

**Republic of Uganda
Ministry of Agriculture,
Animal Industry and Fisheries**

Terminal Evaluation Report

of

Northern Uganda Farmers' Livelihood Improvement Project (NUFLIP)

October 2020

**JAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY
(JICA)**

ED
JR
20-056

Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.3 Terminal Evaluation Team.....	2
1.4 Outline of the Project	2
1.2 Objectives of the Terminal Evaluation	2
1.5 Schedule of the Terminal Evaluation	3
1.6 Methodology of the Terminal Evaluation.....	4
2. Achievement of the Project	5
2.1 Inputs.....	5
2.1.1 Inputs by the Ugandan side	5
2.1.2 Inputs by the Japanese side	5
2.2 Outputs.....	6
2.3 Project Purpose	16
2.4 Overall Goal (Prospect).....	20
3. Implementation Process of the Project	21
4. Results of Evaluation with Five Evaluation Criteria	24
4.1 Relevance: High.....	24
4.2 Effectiveness: Moderately High.....	26
4.3 Efficiency: High.....	27
4.4 Impact (Prospect): Many qualitative and positive impacts have emerged.	29
4.5 Sustainability (Prospect): Medium to moderately High	31
5. Conclusion	34
6. Recommendations	35
5.1 Recommendations to be implemented during the Project period	35
6.2. Recommendations to be implemented after the Project period	36
7. Lessons Learnt from the Project	37

Annexes

ANNEX 1	Project Design Matrix Version 2.0
ANNEX 2	Evaluation Grid
ANNEX 3	List of the Counterparts
ANNEX 4	List of the Japanese Experts
ANNEX 5	Costs borne by the Ugandan Side
ANNEX 6	Costs borne by the Japanese Side
ANNEX 7	List of the Equipment provided by the Japanese side
ANNEX 8	List of the Participants of Training in Japan and Workshops/Seminars in South Africa

Abbreviations

AEG	Agricultural Extension Grant
AO	Agricultural Officer
ASSP	Agriculture Sector Strategic Plan
CAO	Chief Administrative Officer
C/P	counterpart
COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease 2019
DAO	District Agricultural Officer
DDEG	Discretionary Development Equalization Grant
DPO	District Production Officer
DPs	Development Partners
FAPs	Formerly Abducted Persons
GOJ	Government of Japan
GOU	Government of Uganda
IDPs	Internally Displaced Persons
JCC	Joint Coordinating Committee
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
JPY	Japanese Yen
MAAIF	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MM	Minutes of the Meeting
NDP	National Development Plan
NUFLIP	Northern Uganda Farmers' Livelihood Improvement Project
OJT	On the Job Training
QOL	Quality of Life
PDM	Project Design Matrix
PO	Plan of Operation
PRDP	Peace, Recovery and Development Plan
PRELNOR	Project for Restoration of Livelihoods in the Northern Region
PS	Permanent Secretary
PWDs	Person with Disabilities
R/D	Record of Discussions
REAP	Reconstruction Assistance Programme in Northern Uganda
S/C	Sub-County
SHEP	Smallholder Horticulture Empowerment and Promotion
TC	Technical Committee
TOT	Training of Trainers
UGX	Uganda Shilling
USD	United States Dollar

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

In the Northern Region of Uganda, internal conflicts between the Government army and the anti-Government rebels occurred for about 20 years and approximately 2 million people became Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs). With the cease-fire agreement made between the Government and the rebel group in August 2006, the security conditions in the Northern Region have improved. Although the Government of Uganda (GOU) and Development Partners (DPs) have implemented projects for reconstruction after the cease-fire agreement, the poverty rate of the Northern Region remains high at over 40% and disparities between the Northern and other regions persist. Therefore, measures to reduce poverty are necessary with regard to, among others: improvement of economic and social infrastructure; strengthening the administrative capacity of local government; and securing self-sustaining means of livelihood for resettled IDPs

Since 2009, the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) has implemented the Reconstruction Assistance Program (REAP, 2009–2015), and REAP 2 (2016–2021) to support the reconstruction of the Acholi Sub-region. In order to assist repatriation and resettlement of IDPs in the Sub-region, the REAP focused on the following three components: 1) The rehabilitation and reconstruction of economic and social infrastructure which included roads, water supply facilities, schools, health centres, etc.; 2) Empowerment of Local Government administration capability and capacity development of its officials; and 3) Improvement of people's income. To date, the Program has achieved some notable outcomes for components 1) and 2), but some activities remain for component 3). These three areas are priorities for the GOU and are the main themes in the third phase of the Peace, Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP) III which has been implemented by the Government since July 2015.

Uganda is endowed with fertile land and plentiful rainfall (annual range is 750 to 2,000 mm). In the Northern Region suitable areas for agriculture exist. Key road networks connecting to South Sudan and the Democratic Republic of Congo, gives this region an advantageous position for exporting agricultural products and to function as a regional logistical hub. However, experience and technical knowledge base on agriculture has been reduced due to the armed conflict and agricultural productivity is low. Consequently, agricultural demands are not met as the potential of the region are not well utilised. About 90% of the labour force in the Northern Region is engaged in agriculture. Smallholder farmers are more than 70% of the labour force engaged in agriculture, so assistance to improve their livelihoods is important from the point of view of poverty reduction and minimising disparities between the Northern Region and other region. Considering the above situation, the GOU made a request to the Government of Japan (GOJ) to provide the technical assistance for the improvement of livelihoods of smallholder farmers in the Acholi Sub-region through using the Smallholder Horticulture Empowerment and Promotion (SHEP) approach that the Japanese Government has implemented in other countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. The Northern Uganda Farmers' Livelihood Improvement Project (NUFLIP, hereinafter referred to as "the Project") has been implemented with the aim of improving market-oriented agricultural production and the quality of life (QOL) of the target beneficiaries since November 2015 for five years, following the Detailed Planning Survey conducted in April 2015, and the signature of Record of Discussions (R/D) on August 14, 2015.

Due to global spread of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), extension of the period of the Project for nine months was agreed upon in order to complete some of the activities that have been suspended. As the Project will be terminated in August 2021, the Terminal Evaluation Survey was conducted from October 5 to 30, 2020. It is noted here that due to the extraordinary circumstances caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, it was also agreed that the Survey be implemented by the JICA Evaluation Team, using tele-conference facilities, and in close consultations with the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) during the mission period.

1.3 Terminal Evaluation Team

The Terminal Evaluation Team (hereinafter referred as “the Team”) consists of the following members:

Name	Title	Affiliation
Mr. Hiroshi Hiraoka	Leader	Senior Advisor (Agriculture and Rural Development), JICA
Ms. Azusa Tsuruta	Evaluation Planning	Agricultural and Rural Development Group 2, Economic Development Department, JICA
Ms. Toshiko Shimada	Evaluation Analysis	Senior Consultant, IC Net Limited

1.4 Outline of the Project

The Project was implemented based on the tentative Project Design Matrix (PDM) that was agreed in the R/D on August 14, 2015. Once the Project commenced, the PDM Version 1 was as agreed upon by the 3rd Joint Coordinating Committee (JCC) held on April 17, 2017. This PDM was revised in August 2020 in accordance with the extension of the duration of the Project. The PDM Version 2 is described below.

(1) Overall Goal

Livelihood improvement approach is adopted in Acholi Sub-region.

(2) Project Purpose

Livelihoods of target farmer groups are improved through establishment of livelihood improvement approach.

(3) Output

Output 1	Vegetable production knowledge and skills of agricultural officers are improved through verifying appropriate technologies at demonstration farms.
Output 2	Activity package is developed and implemented to promote market-oriented agriculture.
Output 3	Practical tools to improve quality of life at household level are developed and implemented.
Output 4	Effective dissemination methods of livelihood improvement approach are streamlined.

1.2 Objectives of the Terminal Evaluation

- (1) To confirm the progress of the Project and examine achievement of the Project Purpose by the end of the Project

- (2) To clarify the priority issues and challenges by the end of the Project
- (3) To assess the Project based on the five criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability
- (4) To make recommendations to be implemented by the end of the Project and after the termination of the Project
- (5) To obtain lessons learned from the Project for better implementation of other projects

1.5 Schedule of the Terminal Evaluation

Date	Program 15:00-19:00 (Japan time: JT) /9:00-13:00 (Uganda time)
5 Oct (Mon)	15:00 Kick off meeting including the explanation of evaluation objectives and methods.
6 Oct (Tue)	10:00-12:30 (JT) Interview with the Japanese expert team 15:00-19:00 Interview with District Production Officers (DPOs) and District Agricultural Officers (DAOs) in Gulu and Omoro Districts,
7 Oct (Wed)	10:00-12:00 Interview with the Japanese expert team 15:00-19:00 Interviews with Agricultural Officers (AOs) of the model Sub-county (S/C) and 2 farmer groups in Gulu and Omoro Districts
8 Oct (Thu)	10:00-12:00 Interview the JICA Advisor and JICA Uganda Office 15:00-19:00 Interviews with MAAIF counterparts
9 Oct (Fri)	15:00-19:00 Interview with Japanese Expert Team and MAAIF counterparts
12 Oct (Mon)	15:00-19:00 Interviews with DPOs and DAOs in Nwoya and Amuru Districts
13 Oct (Tue)	15:00-19:00 Interviews with AOs of the model S/C and 2 farmer groups in Nwoya and Amuru Districts
14 Oct (Wed)	15:00-19:00 Interviews with DPOs and DAOs in Kitgum and Lamwo Districts
15 Oct (Thu)	15:00-19:00 Interviews with AOs of the model S/C and 2 farmer groups in Kitgum and Lamwo Districts
16 Oct (Fri)	15:00-19:00 Interview with retailers and dealers in Kampala, and Progress sharing with NUFLIP Coordinator (Dr. James Tumwine)
19 Oct (Mon)	Internal Meeting, 15:00-19:00 Interview with retailers in Gulu
20 Oct (Tue)	Preparation of the evaluation report
21 Oct (Wed)	13:00-14:30 Briefing to the Expert Team, 15:00-16:30 Briefing to Dr James Tumwine
22 Oct (Thu)	Preparation of the evaluation report, 15:00-19:00 Interview with DPOs and DAOs of Pader and Agago Districts, and AO of Agago District
23 Oct (Fri)	Preparation of the evaluation report, 15:00-20:30 Interview with 2 farmer groups of Pader and Agago Districts, AO in Pader District, and Local Project Staff members
26 Oct (Mon)	Preparation of the evaluation report
27 Oct (Tue)	Preparation of the evaluation report, 15:00-17:00 Briefing to Dr James Tumwine and Experts
28 Oct (Wed)	Preparation of the presentation
29 Oct (Thu)	Preparation of the presentation, 15:00 Report Presentation
30 Oct (Fri)	Finalization of the evaluation report and signing of the Minutes of the Meeting (MM)

1.6 Methodology of the Terminal Evaluation

The Project was evaluated using Project Cycle Management method defined in the New JICA Guidelines for Project Evaluation Second Edition (2014). The procedures for the Terminal Evaluation were as follows:

- 1) The Team reviewed the PDM Version 2 (See the ANNEX 1).
- 2) The Team developed an Evaluation Grid (See the ANNEX 2).
- 3) The Team collected the necessary data for evaluation by reviewing the Project reports and the relevant documents and undertaking a questionnaire survey for the counterparts (C/Ps) of District Production Offices including District Production Officers (DPOs), District Agricultural Officers (DAOs) and Agricultural Officers (AOs) and the Japanese Expert Team. The Team received and analysed the questionnaires from 16 C/Ps and 12 Japanese Expert Team including the Local Project Staff.
- 4) The Team also conducted an interview with the Project Manager, the Project Coordinator, the C/Ps of the MAAIF, and the C/Ps of eight districts in Acholi Sub-region, i.e., Gulu, Kitgum, Pader, Omoro, Nwoya, Agago, Lamwo and Amuru. In addition, the Team conducted the interview with the 8 model farmers groups comprising 16 male members and 16 female members in these eight districts. The Team also undertook the interview with the JICA Advisor who has been deployed in the MAAIF and the JICA Uganda Office, 2 agro-dealers in Kampala and 2 retailers in Gulu. The Team undertook the interview with 81 project stakeholders including target farmers.
- 5) The Team verified and evaluated the achievements as per the PDM Version 2 and implementation processes of the Project by referring to the Evaluation Grid.
- 6) The Team evaluated the Project based on the following five criteria:

Relevance	Relevance refers to the validity of the Project Purpose and the expected Overall Goal in accordance with the policy direction of the GOU and the Japanese Official Development Assistance as well as needs of beneficiaries and target groups.
Efficiency	Efficiency refers to the productivity of the implementation process, examining if the inputs of the Project were efficiently converted into the Output.
Effectiveness	Effectiveness refers to the extent to which the expected or desired outputs have been achieved as planned and examines if the outputs were produced by the Project.
Impact	Impact refers to direct and indirect, positive and negative impacts caused by implementing the Project, including the extent to which the expected Overall Goal has been attained.
Sustainability	Sustainability refers to the extent to which the GOU can further develop the Project, and the benefits generated by the Project can be sustained in the policy, financial, institutional, organisational and technical aspects.

- 7) The Team made a conclusion based on the results of evaluation analysis. Also, the Team made recommendations to the Project, and obtained lessons learned from the Project.

2. Achievement of the Project

2.1 Inputs

2.1.1 Inputs by the Ugandan side

- 1) At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, 43 people were assigned as the C/Ps including the Project Director and the Project Manager, the Project Coordinator, the officials of the MAAIF, the DPOs, DAOs and AOs in eight districts of Acholi Sub-regions. As some of the C/Ps have been retired, transferred or newly assigned, the total accumulated number of the C/Ps by the time of the Terminal Evaluation stood at 53 people (See ANNEX 3).
- 2) The MAAIF provided financial support of UGX 553.17 million (JPY 15.88 million¹) as the Counterpart Fund as of June 2020. The said fund covered the costs of: 1) remuneration of two Local Project Staff at MAAIF (Assistant Programme Officer and a driver); 2) procurement of one project vehicle and eight motorcycles, 3 sets of ICT items comprised of Desktop computers, Printers, scanner and power surge stabilizers; 3) running costs such as fuel, field allowance, 100 reams of photocopying papers, 3 printer cartridges; and 4) 193 polo T-shirts (See ANNEX 4).
- 3) Eight District Local Governments have allocated UGX 171.29 million (JPY 4.92 million²) as of June 2020. The fund was spent on NUFLIP-related activities such as training of farmers and AOs, monitoring of target farmer groups, extension activities to non-target farmer groups, and meetings /workshops/ seminars. Most District Local Governments sourced the fund from their budgets of Agricultural Extension Grant (AEG) and Discretionary Development Equalisation Grant (DDEG) for these activities (See ANNEX 4).
- 4) The Gulu District Local Government has provided an adequate space in its district office which have been used for the main office for the Project. As for utility bills for this office, the Gulu District Local Government has covered around 50,000 to 100,000 UGX for water and 100,000 to 200,000 UGX for electricity monthly from April 2016 to June 2017. It is noted because of untimely disbursement of the district budget, JICA occasionally made payments before they were reimbursed by the Gulu District Local Government.
- 5) Kitgum and Pader District Local Governments provided the satellite offices for the Project.

2.1.2 Inputs by the Japanese side

- 1) Six (6) experts were assigned whose expertise are as follows: 1) Chief Advisor/Extension/ Market-oriented Agriculture; 2) Deputy Chief Advisor/Extension/Market-oriented Agriculture; 3) Vegetable Production; 4) Improvement of QOL/ Gender; 5) Nutrition Improvement/ Coordinator; and 6) Farming Plan/Marketing. The total man (person)-months for the Japanese Experts were 134.76 as of the end of September 2020 (See ANNEX 5).
- 2) The Japanese side has allocated JPY 99.49 million (UGX 3.46 billion)³ as of June 2020 for the cost of operation in Uganda such as salary of Local Project Staff, vehicle related expenses, necessary materials for training, printers, daily allowances of AOs and Local Project Staff, and costs for

¹ Exchange rate was adopted according to JICA's procurement rate (UGX1=¥ 0.02871 in June 2020).

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

meetings and training, and security and maintenance of the Project office in Gulu (See ANNEX 6).

- 3) The Japanese side provided 8 laptops and 10 motorcycles for the model three districts such as Gulu, Kitgum and Pader. Also, the Japanese side provided 2 vehicles. The total cost was 11.14 million yen⁴ (USD 0.09 million) (See ANNEX 7).
- 4) The Project provided the training in Japan, in which 16 C/Ps participated. The Project also dispatched 16 C/Ps⁵ to the Workshops and the Seminars in South Africa. (See ANNEX 8).

2.2 Outputs

The degree of achievement on each output is described below:

Output 1:	Vegetable production knowledge and skills of agricultural officers are improved through verifying appropriate technologies at demonstration farms.
------------------	---

Summary of Results of Evaluation for Output 1

At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, Indicator 1-1 and Indicator 1-2 have been already achieved. However, Indicator 1-3 has not been achieved. Thus, it is fair to judge that **Output 1 has been almost achieved.**

The following are the indicators to assess the achievements of Output 1.

Indicator 1-1	More than five potential vegetables are confirmed and their appropriate cultivation methods suitable for Acholi Sub-region are identified.
----------------------	---

Indicator 1-1 has been already achieved. The Project established one demonstration farm in each model district to promote vegetable production, verify adaptability and effectiveness of the cultivation technologies and examine potentials and risks on vegetable product. To avoid the politically-motivated disturbances related to the presidential election in 2016, the Project established these demonstration farms in the public spaces for the first season from March to June in 2016 (See Table 1). In the second season, the Project, in cooperation with the C/Ps of model districts selected and established five demonstration farms in the five model sub-counties in these districts (See Table 2).

Table 1: Details of demonstration sites of NUFLIP in the first season (from March to June) in 2016

District	Location	Area	Cultivated items
Gulu	Gulu University Bio-system Engineering Department	15m x 25m	5-vegetables: Determinate tomato, green pepper, watermelon, carrot, and onion
Kitgum	Ngetta ZARDI Kitgum Satellite Station	13m x 18m	3-vegetables: Determinate tomato, eggplant, and cabbage
Pader	Pader District Local Government office	15m x 19m	4-vegetables: Determinate and indeterminate tomatoes, green pepper, and cabbage

Source: Monitoring sheets provided by the Project

Table 2: Details of demonstration sites in the second season (from September to November) in 2016

District	Location	Cultivated items at demo site	Trial for new techniques
Gulu	Awach S/C	Tomato, green pepper, carrot	Effectiveness of application of cow manure for tomato

⁴ Exchange rate was adopted for respective items when they were procured according to JICA's procurement rate (USD1=¥ 124.21 in August 2015), (USD1=¥ 102.19 in September 2016) and (USD1=¥ 100.606 in October 2016).

⁵ Two C/Ps participated in it twice.

	Paicho S/C	Tomato, cabbage, watermelon	Not established
Kitgum	Lagoro S/C	Tomato, eggplant, cabbage	Effectiveness of application of cow manure for three items
	Labongo Amida S/C	Tomato, onion, watermelon	Comparison among different varieties of tomato
Pader	Atanga S/C	Tomato, onion, watermelon	Comparison among different varieties of eggplant regarding resistance for bacterial wilt disease

Source: Monitoring sheets provided by the Project

During the second season from September to November in 2016, the drought seriously affected the vegetables at the demonstration farms. Despite these challenges, the Project has identified the following seven types of vegetables that are to be promoted to the beneficiaries: 1) tomatoes, 2) eggplants, 3) green pepper, 4) cabbages, 5) onions, 6) carrot and 7) watermelon. The Project has also developed their appropriate cultivation methods.

Indicator 1-2	Training materials on vegetable production are developed.
----------------------	--

Indicator 1-2 can be seen as being achieved although the target value was not set. Based on the results of demonstration farms, the Project has developed training materials on vegetable production of eight subjects. They included: 1) farm planning, 2) seed and raising seedling, 3) cultivation technologies⁶ for six types of vegetables, namely tomatoes, eggplants, green peppers, cabbages, onions and watermelon, 4) soil and fertilizer management, 5) growth diagnosis, 6) major pests and diseases of the target vegetables, 7) pest and disease management and 8) post-harvest technology. The Project has also formulated and released a “Factsheet on vegetable pests, diseases, and physiological disorders”, which can serve as an important guide for not only AOs but also farmers involved in the cultivation of vegetable crops. The Project has printed these materials with the Counterpart Fund provided by the MAAIF and distributed them to the stakeholders. This factsheet can be downloaded and available on the smartphone.

Indicator 1-3	More than 90% of agricultural officers in the model districts understand appropriate technologies on vegetable production.
----------------------	---

Indicator 1-3 has not been achieved. To improve knowledge on appropriate technologies on vegetable production among AOs, the Project conducted pre- and post-examination twice: 1) the Training of Trainers (TOT) in 2016 and 2) Refresher Training in 2017. “Sound understanding of the appropriate technologies” as per Indicator 1-3 is defined as that an applicant has scored more than 60% marks in the post-examination. As shown in Table 3, 11 out of 14 AOs (78.6%) cleared the above-mentioned target during the TOT in 2016 while 19 out of 29 AOs (65.5%) did so during the Refresher Training in 2017. In none of the two occasions, the result surpassed the target as per Indicator 1-3. According to the Japanese Experts, one AO who did not take the post-examination of both training has gained adequate knowledge and skills from the training conducted in the first year and engaged in extension activities. Regarding other four AOs who did not take the post examination in 2017, they have improved their capacity by participating in other activities such as

⁶ Carrot was not included in cultivation technology because any farmer groups did not select it.

the on-the- job Training (OJT).

Table 3: Data on achievement of Indicator 1-3

Descriptions		1) TOT in 2016	2) Refresher training in 2017
a)	Total number of AOs in model districts	14	29
b)	Number of AOs of target value of Indicator 1-3 (More than 90% of AOs in the model districts)	14	24
c)	Total number of AOs who took the post-test	12	26
d)	Total number of AOs in model districts who got more than 60 out of 100 scores	11	19
e)	Percentage of AOs in the model districts who got more than 60 out of 100 scores	78.6%	65.5%

Source: Data provided by the Project

Output 2: Activity package is developed and implemented to promote market-oriented agriculture.

Summary of Results of Evaluation for Output 2

Out of three Indicators, Indicator 2-2 has been already achieved and Indicator 2-3 can be surmised as being achieved. Indicator 2-1 is likely to be achieved. Therefore, it is fair to judge that **Output 2 has been almost achieved as of the time of this Terminal Evaluation and is likely to be achieved by the end of the Project.**

The following are the indicators to assess the achievements of Output 2.

Indicator 2-1 Guidelines and training materials on market-oriented agriculture (including materials developed in Output 1) are developed.

Indicator 2-1 is likely to be achieved. The Project has developed training materials on market-oriented agriculture in 2016, and updated thereafter. At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, the Project has revised training materials again and prepared for developing audio-visual training materials with a view to minimising human interactions and to, in turn, the risk of disease infection, particularly of COVID-19. According to the Expert Team, the Project has decided not to develop guidelines stated in Indicator 2-1 based on the discussions with the C/Ps of MAAIF. Instead, the Project has engaged in compilations of good practices and development of a vegetable production handbook, which are likely to be finalized by the end of the Project.

Indicator 2-2 More than 70% of agricultural officers in the model districts understand and teach market-oriented agriculture to farmers in the model districts by using materials developed by the Project.

Indicator 2-2 has been achieved. To enable all AOs of three model districts to undertake extension activities

by using the extension package for market-oriented agriculture, the Project has organized the OJT in 2018. The model AOs and non-model AOs have carried out the training for farmers as trainers to improve their practical knowledge and skills of training. As illustrated in Table 4, 26 out of 29 AOs (89.7%) conducted this training, which exceeded the target value of Indicator 2-2.

Table 4: Data on achievements of Indicator 2-2

OJT in 2018		
a)	Total number of AOs deployed in model districts at that time	29
b)	Number of AOs of target value of Indicator 2-2 (More than 70% of AOs in the model districts)	20
c)	Total number of AOs who attended OJT	26
d)	Total number of AOs in model districts who conducted training for farmers during the OJT	26
e)	Percentage of AOs in the model districts who conducted training for farmers during the OJT	89.7%

Source: Data provided by the Project

Indicator 2-3	After two-year project intervention to each target farmer group in the model districts, more than 60% of individual members of target farmer groups adopt more than 70% of techniques of market-oriented agriculture introduced by the Project.
----------------------	--

Indicator 2-3 can be surmised as being achieved. The Project undertook the End-Line Survey for all target farmers in the model districts after the two-year intervention to examine whether they adopted the techniques of market-oriented agriculture. During the End-Line Survey, the Local Project Staff members asked 14 questions to farmers (See Table 5) and collected responses from 617 farmers. The rate of response against the number of respondents at the Base-Line Survey stood at 48.5% (See Table 6).

Table 5: A list of 14 techniques of market-oriented agriculture

Category		Question
Farm planning for vegetable production	(1)	Do you select vegetable items and varieties with considering marketability and productivity?
	(2)	Do you consider a selling channel before start cultivation?
	(3)	Do you have a farming plan with considering production costs (seeds, fertiliser, pesticide, etc.) and expected profits, cultivation period, manageable field size, available workforce, balance with staple crops and risk management?
Raising seedling	(4)	Do you set up a nursery at a suitable location and sow seed with appropriate density?
	(5)	Do you practice recommended management activities such as appropriate shading, daily watering, fertiliser application, thinning, and insect pests management?
	(6)	Do you monitor a nursery frequently?

Field preparation and planting	(7)	Do you select a suitable field with considering crop rotation, land conditions (low/high or slope), tree shade, and accessibility to water source and home?
	(8)	Do you apply organic/inorganic fertiliser?
	(9)	Do you plant seedlings with suitable spacing in a main field?
Crop management	(10)	Do you frequently monitor plant growth and pests and diseases occurrence?
	(11)	Do you practice recommended crop management techniques such as training, pruning, weeding and mulching?
	(12)	Do you practice recommended pests and diseases management and handles pesticides properly?
Harvest and post-harvest handling	(13)	Do you harvest vegetables in appropriate timing, store properly not to spoil quality and sort them by quality before shipping?
Record keeping	(14)	Do you keep records of production, costs and profits?

Source: Information for NUFLIP Terminal Evaluation provided by the Project

According to the results of the End-Line Survey, 254 out of 256 (99.2%) respondents of the 1st batch farmer groups answered “Yes” to more than 70% of the above questions (See Table 6). Considering this high adaptation rate, it is very likely that 39 (293-254) out of 232 non-respondents (i.e. 16% of non-respondents) have adopted more than 70% of the introduced techniques to meet the target (i.e. adoption by more than 60% of the target beneficiaries). As for the 2nd batch farmers, 271 out of 361 (75%) respondents replied “Yes” for more than 70% of the above questions. The Team is of the opinion that the application of the above-mentioned logic would allow to draw a similar conclusion, though to a lesser extent. In consideration of the above, the Team judges that the Indicator 2-3 is surmised as being achieved.

Table 6: Data on achievements of Indicator 2-3

Descriptions		1st batch	2nd batch	Total
a)	Total number of target farmers in model 3 districts	488	785	1273
b)	Target value of Indicator 2-3 (60% of target farmers in model 3 districts)	293	471	764
c)	Total number of respondents for questionnaires of the End-Line Survey in model 3 districts	256	361	617
d)	The response rate of End-Line Survey for market-oriented agriculture	52.5%	46.0%	48.5%
e)	Total number of target farmers in model 3 districts who did not respond the End-Line Survey for market-oriented agriculture	232	424	656
f)	Number of target farmers who answered that they adopted more than 70% of activities related to market-oriented agriculture (10 of 14 activities)	254	271	525
g)	Percentage of f)	99.2%	75%	85.1%

Source: Data provided by the Project

Output 3:	Practical tools to improve quality of life at household level are developed and implemented.
------------------	---

Summary of Results of Evaluation for Output 3

Out of three Indicators, Indicator 3-2 has been already achieved. Also, Indicator 3-3 can be regarded as being achieved. Indicator 3-1 is likely to be achieved. Given this, it is fair to conclude that **Output 3 has been almost achieved as of the time of this Terminal Evaluation and is likely to be achieved by the end of the Project.**

The following are the indicators to assess the achievements of Output 3.

Indicator 3-1	Practical tools to improve quality of life are identified and guidelines and training materials are developed.
----------------------	---

Indicator 3-1 is likely to be achieved. Because the Acholi Sub-region is a conflict-affected area, the Project has highly considered issues of gender and socially vulnerable people such as widows, Formerly Abducted Persons (FAPs) and Person with Disabilities (PWDs) into not only its activities but also development of training curriculum and materials for improvement of QOL. In addition, due to the fact that most of the target farmers are illiterate and less educated, the Project has developed simple contents of training in local language and materials such as flip charts and picture icons. To help AOs conduct the training for improvement of QOL more easily and appropriately, the Project has revised its curriculum and reduced from 74 to 51 units. At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, the Project was further revising training materials and developing audio-visual training materials and posters. Moreover, the Project has prepared the manual in place of the guidelines upon an agreement with MAAIF, and the manual is likely to be completed by the end of the Project.

Indicator 3-2	More than 70% of agricultural officers in the model districts understand and teach improvement of quality of life to farmers in the model districts by using the tools developed by the Project.
----------------------	---

Indicator 3-2 has been already achieved. The achievement of Indicator 3-2 is the same as that of Indicator 2-2.

Indicator 3-3	After two-year project intervention to each target group in the model districts, more than 60% of individual members of target farmer groups adopt more than 50% of activities for improving quality of life introduced by the Project.
----------------------	--

Indicator 3-3 can be regarded as being achieved. During the End-Line Survey for the model districts, the Project asked the farmers about the implementation of 12 activities of improvement of QOL (See

Table 7) and collected responses from 734 farmers. The rate of response against the number of respondents at the Base-Line Survey was 57.7% (See Table 8).

Table 7: A list of 12 activities of improvement of QOL

Category		Activity
Household	(1)	A farmer discusses and sets his/her household goals with family members.

level	(2)	A farmer makes a farm plan with family members and produces crops by considering necessary food volume for whole family members throughout the year and sales for their cash needs to minimise the risk of food shortage.
	(3)	A farmer makes a farm plan with family members and produces variety of crops by considering nutritional aspects.
	(4)	A farmer discusses and executes his/her household food stock and livestock management with family members.
	(5)	A farmer discusses and executes his/her household cash management (planning, income and expenditure) with family members.
	(6)	A farmer, a spouse or a person in a household selects food items for cooking and prepares meals for family members by considering nutritional aspects.
	(7)	A farmer or a spouse processes and prepares meals for family members by considering hygienic aspects.
	(8)	A farmer group discusses and sets group goals and prepares an action plan.
Group level	(9)	A farmer disseminates techniques acquired from the Project activities to his/her group members.
	(10)	A farmer provides more supports to socially vulnerable people (e.g., widows/widowers, PWDs, FAPs and illiterate persons) in his/her group members.
	(11)	A farmer considers gender aspects.
Community level	(12)	A farmer disseminates techniques acquired from the Project to other members in a community.

Source: Information for NUFLIP Terminal Evaluation provided by the Project

As shown in Table 8, all the 372 respondents of the 1st batch replied that they adopted more than 50% of activities for improving QOL. The said number exceeds the threshold value of 60% of the beneficiary farmers (i.e. 293, as per b) in Table 8, and therefore the target has been achieved. In the case of the 2nd batch, 359 out of 362 respondents (99.2%) adopted these activities. Though this number does not surpass the threshold value (i.e. 471 in Table 8), the Team estimates that there is a high probability of the sufficient adoption rate among the large number of non-respondents, considering the situation of the respondents, and therefore it is appropriate to regard that the target has been met for the 2nd batch.

Table 8: Data on the achievements of Indicator 3-3

Descriptions		1st batch	2nd batch	Total
a)	Total number of target farmers in model 3 districts	488	785	1273
b)	Target value of Indicator 3-3 (60% of target farmers in model 3 districts)	293	471	764
c)	Total number of respondents for questionnaires of the End-Line Survey in model 3 districts	372	362	734
d)	The response rate of End-Line Survey for QOL	76.2%	46.1%	57.7%
e)	Total number of target farmers in model 3 districts who did not respond the End-Line Survey for QOL	116	423	539
f)	Number of target farmers who answered that they adopted more than 50% of activities related to QOL (6 of 12 activities)	372	359	731
g)	Percentage of f)	100%	99.2%	99.6%

Source: Data provided by the Project

Output 4:	Effective dissemination methods of livelihood improvement approach are streamlined.
------------------	--

Summary of Results of Evaluation for Output 4

At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, **none of four Indicators has yet to be achieved. However, all of them are likely to be achieved** if the remaining activities are conducted as planned by the end of the Project.

The following are the indicators to assess the achievement of Output 4.

Indicator 4-1	More than 60% agricultural officers in the model districts disseminate the livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmers/farmer groups.
----------------------	--

Indicator 4-1 has yet to be achieved as of the time of the Terminal Evaluation, but it is likely to be achieved by the end of the Project if the AOs conduct extension activities extensively in the model districts. The Project was designed to intervene the three model districts for the first two years. Thus, after the two-year intervention of the Project, these model districts were expected to continue extension activities with their District Local Government's initiatives. To extend the livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmer groups in these model districts, the Project has provided an extension package and the training materials to the AOs in 2018. The extension package includes necessary agricultural materials to set up a demonstration field such as sprayer, gloves, hybrid seeds, fertilisers, pesticides, and others. The Project has instructed the AOs to disseminate in the order of market-oriented agriculture followed by QOL activities.

Table 9 presents the number of model AOs and non-model AOs in the model districts who used the extension packages for practicing both market-oriented agriculture and improvement of QOL. Thirteen out of 29 AOs (44.8%) have disseminated the livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmers in the model districts. It did not reach 17 AOs which was set as the target value of Indicator 4-1.

Table 9: Data on the achievement of Indicator 4-1

District	Number of AOs received the extension package		AOs who used extension packages for practicing market-oriented agriculture				AOs who used extension packages for practicing improvement of quality of life			
	Model	Non-model	Model AOs		Non-Model AOs		Model AOs		Non-Model AOs	
Gulu	4	2	4	100%	2	100%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%
Kitgum	4	7	4	100%	5	71.4%	1	25.0%	3	42.9%
Pader	4	8	4	100%	8	100%	2	50.0%	5	62.5%
Total	12	17	12	100%	15	88.2%	5	41.7%	8	47.1%
a)	Number of AOs of target value of Indicator 4-1 (More than 60% of AOs in the model districts)								17	(60%)
b)	AOs in model districts who used extension packages for practicing both market-oriented agriculture and improvement of quality of life								13	(44.8%)

Source: Data provided by the Project

During the interview of the Terminal Evaluation, almost every DPOs, DAOs and AOs highly appreciated both components of the market-oriented agriculture and the improvement of QOL. They did not seem to find it difficult to disseminate the improvement of QOL. The questionnaire survey conducted for these C/Ps as part of the Terminal Evaluation also illustrated their positive responses for these two components. However, as illustrated in Table 9, the rate of utilization the improvement of QOL by AOs is significantly lower than that of the market-oriented agriculture among both the model AOs and the non-model AOs. According to the Japanese experts, it might be the case that some AOs felt obliged to abandon the part of the improvement of QOL component due to the time constraints of some farmers. Some DAOs and the Local Project Staff hinted that the difference in terms of the familiarity of the two components to AOs may result in that of usage rate of the two components.

Indicator 4-2	More than 40% of agricultural officers in other five districts disseminate livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmers/farmer groups.
----------------------	--

Indicator 4-2 has yet to be achieved as of the time of this Terminal Evaluation, but is likely to be achieved by the end of the Project if the AOs resume and conduct extension activities extensively with the support of DPOs and DAOs in other five districts.

The Project has implemented various activities in other five districts, namely Agago, Amuru, Lamwo, Nwoya and Omoro since 2018. To disseminate the livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmer groups, the Project distributed the extension package to the AOs in these districts in March 2020. Some AOs have already started to carry out the extension activities by using this extension package and securing the budget of the District Local Government such as the AEG, the DDEG and their own revenue and other external funds provided by development partners.

However, the COVID-19 pandemic and resultant travel restrictions have seriously affected their extension activities of AOs. As presented in Table 10, 14 out of 37 AOs (37.8 %) have disseminated the comprehensive

livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmers, which failed to reach the target value of Indicator 4-2, i.e., 15 AOs (40%). It is necessary for the C/Ps of other five districts to take follow-up activities during the remaining period of the Project.

Table 10: Data on the achievement of Indicator 4-2

District	Number of AOs	AOs who disseminated only market-oriented vegetable production approach to non-target farmer/farmer groups		AOs who disseminated the comprehensive livelihood improvement approach consisting of both 1) market oriented vegetable production and 2) quality of life to non-target farmer/farmer groups	
		Number	%	Number	%
a) Agago	11	4	36.4%	2	18.2%
b) Amuru	4	2	50.0%	0	0.0%
c) Lamwo	8	7	87.5%	7	87.5%
d) Nwoya	8	3	37.5%	3	37.5%
e) Omoro	6	2	33.3%	2	33.3%
f) Total	37	18	48.6%	14	37.8%
a)	Number of AOs of target value of Indicator 4-2 (More than 40% of AOs in other five districts)			15	(40%)
b)	AOs in other five districts who disseminate livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmers/farmer groups			14	(37.8%)

Source: Data provided by the Project

Indicator 4-3	Activities related to the livelihood improvement approach are incorporated into the District Development Plan of all eight districts.
----------------------	--

Indicator 4-3 has yet to be achieved but is likely to be achieved. To ensure its sustainability, the Project has encouraged the district-level C/Ps to incorporate the action plans for extension activities into their District Development Plans (DDP) and Annual Work Plans respectively. At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, all five districts except for Omoro district have already integrated activities related to the livelihood improvement approach into their five-year DDP. For, Omoro district, their DDP including the extension of livelihood improvement approach was supposed to be approved on October 15, 2020, which, according to the C/Ps of Omoro district, has yet to taken place but the plan is likely to be approved soon.

Indicator 4-4	An extension package for the livelihood improvement approach is prepared for nationwide extension.
----------------------	---

Indicator 4-4 has yet to be achieved, but is likely to be achieved. As previously described in the achievement of Indicator 2-1 and Indicator 3-1, the Project has updated the training materials of livelihood improvement approach and developed the manuals, posters and audio-visual training materials for Acholi Sub-region. Though the package has not yet been complete, the final output is expected to be submitted to MAAIF which will take this extension package forward for the nationwide expansion of the livelihood improvement approach.

2.3 Project Purpose

Project Purpose:	Livelihoods of target farmer groups are improved through establishment of livelihood improvement approach.
-------------------------	---

Summary of Results of Evaluation for the Project Purpose

The End-Line Survey in the three model districts of Gulu, Kitgum and Pader has revealed that almost all the respondents of target farmers now realise improvement of their livelihoods at least in 5 out of 9 aspects of livelihood improvement approach developed by the Project. Based on the finding the Team concludes that **Indicator 2 can be regarded as achieved**. As for Indicator 1, **the increasing trend in the real annual income through cash crop production including vegetable production was observed among the respondents of the End-Line Survey** which allows the Team to argue that the Project is on the right track towards achieving its Project Purpose. Meanwhile, the Team also observes that **additional information and data regarding the non-respondents would be necessary** to confirm this trend from the statistical point of view.

The status of each verifiable indicator is presented below.

Indicator 1	After two-year project intervention to each target farmer group in the model districts, real annual income of individual members of target farmer groups from cash crop production (including vegetables and traditional cash crops) increases at least 30% on an average.
--------------------	---

The increasing trend in the real annual income through cash crop production was observed among the respondents of the End-Line Survey for the model districts, which allows the Team to argue that the Project is on the right track to achieve this indicator target. **Meanwhile, additional information and data regarding the non-respondents would be necessary to confirm this trend from the statistical point of view.**

The Project conducted the Baseline Survey and the End-Line Survey in the model districts. The number of respondents were 1143 (398 for 1st batch and 745 for 2nd batch) for the former and 533 (243 for 1st batch and 290 for 2nd batch) for the latter. Table 11, shows that in general the number of farmers who earned income from vegetable production⁷ increased from 14% to 53%, which is accompanied with a significant increase in the average income of vegetable cultivation. Meanwhile it is noteworthy that a more sizable increase in the income was derived from the non-agriculture income. Based on this, one may argue that the introduction of market-oriented agriculture component is to a certain extent effective in favour of adoption of vegetable production as well as of increase in the overall household income. The same trend is observed in the data by batch (Table 12) and this trend is confirmed. On the other hand, the Team suspects a relationship between project interventions, particularly the QOL component, and the increase in the non-agricultural income based on numerous anecdotes heard from farmer interviewees such as “Knowledge on the household financial balance made us aware of the importance of making more income to make ends meet” or “some of us capitalized the revenue from vegetable production to start a new business (and stopped vegetable production as a result)” though formal casual relationships need to be sought after.

⁷ Note that these calculations and arguments above are based on the farmers who actually gained income from the vegetable production. This means that this analysis and discussion excludes the data of those who practiced the vegetable production but did not gain income.

Table 11: Comparison of the number who earned income from each component and disaggregation of overall income into each component

Overall		Baseline data (n=1143)		Endline data (n=533)		Gap (percentage points)
		Number	%	Number	%	
<i>Number of farmers earned income from each source</i>						
a)	Agricultural Income	1034	90%	508	95%	5
a-1)	Traditional Crop	1017	89%	482	90%	1
a-2)	Vegetables	163	14%	283	53%	39
b)	Non-agricultural Income	581	51%	364	68%	17
Overall average income (a+b)						

Baseline data (n=1143)		Endline data (n=533)		Increment of average income	% of increment
Average income		Average income			
<i>Average income for each source</i>					
590,593 ugx		830,749 ugx		240,156 ugx	40.7%
522,131 ugx		577,006 ugx		54,875 ugx	10.5%
68,463 ugx		253,744 ugx		185,281 ugx	270.6%
294,439 ugx		647,495 ugx		353,056 ugx	119.9%
885,032 ugx		1,478,244 ugx		593,212 ugx	67.0%

Source: Results of End-Line Survey on Income and Agricultural Data for the 1st and 2nd Batch Farmer Groups

Table 12: Comparison of the number who earned income from each component and disaggregation of overall income into each component (1st and 2nd batch separately)

1st batch		Baseline data (n=398)		Endline data (n=243)		Gap (percentage points)
		Number	%	Number	%	
<i>Number of farmers earned income from each source</i>						
a)	Agricultural Income	392	98%	228	94%	-4
a-1)	Traditional Crop	388	97%	206	85%	-12
a-2)	Vegetables	55	14%	132	54%	40
b)	Non-agricultural Income	185	46%	156	64%	18
Overall average income (a+b)						

Baseline data (n=398)		Endline data (n=243)		Increment of average income	% of increment
Average income		Average income			
<i>Average income for each source</i>					
606,844 ugx		638,861 ugx		32,017 ugx	5.3%
540,307 ugx		438,293 ugx		-102,014 ugx	-18.9%
66,537 ugx		200,568 ugx		134,031 ugx	201.4%
244,128 ugx		543,883 ugx		299,755 ugx	122.8%
850,972 ugx		1,182,744 ugx		331,772 ugx	39.0%

2nd batch		Baseline data (n=745)		Endline data (n=290)		Gap (percentage points)
		Number	%	Number	%	
<i>Number of farmers earned income from each source</i>						
a)	Agricultural Income	642	86%	280	97%	11
a-1)	Traditional Crop	629	84%	276	95%	11
a-2)	Vegetables	108	14%	151	52%	38
b)	Non-agricultural Income	396	53%	208	72%	19
Overall average income (a+b)						

Baseline data (n=745)		Endline data (n=290)		Increment of average income	% of increment
Average income		Average income			
<i>Average income for each source</i>					
581,911 ugx		991,538 ugx		409,627 ugx	70.4%
512,420 ugx		693,237 ugx		180,817 ugx	35.3%
69,491 ugx		298,302 ugx		228,810 ugx	329.3%
321,316 ugx		734,314 ugx		412,998 ugx	128.5%
903,228 ugx		1,725,853 ugx		822,625 ugx	91.1%

Source: Results of End-Line Survey on Income and Agricultural Data for the 1st and 2nd Batch Farmer Groups

Meanwhile, the Team finds some limitations in drawing the same conclusions of this positive effect across all the target beneficiaries. Firstly, there is a significant discrepancy in the rate of income increase from the agricultural production between the 1st (15%) and the 2nd (73%) batch (See Table 13). Most of the difference (UGX 312,040) may be explained by that of the traditional crop (102,014 negative in the 1st batch versus 180,817 positive in the 2nd batch, differential = 282,831). Secondly, the number of respondents at the End-Line Survey was just about 40% of that at the Base-Line Survey (See Table 14) with limited cases of respondents at the End-Line Survey not having been interviewed in the Base-Line Survey. Along with the facts that the Survey did not apply random-sampling method, and that there has been no follow-up investigation on the attributes of the non-respondents, it is technically difficult to evaluate the biases between respondents and non-respondents, giving extrapolation of this trend to non-respondents a limited reliability. Thirdly, the two sets of data (baseline and end-line) are both static and do not allow judging the trend for

some indicators. For example, the ratio of those who gained income from the traditional crop reduced by 12% in the 1st batch while it increased by 11% in the 2nd batch, suggesting the probability of surveys of both batches having taken place at different times, thus referring to the performance during different periods under different prevailing climate conditions. Lastly, the analysis of the average income on Tables 11 to 13 excludes the farmers who practiced vegetable production *but gained no income*. While the intention of the Project to analyse the details of successful cases is understandable, the Team is of the opinion that the omission of zero values deriving from these farmers in calculating the average income might compromise adequacy under some circumstances.

Table 13: Increase of average cash crop income (1st and 2nd batch)

	1st batch	2nd batch	Total
BL: Average income from cash (traditional & vegetable) crop (a)	606,844	581,911	590,593 ugx
EL: Average income from cash crop (individual production) (b)	638,861	991,538	830,749 ugx
EL: Average income from vegetable (group production) (c)	57,935	17,298	32,876 ugx
EL: Average income from cash crop (total) (d=b+c)	696,796	1,008,836	863,625 ugx
EL: Percentage of increment (total) (e=d/a, %)	15%	73%	46%

Source: Results of End-Line Survey on Income and Agricultural Data for the 1st and 2nd Batch Farmer Groups

With the information available at the time of the Terminal Evaluation and the above analysis and observation, the Team considers appropriate to conclude that an increasing trend in the real annual income through cash crop production was observed among the respondents of the End-Line Survey, which allows the Team to argue that the Project is on the right track to achieve this indicator target. Meanwhile, additional information and data regarding the non-respondents would be necessary to confirm this trend from the statistical point of view.

Table 14: Data on the achievement of Indicator 1 of the Project Purpose

Descriptions		1st batch	2nd batch	Total
a)	Total number of target farmers in model 3 districts	488	785	1273
b)	No. of farmers in model 3 districts who responded to Base-Line Survey on Income & Agricultural Data	398	745	1143
c)	The response rate of Base-Line Survey on Income& Agricultural Data	81.6%	94.9%	89.8%
d)	No. of farmers in model 3 districts who responded to End-Line Survey on Income & Agricultural Data	243	290	533
e)	The response rate of End-Line Survey on Income& Agricultural Data	49.8%	36.9%	41.9%
f)	Total number of target farmers in model 3 districts who did not respond the End-Line Survey for Income and Agricultural Data	245	495	740
g)	Percentage of f)	50.2%	63.1%	58.1%

Source: Data provided by the Project

Indicator 2	After two-year project intervention to each target farmer group in the model districts, more than 50% of individual members of the target farmer groups realise improvement of their livelihoods on at least five aspects.
--------------------	---

Indicator 2 can be seen as being achieved. After the two-year intervention, the Project asked the farmers in the model districts about the nine aspects of their livelihood improvement (See Table 15) and obtained responses from 616 farmers. The rate of response against the number of respondents at the Base-Line Survey was 48.4% (See Table 8).

Table 15: Nine aspects of farmers' livelihood improvement

	Question
(1)	Increase of income from cash crop production including vegetables and traditional cash crops
(2)	Better technical knowledge and skills on vegetable production
(3)	Better knowledge and skills on market-oriented agriculture (collection of market information and decision to be made based on the information)
(4)	Better planning for all family members (family goal, farm plan, stock management plan, and cash management plan)
(5)	Better management of food stock and livestock in a household
(6)	Better management of cash income and expenditure in a household
(7)	Preparation of nutritious and hygienic foods for family members
(8)	Support/collaboration among group members by considering socially vulnerable persons and gender
(9)	Dissemination of knowledge and skills to other community members for peaceful community

Source: Information for NUFLIP Terminal Evaluation provided by the Project

Among the 1st batch farmer groups, all respondents of the End-line Survey, i.e., 255 farmers realised improvement of their livelihoods for at least five out of nine aspects and the number exceeds the target value (244 farmers) of the Indicator 1. Thus Indicator 1 has been already achieved for the 1st batch farmer groups. As to the 2nd batch, 359 out of 361 realized improvement of their livelihoods in the at least five aspects, which did not reach the target value. However, judging from the extremely high rate of success, it is highly probable that 34 out of 359 non-respondents have realized the same.

Table 16: Data on the achievements of Indicator 2 of the Project Purpose

Descriptions		1st batch	2nd batch	Total
a)	Total number of target farmers in model 3 districts	488	785	1273
b)	Target value of Indicator 2 (50% of target farmers in model 3 districts)	244	393	637
c)	Total number of respondents for questionnaires of the End-Line Survey in model 3 districts	255	361	616
d)	The response rate of End-Line Survey for livelihood improvement	52.3%	46.0%	48.4%
e)	Total number of target farmers in model 3 districts who did not respond the End-Line Survey for livelihood improvement	233	424	657
f)	Number of target farmers who answered that they adopted more than 50% of activities related to livelihood improvement (5 out of 9 aspects)	255	359	614
g)	Percentage of f)	100%	99.4%	99.7%

Source: Data provided by the Project

2.4 Overall Goal (Prospect)

Overall Goal:	Livelihood improvement approach is adopted in Acholi Sub-region.
----------------------	---

Summary of Results of Evaluation for the Overall Goal

There are positive prospects to achieve Indicator 1 if the several conditions the modality of capacity building, including setting its clear target value. As for Indicator 2, it is too early to predict its achievement particularly because the methodologies of its achievement as well as the modality of capacity building were not clarified at the time of the Terminal Evaluation. Considering the above, the Team concludes that it is too early to prospect the achievement of the Overall Goal although the positive signs for attaining this Overall Goal have been observed. The status of each verifiable indicator is presented below.

Indicator 1	More than 3,000 farmer households in Acholi Sub-region adopt the livelihood improvement approach by five years after the project completion.
--------------------	---

There are positive prospects towards achieving the target. Given the facts and information provided through the outcome of the Project as well as during the Terminal Evaluation, it could be discussed that the

estimated⁸ extent of the farmer outreach will allow the achievement of the above-mentioned target on condition that, among others: 1) adequate capacity building modalities are established to furnish all the AOs across Acholi Sub-region with sufficient knowledge and skills; 2) adequate financial means are provided; and 3) adequate evaluation framework in terms of adoption of the livelihood improvement approach is established. As for 3) the evaluation mentioned above, it should be noted that Indicator 1 does not clearly articulate the adoption judgement, i.e., more than how many percentage of activities related to the livelihood improvement approach need to be adopted by more than 3000 farmers. To measure the achievement of this Indicator objectively, the Project needs to set the appropriate target by the end of the Project.

Indicator 2	More than 70% of agricultural officers in Acholi Sub-region understand and teach the livelihood improvement approach by five years after the project completion.
--------------------	---

It is too early to predict the achievement of Indicator 2. Achieving this indicator requires various aspects. One of the key requirements is the clarification of the methodologies of its achievement. Particularly, there is a need to review and consolidate the current framework of judging the mastery of the approach. Meanwhile, measures should be taken to establish the modality of capacity building as well as that of collecting relevant data. Given this, the Team considers that it is premature to give a fairly logical prediction on the achievement of Indicator 2 five years after the completion of the Project.

3. Implementation Process of the Project

Project management and progress of activities

Overall, the Project had been smoothly implemented by the first quarter of 2020 despite the fact that the post-conflict Acholi Sub-region has been facing various challenges. However, the Project was obliged to suspend its activities in March 2020 due to the influence of the COVID-19 pandemic. Particularly, the Project was forced to suspend the field training for the 4th batch farmer groups expected during the first season from March to June 2020. The Project had to revise the overall implementation plan. Accordingly, GOU and JICA agreed on the extension of the Project period for nine months on August 17, 2020.

Implementation structure

The Project established the Joint Coordinating Committee (JCC) chaired by the Permanent Secretary (PS) of MAAIF in accordance with the R/D. The PS was also appointed as the Project Director while the Commissioner of the Department of Crop Production was appointed as the Project Manager. The Principal Agricultural Officer of the Department of Crop Production was appointed as the Project Coordinator. The

⁸ The Terminal Evaluation Team estimates that theoretically 13,500 farmers could be reached in 3 years if 75 AOs (one in each sub-district) are fully operational and provide services to 2 groups of 30 members each year. Meanwhile, the latest analysis of the market-oriented agriculture component (Table 6) suggests that the adoption rate would be no less than 40%. Along with the fact that the adoption of the QOL component is close to 100%, one could argue that adoption of the livelihood improvement approach would surpass the target value unless the farmer outreach is compromised by more than 40% (threshold farmer outreach is 7,500). It is noted that this argument is based on the current threshold of the adoption judgement (i.e. 70% of 14 technical elements for the market-oriented agriculture component / 50% of 12 elements for the QOL component).

Project has organized JCC meetings in principal once a year as per the R/D. So far, five JCC meetings took place. Most of C/Ps and the Japanese Experts noted that they shared the progress of activities and issues and revised as well as approved the PDM. The Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs) of relevant districts were invited to attend the JCC, which helped their understanding of the Project and their commitment from the District Local Government. Several Japanese Experts commented that the Project Director did not personally attend the JCC meetings. Instead, the different officials of MAAIF who were appointed as his substitute participated in these JCC meetings.

The Project has formed Technical Committee (TC) meetings chaired by the Project Manager. The TC meeting has been held once a year. The C/Ps and the Japanese Experts pointed out that the TC has worked well as a platform to share the progress of Project's activities from each district and challenging issues that particularly the AOs and the target farmer groups faced. Most of the C/Ps also noted the TC has provided good opportunities to exchange experiences and opinions among the C/Ps of eight districts as well as of MAAIF, and the Japanese Expert Team including the Local Project Staff. According to the Japanese Expert Team, the C/Ps used to discuss what JICA or the Project can do for them in the TC meetings at the early stage of the Project. However, the C/Ps have gradually shifted to discuss what they should do and what they can do by themselves instead.

Monitoring

The Project has monitored the progress of activities by the following means: 1) JCC and TC meetings; 2) Monitoring Sheets prepared by the C/Ps and the Japanese Experts, and reviewed by the Coordinator every six months; 3) Field visits by the district- and sub-county-level C/Ps and the Japanese Expert Team and exchanges with the target farmer groups and other stakeholders such as input retailers; 4) Quarterly joint monitoring by the C/Ps of the MAAIF, the district- and sub-county-level C/Ps and the Japanese Expert Team; 5) Regular monitoring by the AOs; 6) Monthly / bi-monthly meetings between the C/Ps of the MAAIF and the Japanese Expert Team; and 7) Project Team meetings between the Local Project Staff and the Japanese Experts twice a week particularly under the influence of the COVID-19. Most of the C/Ps and the Japanese Expert Team noted that all these monitoring modalities were appropriate to consolidate the progress of activities. They also pointed out that the monitoring field visits were effective in disseminating the Project's activities to the various stakeholders including the district- and the sub-county government officials, the development partners and the non-target farmers and the community people.

Communication and coordination among Project stakeholders

All C/Ps and the Japanese Expert Team members who filled out the questionnaires stated that they have closely and effectively communicated and coordinated with one another between the C/Ps at central-, district- and sub-county-levels and the Japanese Expert Team. Several C/Ps interviewed highly appreciated the close communication and coordination as well as sharing issues among the Project stakeholders, which helped foster a common understanding and ensure the transparency of implementation process. Others pointed out that the close coordination with district- and sub-county-government officials and agricultural retailers have contributed to enhance their cooperation and the smooth implementation of the Project.

Several Japanese Experts and the JICA Uganda Office indicated there was room for further improvement for communicating and sharing both achievements and issues among the high-ranking officials of the MAAIF, the Japanese Expert Team and the JICA Uganda Office. Some C/Ps of the MAAIF, several Japanese experts and the JICA Advisor pointed out the needs of disseminating the Project's outcomes and advocating the expansion of livelihood improvement approach in Acholi Sub-region within the MAAIF.

Sharing of knowledge and expertise and technical transfer

At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, most of the C/Ps interviewed highly appreciated the ways of technical transfer and guidance from the Japanese Experts and the Local Project Staff members. According to the C/Ps interviewed, they acquired the following: 1) practical knowledge and skills about the market-oriented agriculture and the QOL activities; 2) pests and diseases; and 3) marketing through the technical transfer from the Japanese Experts and the Local Project Staff members as well as a series of field training programs, the training in Japan and the third country training. Many C/Ps have recognized the importance and the necessity of comprehensive livelihood improvement approach that consists of both the market-oriented agriculture and the QOL by learning the comprehensive knowledge and know-how of these activities. Others opined that the concept of 0.1 acre for vegetable production targeting the smallholder farmers and the SHEP approach of “starting with the market and ending with the market” have brought about the drastic change of the mind-sets of not only the target farmers but also the C/Ps. Furthermore, most of the C/Ps greatly appreciated the components of the Project, the training curriculum and training materials, which helped the smooth technical transfer and knowledge sharing from the Japanese Expert Team to the C/Ps. Some of the C/Ps indicated that they have learned the importance of project management including planning and time management. Also, several C/Ps mentioned that the Project has timely provided the practical knowledge and techniques of vegetable production for the target farmer groups in accordance with the crop calendar. This has helped building the trust toward the Project among the target farmers.

At the initial stage of the Project, the Japanese Expert Team focused on thorough stock-taking in terms of the socio-economic attributes of target communities of Acholi Sub-region, such as influences of conflicts, status of farmers' livelihood, their capacity of vegetable cultivation and the institutional and individual capacity of agricultural extension at the district and sub-county levels. In this regard, the Project conducted the Baseline Survey, the situation analysis, and more significantly, three-month on-site observation visits at the farm households by the Japanese Expert on Nutrition Improvement/ Coordinator. These activities have served as a basis for 1) identifying appropriate commodities and technologies for vegetable cultivation, and 2) developing appropriate approach, training curriculum and materials, which contributed to enhancing the capacity of C/Ps. The Project has also valued consultations among / feedbacks from key project stakeholders such as the C/Ps, the Local Project Staff members, the Japanese Experts and the target farmer groups in the process of development of the livelihood improvement activities, user-friendly training curriculum and materials. This time-taking process has been rewarded by enthusiastic responses of farmers who have made a long stride in transforming themselves from 'grow-and-sell' peasants to 'grow-to-sell' entrepreneurs.

Ownership of the Project by C/Ps

Overall, the C/Ps have been actively involved in the Project activities with a strong sense of ownership. The MAAIF has allocated the Counterpart Fund for joint monitoring with the C/Ps of eight districts and the Japanese Expert Team. All the Japanese Experts and the Local Project Staff members appreciated the strong leadership and commitment of the Project Coordinator for the smooth implementation of the Project. On the other hand, several C/Ps of districts pointed out that more proactive involvement of the Directorate of Extension of the MAAIF would be required when the livelihood improvement approach rolls out for sub-region-wise expansion. Also, some Japanese experts noted that the high-ranking officials of the MAAIF need to be further involved in the Project to accelerate the extension of the Project's outcomes.

The Team has observed that the level of ownership of C/Ps of districts towards the Project was not so high at the initial stage of the Project. Some of them expected handouts such as agricultural inputs rather than the technical support. As the project activities and technical transfer from the Japanese Experts and the Local Project Staff members unfolded, the DPOs, the DAOs and the AOs have nurtured their sense of ownership and responsibilities and participated in the Project in a more proactive manner. The training programme in Japan and the workshops and seminars in South Africa were greatly effective in not only improving the capacity of C/Ps but also enhancing the motivation and ownership of C/Ps. The C/Ps who participated in these training abroad have shared the experiences and knowledge that they gained with other C/Ps.

During the interviews by the Team, almost all C/Ps stated that the Project has developed the unique and effective livelihood improvement approach, which brought about the various positive outcomes such as increase in production of good quality vegetables and improvement of daily life among farmer groups. The visible changes of the beneficiaries and the sense of achievement have greatly contributed to further enhancing the motivation and ownership of the C/Ps many of whom spontaneously internalized these initiatives of the Project in their routine work. At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, seven district offices have incorporated the livelihood improvement approach into their DDP and initiated to disseminate this approach to non-target farmers with their own financial resources. Another contributing factor for ensuring the ownership of C/Ps might be a good relationship and trust between the C/Ps and the Japanese Expert Team including the Local Project Staff members.

4. Results of Evaluation with Five Evaluation Criteria

The Team assessed the Project based on the five evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability on a five-level scale from low to high.

4.1 Relevance: High

(1) Consistency with the policies of the Government of Uganda and the Government of Japan

The Project is consistent with the Second Agriculture Sector Strategic Plan (ASSP II, 2015/16–2019/20) that emphasizes increasing agricultural production and productivity and prioritizes 12 commodities,

including vegetables. Considering the nature of outcomes, it is particularly pointed out that the Project is highly relevant to the achievement of: ‘Improving access to agricultural markets and value addition (Sector Growth Priority 3)’ through supporting farmer groups in formulating and implementing technical, managerial and marketing strategies and developing feasible business plans in a way that suits the socio-economic circumstances of the target beneficiaries, while providing effective extension tools and related capacities to the front-line Agriculture Officers. This resulted in the transformation of the mind-set of the target farming populations from ‘grow and sell’ to ‘grow to sell’ which, in turn, generated farmers’ demand for / adoption of agriculture inputs such as high-quality seeds, fertilizers and chemical (Sector Growth Priority 2).

Meanwhile, the Project is also consistent with the PRDP II (2012/13 – 2015/16) and the PRDP III (2015/16 – 2019/20) whose three strategic development objectives. They include: 1) consolidation of peace such as elimination of gender-based violence; 2) development of the economy including agriculture productivity and value chains; and 3) reduction of vulnerability. As described elsewhere, the QOL component has provided an extremely effective and feasible pathway particularly for converting cash income into the enhanced level of welfare without causing commotions at the household and community levels, thereby greatly contributing to the above-mentioned objectives.

Moreover, the Project is in line with Japan’s Country Development Cooperation Policy for the Republic of Uganda (2017) and the Official Development Assistance Rolling Plan of Japan for the Republic of Uganda (2018). According to the policy and the plan, “stabilizing the society in Northern Uganda” is one of the four priority areas for assistance. The Project is also a component under the JICA’s REAP Phase 2 (2016 – 2021) that focuses the improvement of livelihood of community people in the conflict affected areas of Northern Uganda. Therefore, the Project is consistent with these Japanese aid policies.

(2) Consistency with the needs of Local Governments and Farmers

The Northern Region has suitable areas for agriculture and high potential to function as a regional trade hub to export agricultural products to South Sudan and the Democratic Republic of Congo. However, the local governments and farmers in this region have very limited technical knowledge and experience in the agriculture production due to the prolonged armed conflict and displacement. As for the labour force, more than 70% of the total labour force are smallholder farmers who are engaged in dominantly subsistence agriculture. Increase in agricultural production and improvement of their livelihoods have been urgent issues from the viewpoint of poverty reduction and reducing disparities between the north and the south. Against this backdrop, the Project has adequately addressed the needs of the local governments as well as farmers in eight districts of Acholi Sub-region to improve their livelihoods through the market-oriented agriculture and the QOL components.

(3) Appropriateness of project approach

The Project has developed and applied the comprehensive livelihood improvement approach consisting of both the market-oriented agriculture and the QOL components. The components were remarkably appropriate for empowering smallholder farmer groups and their households to produce vegetables for market and

improve their livelihoods. More specifically, the market-oriented agriculture component has enabled the smallholder farmers to produce vegetables by using appropriate technologies and to increase their income to a great extent even on a small piece of land, e.g. 0.1 acre. Furthermore, the QOL component was equally appropriate and at the same time provided indispensable complementarity to the market-oriented agriculture component because it has brought about many and positive behaviour changes among farm households and communities in which the unequal resource distribution and the gender issues existed because of the traditional culture and the influence of conflicts.

(4) Appropriateness of the provision of assistance in the development phase in the conflict affected areas of the country

The timing of the commencement of the Project was very appropriate because it coincided with the commencement of the PRDP III (2015/16–2020/21) which is the strategic framework for development of Northern Uganda. Particularly, the PRDP III has given more focus on service delivery and socio-economic outcomes for reducing gaps in income and poverty levels between the Northern Region and the rest of Uganda. It has also emphasized the livelihood improvement and increase in agricultural productivity in its framework. In this regard, the Project is greatly consistent with the strategic direction of PRDP III.

The target area and scope of the Project was also appropriate since no other Development Partners had provided technical support of vegetable production for the AOs and the farmer groups intensively, covering all the District Local Governments of Acholi Sub-region. The selection of target farmer groups was valid because inclusion of the socially vulnerable people was one of the selection criteria. The Project has by encouraged target farmer groups to support vulnerable community members such as FAPs and PWDs and widows and if possible, to share the division of work with them.

4.2 Effectiveness: Moderately High

Effects of the Project

The most significant and synergistic effect of the Project is that it has changed the mind-sets of subsistence and smallholder farmers of the conflict-affected Acholi Sub-region in various aspects through adopting the market-oriented agriculture and the QOL components. They included changes of the following mind-sets: 1) from “grow and sell” to “grow to sell” (transition from subsistence to market-oriented); 2) from “receiving distribution of free agricultural inputs and any support from outsiders in a dependency culture” to “planning and managing by households themselves” (from emergency to development / from dependency to self-reliance); and 3) from “optimizing the individual benefit” to “pursuing the well-being at the collective level such as family and community” (from individualism to altruism). This nature of the Project has significantly contributed to improvement of their livelihood including increase in agricultural income.

The Project has also brought about various effects including the following: 1) establishing appropriate technologies of vegetable production in Acholi Sub-region; 2) acquiring practical knowledge and skills of market-oriented vegetable production and marketing among the target farmer groups and even non-target farmers; 3) changing behaviour for improvement of QOL among the target farmers and their households; 4)

enhancing the capacity of extension services of AOs; 5) strengthening the relation and the network among the value chain actors, i.e. the target farmers, vendors and retailers in Acholi Sub-region; and 6) internalizing and institutionalizing the livelihood improvement approach by incorporating it into the DDP of eight districts. All of the above has helped enhance the overall effectiveness of the Project.

The contributing factors for generating various effects of the Project included:

- Accurately grasping the actual situation of conflict-affected settings, target communities, and target farmers through the Baseline Survey, the situation analysis and the long-term on-site observation visits at farmers' households;
- Developing the practical training curriculum to meet the needs of subsistence smallholder farmers by taking the level of their learning capacity and socio-economic conditions into consideration;
- Developing teaching material packages that are simple, easy to use and friendly for illiterate people;
- Managing the implementation of the Project effectively and efficiently by emphasizing the close communication, consultation, coordination between the central- and the district-level C/Ps and the Japanese Expert Team; and
- Fostering a good relationship of trust among various stakeholders.

Degree of the achievement of the Project Purpose

The target farmers have gradually realized their livelihood improvement through the livelihood improvement approach in the Project. The increase in the real annual income from cash crop production including vegetable production was confirmed among the respondents of the End-line Survey which allows the Team to argue that the Project is on the right track towards achieving its Project Purpose while the Team also observes that additional information and data regarding the non-respondents would be necessary to confirm this trend from the statistical point of view.

Contribution of Outputs

It is fair to argue that the achievement of all the four Outputs is likely to contribute to the attainment of the Project Purpose although not all of them have been fully achieved at the time of the Terminal Evaluation.

Influence of Important Assumptions from the Outputs to the Project Purpose

Five Important Assumptions were set from the Outputs to the Project Purpose. They included: 1) Decentralisation is maintained; 2) The Ugandan Government creates favourable conditions for private investments; 3) There is no unfavourable weather and/or outbreak of pests and diseases; 4) The Ugandan Government policies continue to support development and maintenance of infrastructure necessary to promote market oriented agriculture (e.g. market facilities, roads, and bridges) and 5) There is no serious social disturbance. During the implementation of the Project, all these Important Assumptions were met.

4.3 Efficiency: High

Inputs from both sides

Most of the inputs from both the Ugandan and the Japanese sides were provided as scheduled. The quality

and quantity of the Project inputs by both sides were adequate. By using these inputs, the Project has implemented various activities, which was transformed to the respective Outputs. As previously described in “3. Implementation Process of the Project”, the overall implementation of the Project had been smoothly undertaken before the final year of the Project. However, the spread of COVID-19 pandemic adversely affected Project’s activities. Particularly the Project was obliged to suspend the field training for the 4th batch of farmer groups during the first season from March to June 2020. Under these extraordinary circumstances, the Project needed to revise the overall implementation plan and extend its duration for nine months.

Degree of the achievement of the Outputs

The degree of the achievement of the Outputs varies among the four Outputs. Output 1 has been almost achieved. Output 2 and Output 3 have been almost achieved as of the time of the Terminal Evaluation and are likely to be achieved. Output 4 has yet to be achieved as of the time of the Terminal Evaluation but is likely to be achieved by the end of the Project.

Influence of Important Assumptions from the Activities to the Outputs

No Important Assumptions was set from the Activities to the Outputs in the PDM.

Influence of Pre-Conditions

The Project set "The Ugandan Government maintains Northern Uganda development and agricultural development policies" as a Pre-Condition of the PDM which has been met to date.

Hindering factors that have influenced the efficiency of the Project

As described above, the COVID-19 pandemic has affected the smooth implementation of the Project. From March to June in 2020, the Project was forced to suspend most of the activities. During the period of lockdown, farmers were unable to sell the vegetables and AOs were unable to continue the extension activities as expected. At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, the Project has already resumed some of the activities such as holding workshops and development of training materials although the Japanese Experts have not been able to return to Uganda for continuing assignments.

According to the Japanese Experts, the political instabilities before and after the presidential election held in February 2016 affected the implementation at the initial stage of the Project to some extent. To avoid the disturbances, the Project established demonstration farms in the public spaces of the model districts rather than the target farmer groups’ lands. However, this did not affect the achievement of Outputs. Another hindering factor was that it took time to complete the renovation work in the Project office provided by Gulu district, which led the Japanese Expert Team to carry out the Project’s activities under the make-shift facilities for a certain period. Nevertheless, this did not seriously affect the achievement of Outputs.

Contributing factors that have influenced the efficiency of the Project

- 1) Project Coordinator from the Ugandan side and the Chief Advisor from the Japanese sides have demonstrated the strong leadership.

- 2) Most of the C/Ps including the MAAIF, DPOs, DAOs and AOs have strong commitment and sense of ownership for the Project.
- 3) The MAAIF has allocated the Counterpart Fund, with which one project vehicle and eight motorcycles were provided for enhancing mobility of district-level C/Ps.
- 4) The District Local Governments have allocated its budget including AEG and DDEG for extension activities to non-target farmers.
- 5) From the second year of the Project, more AOs who were newly recruited or deployed have joined the Project although the limited number of AOs were deployed and involved in the Project in the first year of the Project.
- 6) The Japanese Experts have adequate expertise in the respective fields.
- 7) Several Japanese experts have extensive work experiences in Uganda.
- 8) The Local Project Staff members have played a key role of coordinator and facilitator among the Project stakeholders. Thanks to this, the Project has resumed its activities since July 2020 even under the influence of COVID-19.
- 9) The good project management including detailed planning, on-time execution and frequent monitoring has led to the smooth implementation.
- 10) The good relationship of trust and the close communication among the Project stakeholders have helped the effective and efficient implementation of the Project.

4.4 Impact (Prospect): Many qualitative and positive impacts have emerged.

Prospects for the achievement of the Overall Goal

The extension of the livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmers was included in the Output 4 of the PDM. Accordingly, the District Production and Marketing Departments of eight districts have already embarked on integrating the approach into their five-year DDP and its annual work plan and to disseminate it to non-target farmers with their own resources such as the AEG and the DDEG.

Some AOs have extended the livelihood improvement to not only farmers but also other types of groups. For example, one of AOs in Lamwo district has initiated to disseminate the livelihood improvement approach in a refugee camp. Another AO in the same district has established a demonstration farm within a school and carried out the training of market-oriented agriculture component for guardians of students. One of AOs in Nwoya district has also established a demonstration farm in a learning centre and provided the training on livelihood improvement for women who participated in adult literacy classes. Youth can be another potential target group. Some AOs in Omoro, Nwoya and Pader districts have already carried out the training on the livelihood improvement for them.

There were some cases in which AOs have applied a part of the livelihood improvement approach to the government's and other donor-supported programmes. In Pader districts, all AOs have initiated to integrate a part of the approach into the government's program of Village Four Acre Model Farmer. Some AOs of Nwoya district have extended a part of the approach to Youth in Agriculture Program. In Kitgum district, one of the AOs has already disseminated a part of the approach to 10 farmers groups supported by the Ministry

of Water and Environment. The DAO of Lamwo district has encouraged AOs to apply the approach to not only vegetables but also other commodities such as beans, maize, cassava and sesame. Some AOs of Nwoya and Pader districts reported that they have already incorporated a part of the livelihood approach in the NGO's programmes.

The Project has encouraged the target farmer groups to impart what they learned from the Project to other farmer groups as well as community members with a primary intention of avoiding any conflicts. At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, many members of the farmer groups mentioned they have already shared their knowledge and skills to others. Some farmer groups in Gulu which were interviewed noted that they have already disseminated their knowledge and skills to other five farmer groups. They have been recently requested to conduct training for farmers from the large farming company. Such capable farmer groups can be regarded as potential agents to engage in farmer to farmer extension in the future. The above modalities, emerging spontaneously from the beneficiaries, are some positive signs towards the achievement of the Overall Goal. On the other hand, to scale up the activities of the livelihood improvement approach to the Acholi Sub-region is beyond the current mandates of the District Production and Marketing Departments and therefore it is suggested that the MAAIF take the initiatives in formulating the extension strategy or the extension plan and budget for further dissemination of the livelihood improvement approach.

Influence of Important Assumptions from the Project Purpose to the Overall Goal

Four Important Assumptions were set from the Project Purpose to the Overall Goal. They included the following: "Ugandan Government continues providing extension services"; "There is no unfavourable weather and/or outbreak of pests and diseases"; "Macro-economic conditions of Uganda are stable"; and "There is no serious social disturbance". At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, it can be prospected that these Important Assumptions are likely to be maintained after the completion of the Project.

Ripple effects

The following positive impacts have already emerged:

- 1) **Minimizing gender violence at household level:** Almost all male and female farmer groups, DPOs, DAOs and AOs interviewed pointed out this point as one of the notable impacts of the QOL component under the Project. According to most of the farmers interviewed, it was the first time for them to learn gender consideration, setting family goals and cash management in a comprehensive manner. Before the Project's intervention, households had suffered from frequent disputes particularly between husbands and wives mainly due to lack of cash and food stock. Several C/Ps emphasized that increased income from vegetable production by applying the market-oriented agriculture approach alone might exacerbate family conflict and household gender violence due to the deep-rooted social, traditional and cultural norms in Acholi Sub-region at the household and community levels.
- 2) **Minimizing food shortage at household level:** Many farmers interviewed reported that the Project has generated such a remarkable impact as minimizing food shortage at household level. Before the Project's intervention, most of them had suffered from the shortage of food, particularly between May and July.

After receiving training from the Project, they have made a farm plan and applied food stock and livestock management skills with family members, which helped minimize food shortage. Some of them noted that they did not have any food shortage even during the period of lockdown due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

- 3) Improving the health status of children: Nutrition and hygiene is a key component of the QOL and has brought about an impact of improvement of the health status of family, particularly children. Most of the farmers interviewed noted that the frequency of taking their children to hospitals has been reduced and that diarrhoea cases for their children have been almost eliminated thanks to the interventions. This has also contributed to the reduction of medical bills.
- 4) Increasing non-agricultural income: The Project aims to increase agricultural income of the target farmer groups through the livelihood improvement approach. During the interview of the Terminal Evaluation, several farmers indicated they have increased not only agricultural income but also non-agricultural income from vegetable production and cash management. For example, some farmers have capitalised income from vegetable production to initiate small business or to build houses for rent.
- 5) Improvement of access to education and health for children: The livelihood improvement approach has enabled farmers to increase their income, which has contributed to sending their children to school and taking them to clinics or purchasing medicines when they are sick.
- 6) Minimizing negative impacts and promoting inclusiveness among farmers: The Project has encouraged the target farmers to share what they learned from the Project with other community members, including the Farmer Field Day to promote the extension activities at demonstration farms. These initiatives have contributed to minimizing negative impacts such as conflicts among farmers and promoting farmer to farmer extension to some extent. The Project has also emphasized inclusiveness of socially vulnerable people in the farmer groups as well as their communities. According to several farmers interviewed, this has led to mutual assistance and exchange as well as improvement of harmony within their groups and communities.
- 7) Increasing sales of agro-dealers and retailers and expanding their business: According to the agro-dealers in Kampala and the retailers in Gulu interviewed, they have increased their sales volume and expanded their business through business forums and agro-dealers forums which for them served as an opportunity to create and nurture reliable long-term trade-relationships with the target farmers.

4.5 Sustainability (Prospect): Medium to moderately High

Policy aspect: High

Agro-industrialisation is prioritised as one of the major programmes for implementation in the National Development Plan (NDP) III (2020/21 – 2024/25). The ASSP III (2020/21 – 2024/25) which was a draft version at the time of the Terminal Evaluation is expected to be in alignment to NDP III and focus on the

implementation of agro-industrialisation programme with a goal to increase household incomes from agro-industry. Increasing agricultural production and productivity is one of the six objectives in the ASSP III, in which strengthening the agricultural extension system is emphasized. Particularly, both NDP III and draft ASSP III stress the importance of capacity building of the farming populations in terms not only of on-farm production but also of skills and knowledge to promote their market access. Given the nature of the Project, this policy environment is very much conducive to the sustainability of the Project. Thus, it is fair to say that the sustainability in the policy aspects is high.

Organisational aspect: Medium to moderately high

At the district level, the District Production and Marketing Department has strengthened its organisational capacity as the implementing agency of the Project to disseminate the livelihood improvement approach by deploying one AO to each sub-county. At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, the DPOs and the DAOs had demonstrated a strong commitment to continue and expand the Project's activities after the end of the Project.

However, with a view to rolling out the outcomes of the Project including extension of this livelihood improvement approach to the entire Acholi Sub-region, the Directorate of Agricultural Extension Services of MAAIF needs to take more proactive roles. The Terminal Evaluation has not been able to clarify the intention of the Directorate of Agricultural Extension Services in this regard. Given this, the sustainability in the organisational aspect can be considered as medium to moderately high.

Institutional aspect: Medium to moderately high

The C/Ps of the eight districts have already taken their own initiatives to incorporate the livelihood approach developed by the Project into their five-year DDP and annual work plan as well as their annual budget. Such actions, if continued, would ensure the sustainability of the Project's outcome. The extension package including training curriculum and materials prepared by the Project is very likely to be sustained, though, as pointed out in elsewhere, the issue of the utilisation of the QOL package by AOs needs to be resolved.

On the other hand, as many C/Ps pointed out, the budget of district and sub-county including their own revenue, the AEG and the DDEG was insufficient to upscale the extension of livelihood improvement approach in Acholi Sub-region. This situation calls for an immediate and strong leadership of MAAIF for development of extension modalities including allocation of financial and human resources, for which there has been no actions taken to date. Accordingly, it is fair to say that the sustainability in the institutional aspect is medium to moderately high.

Financial aspect: Medium to moderately High

As previously described, the eight districts and the target sub-counties have already allocated their budget mainly sourced from the AEG, the DDEG and other local resources for promoting extension activities. Also, the Counterpart Fund provided by the MAAIF has been instrumental for smooth implementation of their extension activities. Nonetheless, most of C/Ps pointed out the inadequate financial resources was a major constraint. As for the AEG, its disbursement was often delayed, which prevented AOs from conducting

extension activities in a timely manner. Regarding the DDEG, this grant is allocated for prioritized local development activities at district and sub-county levels in which there were high demands from each sectoral department. The sporadic nature of these finding resources needs to be rectified for timely and uninterrupted execution of activities.

To accelerate the extension activities of the livelihood improvement approach in Acholi Sub-region after the completion of the Project, formulation of the above-mentioned modalities is strongly required, which is yet to be developed. Considering this, it is fair to say that the sustainability in the financial aspect is medium to moderately high.

Technical aspect: Moderately High

The Project has strengthened the human resource capacities of the C/Ps, namely the DPOs, DAOs, and AOs in eight districts of Acholi Sub-region, through various capacity building opportunities, TOT, OJT programmes and technical transfer from the Japanese Expert Team. The Project has also enhanced the non-model AOs by providing various training and encouraging OJT among AOs. Almost all who were interviewed or replied the questionnaires for the Terminal Evaluation appreciated the technical transfer from the Project and showed strong willingness to embrace the livelihood improvement approach after the completion of the Project.

In contrast, the usage rate of QOL component among the AOs was 44.8% in the model three districts while it was still 37.8 % in other five districts (See 2.2 Output 4). This fact should be further analysed by AOs themselves in cooperation with the DPOs, the DAOs and the Japanese Expert Team. The capacity improvement for newly recruited or newly deployed AOs is another challenge. In this regard, the OJT or other effective means should be sought by the respective districts. At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, there was no comprehensive capacity enhancement program for AOs.

As for the capacity development of target farmers, they have acquired the practical knowledge and skills through the Project's intervention. As standardisation and stabilisation of the capacity of the target farmer groups remains an issue, there is a need to consider some refresher training or follow-up activities. The key farmers' extension, which is tested in the 4th batch farmer groups, might be an option to strengthen the capacity of farmers. The feasibility of this key farmers' extension in Acholi Sub-region has yet to be fully explored among the Project's stakeholders. For some leading farmers who have successfully evolved from subsistence and started climbing the ladder towards market-oriented commercial entity, their next steps would be to strengthen competitiveness of their products and financial abilities. The District Production and Marketing Departments need to address such technical supports for such farmers.

Given the above, the sustainability in the technical aspect can be considered as moderately high.

5. Conclusion

The Project has significantly changed the mind-sets of subsistence and smallholder farmers of the conflict-affected Acholi Sub-region in various aspects by adopting the market-oriented agriculture and the QOL activities. They included the change of following mind-sets: 1) from “grow and sell” to “grow to sell”; 2) from “receiving distribution of free agricultural inputs and any support from outsiders in a dependency culture” to “planning and managing by households themselves”; and 3) from “optimizing the individual benefit” to “pursuing the happiness at the collective level such as family and community”.

The Project has also brought about various effects including the following: 1) establishing the appropriate technologies of vegetable production in Acholi Sub-region; 2) acquiring practical knowledge and skills of market-oriented vegetable production and marketing among the target farmer groups and even non-target farmers; 3) changing behaviour for improvement of QOL among the target farmers and their households; 4) enhancing the capacity of extension services of AOs; 5) strengthening the relation and the network among the value chain actors, i.e. the target farmers, vendors and retailers in Acholi Sub-region; and 6) internalizing and institutionalizing the livelihood improvement approach by incorporating it into the DDP of eight districts. All of the above has helped enhance the overall effectiveness of the Project.

All four Outputs have been almost achieved at the time of the Terminal Evaluation and are likely to be achieved by the end of the Project based on the PDM. The increasing trend in the real annual income through cash crop production including vegetable production was confirmed among the respondents of the End-line Survey for the three model districts which allows the Team to argue that the Project is on the right track towards achieving its Project Purpose. Meanwhile, the Team also observes that additional information and data regarding the non-respondents would be necessary to confirm this trend from the statistical point of view.

As for the results of the five evaluation criteria, the Project has a high degree of relevance, while the Project has a moderately high degree of effectiveness, and high degree of efficiency. At the time of the Terminal Evaluation, many qualitative and positive impacts have been already observed, which can be considered as positive signs towards achievement of the Overall Goal. The results of the evaluation on sustainability in the different aspects varied: the sustainability in the policy aspect is high, the sustainability in the organisational, institutional and financial aspects is medium to moderately high, while the technical sustainability is moderately high. Given the above, the overall sustainability of the Project is likely to be medium to moderately high.

Considering the above circumstances, the Team concludes that the Project should be terminated as planned. To implement the remaining activities and make the Project sustainable, it is recommended that the Project and the Ugandan side duly take into account the recommendations as following.

6. Recommendations

5.1 Recommendations to be implemented during the Project period

For the Project (C/Ps and Japanese Expert Team)

1. Analysing the End-Line Survey for model districts on income and agricultural data and collecting supplementary information

It is recommendable to further analyse the result of the End-Line Survey in order to examine the reason for the difference in the rate of increase in agricultural income between the first and the 2nd batch groups. In doing so, it would be useful to clarify on the attributes of non-respondents as well as those who discontinued vegetable production.

2. Conducting the End-Line Survey on income and agricultural data for the 3rd batch farmers in other five districts

According to the R/D, the End-Line Survey was supposed to measure the effects for the 1st and 2nd batch farmer groups in the three model districts after the two-year intervention period. Now that the Project has been extended until August 2021, it would be appropriate for the Project to consider conducting the End-Line Survey for the 3rd batch farmers in other five districts. The Team is aware of the necessity to take into account the potential influence of the COVID-19 in designing the questionnaire as well as in analysing the data.

3. Reviewing and identifying the issues related to QOL component by AOs

The End-line Survey has found out that the usage of the QOL component extension packages by the AOs is significantly lower than that of the market-oriented agriculture component. On the other hand, it is felt that this outcome is somewhat inconsistent with enthusiastically positive testimonies of almost all AOs whom the Team interviewed. Therefore, it is recommended to do some deep dive analysis on the causes of this gap, and take possible countermeasures as necessary and appropriate.

4. Analysing the outcomes and the lessons learned regarding the livelihood improvement approach

The Project plans to develop not only the manual for extension of the livelihood improvement approach but also the case studies of target farmers in the Project. In this process, it is recommended that the Project put sufficient focus on compiling achievements and lessons learnt, which includes what worked and what did not to the beneficiaries.

5. Sharing achievements and lessons learnt from the Project with relevant stakeholders

Mainly with a view to enhancing recognition of the livelihood improvement approach among relevant actors (senior / technical officials of MAAIF, key development partners) in the agriculture sector in Uganda and thereby seeking opportunities of collaboration, it is recommended that the Project organize events for sharing its achievements and lessons learnt by the end of the Project in collaboration with MAAIF, JICA Uganda Office and the JICA Policy Advisor at MAAIF.

6. Finalizing the extension materials of the livelihood improvement approach for Acholi Sub-region

The Project is expected to produce the extension materials on the livelihood improvement approach for Acholi Sub-region (as an output under Output 4) which will be used not only for roll out at the sub-regional level but also as a basis for the nationwide expansion by MAAIF in the long run. As such, it would be most appropriate if the Project keep in close contact with the Directorate of Agricultural Extension Services in the course of the development.

7. Promoting further to use media for effective extension activities

During the series of interview sessions, several C/Ps commended the Project for having broadcast its activities through the local radio programmes which is a key source of information of most farm households in the rural area. In the face of the prevailing restrictive measures due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it is recommended that the Project further promote utilization of media such as local radio programmes in addition to ICT-teaching materials.

For MAAIF

1. Promotion of the livelihood improvement approach within MAAIF, especially senior officials

It is recommended that the C/P of the MAAIF take initiative in various activities such as holding workshops or seminars and distribution of posters in collaboration with JICA Uganda Office and Policy Advisors to further enhance visibility and recognition of the livelihood improvement approach among senior officials as well as technical officials.

2. Exploring appropriate extension mechanism of the Project's outcomes in Acholi Sub-region

To roll out the livelihood improvement approach in Acholi Sub-region after the completion of the Project, it is necessary for MAAIF, under the leadership of the Directorate of Agriculture Extension Services, to examine the adequate and feasible extension modalities of the life improvement approach based on the existing extension system. The work consists of: 1) mapping the approach in the framework of ASSPIII; 2) establishment of human resource development system within/across districts; 3) exploring to secure more streamlined allocation of budget from the MAAIF; 4) utilization of human and financial resources of other development partners; and 5) exploring feasible modalities of key farmer extension.

For JICA

1. Sharing experiences of Baseline and End-Line Surveys in the projects applying the SHEP approach

It is strongly recommended that JICA facilitates exchanges on design and implementation of baseline and end-line surveys for the projects of the SHEP approach so that relevant projects are able to conduct the said surveys effectively and efficiently.

6.2. Recommendations to be implemented after the Project period

For MAAIF and the District Production and Marketing Departments of eight districts

1. Institutionalizing / standardizing the OJT and the refresher training for AOs

Occasional staff rotations pose challenges to maintain the dissemination capacity of the livelihood

improvement approach at the sub-district levels. While the Team commends the initiative of the eight participating districts to conduct OJT and refresher courses for AOs, it is suggested that the Directorate of Agricultural Extension Services play pivotal roles to complement these efforts by addressing the issues of, *inter alia*: 1) expansion of training arrangements to other districts; 2) standardization of training modalities and provisions across districts; and 3) securing sufficient financial resources to all participating districts.

For the District Production and Marketing Departments of eight districts

1. Continuing to institutionalize the Project outcomes in the DDP

It is recommendable that the eight District Production and Marketing Departments continue to institutionalize the Project outcomes in their DDP and annual work plan for further extension of the livelihood improvement approach effectively. In this regard, they need to keep undertaking sensitization for the decision markers at the district- and sub-county-levels, and to report the achievements and the effectiveness of this approach regularly to the CAO and the Planning Officer of the District Local Government as well as the Sub-county Chief and the Community Development Officer who is in charge of planning at the Lower-level Local Government.

For JICA

1. Compiling and disseminating achievements and lessons learnt from the Project as a part of Reconstruction Assistant Programme Phase 2 (REAP 2, 2016-2021)

It is recommended for JICA, in coordination with Government of Uganda, to compile and disseminate the holistic outcome of various cooperation in the context of the JICA's Reconstruction Assistant Programme Phase 2 (REAP 2, 2016-2021) in Northern Uganda. In this regard, the Project's achievements and lessons learnt in the period of reconstruction to development are remarkable assets.

7. Lessons Learnt from the Project

1. To provide effective livelihood improvement support, it is crucial to develop an approach, training curriculum and materials based on detailed and evidence-based surveys regarding the status of target societies and communities as well as living conditions of households. Particularly, in the context of peacebuilding and reconstruction assistance, special attention and consideration are required for socially vulnerable groups. In addition, thorough reflection of views, opinions and socio-economic settings of relevant actors, such as beneficiaries, extension officers and other local stakeholders is indispensable to make the above-mentioned outputs truly useful, practical and adoptable to the beneficiaries.

2. The combination of both the market-oriented agriculture component and the QOL component is not only effective but also indispensable in effectively realizing the livelihood improvement of agriculture-based rural households in the conflict-prone environment. In other words, these two components complement each other and effectively increase agricultural production and income by re-building social capitals through collaborative work at household and community levels on one hand, and ensure the conversion of income to enhancement of the wellbeing at both levels on the other.

3. As remarkable outcomes are emerging from the Project, it would be important to make these outcomes communicated in a proper manner. In this regard, identification of cost-effective approaches and methodologies of generation as well as dissemination of messages plays a crucial part. Particularly one needs to pay good attention to appropriate scope and framework of activities, monitoring and surveys.

=END=

ANNEX 1: Project Design Matrix (PDM)

Outputs	<p>1-1. More than five potential vegetables are confirmed and their appropriate cultivation methods suitable for Acholi Sub-region are identified.</p> <p>1-2. Training materials on vegetable production are developed.</p> <p>1-3. More than 90% of agricultural officers in the model districts understand appropriate technologies on vegetable production.*³</p>	Project report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decentralisation is maintained. - Ugandan Government creates favourable conditions for private investments. - There is no unfavourable weather and/or outbreak of pests and diseases. - Ugandan Government policies continue to support development and maintenance of infrastructure necessary to promote market oriented agriculture (e.g. market facilities, roads, and bridges) - There is no serious social disturbance.
1. Vegetable production knowledge and skills of agricultural officers are improved through verifying appropriate technologies at demonstration farms.	<p>2-1. Guidelines and training materials on market oriented agriculture (including materials developed in Output 1) are developed.</p> <p>2-2. More than 70% of agricultural officers in the model districts understand and teach market oriented agriculture to farmers in the model districts by using materials developed by the Project.</p> <p>2-3. After two-year project intervention to each target farmer group in the model districts, more than 60% of individual members of target farmer groups adopt more than 70% of techniques of market-oriented agriculture introduced by the Project.</p>	Project report	
2. Activity package is developed and implemented to promote market oriented agriculture.	<p>3-1. Practical tools to improve quality of life are identified and guidelines and training materials are developed.</p> <p>3-2. More than 70% of agricultural officers in the model districts understand and teach improvement of quality of life to farmers in the model districts by using the tools developed by the Project.</p> <p>3-3. After two-year project intervention to each target group in the model districts, more than 60% of individual members of target farmer groups adopt more than 50% of activities for improving quality of life introduced by the Project.</p>	Project report	
3. Practical tools to improve quality of life at household level are developed and implemented.			

ANNEX 1: Project Design Matrix (PDM)

<p>4. Effective dissemination methods of livelihood improvement approach are streamlined.</p>	<p>4-1. More than 60% agricultural officers in the model districts disseminate the livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmers/farmer groups.</p> <p>4-2. More than 40% of agricultural officers in other five districts disseminate livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmers/farmer groups.</p> <p>4-3. Activities related to the livelihood improvement approach are incorporated into the District Development Plan of all eight districts.</p> <p>4-4. An extension package for the livelihood improvement approach is prepared for nationwide extension.</p>	<p>Project report</p>	
Activities	Inputs		Pre-conditions
<p>1-1 Conduct initial assessment on present conditions of target areas (e.g. production skills and socio-economic conditions of farmers, market functions and stakeholders)</p> <p>1-2 Prepare verification items and selection criteria of demonstration farm locations based on the assessment results conducted in 1-1</p> <p>1-3 Establish demonstration farms and verify appropriate vegetable production technologies</p> <p>1-4 Strengthen agricultural officers' capacity through training and management on demonstration farms</p> <p>1-5 Prepare training materials based on the results from demonstration farms</p> <p>2-1 Set criteria for selecting farmer groups through discussions with government stakeholders and select target groups</p> <p>2-2 Conduct sensitisation workshops on market oriented agriculture for relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>Japanese Side</p> <p>(a) Dispatch of Experts -Chief Advisor -Coordinator -Horticultural Crop Production and extension -Others if necessary arises</p> <p>(b) Training Training for Counterpart Personnel</p> <p>(c) Machinery and Equipment Necessary equipment for the effective implementation</p> <p>(d) Project Operation Cost</p> <p>Input other than indicated above will be determined through mutual consultations between JICA and GOU through MAAIF during the implementation of the Project, as</p>	<p>Ugandan Side GOU through MAAIF will take necessary measures to provide at its own expense:</p> <p>(a) Services of MAAIF's counterpart personnel and administrative personnel as referred to in implementation structure.</p> <p>(b) Suitable office space with necessary equipment</p> <p>(c) Supply or replacement of machinery, equipment, instruments, vehicles, tools, spare parts and any other materials necessary for the implementation of the Project other than the equipment provided by JICA</p> <p>(d) Credentials or identification cards</p>	<p>Ugandan Government maintains Northern Uganda development and agricultural development policies</p>

ANNEX 1: Project Design Matrix (PDM)

<p>2-3 Develop an activity package to promote market oriented agriculture and prepare necessary training materials</p> <p>2-4 Conduct training on market oriented agriculture for agricultural officers</p> <p>2-5 Conduct a series of activities on market oriented agriculture for target farmer groups (the following are expected activities)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Conduct induction training on market oriented agriculture b. Conduct baseline surveys on present conditions of target farmer groups c. Conduct the Farm Business Linkage Stakeholder Forum d. Conduct training on participatory market survey for extension service providers and target farmer groups e. Select target crops based on the market survey results f. Conduct a series of in-field training sessions on selected crop production for target farmer groups <p>2-6 Conduct monitoring, follow up, and evaluation of target farmer groups</p> <p>2-7 Continuously improve contents and activity flow on market oriented agriculture based on the field experiences</p> <p>2-8 Create favourable conditions for market oriented agriculture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3-1 Develop practical tools to improve quality of life at house hold level (e.g. family budgeting, nutrition, and gender) 	<p>necessary.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (e) Available data (including maps and photographs) and information related to the Project (f) Running expenses necessary for the implementation of the Project (g) Expenses necessary for transportation within Uganda of the equipment as well as for the installation, operation and maintenance (h) Necessary facilities to the JICA experts for the remittance as well as utilization of the funds introduced into Uganda from Japan 	
---	-------------------	--	--

ANNEX 1: Project Design Matrix (PDM)

<p>3-2 Prepare training materials to improve quality of life</p> <p>3-3 Conduct training on improving quality of life for agricultural officers</p> <p>3-4 Conduct training on improving quality of life for farmer groups</p> <p>3-5 Conduct monitoring, follow up, and evaluation of farmer groups</p> <p>3-6 Continuously improve contents and activity flow on improving quality of life based on the field experiences</p> <p>4-1 Livelihood improvement approach is formed based on Outputs 1, 2, and 3.</p> <p>4-2 Agricultural officers disseminate livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmers/farmer groups in the model Sub-counties.</p> <p>4-3 Production Departments disseminate livelihood improvement approach to other Sub-counties in the model Districts.</p> <p>4-4 MAAIF in collaboration with development partners disseminates livelihood improvement approach to other Districts in Acholi Sub-region.</p> <p>4-5 Recommend effective dissemination methods at National, District and Sub-county levels by the Project based on field experiences.</p>			
--	--	--	--

ANNEX 2: Evaluation Grid

1. Achievement of the Project

Evaluation Item	s.n.	Narrative Summary	Indicators	Data Needed	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods
Achievement/ Prospect of achievement of Overall Goal	1	The extent of achievement or the prospect of achievement of Overall Goal "Livelihood improvement approach is adopted in Acholi Sub-region."	1. More than 3,000 farmer households in Acholi Sub-region adopt the livelihood improvement approach by five years after the project completion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adoption of livelihood improvement approach by more than 3000 farmers Target value needs to be set. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project completion reports and other reports Counterpart Personnel (C/P), Japanese Expert Team (JET) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
	2		2. More than 70% of agricultural officers in Acholi Sub-region understand and teach the livelihood improvement approach by five years after the project completion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AOs who can understand and teach the livelihood improvement approach Modalities of extension of livelihood improvement approach need to be developed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project documents reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
Achievement (Project Purpose)	3	The extent and the prospect of achievement of Project Purpose "Livelihoods of target farmer groups are improved through establishment of livelihood improvement approach."	1. After two-year project intervention to each target farmer group in the model districts, real annual income of individual members of target farmer groups from cash crop production (including vegetables and traditional cash crops) increases at least 30% on an average.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rate of income increase from the agricultural production 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The End-line Survey and Project reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
	4		2. After two-year project intervention to each target farmer group in the model districts, more than 50% of individual members of the target farmer groups realise improvement of their livelihoods on at least five aspects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rate of target farmers who realise improvement of their livelihoods in at least five out of nine aspects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The End-line Survey and Project reports C/P and JET Other stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
Achievement (Outputs)	5	The extent of achievement of Output 1 "Vegetable production knowledge and skills of agricultural officers are improved through verifying appropriate technologies at demonstration farms."	1-1 More than five potential vegetables are confirmed and their appropriate cultivation methods suitable for Acholi Sub-region are identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified potential vegetables 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
	6		1-2 Training materials on vegetable production are developed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The target value was not set. The status of development of training materials and guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
	7		1-3 More than 90% of agricultural officers in the model districts understand appropriate technologies on vegetable production.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AOs' capacity of appropriate technologies on vegetable production 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
	8	The extent of achievement of Output 2 "Activity package is developed and implemented to promote market oriented agriculture."	2-1 Guidelines and training materials on market oriented agriculture (including materials developed in Output 1) are developed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The status of development of training materials and guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
	9		2-2 More than 70% of agricultural officers in the model districts understand and teach market oriented agriculture to farmers in the model districts by using materials developed by the Project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AOs' capacity of conducting training on market-oriented agriculture to farmers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
	10		2-3 After two-year project intervention to each target farmer group in the model districts, more than 60% of individual members of target farmer groups adopt more than 70% of techniques of market-oriented agriculture introduced by the Project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rate of target farmers who adopt more than 70% of techniques of market-oriented agriculture (70 % out of 14 activities) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports, and End-Line Survey report C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders

ANNEX 2: Evaluation Grid

Achievement (Outputs)	11	The extent of achievement of Output 3 "Practical tools to improve quality of life at household level are developed and implemented. "	3-1 Practical tools to improve quality of life are identified and guidelines and training materials are developed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The status of development of training materials and guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
	12		3-2. More than 70% of agricultural officers in the model districts understand and teach improvement of quality of life to farmers in the model districts by using the tools developed by the Project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AOs' capacity of conducting training on market-oriented agriculture to farmers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
	13		3-3 After two-year project intervention to each target group in the model districts, more than 60% of individual members of target farmer groups adopt more than 50% of activities for improving quality of life introduced by the Project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The rate of target farmers who adopt more than 50% of techniques of market-oriented agriculture (50 % out of 12 activities) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports, and End-Line Survey report C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
	14		4-1. More than 60% agricultural officers in the model districts disseminate the livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmers/farmer groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The status of extension of livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmer groups among AOs of the model districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
	15		4-2. More than 40% of agricultural officers in other five districts disseminate livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmers/farmer groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The status of extension of livelihood improvement approach to non-target farmer groups among AOs of other five districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
	16		4-3. Activities related to the livelihood improvement approach are incorporated into the District Development Plan of all eight districts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The status of incorporating the livelihood improvement approach into the DDP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
	17		4-4. An extension package for the livelihood improvement approach is prepared for nationwide extension.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The status of development of the extension package for the livelihood improvement approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
Achievement (Inputs from the Government of Uganda)	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment of counterpart personnel (C/P) Allocation of operational cost for the Project Provision of land, building, and other necessary facilities 	Actual inputs including comparison with the description of Record of Discussion (R/D)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of counterpart personnel Operational cost borne by the Ugandan side (including the Counterpart Fund) Office space and facilities provided by the Ugandan side 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Interview with stakeholders
Achievement (Inputs from JICA)	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number and professional field of Experts Provision of equipment (list and total cost) Number of training participants in Japan Allocation of operational cost for the Project 	Actual inputs (including comparison with the description of R/D)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of dispatched Experts and professional field List of equipment List of training participants Operational cost borne by the Japanese side 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Interview with stakeholders

ANNEX 2: Evaluation Grid

2. Process of Project Implementation

Evaluation Item		Evaluation Question (Main Question)	Evaluation Question (Sub Question)	Data Needed	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods
Project management and progress of activities	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall project management Contributing and hindering factors from the operational and technical aspects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the project management and the technical transfer been conducted smoothly? If they have been smoothly conducted, what are contributing factors? If not smoothly conducted, what are hindering factors? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project management system (internal factors) Divergence between original PDM and current activities Changes of important assumptions and other external factors that might influence the Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress of activities Contributing and hindering factors for implementation of activities Any challenges arisen during implementation of activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the activities of each output been smoothly conducted? What are the contributing and hindering factors which might influence implementation of activities? Are there any activities that have not been completely conducted? If not completely conducted, what is a cause? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Divergence between original Plan of Operation and current activities Changes of inputs and important assumptions Other internal factors such as contributing and hindering factors and countermeasures Process of modifying activities and relevant documents describing such modification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Interview with stakeholders
Monitoring of progress of activities	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring mechanism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How have the monitoring activities been conducted? (including methods and frequency) How have the PDM indicators been monitored? How were the results of monitoring fed back to the Project? Is there any room for improving monitoring methods? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether or not any monitoring tools Methods of monitoring, and of utilization and feedback of monitoring results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders
Monitoring of progress of activities	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response to changes of Important Assumptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were there any changes of Important Assumptions? If there were any changes, who responded to them and how? Were there any changes caused by external factors that were not originally described in the PDM as Important Assumptions? If there were such changes, who responded to them? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes of Important Assumptions and countermeasures Whether or not there are any records, and methods of recording/reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Interview with stakeholders
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-conditions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were there any changes of Pre-conditions? If there were any changes, who responded to them and how? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Views of Project Manager/Project Coordinator and Chief Advisor about preconditions of the Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports Project Manager (C/P) and Chief Advisor of JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Interview with stakeholders
Communication among project stakeholders	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication and common understanding about problems/concerns related to the Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the JET and the C/Ps communicated sufficiently? Have the JET and the C/Ps had common understanding about problems/concerns related to the Project? Have the C/P organizations (MAAIF and 8 Districts) communicated sufficiently? Have the C/P organizations (MAAIF and 8 Districts) had common understanding about problems/concerns related to the Project? Has the JET communicated within the team sufficiently? Has the JET had common understanding about problems/concerns related to the Project within the team? Have the Project, JICA Headquarters and JICA Uganda Office communicated sufficiently? Have the Project, JICA Headquarters and JICA Uganda Office had common understanding about problems/concerns related to the Project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whether or not there are any communication tools Frequency of various meetings for project management and methods of recording/reporting Views of JICA Headquarters, JICA Uganda Office, C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents and reports C/P and JET JICA Headquarters and JICA Uganda Office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of documents and reports Questionnaire Interview with stakeholders

ANNEX 2: Evaluation Grid

<p>Knowledge, knowhow & expertise exchange</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>•Progress of knowledge, knowhow and expertise exchange</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •What type of knowledge and skills that should be transferred to which level of C/P? •Have knowledge and skills that should be transferred to C/P been changed compared to the beginning of the Project? •Have such knowledge and skills been transferred to C/P in an appropriate manner? •How did the JET work out to transfer knowledge and skills mentioned above? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Target groups of knowledge and skills transfer, detailed information on knowledge and skills that should be transferred to C/P • Whether or not there are any changes in knowledge and skills that should be transferred to C/P by comparison with the original plan •Methods of transfer of knowledge and skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Project documents and reports •C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports •Questionnaire •Interview with stakeholders
<p>Ownership of implementing organizations</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>•Progress of nurturing a sense of ownership among the implementing organization and the responsible organization</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Extent of recognition of the Project among District-level C/Ps in Acholi Sub-region and MAAIF •Extent of participation of the Project among the above organizations •Appropriateness of assignment of C/Ps •Operational costs borne by the Ugandan side 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Frequency of each meeting, participants of each meeting, and issues discussed •Whether or not there are any case examples that might indicate the ownership of implementing agencies has been enhanced. •Number and duty position of C/Ps •Project operational costs borne by the Ugandan side 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Project documents and reports •C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports •Questionnaire •Interview with stakeholders

Evaluation by Five Criteria

Evaluation Item	S. N.	Evaluation Question (Main Question)	Evaluation Question (Sub Question)	Data Needed	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods
Relevance (Are the Project Purpose and the Overall Goal valid for the Project?)	1	Necessity of the Project	Does the Project, focusing on development of appropriate technologies of vegetable production, development of market-oriented agriculture and quality of life improvement components, and disseminating of the livelihood improvement approach, meet the needs of the MAAIF, 8 districts and target farmers groups?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceptions and views of MAAIF and the district-and sub-county-level C/Ps in Acholi Sub-region about the Project • Perceptions and views of JET about the Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders
	2	Priority of the Project	Are the Project Purpose and the Overall Goal consistent with the National Development Plan II & III, the Agricultural Sector Strategy Plan II & III, the PRDP 3 and other related policies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Development Plan II(2015/16 – 2019/20) and NDP III (2020/21 – 2024/25) • The Agricultural Sector Strategic Plan II(ASSPII 2015/16 – 2019/20) and ASSP III (2020/21 – 2024/25) • The PRDP 3 (2015/16 – 2020/21) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET • Relevant policies and strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Interview with stakeholders
	3		Are the Project Purpose and the Overall Goal consistent with Japanese Government's as well as JICA's aid policies for Uganda? Are the Project Purpose and the Overall Goal in line with the JICA's assistant policy in the aspect of peacebuilding?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Japan's Country Development Cooperation Policy for Republic of Uganda (2018) • Rolling plan for Republic of Uganda (2018) • JICA's REAP Phase 1 (2009 – 2015), Phase 2 (2016 – 2021) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website of Ministry of Foreign Affairs • Website of JICA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports
	4	Appropriateness of strategies and approaches of the Project	Is the approach which consists of both market-oriented agriculture component and the quality of life component adopted by the Project relevant as means for improving the livelihood?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views of C/P, JET and other stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET • Other stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders
	5		Does JICA have the adequate experiences and know-how of development and implementation of SHEP approaches and quality of life improvement as well as of agricultural development in North Uganda?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Japan's similar cooperation • C/P's perceptions and views about the Japanese support for livelihood improvement • Application of experiences and lesson from the similar interventions of past cooperation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders

ANNEX 2: Evaluation Grid

Relevance	6	Appropriateness of timing for implementation of the Project	Was the timing of implementation of the Project appropriate in terms of support for the conflict affected area of the Northern Uganda?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture sector of the PRDP 3 (2015/16 – 2020/21) • JICA's REAP Phase 2 (2016 – 2021) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET • The PRDP 3 • The REAP 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders
	7	Appropriateness of selection of the target areas and the target groups for the Project	Was the selection of the target districts/sub-counties and the target farmer groups appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views of C/P, JET and other stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET • Other stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders
	8	Appropriateness of scope of the Project in terms of support for the conflict affected areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the needs of the communities which were affected by the conflict specified? Has the Project adversely influenced the unstable factors? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views of C/P, JET and other stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET • Other stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders
Effectiveness (Has the target group received benefits from implementation of the Project? Has the Project Purpose been achieved or going to be achieved? Did or does the achievement of the Project Purpose result from Outputs?)	9	Achievement of the Project Purpose	Is there a good chance that the Project Purpose would be achieved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievement Grid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievement Grid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievement Grid
	10	Contribution of Outputs	Has the Project Purpose been achieved due to the effect of achievement of each Output?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievement of Outputs • Stakeholders' views 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	11	Contribution of Outputs	In order to achieve the Project Purpose, are there any Outputs that were not described in PDM but should be added in PDM?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison between original Plan of Operation and actual performance of activities • Views expressed by the stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	12	Influence of Important Assumptions from the Outputs to the Project Purpose	Did the Important Assumption, i.e., "Decentralisation is maintained", "Ugandan Government creates favourable conditions for private investments", "There is no unfavourable weather and/or outbreak of pests and diseases", "Ugandan Government policies continue to support development and maintenance of infrastructure necessary to promote market oriented agriculture (e.g. market facilities, roads, and bridges), and "There is no serious social disturbance" influence implementation of activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Influence of these Important Assumptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	13		Except for the Important Assumptions, were there any external factors that have influenced the Project positively or negatively? Has the influence of COVID-19 pandemic affected the Project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of external factors that contribute to and impede the achievement of the Project Purpose • Influence of the COVID-19 pandemic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	14	What are the contributing and hindering factors that have influenced effectiveness of the Project?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of external factors that contribute to and impede the achievement of the Project Purpose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid

ANNEX 2: Evaluation Grid

<p>Efficiency (Was input converted to efficient activities? Was the Project carried out efficiently?)</p>	15	Achievement of Outputs	Is there a good chance that four Outputs would be achieved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievement Grid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievement Grid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievement Grid
	16	Efficiency of the inputs from the Japanese side in terms of quality, quantity and timing, judging from the achieved outputs	Were the number of experts dispatched, their special fields of expertise, and timing of dispatch appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of dispatch of experts • Stakeholders' views about the experts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	17		Were the type, quantity and timing of the procurement of equipment appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of equipment provided • Usage and condition of equipment • Stakeholders' views about equipment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	18	Efficiency of the inputs from the Japanese side in terms of quality, quantity and timing, judging from the achieved outputs	Were the number of trainees of counterpart' training in Japan and seminars as well as Workshops in South Africa, the program content and the program period appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of C/P training in Japan • Stakeholders' views about the C/P training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	19		Was the project operational cost borne by the Japanese side appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of project operational costs borne by the Japanese side • Stakeholders' views about project operational costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	20	Efficiency of the inputs from the Ugandan side in terms of quality, quantity and timing, judging from the achieved outputs	Were the number of counterparts, their assignment and their capabilities appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of C/P • Stakeholders' views about assignment of the C/P 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	21		Were there any problems related to the land, the buildings and facilities provided by the Ugandan side in terms of area, quality and convenience?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current state of buildings and facilities provided by the Ugandan side • Stakeholders' views about the buildings and facilities provided by the Ugandan side 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	22		Was the project operational cost borne by the Ugandan side appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of project operational cost borne by the Ugandan side • Stakeholders' views about project operational costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid

ANNEX 2: Evaluation Grid

Efficiency (Was input converted to efficient activities? Was the Project carried out efficiently?)	23	Contribution of Activities	Were sufficient activities planned to produce the Outputs? Were these activities carried out in a timely manner?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison between the Plan of Operation and the actual performance • Stakeholders' views 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	24		Were there any activities that were not described in PDM but contributed to the achievement of Outputs? If there were, should such activities have been additionally described in PDM?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison between the Plan of Operation and the actual performance • Stakeholders' views 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	25		Were there any activities that have not been carried out but need to be added in PDM in order to achieve the Outputs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison between the Plan of Operation and the actual performance • Stakeholders' views 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	26	Influence of Important Assumptions from the Activities to the Outputs	Important Assumptions were not set. Were they any external factor which influence implementation of activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Influences of Important Assumptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	27		Were the Pre-Conditions including "Ugandan Government maintains Northern Uganda development and agricultural development policies " met?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of Pre-condition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	28	What are the contributing and hindering factors that have influenced efficiency of the Project?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of external factors that contribute to and impede efficiency of the Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid

ANNEX 2: Evaluation Grid

<p>Impacts</p> <p>(Has the Project generated the long-term, indirect and ripple effects? Is there a good chance that the Project would generate these impacts?)</p>	29	Prospect of achievement of the Overall Goal	Is there a good chance that the Overall Goal "Livelihood improvement approach is adopted in Acholi Sub-region" would be achieved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievement of the Overall Goal Indicators • Stakeholders' views 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	30	Influence of Important Assumptions	Are the Important Assumption i.e. "Ugandan Government continues providing extension services", "There is no unfavourable weather and/or outbreak of pests and diseases", "Macro-economic conditions of Uganda are stable", "There is no serious social disturbance" and other external factors that were not described in PDM likely to influence the achievement of the Overall Goal? .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation of Important Assumptions and prospects of their influence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	31	Ripple effects	Except for the Overall Goal, were there any positive effects brought about by the Project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of other impacts and prospects for their influence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	32		Were there any unexpected and negative effects brought about by the Project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of negative impacts and prospects of their influence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	33	Impacts on unstable factors and stable factors	Are there any impacts on improvement of relationship and trust in the farmers groups or between the target groups and other community people?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples which indicate improvement of relationship and trust between community people and LGs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid
	34	What are the contributing and hindering factors that have influenced or will influence the achievement of the Overall Goal?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of internal contributing and hindering factors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders • Achievement Grid

ANNEX 2: Evaluation Grid

<p>Sustainability (Is there a good chance that the effects of the Project would be sustained after the termination of the Project?)</p>	35	<p>Policies</p> <p>Are there any policies that can ensure sustainability and expansion of the Project's effects?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders' views • NDP III and ASSP III 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders
	36	<p>Institution</p> <p>Will the various Project's activities and deliverables be sustained, including the livelihood improvement approach, training curriculum and materials? Have the MAAIF and the District Local Governments in eight districts taken initiatives in institutionalization of the Project's effects? Are there any mechanisms for ensuring the scaleup of the extension of livelihood improvement approach?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders' views • Examples of sustainability in the institutional aspect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders
	37	<p>Organization</p> <p>Will the District Production and Marketing Department be able to continue to disseminate the livelihood improvement approach? Will the Directorate of Agricultural Extension Services of MAAIF be able to involved the scale up the livelihood improvement approach?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders' views • Examples of sustainability in the organizational aspect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders
	38	<p>Finance</p> <p>Have the District Local Governments allocated sufficient budget to sustain the Project's effects? Are there any mechanism to ensure the further extension across the districts of Acholi in the financial aspect?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders' views • Examples of sustainability in the financial aspect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders
	39	<p>Knowledge/Skills</p> <p>Will the district- and sub-county-level C/Ps be able to utilize and sustain the knowledge and skills transferred by JET and obtained from the Project after the completion of the Project? Are there any areas for improvement of capacity development for AOs related to the livelihood improvement approach? Will the target farmers be able to continue the livelihood improvement approach? Are there any areas for improvement of capacity development for the farmers who were transformed from the subsistence to the semi-agricultural farmers?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders' views • Case examples of sustainability in the technical aspect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders
	40	<p>What are the contributing and hindering factors that have influenced or will influence sustainability of the Project?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of internal and external factors, and contributing and hindering factors for sustainability of the Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents and reports • C/P and JET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents and reports • Questionnaire • Interview with stakeholders

ANNEX 3: List of the Counterparts

1. Counterparts of Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF)

	Name	Role in NUFLIP	Position	Ministry/Department
1	Pius Wakabi Kasajja	Project Director	Permanent Secretary	MAAIF
2	Alex Lwakuba	Project Manager	Commissioner	Department of Crop Production/ MAAIF
3	James Tumwine	Project Coordinator	Acting Principal Agricultural Officer	Department of Crop Production/ MAAIF
4	Maurice Opio	Crop Protection	Senior Agricultural Inspector	Department of Crop Protection/ MAAIF
5	Yafesi Ogwang	Agribusiness	Assistant Commissioner, Agribusiness	Department of Agricultural Investment and Enterprise Development/ MAAIF
6	Stephen Biribonwa	Nutrition	Principal Agricultural Officer	Department of Crop Production/ MAAIF
7	Kizito Odongo	Nutrition	Senior Agricultural Officer/Home Economics	Department of Crop Production/ MAAIF
8	Daisy Eresu	Gender	Senior Agricultural Officer	Department of Crop Production/ MAAIF
9	Sunday Godfrey	Monitoring and Evaluation	Senior Statisticians	Agricultural Planning/ MAAIF
10	Robinson Lufafa	Monitoring and Evaluation	Statisticians	Agricultural Planning/ MAAIF
11	Dorothy Mujawimana	Monitoring and Evaluation	Statistician	Agricultural Planning/ MAAIF
12	Godfrey Kamanda	Programme Assistant/Extension	Assistant Project Coordinator	Department of Crop Protection/ MAAIF

2. Counterparts of District

	District	Name	Position	Department/Sub-county	Remarks
1	Gulu	Mr. Jackson Lakor	District Production Officer	District Production Department	Still in office
2	Gulu	Mr. Paul Kilama	District Agricultural Officer	District Production Department	Assigned in 2018
3	Gulu	Mr. David Latim	Agricultural Officer	Awach Sub-county	Retired in 2018
4	Gulu	Mr. Francis Nyeko	Agricultural Officer	Paicho Sub-county	Still in office
5	Gulu	Mr. Patrick Oloya	Agricultural Officer	Bungatila Sub-county	Assigned in 2018
6	Gulu	Mr. Geoffrey Anywar	Senior Agricultural Engineer	Unyama Sub-county	Resigned in 2019
7	Kitgum	Mr. Peter Abal	District Agricultural Officer	District Production Department	Retired in 2019
8	Kitgum	Mr. Omony Alfred	District Production Officer	District Production Department	Assigned in 2020
9	Kitgum	Mr. Denish Ocira	District Agricultural Officer	District Production Department	Assigned in 2019
10	Kitgum	Mr. Bosco Ocean	Agricultural Officer	Lagoro Sub-county	Transferred to Omiya Anyima in 2019
11	Kitgum	Ms. Lona Ajok	Agricultural Officer	Kitgum Matidi Sub-county	Transferred to Labongo Akwang in 2019
12	Kitgum	Mr. Anthony J. Okello	Agricultural Officer	Labongo Amida Sub-county	Retired in 2018
13	Kitgum	Ms. Ikeba Damali	Agricultural Officer	Labongo Amida Sub-county	Assigned in 2018

ANNEX 3: List of the Counterparts

	District	Name	Position	Department/Sub-county	Remarks
14	Kitgum	Ms. Pheobe Amito	Agricultural Officer	Labongo Akwang Sub-county	Transferred to Labongo Layamo in 2019
15	Pader	Mr. Robert S. Okeny	District Production Officer	District Production Department	Still in office
16	Pader	Mr. Peter Odongkara	District Agricultural Officer	District Production Department	Still in office
17	Pader	Mr. Andrew Oketayot	Agricultural Officer	Atanga Sub-county	Still in office
18	Pader	Mr. Jefferson Kinyera	Agricultural Officer	Puranga Sub-county	Still in office
19	Pader	Ms. Lillian O. Latabu	Veterinary Officer	Pader Town Council	Still in office
20	Pader	Ms. Prossy Anyango	Agricultural Officer	Pajule Sub-county	Still in office
21	Agago	Mr. Okidi sam	District Production Officer	District Production Department	Still in office
22	Agago	Mr. Sam Elem	District Agricultural Officer	District Production Department	Still in office
23	Agago	Mr. Olanya Richard	Agricultural Officer	Parabongo Sub-county	Still in office
24	Agago	Mr. Owiny David	Agricultural Officer	Lamiyo Sub-county	Assigned in 2019
25	Amuru	Mr. Batulumayo Okwonga	District Production Officer	District Production Department	Still in office
26	Amuru	Mr. Komakech Simon Peter	District Agricultural Officer	District Production Department	Assigned in 2019
27	Amuru	Mr. Otim Julius	Agricultural Officer	Pabbo Sub-county	Still in office
28	Amuru	Ms. Auma Esther	Agricultural Officer	Lamogi Sub-county	Still in office
29	Amuru	Mr. Amone Denish	Agricultural Officer	Atiak Sub-county	Still in office
30	Lamwo	Mr. Kolo Tobia	Acting District Production Officer	District Production Department	Assigned in 2018
31	Lamwo	Mr. Komakech Richard Cyrus	Acting District Agricultural Officer	District Production Department	Assigned in 2018
32	Lamwo	Mr. Nokrach Obwona Clement	Agricultural Officer	Paloga Sub-county	Still in office
33	Lamwo	Mr. Otema Francis Omach	Agricultural Officer	Padibe Sub-county	Assigned in 2018
34	Nwoya	Dr. Ukwir James	District Production Officer	District Production Department	Still in office
35	Nwoya	Mr. Kilama Alfred	District Agricultural Officer	District Production Department	Still in Office
36	Nwoya	Mr. Maktunu Benard	Agricultural Officer	Koch Goma Sub-county	Assigned in 2018
37	Nwoya	Mr. Omony Moses Okumu	Agricultural Officer	Purongo Sub-county	Assigned in 2018
38	Omoro	Mr. Oyet Godfrey Jomo	District Production Officer	District Production Department	Still in Office
39	Omoro	Ms. Lillian Wanican	District Agricultural Officer	District Production Department	Still in Office
40	Omoro	Mr. Okot Francis	Agricultural Officer	Bobi Sub-county	Still in Office
41	Omoro	Mr. Oweka Ivan	Agricultural Officer	Koro Sub-county	Still in Office

Remarks: C/Ps who are indicated in gray have already left the Project.

Source: Data obtained from the Project

ANNEX 4: Costs borne by the Ugandan side

(1) Total costs borne by the Ugandan side as of June 2020

Description	Costs UGX	Costs JPY*
Costs borne by the MAAIF (Counterpart Fund)	553,175,400	15,881,665
Costs borne by the eight District Local Governments	171,296,156	4,917,912
Total costs borne by the Ugandan side	724,471,556 UGX	20,799,578 JPY

Note: * Exchange rate was adopted according to JICA's procurement rate (UGX1=¥ 0.02871 in June 2020).

Source: Data obtained from the Project

(2) Costs borne by the MAAIF as of June 2020

Cost borne by the MAAIF (Counterpart Fund)	UGX 553,175,400 (USD 3,043,025).
It was used for the salary of two project staff at MAAIF (Assistant Programme Officer and a driver), purchase of one project vehicle and seven motorcycles, fuel, field allowance, 100 reams of photocopying papers, 3 printer cartridges and 193 polo T-shirts.	

Source: Data obtained from the Project

(3) Costs borne by the eight District Local Governments ad of June 2020

1) Gulu

Total expenditure: UGX 2,924,000

Purpose	Target (location, number)	Period	Items	Expenditure	Remarks (if any)
Training of farmers in agribusiness	Farmers in all Sub-counties (S/Cs)	2018-2020	Allowance, stationery and welfare	320,000	Training included knowledge/skills on vegetable production
Training of farmers in application of appropriate yield-enhancing technologies	Farmers in all S/Cs	2018-2020	Allowance, stationery and welfare	240,000	Training included knowledge/skills on vegetable production
Extension and advisory services for farmers	Farmers in all S/Cs	2018-2020	Allowances	432,000	Visits include vegetable farmers
Establishment of Demonstration sites	Farmers in all S/Cs	2018-2020	Fuel	1,296,000	Estimated cost
Promotion of vegetable production approach to farmers	Farmers in all S/Cs	2019	Fuel, allowance, stationery	422,000	
Agro-input quality compliance	Agro-chemical dealers	2019	Allowance, fuel	214,000	

Source: Data obtained from the Project

ANNEX 4: Costs borne by the Ugandan side

2) Kitgum

Total expenditure: UGX 56,438,000

Purpose	Target (location, number)	Period	Items	Expenditure	Remarks (if any)
Field monitoring of farmers by AOs	18 farmer groups by 10 AOs (for all S/Cs)	2019-2020	Fuel/transport Allowance	2,600,000 1,160,000	Some part of AEG allocated for NUFLIP activities
Training on vegetable cultivation techniques	18 farmer groups by 10 AOs (for all S/Cs)	2019-2020	Fuel/transport Allowance Stationaries Agricultural inputs	2,500,000 2,400,000 580,000 620,000	Some part of AEG allocated for NUFLIP activities
AOs' coordination meetings	10 AOs (for all S/Cs)	2019-2020	Fuel/transport Allowance	1,617,000 950,000	NUFLIP agenda was in some meetings.
Training of farmer groups on Improvement of Quality of Life	18 farmer groups by 10 AOs (for all S/Cs)	2019-2020	Fuel/transport Allowance Stationaries	2,458,000 1,845,000 3,215,000	Some parts of AEG allocated for NUFLIP activities
Conducting Market Surveys	18 farmer groups by 10 AOs (for all S/Cs)	2019-2020	Fuel/transport Allowance Stationaries	512,000 318,000 230,000	Not much market surveys done due to cost implications
Technical backstopping by DAO, DPO and CAO of NUFLIP activities	18 farmer groups by 10 AOs (for all S/Cs)	2019-2020	Fuel/transport Allowance Airtime	813,000 480,000 100,000	Done as part of routine supervision of extension activities
Purchase of 5 irrigation equipment	5 farmer groups in 4 S/Cs	2019-2020	Agricultural inputs	40,000,000	From DDEG under S/C

3) Pader

Total expenditure: UGX 5,885,000

Purpose	Target (location, number)	Period	Items	Expenditure	Remarks (if any)
Field Monitoring of farmer groups by AOs	22 farmer groups for all 11 AOs & 1 AVO	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel/transport Allowance stationeries	480,000 420,000 240,000	
Field trainings of farmer groups by AOs	22 farmer groups for all 11 AOs & 1 AVO	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel/transport Allowance stationeries	480,000 420,000 240,000	
Establishment & management of Nursery beds	22 farmer groups for all 11 AOs & 1 AVO	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel/transport Inputs Allowance stationeries	480,000 185,000 420,000 240,000	
Farmer group meetings	22 farmer groups for all 11 AOs & 1 AVO	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel/transport Allowance stationeries	480,000 420,000 240,000	
Exchange visit between groups	22 farmer groups for all 11 AOs & 1 AVO	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel/transport Allowance stationeries	480,000 420,000 240,000	

ANNEX 4: Costs borne by the Ugandan side

Source: Data obtained from the Project

4) Agago

Total expenditure: UGX 5,296,156

Purpose	Target (location, number)	Period	Items	Expenditure	Remarks (if any)
Monitoring by DAO	4 farmer groups in 2 S/Cs	Till July 2020	Fuel, SDA, Fuel, stationaries	723,000	Carried out when monitoring other departmental activities/projects
Technical backstopping on AOs	11 AOs in 16 lower local government (LLGs)	Till July 2020	Fuel, SDA, Fuel, stationaries	778,975	Carried out when conducting support supervision of AOs by DAO
Holding Farmer Field Days (FFDs)	4 FFDs in 4 LLGs	Till July 2020	Fuel, SDA, Fuel, stationaries	1,293,375	Conducted in 4 LLGs
Crop field inspections	18 Fields in 16 S/Cs	Till July 2020	Fuel, SDA, Fuel, stationaries	750,000	Conducted seasonally
Farmer group selections by AOs	4 LLGs	Till July 2020	Fuel, SDA, Fuel, stationaries	605,408	Conducted by the AOs within the Sub counties
Supervision of farmer groups activities by AOs	4 AOs in 4 S/Cs (Each AOs conducted 122 visits totaling to 488 visits)	Till July 2020	Fuel, SDAs	1,145,398	Conducted by the AOs within the Sub counties

Source: Data obtained from the Project

5) Amuru

Total expenditure: UGX 20,208,000

Purpose	Target (location, number)	Period	Items	Expenditure	Remarks (if any)
Select farmer groups and conduct training	4 AOs in all S/Cs	July 2019-June 2020	Fuels Motorcycle services Stationaries Allowances	8,000,000 4,800,000 3,200,000 3,072,000	Each AO was assigned at 1 S/C
Technical Planning Committee (TPC) meetings at department	Quarterly meetings at district	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel SDA	800,000 336,000	NUFLIP approach has been integrated into annual work plan 2020-2021 to be expanded in all S/Cs

ANNEX 4: Costs borne by the Ugandan side

Monitoring and technical backstopping of the AOs and farmers groups	All AOs, DAO, DPO, DCO	July 2019- June 2020	Fuel Allowance	1,600,000 1,200,000	They visited only group leaders due to COVID 19 SOP on social distancing
---	------------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------------	--

Source: Data obtained from the Project

6) Lamwo

Total expenditure: UGX 16,524,000

Purpose	Target (location, number)	Period	Items	Expenditure	Remarks (if any)
Field monitoring by DAO, DPMO and DCO	All 11 lower local governments (LLGs)	Sep 2018- June 2020	Fuel Allowance	2,000,000 1,200,000	It was conducted to assess the potential for vegetable production and marketing
Regular planning meetings on NUFLIP	All AOs and DAO, at District Headquarters	Sep 2018- June 2020	Fuel Allowance Stationaries	840,000 504,000 100,000	It was organized by DPMO to plan ways of implementation of NUFLIP approach to non-model S/Cs and parishes
Training of farmer groups and field monitoring and supervision by AOs	8 Farmer groups in 8 LLGs	July 2019- June 2020	Fuel/transport Allowance Stationaries Agricultural inputs	5,500,000 1,980,000 2,200,000 2,200,000	7 AOs implemented NUFLIP approach in 8 S/Cs including the model S/C AOs who implemented in non-model parishes

Source: Data obtained from the Project

7) Nwoya

Total expenditure: UGX 49,261,000

Purpose	Target (location, number)	Period	Items	Expenditure	Remarks (if any)
Sensitization meeting at District and Sub counties (S/Cs)	20 farmer groups by 8 AOs (for all S/Cs) and 4 Production staffs	July 2019- June 2020	Fuel, Allowance, Stationery	1,240,000	Supported by fund under DDEG, AEG and Local Revenues
Conducting market baseline and market survey	8 Farmer groups in 4 S/Cs	July 2019- June 2020	Fuel, Allowance, Stationery	1,437,000	Supported by fund under DDEG, AEG and Local Revenues

ANNEX 4: Costs borne by the Ugandan side

Disseminations of baseline and market survey reports	8 Farmer groups in 4 S/Cs	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel, allowance, Stationery	1,600,000	Supported by fund under DDEG, AEG and Local Revenues
Enterprise selection and site selection for demonstration plots	24 farmers groups in 7 S/Cs	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel, allowances, Stationery	2,481,000	Supported by fund under DDEG, AEG and Local Revenues
Farmer Action Plan/ Business Plan	24 farmers groups in 7 S/Cs	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel, allowance, Stationery	1,600,000	Supported by fund under DDEG, AEG and Local Revenues
Orientation and refresher training as ToT	8 AOs and 8 CDOs in all S/Cs	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel, allowance, Stationery and refreshment	2,636,000	Supported by fund under DDEG, AEG and Local Revenues
Input support towards demonstration gardens	24 farmers groups in 7 S/Cs	July 2019-June 2020	Inputs(Seeds and Agrochemicals)	7,635,000	Supported by fund under DDEG, AEG and Local Revenues
Technical backstopping	8 S/Cs in 2 seasons	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel, allowance, Stationery field refreshment	4,518,000	Supported by fund under DDEG, AEG and Local Revenues
Establishment of demonstration gardens	16 demonstration gardens established in 7 S/Cs	July 2019-June 2020	Agricultural inputs	3,200,000	Supported by fund under DDEG, AEG and Local Revenues
Farmers field days	6 Farmers' field days conducted in 4 S/Cs	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel, allowance, Stationery field refreshment	3,100,000	Supported by fund under DDEG, AEG and Local Revenues
Training of crop production and marketing (Crop Production Phenology)	24 Farmers groups in 8 S/Cs by 8 AOs	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel, allowance, Stationery of refreshment	8,814,000	Supported by fund under DDEG, AEG and Local Revenues
Gender, Home hygiene and nutrition, Farm Family Budgeting & Group Empowerment Training	24 Farmers groups in 8 S/Cs by 8 AOs	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel, allowance, Stationery, refreshment	6,200,000	Supported by fund under DDEG, AEG and Local Revenues
Monitoring, follow up and evaluation	12 members of the District Technical Committees and 5 District Executive Committee members jointly monitored the activities in the field in 7 S/Cs	July 2019-June 2020	Fuel, allowance, Stationery follow refreshment	4,800,000	Supported by fund under DDEG, AEG and Local Revenues

Source: Data obtained from the Project

ANNEX 4: Costs borne by the Ugandan side

8) Omoro

Total expenditure: UGX 14,760,000

Purpose	Target (location, number)	Period	Items	Expenditure	Remarks (if any)
Group selection, field training, market survey, technical follow up, backstopping and monitoring	4 farmer groups in Bobi and Koro S/Cs by 2 AOs	July 2018-July 2020	Fuel allowance	4,800,000	5 liters of fuel per day for 15 days is UGX 300,000 for 2 AO per quarter for 8 quarters
Group field training and follow up activities	4 batch 1 groups in Koro and Bobi S/Cs	July 2018-July 2020	SDA	2,880,000	12,000 per day per staff for 15 days in a quarter. 2 AOs of Bobi and Koro for 8 quarters
Expansion of NUFLIP activities in non- model sites	6 roll out farmer groups in Koro S/Cs	July 2018-July 2020	Agricultural inputs Stationeries	6,000,000 1,080,000	6 demos were set up at group level in Koro S/Cs 180,000= spent on 2 cartons of papers/stationery each quarter for 6 quarters
Quarterly Supervision and technical backstopping by DAO and DPO	Koro and Bobi S/Cs	July 2018-July 2020	Fuel allowance	1,184,000	40 liters of diesel per quarter for 8 quarters

Source: Data obtained from the Project

ANNEX 5: List of the Japanese Experts

As of the end of September 2020

Name	Title	Place	Terms*			Total** (Days)	Total** (M/M)
			1 st Term	2 nd Term	3 rd Term (on going)		
1. Yasuo OHNO	Chief Advisor/ Extension/ Market- oriented Agriculture	Uganda	195	318	153	666	22.20
		Japan	-	2	42	44	2.20
2. Masafumi NAKANISHI	Deputy Chief Advisor/ Extension/ Market- oriented Agriculture	Uganda	240	338	169	747	24.90
		Japan	-	14	30	44	2.20
3. Kosuke SAWADA	Vegetable Production	Uganda	210	464	224	898	29.93
		Japan	-	4	69	73	3.65
4. Riai YAMASHITA	Improvement of Quality of Life/ Gender	Uganda	135	274	153	562	18.73
		Japan	-	3	37	40	2.00
5. Nagisa ISHIKAWA	Nutrition Improvement/ Coordinator	Uganda	155	285	138	578	19.27
		Japan	-	3	28	31	1.55
6. Fumiko MIYASHITA	Farming Plan/ Marketing	Uganda	60	103	54	217	7.23
		Kampala	-	18	-	18	0.90
Total						3018 Days	134.76 M/M

Note: * [1st Term] November 2015 – January 2016, [2nd Term] February 2016 – January 2019, and
[3rd Term] February 2019 – August 2021

** As of the end of September 2020

Sources: Obtained from the Project

ANNEX 6: Costs borne by the Japanese side

(1) Total operational costs borne by the Japanese side as of June 2020

Description	Costs UGX	Costs JPY
Cost borne by the Japanese Side	3,465,387,774*	99,491,283

Note: * Exchange rate was adopted according to JICA's procurement rate (UGX1=¥0.02871 in June 2020)

(2) Operational Costs borne by the Japanese side on the yearly basis as of June 2020

Fiscal Year of Japanese side	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	TOTAL
Term & Number of Months	November 2015 to March 2016	April 2016 to March 2017	April 2017 to March 2018	April 2018 to March 2019	April 2019 to March 2020	April 2020 to June 2020	November 2015 to June 2020
	5 months	12 months	12 months	12 months	12 months	3 months	56 months
JPY	4,530,203	24,622,134	20,825,223	24,602,941	21,191,503	3,719,279	99,491,283
Remarks	The costs were paid for Project staff employment, vehicle related expenses (e.g. fuel for project vehicles, car rental fee and maintenance cost of project vehicles), necessary materials for training sessions (e.g. seeds, fertilizers, agricultural chemicals, farm tools, consumables of copier machine/printers, and stationery), equipment such as printers, daily allowances of AOs and Project staff meetings and trainings (e.g. Training of Trainers (TOT), Market Survey and Business Forum, Retailers' and Dealers' Forums and Joint Coordination Committee (JCC) and Technical Committee (TC) meetings), security and maintenance of the project office in Gulu.						

Source: Data obtained from the Project

ANNEX 7: Equipment provided by the Japanese side

(4) Total Costs of Equipment provided by the Japanese Side

(as of October 2020)

Items	Costs USD	Costs JPY
1. Station Wagons (2)	61,838.10	7,680,910*
2. Laptop computers (8)	7337.80	738,227**
3. Motorcycles (10)	27,070.00	2723,404***
Total	96,245.90	11,142,541
	USD	JPY

Note: * Exchange rate was adopted according to JICA's procurement rate (USD1=¥124.21 in August 2015).

** Exchange rate was adopted according to JICA's procurement rate (USD1=¥102.19 in September 2016) and (USD1=¥100.606 in October 2016)

*** Exchange rate was adopted according to JICA's procurement rate (USD1=¥100.606 in October 2016)

Source: Data obtained from the JICA Headquarters and the Project

(5) List of Equipment provided by the Japanese Side

(as of October 2020)

No	Item	Qn	Unit Price (USD)	Total Price (USD)	Total Price (JPY)	Location	Frequency of Use *1	Condition *2	Remarks
Japanese Fiscal Year 2015									
1	Station Wagon (Nissan Patrol)	1	36,477.90 USD	36,477.90 USD	4,530,920* JPY	Project office	A	A	
2	Station Wagon (Toyota Hilux)	1	25,360.20 USD	25,360.20 USD	3,149,990* JPY	Project office	A	A	
Japanese Fiscal Year 2016									
1	Laptops	1		5887.80 USD	592,348** JPY	Gulu District	A	B	
2	Laptops	1					A	B	
3	Laptops	1					C	C	It has memory problem and being used.
4	Laptops	1				Kitgum District	A	B	
5	Laptops	1					A	B	
6	Laptops	1					E	C	It's out of order and not yet fixed.
7	Laptops	1		1450.00 USD	145,879*** JPY	Pader District	A	B	
8	Laptops	1					A	B	

ANNEX 7: Equipment provided by the Japanese side

9	Motorcycle	1		27070.00 USD	2,723,404** * JPY	Gulu District	A	A	
10	Motorcycle	1					A	A	
11	Motorcycle	1					A	A	
12	Motorcycle	1				Kitgum District	A	A	
13	Motorcycle						A	A	
14	Motorcycle						A	A	
15	Motorcycle					Pader District	A	C	It requires parts replacement and not yet fixed.
16	Motorcycle						A	B	
17	Motorcycle						A	B	
18	Motorcycle				A	B			
Total				11,142,541 USD	110,754.24 JPY				

Note*1: A-Frequently (almost every day), B-Sometimes (1-3 a week), C-Use concentrated on particular period, D-rarely (1-3 times a year), E-No use due to particular reasons

*2: A-Always possible to use with sufficient maintenance, B-Almost no problem in use, C-Possible to use if repaired, D-Difficult to use

* Exchange rate was adopted according to JICA's procurement rate (USD1=¥ 124.21 in August 2015).

** Exchange rate was adopted according to JICA's procurement rate (USD1=¥ 102.19 in September 2016)

*** Exchange rate was adopted according to JICA's procurement rate (USD1=¥ 100.606 in October 2016)

Source: Data obtained from the JICA Headquarters and the Project

ANNEX 8: List of Participants of Training in Japan and Workshop/Seminars in South Africa

1. Training in Japan

Number of Participants: 16 people

S. N.	Training title	Period	Name of trainee	Position	Sharing method
Year 2016					
1	Knowledge Co-Creation Program: Market-Oriented Agriculture Promotion For Africa (Extension Officer)	3rd April to 17th September, 2016 (Including training period in Kenya)	Mr. Denish Ochira	Agricultural officer from Kitgum District Local Government	Knowledge shared within Kitgum District
2	Knowledge Co-Creation Program: Integrated Agriculture and Rural Development Through the Participation of Local Farmers (B)	2nd August to 13th September, 2016	Mr. Peter Odongkara	DAO from Pader District Local Government	Presentation made at the 1st TC meeting
3	Knowledge Co-Creation Program: Agribusiness Promotion for Rural Development in African Countries (A)	10th October to 26th November, 2016	Mr. Yafesi Ogwang	Agricultural Investment and Enterprise Development MAAIF, Acting Assistant Commissioner/Agribusiness	Knowledge shared within MAAIF
4	Knowledge Co-Creation Program: Market-Oriented Agriculture Promotion for Africa (Planning and Management) (B)	6th to 26th November, 2016 (Including training period in Kenya)	Mr. Abal Peter	DAO from Kitgum District Local Government	Presentation made at the 3 rd JCC Meeting
5			Dr. Robert Okeney	DPO from Pader District Local Government	Same as above
6			Ms. Daisy Eresu	Directorate of Crop Production, MAAIF, Senior Agricultural Inspector	Same as above
Year 2017					
7	Knowledge Co-Creation Program: Market-Oriented Agriculture Promotion For Africa (Extension Officer)	3rd April to 10th September, 2017	Ivan Oweka	Agricultural Officer from Omoro District Local Government	Presentation made at Retailer's Forum in 2018
8	Knowledge Co-Creation Program: Market-Oriented Agriculture Promotion for Africa (Planning and Management) (B)	5th November to 24th November 2017 (including training period in Kenya)	Kamanda Godfrey	Directorate of Crop Production, MAAIF, Assistant Project Coordinator	Knowledge gained was shared within MAAIF
9			Paul Kilama	DAO from Gulu District Local Government	Presentation made for AOs in Gulu District

ANNEX 8: List of Participants of Training in Japan and Workshop/Seminars in South Africa

S. N.	Training title	Period	Name of trainee	Position	Sharing method
10	Knowledge Co-Creation Program: Nutrition Improvement Through Agriculture	2nd July to 29th July 2017 (including training period in Madagascar)	Ikeba Damali	Agricultural Officer from Kitgum District Local Government	Presentation made at TOT held in Gulu in 2017
Year 2018					
11	Knowledge Co-Creation Program: Market-Oriented Agriculture Promotion For Africa (Extension Officer)	1st April to 7th September, 2018	Otim Julius	Agricultural Officer from Amuru District Local Government	Presentation made at Retailer's Forum in 2018
12	Knowledge Co-Creation Program: Market-Oriented Agriculture Promotion for Africa (Planning and Management) (B)	4th November to 23rd November 2018 (including training period in Malawi)	Alfred Kilama	DAO from Nwoya District Local Government	Shared with his colleagues of Nwoya District
Year 2019					
13	Knowledge Co-Creation Program: Market-Oriented Agriculture Promotion For Africa (Extension Officer)	1st April to 7th September, 2019	Kinyera Jefferson	Agricultural Officer from Pader District Local Government	Presentation made at a meeting with DPO, DAO, and other AOs for monitoring on their extension activities
14	Knowledge Co-Creation Program: Market-Oriented Agriculture Promotion for Africa (Planning and Management) (B)	11th November to 29th November 2019 (including training period in Malawi)	Komakech Simon Peter	DAO from Amuru District Local Government	Presentation made at the 4th TC meeting
15			Lillian Wanichan	DAO from Omoro District Local Government	Same as above
16	Knowledge Co-Creation Program: Nutrition Improvement Through Agriculture	12th May to 1st June 2019	Kizito Odongo	Directorate of Crop Production/ MAAIF Senior Agricultural Officer/Home Economics	Report submitted to MAAIF to share the knowledge gained

Source: Provided by the Project

ANNEX 8: List of Participants of Training in Japan and Workshop/Seminars in South Africa

2. Seminars and Workshops in South Africa

Number of Participants: 16 (2 people participated twice)

List of Participants for Seminar in South Africa for year 2016					
SHEP Approach Seminar					
	Name	Organization	Department	Title	Opportunity of sharing with other counterparts
1	Jackson Lakor	Gulu District Local Government	Production Department	Acting District Production Officer	Shared information with his colleagues in Gulu District
2	Nyero Phillip	Kitgum District Local Government	Production Department	Agricultural Officer	Shared information with his colleagues in Kitgum District
3	Okidi Festo	Pader District Local Government	Community Based Services Department	Senior Community Development Officer	Shared information with his colleagues in Pader District *
4	Peter Odongkara	Pader District Local Government	Production Department	District Agricultural Officer	Shared information with his colleagues in Pader District
5	Angella Namyanya	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Department of Extension	Senior Agricultural Officer	Shared information with her colleagues in MAAIF
6	Annunciata Hakuza	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Department of Planning	Senior Economist	Shared information with her colleagues in MAAIF *
Gender Workshop					
	Name	Organization	Department	Title	Opportunity of sharing with other counterparts
1	Okidi Festo	Pader District Local Government	Community Based Services Department	Senior Community Development Officer	Shared information with his colleagues in Pader District *
2	Annunciata Hakuza	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Department of Planning	Senior Economist	Shared information with her colleagues in MAAIF *
Participants with * mark are the same people.					
List of Participants for SHEP Approach Workshop in South Africa for year 2017					
SHEP Approach International Workshop					
	Name	Organization	Department	Title	Opportunity of sharing with other counterparts
1	Stephen Biribonwa	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Directorate of Crop Production	Acting Principal Agricultural Officer	Shared information with his colleagues in MAAIF
2	Francis Nyeko	Paicho Sub-county, Gulu District Local Government	Production Department	Agricultural Officer	Shared information with his colleagues in Gulu District
List of Participants for SHEP Approach Workshop in South Africa for year 2018					
SHEP Approach International Workshop					
	Name	Organization	Department	Title	Opportunity of sharing with other counterparts
1	Dr. James Tumwine	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Directorate of Crop Production	Project Coordinator	4th JCC held in May 2018
2	Abal Peter	Kitgum District Local Government	Production Department	District Agricultural Officer	4th JCC held in May 2018
List of Participants for SHEP Seminar in South Africa for year 2019					
SHEP Approach International Workshop					
	Name	Organization	Department	Title	Opportunity of sharing with other counterparts
1	Dr. James Tumwine	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Directorate of Crop Production	Project Coordinator	5th JCC held in August 2019
2	Abal Peter	Kitgum District Local Government	Production Department	District Agricultural Officer	5th JCC held in August 2019
3	Paul Kilama	Gulu District Local Government	Production Department	District Agricultural Officer	5th JCC held in August 2019
4	Odongkara Peter	Pader District Local Government	Production Department	District Agricultural Officer	5th JCC held in August 2019
List of Participants for SHEP Seminar in South Africa for year 2020					
SHEP International Seminar					
	Name	Organization	Department	Title	Opportunity of sharing with other counterparts
1	Sam Elem	Agago District Local Government	Production Department	District Agricultural Officer	Not yet done
2	Komakech Simon Peter	Lamwo District Local Government	Production Department	District Agricultural Officer	Not yet done

Source: Provided by the Project