purchase for Progress program will result in nine new commodity warehouses, establishing drying and bulking infrastructure in areas of the country where production potential is

relatively high, but post-harvest losses are often devastating. These warehouses, certified by UCE, will give a foothold to the fledgling agricultural commodity export industry, increasing farmer income based on improved quality, linking farmers with markets, and producing enough consistent quality maize to meet a growing export market.

**FtF Principle: Ensure a comprehensive approach that accelerates inclusive agricultural-led growth and improves nutrition, while also bridging humanitarian relief and sustainable development efforts**

USAID/Uganda's Community Connector, seeks to address both agriculture and nutrition through an integrated approach at the community level. Based on empirical research on the efficacy of similar integrated programs, the Community Connector seeks to serve communities that suffer from low incomes and poor nutrition, but are not yet equipped to make the transition to commercially viable agriculture. Building upon agriculture-nutrition linkages within the MoH and MAAIF, as well as within the FtF team at USAID, this program will address the problems poverty and nutrition in a comprehensive manner. Food for Peace programs are a strategic partner that will support FtF and are squarely focused on vulnerable populations (see further description on page 25).

**FtF Principle: Leveraging the benefits of multilateral institutions so that priorities and approaches are aligned, investments are coordinated, and financial and technical assistance gaps are filled**

USAID/Uganda has played an important role in the Agriculture Sector Donor Working Group based in Kampala. Through bi-monthly meetings among stakeholders, the group has been able to coordinate planning, activities, and present a unified voice to the GoU on key issues. Working closely with Danida, the EU, World Bank, WFP, and others, the Mission has been able to take advantage of the strengths of each partner and ensure that program overlap is minimized. In line with USAID Forward, we have also engaged other donors in pooling and leveraging resources, which we anticipate will result in an innovative Donor to Donor transfer. With Danida covering extension activities, the EU working in post-conflict livelihoods and agricultural research, the World Bank strengthening local institutions, and WFP supporting markets and vulnerable populations, USAID is poised to make a significant impact at both the household and national level.

**FtF Principle: Deliver on sustained and accountable commitments phasing-in investments responsibly to ensure returns, using benchmarks and targets to measure progress toward shared goals, and holding ourselves and other stakeholders publicly accountable for achieving results**

Through a worldwide FtF M&E system using common indicators, strengthening GoU capacity for research, policy, & service delivery, and increasing donor coordination and accountability, USAID/Uganda seeks to increase transparency, communication, and accountability for all parties. The GoU, USAID, the Donor Community, and other stakeholders have a demonstrated commitment to

agricultural development and improved nutrition, and will continue to rely on one another to uphold commitments over the next five years and beyond.



## END NOTES:

---

<sup>1</sup> Uganda Demographic and Health Survey - 2006

<sup>2</sup> This target is based on earlier projects (albeit with a much smaller target population) that showed a 300% increase in target population incomes.

<sup>3</sup> *ibid*

<sup>4</sup> *ibid*

<sup>5</sup> *ibid*

<sup>6</sup> *ibid*

<sup>7</sup> S. O. Rutstein, ORC Macro, "Effects of preceding birth intervals on neonatal, infant and under-five years mortality and nutritional status in developing countries: evidence from the demographic and health surveys", *International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics* (2005) 89, S7 — S24

<sup>8</sup> Minimum acceptable diet is a composite indicator that includes breastfeeding practices, dietary diversity and frequency of feeding for children 6-23 months of age.

<sup>9</sup> In the preceding two weeks

<sup>10</sup> Uganda Demographic and Health Survey - 2006

<sup>11</sup> Advocacy Brief 2: Agriculture and Nutrition. FANTA-2, 2010.

<sup>12</sup> United States Government, *KAMPALA 2396, SUBJECT: UGANDA: SCENESETTER FOR CODEL LUGAR*, 2010. Population statistics from UN Population Division, "World Population Prospects." Accessed December 14, 2010, <http://esa.un.org/unpp/>.

<sup>13</sup> USAID/Health Policy Initiatives Project, *Uganda Population Factors & National Development*, accessed December 6, 2010, [http://www.healthpolicyinitiative.com/Publications/Documents/1068\\_1\\_Uganda\\_4\\_page\\_March\\_1\\_2010\\_FINAL\\_acc.pdf](http://www.healthpolicyinitiative.com/Publications/Documents/1068_1_Uganda_4_page_March_1_2010_FINAL_acc.pdf).

<sup>14</sup> Uganda Bureau of Statistics - 2008

<sup>15</sup> *Agriculture for Food and Income Security: Ag Development Strategy and Investment Plan: 2010/11 – 2014/15*, Republic of Uganda Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries.

<sup>16</sup> Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2008

<sup>17</sup> UBOS, 2007

<sup>18</sup> AgCLIR: Uganda – Commercial, Legal and Intuitional Reform in Uganda's Agriculture Sector - September 2010

<sup>19</sup> LTS, International, 2008: Climate Change in Uganda; Understanding Implications and Appraising the Response. A scoping Mission for DFID

<sup>20</sup> Dr. African Kangire – Uganda Research Center Kituza

<sup>21</sup> *Agriculture for Food and Income Security : Ag Development Strategy and Investment Plan: 2010/11 – 2014/15*, Republic of Uganda Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries

<sup>22</sup> Exclusive breastfeeding for six months; Adequate complementary feeding starting at about six months with continued breastfeeding for two years; Appropriate nutritional care of sick and severely malnourished children; Adequate intake of vitamin A for women and children; Adequate intake of iron for women and children; Adequate intake of iodine by all members of the household.

<sup>23</sup> East Africa has established East Africa Grade 1 and Grade 2 with criteria for humidity levels (13.5 percent) foreign matter, broken grains, and aflatoxin. This is also the standard used by the World Food Programme for their procurement.

<sup>24</sup> The Uganda Maize Sub-sector – Addressing the problem of maize price volatility – June 2006

---

<sup>25</sup> AgCLIR: Uganda – Commercial, Legal, and Institutional Reform in Uganda’s Agriculture Sector - September 2010.

<sup>26</sup> The Uganda Maize Sub-sector – Addressing the problem of maize price volatility – June 2006

<sup>27</sup> AgCLIR: Uganda – Commercial, Legal, and Institutional Reform in Uganda’s Agriculture Sector - September 2010.

<sup>28</sup> *Agriculture for Food and Income Security: Ag Development Strategy and Investment Plan: 2010/11 – 2014/15*, Republic of Uganda Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries.

<sup>29</sup> Alderman, H. Stimulating Economic Growth through Improved Nutrition. Disease Control Priorities Project, 2007

<sup>30</sup> See the Community Connector description page 30

<sup>31</sup> USAID, Gender-Informed Nutrition and Agriculture (GINA) Project Evaluation, 2008

<sup>32</sup> 2,000 metric ton and above warehouses with drying, cleaning and sorting capability located in key maize-growing regions

<sup>33</sup> Targeted commodities were selected based on various studies, including: a) USAID/Livelihoods and Enterprises Agricultural Development (LEAD) Project, *LEAD Value Chain Assessments, 2009-2010*; b) USAID/LEAD Project, *Uganda Maize Situation Analysis, 2009*; c) Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System care of International Food Policy Research Institute, *Agricultural Growth and Investment Options for Poverty Reduction in Uganda, 2008*; and d) GOU’s Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industries and Fisheries, *Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan: 2010/11 – 2014/15, 2010*.

<sup>34</sup> As defined in the USAID’s Evaluation Policy: Impact evaluations measure the change in a development outcome that is attributable to a defined intervention; impact evaluations are based on models of cause and effect and require a credible and rigorously defined counterfactual to control for factors other than the intervention that might account for the observed change. Impact evaluations in which comparisons are made between beneficiaries that are randomly assigned to either a treatment or a control group provide the strongest evidence of a relationship between the intervention under study and the outcome measured.