

**GOODBYE TO PROJECTS?  
THE INSTITUTIONAL IMPACTS OF A LIVELIHOOD APPROACH ON  
DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTIONS**

**RESEARCH PROJECT NO. R7908**

**DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**WORKING PAPER SERIES**

Paper No 14

**A livelihoods-grounded audit of the  
Plan for the Modernisation of  
Agriculture (PMA) in Uganda**

By Fred Muhumuza

October 2003

---

**ISBN:** 1 898828 52 0  
Published by: Bradford Centre for International Development, University of Bradford,  
Pemberton Building, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD7 1DP  
Tel: +44-1274 233980 Fax: +44-1274 235280  
[www.brad.ac.uk/acad/bcid](http://www.brad.ac.uk/acad/bcid)

## **BACKGROUND TO PROJECT AND WORKING PAPER SERIES**

This paper is one in a series of working papers prepared under a research project entitled *Goodbye to Projects? The Institutional Impacts of a Livelihood Approach on development interventions*.

This is a collaborative project between the Bradford Centre for International Centre for Development<sup>1</sup> (BCID) with the Economic and Policy Research Centre (EPRC), Uganda; Khanya – managing rural change, South Africa; and, Mzumbe University (formerly the Institute for Development Management (IDM)), Tanzania. The project is supported by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) under their Economic and Social

Approaches to projects and development have undergone considerable change in the last decade with significant policy shifts on governance, gender, poverty eradication, and environmental issues. Most recently this has led to the adoption and promotion of the sustainable livelihood (SL) approach. The adoption of the SL approach presents challenges to development interventions including: the future of projects and programmes, and sector wide approaches (SWAPs) and direct budgetary support.

This project intends to undertake an innovative review of these issues. Central to this will be to question how a livelihood approach is actually being used in a range of development interventions. This will be used to identify and clarify the challenges to the design, appraisal and implementation of development interventions and changes required from the adoption of a livelihoods approach.

The research was conducted in two phases. The first phase consisted of general and country reviews on SL and development interventions. The second phase of the research involved the compilation of ten detailed case studies of development interventions in Uganda, Tanzania and South Africa. These case studies compare and contrast the implementation of a range of sector wide approaches, programmes and projects all developed with a livelihoods-orientation.

Each case study intervention was examined through what might be termed as a ‘sustainable livelihoods (SL)-grounded audit’, which uses sustainable livelihoods ‘principles’ as the basis. The results of this analysis offer useful guidance on the opportunities and challenges faced by development practitioners in operationalizing sustainable livelihoods approaches.

Research Programme (ESCOR).

**This paper ‘A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture in Uganda’ is the fourteenth in the series of project working papers.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Formerly Development and Project Planning Centre (DPPC)

*This research is funded by the Department for International Development of the United Kingdom. However, the findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed in this paper are entirely those of the author(s) and should not be attributed to the Department for International Development, which does not guarantee their accuracy and can accept no responsibility for any consequences of their use.*

## **THE AUTHORS**

**Fred Muhumuza is a Research Fellow at the Economic Policy Research Centre in Uganda.**

## **PROJECT WORKING PAPERS TO DATE**

- 1. Annotated bibliography on livelihood approaches and development interventions.**
- 2. Appraisal of the use of livelihoods approaches in South Africa.**
- 3. Review of approaches to development interventions in Tanzania: From projects to livelihoods approaches.**
- 4. Review of development interventions and livelihoods approaches in Uganda**
- 5. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Participatory Planning for District Development within Capacity 21 programme (Tanzakesho) in Tanzania**
- 6. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Community-Based Planning (CBP) action research project in South Africa.**
- 7. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Agricultural Sector Programme Support (ASPS) in Tanzania.**
- 8. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Sustainable Management of the Usangu Wetland and its Catchment (SMUWC) project in Tanzania.**
- 9. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Magu District Livelihoods and Food Security Project (MDLFSP) in Tanzania.**
- 10. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Sexual Health and Rights Programme (SHARP!) in Lesotho and South Africa.**
- 11. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Training for Environmental and Agricultural Management (TEAM) project in Lesotho.**
- 12. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Sustainable Coastal Livelihoods Programme**

**(SCLP) in South Africa.**

**13. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA) in Uganda**

*For more details on the project, this paper, and others in the series, please contact the UK or African co-ordinators:*

Tom Franks or Anna Toner, BCID, University of Bradford, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD1 7DP, UK Tel: +44 (0) 1274 235286; Fax: +44 (0) 1274 235280; email: [t.r.franks@bradford.ac.uk](mailto:t.r.franks@bradford.ac.uk) or [a.l.toner@bradford.ac.uk](mailto:a.l.toner@bradford.ac.uk) ; [www.brad.ac.uk/acad/bcid](http://www.brad.ac.uk/acad/bcid)

Ian Goldman or Tsiliso Tamasane, Khanya – managing rural change, 17 James Scott Street, Brandwag, Bloemfontein 9301, Free State, South Africa. Tel +27 (0)51 430 8314; Fax: 27 (0)51 430 8322; email: [goldman@khanya-mrc.co.za](mailto:goldman@khanya-mrc.co.za) or [tsiliso@khanya-mrc.co.za](mailto:tsiliso@khanya-mrc.co.za) [www.khanya-mrc.co.za](http://www.khanya-mrc.co.za)

Fred Muhumuza, EPRC, Makerere University Campus, 51 Pool Road, PO Box 7841, Kampala, Uganda. Tel: +256 (0)41 541023; Fax: +256 (0)41 541022; email: [muhuma@hotmail.com](mailto:muhuma@hotmail.com)

Faustin Kamuzora, Mzumbe University, P.O. Box 397, Morogoro, Tanzania. Tel: +255 (0)23 604380; Fax: +255 (0)23 4382; email: [frkamuzora@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:frkamuzora@yahoo.co.uk)

For more details on the project and copies of recent publications please consult the project's web site:

**14. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the AIDS/STD programme in Uganda.**

<http://www.brad.ac.uk/acad/dppc/GTP/goodbye/html>

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1. An SL-grounded audit approach</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2. PMA- the case study</b>	
2.1 Description of the intervention	<b>10</b>
2.2 Impact	<b>14</b>
2.3 Poor people as focus	<b>15</b>
2.4 Participation	<b>15</b>
2.5 Partnership	<b>16</b>
2.6 Holistic approach	<b>16</b>
2.7 Policy and institutional links	<b>17</b>
2.8 Building on strengths	<b>18</b>
2.9 Dynamic and flexible	<b>19</b>
2.10 Accountability/responsiveness	<b>19</b>
2.11 Sustainability	<b>20</b>
2.12 Critical factors	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix 2.1 Documents reviewed</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix 2.2 Acronyms and Abbreviations</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Appendix 2.3 Stakeholders</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Appendix 2.4 People interviewed</b>	<b>27</b>

## 1. The SL-grounded audit of development interventions

The cases studies in this research were chosen for inclusion following a first phase review of the use of livelihoods approaches in Tanzania, Uganda and Southern Africa. Data was collected using a number of methods including questionnaires, semi-structured individual and focus group interviews, collection and review of process documentation and workshop activity.

All ten case studies have been analysed according to what we term a ‘SL-grounded audit’ described below so that the emerging lessons can be compared. Each study is divided into two sections: the first a general introduction to the intervention; and the second, a structured response to a series of questions adapted from the SL-principles as defined by Carney (2002) in Box 1. SL principles are one element of sustainable livelihoods approaches. This research adopts these principles as a structuring tool and as means of pinpointing the practical implications of adopting a sustainable livelihoods approach to development.

### **Box 1. SLA principles defined by Carney (2002)**

Sustainable livelihoods approaches: Progress and possibilities for change, p14-15, London: Department for International Development

Normative principles:

**People-centred:** sustainable poverty elimination requires respect for human freedom and choice. People- rather than the resources, facilities or services they use- are the priority concern. This may mean supporting resource management or good governance, for example but the underlying motivation of supporting livelihoods should determine the shape and purpose of action.

**Empowering:** change should result in an amplified voice opportunities and well-being for the poor.

**Responsive and participatory:** poor people must be key actors in identifying and addressing livelihood priorities. Outsiders need processes that enable them to listen and respond to the poor.

**Sustainable:** there are four key dimensions to sustainability-economic, institutional, social and environmental sustainability. All are important-a balance must be found between them.

Operational principles:

**Multi-level and holistic:** micro-level activity and outcomes should inform the development of policy and an effective governance environment. Macro- and meso-level structures should support people to build on their strengths.

**Conducted in partnership:** partnerships can be formed with poor people and their organisations, as well as with public and private sector. Partnerships should be transparent agreements based upon shared goals.

**Disaggregated:** it is vital to understand how assets, vulnerabilities, voice and livelihood strategies differ between disadvantaged groups as well as between men and women in these groups. Stakeholder and gender analysis are key tools.

**Long-term and flexible:** poverty reduction requires long-term commitment and a flexible approach to providing support.

Each case study follows the structure detailed below:

**Description of the intervention:** this includes a chronological description of the evolution of the particular intervention and details the main stakeholders and activities undertaken in implementation. Original logframes and planning documents have been reviewed where possible.

**Impact:** Assessment of the impact of interventions relates to the success or failure of an intervention to achieve the outputs or outcomes that were the main focus of the intervention. The effect of this is that our understanding of impact is somewhat limited and partial. The methodology used in this research project did not allow for significant impact assessment with intervention beneficiaries at the micro-level (although this was done on a small-scale in most of the case studies). This section also includes some assessment of the costs of the intervention balanced against the number of people who benefit from it.

### **Poor People as focus**

Do, or did, the objectives of the intervention include a mention of people and their livelihoods?

How central is this to the intervention's objectives?

How much were household livelihoods a focus during implementation?

### **Participation**

What type of participation was used at each stage of design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?

How and when did this participation occur?

What incentives were there for people to participate?

### **Partnerships**

What was the type of partnership and collaboration between these organisations at micro-meso-macro?

Who owned the project?

### **Holistic approach**

How holistic was the analysis used in design?

How does the plan for the intervention fit into the broader development plan?

How does the intervention coordinate with other development interventions in the area?

### **Policy and institutional links**

How integrated was the intervention with existing institutional structures?

What evidence is there that the intervention addressed linkages between policy at micro, meso and macro levels and across sectors?

### **Building on strengths**

Does the intervention build on existing strengths at the different levels?



### **Dynamic and flexible**

Did the objectives and activities of the intervention change to respond to a changing environment and/or demands?

What further interventions have arisen from the intervention? How did this take place?

### **Accountability/ responsiveness**

How were those implementing the intervention accountable to the public and intervention's beneficiaries?

Who reports to whom and what about?

Do beneficiaries (micro) or partners (meso) have an influence on the intervention and how?

### **Sustainability**

#### Economic

Is the system able to be sustained financially?

Are the "technologies/services" economically viable for beneficiaries?

#### Social

Are vulnerable groups able to access and use effectively the systems of the intervention?

Are the institutions created/used by the intervention able to sustain themselves beyond the life of the intervention?

#### Environmental

Are the technologies/services environmentally beneficial?

Are the systems (meso level) beneficial/neutral?

#### Institutionally

Are the capacities and systems established in such a way so that the system will continue (beyond the life of the intervention)?

Will they continue to generate the outcomes envisaged?

### **Critical factors**

What were critical factors affecting the performance of this intervention?

### **Comparing Cases**

Each case study can be read as a stand-alone document as the SL-grounded audit is in itself a useful means of understanding the strengths and weaknesses of an intervention. However, the broader aim of this research is to compare lessons across all ten case studies in order to identify more generally the challenges and opportunities faced by development practitioners in operationalising a sustainable livelihoods approach.

## **2.0 PLAN FOR THE MODERNISATION OF AGRICULTURE (PMA) in Uganda**

---

### **2.1 Description of the intervention**

This paper presents a Sustainable Livelihood- (SL) grounded audit of the Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA). Since the PMA is still in its early stages of implementation, (it's second year by the time of the study), much of the review and analysis focused on the design, assumptions and intention and, to an extent, outputs. A number of components of the PMA framework were yet to be fully designed and implemented. The report, therefore, has a significant inclination to the National Agricultural and Advisory Services (NAADS), which is the one component that had been implemented to a substantial degree.

The PMA is a holistic, strategic framework for eradicating poverty through multi-sectoral interventions aimed at enabling the small-scale subsistence farmers to improve their livelihoods in a sustainable manner. The PMA is part of the Government of Uganda's broader strategy of poverty eradication contained in the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP). The content of the PMA is underpinned by the premise that modernising small-scale agriculture will contribute to increasing incomes of the poor by raising farm productivity, increasing the share of agricultural production that is marketed, and creating on-farm and off-farm employment.

The PMA, which is outcome-focused, is based on principles upon which sectoral and inter-sectoral policies and investment plans can be developed at all levels of government to identify and address the key constraints to better and more efficient agricultural production. This can be done through "joined-up" public sector interventions involving policy adjustments when required, public sector investments or new public service delivery mechanisms as found to be appropriate.

Based on the poverty focus and the need to transform agriculture, the vision of the PMA encompasses both the farmer and the sector. The PMA vision is poverty eradication through a profitable, competitive, sustainable and dynamic agricultural and agro-industrial sector. Achieving this vision will depend on two related processes: transforming the subsistence farmer, and transforming the agricultural sector in general. The mission of the PMA is to eradicate poverty by transforming subsistence agriculture into commercial agriculture. The framework aims to accelerate agricultural growth in Uganda by introducing profound technological change throughout the sector. Technological change is expected to lower unit costs of agricultural production, thereby increasing Uganda's agricultural competitiveness on international markets.

Uganda has three main categories of farmers namely subsistence, semi-commercial, and commercial. The majority are subsistence farmers predominantly producing on a small scale for household consumption. These are the farmers that form the core focus of the PMA. Thus, the PMA interventions are intended to augment the poor farmers' capital

assets, thereby improving their livelihoods in a sustainable manner. Improving the welfare of poor subsistence farmers will require that the farmers re-orient their production towards the market. In addition, the PMA intends to improve household food security, provide gainful employment, and promote sustainable use and management of natural resources.

Transforming subsistence agriculture requires addressing the constraints of the subsistence farmers. Consultations with poor farmers revealed two types of constraints: productivity related constraints and constraints related to governance. Productivity related constraints included lack of sufficient food, lack of land, soil infertility, lack of proximal water sources and lack of inputs. Others included pests and diseases, lack of skills and knowledge, lack of capital and access to credit, market problems especially the low prices and general lack of markets, effective transport systems, and storage and processing facilities.

In light of these constraints, the PMA was designed as a holistic framework and is expected to promote rural development through investments in rural infrastructure especially feeder roads, telephones, rural electrification, the development of markets and expansion of the service sector. It will also entail significant land reforms, which will provide security of property, develop land markets and increase efficient use of land and related investments.

In light of the diverse nature of the task of modernising agriculture, the framework is structured along the following seven (7) pillars or priority areas: research and technology development, national agricultural advisory services, agricultural education, improving access to rural finance, agro processing and marketing, sustainable natural resource utilisation and management, and physical infrastructure. Most of these components are to be implemented in a public-private sector partnership.

### ***Activities***

The activities associated with the PMA can be broken down into several categories including institutional reform and strengthening, continued policy formulation, mobilisation of financial resources, and building of partnerships and sensitisation. It was decided, by Government and other stakeholders, that in the medium term, the main thrust for public action in the modernisation of agriculture should be in the provision of services that are of "public good" in nature. These include:

- Reform and strengthening of institutions for improved efficiency and effectiveness in service delivery. This shall include provision of regulatory services, and capacity building for marketing and agro processing infrastructure,
- Carrying out policy formulation and strategic planning including collection of agricultural statistical data and, provision of market information. One of the major tasks is the formulation of land policy and implementation of land reform,
- Provision of agricultural advisory services for farmers and promotion of agricultural research and technological development for farmers. This will include capacity building for production of seeds, planting and stocking materials,

- Control of epidemic diseases and pests,
- Building capacity for sustainable use of the natural and physical resources including management of soil fertility, water conservation and environmental protection. It is hoped that technology will be developed for irrigation and water harvesting, and
- Building capacity for micro-financial services and risk management.

On the other hand, the Government intends to withdraw from commercial activities that can be carried out by the private sector. While in the short- to medium-term public expenditure will increase in a number of areas such as supply of agricultural advisory services, in the long-term, private sector funding is expected to exceed public funding. Some of the areas targeted for increased private sector funding include: actual production and supply of planting materials or other agricultural inputs (except for research and demonstration purposes), processing and/or marketing of agricultural products, direct provision of total or subsidised credit to the farmers, and construction of irrigation infrastructure.

The focus on research and development of technology is expected to recognise the need to make such research more relevant and responsive to the needs of subsistence farmers. Research will be conducted in a decentralised arrangement through the proposed Agricultural Research and Development Centres (ARDCs), which are to be strategically located across the country. Technology development and dissemination supported by socio-economic research will be intensified in partnership with the private sector and research institutions.

The PMA recognises the importance of rural financial services in savings mobilisation and in the provision of production and marketing credit for subsistence farmers. However, Government is not to get involved in the direct provision of micro-financial services to the public. This is partly due to the fact that Government provided financial services, especially credit services, are often subjected to non-commercial pressures, which undermine their viability and sustainability. The role of Government will primarily be to put in place a policy and regulatory framework in which the private sector providers of micro-financial services can thrive.

A National Agricultural Advisory Service (NAADS) Secretariat has already been established to co-ordinate service provision to subsistence farmers. Apart from the traditional advice on productivity enhancing technologies and soil conservation, other components, which are supposed to feature highly as part of the component of the advisory services include: knowledge and skills development, marketing, storage and agro-processing.

### ***Stakeholders***

An institutional and organisational framework has been designed and developed in order to provide for effective contribution to the objectives of agricultural modernisation by all stakeholders. The key players in Uganda's agricultural sector include the: (i) Public Sector - Central Government and Local Governments (LGs), (ii) Private Sector - farmers,

livestock keepers, fisher-folk, foresters, traders, small-scale entrepreneurs and manufacturing, and processing industries; (iii) Civil Society which includes the Non-Government Organisations (NGOs), Community Based Organisations (CBOs), academic institutions and the general public, and (iv) Development Partners (DPs). Given that the programme is in the early stages of implementation some of these stakeholders are yet to feature highly in the ongoing activities.

The DPs include the multilateral and bilateral organisations and agencies that support government and community organisations in the agricultural sector through grants, soft loans of a financial or technical assistance nature. They also include international NGOs through which certain foreign governments or agencies operate in the channelling of funds for the implementation of programmes. Evaluation reports indicated an increasing eagerness of the development partners to support the PMA activities.

The decentralisation process, in particular, has given greater authority to local governments at the district and sub-county levels to plan and implement programmes. Apart from making officers more accountable, decentralization is expected to increase people's participation in decision-making and make development more relevant to the local needs and decisions more transparent. The responsibilities of LGs are to be effected at district and sub-county levels and could be delegated even to lower levels at parish and village councils. A more detailed description of the roles for each of the stakeholders is included in appendix 2.1.

### ***Beneficiaries***

The majority of the direct beneficiaries will be the different persons who are involved in the agricultural sector, especially these related to small-scale agricultural production. The agricultural sector presents a great opportunity for poverty eradication because it employs over 80 percent of the labor force in the country. It is estimated that, over 85 percent of Uganda's population live in rural areas where their participation in agricultural production, processing and trade is the major contributor to their livelihoods.

### ***Cost***

There is no fixed cost to the PMA given that it is designed to be an ongoing framework and, which is to be implemented through several sectors. The funding, therefore, is largely embedded within the main government financial framework comprised of general budget support, budget support that is earmarked to the Poverty Action Fund (PAF), sector budget support or basket funding, and project aid. The sources of these funds largely come from domestic government revenues and foreign sources in form of loans and grants.

The figures for 2001/02 indicate that a total of Uganda shillings (Ushs) 403 billion, 16 percent of the total national budget, was allocated to PMA priority areas. In addition, Ushs 37 billions, out of Ushs 614 billions of direct transfers to the districts, was relevant to the PMA. An example of the distribution of resources among the different priority areas is provided in table 2.1 below.

**Table 2.1: Summary of PMA Projects by Priority Areas: 2001/02**

No	PMA Priority Area	No. Projects	Ushs (Bns)	% Budget
1	Physical Infrastructure	16	102.3947	29.4
2	Agriculture Advisory Services	38	88.1607	25.3
3	Natural Resource use & Management	22	50.0741	14.4
4	Institutional Reform, Reform of Policy & Regulation	29	33.4960	9.6
5	Research and Technology	14	32.1552	9.2
6	Agro-processing and Marketing	7	28.2624	8.1
7	Access to Rural Finance	4	11.3920	3.3
8	Agricultural Education	2	2.0508	0.6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>347.9859*</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: PMA Steering Committee Report on The First Joint GOU-Donor Review of PMA Implementation July 2002. (\*Approximately US\$180million)

## 2.2 Impact

As already noted, the major focus of the paper was on the intention and assumptions, since the PMA has not been under implementation for a period that is long enough to produce substantial impacts. However, some intermediate outputs and outcomes can be noted especially in the areas of policy, programme and institutional reform. A number of the institutional arrangements for the implementation at the national level have been established and are already operational. These include the PMA Forum, the PMA Steering Committee (PMA SC), the PMA Secretariat and eight PMA sub-committees to steer, guide, coordinate and give policy direction for implementation of the different priority areas within the different sectors.

In addition, the PMA, through its various organs, has progressed steadily in ensuring the realignment of several public expenditures to make them PMA compliant. Several documents have been produced as intermediate outputs aimed at explaining the PMA and outlining the roles of the different stakeholders. The different roles and responsibilities for Local councillors, sub-county extension providers, NGOs, and CBOs have all been documented.

What is yet to be demonstrated, and which appears to be crucial for the long-term impact, is the validity of the underpinning assumption: that through reform of institutional and regulatory frameworks, increased production will follow and markets will develop both internally and externally.

### *Cost Effectiveness*

There was an appreciation of the difficulty to establish the cost effectiveness with which the current level of success has been attained, not much in the area of establishing the cost but the associated output. As noted above, the level of impact attained is more in influencing policy with the rest being in the domain of outputs related to institutional building and development. None of these offers a practical way to gauge the level of effectiveness so far attained given that these are intermediate rather than final products of the PMA process.

Besides, the interactive and crosscutting nature of activities and the different sources of funding, in a sector-based economy, does not make it any easier to have the relevant data and information for making such an analysis. The PMA simply set out a broad vision of how agricultural transformation and the associated investments in the supporting sectors can contribute to sustainable livelihoods of the poor in the agricultural sector. Its implementation is dependent entirely on the actions of the private sector as enabled by actions of the central government, local governments and donor partners.

### **2.3 Poor People as Focus**

The fact that the PMA is derived from the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) in theory ensures that its main focus is on the poor people. Specifically, the entire design is aimed at modernising the rural poor in agriculture or agricultural related enterprises, which makes 'focus on the poor' a central theme of the PMA interventions. This is further expressed in the NAADS approach whereby the poor local communities are the ones to demand the types of services that they need.

However there were some indications that political discontent at higher levels of government, with regard to the slow pace of impact at the micro-level would re-orient the focus towards commercial farmers in order to produce quicker outputs. More so, the feasibility of the poor being able to articulate their needs and solicit for services from the private sector was yet to be fully tested. The implication is that, in practice, focus may eventually shift away from the poor.

### **2.4 Participation**

The PMA framework received a good level of participation from a wide range of stakeholders. Unlike some other government policies and strategies that are designed in a 'black box', the PMA was in the limelight right from the early stages. A cross-section of people and organisations were active in the contribution and refinement of initial ideas. The process benefited from existing, ongoing and other commissioned studies some of which were aimed at soliciting the views of the poor, including the Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project (UPPAP) reports.

At the implementation level it was noted that success would depend on the actions of a wide range of stakeholders including: Central Government Ministries and Parastatals, Local Governments, the private sector, the civil society, educational and research institutions, and development partners. The implementation is being guided by the PMA SC, which has executive powers with respect to the planning and financing of PMA programmes. The membership of the PMA SC is restricted to 30 people who are representatives of key stakeholders.

Because of the restriction on the size of the PMA SC and the need to allow for broader participation of stakeholders in PMA matters, it was agreed to have PMA Forum to churn out ideas for the PMA SC. The Forum, though comprised of the same membership as the Steering Committee, virtually has no limit on the number of participants. The terms of reference for the PMA Forum include:

- Soliciting stakeholder inputs (monitoring and evaluation reports) into the PMA implementation process.
- Dissemination of the decisions of the PMA SC and progress reports on policy developments and financing and other PMA implementation issues.
- Harmonisation of cross-sectoral implementation policies and constraints, and
- Sharing of best international and local practices and other lessons from PMA implementation among stakeholders.

The framework has had significant support and commitment from the politicians and several of the development partners (DPs). For example, the DPs are part of the various sector-working groups and are also represented in the National Forum and Steering Committee. In addition, the DPs have carried out joint reviews with government and are expected to realign both present and future projects and programmes to suit the PMA process and also to increase their interaction with the lower levels of Government at the districts.

However, the level of enthusiasm, commitment, and hence support at the implementation stage appeared to be lower than what was displayed in the early stages. This observation was raised by a number of people interviewed and was also reflected in the attendance of committee meetings. In one of the sectoral committee meetings it was noted that many government and other officials (25 out of 45) had failed to attend an important M&E workshop. Reporting was also not as comprehensive as several key stakeholders were not getting all the necessary reports. Institutional linkages were not yet strong and in some cases were built upon individuals. This was cutting across both centre-to-centre and centre-to-district institutions.

## **2.5 Partnerships**

Under the PMA it was recognised that there are different stakeholders with different roles and responsibilities. It is therefore important that the different players work in partnership for mutual benefit. It has also become evident that given the multi-dimensional nature of poverty, the best approach to it is multi-sectoral approach. The Government of Uganda through central budgeting processes, and in liaison with development partners, funds the PMA. The PMA secretariat oversees the core implementation of both policy and activities under the guidance of the PMA steering committee, which has representation from donors, government, civil society and the private sector

It should be noted, however, that willingness and eagerness are yet to be translated into reality in a number of cases. Thus, there are instances when PMA activities have not been implemented or have been delayed due to problems of processing and release of funds from the responsible stakeholder. The causes for this vary including failure to meet certain conditionalities or mismatches with inbuilt donor procedures for the release of funds.

## **2.6 Holistic Approach**

To an extent, it is possible to say a holistic approach was used in the analysis and the design of the intervention. Poverty, which is the major focus of the PMA, was considered



a complex, multi-dimensional phenomena in which the influencing factors are inter-linked and often inter-dependent. Consequently, it was argued that, in order for the PMA to address poverty, it must combine complimentary, sustainable and relevant interventions that allow for collaboration of agricultural programmes with other sectors. This led to selection of thematic areas with a wide coverage including institutional reform and strengthening, private sector involvement, rural finance, water for production, land reform and management, environment, marketing, gender analysis, and agricultural education. The same arguments were carried forward into the design and are reflected in the seven priority areas.

### **2.7 Policy and Institutional Linkages**

The PMA framework portrays a wide and rich mix of policy and institutional linkages. In the first place the framework is implicitly linked to the Government's broader strategy of poverty eradication contained in the PEAP, and has been embedded within the decentralisation framework, which is the main system for delivering services to the population. PMA coordinators have been appointed in each district and in NAADS pilot districts the previous agricultural extension system has been replaced by Farmers' Forums who select a small range of agricultural products and contract private sector extension-service providers to offer the necessary services.

The mechanisms for disbursement of funds to the districts have been put in place and, where necessary, integration with existing government frameworks, especially the LG structures, has been achieved. In particular, the financial resources for the implementation of PMA activities are largely based on the existing Local Government systems. For example, the funds under the Non-Sector Conditional Grant (NSCG), which are intended for the local community levels, are disbursed following a criterion of the Local Government Development Program (LGDP).

In some cases existing institutions will have to be reformed in order to make their operations compliant with the PMA. The overarching objective for institutional reform is to improve efficiency and effectiveness. This entails formal institutional assessment and functional analysis leading to reform and strengthening of the agricultural sector institutions. The first step involves a review of the policy and legal basis for the current mandate and roles of respective institutions involved in the implementation of the PMA. This is to ensure that the mandate and roles being developed derive from existing policies and laws. Otherwise appropriate revisions or enactment of new laws would have to be carried out in case the existing laws are found to be inadequate. Functional analysis is then conducted to articulate the roles, assess operational capacity, and recommend the necessary restructuring and reforms. In all this, adequate human, physical and financial resources and appropriate management systems are considered critical to the performance of every PMA implementing institution.

However, fieldwork conducted during this study revealed that the capacity of the private sector was still weak and unable to fill the gap left by the removal of government-provided extensions services, especially in the area of technical agricultural services. There were also concerns about the concentration by Farmer's Forums on a limited range

of agricultural enterprises. The selection of enterprises, which is to be influenced by the membership of the Farmers' Forum, may not reflect the wider agricultural needs of all the farmers, which may prompt some farmers to look for alternative sources of agricultural information or do without it all together.

## **2.8 Building on Strengths**

At the national level, substantial progress has been made in terms of building capacity, or tapping into the existing capacities of participating organisations, institutions and ministries. Where necessary, there are provisions to increase the strengths and capacities of both new and old institutions. For example, in order to maintain focus and ensure good performance, a monitoring and evaluation systems are being established in the different institutions. Information and communication systems are to be established in order to cater for the vertical (macro-meso-micro) and horizontal (macro-macro, meso-meso and micro-micro) linkages, and co-ordination and collaboration mechanisms with all the stakeholders. Where possible M&E will build on existing information collection and management systems.

In addition, resources are being provided under the PMA implementation process to enable key sector institutions to undertake priority reforms and strengthening processes. As indicated in table 2.1, almost 10 percent of the PMA allocations for 2001/02 were used to finance 29 projects in the area of institutional reform, and reform of policy and regulation. The framework also relies on other capacity building components such as the LGDP. The results of these reforms are expected to ensure attainment of institutional sustainability, whereby an institution is considered sustainable if its services continue to be demanded by the clients and/or it has the capacity to generate or attract sufficient resources for its operations.

The task of building strength within the different institutions was evident at all levels from macro to micro. The PMA Secretariat itself had a small number of staff compared to the task at hand. At the Local Government and Community Levels, the definition of roles and responsibilities as well as building of certain special capacities remains an area of concern. In particular, the capacities for planning, budgeting and articulating PMA related investment programmes in a manner that would contribute effectively to poverty eradication were still weak. The level three Local Councils (LCs), needed more skills in articulation of ideas coming in from the communities.

In line with the above observation, a draft Guide for Harmonized Participatory Development Planning and Management for Lower Local Councils had been developed under the guidance of the MoLG. The draft guide is intended to address the issues of local government planning and implementation capacities and hence improve the planning and budgeting processes of PMA related activities at the lower levels. In order to enhance participatory planning at lower levels, it was agreed to simplify the planning process so as to avoid making excessive demands at the village and parish levels.

At the micro-level, NAADS aims to empower farmers' representatives to choose agricultural service providers, which, whilst attempting to work from farmers' strengths

in identifying the services they require, fails to recognise the weaknesses in private sector capacity. It was noted that the lower level NGOs and CBOs did not have the anticipated capacity such that National level NGOs were to be contracted to provide the necessary skills within the lower level private institutions.

A greater weakness, at the micro level, which was expected to persist for a longer period arose from the lack of technical skills, which were largely in the domain of the government-provided agricultural extension staff. The existing private institutions could only provide the mobilisation and organisational skills to the communities but not the technical skills for agricultural production. This is in line with findings by the Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture, which expressed concerns about the limitations of the private sector with regard to delivery of a whole range of extension services. The Members of Parliament found no significant evidence to show that the required capacities existed in a number of areas yet the implementation had been allowed to continue. They, therefore, recommended a review of the entire programme implementation.<sup>2</sup>

### **2.9 Dynamic and Flexible**

The framework is relatively flexible, given that it was designed to adapt to a changing environment and also incorporate lessons from both the past and present. It is still too early to explicitly pick out any changes to the framework that are a result of lessons picked from the changing economic, social or physical environment. However, it is possible that the need to be close to national level activities by several of the stakeholders, the PMA Secretariat was relocated to the capital city in Kampala from Entebbe, some 41 kilometres away.

Nevertheless, with regard to learning from best practices, it is doubtful whether this objective, highlighted at the planning and design stage, is duly being achieved at the implementation level. Though the implementation of the PMA has been sequenced in a way that allows the number of participating districts to be increased over the years, the additions appear to be based more on political rather than technical reasons of learning from earlier experiences. For example, NAADS is an act of parliament and its implementation has political and constitutional requirements, which do not necessarily make room for a phased implementation. The annual increments of participating districts, even before any evaluations of the past interventions are done or analysed and shared, raises doubts as to whether best practices, from within the country, are being identified and incorporated as the program was being introduced into other districts.

### **2.10 Accountability**

Being a Government policy framework and supported by national resources, accountability by those implementing the interventions is mainly to the entire team of stakeholders including government, citizens and donors. For example, there was a joint Government and Donor review of the performance of the PMA for the period of December 2000 - April 2002. The PMA Secretariat has had to report to Parliament on the progress made, while the members of Parliament have visited some of the districts to gauge for themselves the performance of the implementing agencies.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Monitor Newspaper, July 2003.

Furthermore, by the design of the mechanism for delivering the advisory services, the communities are supposed to identify the type of service required and have Government pay for the delivery of such services through a private sector provider. In case the communities are dissatisfied with the services rendered, they are expected to reject the service provider. However, there were indications that, at least, one service provider rejected by the people had still been given the responsibility to deliver the services. This development casts doubt on whether the system is versatile enough to protect the interests of the poor communities against the decisions of the elites who may not be benevolent actors.

### **2.11 Sustainability**

Sustainability has been looked at in terms of the economic, social, environmental and institutional aspects. Economically, the PMA is sustainable in as much as Government continues to mobilise financial resources both from domestic and foreign sources in collaboration with DPs. In the long-run, it is anticipated that small-scale agricultural units will be able to use their increased commercial component to sustain themselves.

#### **Social**

In recognition of the potential and crucial role played by social aspects in successful implementation of many development programmes, it was agreed that agricultural research should not only focus on physical and biological research but have elements of social and cultural research as well. This approach is expected to ensure social sustainability, not least, by incorporating aspects of the vulnerable groups.

#### **Environmental**

Technologically, the research component of the PMA is expected to come up with varieties, implements and systems that are specific to the different social-economic and geographical environments. The research and information centres are expected to produce technologies that are appropriate for adoption by the local population and are also in harmony with environmental concerns. The involvement of the Government Ministry in charge of the environment and the National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) is an indicator of the concerns for ensuring that the PMA is environmentally sustainable. However, project documents indicated that the possible environmental consequences of modernising agriculture have not been widely discussed by stakeholders.

#### **Institutional**

There was a high possibility of overloading existing institutions, which had been created for different purposes, but were now expected to take on additional responsibilities under the PMA framework. Thus, the implementation of the PMA using multiple bodies both at the central and local levels (districts), some of which are newly created for this purpose, is likely to, not only constrain the already stretched district human and financial resources but also, provide a potential for desegregations, multiple reporting and difficulties of keeping within the right focus. Institutional sustainability may therefore not be guaranteed in the long run or will be attained with great difficulty.

## **2.12 Critical factors**

In this section, consideration is given to the factors that were considered critical to the performance and success of the PMA in an SL context. They include the maintenance of partnerships and stakeholder involvement, sensitisation and dissemination, and streamlining of procedures.

### *Sensitisation and Dissemination*

The PMA is largely a learning process with hardly any known precedents and is set to continue being evolutionary rather than an unwinding of a known and complete framework. M&E and use of the results to feed-back into the process will, therefore, be critical for guiding the process towards the anticipated success. To further improve the value of information coming from the evaluations, it will be necessary to increase on the analytical component of the findings for clear diagnosis of the underlying causes.

Sensitisation, at all levels, is important for minimising disagreements and disharmonies between the various stakeholders, agencies and institutions. A weak comprehension of the framework's design and mode of operation can easily result into different opinions on any given aspects of the intervention. A potential source of disharmony that was noted during the interviews was the use of the word 'agriculture' on what was supposed to be an all-embracing framework. In a sector-based economy, a number of sectors, conceptually, felt they had their own concerns to address rather than getting 'dragged' into the agricultural sector issues.

It is worth noting that a strategy for enhancing sensitisation had been finalised and funding sourced for its implementation. However, review reports had indicated that Government funded extension staff were a major source of information for the communities and yet the continuation of this structure was not guaranteed under the PMA. Such an observation underlies the importance of a speedy implementation of farmers' forums, or implementation of a phased withdrawal of the extension staff.

### *Streamlining of Procedures*

The procedures need to be harmonized such that different interventions do not overburden one institution, and also cause a potential of divided staff interest and loyalty to different programmes. The learning process and feed back mechanism was well advanced in the development of guidelines and procedures. For example, in its progress report, the PMA Secretariat noted that there was still considerable misunderstanding on the investment menu for the use of the NSCG arising mainly from the definition of items that fall under the category of "public good". Consequently, the guidelines on the use of the NSCG were revised and sent to all the 24 districts and their sub-counties during 2001/02. It was also resolved to carry out dissemination and sensitisation on the objectives and investment menu of the NSCG, particularly to the new councils. Continued reliance on such dynamic aspects of the PMA is crucial for error-correction and strengthening of the involvement of all stakeholders.

*Institutional Issues*

The building of multiple institutions during programme implementation has a potential to draw resources from actual delivery of services to maintenance of administrative and other fixed costs. Another source of potential problems associated with multiple institutions is the co-ordination and maintenance of harmony between activities and loyalty, as noted under streamlining of procedures. It was observed that several of the technical staff in the districts had lost touch with their line/parent ministries and were only reporting to the district authorities or apex bodies such as PMA and NAADS.

The holistic nature of development interventions means that, much as agricultural-based interventions need contribution from other sectors, the other sectors, too, will need the contribution of agricultural institutions and staff. For example, as a result of the operationalisation of NAADS, there is growing tendency to dismantle the existing extension staff and yet, these remain a crucial entry point for a number of other interventions and organisations. For example, the extension staffs have been active in mobilising and compiling local priorities for forward transmission to the sub-county and the district. More so, most of the NGOs do not have established technical staff on the ground, and partly relied on the government extension staff to implement their own programmes.

Related to the above observation is the fact that the private sector, by its structure of being profit-led and competitive in nature, may not do a comprehensive coverage, especially of the remote places. Most NGOs, for example, have a set agenda and specific areas of operation. The extent to which the NGO agenda and mode of operation matches the PMA priorities, is yet to be fully established.

There is no doubt that the PMA is an ambitious development framework aimed at transforming small-scale agriculture into an activity that ensures faster and consistent reduction of poverty for majority of Ugandans. Based on the findings from this SL-based review, the framework has been found to have a number of strengths in the design but also challenges at the implementation level. The success of the intervention will depend on realisation of a number of assumptions or adjustment of the design to address emerging issues.

## **Appendix 2.1 Documents reviewed**

Bahigwa G., (1999), Plan for Modernization of Agriculture in Uganda: Vision and Strategic Purpose.

Campbell D. and C. Garforth (2001), Communication Strategy for the Plan for Modernization of Agriculture in Uganda.

MAAIF, (2002), National Agricultural Advisory Services Programme- Master document of the NAADS Task Force and Joint Donor Groups., Ministry of Agriculture, Animal industry and Fisheries

MFPED/MAAIF, (2002), Guidelines, Project/Programme Submission for PMA Compliance and Clearance by MFPED, Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development, and Ministry of Agriculture, Animal industry and Fisheries

NAADS (2002), Guidelines., National Agricultural Advisory Services.

PMA Secretariat (2000),Progress Report on the PMA Implementation.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2001), Memorandum to the PMA Steering Committee, Draft terms of reference, Designing the National Agricultural Education Strategy (NAES)

\_\_\_\_\_ (2001), Memorandum to the PMA Steering Committee, PMA issues for consideration in phase two of the Local Government Development Programme (LGDP II).

\_\_\_\_\_ (2001), Report on the Non-Sectoral Conditional Grant Monitoring Exercise.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2001), Working Paper for the PMA Review, Key Issues and Recommendations of the PHRD Studies Conducted in Support of PMA Implementation.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2002), Report on the first joint GOU-Donor Review of PMA Implementation for December 2000 - April 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2002), PMA SC Feedback to members on the 38th PMA SC meeting

\_\_\_\_\_ (2002), Memorandum to the PMA Steering Committee, Progress on Implementation of PRSC III Policy Matrix.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2002), Memorandum to the PMA Steering Committee, Integration of PMA priority areas into the MTEF- (2003/2004-2005/2006).

\_\_\_\_\_ (2002), Joint PMA Mini-Review, April/May 2002 (Task 3): Role of Development Partners in the PMA Process

Turanye, B. and S. Bikangaga, (2002), Report of The Evaluation of the Performance of NGO's Collaborating with NAADS in the Districts of Mukono, Kibale and Kabale.



## **Appendix 2.2: Acronyms and Abbreviations**

ARDCs	Agricultural Research and Development Centres
CBOs	Community Based Organizations
DPs	Development Partners
LCs	Local Councils
LGs	Local Governments
LGDP	Local Government Development Programme
MoLG	Ministry of Local Government
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory Services
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NSCG	Non-Sectoral Conditional Grant
PAF	Poverty Action Fund
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PMA	Plan for the Modernization of Agriculture
PMA SC	Plan for the Modernization of Agriculture Steering Committee
SL	Sustainable Livelihoods
SLAs	Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches
UPPAP	Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project

### Appendix 2.3: Roles of Different Stakeholders

Stakeholder	Role(s)
Central Government	The Central Government role is to ensure the security of person and property, the provision of an appropriate policy environment, basic infrastructure and social services (health care, education, safe drinking water) to the population. At the central government level, therefore, different Ministries will be in charge of some functions within their general mandate. Specifically, the new mandate of Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) is "to support, promote and guide the production of crops, livestock and fisheries, so as to ensure improved quality and increased quantity of agricultural produce and products for domestic consumption, food security and export".
Local Government	LGs are responsible for designing local government agricultural sector plans. In addition, the following functions have been decentralised for implementation by LGs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agricultural extension for crops, animals and fisheries,</li> <li>• Entomological services and vermin control,</li> <li>• Design of development plans,</li> <li>• Land administration and surveying,</li> <li>• Management of forests and wetlands,</li> <li>• Control of soil erosion, bush fires, local hunting and fishing, and</li> <li>• Licensing of produce buying.</li> </ul>
Private Sector	The private sector is the largest category of stakeholders in the agricultural sector. It includes the subsistence farmers, traders, processors and service providers in rural finance, land surveying and legal profession. Agricultural transformation and structural change will demand that the provision of private sector services be expanded and the quality of services improved. Agricultural transformation will imply that farmers will use more and more hired labor, more external inputs, which will increase farm output. The increases will require more markets, more transport services, more storage, more agro-processing industries, more packaging, more production and marketing credit, and other financial and legal services.
Civil Society	Civil society will be involved in the process of planning, implementing, financing and delivery of services especially at local levels of Government. In some cases, public sector resources will be used to build the capacity of the civil society, facilitating their participation in public sector activities and in contracting them to deliver certain categories of public sector services.
Development Partners	To work closely with the Central Government and the different stakeholders depending on their special interests and mandates.

**Appendix 2.4: List of Some Key Persons Interviewed**

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Location</b>
1	Akwang Agnes	Monitoring Officer	NAADS	Kampala
2	Bahiigwa Godfrey	Senior Research Fellow	EPRC	Kampala
3	Byekwaso (Dr)		NAADS	Kampala
4	Drake Liz	Technical Advisor	PMA Sec	Kampala
5	Ikagobya Moses	Sub County Chief	Buhesi Sub County	Kabarole
6	Kakuba Tom		PMA Sec	Kampala
7	Mugisha Tom		PMA Sec	Kampala
8	Ngategize Peter	PMA Advisor	MFPED	Kampala
9	Nsemerirwe (Dr)	PMA Coordinator	MAAIF	Kabarole
10	Rubaihayo (Dr)	Production Coordinator	MAAIF	Kabarole
11	Rwamugisha Patience	Senior Entomologist	MAAIF	Entebbe
12	Tumusiime Rhoda	Commissioner (Planning)	MAAIF	Entebbe