

Karamoja Livestock Development Project (Phase II)

End Evaluation Report

January 2014

Prepared By:

Regina Juma Apiyo

P.o.Box 4233, 00506 Nairobi, Kenya

Email: apiyoregina@yahoo.com



DIERENARTSEN | VETERINAIRES
ZONDER GRENZEN | SANS FRONTIERES
BELGIUM

Members of the Evaluation Team

Joseph Mbane	Data Collection Team
Paul Kidon	Translator/ Data Collection Team
Regina Juma Apiyo	Consultant
Simon Omeri	Translator/Data Collection Team
Stella Lunkuse	Data Collection Team

ABBREVIATIONS

CAHWs	Community Animal Health Workers
CHWs	Community Health Workers
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
IGAs	Income Generating Activities
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority for Development
MADEFO	Matheniko Development Forum
PPR	Peste Des Petits Ruminants
VSF Belgium	Vétérinaires Sans Frontières (VSF) Belgium

Table of Contents

ABBREVIATIONS	3
LIST OF TABLES	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	9
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	10
1.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAMME	10
1.2 PURPOSE OF THE PROGRAMME	11
2.0 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	12
2.1 DATA COLLECTION METHODS.....	12
2.2 DATA COLLECTION TOOLS	12
2.3 SAMPLING METHODOLOGY.....	12
2.4 SAMPLE SIZE	13
2.5 EVALUATION LIMITATIONS.....	13
3.0 KEY FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION	14
3.1 IMPACT OF THE PROGRAMME	14
3.2 RELEVANCE OF THE PROGRAMME DESIGN.....	23
3.3 RELEVANCE OF THE PROJECTS IMPLEMENTED	23
3.4 PROGRAMME EFFECTIVENESS	28
3.5 PROGRAMME EFFICIENCY	30
3.7 CHALLENGES EXPERIENCED DURING THE PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION.....	31
3.8 PROGRAMME SUSTAINABILITY.....	32
4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	34
4.1 CONCLUSIONS.....	34
4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	35
5.0 LESSONS LEARNT.....	41
REFERENCES.....	42
LIST OF APPENDICES	42
APPENDIX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR END EVALUATION OF KARAMOJA LIVESTOCK DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (PHASE II)	43
APPENDIX 2: FIELD WORK PLAN	46
APPENDIX 3: GUIDES	47

APPENDIX 4: LIST OF PEOPLE CONSULTED54

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Profits generated by the community members.....25
Table 2 Key recommendations for the KLDP II evaluation.....36
Table 3 Lessons learnt from KLDP II.....41

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

VSF Belgium implemented the Karamoja Livestock Development Project II with the objective of addressing insecurity and inadequate access to grazing land and water for optimal animal health and production. The project tried to improve the social, welfare and economic status of households in the targeted areas. The project also addressed improved livelihood security of the targeted households as well as informed future design of similar interventions by VSF Belgium and provided the staff with a learning opportunity.

A consultant was commissioned by VSF Belgium to conduct the End Evaluation of Karamoja Livestock Development Project (Phase II). The evaluation was conducted in Moroto and Napak districts of Karamoja Region. The overall objective of this End of Phase II evaluation was to assess and document the benefits and impact of the Karamoja Livestock Development Project on the social and economic status, welfare and livelihoods of the intended direct and indirect project beneficiaries. The other objectives included; to measure the extent to which the programme's objectives improved the social and economic status of households in the targeted areas, to provide VSF Belgium and donors with information on how the program interventions have contributed to livelihood security of the targeted households and to inform future design of similar interventions by VSFB and provide the staff with a learning opportunity.

Qualitative evaluation methodologies were used in this evaluation. A total of 9 focus group discussions and 4 in-depth interviews were conducted in Moroto and Napak districts. Both male and female respondents participated in the focus group discussions. The specific evaluation tools used included; Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews tools. The participants who took part in this study included: IGAs groups, VICOBA groups, peace building initiative committee members, CAHWs and community members who benefitted from water structure and rangeland management. The collected data was thoroughly analyzed to produce this evaluation report.

The key findings of the KLDP end of project evaluation were;

- ❖ **Social cohesion** – the project has brought community members together and as a result promoted unity, this is because of the involvement of community members in the various project activities that were implemented in the KLDP II including; IGAs, CAHWs, peace building initiatives, VICOBA etc.

- ❖ **Improved saving culture amongst community members** – the community members were introduced to VICOBA and also provided with cash boxes, this has not only helped improve their saving culture, but it has also made them accessible to finances within their reach. The finances are acquired in form of loans that have seen community members initiate businesses that has helped them pay school fees for their children, access medical care, buy clothing as a result of profit accrued from the businesses initiated.
- ❖ **Economic diversification** - The knowledge acquired by the project beneficiaries has helped them venture into alternative livelihood sources such as agriculture which has not only improved their economic status as a result of the sale of the vegetables but has also improved their nutrition since the number and quantity of meals taken by families have improved from one meal per day to 2 – 3 meals per day due to diversity and availability of vegetables and fruits within the community reach.
- ❖ **Increased knowledge and awareness amongst community members** – community members were trained on various issues including business planning, animal health, HIV and AIDS etc. The knowledge on business planning has helped community members initiate their own businesses and this has helped them earn income which has resulted into them accessing health care services, paying school fees for their children, buying clothing and food for the family and also increasing the household income. In addition, trained CAHWs have been handy in providing animal health care services to the livestock within the communities and thus reducing the prevalence of diseases amongst livestock thus promoting increased production.
- ❖ Areas where the KLDP II project was implemented have become learning and reference points where other community members get information on projects so as to replicate in other areas, for example the Kitobarae VICOBA group constructed a shelter for the goats that has become a learning and reference point for the community members. In addition, some of the activities undertaken in some project sites have been replicated in other areas as a result of the exchange visits conducted.
- ❖ **Women empowerment** - The KLDP II project was gender sensitive, it gave women who previously could not even interact with men in the society an opportunity not only to be heard but also to actively participate in the project. They have acquired skills in various issues including; IGA, VICOBA, peace building, animal health and as a result, they have used these skills to initiate businesses within the community that has seen them advance socially and

economically. At household level women can also participate in decision making. In addition, women have also become empowered and can now even contest for political offices.

- ❖ **Change in community attitude** – The various trainings that were conducted in the community has enabled community members change their attitude, for example previously community members were not involved in planting of vegetables and fruits, however, with the knowledge acquired on agriculture, community members have been able to venture into agriculture that has enabled them access vegetables and fruits from their own farms this has reduced the community household expenses previously spent on purchase of vegetables. Men who were previously cattle raiders have also changed their attitude and left the vice and are now involved in various activities ranging from businesses, agriculture to peace ambassadors.
- ❖ Prevailing peace within Karamoja Region has also enabled community members to settle in homes that they had previously deserted as a result of insecurity and they are even participating in economic development. The prevailing peace has also reduced the migration of livestock thus reducing the chances of disease infection.
- ❖ The KLDP II has also led to the improvement of community livelihood, this is as a result of the community venture into agriculture and businesses. The distribution of the billy goats to the community members has also improved cross breeding within the community thus increasing production of livestock resulting into improved livelihood.

Lessons learnt from the KLDP included; the community members have learnt that they can successfully plan and manage projects on their own, they only need to be facilitated. To improve the community livelihood, it is important to focus on both emergency and development projects. The implementing agencies have also learnt that one organization cannot improve the livelihood of the community, it requires a concerted effort of the community, implementing agencies, the government and the donor agencies. Likewise communities can co-exist peacefully by sharing resources.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This evaluation was undertaken by Regina Juma Apiyo.

First, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Joseph Mbane, Natural Resources Management Officer, VSF Belgium, Paul Kidon, Community Development Officer, Matheniko Development Forum (MADEFO), Simon Omeri, Community Field Assistant and Stella Lunkuse, Livestock Extension Officer VSF Belgium, Uganda, Moroto Office for their wonderful support, time and dedication they accorded to the evaluation. They accompanied the evaluation consultant to the field, introduced the consultant to the target respondents and bridged the communication gap between the consultant and the community members.

I also wish to acknowledge and thank the government officials in the two districts who granted the evaluation consultant appointments despite their busy schedule; Elanyu Sam – Veterinary Officer, Moroto District, Dr. Orongo Walter – District Veterinary Officer, Moroto District and Joshua Riisa – Senior Commercial Officer, Napak District. Your contribution is highly appreciated.

I am also indebted to the VSF Belgium staffs; Hilda Arigi, Caroline Omondi and Emmanuel Emaruk for providing management and technical services during this evaluation. Am also indebted to MADEFO staff, Paul Kidon for providing rich insights to this evaluation that provided a bench mark to the end evaluation report, I am grateful.

Lastly, I would like to thank all the people that contributed in one way or another for the success of this evaluation and their names have not been mentioned in this piece of work, always know that your effort was not in vain, it is eminent and much appreciated.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Description of the programme

The Karamoja 'cluster' is a term used to describe the pastoral and agro-pastoral ethnic groups in an area comprising north-eastern Uganda, north-western Kenya, southern Sudan and south-western Ethiopia, most of whom share a common language, culture and land area.

The communities that constitute the Karamoja cluster include: Turkana, Matheniko, Bokora, Pian, Dodoth, Nyangatom, Didinga, Merille, Toposa, Jie, Tepeth, Acholi, Labwor and Upe.

In Uganda, Karamoja region covers 27,200 Km² semi-arid plain, with an average rainfall of 500-700 mm per annum, variable in space and time. The environment is classified as in disequilibrium, where vegetation in areas not receiving rain for two or more years is able to regenerate rapidly when it receives adequate moisture.

There is a limited amount of acacia/commiphora forest in the higher ground to the east of Moroto, which is the Regional Headquarters, but the vast majority of the district can be classified as semi-arid savannah covered with seasonal grasses, thorny plants, and occasional small trees.

The Karamoja region is characterized by a combination of acute poverty, vulnerability to drought, poor infrastructure, basic social services delivery, limited marketing opportunities, especially for livestock, natural resource degradation, social and cultural marginalization, long-standing dependency on external aid and most importantly, chronic insecurity.

The region is the least socially and economically developed in Uganda, even among the generally poor parts of Northern Uganda as a whole. Due to the aridity, extensive livestock keeping is the principal economic activity within the district. Livestock are kept primarily to sustain livelihoods through milk, meat and barter; the sale of livestock is only of secondary importance.

The livestock keeping system, which is exceptionally well adapted to the disequilibrium environment, is hindered primarily by the chronic insecurity (which has its basis in a tradition of cattle rustling) of the area, but also by poor access to water in the dry season, poor quality of available forage, high incidence of contagious

diseases and limited access to veterinary services. Whereas the prevalence of diseases, poor access to water and poor quality of the available forage limit the possibilities for breed improvement, the conflict provides an active disincentive for breed improvement as families do not want to draw attention to their herds.

Vétérinaires Sans Frontières (VSF) Belgium, is an international non-governmental organization with a mission to Empower disadvantaged livestock dependent communities (in the South) to improve their well being. VSF-Belgium is officially registered as an NGO with the Belgian Government and operates in several African countries. The Karamoja Livestock Development Project (KLDP) focuses on addressing insecurity and inadequate access to grazing and water for optimal animal health and production.

1.2 Purpose of the programme

The overall objective of this End of Phase II evaluation was to assess and document the benefits and impact of the Karamoja Livestock Development Project on the social and economic status, welfare and livelihoods of the intended direct and indirect project beneficiaries. This involved assessing and documenting the project's contribution to improving the livelihoods of the direct and indirect project beneficiaries.

The evaluation included identifying the impact, changes, timeliness, coverage, appropriateness and connectedness of the project, highlighting key lessons learned in the current phase and recommendations for improving the future structuring of interventions.

1.3 Scope and focus of the programme

The broad terms of reference include the following:

1. Measure the extent to which the programme's objectives to improve the social and economic status of households in the targeted areas have been achieved;
2. Provide VSF Belgium and donors with information on how the program interventions have contributed to livelihood security of the targeted households;
3. Inform future design of similar interventions by VSFB and provide the staff with a learning opportunity.

The evaluation will focus on the operational approach, the implementation process

and the performance of the programme.

Specifically the evaluation addressed the following questions:

1. Did the expected results fulfill the needs identified prior to the intervention? (relevance)
2. Do the expected results meet the major current needs? (relevance)
3. Does the program cover the initially targeted population? (coverage)
4. Has the project appropriately targeted the right beneficiaries and the deserving villages? (relevance and coverage)
5. Are the project activities timely implemented as planned? (effectiveness of work plan implementation)
6. Is the project on course to meet expected results? (effectiveness)
7. How are the resources being utilized in the course of project implementation so far? (efficiency)
8. Are the results of activities sustainable and to what extent?
9. What negative or positive End of Phase II influence of the project is already foreseen? (impact)

Finally, the evaluation should also assess the appreciation of the program by the beneficiaries as well as their participation at various levels of the project management cycle.

2.0 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was conducted from 14th to 18th in Moroto and Napak Districts in Karamoja Region, Uganda (**see Appendix 2: Field work plan**).

2.1 Data collection methods

A number of participatory methodologies were employed in this evaluation including; examination of secondary data, focus group discussions and key informant interviews.

2.2 Data collection tools

The data collection tools that were used in this study include interview schedule and focus group discussion guide.

2.3 Sampling methodology

This evaluation employed both purposive and quota sampling methodologies.



Community members participating in a focus group discussion in Kitobarae Village

2.4 Sample size

A total of 9 focus group discussions were conducted with community members and 4 Key Informant Interviews with government officials and one key informant interview with MADEFO staff.

2.5 Evaluation limitations

- ❖ **Inaccessibility of the government officials in water sector;** two government officials working in the water sector could not be reached for key informant interviews due to their busy schedule. Despite this challenge, the consultant managed to collect relevant information related to the impact of the water in the community.

3.0 KEY FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation targets KLDP II.

3.1 IMPACT OF THE PROGRAMME

Definition of livelihood

A livelihood is a means of making a living. It encompasses people's capabilities, assets, income and activities required to secure the necessities of life. A livelihood is sustainable when it enables people to cope with and recover from shocks and stresses (such as natural disasters and economic or social upheavals) and enhance their well-being and that of future generations without undermining the natural environment or resource base.

Definition of household livelihood security

Household Livelihood Security has been defined as adequate and sustainable access to income and resources to meet basic needs (including adequate access to food, potable water, health facilities, educational opportunities, housing, and time for community participation and social integration).

The programme interventions undertaken during the KLDP II included capacity building initiatives on IGAs, VICOBAs, peace building initiatives and training of CAHWs. In addition, the project also rehabilitated several boreholes, rehabilitation of rangeland and emergency vaccinations.

Programme interventions contribution to livelihood security of the targeted households

VICOBAs

A total of 8 VICOBA groups were initiated and supported during the KLDP II project life span. A total of 59,619,400 Ush (Euros 17,034.11) was saved by the members of the VICOBA groups in 2012, which enabled 247 members out of 487 (212M, 275F) members to access loans. The loans enabled members initiate other businesses and the profit accrued from the businesses have enabled parents to pay school fees for their children, buy clothing and food for the family as well as cater for medical care for the family.

The KLDP II project also provided community members with cash boxes for saving and safe keeping of their money, this has helped improve the saving culture of the community members and also it has enabled community members have access to loans at low interest rates.

During the life span of the KLDP II project, the community members were trained on various capacity building initiatives including; business planning, animal health, HIV and AIDS etc. The knowledge and skills gained by the community members on business planning has helped community members initiate their own businesses and this has helped them earn income which has resulted into them accessing key basic needs such as health care services, paying school fees for their children, buying clothing and food for the family and also increasing the household income. In addition, community members trained as CAHWs have used their knowledge and skills on animal health to provide animal health care services to the livestock within the communities and thus reducing the prevalence of diseases amongst livestock and thus promoting increased production. Likewise, the knowledge acquired by the community members has also enabled them venture into alternative livelihood sources such as agriculture which has not only improved their economic status as a result of the sale of the vegetables and fruits but has also improved their nutrition since the number and quantity of meals taken by families have improved from one meal per day to 2 – 3 meals per day due to diversity and availability of vegetables within the community reach.

Areas where the KLDP II project was implemented have become learning and reference points where other community members learn from. Through this, some community members have borrowed the idea from these communities and replicated in other areas. For example the Kitobarar VICOPA group – shelter for the goats has become a learning and reference point for the community members. The shelter constructed for the goats has demonstrated to the community members that the goats that have shelter are healthier compared to the goats that sleep in open enclosures. The goats with shelter have refined and soft skin as a result of protection from harsh weather conditions due to the warmth generated from the shelter thus improved health unlike the goats that sleep in open who have exposure to all manner of disease infections including weather related diseases.

Women participation and empowerment in the KLDP II project was a concern of VSF Belgium and its partner agency MADEFO. Gender issues were integrated in all its

interventions in order to reverse the traditional disparity advanced by cultural arrangements. Karamojongs being a patriarchal community, women are normally deprived off the opportunity to participate in economic development and decision making. However, the implementation of the KLDP II project gave women an opportunity to be involved in economic development and also participate in decision making. This was done through the involvement of women in a number of initiatives including; VICOBA's, IGAs, peace building initiatives and as well as training women as CAHWs. Women empowerment has also gone beyond household levels as some women have taken have also been empowered to contest for political offices.

Income generating Activities

During the KLDP II, a total of 16 IGA groups were initiated, the activities of the IGA groups ranged from vegetable growing, goat keeping, cereal banking to poultry production. Income generated from the group projects have helped supplement the individual savings by group members thereby increasing the amount of money available for member's loans. In addition the profits generated from the IGAs have helped members establish other businesses, pay school fees for their children, buy clothes and food for the families as well as access medical care thus improving the health status of the community members. Previously, the community members were not able to access these benefits adequately and more often, however with the implementation of the KLDP II project, the nutrition status of the community members has changed. Community members who previously could only afford one meal per day can now comfortably afford 2 – 3 meals per day. The quality of the meal has also improved as a result of diversity in terms of meals being taken since community members also have ventured into agriculture where they grow vegetables and fruits for both home consumption and for sale, thus improving the health status of community members.

The knowledge and skills gained by the community members as a result of the KLDP II project, has enabled project beneficiaries to utilize their money wisely thus promoting business continuity. The profits generated from the various businesses initiated by the community members have also enabled community members who are tenants to be able to pay for their rents. Likewise, some community members have been able to construct permanent houses with iron sheets as a result of being involved in the IGA project.

Rehabilitation of the boreholes and rangelands

Rehabilitation of the boreholes

A total of 8 boreholes were rehabilitated and 5 cattle watering troughs constructed, these water sources have enabled the community members have access to water within their vicinity. Previously the community would travel long distances in search of water and this led to loss of livestock due to attacks from other communities thus depriving the community members of their livelihood. Lack of water also meant that women could not be involved in other constructive and development activities since they would be out looking for water. However, with the rehabilitation of the boreholes within community has reduced chances of loss of livelihood (livestock) since the animals are now being watered within the community vicinity.

Availability of water within the community has also led to emergence of other unintended activities within the community to complement community livelihood such as agriculture, the community members are involved in agriculture, they plant vegetables and fruits to supplement their diet. This has also reduced household expenses on vegetables and fruits since the community members can now access vegetables and fruits from their farms and thus the money can now be used for other activities. Vegetables and fruits generated from the farms have also enabled community members to engage in business that have seen them sell the vegetables and fruits to get income that have enabled them improve their livelihood. Community involvement in agriculture has provided community members with jobs and income from the sale of the vegetables and fruits.



Vegetable farm for Okenyutu VICOBA group members

Access to water has also meant improved hygiene amongst community members, community members now have water for both domestic use as well as animal use. Through the KLDP II project, the boreholes were rehabilitated and this has increased not only water availability but also access in the community and this has enabled community members have water within their reach for activities such as bath and this has improved hygiene amongst community members thus reducing chances of disease infection.

The rehabilitation of the borehole has also led to the emergence of unintended activities such as an informal small market place where community members sell

their products. These traders target community members who go to the borehole to fetch water. Thus, this has improve social integration within the community since it gives the community members an opportunity to not only fetch water from the borehole but it also gives the community members an opportunity to have access to some items that they might require within their households. Through this, the community members also have time to socialize with other community members thus promoting peace and unity.

Presence of water in any community is normally considered as life since literally water is required and used in everything from agriculture, domestic chores, food preparation and also livestock and human beings require water to survive. Water source in the community is also highly valued since water is life, with this notion in mind, the presence of the borehole within the community has given the community members an avenue to have a meeting area at close proximity to the borehole.



Community members fetching water from a borehole rehabilitated by VSF Belgium in Kanakomol village

The evaluation also established that the community members have taken ownership of the structures established for example the boreholes. Community members have put enclosures (fence) for protection purposes. Community members also do contribute their own money towards the maintenance of the borehole in case of damage and this further promotes ownership and sustainability of the project amongst community members.

Rehabilitation of the rangelands

The rehabilitation of rangelands coupled with prevailing peace in Karamoja Region has enabled community members access grazing fields that were previously out of reach as a result of the escalating conflict in the region by then and thus this has resulted into increased livestock production. Improved livestock production amongst the pastoralists has resulted into increased milk production, thus complementing the dietary needs of community members. Nutrition amongst children has improved since they have access to more milk. The grazing fields that have been opened up include; Nakala, Kabila, Tirikol, Nachnoakimat, Nayonai and Ngitomei. The new grazing fields have helped reduce pressure on the grazing area and thus saving the environment from adverse degradation. Opening up of the new grazing fields have also promoted peaceful co-existence amongst communities since they are able to share vital resources such as pasture.

Community Animal Health Workers

During the KLDP II, a total of 20 new CAHWs were trained in Napak District and provided with basic kits of drugs and equipment to functionalise their new acquired skills. Refresher training for 7 days was conducted to the CAHWs to complement their basic animal health skills and ensure quality service delivery to the communities which they serve. This training was conducted as a result of the high demand of Community Animal Health Workers due to shortage of professional veterinary personnel and this was the very reason why more CAHWs were trained. The evaluation established that the trained CAHWs have been using their skills to offer services to the community members by tending to the livestock and this has led to improvement in the health status of the animals in the community thus reducing disease prevalence amongst livestock and thus improving production thus livelihood improvement. Likewise, the KLDP II project has brought animal health services closer to the community members the community members are now accessible to the drugs that are sold by the CAHWs within the community reach. The KLDP II project also brought the drug stores closer to the community members thus enabling

community members have access to drugs within their reach in the community. The trained CAHWs are also community members and therefore they can be reached by the community whenever they are required.

The community animal health workers project has also enhanced the community livelihood. The trained CAHWs are using their skills to earn income for their households since they charge for their services and this has improved their financial status and their lives as a whole. The income generated from these service provision, has enabled the CAHWs to diversify the sources of household incomes. Profit generated from other businesses have enabled CAHWs access vital basic needs such as paying school fees to children, cater for health care for the family as well as buy clothing for the family. Community members who were trained as community animal health workers were previously not able to access these benefits but with the KLDP II project they have been able to access these services.

The skills acquired by the CAHWs have also been transferred to some of the community members as a result increasing community knowledge and skills on animal health. As a result some community members have been able to administer drugs and treatment to their own livestock thus reducing disease prevalence amongst livestock thus improved health status of the livestock resulting to improved livelihood.

Socially, the CAHWs have also become respected community members as a result of the knowledge and skills that they have acquired from the KLDP II project and they are outstanding in social circles within the community. In the community, they are referred to as animal doctors.

The availability and access of the CAHWs within the community has also led to reduced disease burden amongst livestock, this is as a result of the treatment that the CAHWs have been providing to the livestock coupled with availability of drugs within the community.

Peace building initiatives

The peace building initiatives involved organizing meetings within the community to discuss peace initiatives. The men were instrumental in organizing meetings to discuss peace initiatives with other community members, however the women used song and dance to advocate for peace within the community. Through these

ventures, the peace building initiatives enabled community members to access grazing fields that were previously out of their reach as a result of conflict, these grazing fields include; Nakala, Kabila, Nachinoakimat, Nayonai, Ngitomei and Tirikol. Thus, this has led to improved health in livestock resulting to increased production. Increased production in livestock has enabled community members have access to milk thus improved nutrition.

The prevailing peace in Karamoja Region has also enabled community members to construct houses and settle down in villages that were previously deserted as a result of conflict. With the community members settling down in villages, they have been able to venture into agriculture as a source of food and also as a source of family income through the sale of produce from the farms and this has further increased the community livelihood. Agriculture has also enabled community members supplement and diversify their dietary needs since the community members have access to vegetables, onions and fruits. Availability of food has also improved family food consumption resulting to improved health since community members have access to approximately 2 – 3 meals a day unlike before.

Prevailing peace has also promoted intermarriages amongst communities who previously could not see eye to eye, thus promoting unity and social cohesion amongst community members. This has also led to an increase in family size since the men who previously were engaged in cattle raids and also spend sleepless nights proving protection to the livestock are now spending more time with the families.

Prevailing peace in Karamoja Region has opened the area, there is free movements. More roads are accessible which were previously not accessible (for herding livestock, collecting of firewood or trade). For example the road Moroto- Tapac and the Moroto-Nakiloro-Lokiriama road are currently busy with people moving particularly women. Improved security situation has also lead to increased trade and the establishment of the cattle trade in Musas where Pokots, Tepeths and Mathenikos conduct livestock trade.

The KLDP II project has also led to change of attitude amongst community members. Community members who were previously cattle raiders have changed their attitude and left the vice as a result of the peace building initiative and are currently involved in constructive economic development activities including businesses and agricultural production.

3.2 RELEVANCE OF THE PROGRAMME DESIGN

The project sites, Moroto and Napak Districts in Karamoja Region of Uganda are inhabited by pastoralists. Thus, it was important for VSF Belgium to design a programme that would ensure that the community's livelihood is not only improved but also protected and also ensure that the community owned the design. Through this approach, two programme components were implemented, that is software projects and hardware projects. The hardware interventions included projects that responded to the community urgent needs so as to sustain their livelihoods such as the rehabilitation of the borehole and rehabilitation of the rangelands etc while the software interventions focused on equipping the community with necessary skills to help them improve their livelihoods such as capacity building in various aspects including peace building initiative, animal health, business planning etc.

3.3 Relevance of the projects implemented

VSF Belgium and its partner agency MADEFO implemented the following projects in Karamoja Region during the KLDP II;

- ❖ VICOBA
- ❖ Income Generating Activities
- ❖ Rehabilitation of boreholes
- ❖ Rangeland rehabilitation
- ❖ Capacity building initiatives – training of CAHWs
- ❖ Peace building initiatives
- ❖ Cross cutting issues
- ❖ Emergency vaccinations against livestock diseases
- ❖ Breed and livestock husbandry improvement

The projects implemented were in line with the governments policy as stipulated in the Ugandan Policy on Disaster Risk Management which advocates for the promotion of programmes and strategies that improve the livelihoods of the communities. These activities were also in line with VSF Belgium and MADEFO mandates which is to improve the livelihoods of community members.

3.3.1 Relevance of VICOBA

The VICOBA project implemented in the course of the KLDP II project implementation has introduced community members to a saving culture. The

community members were provided with skills on savings and also provided with a saving box. Through this initiative community members have adopted the saving culture and they now practice savings. The VICOBA initiative has enabled community members save money that has enabled them have access to finance within their reach. Community members access finances from the VICOBA in form of loans which has enabled them pay school fees for their children, start businesses and the profit accrued from these businesses have enabled community members access medical care, buy food and clothing for the families etc.



Goat shelter constructed by Kitobarae VICOBA Group

3.3.2 Relevance of the Income Generating Activities

VSF Belgium implemented Income Generating Activities in the community as a component of improving the community livelihood. Through this, the community members initiated income generating activities that has changed the lives of the community members who were involved. The community members have used the profits from the IGAs to establish other business, pay school fees for their children, buy clothes, access medical care and food for the families. The KLDP II also enabled the IGAs acquire government recognition since they are registered entities, thus they have acquired legal status as well as they are cooperatives and they are involved in money transaction as registered entities.

The income generating activities initiated by community members have enabled them make profits in the various activities that the community members have established. **Table 1 below** provides approximate profits that the community members receive from the various businesses that they were involved in.

Table 1: Profits generated by the community members

Business	Profit (Ugandan Shillings)	Days within which the profit is accrued
Brewing	200,000	8 days
Roasted meat	5,000	1 day
Sweet potato	6,000 – 7,000	1 day
Chicken	7,000	1 day

3.3.3 Relevance of water structures and rehabilitation of rangelands

The rehabilitation of the boreholes for example in Kanakomol village the borehole was handy to the community as it is currently a source of water to 15 villages. The evaluation established that 3 boreholes in three villages namely; Komagal, Longáro and Namoniangimonia villages are currently not operational and thus all these community members depend on the borehole from Kanakomol village as their main source of water. Rangeland rehabilitation has enabled community members access pasture for their livestock.

3.3.4 Relevance of capacity building initiatives

A number of capacity building programmes were conducted targeting the community as a strategy to pass skills and knowledge to the community members. This was in response to community needs that were identified by the community members themselves. The capacity building initiatives conducted included; business planning, animal health, peace building initiative, HIV and AIDS awareness, savings etc. These capacity building initiatives have enhanced the community capacity in improving the community livelihood since the community members have used these skills to initiate businesses, advocate for peace in the community, provide treatment to animals as well as improve the community saving culture.

3.3.5 Relevance of peace building initiative

The peace building initiative was adapted by the project so as to create harmony in the community. Karamoja Region was previously characterized by conflicts amongst community members that led to loss of lives amongst community members and it was important to implement a project that would promote harmony in the community so as to promote development within the community. The peace building initiatives involved promoting peace in the community on resource sharing; water and pasture. The peace building initiative has reduced deaths amongst community members, deaths that were previously triggered by conflicts. The initiative has also led to improved production amongst livestock since the livestock can now access pasture from the fields that they could not previously access. The peace building initiative has also promoted social cohesion amongst community members and this has also promoted intermarriages amongst community members who were previously in conflict with each other. Peace building initiative has also promoted interconnection of villages and has also opened areas that could previously not be accessed are now accessible and this has led to settlement of community members in areas which were previously deserted. The community members are also now practicing agriculture thus improved livelihood.

3.3.6 Relevance of the cross cutting issues

VSF Belgium and its partner agency - MADEFO integrated a number of cross cutting issues in its planning and implementation so as to reach its objective and targeted audience. The cross cutting issues were mainly to ensure that as many women participated in the project as possible since Karamoja Region being a patriarchal

community many women are normally deprived off opportunity to participate in development projects. The cross cutting issues that were addressed in this project include;

- ❖ Gender
- ❖ Children
- ❖ Environmental protection
- ❖ HIV and AIDS

Gender issues, more so women participation and empowerment, was concern to VSF Belgium and its partner agency - MADEFO. This integrated in all of its interventions in order to reverse the traditional disparities advanced by cultural arrangements. Against this backdrop, VSF Belgium and its partner advocated for gender agenda geared towards attaining gender sensitivity and equity within the project area.

Through the various income generating businesses that the community members have established, profits that accrued from these businesses have enabled the community members to pay school fees for the children, buy clothing for the family, food and even access medical care. Community involvement in agriculture has also enabled the community members to access vegetables and fruits that have supplemented their diets. Promotion of animal health through the project has also enabled the community members to access milk which not only have they sold in the market to get an income but has also enabled them use it at home and as a result diversifying family dietary needs.

The evaluation also established that the KLDP II project also focused on HIV and AIDS, awareness on HIV and AIDS were created during the trainings and the community members have taken the initiative of putting into practice the knowledge gained from the trainings as part pre-cautionary measures to curb the scourge. The community members are also using the knowledge acquired on HIV and AIDS to sensitize other community members on HIV and AIDS thus increased awareness. The community members who previously were involved in firewood collection that destroyed the environment were also introduced to alternative sources of livelihood like venturing into agriculture, initiating income generating activities and VICOBA as a way of protecting the environment.

3.3.7 Relevance of emergency vaccinations against livestock diseases

The emergency vaccinations against livestock diseases was conducted so as to reduce disease prevalence rates amongst livestock. This initiative helped curb the rates of disease infection and spread amongst livestock thus improving health of the livestock thus resulting to improved productivity. The emergency vaccination also involved vaccinating livestock from neighboring countries that had migrated to Karamoja Region in search of pasture and water for example livestock from Pokot, Kenya. Three emergency vaccinations for small ruminants against CCPP and PPR were conducted in Moroto District and one in Napak District. A total of 99,000 goats and sheep were vaccinated in Moroto District alone during the period. This was 49.5% of the estimated 200,000 livestock in the District. In Napak District 57,000 were vaccinated, about 10.3% of the 540,000. The emergency vaccination had a positive effect on the animal health situation, contributing significantly to the reduction in the livestock mortality rates due to herd diseases. This noble gesture was done by VSF Belgium in collaboration with the Ugandan Government so as to curb the spread of diseases not just within Karamoja Region but also at cross border levels.

3.3.8 Relevance of breed and livestock husbandry improvement

The community members were provided with bucks and through this initiative, there has been an improvement in livestock production as a result of cross breeding. Community members were also trained on animal husbandry and through this, the community members acquired knowledge and skills that have enabled them in rearing of their livestock.

3.4 PROGRAMME EFFECTIVENESS

3.4.1 Effectiveness of project implementation through partner

The KLDP II project was implemented in collaboration with VSF Belgium partner agency – MADEFO; this was an important initiative considering the fact that MADEFO has presence in the districts where the project was implemented. Likewise this was part of enhancing project sustainability since the partner organizations also have other projects that they are being supported by other donor agencies within the targeted areas.

The evaluation results established that the partnership between VSF Belgium and its partner organization - MADEFO was and is still effective and the partner was committed to the implementation of the KLDP II project.

3.4.2 Relationship with the government authorities

This evaluation established that VSF Belgium has good working relationship with the government departments. It was reported that the government was involved in the KLDP II project activities. The Veterinary Officer from Moroto District participated in the training of CAHWs on basic livestock disease control including; disease surveillance and treatment technique. Likewise, the government was involved in supervision of the project activities, monitoring and provision of general guidance in the course of the project implementation. In addition, the government officials from Napak district provided training to the project beneficiaries on VICOBA. The government also participated in the vaccination programme that was organized in the course of the project that ended up providing services to livestock from Turkana – Kenya. However, there is no policy in place that promotes cross-border joint service delivery between Uganda and Kenya. Thus, for effective livelihood improvement, it is important for VSF Belgium and its affiliated partner organizations to consider influencing the government to develop a policy that would promote joint service delivery between the two countries especially in vaccination of livestock considering the migratory nature of livestock. This would reduce the incidences of disease infection and improve livelihood.

3.4.3 Extent to which the programme’s objectives to improve the social and economic status of households in the targeted areas have been achieved.

Effectiveness of work plan implementation

The evaluation established that all the planned activities were implemented except for three activities namely;

- ❖ Provision of nanny goats to community members (six groups have benefited from 84 nanny goats)
- ❖ Provision of chicken to community members and
- ❖ Training on chicken rearing

It was reported that the major reason for the delay in implementing these activities was because funds meant for these activities were not transferred on time. However, by the time this evaluation was being conducted plans were underway and preparations were being made to implement these activities.

3.5 PROGRAMME EFFICIENCY

3.5.1 Resource utilization

The resources that were examined in this evaluation include; time, finances and human resources. The evaluation established that the resources were utilized efficiently and for its intended purposes, for example the capacity building initiatives that were organized in the course of the project implementation by VSF Belgium, the partner agency was involved, MADEFO participated actively in the trainings. There are also books of accounts that reflect the usage of financial resources as well as the reports that were produced and shared in the course of the project implementation are evidences of proper resource utilization. It is also worth noting that by the time of this evaluation, some activities had not been conducted because the resources (finance) meant for the project activities had not been released.

3.5.2 Strengthening and working through partner organizations

VSF Belgium partnered with a local organization – MADEFO to implement the Karamoja Livestock Development Project. This was an efficient way of managing the project based on the fact that MADEFO has presence within the project target areas. MADEFO is known by the community members since it has been working in the targeted project site before, while implementing projects funded by other donors. The partner organization also has the required logistic and staffing for project. This saved VSF Belgium the time and costs it could have incurred if at all it was implementing all the projects by itself. VSF Belgium facilitated the partner organization by providing funding for the projects.

However, the evaluation established that in the project sites, visibility of VSF Belgium and MADEFO were not evident since they did not have bill boards indicating their presence at the time of the evaluation. Thus, awareness on the presence of VSF Belgium and MADEFO were only limited to the project beneficiaries. However, by the end of December 2013 a total of 6 visibility sign posts were installed in the project sites.

3.5.3 Project monitoring system

During the KLDP II project implementation, monitoring was conducted in the various project sites by a number of stakeholders including the governments, VSF Belgium, MADEFO and the community. The main objective of conducting monitoring was to

provide VSF Belgium and stakeholders with regular feedback and early indications of progress or lack of achievement of the intended results. Feedback from the monitoring exercise was shared with the community and this formed the basis for the project planning.

3.6 PROGRAMME COVERAGE

The evaluation established that the project covered the initially targeted intended beneficiaries of the project and the deserving villages and these were the planned beneficiaries of the project. However, it was also noted that the coverage was low compared to the persons that are in need in the community. Thus, it is important for VSF Belgium and its partner agency to consider scaling up the project in future so as to accommodate other villages and community members who have not yet been reached by the project.

3.7 CHALLENGES EXPERIENCED DURING THE PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

- ❖ In some project sites, it was reported that the CAHWs and peace building committees specifically are forced to travel long distances in their attempt to render services to the communities and this is because of the geographical location of the communities, the communities are far apart. This is tiresome and cumbersome to the community members.
- ❖ Poor weather patterns also exposed the some community members to work under very unconducive circumstance for example the CAHWs were forced to render services in very difficult conditions during the rainy season considering the fact that they do not have facilities such as the bicycles, gum boots and rain coats. Inaccessibility to facilities such as gum boots exposed the CAHWs to accident related challenges in some project sites, two cases were reported where the bulls tramped on a foot and caused injury of a CAHW when he was administering medication to a bull. Likewise, poor weather patterns rendered some areas inaccessible during the rainy season. This jeopardized the implementation process since some vital activities such as community service delivery activities such as monitoring of the health status of the livestock and treatment could not be done on time. In addition, the unreliable weather conditions also had an impact on agricultural produce. This had a negative impact on the community programmes, since community members who borrowed loans from the cooperatives and invested in agriculture had a set

back due to unreliable weather conditions since they could not repay the loan on time and some even failed to pay completely.

- ❖ The organizations operations were also limited and thus not able to cover all the deserving villages and community members and as a result some community members felt that people who are in need of the services were left out of the project. This was as a result of the limited finances allocated for the project thus limited the number of groups that the project worked with. However, it is also worth noting that there are other non governmental organizations and community based organizations including MADEFO and Save the Children that are working in these areas to complement the effort by made by VSF Belgium.
- ❖ The existence of guns amongst some community members was and is still a challenge since these community members use these weapons in instigating cattle raiding within communities.

3.8 PROGRAMME SUSTAINABILITY

Programme sustainability is determined by whether the programme is able to sustain itself after the donor funding is over as well as whether the projects implemented have a longer term impact on the developmental process and could be sustained by the community members. Developing sustainability strategies at the community levels involves strengthening existing structures that govern the management of community resources as well as involving the community in the implementation and management of the project activities so as to promote community ownership. The KLDP II adapted the community managed participatory approach so as to promote community ownership as well as programme sustainability. The evaluation established that the extent of the project sustainability is infinite and this is because of the sustainability measures that have been put in place including;

- ❖ Capacity building; the project empowered the community on various aspects including business planning skills, peace building, animal health etc and it is envisaged that with these information, knowledge and skills will be transferred to other community members for purposes of promoting sustainability.
- ❖ The IGAs and VICOBA groups that were strengthened in the course of the project implementation will continue to exist since some community members who participated in the IGAs project have established other businesses. They have also diversified their businesses and are not dependent on one activity.

For example some community members are involved in petty trade including; brewing, roasting meat, chicken and sweet potato businesses and these activities are complemented with agriculture. Thus, these activities promote project continuity.

- ❖ The by-laws established by the community members also regulate the operations of these committees and groups and thus the group members adhere to the by-laws thereby promoting sustainability at the community level.
- ❖ The committees and groups established in the various projects undertaken will influence the continuity of the project through monitoring and sharing information with the community members. Likewise, these groups are registered groups and as a result they are recognized and thus this is a sustainability measure since the groups can still lobby for funding from either the government or other non governmental organization to support the continuity of the activities started in the community.
- ❖ The rehabilitation and management of the water sources by putting up enclosures (fencing) has enhanced community project ownership and thus promoting sustainability. Likewise the community also contributed their own resources (both physical labor and finance) for the rehabilitation of the community structures thus promoting ownership and hence sustainability.
- ❖ Government involvement in the project was important in promoting sustainability of projects, once the NGO phase out from the project; the government takes over project management.
- ❖ The involvement of the community members in agriculture is part of the sustainability measure since the community members have already been trained in alternative livelihood to diversify their income and also the community own land which they can use for agriculture even at the end of the project phase. In addition, the billy goats received by the community members are part of the sustainability measures as the some billy goats have already mated with the community goats and produced young ones.
- ❖ The structures established within the community in the various projects undertaken will influence the continuity of the project for example the drug and cereal stores and cattle crush since the community members can still use these facilities beyond the project phase.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Conclusions

4.1.1 Opportunities to improve and inform the design of similar interventions by VSFB and provide the staff with a learning opportunity

The community has gained adequate knowledge on various livelihood security aspects including business planning, animal health, peace building initiative, savings etc. The knowledge acquired by the community is an opportunity that can be used by the community members themselves to create more awareness on livestock health, peace, savings as well as initiate businesses so as to improve their income and as a result promoting livelihood security.

The willingness by the community members to support project implementation through contribution of their physical strength and resources in the community is an opportunity that needs to be capitalized on in future.

The existence of the various structures within the community is an opportunity that needs to be strengthened for the continuity of the projects implemented. Some of the structures that were established include; drug stores, cereal stores, cattle crush etc. These facilities will go a long way in protecting the livelihood of the community since they will be used way beyond after the exit of the implementing agency. Likewise, the various groups that exist in the community, the CAHWs, IGAs, VICOBA's etc are registered organizations that have constitution and by-laws that govern their management. These by-laws compels community members to adhere to the rules and regulations of the various groups, failure subjects a community member to a punishment. The existence of the by-laws will support the management of the various projects through the groups way beyond the donors' phase out from the project.

The evaluation established that VSF Belgium has a good working relationship with its partner agency (MADEFO), the government as well as the community. MADEFO as well has a good working relation with the community and the government and thus this promotes project sustainability.

The existence of a livelihood forum within Karamoja Region for example the Karamoja Livestock Development Forum is an opportunity to improve on the management of the KLDP II. The Karamoja Livestock Development Forum is a platform that brings all stakeholders in Karamoja Region together with an interest of promoting, protecting and improving the community livelihood. This is an opportunity for VSF Belgium to collaborate with other organizations with the same interest, that is protecting the livelihood of the community. This forum can also be used to lobby for funding of livelihood initiatives from the government other donors.

The prevailing peace within the Karamoja Region is also an opportunity that VSF Belgium and its partner organization can capitalize on in its attempt to improve the livelihood of the Karamoja people. The prevailing peace in Karamoja Region has also been facilitated by the disarmament initiative by the Ugandan Government in Karamoja Region. Due to peace communities have settled on their lands and thus this is a perfect opportunity to capitalize on the diversification of alternative sources of livelihood including agriculture.

The presence of hectares of land is an opportunity to improve and inform the design of the livelihood security project as part of VSF Belgium initiative. Ideas on how to commercialize agriculture would be an added advantage in attempt to secure community livelihood. Where as crop agriculture has been largely promoted by the government, issues pertaining to erratic rainfall and decreasing soil fertility have hampered its progress. Livestock rearing still remains a very feasible alternative that should be improved for sustainable livelihoods of the pastoralists.

The existence of national policy on livelihood improvement is an opportunity to improve on livelihood activities in Karamoja Region. The Livelihood national policy also complements VSFB and MADEFO mandates which is to improve the livelihoods of pastoral communities.

The achievement of the KLDP II should be used and documentation on how to improve community livelihood should be considered. This can be used to influence stakeholders programming around livelihood improvement within Northern Uganda.

4.2 Recommendations

Key recommendations that emerge from the KLDP II evaluation have been summarized in **table 2** below.

Table 2: Key recommendations for the KLDP II evaluation

Recommendations at community level

1. The community members have acquired knowledge on a number of issues including business planning, animal health, peace building, HIV and AIDS, agriculture etc. Thus it is important for the community members to cascade the information, knowledge and skills acquired to other community members so as to increase awareness and equip the community members with the required knowledge. This will enable the community members who are not involved in business to initiate IGAs so as to improve their livelihood.

Recommendations at government level

1. Develop policies that promote joint service delivery

The evaluation established that cross border peace initiatives were conducted during the phase of this project as well as vaccination of shoats from Turkana who had crossed over to Uganda in search of water and pasture. This noble gesture was to ensure that disease prevalence is reduced at cross border levels due to the migratory nature of livestock. Government departments need to develop and support policies that would support joint service delivery as well as policies that would support livelihood improvement at cross – border levels. It was recommended that institutions such as IGAD need to be involved in the discussions so as to mediate between the two governments.

2. Strengthen government involvement in cross-border initiative

The government institutions also need to be strengthened to own livelihood development projects, they need to own the process so that they can take over the responsibility of project monitoring and management once the non-governmental organization implementing the projects phase out of the project.

Recommendations at VSF Belgium and MADEFO level

1. Organize joint planning and monitoring visits

Joint planning and monitoring between stakeholders involved in the livelihood projects needs to be promoted as this increases the quality of programme delivery and also provides an avenue for case study development as well as documenting best practices coming out from the project. In addition, joint monitoring visits gives an opportunity to implementing agencies to address necessary challenges emerging from the project immediately.

2. Focus on development projects that strengthen community livelihood security

Despite VSF Belgium implementing development projects such as IGAs, VICOBA's and capacity building activities such as training of CAHWs that have enabled community members change their behaviors by initiating businesses that have enabled them gain income to improve their livelihood as well as treat animals thus further improving the community livelihood. The community members felt that these projects need to be complemented with the implementation of other development projects that would improve the food security of the community members including investment in infrastructure such as construction of permanent cereal and drug stores that are spacious, well ventilated, safe and secure with all the necessary amenities as part of improvement of the livelihood of the community since the community depends on livestock and cereals as part of their livelihood. However, the lessons that have been learnt with construction of cereals stores is that if factors affecting levels of production are not addressed the cereal stores will remain largely unused. For example, in Kaabong district Mercy Corps a non governmental organization constructed a number of cereal stores but this has remained largely un-used and empty because there wasn't enough food produced to fill them.

In addition, the project need to diversify its activities to include construction of facilities such as shelter for the goats so as to improve on their health status as livestock is part of the culture of the Karamojong' and giving the goats proper and adequate shelter means protecting the livelihood of the community. The evaluation also established that the community members do not have social halls for holding their meetings, a number of meetings during the focus group discussions were held under trees, thus VSF Belgium and its partner organization should consider constructing social halls for the community members that can be used for meetings within the community. Thus, it is important for VSF Belgium and its partner agencies to complement emergency projects with development projects for purposes of project continuity as well as to enable community members to continue receiving services from the project even after the phase out of emergency projects.

3. Facilitate exchange visits

Exchange visits in project sites should be encouraged as this provides avenue for lesson learning. The evaluation established that the exchange visits conducted in some project sites were fruitful as some community members are already replicating ideas that they learnt from some of the project sites they visited. Thus, it is important to organize these exchange visits in future as it gives community members opportunity to learn and share ideas with other community members. A suggestion was made that community members need to be given opportunity to go for exchange visits in Gulu and Kenya.

4. *Completion of planned activities*

Provision of training on chicken rearing and provision of chicken

The training on chicken rearing and provision of chicken to the community members were part of the planned activities but at the time of this evaluation these activities had not been done and this was as a result of delay in fund disbursement. However, plans were underway to ensure that these activities are conducted as earlier planned.

5. Promote coordination between actors implementing livelihood programme

It is important in future for VSF Belgium and its partner organization to consider coordination with other actors implementing livelihood programmes so as to reduce duplication of roles and activities and as well as to diversify needs provision. This is important as it would not only scale up the scope of the project areas and put more beneficiaries on board but it would also diversify the services provided to the community members for purposes of community satisfaction. This also gives the implementing actors an opportunity to share experiences, challenges and lessons learnt from the project for purposes of improvement in the future.

6. Scale up the scope of the project areas

Due to the benefits that have accrued from the KLDP II including improving community livelihood security, the community members felt that the project only covered a relatively small area in the community. Thus, a number of community members who have similar predicament – livelihood insecurity did not participate in the project and they the impact of the KLDP II has not reached them. Thus, it is important for VSF Belgium to consider scaling up the project areas so as to include other community members that have not yet participated in the project yet they face the same challenges as community members and villages that were selected as project sites.

7. Source additional funding for the project

The end evaluation established that the project has created substantial gains amongst community members, the community members now have access to community animal health workers within their reach to attend to their livestock, the VICOBAs established have enabled community members have access to finances and financials services, the peace project has promoted conducive environment in the community since community members can now walk freely, do business and even engage in other alternative livelihood sources such as agriculture. Thus, it is important for VSF Belgium not only to continue funding this initiative but also to increase the funding so that the KLDP II impact can reach the wider part of the community.

VSF Belgium and its partner organizations also need to market the KLDP II to other donor agencies so

as to source for funding for purposes of project continuity so that the impact of the project can be felt in the wider community.

8. Organize refresher trainings

VSF Belgium and MADEFO have done an exemplary job in ensuring that the community gain relevant skills in a number of aspects including IGA, peace building initiative, HIV and AIDS and animal health. The knowledge gained from these trainings have enabled community members initiate businesses, venture into alternative livelihood source that has improved their livelihood security. However, it is important for VSF Belgium and MADEFO to consider organizing refresher courses for the community members so as to update their knowledge.

9. Rehabilitation of non functional boreholes

The rehabilitated borehole in Kanakomol serves 15 villages including Komagal, Longáro and Namoniangimonia villages. Thus, to reduce congestion in the borehole located in Kanakomol, it is important for VSF Belgium and its partner organization to consider rehabilitating these non functional boreholes so bring water closer to these communities. The evaluation established that there are 3 non functional boreholes located in Kamagal, Longáro and Namoniangimonia villages.

10. Provision of identification documents and certificates to CAHWs

Community members especially the trained CAHWs do not have certificates and identification cards to prove their legibility as CAHWs despite having been trained as CAHWs, thus it is important for VSF Belgium to consider liaising with the District veterinary office so as to ensure that the trained CAHWs have certificates and identification documents so as to promote their recognition as well as expose them to other organizations and the government as well. So far, the CAHWs are discharging their duties in the community without any identification documents.

11. Integration of the KLDP II with other projects for purposes of sustainability

In some project sites it was observed that the KLDP II were implemented as stand alone projects. However, it is also worth noting that VSF Belgium is already integrating some of its projects with other activities including the KLDP National agric advisory series, disease surveillance by C&D, training of community animal health workers by KLDP this also provided co-funded to the KLDP II, Agro-pastoral field schools implemented by FAO, and livestock health activities implemented by the District Veterinary Office. Thus, it is important in future for VSF Belgium and its partner organization to consider integrating KLDP II with other projects that are being undertaken by the organizations for purposes of sustainability.

12. Complement community livelihood development project with economic development projects

The evaluation established that the focus on the project was basically on creating improving the livelihood of the community; thus all the energies and resources were budgeted for community livelihood development. It is important in future for a KLDP II to consider incorporating economic development and livelihood diversification; VSF Belgium and its partner organization should consider influencing the market value chains for pastoral products. This would not only provide employment and income to the pastoral communities but it would also provide them with diversity of a chain of livestock products within their reach.

13. Strengthen agricultural component

Agricultural component should be strengthened as part of the livelihood development since the community already has available land at their disposal and likewise the willingness of the community members to participate in the project and ensure that their livelihood is protected is an opportunity to venture into agriculture extensive so as to increase the income of the community members. It was also reported that agriculture is not a core business of VSF Belgium, however they need to consider initiating this activity in collaboration with other NGOs in future.

14. Strengthen project fund disbursement process

VSF Belgium and its partner organization are doing a recommendable job in the community and so far a number of activities planned were implemented, however at the time of this evaluation, some activities had not been implemented though plans are underway to implement them. The delay in the implementation of the project is as a result of delay in funds disbursement. The activities that had not been implemented include; chicken to the community members and training on chicken rearing. Thus, it is recommended that in future it is important for proper fund disbursement plan to be put in place to enable planned project activities to be conducted on time.

5.0 LESSONS LEARNT

Lesson learning is an important component of effective programme management and implementation. A lesson is a new idea, process, experience or understanding, which goes to improve the way the project is managed and contributes to greater effectiveness and wider impact of an activity. Usually interventions do not turn out exactly the way they were planned; sometimes the needs are not immediately clear or cannot be easily understood; circumstances also do change. **Table 3** provides a summary of the key lessons emerging from the KLDP evaluation.

Table 3: Lessons learnt from KLDP II

1. Implementing projects that support women is synonymous to supporting the whole community since money or profit made by women is normally used in the household to provide for the needs of the family including purchase of food, clothing, medical care and even buying necessities for school children.
2. Promoting livelihood security requires a concerted effort, coordination and collaboration of communities, implementing agencies, stakeholders and donor agencies. One organization cannot do it a lone. An example was provided in Kanakomol village in Moroto District where community members have learnt to work with the local implementing partner - MADEFO in monitoring the functionality of the borehole and even participating in repair in case of any damage.
3. Community members do play an important role in the management of a project if they are empowered and strengthened than the non-governmental organizations and the government since the community members are the community themselves and they understand the challenges faced by the community better than anyone else and as a result they can contribute to the solutions of the challenges facing the community. Thus it is important to involve community members in project cycle management for purposes of ownership.
4. Communities can co-exist peacefully by sharing resources.
5. The community based participatory approach adopted by VSF Belgium and its partner organizations is the best and recommended strategy for implementing a KLDP II, since promotes community project ownership, it gives the community members a chance to learn by doing, it also promotes information exchange and experience sharing thus promoting project sustainability. An example was provided in Kanakomol village where community members have learnt borehole renovation and maintenance, they are able to identify if there is a problem and participate in renovation.
6. Livelihood improvement has no boundaries – focus should be on cross border projects.

REFERENCES

KLDP (2011): Annual Report (January – December)

KLDP Project Document (2011 – 2013)

KLDP project update (January – November 2013)

KLDP II Annual Report Year 2012

KLDP II critical information

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference

Appendix 2: Field work plan

Appendix 3: Guides

Appendix 4: List of people consulted

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference for End Evaluation of Karamoja Livestock Development Project (Phase II)

End Evaluation of Karamoja Livestock Development Project (Phase II) Consultancy

Terms of Reference for Evaluation of Karamoja Livestock Development Project (Phase II)

Country: Uganda

Location: Moroto and Napak District of Karamoja Sub-region

Project to be evaluated: "Karamoja Livestock Development Project Phase II"

I. Background

The Karamoja 'cluster' is a term used to describe the pastoral and agro-pastoral ethnic groups in an area comprising north-eastern Uganda, north-western Kenya, southern Sudan and south-western Ethiopia, most of whom share a common language, culture and land area.

The communities that constitute the Karamoja cluster include: Turkana, Matheniko, Bokora, Pian, Dodoth, Nyangatom, Didinga, Merille, Toposa, Jie, Tepeth, Acholi, Labwor and Upe.

In Uganda, Karamoja region covers 27,200 Km² semi-arid plain, with an average rainfall of 500-700 mm per annum, variable in space and time.

The environment is classified as in disequilibrium, where vegetation in areas not receiving rain for two or more years is able to regenerate rapidly when it receives adequate moisture.

There is a limited amount of acacia/commiphora forest in the higher ground to the east of Moroto, which is the Regional Headquarters, but the vast majority of the district can be classified as semi-arid savannah covered with seasonal grasses, thorny plants, and occasional small trees.

The Karamoja region is characterized by a combination of acute poverty, vulnerability to drought, poor infrastructure, basic social services delivery, limited marketing opportunities, especially for livestock, natural resource degradation, social and cultural marginalization, long-standing dependency on external aid and most importantly, chronic insecurity.

The region is the least socially and economically developed in Uganda, even among the generally poor parts of Northern Uganda as a whole.

Due to the aridity, extensive livestock keeping is the principal economic activity within the district. Livestock are kept primarily to sustain livelihoods through milk, meat and barter; the sale of livestock is only of secondary importance.

The livestock keeping system, which is exceptionally well adapted to the disequilibrium environment, is hindered primarily by the chronic insecurity (which has its basis in a tradition of cattle rustling) of the area, but also by poor access to water in the dry season, poor quality of available forage, high incidence of contagious diseases and limited access to veterinary services.

Whereas the prevalence of diseases, poor access to water and poor quality of the available forage limit the possibilities for breed improvement, the conflict provides an active disincentive for breed improvement as families do not want to draw attention to their herds.

Vétérinaires Sans Frontières (VSF) Belgium, is an international non-governmental organization with a mission to Empower disadvantaged livestock dependent communities (in the South) to improve

their well being.

VSF-Belgium is officially registered as an NGO with the Belgian Government and operates in several African countries.

The Karamoja Livestock Development Project (KLDP) focuses on addressing insecurity and inadequate access to grazing and water for optimal animal health and production.

II. Objective

The overall objective of this End of Phase II evaluation is to assess and document the benefits and impact of the Karamoja Livestock Development Project on the social and economic status, welfare and livelihoods of the intended direct and indirect project beneficiaries.

This will involve assessing and documenting the project's contribution to improving the livelihoods of the direct and indirect project beneficiaries.

The evaluation will include identifying the impact, changes, timeliness, coverage, appropriateness and connectedness of the project, highlighting key lessons learned in the current phase and recommendations for improving the future structuring of interventions.

III. Scope and focus

The broad terms of reference include the following:

1. Measure the extent to which the programme's objectives to improve the social and economic status of households in the targeted areas have been achieved;
2. Provide VSF Belgium and donors with information on how the program interventions have contributed to livelihood security of the targeted households;
3. Inform future design of similar interventions by VSFB and provide the staff with a learning opportunity.

The evaluation will focus on the operational approach, the implementation process and the performance of the programme.

Specifically the evaluation must give answers to the following questions:

- i) Did expected results fulfill the needs identified prior to the intervention? (relevance)
- ii) Do expected results meet the major current needs? (relevance)
- iii) Does the program cover the initially targeted population? (coverage)
- iv) Has the project appropriately targeted the right beneficiaries and the deriving villages? (relevance and coverage)
- v) Are the project activities timely implemented as planned? (effectiveness of work plan implementation)
- vi) Is the project on course to meet expected results? (effectiveness)
- vii) How are the resources being utilized in the course of project implementation so far? (efficiency)
- viii) Are the results of activities sustainable and to what extent?
- ix) What negative or positive End of Phase II influence of the project is already foreseen? (impact)

Finally, the evaluation should also assess the appreciation of the program by the beneficiaries as well as their participation at various levels of the project management cycle.

The estimated duration of the assignment is Twelve (12) working days.

IV. Evaluation process and methods

Evaluation methods to be clearly outlined in the report and their appropriateness, relative to the evaluation's primary purpose, focus and users, explained pointing out the strengths and weaknesses of the methods.

A description of the overall flow of the evaluation process (i.e. sequence of the key stages) should be given in the evaluation report.

The evaluation approach and the methods used to collect and analyze data should also be

described.

The nature (e.g., external or mixed) and make-up of the team (e.g. sector expertise, local knowledge, gender balance) and its appropriateness for the evaluation should be outlined.

The evaluation report should outline the sources of biases that might affect the evaluation and how these have been addressed.

The evaluation report should also present the key constraints to carrying out the evaluation (e.g., lack of baseline data, lack of access to key information sources, use of translators), and the effect of these constraints. Whenever secondary sources will be referred to, the evaluator should indicate the level of reliability of the given information.

After the field work, the evaluation team will present and discuss with the project team the preliminary findings and the proposed recommendations.

A first draft of the evaluation report should be shared with VSFB before a final version is submitted incorporating all the comments.

V. Deliverables

The evaluation report should include at least:

- Three bound hard copies narrative report (max 40 pages) including an executive summary (2 pages maximum) and a soft copy submitted to the Country Director.
- A separate table summarizing the main findings and the lessons learned.
- A separate table showing the different recommendations and tips for their implementation (who will be in charge of implementing these recommendations, when? dead line? necessary means? who will be in charge of checking that the recommendations are being implemented and when? etc.).
- Relevant maps and photographs of the assessed zone and programme.

VI. Documents of reference (on request only)

- Project document (KLDPII)
- Last two annual reports (2011 and 2012) to the donor
- Current organizational chart
- Last Activity Progress Update of the programme

VII. Qualification of the Lead consultant

- Relevant University degree
- Minimum 5 years of proven experience with NGOs
- Proven experience in similar evaluation context (ASAL)
- Strong methodology and writing capacities

How to apply

Please send your proposal, highlighting the following:

- A brief introduction of bidding firm or person attaching relevant CVs
- Your understanding of the Terms of Reference
- Proposed methodology and approach
- Proposed work plan and budget
- Your availability

Please send all relevant information (CV, cover letter, copies of testimonials, copies of relevant certificates and 3 contact references) (reference "KLDP II-Final Evaluation 2013"), by e-mail to recruitment@vsfb.or.ke on or before 30th November 2013.

Only shortlisted applications will be contacted.

Appendix 2: Field Work plan

ITINERARY FOR EVALUATION OF KLDP II PROJECT				
Day	Date	Activity	Time	Responsible Person
Day 1/ 14 th December 2013		Meeting with Consultant for Familiarization on the project and context of the area	7.30 - 8.00 a.m	PM
		Acholinn Women Group	8.30 - 10.00 a.m	Paul
		Kitobarae VICOBA Group	10.30 - 12.00	Paul
		Borehole rehabilitation and WUCs in Kanakomol	12.30 -2.00 p.m	Paul
Day 2/ 15 th December 2013		Meeting with Nadunget CAHWs Associations	10.30 a.m - 12.00	Stella/Simon
Day 3/ 16 th December 2013		Okenyutu VICOBA group	8.30 - 10.00 a.m	Paul
		CAHWs Rupa	10.30 - 12.00 a.m	Stella/Simon
		Kiteyarae VICOBA Group	12.30 - 2.00 a.m	Paul
Day 4/ 17 th December 2013		Meeting with local partner MADEFO	8.30 - 10.00 a.m	Lucy
		Meeting with District Officials in Moroto	10.00 -2.00	Paul & Stella
		Meeting with Districts officials of Napak	2.30 a.m - 4.00p.m	Paul, Stella
Day 5/ 18 th December 2013		Meeting with CAHWs from Tapac	10.00 a.m - 12.00 a.m	Stella/Simon
		Interview communities on Peace building activities (Nakonyen/Tapac)	2.00 p.m - 4.pm	Mbane
		De-brief on the evaluation	4 - 5p.m	Consultant

Appendix 3: Guides

Stakeholders guide

Government

Relevance

1. Was the project relevant?
 - ❖ Has it met the needs of the community members
2. Was the project consistent with the national and local policies and the needs of the intended beneficiaries?
3. The project appropriateness i.e. the cultural acceptance as well as feasibility of the activities or method of delivery in the project locations
 - ❖ Livelihood – cattle keeping
 - ❖ IGAs
 - ❖ CAHWs
4. What do community members feel about the project
 - ❖ Was it useful, necessary?
 - ❖ Would the community members recommend its implementation again

Coverage

5. Does the program cover the initially targeted population?
6. Has the project appropriately targeted the right beneficiaries and the deriving villages?

Effectiveness

7. Extent of VSF Belgium contribution/s toward accomplishment of the project's intended outcomes/goal
8. Judgment on the value of the change brought about by the project (positive or negative)
9. What further improvements would you suggest for future programme of the KLDP II project?

Efficiency

10. Partnership between the government, VSFB, MADEFO and the community
 - ❖ Was the partnership effective
 - ❖ How the partnership influenced efficiency in project management
11. Suggestions for further improvement for future programming

Impact

12. What negative or positive End of Phase II influence of the project is already foreseen?
 - ❖ Intended and or unintended results of the project interventions?
13. What is the impact or effect of the intervention in proportion to the overall situation of the target beneficiaries or those affected by the project?
 - ❖ Social change
 - ❖ Economic status
 - ❖ Welfare and livelihood
 - ❖ Change in livelihood
 - ❖ Peace building initiative
 - ❖ Emergency vaccinations

14. How is the well-being of the project beneficiaries as compared to before the project?
15. What further improvements can you recommend in future for the effective management of the KLDP II project?

Sustainability

16. Are the results of activities sustainable and to what extent?
17. Sustainability strategy developed in the course of the project implementation
 - ❖ Trained CAHWs
 - ❖ IGAs
 - ❖ Training on animal health and production
 - ❖ Are there policies in place to promote sustainability
 - ❖ Capacity building of community groups, staff and expertise exists

Weaknesses and strengths of KLDP II

18. What are weaknesses and strengths of the KLDP II

Lessons learnt

19. What lessons have been learnt from the Karamoja Livestock Development Project?

Challenges

20. What challenges were experienced in the course of the project implementation?
21. How were the challenges addressed?

Opportunities/Recommendations

22. What further improvements would you suggest for future programming of the Karamoja Livestock Development Project?
23. What opportunities exist in improving and informing the design of Karamoja Livestock Development Project?

Cross-cutting issues: To what extent has the project taken into account cross-cutting issues such as gender, children, environmental protection and HIV/AIDS, in the planning and implementation of the KLDP?

- ❖ Any indication of increased involvement of women, children or PLWHAs or children or PLWHAs women's groups/organizations in project activities.
- ❖ What is the added value of this project in terms of addressing HIV/AIDS?

Monitoring

- ❖ Was the government involved in monitoring?
 - What was the role of the government in monitoring
- ❖ Did the government provide technical advise to the project
 - Content of the technical advise
 - Use of the technical advise
 - Improvement as a result of the technical advise

Community guide

Relevance

1. Were the project activities relevant (design)
 - ❖ Capacity building
 - ❖ Training of CAHWs
 - ❖ IGAs

- ❖ Livelihood
 - ❖ Peace Building Initiative
2. Did the project meet the needs of the intended beneficiaries
 3. The project appropriateness i.e. the cultural acceptance as well as feasibility of the activities or method of delivery in the project locations
 - ❖ Livelihood – cattle keeping
 - ❖ IGAs
 - ❖ CAHWs
 - ❖ Peace building initiatives
 - ❖ Was the community involved in planning, and implementation of the project
 4. What do community members feel about the project
 - ❖ Was it useful, necessary?
 - ❖ Would the community members recommend its implementation again

Coverage

5. Does the program cover the targeted population?
6. Has the project appropriately targeted the right beneficiaries and the deserving villages?

Effectiveness

7. Are the project activities timely implemented as planned? (effectiveness of work plan implementation)
8. Did the project meet your needs
9. Judgment on the value of the change brought about by the project (positive or negative) examples basing on activity
10. What further improvements would you suggest for future programme of the KLDP II project?

Impact and/or change as a result of the KLDP II on the beneficiaries

11. What is the impact of the KLDP II intervention to the community?

Probe:

- ❖ Impact on the lives of the community members
- ❖ Impact on livelihoods
- ❖ Capacity building
- ❖ Improved coordination
- ❖ Economic diversification
- ❖ Is there conflict as a result of the program
- ❖ Access to natural resources

12. How has the KLDP II contributed to these impacts/changes?
13. What further improvements can you recommend in future for the effective management of the KLDP II?

Water points and management of natural resources

14. Where does the community fetch/collect water for both domestic use and animal use?
15. Are there strategic water points and grazing reserves in this community? If yes, where are they located?

Probe:

- ❖ Are the strategic water points and grazing reserves functional?
- ❖ Who manages the strategic water points and grazing reserves?
- ❖ Accessibility; are the strategic water points and grazing reserves accessible to both the community members and their animals?

16. Are there periods within the year that the strategic water points and grazing reserves are not operational?

a. If yes, how does the community cope during these periods?

17. What difference has the water points and grazing reserves created in the lives of the community members?

Probe:

- ❖ Accessibility to the strategic water points
- ❖ Reduced conflict amongst community members
- ❖ Impact of the water points and grazing reserves

18. What role does the community play to ensure that the water points and grazing reserves are operational throughout the year?

Peace building initiatives

19. Peace building initiatives implemented

- ❖ Activities implemented

19. Role of peace building initiatives in the community

- ❖ Access to natural resources
- ❖ Improvement of livelihood

20. Role of the community in the implementation of peace building initiatives

21. Are the peace building initiatives sustainable?

- ❖ Provide evidence of sustainability

22. Challenges facing peace building initiatives

23. What further improvements would you suggest in order to improve peace building initiatives?

24. Have you been able to access new grazing areas as a result of peace building initiatives?

Income Generating Activities

25. Existence of IGAs

- ❖ Are the IGAs functional
- ❖ Role of IGAs in improving community livelihood
 - i. Evidences/signs of improvement
- ❖ Challenges facing IGAs
- ❖ Coping strategies
 - i. Can the IGAs survive drought

26. What category of community members have benefitted from the IGAs?

- ❖ Men, women, youth, children

27. How much profit has been generated from the IGAs?

28. How have the IGAs contributed to the livelihoods of the households

29. What does the community members use the IGA money (profit) for?

30. Are the IGA project sustainable

- ii. Evidences of sustainability
- iii. Integration of IGA programmes with other projects for sustainability purposes

CAHWs

31. Impact of the training to the community

- ✓ Impact at household level
- ✓ Impact at community level

32. Is the CAHWs programme sustainable?/Can it survive beyond the project phase

33. Challenges faced by CAHWs

34. What further improvements would you suggest

Operation and coordination and lessons learnt

35. Meetings take place, joint work and decisions are made.

- ✓ Who are the actors in these meetings
- ✓ Agenda of the meetings
- ✓ Frequencies of the meetings

36. How the meetings influenced project management?

37. What good or bad things have you learnt as a result of the project implementation

Opportunities to improve and inform the design of KLDP II

38. What opportunities exist in improving and informing future projects?

39. What recommendations would you give to further improve KLDP II?

Challenges in project implementation

40. What challenges were experienced in the course of the project implementation?

41. How were the challenges addressed?

Monitoring

- Role of the community in the monitoring process
- Suggestions on improvement of the monitoring process

Stakeholders guide

MADEFO

Relevance

1. Did expected results fulfill the needs identified prior to the intervention?
2. Do expected results meet the major current needs?
3. The extent to which the project design was relevant to the delivery of the expected interventions and how well it was executed;
 - ❖ Capacity building
 - ❖ Training of CAHWs
 - ❖ IGAs
 - ❖ Livelihood
 - ❖ Peace building initiatives
4. The extent to which the project and its intended outputs or outcomes were consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of the intended beneficiaries
5. The project appropriateness i.e. the cultural acceptance as well as feasibility of the activities or method of delivery in the project locations
 - ❖ Livelihood – cattle keeping
 - ❖ IGAs
 - ❖ CAHWs
6. The extent to which the planning, design and implementation of the project took into account the local context.
 - ❖ Was the community involved in planning, design and implementation of the project
7. What do community members feel about the project
 - ❖ Was it useful, necessary?
 - ❖ Would the community members recommend its implementation again

Coverage

8. Does the program cover the initially targeted population?
9. Has the project appropriately targeted the right beneficiaries and the deriving

villages?

Effectiveness

10. Are the project activities timely implemented as planned? (effectiveness of work plan implementation)
11. Is the project on course to meet expected results?
12. The extent to which the project's intended outcomes and outputs have been achieved or the extent to which progress toward outputs or outcomes has been achieved
13. An assessment of cause and effect (attribution of observed changes to project activities and outputs)
14. Extent of VSF Belgium contribution/s toward accomplishment of the project's intended outcomes
15. Judgment on the value of the change brought about by the project (positive or negative)
16. How effective was it to work with VSFB and the government department?
 - ❖ Achievements
 - ❖ Were there challenges experience?
 - ❖ How were the challenges addressed?
17. What further improvements would you suggest for future programme of the KLDP II project?

Efficiency

18. How were the resources utilized in the course of project implementation so far?
 - ❖ Funds
 - ❖ Expertise
 - ❖ Time
19. How significant is the efficiency or utilization ratio of the resources used
 - ❖ (Comparison: resources applied viz a viz the total number of primary beneficiaries reached?)
 - ❖ Project organization and management? How accountable, responsive, transparent & capacitating? Evidences if available

Impact

20. What negative or positive End of Phase II influence of the project is already foreseen?
 - ❖ Intended and or unintended results of the project interventions?
21. What is the impact or effect of the intervention in proportion to the overall situation of the target beneficiaries or those affected by the project?
 - ✓ Social change
 - ✓ Economic status
 - ✓ Welfare and livelihood
 - ✓ Change in livelihood
22. How is the well-being of the project beneficiaries as compared to before the project?
23. What further improvements can you recommend in future for the effective management of the KLDP II project?

Sustainability

24. The extent to which benefits of the project continue after end of the project phase? And to what extent?
 - ❖ Evidences of sustainability
25. Are the results of activities sustainable and to what extent?
26. Sustainability strategy developed in the course of the project implementation

- ✓ Trained CAHWs
- ✓ IGAs
- ✓ Training on animal health and production
- ✓ Are there policies in place to promote sustainability
- ✓ Capacity building of community groups, staff and expertise exists

Weaknesses and strengths of KLDP II

27. What are weaknesses and strengths of the KLDP II

Lessons learnt

28. What lessons have been learnt from the Karamoja Livestock Development Project?

Challenges

29. What challenges were experienced in the course of the project implementation?

30. How were the challenges addressed?

Opportunities/Recommendations

31. What further improvements would you suggest for future programming of the Karamoja Livestock Development Project?

32. What opportunities exist in improving and informing the design of Karamoja Livestock Development Project?

Cross-cutting issues: To what extent has the project taken into account cross-cutting issues such as gender, children, environmental protection and HIV/AIDS, in the planning and implementation of the KLDP?

- ❖ How do you know if you are contributing or not to gender equity?
- ❖ What range of gender specific focus has been implemented across the KLDP components?
- ❖ Are gender issues included in training programs?
- ❖ Any indication of increased involvement of women, children or PLWHAs or children or PLWHAs women's groups/organizations in project activities.
- ❖ What is the added value of this project in terms of addressing HIV/AIDS?

Monitoring

- ❖ How was monitoring used to inform planning?
- ❖ How regular was monitoring reviewed for improvement?
- ❖ Is there currently existence of both a range of qualitative and quantitative information?
- ❖ How often was technical advice provided – from VSF Belgium and externally?
- ❖ Was there an M&E framework developed? Was it satisfactory?

Appendix 4: List of people consulted

Focus group discussions		
Acholin Women Group, 14 December 2013		
1.	Awino Rose	Chairperson
2.	Nangiro Villia	Vice Chairperson
3.	Apie Maria	Treasurer
4.	Longoli Rita	Secretary
5.	Ayugi Maria	Assistant Secretary
6.	Ngorok Florence	IGA
7.	Atukoi Christine	IGA
8.	Napeyok Betty	IGA
9.	Angole Jennifer	IGA
10.	Lomonyang Clementina	IGA
11.	Aiko Sarah	IGA
12.	Ilukol Susan	IGA
13.	Manang Rayio	IGA
14.	Awosit Marita	IGA
15.	Lowanyang Betty	IGA
16.	Areilot Betty	IGA
17.	Otiang Florence	IGA
18.	Sarah Keem	IGA
19.	Nangololo Agnes	IGA
20.	Longorok Maria	IGA
21.	Nakiru Luga	IGA
22.	Kolibi Christine	IGA
23.	Ayugi Margret	IGA
24.	Loumo Lucia	IGA
24.	Namuya Josephine	IGA
25.	Aluka Miriam	IGA
26.	Itiang' Annet	IGA
27.	Lokwang' Anna	IGA
28.	Abwono Silvia	IGA
29.	Angella Lucia	IGA
30.	Lokwang' Pasila	IGA
31.	Awasi Maria	IGA
32.	Aboka Alice	IGA
33.	Koriang Paulina	IGA
34.	Nasabu Maria	IGA
Kitobarae VICOBA Group Members, 14 December 2013		
35.	Lokalei Luka	
36.	Lolem Loguti	
37.	Lochoro Mutun	
38.	Lokeno Philipo	
39.	Lokeris Veronica	
40.	Keeya Longok	
41.	Loroo Aboliar	
42.	Losur Lokwapir	
Borehole rehabilitation and WUCs in Kanakomol, 14 December 2013		

43.	Athiono Maria	
44.	Nakoroi Maria	
45.	Longes Paul	
46.	Nangiro Emmanuel	
47.	Lopwono Lopeteron	
48.	Amicu Lolimor	
49.	Regina Nawal	
50.	Lubur Max	
Nadunget CAHWs Associations, 15 December 2013		
51.	Apunuyo John	
52.	Logit Cholima	
53.	Keem Mariko	
54.	Akol Ananiya	
55.	Bubutak Lociyo	
56.	Lokiru Anthony	
57.	Lochuge Joseph	
58.	Lokimu Lomuth	
59.	Lomuma Paul	
60.	Lochoro Maria	
61.	Nakut Hellen	
62.	Naitan Maria	
63.	Ayopo Andrew	
64.	Namuya Anna	
65.	Losike Apamwai	
66.	Akwang Longora	
67.	Logiel Andrew	
68.	Loru Moses	
Kiteyarae VICOBA Group, 15 December 2013		
69.	Nakadio Joseph	
70.	Akudo Mwanamis	
71.	Lochoro Maria	
72.	Natee Rose	
73.	Arayo Catherine	
74.	Kodet Margaret	
75.	Auda Paul	
76.	Aleper Peter	
77.	Sagal Florence	
78.	Lokol Samson	
79.	Lokol Margaret	
80.	Teko Michael	
81.	Lorot Paulina	
82.	Akello Maria	
83.	Achii Teresa	
84.	Nangiro Anna	
85.	Munyos Lucia	
86.	Aboka Christine	
87.	Losike Hellen	
CAHWs Rupa, 16 December 2013		
88.	Lochoro Tomon	
89.	Mukad Loreyou	

90.	Angella Anna	
91.	Ngorou Alice	
92.	Akol Mary	
93.	Nagee Rita	
94.	Lokot Paul	
95.	Achila Peter	
96.	Teko Peter	
97.	Akol Peter	
98.	Awas Albino	
99.	Angolere Augustin	
100.	Owili John	
111.	Kodet Peter	
Okenyutu VICOBA group, 16 December 2013		
112.	Lomokol Apalimiareng'	
113.	Lokure Teresa	
114.	Margaret Lokubwal	
115.	Sabina Nakee	
116.	Anna Loukai	
117.	Naalany Angelina	
118.	Lochoro Lucy	
119.	Acura Lucia	
120.	Rebecca Itai	
121.	Loumo Susan	
122.	Sagal Marta	
123.	Risa Sabina	
124.	Aliat Rose	
125.	Keem Sanitina	
126.	Lochoro Lucia	
127.	Nakong Hellen	
128.	Loru Albert	
129.	Sagal Camilion	
130.	Longes Veronica	
131.	Achia Ebokosiwa	
132.	Achola Maria	
133.	Lowalem Lotorongole	
134.	Sagal Lopusikwang	
135.	Lokong Stephano	
136.	Amiyo Anthony	
Peace building community members (Nakonyen/Tapac), 18 December 2013		
137.	Lomuron Logiel	
138.	Lodiriru Emeriboi	
139.	Logira John	
140.	Apalo Mug Nakomo	
141.	Nakoru Madita	
142.	Lotee Lomer	
143.	Adita Elola Lomilo	
144.	Iriama Korobe	
145.	Loponno Nagaditewa	
146.	Loyuum Longilebole	
147.	Lotee Simon	
148.	Chokon Itameri	

149.	Lomer Logwee	
150.	Lotee Lotiakangiro	
151.	Angiroi Loitanya	
152.	Loreyou Limaruk	
153.	Lokedi Lopongo	
154.	Angorece Engorimeru	
155.	Locolia Lousungu	
156.	Lomemkoru Locolol	
157.	Lorut Loesengura	
TAPAC CAHWs, 18 December 2013		
158.	Ariko Michael	
159.	Lipale Thomas	
160.	Lokiru Nawalangiro	
161.	Naluk Simon	
162.	Lopeyole Louwajam	
163.	Lochar Peter	
164.	Naruyo Alice	
Key Informants		
165.	Dr. Orongo Walter	District Veterinary Officer, Moroto District
166.	Dr. Elanyu Sam	Veterinary Officer, Moroto District
167.	Paul Kidon Akutho	Community Development Officer, MADEFO
168.	Joshua Riisa	Senior Commercial Officer