|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall Objective |  | Intervention | Objective verifiable indicators | Sources of verification | Assumptions |
| Improved policies and practices lead to a more food secure Uganda  | * Increased levels of food security
* Increased percentage of national budget allocated to food security related areas
 | * National data of Ugandan Bureau of Statistics
* MDG and FAO Reports
* Monitoring reports of the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy and Investment plan (DSIP) and related policies
* National Budget
 |  |
|  |  |
| Specific Objective | 1 | Eight Local Governments (LGs) better fulfil their mandates to develop the regulatory and policy environment for food security  | 1. Relevant national policies and regulations for food security translated to the local needs and included in LGs local development plans / annual action plans
2. More systematic food security data available and used to inform local development plans / annual action plans
3. By-laws on food security issues e.g. market hygiene, pest control etc. developed and gazetted
4. Gazetted by-laws on food security are disseminated to general public through the usage of media/ communication strategies and enforcement is ongoing
5. Improved level of implementation of food security priorities as indicated in local development plans/ annual action plans, like pilot projects on e.g. soil improvement, composting, waste management, etc.
6. Improved understanding of the division of roles and responsibilities in the food security sector and developed consultation / collaboration with stakeholders
 | 1. Annual action plans (food security & LGCP activities included), Local development plans (5 year plans)
2. Benchmark cycle reports, pilot database in Bukomansimbi
3. Bye laws, reports of council meetings, LGs progress reports
4. Evidence of dissemination/ communication, announcements, reports on bye law enforcement
5. LG progress reports, minutes of / platform meetings , field visits., pictures
6. Reports on stakeholder meetings, stakeholder mapping, MoU's or other formalised forms of cooperation documents with stakeholders
 | * Commitment of the Government of Uganda (GoU) to the Agriculture Sector Development and Investment Plan (DSIP) and related policies
* Concomitant transfers for national government to finance decentralized tasks
 |
| 2.  | UAAU and ULGA are undertaking action to influence food security policies and practices and deliver relevant services to their members | 1. Consultation processes organized by UAAU and ULGA with their membership to define positions on food security related issues
2. Position papers on food security issues developed by UAAU and ULGA , used to communicate and lobby at national level
3. Relevant (food security) services delivered to members by UAAU and/or ULGA : designed models and / or templates for bye-laws
 | 1. UAAU and ULGA reports on member consultation meetings, reports on feedback sessions.
2. UAAU and ULGA position papers and evidence of communications to national government actors, evidence of inclusion of LGCP best practices in the LGAs lobby activities
3. UAAU and ULGA service reports, Model bye laws, templates, (revised) guidelines on drafting bye laws, progress reports
 | * Members of both UAAU and ULGA are responsive to the requests of the associations .
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Results  |
|  |  |
| 1 | 1. Increased capacity of eight district, municipal and town council local governments (hereafter referred to as LGs) in Uganda to create an enabling environment and deliver services for improved food security
 | 1. Local development plans, annual action plans and implementation plans for LGCP related activities are in place and describe the priorities of the local government
2. Implementation plans are carried out and results are achieved
3. Learning from other organizations has taken place by peer to peer meetings, exchange visits etc.
4. Relevant stakeholders have been identified in implementation plans of the local government
5. Local governments maintain relevant relationships with external stakeholders, like farmer associations, schools, private companies
 | 1. 5C assessment reports of the 8 LG's involved
2. Reports by VNG experts and Dutch LG experts
3. Annual plans and reports by VNG management, monthly reports by RPM and LGs
4. Reports of training sessions, on the job coaching, exchange visits, benchmark

Cycles1. Media coverage
 | * LG staff show willingness to use capabilities developed
* Focal persons and other relevant staff (NAADS) remain in their position within the UG LGs
* National government fosters an environment in which the number, composition and expertise of staff is adequate in the view of the objectives to be achieved.
 |
| 2 | 2. Increased capacity of UAAU and ULGA to lobby and advocate for local governments on food security issues as well as to deliver services to their membership | 1. UAAU has an improved strategic plan in place that describe the priorities of the local government association (Y/N).
2. ULGA has an improved lobby and advocacy strategy in place (Y/N).
3. Both UAAU and ULGA have sustainability strategies in place to mobilize resources (human, institutional and financial) (Y/N)
4. Funding levels are more adequate in view of the objectives of UAAU and ULGA (Y/N)
5. Political leadership of UAAU and ULGA respond adequately to changes in the context and the environment (Y/N)
6. UAAU and ULGA are accountable to their constituents (Y/N)
7. Political leadership of UAAU and ULGA is capable of maintaining coherence between ambition, vision, strategy and operations (Y/N)
 | * 5C assessment reports for UAAU and ULGA
* Reports of LGCP capacity development activities
* UAAU and ULGA strategic plans and lobby strategies
* UAAU and ULGA financial statements
* UAAU and ULGA AGM and board of directors reports
* Member satisfaction survey results
 | * Both UAAU and ULGA have willingness to implement lobby and services on food security.
 |
|  | Result 1: Increased capacity of eight district, municipal and town council local governments (hereafter referred to as LGs) in Uganda to create an enabling environment and deliver services for improved food security |
|  | Activities |
| 1.1 | Conducting a baseline study to assess the capacity needs of local governments in the field of food security for fine-tuning interventions  |  |  | * Availability of LG colleagues for LGCP activities
* Willingness of LGs to learn and to build their capacity
* Continued contribution of Dutch municipalities to the programme
* Willingness of LGs to be open and share with colleagues
* Leadership in LG's fosters capacity development at HR, organizational and institutional levels
* Political stability and commitment which facilitates participation in the programme
* Continued mandate for Local Governments on food security related issues
* Political commitment to food security issues leading up to, during and after the elections.
 |
| 1.2 | Training and sensitization of local governments on existing national and local food security policies and regulations. |  |  |
| 1.3 | Sensitization for food security as a cross cutting issue  |  |  |
| 1.4 | Development and implementation of Benchmark cycle. |  |  |
| 1.5 | Facilitation and Coaching of local governments to implement benchmark best practices and pilot projects;* Pest and disease control (BBW and Mango fruit flies)
* Market and food Hygiene
* Quality control
* Soil fertility
* Yield monitoring
 |  |  |
| 1.6. | Training and Coaching on the design, use and effectiveness of bye laws and its respective legal framework;* Market Hygiene
* Pest and disease control
 |  |  |
| 1.7 | Training and Coaching on the enforcement of bye laws |  |  |
| 1.8 | Supporting the implementation of prioritised local food security services; - waste management system- processing waste into compost- marketing of compost- demonstration gardens - development of school garden project  |  |  |
| 1.9 | Stakeholder mapping of relevant stakeholders in the field of food security |  |  |
| 1.10 | Sensitization of local governments on the division of roles and responsibilities in the food security sector  |  |  |
| 1.11 | Organization of network events and providing tools to enable communication, collaboration and exchange between local governments, LGAs and various external stakeholders like farmer associations and private partners  |  |  |
| 1.12 | Facilitation of colleague to colleague exchange within Uganda through learning visits, peer to peer meetings |  |  |
| 1.13 | Conduct annual 5 C assessments and logframe measurements |  |  |
|  | Result 2: Increased capacity of UAAU and ULGA to lobby and advocate for local governments on food security services as well as to deliver services to their membership |
|  | Activities |
| 2.1 | Training and coaching of LGAs on lobby and advocacy methods to be applied to food security service delivery challenges |  |  | * Both UAAU and ULGA show willingness to learn and to build their capacity.
* Continued existence of LGA’s (in particular UAAU)
* Political stability and commitment which facilitates participation in the programme
 |
| 2.2 | Advise on strategic planning and lobby strategies |  |  |
| 2.3 | Advise on financial and institutional sustainability |  |  |
| 2.4 | Monitoring and support on merger initiatives |  |  |

 Annualized growth rate in per capita real survey mean consumption or income of the bottom 40%. However, if this data is not available we can use The World Bank’s share of income held by the lowest 40%