

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 4

A REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTIONS AND LIVELIHOOD APPROACHES IN UGANDA

FRED MUHUMUZA AND ANNA TONER

FEBRUARY 2002



*Bradford Centre for
International Development,
University of Bradford, UK*



*Economic Policy Research
Centre, Makerere, Uganda*



*Institute of Development
Management, Mzumbe,
Tanzania*



*Khanya – managing rural
change, Bloemfontein, South
Africa*

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

BACKGROUND TO PROJECT AND WORKING PAPER SERIES

This paper is one in a series of working papers prepared under a research project on *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 Development¹ (BCID) with the Economic and Policy Research Centre (EPRC), Uganda; Khanya – managing rural change, South Africa; and, the Institute for Development Management (IDM), Tanzania. The project is supported by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) under their Economic and Social Research Programme (ESCOR).

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 is to be conducted in two phases. The first phase consists of general and country reviews on SL and development interventions. The second phase of the research is detailed case studies on development interventions in Uganda, Tanzania and South Africa. These case studies will compare and contrast the implementation of sector wide approaches, programmes and projects developed following an SL approach against those designed using a “classical” approach.

This paper ‘*Review of development interventions and livelihood approaches in Uganda*’ is the fourth in the series of the project working papers. This is the output of a literature review and series of interviews on development interventions in Uganda.

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.

¹ Formerly Development and Project Planning Centre (DPPC)

THE AUTHORS

Fred Muhumuza is a researcher and lecturer in Economics at the Economic Policy Research Centre in Uganda.

Anna Toner is a research assistant at the Bradford Centre for International Centre for Development University of Bradford.

PROJECT WORKING PAPERS TO DATE

1. Annotated bibliography on livelihood approaches and development interventions.
2. Review of livelihoods approaches and development interventions 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

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

David Howlett, Project coordinator, BCID, University of Bradford, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD1 7DP, UK Tel: +44 (0)1274 235286; Fax: +44 (0) 1274 235280; email: d.howlett@brad.ac.uk; www.brad.ac.uk/acad/bcid

Ian Goldman, 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; 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

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

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

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

1.0 Introduction

This paper charts Uganda's current development strategy, and seeks to identify to what extent such a strategy can be seen as fitting a 'sustainable livelihoods approach'.

The findings presented here are the result of a literature review covering current intervention policy, and a series of interviews with development practitioners in Uganda. (See Appendix 1) Interventions are then compared against the set of principles defined by DFID as being necessary to a sustainable livelihoods approach, in order to assess the degree to which SL (sustainable livelihoods principles have been adopted.

1.1 The current context of development in Uganda

Uganda has achieved remarkable success since 1992 in economic stabilisation and growth rates of 6.7 percent per annum, albeit with a host of problems. The country is still characterised by declining terms of trade, low tax revenues, high levels of poverty and disease. In addition, there are low rates of investment, low productivity, a limited domestic market and a poor distribution of income. The consequence of all this is that the economic growth rates are not sustainable and are unlikely to support improved income levels for the majority of the population. Much of the growth has been driven by increased consumption based on high levels of donor support, repatriated earnings from Ugandans living abroad, and the short-term benefits of economic reform and liberalisation (USAID, 2001). Economic and social indicators such as income per capita, life expectancy, mortalities and diseases are still reflective of a society that is in need of major improvements.

Given such trends it became clear that the country had to adopt policy options that were specifically, tailored towards eradication of poverty. This required a fundamental change in the development approach by both government and its development partners including donors, Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and the private sector. Poverty eradication required approaches and knowledge that would enable poor people, who are largely dependent on natural resources, to improve their livelihoods in a sustainable manner.

In 1997, the first Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) was launched after a widespread consultative process that began with a national seminar, held in partnership with the World Bank, in November 1995. The overall policy goal was to eradicate mass poverty from Ugandan society by 2017. This was to be achieved through a two-pronged strategy, namely the adoption of measures to increase the incomes of the poor and measures to improve the quality of life of the poor. Since then a revised PEAP, 2001-2003, has been published with the national strategy spelt out as **"poverty eradication through agricultural modernisation, employment creation and industrialisation."**

One significant observation in the adoption of the PEAP has been the shift from project approaches to development to sector-wide approaches (SWAPs) to policy reforms and investment programming. In fact volume 2 of the PEAP, the Public Investment Plan (PIP), is updated regularly with special consideration being given to reshaping it to reflect the shift from projects to the programme-based SWAP approaches.

Project-based approaches to development have been associated with a number of problems (Cassels, 1997). These include: (a) long preparation times; (b) high administrative costs; (c) implementation delays; (d) local managerial passivity and subterfuge; and (e) limited

sustainability and impact.

Some of the underlying causes of these problems have been identified as: (i) lack of ownership by project management; (ii) over-specification and lack of flexibility in prior planning; (iii) competing priorities of donor agencies, governments, and end-beneficiaries; and limited local capacity.

In order to accelerate the attainment of the PEAP objectives a change in approach was found to be necessary in Uganda. The programme-based SWAPs are deemed to offer an opportunity to overcome many of the constraints of the aid control systems associated with the project-based delivery mechanisms (Kadama, 2000).

2.0 Sustainable Livelihoods Approach as a Potential Approach to Development

2.1 Issues in Sustainable Livelihood Approach to Development

The failure to reduce world poverty despite several decades of growth and development has led to a rethinking of the old development theories and has resulted in new recommendations.

One current recommendation is the sustainable livelihoods (SL) approach. Using the Department for International Development (DFID) definition (adapted from Chambers, 1992), “a livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base”(Carney, 1998).

The overall objective of the SL approach is to eliminate poverty, which puts it into the context of the current predominant global drive.

The core principles of SL are geared towards focussing development to poverty eradication. It is argued that poverty-focussed development activity should bear the following characteristics:

1. It should be people-centred since sustainable poverty eradication must directly involve the people and recognise their cultures, assets, skills, strategies, and ability to adapt. People should be the concern for development such that resources and forms of organisation, including governments, revolve around them. Thus, the pursuit of sustainable livelihoods approaches must target institutional changes in order to ensure a consistent positive transformation.
2. In order to fully understand the components of (1) above, the process must be participatory and ready to respond to the voices of the poor. This will ensure that the views and perceptions of the poor are duly integrated in the planning process. The people should be involved in the identification, selection and the setting of priorities. This requirement implies that planners should adopt planning frameworks that are easy to comprehend.
3. Participatory approaches require that interventions be located at various levels of the development process. Participation must be for both local and higher level development

projects. There are lots of interrelations that require a holistic approach to policy since some lower level policy interventions cannot take root unless the higher level policies and institutions are set right, and vice versa. Institutions impact on people's livelihoods through enhancing or limiting their capabilities and/or access to assets. The SL approach, given its widespread implications and interrelations, needs a common focus by all parties that are involved in the development process. These include the government, the private sector and the donors. The multi-dimensional nature of the SL approach rules out any possibility of attaining its objectives without strong partnerships among all the development partners.

4. SL approaches must be dynamic in nature if they are to cause positive change in assets, capabilities and livelihoods. There must be a recursive and interactive web that allows tracking of changes in activities, assets and livelihoods.
5. The broadness of the concept of sustainability should be captured through consideration of (and hence striking a balance between) its key dimensions namely, economic, institutional, social and environmental concerns.

This list of principles should not be regarded as 'fixed', and some recommend additions and variations. For instance, qualifying the principle of participation with the requirement that those who participate should also empower. However, this paper seeks to identify SL themes in accordance with the list of principles outlined above.

2.2 Transforming Structures and Processes

This relates to policy, institutions and processes, which form a range of contextual factors that have a great effect on all aspects of livelihoods.

All the above relate to the services and environment created by government, other local-level organisations and activities of private sector organisations and can be found at all levels, from household to the international scene, and in all spheres, from the most private to the most public.

Policy, institutions and processes are known to determine:

- access to various types of capital and livelihood strategies
- the terms of exchange between different types of capital (markets)
- incentives to undertake certain activities or invest in particular areas.

It is important to understand how transforming structures and processes combine with the livelihood strategies and asset to influence the vulnerability context. This includes the trends, shocks and local cultural practices which affect livelihoods.

2.3 Challenges facing the SLA

Some of the challenges facing the SL approach to development are inherent within the design. For example, the participatory nature of identifying issues is likely to result in localised needs that may not be easy to aggregate at national level. As noted earlier, some of the stated livelihood outcomes may be mutually exclusive thereby causing problems of implementation. Furthermore the maximisation of current production may be achieved at a cost of increased vulnerability to external shocks. A blue print to govern such trade-off decisions is not possible, as each case has

to be handled individually. One can only provide a checklist of issues to consider in the debate and discussions aimed at taking decisions which represent the best judgement.

Additional challenges would be experienced in the area of bringing together different development partners. It may not be easy to agree on the way to combine the different development approaches and orientations of different development partners.

3.0 Current Strategies and Approaches to Development in Uganda: Implementing SL

The PEAP is Uganda's national comprehensive framework and strategy for improving the welfare of all people as well as eradicating poverty. It is based on the realisation that the country is experiencing mass poverty even though recent trends indicate that the population living below the poverty line has reduced. The overall policy goal for Uganda remains the eradication of mass poverty by the year 2017 using a two-pronged strategy. Firstly; the adoption of measures to increase the incomes of the poor, focusing on roads, land, agriculture, rural markets, employment and labour productivity, and improvements in financial services including rural credit. Second are measures to improve the quality of life of the poor. This is to be attained through provision of basic services such as primary education, primary health care, and focussing on water, environment and disaster management.

The Ugandan government has identified three conditions that must be fulfilled if economic growth is to reduce poverty. First, the necessary structural transformations (including agricultural modernisation, industrialisation, institutional reforms and capacity development) to support economic growth must occur. For example agriculture must be modernised and the increased incomes from agriculture should lead to the creation of rural non-farm enterprises and the development of modern industrial and service sectors.

Second, the growth must take a form in which the poor can participate. In order to prevent an increase in inequality and maximise growth the participation of the poor in economic growth is essential. Thirdly, economic growth must be sustainable. Production assets such as land, forests and lakes must be managed in a judicious manner to ensure that they are conserved in order to continue sustaining the gains in poverty eradication.

3.1 The Planning Process

The planning process in Uganda is to some extent participatory in nature, involving districts both at the planning and monitoring stages. The donors, NGOs and private sector also participate in the sharing of information and ideas that led to the development of sector plans and budgets. The entire process can best be described by looking at the different levels of government and horizon of the plan. There have been a large number of initiatives aimed at strengthening the planning process in the country. These include the consultative exercise code named Vision 2025 that led to the definition of the country's long-term goals and objectives. In addition, the PEAP, as national planning framework to guide detailed medium-term sector plans and district plans, was made after an intensive consultation process. Consequently, detailed sector-wide plans and investment programmes for a number of sectors have reached different stages of completion. A programme of strengthening district capacity to prepare medium term expenditure frameworks is underway.

In the planning hierarchy, sector planning follows Vision 2025 and the PEAP. Sector planning gives the technical specifications of sector policies and priorities and investment programmes.

Goodbye to Projects?

The district plans on the other hand are comprised of the district implementation plans for sector strategies that are based on local priorities/needs. The MTEF is an annual rolling 3-year expenditure planning, setting out the medium-term expenditure priorities and hard budget constraints against which the development of sector plans can be based. This is replicated at the district level to yield a district MTEF. The process is crowned by the formulation of national and districts budget, which describe the annual implementation of the three-year planning framework.

The process of transiting from plan to budget involves ‘disciplining’ the medium-term plans to match the hard budget constraints described by the MTEF. “The purpose of an MTEF is the design of all public expenditure by a clear analysis of the links between inputs, outputs, and outcomes, in a framework which ensures consistency of sectoral expenditure levels with the overall resource constraints, in order to ensure macroeconomic stability and to maximise the efficiency of public expenditure in attaining predetermined outcomes” (MFPED, 2001). Thus the MTEF guides all public expenditure including resources committed by donors. In line with this system, sector-wide approaches, under which government and donors contribute to a common pool of resources, have been introduced. The flexibility that this arrangement allows is essential to the efficient use of public expenditure. Government has argued that only in a sector-wide approach can the overall implications of a national programme within each sector be rationally considered. The sector-wide approach is expected to reduce duplication of efforts by different projects and divergences of cost structure between projects and other activities.

This represents a clear departure from the original approach, which was dominated by project management criteria. Before 1992, the budgeting process would entirely focus on the annual budgets and therefore was not linked to economic planning. Budgeting simply involved making changes in expenditure allocations through incremental adjustments in the previous year’s budget. There was no review of all allocations in the light of an overall budget strategy and unfolding economic conditions. This meant that budget administrators and technicians rather than cabinet and parliament, who are the legitimate policy makers in charge of Government policy, were making strategic decisions.

Rather than each ministry designing its own projects for the year, the sector-wide approach relies on the “Budget Framework Paper” (BFP), the preparation of which includes detailed discussions with sector working groups to monitor performance of current programmes and projects and to review strategy and new financing proposals. More recently the process has been broadened to include donors, especially on the sectoral priorities of Government expenditure, and on the consistency of Government assumptions regarding external financing with actual donor financing plans. The discussions identify implementation bottlenecks, inefficiencies in existing operations, and potentially unsustainable imbalances in the size of the recurrent and development programmes.

It is worth noting that policy challenges still exist in a number of areas. In the first case, not all development partners totally agree with the budgetary support approach. Some donors have suggested that concerns about fungibility prohibit them from providing budgetary support. Fungibility in this case refers to the redeployment of Government’s own resources away from a sector when donor support towards a sector increases. If resources are fungible, the effect of the donor support is that other sectors benefit. In particular donors who are contributing to the budget need to be assured that funds are moving in a generally pro-poor direction. Thus, donors get concerned if they want to support a given sector and do not share the Government’s priorities with regard to certain sectors. This has led to adoption of a ‘mixed’ strategy in which some development programmes are still being implemented under the project based approach. Another

challenge is the control of growth of expenditure in public administration to ensure that resources are available for service delivery. Finally, there is need to clarify the mandate of cross-cutting institutions, keeping them lean, and ensuring a smooth cooperation with service deliverers.

3.2 Application of Sector-wide Strategies in Uganda

There are eighteen sectors defined in Uganda . In each sector, all the stakeholders are intended to cooperate in the management of the public expenditure envelope. Attainment of this objective is being hampered by the slow progress in full adoption of sectoral approaches and subsequent development of sector strategies in all areas. Only sectors such as education, health and transport have adopted a full-scale sectoral approach. There are some sectors where sector-wide strategies are being prepared, including environment and lands, but which are not treated as a sector within the budget working groups. The development of sector-wide strategies is expected to justify treating these areas as sectors in future budget processes.

In spite of the steady progress made in the application of sector-wide strategies in Uganda, a number of key issues are yet to be fully resolved. A number of these are technical, relating to the definition of a sector and later design of a sector strategy where some themes are cutting across sectors. Three of these issues are cited below. Firstly, there are ministries, which still have a significant portion of their programmes being implemented under the project approach. For example, some central ministries do not have an initial complete application of sector-wide approaches. Consequently there were problems like parallel responsibilities for project monitoring and parallel reporting systems, and the simultaneous development of detailed mechanisms for fiscal transfers under PAF and the Local government development programme. It is hoped that a thorough and complete introduction of a sector-wide approach will ensure harmonisation at the time of design, and also reduce costs of capacity building and technical assistance.

Second, themes and issues such as pay reform, procurement, poverty eradication, and environment and natural resources are crosscutting in nature. For example environment includes actions such as the wetlands programme and forestry conservation, which require specific public expenditure and are best handled in a sector-wide approach. At the same time environmental issues have important implications for policy formulation in sectors such as agriculture and private sector development.

Finally, there are some crosscutting issues for which specific institutions have been established. These include the Uganda AIDS Commission and the National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA). In the past, these institutions have been operating as projects but now must have their activities and expenditure incorporated within overall sector-wide approaches. The current proposal, which is in effect being practiced in several cases, is to incorporate such expenditure in a sector that has the closest association with the activity of the given institution. Hence expenditure on Uganda AIDS Commission's management is treated as part of the health sector expenditure even though the commission also supports actions in other sectors such as social development and education.

4.0 Management and Implementation of Uganda's Development Programme

The government of Uganda is in the process of strengthening partnership in the PEAP, through dialogue with its development partners, in order to arrive at a consistent framework for the management and implementation of the development programme. While sector wide approaches to development require a move towards an increased budget support as opposed to funding on a project-by-project case, there are donors who prefer not to follow this course in all cases. The objective of attaining complete integration and consistency of the MTEF is complicated by the separation of donor projects from government decisions, of wage and non-wage expenditures and decisions at local and central levels of government (MFPED, 2001). It is clear that the attainment of the benefits of sustainable livelihood approaches to development will largely depend on the way in which the stakeholders in Uganda's growth process are co-ordinated. These include the government (both central and local), donors, NGOs, and civil society.

The overall economic policy, within government, is guided by Cabinet, but with parliament able to influence the allocation of resources at least at three different levels. That is parliament can influence: (i) tax policy; (ii) inter-sectoral allocations, preferably by participating in the work of sectoral working groups; and (iii) by scrutinising projects in the context of sectoral strategies. While MFPED is responsible for overall economic policy and planning, the offices of the President and Prime minister and the Ministries of Public Service (MOPS) and Ministry of Local Government (MOLG) also have responsibilities that bear on overall economic policy. Local authorities too, are continuously receiving increasing responsibilities as political and fiscal decentralisation proceeds. The current project implementation units are to be reintegrated into government structures or established as executive agencies, though the pace and direction of reform is to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Autonomous institutions and agencies are to be integrated within sectoral MTEFs with monitorable performance indicators. The fiscal implications of each of these measures are to be considered in the context of sector-wide approaches before a final decision is made. Options for the contracting out of public services, where these are cost-effective, are continuing to be pursued.

NGOs have advocacy, monitoring and service delivery roles. The advocacy component is required to be independent of government and has a possibility of being supported by donors. In some cases monitoring has been subcontracted to NGOs while in the case of service delivery, government prefers support to NGOs to be integrated within the sectoral framework. Thus in general terms government encourages resources flowing from donors to NGOs to go through the budget. However, donors are free to fund NGOs outside this framework as long as they inform government of what they are doing. Where donors do not send resources through the budget, the Aid Liaison department and local government are required to cooperate with the donors to gather information and improve the overall allocation of these funds. Ultimately, all public expenditure should be fully included within a sector-wide approach.

To improve the prioritisation of projects during the period of transition, each sector is to be given a resource envelope, which includes projects. The proposal is to give each sector two ceilings: a ceiling for flexible expenditure and a ceiling for donor-funded projects. Projects negotiated with donors are to be included in the sector wide budget framework paper in the following ways:

- existing projects should be included in projected expenditures under the project ceiling,
- projects which are due to be proposed in the next year should also be included within the project ceiling.

Sector-wide strategies are expected to include criteria for selecting projects within the sector and to consider the incidence of the benefits of the planned expenditures, using such tools as household survey data. Donor participation in the review process is expected to raise the quality of the analysis and to result into a more concrete agreement on the goals for a particular period and developing such goals into recurrent and development expenditure needs.

The implementation of partnerships is expected to increase responsibilities and staffing requirements in government. In particular the following may be noted:

- the reintegration of project offices will increase the responsibilities of line ministries
- the increased procurement responsibilities of ministries imposes training and recruitment needs
- planning units in leading ministries need to be strengthened to implement the sectoral approach and to take over responsibilities from project units
- government established ceilings need to be adequately flexible to allow for contracting out
- the move to budget support depends on increased top-down and bottom-up accountability. This will require that incentives for public sector workers depend on the evaluation of their clients
- accounting at the district level needs to be strengthened
- sub-county structures in particular need to be strengthened in order to cope with increased responsibilities.

The monitoring and evaluation needs to be streamlined and a new reporting format that is more applicable to sector-wide approaches introduced. It has been noted that physical monitoring cannot be adequately done without involving communities and Local Council-3 (sub-county) level of government. Hence the leaders at this level are to be informed of the projects being under-taken in their locality. Central policy guidelines must be transmitted to such people at local levels, who are responsible for monitoring. Technical supervision of some inputs may be needed in activities such as monitoring of health services. Unfortunately a number of relevant indicators for monitoring both output and outcomes are yet to be fully developed. Otherwise monitoring sector performance will need a definition that is integrated in complex ways especially with regard to crosscutting themes. The situation is worsened by lack of adequate data in a number of areas. The data problem is likely to be worse under sector-wide approaches since it was easier to collect the relevant data under project approaches for monitoring and evaluation purposes. This was partly because projects were small and often had well defined targets.

5.0 Sustainable Livelihoods Approach in current development interventions.

The programmes and projects reviewed in this section cover a broad span of the economy and so bring try to bring out the different dimensions and aspects of implementing SLA in Uganda. The basic preliminary finding is that, though certain programmes/projects may not have been focused on SLAs, they are consistently being directed towards the attainment of SLA objectives. In most case the programmes, as would be expected in practice, are not holistic solutions based on the SLA framework but have their initial assessments and design based on the SLA framework. Thus, though the programmes/projects may not be holistically SLA, they contribute to vital aspects of the SLA framework of analysis and solution proposals.

The review covers Education, Health, Water and Environment, Agriculture, Pastoralism,

Governance, and the Private Sector. Institutions include Government Ministries, Donor Agencies, and Non Governmental Organization (NGOs). These are mainly based at international and national levels but with strong collaborative links with local institutions in both government and the private sector. This review is based on interviews with officials from the organizations detailed in the following sections. (See Appendix 1)

5.1 Universal Primary Education

It is the Government's belief that Universal Primary Education (UPE) will result into a massive increase in the fraction of the population who can read and write, and hence cause a widespread improvement in the stock of human capital.

The Education Strategic Investment Plan (ESIP) framework prioritizes the following policy objectives:

- Ensuring universal access to primary education;
- Improving quality of primary education;
- Ensuring equity of access to all levels of education;
- Forging a stronger partnership between the public and private sector;
- Building the capacity of the Ministry and the Districts to provide public services and to effectively enable private services delivery;

However, there are efforts, currently underway, aimed at reviewing the sector investment plan in order to accommodate emerging priorities including expansion of opportunities for post-primary education in light of the bulge created by Universal Primary Education (UPE); new training institutions that have been transferred from other ministries/sectors under the sector-wide approach to planning (SWAP); increased in-take into public universities; and abolition of cost-sharing in tertiary institutions.

The programme focuses on people's livelihood aspects especially the elements of social and human capital. The skills knowledge and abilities of the poor will be improved through increased access to education. It can also be argued that both parents and children of UPE schools, and others, will form bonds of social groups that will strengthen the social capital base. In terms of coverage, the intervention spans the entire scope of policy levels including micro, meso and macro level institutions.

Communities participate in monitoring and demand accountability, especially resources that are publicized by Government as having been sent to a given area. The decision for location of schools to be built is often left to the people through their representatives at the district level. Thus, though the idea of UPE may be attributed to President Museveni in his campaign manifesto of 1996, and much of the design to the technocrats in the Ministry of Education and Sports, there has been a considerable involvement of the population in the subsequent designs and re-designs and in the implementation and monitoring of the activities.

Construction of classrooms and production of teaching material has largely been left to the private sector on contract basis, with the Ministries and Local or Sub-county governments doing supervision and monitoring roles. In addition, this framework of operation should be seen as building capacity for successful implementation of development programmes both in the private sector and at the lower government levels.

In terms of change and feed-back, the intervention has primarily remained the same – provision of free primary education – though a number of other interventions have emerged to strengthen it and ensure attainment of the stated objective. For example, classroom construction, massive teacher recruitment, and education for those with special needs have received fresh or renewed attention. A case in point is the programme for the girl child education, which has become a vital component of the education sector, and a major concern for donors and policy advocates.

The UPE has been participatory and flexible up to a point. However, the extent to which this intervention is people-centred or sustainable is debatable. The programme builds on need rather than strengths, and being a sectoral programme it cannot be said to be ‘holistic’ in the way that an SL analysis demands.

5.2 Save the Children UK

One of the main components is a juvenile programme, which deals with children who are in conflict with the law. The objectives include ensuring that the children’s statutory rights are being observed, and working towards improving the handling of children in conflict with the law. Stakeholders in this area would therefore include the Police, the Prisons and Court authorities.

Another objective is to ensure children’s participation and integration of their views into the planning processes. Closely related to this is the child poverty dimension, which is aimed at raising the children’s voices about poverty. This is expected to supplement other ventures such as the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) and the Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Project (UPPAP). The whole framework is aimed at yielding policy interventions that are reflective of the characteristics of the poor in terms of their assets, needs and aspirations.

The HIV/AIDS programme is focused on promoting care for HIV affected communities, and is funded by CDC (USA). The programme is the process of developing a manual for health workers who are involved in dealing with people living with AIDS. Funding and technical support is also being given to the National Community of Women Living with AIDS (NACWOLA). At the national level, Save the Children UK supports and contributes to the debates on issues relating to children who are infected with or affected by AIDS. Other HIV/AIDS activities include ‘Child to Child’ in primary schools and peer to education.

The key component of the food security activities is the implementation of the Household Economy Approach (HEA) as a methodology for assessing the food security situation. The justification of this approach is based on the realization that a number of interventions did not deal with all the important issues of food security. The approach builds on the now widely agreed view that hunger and famine are best understood not only in terms of the supply of food, but in terms of people’s ability to gain access to enough of that food. It is argued that determining how for example, an increase in the price of a staple food or some other shock might affect people’s ability to obtain enough food can only be done adequately if one understands the people’s normal economy. That is how they usually make a living, their savings, their reserves and assets; and how household production and labor are exchanged for other goods².

The HEA is in the initial stages of being applied in Uganda, and is being funded by DFID. Activities so far include identification of key partners in the development process (Ministries,

² The Household Economy Approach: A resource Manual for Practitioners. By J seaman, P Clarke, T Boudreau, and J Holt. Published by Save the Children.

Goodbye to Projects?

NGOs, Local Councils, etc), and promotion of the approach among them. The strategy is to start with districts in which Save the Children UK is already operating. An initial assessment is made to find out how the system works. This is followed by identification of people in the District and/or Ministry who are trained to understand, explain and apply the method. Part of the methodology therefore includes advocacy for food security and how the HEA can add value and result into a better understanding of the household food security and livelihoods. The ultimate aim is to get the people to be part of the assessment and then feed the results back into people's planning activities.

The food security project clearly focuses people's livelihoods especially at the micro and meso levels of policy formulation, implementation and governance. The micro level is largely addressed at the advocacy level as the organization tries to influence policy making processes and both decision makers and implementers' orientations towards the food security problem.

Participation and partnerships for situation analysis and implementation of solution ideas are being built up alongside plans to introduce the method. The communities and their local leaders are being encouraged and facilitated to participate in all stages of introducing and implementing the HEA approach since they are the main actors. Unless the findings and recommendations of the HEA are fed-back into the planning processes and activities of the communities, its success and sustainability can easily be jeopardized.

The HEA clearly fits SLA criteria. It begins with people's strengths, makes links between the macro and micro levels and would appear to offer the potential to be flexible and dynamic. The HEA is also an intrinsically holistic approach. However, questions concerning the sustainability of the intervention remain.

5.3 United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

The UNDP programme to support 'Income Generation and Sustainable Livelihoods' (IG&SL) is aimed at supporting institutional capacity development for delivery of services that strengthen the ability of local communities and individuals to engage in sustainable income generating activities.

This is to be achieved through capacity building of; (i) district promotion centers to serve as hubs for the delivery of development services at the local levels, and (ii) Enterprise Uganda to provide business development services for small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in collaboration with the promotion centers. The programme is also going to contribute to the improvement of the policy and regulatory regime for micro and small enterprises (MSEs) by (a) strengthening national capacity for MSE policy formulation, and (b) piloting capacity development of selected village savings and credit institutions as a means of providing improved access to micro finance services by the poor.

The UNDP support to the Ugandan Government derives from the national aspirations as indicated in the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP). The specific pillars of this plan include: Rapid and Sustainable economic growth and structural transformation; Good Governance and Security; Increasing the ability of the Poor to raise their incomes; and Improving the quality of life of the poor. The UNDP Support is focused on two programmes: Good Governance; and Income Generation and Sustainable Livelihoods (IG&SL), suggesting a non-sectoral holism.

Within the SL framework, the programme are more biased towards transforming structures and processes through building and strengthening capacities of both Government and private sector institutions. The basic programme objective is to support the development of institutional capacity for delivery of services that strengthen the ability of Countries and individuals to engage in sustainable income generation.

The Programme will also strengthen the growth of partnerships between the Government and the private sector to allow both to fully participate in the design and improvement of the policy and regulatory regimes at meso and micro levels. The programme focus, up to Local Councils 1 and 2, is expected to result into village plans as the building block for development interventions. In addition, it will empower the villages to be in effective charge of the implementation of their development plans and achievement of the set objectives.

The programme is therefore targeting all levels from micro to macro, and both the public and private sector institutions. Focus on SMEs and MSEs' policy framework and operational abilities should translate into improved markets, and access and effectiveness of various assets and other production inputs.

Monitoring, evaluation and accountability are largely a responsibility of the centre, that is, both the UNDP and Government bodies/officials at the centre and Local Governments. Thus, there is no explicit involvement of the masses except through their political representatives. This observation could basically be rationalized by the enhanced focus on institutions that are responsible for structures and processes rather than the people themselves. However, this would imply that the intervention is institution-centred as opposed to people-centred.

5.4 Ministry of Water, Lands and Natural Resources: Directorate of Water Development (DWD)

The mandate of the DWD is to provide and improve the supply of water and sanitation services to both urban and rural areas of Uganda at reasonable cost and in a sustainable manner. Water supply and sanitation have been combined together to ensure that the former is not contaminated by the later. Being part of the mainstream Government framework, DWD is enshrined in the move from Project Approaches to SWAP and Budget Support arrangements. Thus, the main source of funding for DWD is both Government and the development partners through the Ministry. The funds are largely availed through the Poverty Action Fund (PAF), which is largely comprised of Government savings from HIPC arrangements. In fact the water component was the first to benefit from PAF funds when they were introduced in 1998/99. Additional sources of funds include: DANIDA, CIDA, DFID, JICA, and local people's contributions.

The water sector is structured at three distinct levels: the national level, the decentralized or Local Government level, and the micro or user level. Until recently, the formal role of DWD emphasized service delivery directly to users. This was further reinforced by the project-based approach to investment, where development activities in general have been funded in the context of individual projects on the ground. The changing role of DWD towards a regulatory, supportive and facilitating agency means that the major client groups of the services of the organization are also changing. The directorate is now supposed to assist the Local Government structures at District level, which will in turn take over the responsibility for capital investment and service delivery. This is a move from centrally managed and technically oriented programmes to more demand-responsive decentralized programmes, which deal with both hardware and software (largely socio-economic and cultural issues, including gender) aspects of water development. In fact within the past year, DWD has created a position of a social scientist to cater for the software

Goodbye to Projects?

issues of water development.

One major problem, which is a result of the previous mode of operation, is the ‘project syndrome’. There is little sharing of information both horizontally and vertically such that experiences accumulated from past activities are still confined to ‘islands’ of former projects. A draft report on the water sector gender study indicated that horizontal interactions within DWD among the various programmes and projects are still lacking in intensity. “Sister programmes neither seem to systematically tap the knowledge and experiences of other programmes nor to learn from lessons and best practices in the field of sister programmes”. This is a deficiency in the learning system of the organization, which must begin to analyze and disseminate lessons to the rest of the sector, and store such information for future retrieval and use.

In addition to the parent Ministry, DWD also works with the Ministries of Health, Education and Sports, Gender and Social Development, the Private Sector, and NGOs working in the water sector. For example, the Private Sector has participated in the drilling, which has been privatized, and in provision of software services such as community development and awareness campaigns. Water kiosks, established in a number of places, have been privatized such that collection of dues, management and maintenance can effectively be done and paid for by the communities. The strategy is to ensure that communities are part of the water management and sustainability process. For example, communities have to be trained to use agricultural practices, which do not silt the water sources and channels. Communities are also being mobilized to demand safe water.

It is hoped that water supply activities, which are demand-driven will get easy support, including financial contributions from the population. Community participation will also lead to selection of appropriate technology and location of water points in places that are acceptable to the communities.

The structure of the programme has a direct focus on aspects of people’s livelihoods at National, Local Government and micro/user levels. It addresses a vital aspect of quality of lives of the people and their interaction and use of the natural resource use, to ensure optimality and sustainability.

The initial programme design and implementation under the project approach did not address community participation. Communities were only expected to inherit, and not necessarily own, the project and provide for its operation and maintenance. This appears to have reinforced the idea that the project is owned by the government such that it should be the Government’s responsibility to operate and maintenance. Water and environment are still treated as public goods and the people as pure beneficiaries.

Since the adoption of budget support approaches and SWAPs, significant changes have been made to include community participation in identification, design and implementation of water and sanitation projects. Much as the technical hardware designs are still left to the technical people in DWD, partnerships are being built with communities and Local Government to contribute towards such aspects as selection of water point locations, and designs of operation and maintenance strategies. The current implementers of the programme are therefore more accountable to the people within the sector framework.

The problems of delayed disbursement of funds, partly attributed to the increased bureaucratic tendencies under SWAPs, are feared to slow down physical progress if not addressed adequately. There is need for such preliminary observations by the various stakeholders to be fed-back into

the system in order to change it for the better. The capacities of various stakeholders, especially at the district and lower levels, were said to be very low. Districts are yet to take a more active role community mobilization. Institutional weaknesses even at the Ministry levels and inadequate contributions from other related sectors are still having negative impacts on the successful implementation of water sector programmes.

5.5 National Environment Management Authority (NEMA)

The establishment and mandate of National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) is based on the National Environmental Statute, 1995 (NES) and the National Environment Action Plan (NEAP). The NES provides the legal framework as well as the institutional arrangement for sustainable environmental management in Uganda. NEMA was established to provide the following services: central coordination of national interests on environment, further development of environment policy, enhance the legal and regulatory framework, coordinate and harmonize the sectoral interests and conflicts of other ministries in environmental management, and monitor and supervise all aspects of the environment.

More so, NEMA is meant to assist in the building of capacity of lead agencies at national and district levels, and amongst NGOs, CBOs and the private sector in environmental management. Thus, NEMA has to establish an outreach education programme to assist in strengthening the capacity of Local Governments and communities to address local environmental and natural resource management concerns. The organization is meant to facilitate the integration of environmental concerns into development activities, oversee compliance with regulations and standards and promote environmental awareness. NEMA is, largely, funded by the Government of Uganda and the World Bank.

Given the general level of perception of environmental issues by the majority of the population, the initial NEMA programmes have involved less involvement and participation of the communities, except at the implementation level. The first programme was mainly focused on raising the level of environmental awareness in the country and establishing institutions, institutional capacity, linkages, and the supporting framework/procedures and regulations for sound environmental management at all levels of the country. In particular, enactment and enforcement of key enabling regulations and guidelines was done. The second programme builds on the achievements of the first to strengthen and continue with capacity building at the district and community levels, and among lead agencies.

In terms of an SL Approach, therefore, the programmes are focused on building and strengthening institutions, and initiating and supporting process change for sustainable environmental management. Only then will community participation in environmental policy making, implementation and monitoring be adequate and effective.

5.6 Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) Plan for Modernization of Agriculture (PMA)

The PMA is a holistic, strategic and operational framework for eradicating poverty through multi-sectoral interventions enabling subsistence farmers to improve their natural resource-based livelihoods in a sustainable manner. It provides a set of principles upon which sectoral and inter-sectoral policies and investment plans can be developed at central and Local Government levels, and with an explicit aim of making people more productive, healthier and more educated. The PMA recognizes that farmers are individual, private entrepreneurs who make rational decisions

Goodbye to Projects?

on resource allocation within the agricultural sector. In addition, the PMA recognizes that poor farmers are constrained by problems related to access to inputs, markets, credit, water, productive land, modern technologies, energy sources, advisory services, and access to education and health services. Farmers are also constrained by the behavior of public sector service providers in relation to efficiency, transparency and accountability.

The plan therefore focuses on actions that will help farmers to access a set of facilities that will help them to expand and improve the productivity of their capital assets. These include the natural, physical, financial, human and social assets. Thus the role of the Government in creating an enabling environment for success of private agricultural based enterprises is very crucial. In fact the involvement of Government should go beyond the traditional mandate of the MAAIF, and include several other Ministries and Agencies. This is a clear justification for implementing the PMA within the current SWAP and budget support framework.

The PMA is largely an SLA based programme aimed at poverty eradication through multi-sectoral interventions that will enable subsistence farmers to improve their natural resource-based livelihoods in a sustainable manner. It focuses on all aspects of communities, including assets, and interactions with institutions and processes, which determine output of the population and the resultant impact on their livelihoods.

The analysis and policy recommendations, was based on widespread consultations and participation by all stakeholders. Programme design, implementation and monitoring is to be done at all micro, meso and macro levels. Institutional capacity building and process changes are expected to result into a reorientation and outputs that benefit the poor in a number of ways. Programme implementation will receive a big boost from the Agricultural Sector Programme Support (ASPS), which is supported by Danida (section 10). Implementation is by Government, the private sector, and the general population in partnership with a host of development partners.

5.7 Ministry of Health

The Health Sector Strategic Plan (HSSP – 2000/01-2004/05) has been developed as a collaborative undertaking of the Ministry of Health, related Ministries, the development partners and other stakeholders. The plan was made within the framework of the PEAP and the health sector policy. It describes the major technical health programmes and support services, and their outputs. The technical health programmes arise from the minimum health care package described in the policy, while the support services include human resources, policy and planning, quality assurance, information management systems, research and development, health infrastructure, procurement of drugs, equipment, supplies and logistics, health care financing and legal and regulatory framework.

The implementation structure is such that, the District health system will be used to deliver a package of health services to the population, while the Ministry of Health will be responsible for policy formulation, standards and guidelines, overall supervision and monitoring. In addition, the Ministry will ensure that strategic guidance, technical support, and resources are made available to the Districts and other health care providers. The referral and other national level health care institutions will provide the necessary back up support to the district health services.

The process of financial planning, programming and management will require the participation and commitment of all stakeholders in the health delivery system namely, the Government, the donors, the private sector and the communities. It is envisaged that the Government will seek

support from development partners to redirect spending through a flexible budgetary support procedure. Government will also explore options for improving efficiency within the public health sector.

The entire Plan may be viewed from its components and the respective outputs expected from each. There are five (5) programme outputs namely: minimum health care package; health care delivery system; legal and regulatory framework; integrated support systems; and policy, planning and information management system. Programme 1, in particular, includes elements such as control of communicable diseases such as malaria, STD/HIV/AIDS, and TB. For the purpose of this report, the focus is on STD/HIV/AIDS.

The HSSP is based on a holistic SL analysis of development and is therefore designed to make the health component's contribution towards a holistic poverty eradication problem. It is based on a multi-faceted approach of improving the general health standards of the population, through disease prevention, care and strengthening of supporting institutions including hospitals and policy making organs. The UAC is a special autonomous project within the health sector that is aimed at addressing the crucial demands of combating HIV/AIDS. The project heavily relies on participation and involvement of the private sector, NGOs, and individuals, in addition to Government structures. The UAC is mainly a policy making and coordinating body with all the practical implementation of the project activities left to the aforementioned bodies.

Monitoring and evaluation is done by the UAC and its Secretariat through the various implementing bodies and agencies. For example, hospitals and NGOs collect data, which helps in generating information about the degree of success achieved. Based on these results, evaluations are made and new strategies may be drawn. The project is therefore dynamic in nature with a strong provision to incorporate new ideas and proposals from stakeholders.

5.8 Oxfam GB in Uganda

Oxfam has supported various sectoral programmes including health and HIV/AIDS, education, mental and physical disability, gender, landlessness, pastoralism, relief and emergency for internally displaced persons (IDPs) as well as refugees and lobbying of foreign debt reduction and cancellation. The current programmes in Uganda are based on five (5) strategic change objectives (SCOs) namely:

1. Livelihoods focus;
2. Social Services (particularly health and education);
3. Humanitarian interventions;
4. Right to be heard; and
5. Equity (including gender).

Uganda Livelihoods Programme

The programme has two proposals, which have been developed after an in-depth assessment and analysis of livelihood situations in the target population. These are the Kitgum Livelihood Improvement proposal and the Kotido Sustainable Pastoral Livelihoods proposal. Kitgum district is characterized by chronic conflict both from rebels of the lord's resistance army (LRA) and cattle rustling raids by the neighboring Karamojong population. In 1997, the situation worsened and about 30 percent of the district's population was forced into Internally Displaced People's (IDP's) camps, where they became dependent on relief supplies.

Goodbye to Projects?

The Kotido Sustainable Livelihoods programme targets pastoral communities in northeastern Uganda. The district covers a land area of 13,208 square kilometers with an estimated population of 240,000 people, most of whom are semi-nomadic pastoralists and agro-pastoralists. Majority of the population, 95 percent, live in the rural area where they derive their livelihood from livestock. They are however subject to vulnerability and risks arising from drought, inter-ethnic livestock rustling and distant movements in search of water, pasture and food.

The key components of the programme include:

- Improving access to assets, especially land and water, by the IDPs and women;
- Improving production and savings at household and farm levels;
- Improving access to markets and bargaining power of poor farmers for both livestock and crops products, and labor;
- Improving governance;
- Improving food security through focusing on animal health, livestock marketing, community grains reserve and restocking for the pastoralists;
- Grain reserves, credit and savings and enhancing alternative sources of income for pastoralists;
- Water, rangeland development and management for the pastoralists;
- Early warning systems and drought contingency development.

The overarching objectives include advocacy, involvement in national networks, enhanced participation of women and men, partnerships with small producers, public awareness campaigns and high quality research. All these are expected to enable Oxfam GB to enhance secure livelihoods for the target communities.

The objectives of the programme/projects are derived from the SCOs of the global Oxfam GB framework. In particular, the corporate SCO to which this programme contribute is; “People living in poverty will achieve food and income security”. At regional level³ the SCO objective for the projects; “People living in and affected by chronic conflict will have increased access to land and other natural resources and to better economic opportunities in order to protect their livelihoods and asset base”.

Other SCOs at regional level, which will be met by the projects include:

- Enabling pastoral and IDP families to have tangible improvements in their health through access to good quality basic health services and their children to have relevant basic education;
- Strengthen the capacities of population groups in an area affected by chronic conflict and to strengthen the effectiveness of key institutions as the district level in ways which will lead to a more effective response;
- Build social capital and organizational capacity;
- Ensure that programme interventions are implemented in such a way as to strengthen the social position of women and their control over productive assets.

Like the PMA, the Oxfam programme is purely based on a Sustainable Livelihoods approach right from problem analysis, solution design and implementation. However it requires realization of the contributions of all other sectors of the economy, and at all levels in order to yield its

³ Uganda falls in the Oxfam regional grouping of Horn, East and Central Africa (HECA)

desired outputs and impacts. For example, the security situation in the regions, road and water networks must be adequately improved.

5.9 Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA)

Danida operates as a department under the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It is specifically supporting, at least two, key programmes in Uganda namely the Agricultural Sector Programme Support (ASPS) and the Private Sector Development (PSD) programme. The ASPS was agreed between the Government of Uganda and Danida in September 1998 and formally launched at the beginning of 1999. Under the PSD Programme, Danida works with private business people in the areas of technical assistance, technological adaptation and export promotion.

The overall objective for the bilateral Danida support to Uganda is to improve the general conditions for the poorest part of the population. Given this overall policy objective and also the overall Government of Uganda policies regarding eradication of poverty, the objectives of the ASPS are defined as follows:

- The development objective is **“increased income from farming with special focus on poverty reduction and improved food security with emphasis on household level food security”**;
- The immediate objective is “increased and sustainable agricultural production and productivity as a means to improve the livelihood of small-scale farmers in particular. The situation of women in agriculture shall be given special attention”.

The implementation of both of these programmes is done jointly with the respective Government Ministries and institutions, Agencies and private sector associations. There has been intensive consultation, especially on the agricultural programme, with stakeholders at the design stage, which continues on a regular basis, with the outcomes being fed-back into the design process. The programmes are therefore dynamic in nature, offering the different stakeholders an opportunity to make contributions on a continuous basis.

The two Danida programmes will contribute towards building and sustaining capacity at all levels for a range of sector programme implementation. It is a crosscutting approach, covering a wide range of Ministries and Sectors and therefore a clear representation of an SL based development strategy. Sustainability will be built within the different levels of governance both in the private and public sector institutions, through training, technical support and enabling the communities to participate effectively.

6.0 Conclusions

The implementation of sustainable livelihood principles in development have necessitated a major shift of government and its development partners from project to sector-wide approaches. Participatory approaches have been widely used in planning and implementation of the country’s development agenda. The roles of the different partners in development have been spelt out even though this process is still in progress. Private sector involvement in policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation is being enhanced. The process of budgeting in a way where all government and donor resources are put together is gradually being strengthened by the introduction of the MTEF.

Poverty eradication has been kept as the central theme for planning over the last four years.

Goodbye to Projects?

Scrutinising and prioritisation of projects is in principle based on their contribution to poverty eradication. Efforts to eradicate poverty are centered on increasing household incomes and improvements in the quality of life of the people.

In spite of all the efforts done and the great strides made in the implementation of SL approaches to development in Uganda, a number of issues and task remain to be resolved. For example the definition of sectors in light of cross-cutting themes and securing a complete agreement, on the best approach to funding the development effort, between all the development partners. The task of developing appropriate indicators of output and outcomes for the various sectors is far from being resolved.

If we relate the interventions studied back to the series of SL principles it appears that many interventions do indeed adopt some principles to some degree. It is evident that there is a paradox in the desire to implement 'holistic' interventions within specific sectors. It is also apparent that it is difficult to assess the sustainability of current interventions at any level. This presents us with an analytical problem when an intervention is viewed as a 'snapshot'. However the longer timelines of an extended case study should provide some better indications as to sustainability.

Many NGO programmes are now specifically livelihoods focused as the analysis of SCF and Oxfam above demonstrate, and also governmental and international programmes show some SL elements whether they can offer a complete SL package remains to be seen. The SLA is a relatively new concept and as yet unproven, what needs to be demonstrated is whether or not its use actually produces improved outcomes for poor people.

References

Agricultural Education Component of Agricultural Sector Programme Support, July 2001.

Agricultural Sector Programme Support Progress Report: January - June 2001, Main Report Vol. 3 No.1

Agricultural Sector Programme Support Progress Report: January - June 2001. RFS Component

Agricultural Sector Programme Support: Semi - Annual Report for DATIC Component, July 2001.

Agricultural Sector Programme Support: Semi - Annual Report for Farmers Organization Component, June 2001.

Agricultural Sector Programme Support: Semi - Annual Report of HASP for January to June 2001. July 2001

Carney, D. (1998), **Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: What Contribution Can We Make?** DFID.

Cassels, A. (1997), **A Guide to Sector-wide approaches for Health Development: Concepts, Issues and Working Arrangements**. Rome. World Health Organisation.

Curry, S. and Weiss, J. (1993), **Project Analysis in Developing Countries**. The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Kadama, Y.P., (2000), "Sector Wide Approaches to Health Development in Uganda". Paper presented at an East African Study Workshop on Public Expenditure and Poverty Reduction at Ranch on the Lake, Uganda.

MAAIF and MFPED, (1999), **Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture: Vision and Strategic Purpose**.

MFPED (2001), **Background to the Budget**. Various Issues. MFPED.

_____ (2001) **Budget Framework Paper for the Medium-Term, 2001/02 - 0003/04**. MFPED.

_____ **Poverty Action Fund: Draft Budget Framework Paper**. MFPED

_____ **Poverty Eradication Action Plan [2001 - 2003], Vol. 1**. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development.

_____ **Poverty Eradication Action Plan, Vol. 3. Building Partnerships to Implement the PEAP**. Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development.

_____ **Uganda Poverty Status Report, 2001**. MFPED.

Goodbye to Projects?

Ministry of Education: Education Strategic investment Plan 1998 - 2003

Ministry of Education: Policy Statement to Parliament

Ministry of Health: Health Sector Strategic Plan; 2000/01 - 2004/05

Ministry of Health: HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report - June 2001.

Ministry of Health: Uganda AIDS Commission Mandate and Background Statement

Ministry of Lands, Water, and Natural Resources: Funding Schedules and Releases for DWD for 1993/94 - 1998/99.

Ministry of Lands, Water, and Natural Resources: Report of the Operations and Management of Rural Water Facilities in Uganda

Ministry of Lands, Water, and Natural Resources: Report of the Permanent Secretary on the Experience of the Ministry with the PAF, Nov 2001.

Ministry of Lands, Water, and Natural Resources: Report on the Water Sector Gender Study

NEMA: Environmental Management and Capacity Building Project II; Implementation Plan

NEMA (1998), State of Environment Report for Uganda 1998. NEMA

Norton, A. and Bird, B., (1998), Social Development Issues in Sector Wide Approaches

Oxford Policy Management, (1997), Sector Management in Africa: Issues and Experience. OPM.

Oxfam: Concept Paper on Sustainable Livelihoods in Uganda

Oxfam: Karamoja Region Nutrition (Anthropometric) Survey and Food Security Assessment Report. By Rebecca Brown.

Oxfam: Oxfam GB: Livelihoods Proposal - Uganda

Oxfam: Report on Review of Disability Programme

PMA: PMA Document for Vision and Strategic Purpose

PMA: Procedures and Modalities for PMA.

PMA: Proposed Criteria for Project and/or Programme Compliance with the PMA

Save the Children (UK): The Household Economy Approach: A Resource Manual for Practitioners

UBoS, (2000), 2000 Statistical Abstract. UBOS

UNDP: Background Paper on the First Regular Session 2001, Item 3 of the Provisional Agenda on the Country Cooperation Framework and Related Matters.

UNDP: Second Country Cooperation Framework 2001 - 2005: Programme Support Document for Income Generation and Sustainable Livelihoods.

USAID (2001), Uganda Export Competitiveness, **A USAID Project Report**, USAID Office – Kampala.

Goodbye to Projects?

Appendix 1

Contact Persons and their Respective Institution

Institution	Person/Title
Ministry of Education and Sports	Cathbert Mulyalya: Senior Education Planner (M&E)
Save the Children UK	Peter Muhangi: Project Manager, Food Security
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Wilson Kwamya: Head of the Income Generation Programme
Ministry of Water, Lands and Natural Resources: Directorate of Water Development (DWD),	Femina Acuba: Lead Social Scientist
National Environment Management Authority (NEMA)	Eugine Muramira: Senior Environmental Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) Plan for Modernization of Agriculture (PMA)	1. Ms Liz Drake: DFID officer in charge of SLA, and seconded to PMA, 2. Tom Kakuba
Ministry of Health	Chris Mugarura: Planning Department
Oxfam GB in Uganda	Michael Oyat: Acting Programme Coordinator (Livelihoods Uganda)
Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA)	1. Justine Kihika 2. John Olwenyi: Programme Officer (ASPS) 3. Pamela Kabucho: Programme Officer (PSDP)

: