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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Government of Uganda has received technical assistance from technical consortium of Development Partners to finance the preparation of the proposed Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project – RPLRP) which is to be implemented in the three countries of Uganda, Kenya and Ethiopia.

In Uganda, the project preparation is under the overall supervision of the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF). The Project Development Objective is to enhance livelihoods resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in drought prone areas through regional approach. The project will cover 12 districts which include; Kaabong (bordering Kenya and South Sudan), Amudat, Kween, Moroto, Nakapiripirit, (bordering Kenya) and Kotido, Abim, Napak, Katakwi, Bukedea, Kumi and Amuria which have cross border activities and trans-boundary stock routes linking pastoral communities on either side of the borders.

The objectives of the project are fourfold:

- To mitigate the impact of droughts at the districts, national and regional levels;
- To build capacity in the Government of Uganda and among pastoral and agro-pastoral communities from the 12 project districts;
- To increase resilience of pastoral communities to address medium- and long term climate related vulnerabilities like droughts, resource conflict and food insecurity; and
- To build and strengthen linkages between regional and national institutions to address the issues that affect communities in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs).

The above objectives are expected to be achieved through the implementation of four components namely:

Component 1: Natural Resources Management

This component focuses on eight (3) sub components namely; i) water resource development, ii) sustainable land management in pastoral and agro pastoral areas and iii) securing access to natural resources in the ASALs and border countries.

Component 2: Market Access and Trade

This component will support market infrastructure development with a focus on those that support regional trade and export. The component will assist the three countries and IGAD in: (i) harmonizing their animal health and food safety standards (as part of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards - SPS) in compliance with international ones (set up by the World Organization for Animal Health – OIE and Codex Alimentarius); (ii) strengthening the national and regional market information systems; and (iii) establishing and improving regionally recognized animal identification and traceability systems.

Component 3: Livelihoods Support

Investments under this component will address trans-boundary issues related to improved livestock productivity (fodder/feed production, animal health and breed improvement) and diversification (processing, non-livestock products, etc.). The component will be implemented under three key sub component namely; i) Livestock production and Health, ii) Food and Feed Production and productivity, iii)Livelihood diversification.
Component 4: Pastoral Risk Management
The implementation will be under three key sub components; i) Pastoral risk Early warning and response systems, ii) Disaster Risk Management and iii) Climate Risk Management.

The Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) requires an in-depth assessment on the likely social dynamics due to the planned project activities to be implemented in different communities in the 12 project districts.

Objectives of the Social Assessment
The objectives of the proposed SA are to assess how the planned project activities such as infrastructure development are going to affect the communities physically, socially, economically and psychologically as well as the project acceptability and to propose suitable mitigation measures. The Assessment undertakes to analyze the social characteristics of the communities in the RPLRP project areas.

The main objectives of the Social Impact Assessment include;

- Identifying project stakeholders and establishment of an appropriate strategy for their participation in the project design, implementation, monitoring and feedback.
- Ensuring that project objectives and incentives for change are acceptable to the intended beneficiaries and that gender, ethnicity, and other social differences are taken into account;
- Assessing potential social impact and where adverse impacts are identified, to determine how they could be avoided, minimized or substantially mitigated; and
- To assess institutional frameworks in different communities to resolve conflicts, permit delivery of project activities and carry out mitigation measures in an easy way that is socially sound.

Scope of the Study
The Social Assessment involved primary data collection and additional background information obtained from records in the 12 project districts. Specific social assessment activities undertaken and data sources used for the social assessment are outlined including the locations of the data sources.

Methodology
The social assessment utilized both quantitative and qualitative assessment methods during data collection to generate the required information. It drew its data from three broad data sources namely Household interviews, Key informant interviews, records, reports, and observations.

Sampling
Overall, out of the 12 project districts which are Kaabong (bordering Kenya and South Sudan), Amudat, Kween, Moroto, Nakapiripirit, (bordering Kenya) and Kotido, Abim, Napak, Katakwi, Bukedea, Kumi and Amuria which have cross border activities and trans-boundary stock routes linking pastoral communities on either side of the borders. Seven of these are in the Karamoja Region (Kaabong, Amudat, Kotido, Abim, Moroto, Nakapiripirit and Napak) four in Teso Region (Katakwi, Bukedea, Kumi and Amuria) and one in the Sebei Region (Kween) Three districts, Moroto, Kaabong and Nakapiripirit were sampled in the Karamoja with a purpose of picking one district from the greater Karamoja three districts of Moroto, Kotido (Kaabong) and Nakapiripirit but due to unforeseen circumstances the road to Kaabong developed a security risk forcing the field team decided to replace Kaabong with Amudat district for the household interviews only but an open group discussion was held with Ik community in Kamion Sub-county and with the Local Government Officials at the District headquarters. Katakwi and
Bukedea districts were sampled from the Teso Region and household interviews were held in Kween district.

Since the exact or specific project areas are not yet identified, two sub-counties of which one was a town council/urban the other rural were randomly selected depending on the proximity and 80 households heads (40 in each sub-county) interviewed using a structured questionnaire copy of which is appended in this report.

Policy and Legal Framework and Key Supportive Strategies
Uganda has developed supportive strategies and policies for the sector within the framework of the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) that are important in the context of the project and have informed project design:


Key supportive strategies such as: Development Strategic Implementation Plan (DSIP 2010/11 – 2014/15), National Development Plan (NDP 2010-2014):

World Bank Safeguard Policies
The project triggers the following World Bank Safeguard policies and measures have been outlined in the ESMF for mitigating impacts from the project. The safeguards policies triggered are:

✓ OP 4.10 Indigenous People
✓ OP 4.12 Involuntary Resettlement

FINDINGS
Outcomes/Key Concerns Raised From Consultative Meetings

- Water sources for livestock
Water for production is mainly from the several streams and rivers that in the project area. A few of these streams and rivers flow throughout the year while the majority dry up during the dry season, which may last for as long as six months in the Karamoja region. As a result, the pastoralists have to walk for long distance during the dry season searching for alternatives sources. As a result, the livestock is emaciated and therefore fetches low prices on the market.
• **Capacity for Project Implementation at the District Level**
Issues of capacity building identified as key in all the project districts and this could impact on the RPLRP implementation. Staffing levels are low in line technical departments in terms of availability of veterinary officers, agricultural staff as well as support technical officers from line departments.

• **Veterinary laboratories and training schools**
In the Karamoja region veterinary laboratories have been constructed under the Karamoja Livelihood Project (KALIP). However, the Teso and Sebei regions have not been graced with such an opportunity. This may significantly impact on the project implementation in these regions.

• **Market structures**
From observation, there were no established structures (holding grounds, slaughter facilities, sanitary facilities, waste disposal area, loading platforms) in all the cattle markets. All the markets operated in open spaces without any form of fences. In some, the facilities are old and dilapidated which all make checking and isolation of sick and diseased animals as well as effective control of disease difficult. The markets also lack basic of waste disposal facilities for humans and as well as for animals waste and in the end, the market environment remains with solid waste disposal challenges. Gate collection of market dues is also cumbersome which encourages tax evasion and accountability related problems, and yet this revenue would be useful in the maintenance and operation of the market facilities.

• **HIV/AIDS**
Weekly cattle markets are major human social centers in the project areas with people coming from as far Southern Sudan, Kenya, Kampala, Mbale and from the neighboring districts to trade in the markets. Transactions are carried out in the markets which in the end, translates into merry making and some social interactions and HIV/AIDS transmission through sexual relations.

• **The cost of production**
Farm equipment used by farmers in the project area are traditional; majority still use hand hoes, while some especially in Kween and Teso region use oxen. With households still using traditional equipment, interventions by RPLRP will go a long way to boost household incomes.

• **Marketing**
Marketing of the livestock, livestock products and other produce has been a challenge with middlemen influencing the price hence, cheating farmers. Farmers fetch low prices for their products because they sell their produce without any value addition. Farmers do individually market their products in the weekly markets. There is no collective marketing of the products and this in away offers them low bargain for their products.

• **Social Aspects**
In Amuria and Katakwi areas, the communities at the rural settings seem to have got used to hand outs of free food and households as was the case during insurgency and at the time of floods. This is also the case in Karamoja region where communities have very much depended on food and household handouts from NGOs/international organizations such as World Food Programme.
• **Resource Conflict**

There is serious competition for resources especially water and pasture during the dry seasons. Due to the prolonged droughts, most of the streams and dams dry up thereby forcing the communities to graze the cattle far away from their established settlements. Karamojongs cross to Teso and Kween areas and this has tended to fuel conflicts amongst the communities over water and pasture lands.

• **Natural Resources Issues.**

The project implementers should ensure that the management plans for these resources are developed and that the affected communities are fully involved in the formulation of these management plans. This will ease implementation and monitoring of all the planned activities by the communities and other stakeholders.

• **Livelihood Diversification**

This is already being practiced especially during the rainy seasons; farmers are engaged in crop production. With the availability of water resources and pasture throughout the year, production will then be viable continuously. The project should not only look at the provision of physical structures but also capacity building in better agronomic practices and diversification of farm activities.

• **Increased Income**

Other than imported materials, construction will directly and indirectly inject money into local economies of project areas through supplies and wages to hired construction crew.

• **Health Impacts**

Water in the dams acts as a breeding grounds for mosquitoes and other vectors hence causing malaria, bilharzias etc. Establishment of new dams in the area may imply establishment of new breeding grounds for vectors. Hence project implementers should provide for management of such diseases associated with dams; and communities should be made aware of any such health risks. A baseline study should be conducted to establish the incidence of such diseases before the new dams are constructed. Provision of reliable source of drinking water must be considered as part of the design during project implementation.

**PROJECT IMPACTS AND THEIR MITIGATIONS MEASURES**

The project will generate impacts which are summarized as follows:

**Slaughterhouse projects impacts**

**Positive impacts**

✓ Better and hygienic environment for livestock

**Negative impacts**

✓ Noise and emissions from vehicles transporting construction materials. The contractors to have tarpaulins on trucks to covers loose construction materials. Noise from trucks to mitigated through limiting hours of works from early morning to 5:00pm to avoid disturbing sleep hours for the community;
Loss of vegetation cover through site clearance will be mitigated through limiting excavations and general grass planting;

Management of construction wastes will be through application of good construction practices;

During operation of slaughter houses, there will be issues of public health. These impacts to be mitigated through involvement of public health inspectors in routine daily inspections of the slaughter houses to ensure good hygiene;

Management of condemned meat should be through availing land for disposal of condemned carcasses and in the urban areas, incineration facilities be built. Potential transmission of livestock diseases through movements in and out of districts. Should be addressed through institution of quarantines to restrict such movements; and

Waste disposal especially the horns, hoofs and bones can be a challenge in upcountry settings where by such wastes can accumulate and pose public health concerns. This is to be addressed through use of landfills in urban settings in the project areas and use of incinerators.

Impacts Relating to Rehabilitation and Operation of Cattle Markets

Positive impacts

The project will put in place better cattle trading facilities for livestock;

The cattle markets will be sources of income for the local governments;

The cattle markets will also have good waste management facilities in their vicinity through the project such as toilets.

Negative Impacts and their Mitigation Measures

Site clearance works will lead to soil erosion, loss of vegetation and sedimentation of nearby water areas. This can be mitigated through restricting works to designated areas and planting vegetation after close of works;

Accumulation and management of solid waste during operation of markets. This can be addressed through contracting out the operations and management of such markets by the area local governments;

The cattle market can have issues of crime especially during its operations. The area police will be available to maintain law and order in such areas;

HIV/AIDS is one of the potential concerns resulting from operations and consumption of alcohol. HIV/AIDS service providers to provide condoms in strategic locations in the markets;

Operation of the cattle markets can bring about transmission of livestock diseases. The area Veterinary staff will issue movement permits for cattle that are to be taken to the markets and this will be done after inspection of the animals before issuance of such of authorization;
Rehabilitation and Construction of Dams and Valleys Tanks

Positive impacts

✓ Rehabilitation and construction of valley dams and tanks for animal watering will improve production of livestock; and
✓ Rehabilitation and construction of valley dams and irrigation ponds will provide water for the communities and this will make them settle in their areas thereby reduce their tendency to cross to neighboring districts in search of water with attendant conflicts.

Negative Impacts

✓ Excavation works will generate huge volumes of soils that can silt water sources;
✓ Heaps of excavated soils will be a nuisance to livestock during watering;
✓ In some communities, the local collect domestic water from valley dams and can risks of being knocked down by cattle during water collection process;
✓ During the operation of valley dams, cattle can trample on vegetation in the vicinity of the dam.

Component 1: Natural Resources Development

✓ Water facilities to be rehabilitated in the communities of the project districts;
✓ New water facilities to be constructed in the communities of the project districts;
✓ Watersheds for the existing shared water facilities to be rehabilitated/developed in the communities of the project districts;
✓ Pastoral and Agro-pastoral rangelands/field demonstration schools to be established in the communities of the project districts.

Component 2: Marketing and Trade

✓ Livestock Markets to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
✓ Border Check Points to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
✓ Laboratories to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
✓ Slaughter Facilities to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
✓ Holding/Auction Grounds to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
✓ Trading routes to be demarcated;
✓ Grazing and strategic livestock feed reserves to be demarcated; and
✓ Watering points to be demarcated.

Component 3: Livelihoods Support

✓ Communal demonstration permanent crushes (galvanized iron) to be constructed;
✓ Crushes - Construction in selected sites (on average 5 per district);
✓ Pasture improvement (degrade range rehabilitation/reseeding, pasture seeds scheme);
✓ Field demonstration plots to be established; and
✓ Storage Facilities in the 12 districts to be constructed.
Identification of impacts includes positive and negative impacts, direct and indirect impacts, and immediate and long-term impacts, unavoidable or irreversible impacts.

ISSUES THAT EMERGED FROM THE STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS

Arising out of the consultative meetings held with the various stakeholders, the following were recommended:

a. Local people consulted were found to be very knowledgeable on a number of aspects such as management of resources such as water and rangelands. There are also some mechanisms on the ground on how communities manage conflicts and resolve their differences. In light of this, efforts should be made to make use of, and incorporate, indigenous knowledge and local resource management arrangements into project design. In particular, some components are to support the development of management plans and other forms of land and natural resource use planning. On the ground, there are already operational measures for the recognition and support of customary rights to land and natural resources, which should be developed by the project;

b. Understanding of the capacity aspects across the social divide of the project is paramount for effective and targeting the indigenous groups who have unique social set ups and needs. This will guarantee their involvement in RPLRP activities;

c. The areas of the project are wide and ensuring they are reached by the project may be an uphill task due to distance and a host of social barriers. The study has established that, there are already NGOs groups that are already implementing interventions in some areas of the project with success. It is recommended that, the project partners with some of the NGOs to deliver the project to the communities such as the indigenous people areas who are in secluded areas and are hard to reach;

d. Under Multi-sectoral HIV/AIDS control, all sectors of the economy are to mainstream HIV/AIDS interventions into their plans and activities. In view of this, RPLRP ought to ensure its service providers provide for HIV/AIDS sensitization and VCT services and this should be through engagement of an HIV/AIDS service provider at the local government level and such services should not only target the project but the communities where the project operates due to the mobility nature of the communities;

e. The project should integrate monitoring and reporting arrangements, including mechanisms and benchmarks appropriate to each sub-project and affected communities. Participatory monitoring and evaluation exercises will be adapted to the local context; and

f. Gender equity promotion at project implementation including disaggregated monitoring data should be made a project policy in order to monitor impacts and mitigation actions as a result of the Project. It is important that, both men and women be given equal opportunity in terms of labor employment and participation during project implementation.

CONCLUSION

The estimated 87% of the population in the regions of RPRLP project areas depend on livestock as their main source if livelihood and 11% on crop farming and another 2% on other livelihood options. Furthermore, it is estimated that, a large of the communities in the project regions are traditional pastoralists who practice the traditional livestock production whose output in terms of animals and
animals products are poor and dependent on natural grazing and local breeds. The project investments have great potential to transform the lives of different groups of people including pastoralists, agro pastoralists, indigenous communities and marginalized people in Karamoja, Teso and Sebei sub regions through increased households income, livelihood diversification, early warning information and markets opportunities, modern production technologies, disease control and improved breeds of livestock. This will go a long way to guarantee sustainable livelihoods of the communities in the region.

Other outstanding social negative effects are expected on the land uptake for project facilities given that the main tenure system in the project area is customary. Implementation of project Components 1 & 3 that requires land acquisition will likely trigger social conflicts on the bona fide occupants of the land. Where land uptake challenges may occur, a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF), an Indigenous Peoples Plan Framework (IPPF), and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) that have been prepared for this project will be the instruments that will help guide the project address such issues.

Lastly, the project no doubt, will have large positive impact at household levels with regard to management and ownership of resources that the women can benefit from the project. The Community Development Officers at various levels will assist in managing such challenges as well as operationalizing conflict redress mechanisms in the RPF, IPPF and ESMF documents.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background
The Ugandan economy has enjoyed strong growth during the past two decades, with annual per capita GDP growth rates in the 6 to 8 percent range (1995-2011). The agricultural sector has played an important but declining role in this growth. Although agricultural production made up to 50 percent of total GDP in the early 1990s, other sectors (e.g. services, industry, tourism) have advanced in recent years and agriculture now contributes less than 25 percent of total GDP. The sector remains the main occupation for 60 percent of the Ugandan population (MAAIF, 2011) and is the main source of livelihood for more than 85% of the 33 million people living in rural areas. Livestock production contributes about 1.7 percent of the GDP, and only 7.5 percent of the agricultural GDP, well below the potential of the sub-sector which at one time contributed close to 25 percent of the AGDP. Livestock production contributes about 1.7 percent (USD 285.77 million) of the GDP, and only 7.5 percent of the agricultural GDP (AGDP), well below the potential of the sub-sector which at one time contributed close to 25 percent of the AGDP.

1.1.1 Status of livestock production in North-Eastern Districts
This decline is attributed to civil unrest and cattle rustling that took place from the early 1990s through to 2006, especially in the semi-arid districts of the cattle corridor north of Lake Kyoga (Karamoja and Teso regions). In addition, due to prolonged droughts, endemic livestock diseases, lack of water for livestock, deforestation and land degradation, the area continues to experience low agriculture and livestock productivity with the attendant negative effects on people’s livelihoods. As a result the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities are among the poorest communities in the country in terms of household incomes and food security. The livestock infrastructure such as livestock markets, laboratory facilities, holding grounds, animal health centers, quarantine stations, abattoir and slaughter slabs are in a poor state. There is need for interventions specifically to restore livestock productivity of pastoral communities, increase agricultural productivity of pastoral households, provide alternative means of livelihoods to pastoralists, improve nutritional and food security of poor rural households in the region and halt the environmental degradation.

In Uganda, the semi-arid districts like Abim, Amuria, Amudat, Bukedea, Katakwi, Moroto, Kotido, Napak, Kumi, Kween, Nakapiripirit and Kaabong livelihoods are dominated by pastoralism and agro-pastoralism, which are a major source of food, cash income, employment and social status. Nutritional contributions of livestock to the communities in these districts are significant as these provides the population with highly nutritious foods like milk, blood and meat. Livestock also contributes significantly to food security mainly through sale of animals, meat and milk.

The fact that livestock is the main source of livelihood for pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in the ASALs leaves many communities exposed to food insecurity and conflicts, as these livelihoods are very vulnerable during periods of drought. Following the 2011 drought in the Horn of Africa (HoA) and its resultant effects on food security among pastoral communities in the region, 12 million people were affected. This led to attention being focused on building resilience of affected communities to these conditions. The IGAD Heads of State Summit in Nairobi of September 2011 resolved to build resilience to drought in the HoA and mandated IGAD to coordinate a regional initiative towards this cause.
In line with the above commitment of the IGAD Heads of State and in collaboration with the member states, while recognizing that there had been many interventions to address this problem, the decision was to focus on national level issues with regional impacts related to building resilience to drought. It was realized that there is a profound need for well-coordinated interventions that also address issues at the regional level. Towards strengthening this commitment and increased resources from the international community, this project will ensure that regionally focused interventions are included in this renewed approach.

1.2 Project Description

It is from the above background that GoU has received technical assistance from technical consortium of development partners to finance the preparation of the proposed Regional pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project – RPLRP which is to be implemented in the three countries of Uganda, Kenya and Ethiopia. In Uganda, the project preparation is under the overall supervision of the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF). The Project Development Objective is to enhance livelihoods resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in drought prone areas through regional approach. The project will cover 12 districts (Figure 1) which are Kaabong (bordering Kenya and South Sudan), Amudat, Kween, Moroto, Nakapiripirit, (bordering Kenya) and Kotido, Abim, Napak, Katakwi, Bukedea, Kumi and Amuria which have cross border activities and trans-boundary stock routes linking pastoral communities on either side of the borders.
Figure 1: Project Area (Sebie, Karamoja and Teso Regions Highlighted)
1.3 Environmental and Social Challenges in the Project Area

The three areas are found in the cattle corridor which is characterized by climatic and weather changing shocks. Prolonged draught, water stress for animals and lack pastures for animals. The pastoralists move their animals place to place in search of water and pasture. The fact that livestock is the main source of livelihood for pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in these three sub regions leaves many households exposed to food insecurity and conflicts due resource sharing.

Besides the above challenges, this project area has the following factors hindering development;

- Market access and trade (including transport and market development).
- Trans-boundary animal disease, pastoral mobility for trade.
- Trans-boundary natural resource management (including water and land access).
- Trans-boundary migrations which lead to conflicts and disaster risk such as floods in times of plenty of rainfall.
- Therefore in line with the commitment of the IGAD Heads of State and in collaboration with the member states, while recognizing that there had been many interventions to address these challenges, there was need for member states to focus on national level issues related to building resilience to drought.

This led to the designing of the Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project as an intervention to build resilience of the pastoralists in Karamoja, Teso and Sebei sub region in Eastern Uganda. The Project is to be executed by Government of Uganda through the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries. It will cover Abim, Amudat, Napak, Nakapiripirit, Kotido, Kaabong, and Moroto districts in Karamoja Sub region, Amuria, Bukedea, Katakwi and Kumi districts in the Teso Sub Region and Kween district in the Sebei Sub region.

1.3.1 Project Components

The objectives of the project are fourfold:

- To mitigate the impact of droughts at the districts, national and regional levels;
- To build capacity in the Government of Uganda and among pastoral and agro-pastoral communities from the 12 project districts;
- To increase resilience of pastoral communities to address medium- and long term climate related vulnerabilities like droughts, resource conflict and food insecurity; and
- To build and strengthen linkages between regional and national institutions to address the issues that affect communities in the ASALs.

The above objectives of the Uganda RPLRP project are expected to be achieved through the implementation of 4 components namely:

1.3.1.1 Component 1: Natural Resources Management

This component will support the mapping of major natural resources (water resources, rangelands), their full embedment in the policy design/review process and a better planning of interventions related to them. It will construct and rehabilitate natural resources that are crucial for livestock productivity and resilience.
to droughts, such as major water points and pasture. The activities will empower communities in sustainable natural resources management by introducing collective rangeland management systems.

1.3.1.2 Component 2: Market Access and Trade
This component will support market infrastructure development with a focus on those that support regional trade and export, build the capacity in the national veterinary services, as well as promotion of increased collaboration among countries and improve the surveillance and control systems of trans-boundary animal disease (TADs) such as FMD, PPR and RVF that negatively impact trade.

1.3.1.3 Component 3: Livelihoods Support
Investments under this component will address trans-boundary issues related to improved livestock productivity (fodder/feed production, animal health and breed improvement) and diversification (processing, non-livestock products, etc.). Disseminate across participating countries existing and tested approaches and/or technologies developed through research for the dry lands (e.g. by NARO in Uganda).

1.3.1.4 Component 4: Pastoral Risk Management
This component will strengthen existing national early-warning and response systems (EWRS) in the project districts and link them with a sub region under the IGAD platform. It is aimed at helping pastoralists build resilience to drought and other climatic shocks.

1.4 Rational of the Social Assessment
The Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) requires an in-depth assessment on the likely social dynamics due to the planned project activities to be implemented in different communities in the 12 project districts. It is anticipated that in the process of implementing the proposed RPLRP project in the 12 districts, activities of these component will trigger social affects and safeguard concerns whose impacts may range from small scale and site specific to medium size infrastructure investment activities. Activities in component 1: that will involve mapping of major natural resources (water resources, and rangelands) and in component 2. Support to market infrastructure could trigger The World Bank Policy OP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement as there are likely requirements of land acquisition for the construction of markets and valley tanks/small size dams. This policy requires that, all Bank-financed interventions are screened for potential land take impacts, and that the required adverse impacts on people should be avoided where possible, or where not feasible, they should be minimized or mitigated, which is carried out on the basis of the screened results.

In addition, the project districts of Kaabong and Kween are also inhibited by some of the Indigenous Peoples (IPs) of Uganda who include the IK in Kaabong and Ndorobo also referred as Benet in Kween districts. The IPs may be affected directly in some ways, hence triggering the OP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples. The World Bank Policy Operational (OP) 4.10: Indigenous Peoples, underscores the need for borrowers and Bank Staff to identify IPs, consult with them, ensure that they participate in and benefit from Bank funded operations in a culturally appropriate way and that adverse impacts on them should be avoided where possible, or where not feasible, they should be minimized or mitigated.
1.5 Objectives of the Social Impact Assessment

The objectives of the proposed SIA are to assess how the planned project activities such as infrastructure development are going to affect the communities physically, socially, economically and psychologically as well as the project acceptability and to propose suitable mitigation measures.

The Assessment undertakes to analyze the social characteristics of the communities in the RPLRP project areas. The main objectives of the Social Impact Assessment include:

a. Identifying project stakeholders and establishment of an appropriate strategy for their participation in the project design, implementation, monitoring and feedback;
b. Ensuring that project objectives and incentives for change are acceptable to the intended beneficiaries and that gender, ethnicity, and other social differences are taken into account;
c. Assessing potential social impact and where adverse impacts are identified, to determine how they could be avoided, minimized or substantially mitigated; and
d. To assess institutional frameworks in different communities to resolve conflicts, permit delivery of project activities and carry out mitigation measures in an easy way that is socially sound.

1.6 Study Methodology

The study methodologies employed included:

1.6.1 Kick-off Meetings

Before embarking on the actual assessment, preliminary meetings were held with project officials from Ministry of Agriculture and National Project preparation team members to reach a consensus and common understanding on design of the assessment; agree on tools of analysis; and deadlines for different outputs. Due to the time constraints it was agreed that engaging all the 12 districts in the collection of primary data would not be achievable therefore the consultant sampled 6 out of 12 districts for which household interviews were conducted. However, key informant interviews were held with local Government officials in all the 12 project districts.

1.6.2 Sampling

Overall, out of the 12 project districts which are Kaabong (bordering Kenya and South Sudan), Amudat, Kween, Moroto, Nakapiripirit, (bordering Kenya) and Kotido, Abim, Napak, Katakwi, Bukedea, Kumi and Amuria which have cross border activities and trans-boundary stock routes linking pastoral communities on either side of the borders. Seven of these are in the Karamoja Region (Kaabong, Amudat, Kotido, Abim, Napak, Nakapiripirt and Napak) four in Teso Region (Katakwi, Bukedea, Kumi and Amuria) and one in the Sebei Region (Kween) Three districts, Moroto, Kaabong and Nakapiripirit were sampled in the Karamoja with a purpose of picking one district from the greater Karamoja three districts of Moroto, Kotido(Kaabong) and Nakapiripirit but due to unforeseen circumstances the road to Kaabong developed a security risk forcing the field team that was conducting household interviews to replace Kaabong with Amudat district for the household interviews only but an open group discussion was held with Ik community in Kamion Sub-county and with the Local Government Officials at the District headquarters. Katakiwi and Bukedea districts were sampled from the Teso Region and household interviews were also held in Kween district.
Since the exact or specific project areas are not yet identified, two sub-counties of which one was a town council/urban the other rural were randomly selected depending on the proximity and 80 households heads (40 in each sub-county) interviewed using a structured questionnaire copy of which is appended in this report.

**Table 1: Project Area Sampling Frame for household interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Sub-county</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karamoja</td>
<td>Nakapiripirit</td>
<td>Town Council, Namalu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moroto</td>
<td>Katikekile, Rupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amudat</td>
<td>Town Council, Kalita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teso</td>
<td>Katakwi</td>
<td>Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bukedea</td>
<td>Town Council, Kachumbala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebei</td>
<td>Kween</td>
<td>Ngenge, Kaptonyony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.6.3 Stakeholder Consultations and Engagement**

Key project stakeholders were identified for consultations. The stakeholders and beneficiaries of the project were identified after undertaking literature review and preliminary consultations. The stakeholders consulted included District Local Government Officials (District Veterinary officers, District Environment Officers, District Agriculture officers, Animal Husbandry Officers, Chief Administrative Officers, District Production Officers, District planners, district Entomologist, District Water Officers) officials from the Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), officials from the Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE), Non-governmental organizations Like (Uganda Land Alliance, Action Aid -Uganda) and the local communities in Timu village (IK community), Lokinene village, (Kaabong District), Loletoi and Panyangara villages (Kotido district), Lochengeng Ward (Amudat district), Ochorimongin (Katakwi district,) Akumu village, Ongino, sub-county (Kumi District) and Chesimwao village (Kween district). Among these were men, women, the poor and most vulnerable groups.

**Table 2: Itinerary For Consultative Meetings And Data Collection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stake holder</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date of meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kampala Based Stakeholders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Water and Environment</td>
<td>Ministry headquarters</td>
<td>4/10/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Land Alliance</td>
<td>ULA headquarters, Kamwokya</td>
<td>4/10/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Aid</td>
<td>Kansaga Kampala</td>
<td>7/10/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Government District Officials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abim district</td>
<td>District headquarters</td>
<td>21/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stake holder</td>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>Date of meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotido district</td>
<td>District headquarters</td>
<td>22/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabong district</td>
<td>District headquarters</td>
<td>23/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amudat district</td>
<td>District headquarters</td>
<td>23/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakapiripirit district</td>
<td>District headquarters</td>
<td>23/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroto district</td>
<td>District headquarters</td>
<td>26/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napak district</td>
<td>District headquarters</td>
<td>26/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katakwi district</td>
<td>District headquarters</td>
<td>27/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amuria district</td>
<td>District headquarters</td>
<td>27/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumi district</td>
<td>District headquarters</td>
<td>28/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukedea district</td>
<td>District headquarters</td>
<td>28/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroto district</td>
<td>District headquarters</td>
<td>26/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napak district</td>
<td>District headquarters</td>
<td>26/08/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Household Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date of meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kween district</td>
<td>Ngenge sub county</td>
<td>22/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotido district</td>
<td>Panyangara sub county</td>
<td>22/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroto district</td>
<td>Katikekile sub county</td>
<td>26/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amudat</td>
<td>Town Council, Kalita</td>
<td>28/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakapiripirt</td>
<td>Town Council, Namalu</td>
<td>23/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katakwi</td>
<td>Town Council</td>
<td>27/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukedea</td>
<td>Town Council, Kachumbala</td>
<td>28/08/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Open Discussions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date of meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kween district</td>
<td>Chesimwo village Benet community</td>
<td>22/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabong District</td>
<td>Timu and Lokinene villages Ik Community</td>
<td>24/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotido District</td>
<td>Loletoi and Panyangara villages</td>
<td>22/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amudat District</td>
<td>Lochegeng Ward Town council</td>
<td>23/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katakwi District</td>
<td>Ochorimongin cattle market</td>
<td>27/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumi District</td>
<td>Akumu and Ongino Villages</td>
<td>28/08/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.6.4 Document Review**

A host of documents were reviewed and these included project Document, District Development Plans for the 12 districts, Development Strategic Implementation Plan (DSIP 2010/11 – 2014/15), National Development Plan (NDP 2010-2014), Uganda Strategic Investment Framework for Sustainable Land

1.6.5 World Bank Safeguard Policies
The project triggers the following World Bank Safeguard policies and measures have been outlined in the ESMF for mitigating impacts from the project. The safeguards policies triggered are:
- OP 4.10 Indigenous People;

Other documents reviewed include; draft country project document, draft country program paper, draft implementation manual, animal census report 2008 and District Development Plan reports. Accessed different study reports from different institutions about the livestock sub sector, papers, UBOS surveys and abstract reports and the inter-net. This information formed the basis of literature review and secondary data analysis.

1.6.6 Data Analysis and Report Writing
The management and analysis of the quantitative data collected proceeded simultaneously with information gathering and data collection. The household questionnaires were cleaned, coded and entered into the computer using the SPSS computer software which led to the production of cross-tabulations to establish data in form of table and figures.

Qualitative data was analyzed using thematic approach where themes were developed along the study objectives of the social impact assessment in project districts for coding primary data. Relevant verbatim recordings were obtained during the study were used in the report writing to give anecdotal evidences. The process was done manually in relation to the major areas of the social assessment from which recommendations were made.

1.6.7 Limitation of the Study
The little time given could not permit the consultant gather comprehensive social data from all the project districts as this would have needed a lot more time and would definitely affect the financial obligations.

The unreliable security situation in the Karamoja region were security along the roads is never guaranteed even by the security operatives in the region that resulted in replacing Kaabong district by Amudat for household interviews, however the team to the District headquarters and communities managed to reach under very stressful conditions.

The poor road networks especially in Kween and Nakapiripirit districts which severely affected the start time of household interviews in some circumstances the household heads had already gone to look after their cattle and the women found at home could not divulge much information due the cultural regard of women.
However, these limitations did not hinder the completion of the data collection exercise as the consultant used their experience to gather all the information needed and there was a substantive use of secondary data, telephone interviews and reference to the internet to cover the gaps.
2 POLICY, LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Policy Framework
The relevant policies include:

2.1.1 Draft National Land Policy 2011
The goal of the policy is: “to ensure efficient, equitable and sustainable utilization and management of Uganda’s land and land-based resources for poverty reduction, wealth creation and overall socio-economic development”. **The Rights for Minorities:** As regards land rights of ethnic minorities (term implicitly refers to IPs and other vulnerable groups), the Policy provides that:

a. Government shall, **in its use and management of natural resources, recognize and protect the right to ancestral lands of ethnic minority groups; and**

b. Government shall **pay prompt, adequate and fair compensation to ethnic minority groups that are displaced from their ancestral land by government action.**

With reference to the land rights of pastoral communities, the Policy states that **“Land rights of pastoral communities will be guaranteed and protected by the State.”** To protect the land rights of pastoralists, government will take measures to:

- Ensure that pastoral lands are held, owned and controlled by designated pastoral communities as common property under customary tenure;
- Develop particular projects for adaptation and reclamation of pastoral lands for sustainable productivity and improved livelihood of communities;
- Protect pastoral lands from indiscriminate appropriation by individuals or corporate institutions under the guise of investment;
- Promote the establishment of Communal Land Associations and use of communal land management schemes among pastoral communities;
- Establish efficient mechanisms for the speedy resolution of conflict over pastoral resources, and between pastoral communities and sedentary communities

**Therefore, the land policy recognizes the rights of indigenous people to their ancestral lands and should effectively address the challenges that have been faced by the IPs in Uganda.**

2.1.2 National Policy for Older Persons 2009
This policy is clearly set within the framework of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda and other laws that promote **the rights of older persons among other vulnerable groups.** It provides a framework for enhancing the recognition of the roles, contributions and potentials of older persons in the development process among others. The policy targets older persons aged 60 years and above with special emphasis on the vulnerable. Section 3.4 states that, “All stakeholders will ensure that issues of older women and men are included in planning and implementation of programmes.”
2.1.3 National Trade Policy 2008.
It is aimed at enhancing competitiveness in the regional markets through developing capacity to exploit existing and future market opportunities.

2.1.4 The National Water Policy 1999
It provides a framework for water resources management and guides development efforts aimed at achieving the maximum net benefit from water resources. It outlines the role government, provides sector and user communities in water use and management. It also outlines principles of water for production as one of the key area to promote development of water supply for agriculture production in order to modernize agriculture and mitigate effects of climatic variation on rain fed agriculture through;

i. promoting proper water resource assessment and planning for agriculture production

ii. increasing the capacity of the farmers to access and use water for crop, fisheries and livestock production.

iii. Promote appropriate water harvesting technologies for irrigation and livestock demands

2.1.5 The National Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management (2010)
The policy provides a framework that details mechanisms and structures for the effective and practical management of disasters. The policy covers the broad subjects of vulnerability assessment, mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery, which constitute “comprehensive disaster management”. It networks all the lead sectors, local governments, international development and humanitarian partners, the private sector and the NGOs under the principle of a multi-disciplinary and multi-skilled consultative approach. It also presents an institutional framework under which the partners coordinate their operations. It further recognizes the need to place emphasis on the vulnerable groups in drought prone areas.

2.1.6 The Draft Uganda Rangeland and Pastoralism Policy 2012
The draft provides an institutional framework for rangeland and pastoral resource management. It provides a participatory approach by pastoral communities and other local communities in determining the best opportunities in managing rangelands for sustainable development and improved welfare of the local communities. It provides environmental protection aimed to sustain soil fertility, increase crop and livestock productivity and protect the ecosystem. It further provides for infrastructure development and research, training and advisory service delivery programmes that enhance efficiency and profitability in priority areas. It also covers areas of wildlife and tourism development, mitigation of conflicts and development of a code to govern pastoral activities in Uganda.

2.2 The Legal Framework

2.2.1 Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995
Under its National Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy, provides that every effort shall be made to integrate all peoples while at the same time recognizing the existence of, amongst others, their ethnic, religious and cultural diversity. In this regard, the Constitution requires that everything necessary be done to promote a culture of cooperation, understanding, appreciation, tolerance and respect for each other’s customs, traditions and beliefs. The Constitution however offers no express protection for indigenous peoples but Article 32 places a mandatory duty on the state to take affirmative action in favour
of groups who have been historically disadvantaged and discriminated against. An equally important relevant constitutional provision with respect to the situation of the historically marginalized indigenous communities is contained in Article 32. This article enjoins the state “to take affirmative action in favour of groups marginalized on the basis of gender, age disability or any other reason created by history, tradition or custom for purposes of redressing imbalances that exist against them.” In this regard the Constitution mandates Parliament to enact appropriate laws, including laws for the establishment of an Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC), for the purpose of giving full effect to Article 32(1).

Thus, while the promulgation of the 1995 Constitution was a positive step in the recognition of the rights of indigenous people in Uganda, the provisions fall short of international standards in regard with recognition of Indigenous People.

2.2.2 The Equal Opportunities Commission Act, 2007
The Act makes provision in relation to the Equal Opportunities Commission pursuant to articles 32 (3) and 32 (4) and other relevant provisions of the Constitution; to provide for the composition and functions of the Commission; to give effect to the State’s constitutional mandate to eliminate discrimination and inequalities against any individual or group of persons on the ground of sex, age, race, colour, ethnic origin, tribe, birth, creed or religion, health status, social or economic standing, political opinion or disability, and take affirmative action in favour of groups marginalized on the basis of gender, age, disability or any other reason created by history, tradition or custom for the purpose of redressing imbalances which exist against them; and to provide for other related matters. Regulation 14 2(a) states on the functions of the commission being to investigate or inquire into, on its own initiative or on a complaint made by any person or group of persons, any act, circumstance, conduct, omission, programme, activity or practice which seems to amount to or constitute discrimination, marginalization or to otherwise undermine equal opportunities.

In regard to IPs and the RPLRP, the Commission has to ensure that the rights of the IPs in the project area are respected and that they are not in any way hindered from their full participation in the project.

2.2.3 The National Environment Act
The National Environment Act CAP 153 defines the principles for environment management to include the encouragement of maximum participation by the people in the development of policies, plans and processes for management of the environment. The other principle defined by the Act is the conservation of the cultural heritage and use of the environment and natural resources for the benefit of both present and future generations. The law in effect, therefore, requires that indigenous peoples be consulted and involved in processes leading to the gazetting of their land. The Acts also recognize historical rights of persons who resided inside conservation areas.

2.2.4 The Uganda Wild Life Act
According to the UWA, ‘National Parks are areas of national importance for nature and landscape conservation and natural heritage preservation. They should be ecologically-viable units’. UWA details the permitted activities in the National Parks to include viewing and scientific research and the prohibited activities to include hunting wildlife and the disturbance of vegetation; harvesting/removal of approved resources may be authorized in designated areas.
2.2.5 The Local Government Act, 1997
The Local Government Act, 1997 provides for the local governments as the institutions responsible for the protection of the environment at the district and lower levels. This therefore, implies that local governments shall be consulted on projects to be located within their areas of jurisdiction and on matters that affect their environment. During this SA study, the neighboring local community/Villages and other stakeholders surrounding the project area districts including relevant district technical staff were consulted and their concerns presented in Chapter 7 of this report.

2.3 Institutional Frameworks

2.3.1 Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development
The Ministry’s mandate is to empower communities to harness their potential through cultural growth, skills development and labour productivity for sustainable and gender responsive development. The vision of the Ministry is a better standard of living, equity and social cohesion, especially for poor and vulnerable groups in Uganda. The mission of the ministry is promotion of gender equality, labour administration, social protection and transformation of communities. MAAIF will have to work with MGLSD to ensure that the vulnerable groups participate in the RPLRP.

2.3.2 The Uganda Human Rights Commission
The UHRC is Uganda’s national human rights institution created by the Constitution, with mandate, amongst others, to investigate violations of human rights and to monitor government compliance with its human rights obligations detailed in the Constitution. This is in addition to making recommendations to Parliament on measures to promote human rights. The Commission has since its establishment played a very important role in highlighting human rights violations in the country and making recommendations for rectification. The Commission has on several occasions investigated and published its findings with regard to the human rights problems of marginalized groups and made recommendations on how these could be rectified. A good example is the intervention during the Karamojong disarmament exercise in 2005. It will be a key institution to ensure that the rights of the Indigenous People are respected during RPLRP implementation.

2.3.3 The Equal Opportunities Commission
The mandate of the Commission is to eliminate discrimination and inequalities against any individual or group of persons on the ground of sex, age, race, color, ethnic origin, tribe, birth, creed or religion, health status, social or economic standing, political opinion or disability, and take affirmative action in favor of groups marginalized on the basis of gender, age, disability or any other reason created by history, tradition or custom for the purpose of redressing imbalances which exist against them, and to provide for other related matters. The EOC also has powers to hear and determine complaints by any person against any action, practice, usage, plan, policy programme, tradition, culture or custom which amounts to discrimination, marginalization or undermines equal opportunity.

2.3.4 Ministry in Charge of Karamoja Affairs
The Ministry in Charge of Karamoja Affairs was an initiative started in order to focus on and address the unique problems and development challenges of Karamoja and its peoples. In May 2011, the president elevated the ministry in charge of Karamoja affairs to a full ministry complete with a state minister for
Karamoja affairs. Although it is still too soon to review the relevance and efficiency of this ministry, its elevation can be interpreted as the government’s attempt to scale-up interventions to address water scarcity, food insecurity, insecurity and poverty in Karamoja region. **MAAIF will have to work hand in hand with the ministry during subproject screening/planning and actual implementation.**

### 2.3.5 Non Governmental Organizations

#### 2.3.5.1 Mercy Corps

Mercy Corps is a global aid agency engaged in transitional environments that have experienced some sort of shock: natural disaster, economic collapse, or conflict. People working for it move as quickly as possible from bringing in food and supplies to enabling people to rebuild their economy with community-driven and market-led programs. To lay the groundwork for longer-term recovery, Mercy Corps focuses on connecting to both government and business for the changes they would like to see. Mercy Corps is currently involved in the following in Karamoja:

- **Agriculture & Food:** Training farmer groups in business skills to grow subsistence plots to small-scale commercial farming operations
- **Economic development:** Providing jobs building roads that link farms to markets
- **Conflict & Governance:** Working with elder councils to promote peace building efforts and lead events to foster trust between tribes

#### 2.3.5.2 Uganda Land Alliance (ULA)

Uganda Land Alliance was set up in 1995, this is a consortium of 44 national and international NGOs as well as individuals, lobbying and advocating for fair land laws and policies that address the land rights of the poor, disadvantaged and vulnerable groups and individuals in Uganda. ULC has experience of public interest litigation including assistance of the Benet in which court recognized their right to their ancestral land in MNEP in 2005.

#### 2.3.5.3 Action Aid Uganda (AAU)

Action Aid is a non-political, non-religious organization that has been working in Uganda since 1982 to end poverty and injustice. Action Aid focuses on tackling the root causes of the injustice of poverty rather than just meeting people’s immediate needs. The organization is primarily concerned with defending and raising awareness of human rights, be they economic, social, cultural, civil or political. AAU has been an influential partner in the Benet’s struggle. AAU supported the Benets in building deeper understanding and skills for lobbying and advocacy. This capacity was built through formal training and practical accompaniment as the Benets planned and implemented their advocacy initiatives. **MAAIF should closely work with the different NGOs in the project areas to ensure that the land rights of the IPs are fully respected during project implementation.**

#### 2.3.5.4 International Work Group on Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA)

IWGIA is an international human rights organization staffed by specialists and advisers on indigenous affairs. IWGIA supports indigenous peoples' struggle for human rights, self-determination, right to territory, control of land and resources, cultural integrity, and the right to development. The aim was to establish a network of concerned researchers and human right activists to document the situation of indigenous peoples and advocate for an improvement of their rights. IWGIA works at local, regional and
international levels to further the understanding and knowledge of, and the involvement in, the cause of indigenous peoples. IWGIA publishes a wide range of books, reports, handbooks, and audio-visual material about indigenous peoples' rights and the human right situation of indigenous peoples around the world.

2.3.5.5 Minority Rights Group International

Minority Rights Group International (MRG) is a nongovernmental organization (NGO) working to secure the rights of ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities and indigenous peoples worldwide, and to promote cooperation and understanding between communities. Our activities are focused on international advocacy, training, publishing and outreach. It is guided by the needs expressed by our worldwide partner network of organizations, which represent minority and indigenous peoples. MRI has a wealth of information on Indigenous People and MAAIF can work with its researchers to further develop methods to ensure adoption of the project by the IPs.

2.4 Key Supportive Strategies

2.4.1 Development Strategic Implementation Plan (DSIP 2010/11 – 2014/15)

The DSIP has two development objectives: (i) to increase rural incomes and livelihoods, and (ii) to improve household food and nutrition security. The immediate objectives are to: (a) ensure sustainability of factor productivity; (b) sustainably develop domestic, regional and international markets for primary and secondary agricultural products; (c) create favorable legal, policy and institutional frameworks to facilitate private sector expansion and stimulate profitable value chains; and (d) facilitate MAAIF and agencies functionality as a modern, client-oriented organization within an innovative, accountable and supportive environment. The key areas of investment are enhancing production and productivity, improving access to markets and value addition, creating an enabling environment, and institutional strengthening in the sector. The Regional Pastoral Livelihood Resilience Project will contribute to the following programme areas of the DSIP: (i) Enhancing production and productivity; (ii) Advisory services and better delivery of improved technology; (iii) Improved disease, pest and vector control; (iv) Enhanced productivity of rangelands through sustainable range management and water resources; (v) Increased use of water for agricultural production; and (vi) Improved agricultural livelihoods in Northern Uganda covering among others draught prone areas and the cattle corridor.

2.4.2 The Social Development Sector Strategic Investment Plan (SDIP 2)2011/12 – 2015/16

The Social Development Sector fosters the rights of the vulnerable population, addresses gender inequalities, labour and employment as well as community mobilization and empowerment. The plan recognizes that addressing the rights and needs of the vulnerable and disadvantaged populations such as People with Disabilities (PWDs), older persons, youth, orphans and other vulnerable children and the chronically poor underpins the core concerns of national development. The mission of the SDS is promotion of gender equality, social protection and transformation of communities, while the vision is a better standard of living, equity and social cohesion. The Sector Strategic Objectives include to improve the well being of vulnerable, marginalized and excluded groups and to address gender inequality in the
development process. Expected Outcomes of the plan include gender equality enhanced and vulnerable persons protected from deprivation and livelihood risks among others.

2.4.3 National Development Plan (NDP 2010-2014):
This is Uganda’s overarching five-year strategic framework for economic development. It recognizes that: (a) agriculture employs most of Uganda’s rural population and is where most livelihoods are vested, making it an important target for addressing poverty, food security and income generation, especially of the poor and of women; and (b) agriculture is also the basis of growth, and thus a stimulant for other sectors i.e., industry and services as well as an important contributor to Uganda’s exports.

2.4.4 Uganda Strategic Investment Framework for Sustainable Land Management 2010 – 2020
This offers programmatic approaches to address land degradation and promote sustainable land management and is aligned to CAADP pillar 1. The framework focuses on areas of the cattle corridor among others where land is degraded due to overgrazing, climatic effects and high population density.

2.4.5 Water for Production Strategy and Investment Plan 2010 – 2035, and Draft National Irrigation Master Plan
These are aimed at promoting the use of water in agricultural production through supporting farming system diversification, private investment in bulk water infrastructure and service delivery and more Public-Private Partnerships.

2.4.6 National Peace, Reconstruction and Development Plan (PRDP) for Northern Uganda
Overall, the goal is to consolidate peace and security and lay foundation for recovery and development through, among others, rebuilding and empowering communities, revitalization of the local economy, and peace building and reconciliation. It address livelihood options for war affected communities in Northern Uganda and communities affected by conflicts resulting from shared resources in Karamoja and Teso regions.

2.4.7 Karamoja Integrated Development Programme (KIDP) (2011-2015)
This is a medium-term development framework specifically tailored to address the unique context and development challenges in the Karamoja region and is part of the broader National Development Plan and the Peace, Recovery and Development Programme (PRDP). KIDP harmonizes the various development interventions by Government, bi-lateral and multi-lateral development partners, international and national NGOs and CBOs.

2.4.8 Karamoja Action Plan for Food Security (2011 - 2014)
This is geared towards building resilience of the Karamoja communities to drought and making the sub-region self-productive thereby improving food security to reduce the need for emergency relief.
2.5 THE WORLD BANK OPERATIONAL POLICIES

2.5.1 O.P 4.10 Indigenous Peoples
This Policy contributes to the Bank's mission of poverty reduction and sustainable development by ensuring that the development process fully respects the dignity, human rights, economies, and cultures of Indigenous Peoples. For all projects that are proposed for Bank financing and affect Indigenous Peoples, the Bank requires the borrower to engage in a process of free, prior, and informed consultation. The Bank provides project financing only where free, prior, and informed consultation results in broad community support to the project by the affected Indigenous Peoples. The policy establishes processing requirements: screening, social assessment, consultation with communities involved, preparation of plan or framework, and disclosure. It also requires the borrower to seek broad community support of Indigenous Peoples through a process of free, prior and informed consultation before deciding to develop any project that targets or affects indigenous communities.

2.5.2 O.P 4.12 Involuntary Resettlement
Bank experience indicates that involuntary resettlement under development projects, if unmitigated, often gives rise to severe economic, social, and environmental risks: production systems are dismantled; people face impoverishment when their productive assets or income sources are lost; people are relocated to environments where their productive skills may be less applicable and the competition for resources greater; community institutions and social networks are weakened; kin groups are dispersed; and cultural identity, traditional authority, and the potential for mutual help are diminished or lost. For these reasons, the overall objectives of the Bank's policy on involuntary resettlement are the following:

a. Involuntary resettlement should be avoided where feasible, or minimized, exploring all viable alternative project designs;

b. Where it is not feasible to avoid resettlement, resettlement activities should be conceived and executed as sustainable development programs, providing sufficient investment resources to enable the persons displaced by the project to share in project benefits. Displaced persons should be meaningfully consulted and should have opportunities to participate in planning and implementing resettlement programs; and

c. Displaced persons should be assisted in their efforts to improve their livelihoods and standards of living or at least to restore them, in real terms, to pre-displacement levels or to levels prevailing prior to the beginning of project implementation, whichever is higher.
3 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED THE REGIONAL PASTROL LIVELIHOODS RESILIENCE PROJECT IN THE PROJECT AREAS

3.1 Screening of Indigenous, Vulnerable & Marginalized Groups in the Project Areas

It is anticipated that in the process of implementing the proposed RPLRP project in the 12 districts, activities of these component will trigger social affects and safeguard concerns whose impacts may range from small scale and site specific to larger infrastructure investment activities. Activities in component 1: that will involve mapping of major natural resources (water resources, and rangelands) and in component 2. Support to market infrastructure could trigger The World Bank Policy OP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement and OP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples as there are likely requirements of land acquisition for the construction of markets. This policy requires that all Bank-financed operations are screened for potential impacts, and that the required compensation work is carried out on the basis of the screening results. Below is a summary of some other social impacts expected to caused during the implementation of the project beyond land take.

- Dam construction creates borrow pits which degrade the environment through extraction of fill materials for embankments. The borrow pits if poorly restored can be breeding sites for malaria and other water based vectors. These borrow pits many hinder access to other natural resources such as firewood, water, gardens and pasture land.

- The excavation works for valley dams generates volumes of cut to spoil materials which will need to be disposed from the site. In addition, the cut to spoil materials generates loose soils that can silt the water sources, making them unfit for both human and animal consumption.

- The construction and rehabilitation works for the dams involves use of plant equipment whose storage and operations can have attendant impacts on environment in terms of noise and compaction of soil thereby affecting soil percolation ability and may affect thr growth of natural vegetation like grasses which the animals feed on.

- In addition, dam embankments can pose safety risk to both livestock and the communities. If the banks are high, safety of cattle to access water becomes an issue as well for the communities to draw water. In some instances, children can tempted to swim in the dams and may end up drowning.

- Construction based impacts arising from excavation works during construction markets and associated project infrastructures will generate dust and other health associated implications on the workers and neighboring communities.

- Potential relegation of traditional crop varieties in favor of projects high yielding varieties that will be developed by the project. The traditional varieties are adapted to the local environment.

- Operation of slaughter facilities will generate a host of public health issues that can compromise the quality of meat products.
There can be instances when animals die in markets due to transportation or disease. In addition, some meat in the slaughtered in the market could be declared unsafe for human consumption.

Markets during their operations can have issues of crime triggered by alcohol consumption etc.

HIV/AIDS is one of the potential concerns resulting from operations and consumption of alcohol.

Livelihoods interventions at households level can fuel instances of domestic violence against women by men over resources. It is common, when women get resources especially money; men tend to grab it for their needs.

Apart from meeting a basic human need, new water points in Karamoja could have a direct impact on the spread of livestock and human diseases since most water sources are shared in the region. The Project will sensitize communities on risks of sharing water sources with livestock;

Choice of where to construct the sub-projects like dams and markets may be to the disadvantage of the indigenous people mentioned above in terms of accessibility if no deliberate efforts are put in place to consider their involvement right from the beginning and also allow them participate when it comes to making choices of sites.

3.1.1 Definition of Indigenous People
There is no universally accepted definition of “Indigenous Peoples.” Indigenous Peoples may be referred to in different countries by such terms as “Indigenous ethnic minorities,” “aboriginals,” “hill tribes,” “minority nationalities,” “scheduled tribes,” “first nations,” or “tribal groups.” In Uganda, the term “ethnic minorities” is used to refer to such groups. However, for this social assessment, the World Bank criterion to identify indigenous peoples from the 65 ethnic groups in Uganda has been adapted. These people have historically suffered, and continue to suffer disempowerment and discrimination on economic, social and cultural grounds. The term “Indigenous Peoples” is used in a generic sense to refer to a distinct social and cultural group possessing the following characteristics in varying degrees:

- Self-identification as members of a distinct indigenous cultural group and recognition of this identity by others;
- Collective attachment to geographically distinct habitats or ancestral territories in the project area and to the natural resources in these habitats and territories;
- Customary cultural, economic, social, or political institutions that are separate from those of the mainstream society or culture; or
- A distinct language or dialect, often different from the official language or languages of the country or region in which they reside.

The project districts of Kaabong and Kween are also inhibited by some of the Indigenous Peoples (IPs) of Uganda who include the IK in Kaabong and Ndorobo also referred as Benet in Kween districts. The IPs may be affected directly in some ways, hence triggering the OP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples. The World
Bank Operational Policy (OP) 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples, underscores the need for borrowers and Bank Staff to identify IPs, consult with them, ensure that they participate in and benefit from Bank funded operations in a culturally appropriate way and that adverse impacts on them should be avoided where possible, or where not feasible, they should be minimised or mitigated.

3.1.1.1 The Ik Community
This group is also referred to as gatherers/hunters, they deserve special attention under marginalized and vulnerable groups. The Ik are a group of minority people who live on the mountains of Kaabong district. They speak a language called Iche’tod\(^1\), which is totally different from, not only the widely spoken Karamojong in the district but also different from other dialects spoken in the entire Karamoja region. While communities who speak Karimojong and other dialects in the region understand each other, none of them understand or are able to speak Iche’tod. On the other hand, the Ik community speaks Karamojong but prefer to speak Iche’tod in their community and enjoy using it around people they do not trust for security purposes.

According to the Karimojong, the Ik are small and weigh not more than 60Kgs which enables them move swiftly in the forests and climb the mountains. The 2002 population Census puts the Ik at 11,200 people and are projected at a population of 15,000 (2013). They now occupy an entire Sub-County of their own (Kamion SC) which was curved from Kalapata SC in July 2012 in a bid to advance the Ik community. The Ik were marginalised for a long time until 2005 when Kaabong district was established out of Kotido district and until more recently when they were granted their own SC. Granting Kaabong district status has helped to bring services closer to its people as the furthest school to the North of Kaabong district headquarters is 90 Km and to the South is 63 Km, while Kamion PS which serves the Ik community is about 48 Km from Kaabong district headquarters. As a result the district is making efforts to ensure that primary schools in the Ik community reach the same level as the rest of schools in the district.

The level of education of the Ik people is very low. None of them has reached a level of being employed in the district Local Government (LG) and none is employed even at the lowest level. Reports tell of only one Ik man, having worked for a long time as a driver with an international NGO (AVSI) in Gulu managed to educate his children to higher levels. He is known to be working in Nimule (South Sudan) and has since settled in Masindi with his family. However, reports indicate that he is contemplating to return home as Ik people have strong ties with their place. Due to low education, none of them is in formal employment in the district, which makes teaching the thematic curriculum a problem as there are no teachers from Ik community. It would be easier for an Ik teacher who can speak both Karimojong and Iche’tod languages to teach the lower classes since the instructional materials for the thematic curriculum are in Karimojong and some Ik learners do not understand the language. The Ik children are therefore forced to use the Karamojong language which is not suitable according to the thematic curriculum. There is need to build on their language and culture. It thus follows that they also lack instructional materials and text books in their language which causes their further marginalisation. The RPLRP should consider affirmative action for the Ik community in order to address this problem.

\(^1\) The Ik said that their language is called Iche’tod. However, the Karamojong in Kaabong district call the language spoken by the Ik teuso which according to sources is a derogative term meaning ‘servants’ of other people.
The Ik’s marginalisation and isolation have also been caused by superstitions by themselves and others. For instance, the Karimojong believe that if a Karimojong man married an Ik woman, his first wife would die, so intermarriages between the Ik and Karimojong have been limited. Meanwhile the Ik were known to marry strictly one wife because of the same belief that if they married a second wife, the first one would die. However, the trend is slowly changing as a few of them are known to have married two wives, something which was unheard of in the past. They were also known to be very religious people and staunch in their Catholic faith. The warriors or cattle rustlers surrounding the Ik community on all sides are their biggest cause of marginalisation. These are a threat to the Ik communities which live in constant fear and uncertainty of their lives. Consequently, as a survival mechanism, the Ik keep very close to each other with a strong informal network of communication to alert each other in case of danger or some good news. They can thus be either very easy or difficult to mobilize depending on how they perceive the motives of the visitor/outsider. For example:

*If Iks see a car coming in their area, one person will emerge from the bush to confirm who the person in the car is and depending on his assessment, the person will send an echo/sound to communicate the message to others telling them either to come out or keep away. And if they are really suspicious about the visitor, they will all disappear in the forests.*  

Kaabong district
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Apart from speaking a unique language and living on mountains, the Ik have a unique way of life as well. For instance, they do not cook and eat together as a family like most communities do. Whoever feels hungry, cooks what is enough, eats and goes away without caring about others. Eating takes place any time one feels hungry and others will do the same – children, women and men. However, cooking usually takes place in the evenings as during the day, they are mainly gathering fruits, greens, and firewood. The lack of an organized system of cooking at home implies that children who go to school will not find any cooked food at home to eat when they return. As a result, Ik children are encouraged to go to school when they are sure the school will provide food, otherwise they will not attend school. A study was carried out to investigate why Ik children drop out of school – many of these children; especially girls are sent to school in waiting for marriage. Usually in about P.5 to P.7, they are married off during holidays. Poverty and lack of wealth (no cows) among the Ik make them look at the girls as a source of wealth. Many times they arrange these marriages without the girls’ knowledge.

A government initiative to protect all people including the Ik and property in Kaabong district is in place – the disarmament process and deployment of armed personnel has created some security. The district prioritizes the development of schools in Kamion SC whenever it gets resources. With their own SC and a counselor (though not Ik, but married in the community) representing them at the district, the Ik are expected to slowly progress. A constituency of their own is also being lobbied for in efforts to recognize the Ik and raise their standard of living.

3.1.1.2 The Benet/Ndorobo in Kween District

The Benet indigenous people, who are part of the larger tribe called the Sabiny, are a pastoralist forest dwelling community who traditionally resided in the grassland and moorland areas of Mt Elgon forest. There are mainly two groups namely; the lowland Sabiny people and the forest-dwelling Ndorobo people. Ndorobo are the indigenous Benets, the first occupants of Mt. Elgon. The Ndorobo indigenous people
have four social groupings namely; The Benet, the Piswa, the Kwoti, and the Yatui clans. The Benet community is a historical term which was used to describe the contested area of Mount Elgon where Ndorobo and settlers currently reside. The terms ‘Benet’ and ‘Benet community’ were revitalized to describe the people in that area (both settlers and Ndorobo) for the purposes of pursuing the legal strategy.

Although the 1983 resettlement scheme was meant to remove the Ndorobo Indigenous people from the Mt. Elgon Forest Reserve, it was found expedient to resettle the lowland Sabiny people, who had been rendered landless by the fatal cattle rustling raids of the Karamajong and the Kenyan Pokots, together with the Ndorobo indigenous people. During the 1983 resettlement exercise, the two groups were resettled together in the present day Benet Resettlement Area and thereby adopting the generic term Benet people. Their population is estimated at 20,000.

The Benet communities were allowed to remain in the moorlands of Mt. Elgon Forest Reserve without residence documentation on an understanding that this was their home. The assumption was that the Benet community would remain a small community, practicing pastoralism, hunting and fruit and herbs collecting for their livelihood. Later on their population and number of livestock grew significantly, thus interfering with forest regeneration. In addition to other activities they took up subsistence agriculture, growing Irish potatoes. In so doing, they damaged the fragile ecosystem within the moorland, bringing sizeable chunks of the montane forest under agriculture, thus encroaching. These activities became increasingly damaging and incompatible to the fragile ecosystem.

**Key Livelihood Challenges**

In February 2008, the Uganda Wildlife Authority and the Uganda People’s Defense Forces evicted the Benet/Ndorobo communities living in Mount Elgon National Park in East Uganda. It is reported that people’s houses and crops were destroyed, cattle were confiscated and the people were left homeless. They found shelter where they could: in caves and under trees. In October 2005, the High Court in Mbale ruled that the Benet were the “historical and indigenous inhabitants” of parts of Mount Elgon National Park. The ruling stated that the Benet should be allowed to “carry out agricultural activities” in the areas to which they have historical claim. Despite a landmark victory against the government in 2005, the Benet people continue to suffer from the effects of their evictions from the Mt. Elgon National Park. Landlessness and its resulting negative effects continued to top the list of frustrations for the Benet community in 2011. However, their resettlement by Government is ongoing. Three main challenges currently face the Benet namely:

a. The state expropriated their resources by evicting them from Mt. Elgon National Park in 2005;
b. They feel they are deprived of their resources and that deprivation has impoverished them. Activities such as hunting, gathering fruits, grazing are prohibited and yet they provided people with means of securing food and nutrition;
c. The degradation of the forest continues in which they were resettled is continuing due to illegal tree cutting; and
d. They have no tenure of the land where they have been resettled.
3.1.2 Marginalized Groups
The term “Marginalization” generally describes the overt actions or tendencies of human societies whereby those perceived as being without desirability or function are removed or excluded (i.e., are "marginalized"…) from the prevalent systems of protection and integration, so limiting their opportunities and means for survival. This applies to the Ik, and Benet who were evicted from their original habitants of the Mt. Kidepo and Mt. Elgon respectively. The entire Karamoja region got marginalized when Government degazzeted close to 5,000 square kilometers of land into Kidepo Valley National Park, Matheniko Game Reserve, South Karamoja controlled hunting area and forest reserves. In Teso Region, especially in Katakwi and Amuria districts during the LRA war almost the entire populace was forced into camps due to insecurity living them completely marginalized in terms of access to opportunities and means for survival. In this report the terms “Marginalized and Vulnerable groups” are together or interchangeably given the fact that they both refer to being in disadvantaged situation leading to dependency for survival.

3.1.3 Vulnerable Groups
Vulnerability refers to the conditions determined by physical, social, economic and environmental factors or processes, which increase the susceptibility of a community to the impact of hazards. A vulnerable group is therefore a population that has some specific characteristics that make it at higher risk of falling into poverty than others living in areas targeted by a project. Vulnerable groups include the elderly, the mentally and physically disabled, at-risk children and youth, ex-combatants, internally displaced people and returning refugees, HIV/AIDS-affected individuals and households, religious and ethnic minorities and, in some communities or societies, women.

Vulnerable people or groups in this study are those who by virtue of gender, ethnicity, age, physical or mental disability, economic disadvantage, or social status may be more adversely affected by the project than others and may be limited in their ability to claim or take advantage of resettlement assistance and related development benefits. The social assessment has contributed to identifying issues of potentially vulnerable populations in the project area.

The problem of poverty and vulnerability in Uganda can be analyzed in terms of spatial and social aspects. The ‘social’ aspect refers to vulnerable groups while the ‘spatial’ refers to the geographical location of the poor. The two, however, are inseparable. In the Uganda context, disaggregating the various categories of ‘vulnerable groups’ can serve as an entry point for understanding the diversity of poverty, as the vulnerable groups experience different forms of disadvantage. According to official statistics derived from the 1997 survey data, vulnerable groups in Uganda include children, elderly, women and people in large households. The following groups have been identified as specific vulnerable groups by various research studies undertaken on poverty in Uganda. See table 3 below.
Table 3: Vulnerable Groups in Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict-Related</th>
<th>Demographic Categories</th>
<th>Poverty-Related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✤ Refugees</td>
<td>✤ Asset less widows and widowers</td>
<td>✤ Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✤ Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)</td>
<td>✤ Orphans and abandoned children</td>
<td>✤ Urban unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✤ War orphans</td>
<td>✤ Female-headed households</td>
<td>✤ Low-paid workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✤ Abductees</td>
<td>✤ Child-headed households</td>
<td>✤ Informal sector workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✤ Traumatized civilians</td>
<td>✤ Elderly-headed households</td>
<td>✤ Beggars and squatters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✤ Households living in or near conflict zones</td>
<td>✤ People with disabilities (PWD)</td>
<td>✤ Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✤ Region of operation prone to internal and trans-boundary conflicts</td>
<td>✤ Chronically sick</td>
<td>✤ Rural landless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ HIV/AIDS sufferers and care takers</td>
<td>✤ Cash-crop farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ Victims of domestic abuse</td>
<td>✤ Pastoralists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ Ethnic minority groups</td>
<td>✤ Plantation workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ Street children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.1.3.1 Potentially Vulnerable Groups

Implementation of projects that lead to property take and livelihood disruption usually affects some people more than others. These categories of people are known as the potentially vulnerable. Vulnerable groups are defined by the World Bank policy on involuntary resettlement (O.P. 4.12) as ‘people who by virtue of gender, ethnicity, age, physical or mental disability, economic disadvantage, or social status may be more adversely affected by resettlement than others and who may be limited in their ability to claim or take advantage of resettlement assistance and related development benefits’.

Since the overall Project Development objective of is to enhance livelihoods resilience of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in drought prone areas, it is important to identify groups that are particularly at risk. Therefore, vulnerable groups require special attention in planning and implementing development projects.

### 3.1.3.2 Vulnerable Groups in the Project Areas

The vulnerable groups who may not qualify under the Bank’s definition of “indigenous”, but who have also suffered the consequences of generations of conflict, discrimination, and marginalization are highlighted below. It is important to note that whereas these groups of people are vulnerable and marginalized, they are not indigenous in the context of OP 4.10 application.
3.1.3.3 Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)

These are people who had to flee their homes as a result of rebel atrocities committed against their communities and are now virtually refugees in their own country and have not returned. Five years after the signing of the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement between GoU and the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA), the majority of IDPs have left the camps. More than 98% of the 1.8 million IDPs who lived in camps at the height of the conflict have returned to their areas of origin or have resettled in new locations. They may however be still dependent on the NGO community and others for support. The last survey on IDP figures by the UNHCR sub-office in Gulu reported that there were still 29,776 IDPs in four sub-regions of Uganda as of December 2011 out of which 720 IDPs were reported in Katakwi and Amuria districts in Teso sub-region. IDP estimates do not take into account new patterns of displacement caused by land disputes which often arise after attempts to return. Latest figures for 2013 are not available at the moment. Sporadic cattle-raids in Karamoja are reported but there are no estimates of the number of people recently displaced in the region.

3.1.3.4 Vulnerable Ethnic Groups in Karamoja Region

As earlier on mentioned ethnicity is another source of discrimination and vulnerability in Karamoja Subregion (Ayoo et al 2013). Among the different ethnic groupings, the Jie and Bokora have been cited as more vulnerable than the Dodoth and Matheniko. For a long time, the government concentrated its disarmament efforts among the Jie and Bokora, yet focused very little on the Dodoth. The Jie and Bokora became prone to attacks by the Dodoth, and as a result lost cattle and lives (CPRC, 2008). The Ik and the Tepeth are most marginalized ethnic groups in Karamoja. They are socially excluded because their language is not understood by the major groups, their cultural practices and different, and they are few in number (Ayoo et al. 2013). These minority groups are often poorer than the major groups. They are sometimes labeled and referred to as dogs or “Ngingokin.”

The Tepeths/tepes who inhabit mount Napak District in Karamoja Subregion are nomadic hunters and gatherers. The Tepeth speak the Soo language. They reside in conical huts made of sticks, thatch and mud in the semi-arid savannahs and scrubby forests. Some few Tepeths are pastoralists and practice hunting. There is very little written about them, but local oral history records all these groups as having been the inhabitants of wider areas of present-day Karamoja who took refuge in the mountains when the Karamojong arrived from Ethiopia in the 1600s. They are one of the few peoples in Uganda to practice Female Genital Mutilation but the practice has been abandoned of late due to a number of campaigns by Government of Uganda. Their population is estimated at 17,000.

3.1.3.5 Iteso Communities in Amuria, Bukedea, Kumi and Katakwi Districts

The Iteso and Karamojong of northeast Uganda have existed side by side for centuries. They are closely related communities who trace back their origins to Ethiopia, and came to inhabit the arid lands in the far northeast of Uganda. Both traditionally pastoralist communities, the two groups have strived for amicable relations and depended on each other for their survival in harsh environments, by, for example, trading and intermarrying (Chapman and Kagaha, 2009). The communities speak mutually intelligible languages and share many customs. There have also been conflicts involving cattle rustling and disputed boundaries. Gradually some Iteso gave up pastoralism and became settled cultivators (Chapman and Kagaha, 2009).
In the Katakwi district on the border of the Karamoja region, however, Iteso feel that they are a targeted minority and are losing access to their traditional lands. As the result of a border dispute between the Iteso of Katakwi and the Karamojong of Moroto that is more than a century old, the two communities have lived under constant threat of conflict. The Karamojong, who are a pastoralist cattle-keeping community, regularly move into Teso territory in order to find grazing land and water. Because the rain that falls in the mountains near Moroto runs off quickly and drains into the wetlands in Teso, the Karamojong are known to say that they are following ‘their’ water into Teso. Recently, Karamojong have also been settling in what Iteso consider to be their territory based on a colonial-era map; Karamojong see the border differently. The border conflict has led to Karamojong raids into Teso territory, during which there are killings and property destruction. Iteso in turn have burned down Karamojong settlements in Katakwi that they believe to be illegal. This type of traditional territorial conflict creates an escalating cycle of violence.

3.1.3.6 Vulnerable Households
Internal conflicts, drought, floods, historical marginalization, poor infrastructure, and diseases still affect the Karamoja region, with significant impacts on human welfare and quality of life. The sub-region has the lowest human development indices in the country. Nearly 80% of the population experiences some degree of food insecurity, mainly due to unreliable rainfall. The seven districts of Kaabong, Abim, Kotido, Nakapiripirit, Amudat, Napak and Moroto, are all located within a "red" food security zone, according to a recent government assessment. WFP, working with the government's Karamoja Productive Assets Programme to increase household incomes and create assets, provided targeted relief food to the 140,000 extremely vulnerable persons in 2011. The Teso sub-regions has suffered from floods, drought and famine, conflicts and cattle raiding. This vulnerability to floods, compounded by unpredictable weather patterns and Karamojong cattle raiding, continues to negatively impact the livelihood security of people at community and household levels in the sub region. While internal displacement has ended in Teso, several factors are undermining sustainable resettlement and recovery. Gaps in social service provision and limited livelihood opportunities continue to hamper the quest for durable solutions.

Poor men and young uninitiated men in Karamoja are also discriminated because of poverty (Ayoo et al. 2013). The poor people are labeled “Ngikuliak” and the rich labeled “Ngikabarak.” The Ngikuliak are people without cattle. They suffer the shocks of disasters like drought and poor harvests because they have no reserves or safeguards to fall back to. They eat one meal a day or even stay hungry some days to cope with deprivation. The Ngikuliak cope in bad times through temporary migration to neighbouring communities to look for food. Some of them migrate permanently out of the region (Ayoo et al. 2013).

3.1.3.7 Vulnerability Due to Conflict
The Karamojong who inhabit the region’s marginal dry lands are predominantly pastoralist, though most groups farm as well. Cattle raiding has characterized the relationship between Karamojong tribes and their neighbours for generations. In recent years, however, raiding has become increasingly violent, due in part to the proliferation of small arms. As traditional power structures have eroded, social norms that once moderated raiding have dissolved, and raids are increasingly carried out by young men for their own personal gain. Although security has improved over the past several years, cattle raiding continues to take lives, undermine livelihoods, and discourage both development and private sector investment in the region. The conflict management system in Karamoja includes both formal government and customary
actors. These actors play complementary roles in maintaining peace and security in Karamoja. Collaboration between actors – both vertically between customary leaders and government officials at the sub-county and district level, and horizontally between actors in neighboring districts – is crucial to the ability of these actors to effectively and appropriately respond to security incidents, resolve disputes, and facilitate the return of stolen livestock.

In a place such as Karamoja, where conflict and poverty conspire to prevent regional development, reducing conflict and boosting economic development can only happen incrementally and in tandem. While stability is often viewed as a prerequisite for economic development, economic growth itself offers a path toward peace. Rather than directly delivering goods and services, aid actors should facilitate market system change that enables market actors to sustainably address the economic drivers of conflict. This includes providing viable economic opportunities, encouraging private sector investment and job creation, and strengthening the institutions that regulate the cattle trade. At the same time, activities that build trust between antagonistic groups and reinforce local conflict resolution mechanisms are needed to lay the foundation for economic cooperation and prevent the violence that inhibits business and trade.

**Conflict Resolution**

**Customary actors:** Conflict in Karamoja has traditionally been managed by elders, who comprise the customary authority in the cephalous and decentralized societies of Karamoja. Far from being a monolithic group, elders of a given community have their own internal hierarchy and are organized to varying degrees in different communities. Although the authority of elders has weakened in recent years, they continue to play a role in promoting social harmony, disseminating information, and identifying criminals in the community, disciplining errant youth, mediating disputes, and negotiating peace. Generally speaking, conflict management processes followed by elders emphasize consensus, reconciliation, and restorative justice and are often perceived as more legitimate and more compatible with local values than justice delivered through the formal system.

**Formal government actor:** Government conflict management actors include district-level officials with a mandate to promote peace and security, notably the members of the District Peace Committee and the District Security Committee; the Sub-county Peace Committee, comprised of both government officials (e.g., LC1, LC3) and community representatives; the Uganda People’s Defence Force (UPDF); and the police. Government involvement in conflict management emphasizes the maintenance of security (through activities such as disarmament, intelligence gathering, and patrols) and both legal and security responses to conflict incidents (including livestock recovery and arrest of perpetrators).

Therefore the implementation of the RPLRP project in this region will go a long way in contributing to reduction of conflicts caused mainly due insufficient water and graze land which are main reasons usually given by the Karamojong in their continued raids to neighbours especially Teso and Sebei regions when they claim to be following their water that has gone to Teso. The organized markets will also reduce on the trans-boundary conflicts with the neighbouring countries and tracing of stolen cattle will be made easier with established systems.
4 SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS DYNAMICS and CHALLENGES OF REGIONAL AREAS

This section gives a comprehensive picture of the social characteristics, dynamics and challenges in the project area. The assessment will specifically look at the gender issues and concerns; livelihood and coping strategies; cultural resources; community types; Institutions; Stakeholders; land tenure systems; Social, political and other risks plus specific trans-border issues. It also identifies potential social impacts and where adverse impacts are identified suggests how they can be avoided, minimized or substantially mitigated.

4.1 Overview of the Karamoja Region

Karamoja sub-region is a region in North-Eastern Uganda comprising of the seven districts of Abim, Kaabong, Kotido, Moroto, Napak, Amudat and Nakapiripirit. Kaabong lies on the North-Eastern, borders with Sudan and Kenya, and is home to the Kidepo Valley National Park. Nakapiripirit is the most-eastern one, bordering Mount Elgon National Park. Karamoja region covers over 27,900 square kilometers. The region is mostly a semi-arid plain with harsh climate and low annual rainfall. It is largely savannah covered with seasonal grasses, thorned plants, and occasional small trees. The average elevation of the plain of Karamoja lies at around 1400 meters (4500 feet) above sea level. The large mountains are Mt. Kadam, Mt. Napak, and Mt. Moroto — lying at the periphery of Karamoja. The region sprawls on two of the four hyper basins of Uganda: the Upper Nile Management Zone in the north (almost 22%) and the Kyoga Water Management Zone in the south (78%). The Karamajong are a semi-nomadic warrior community living in the North-eastern part of the country, which is also the most marginalised and least developed area in the country. They combine a number of social groups including the Matheniko, Pian and Bakora, who are the main groups. Other groups include the Pokot (living on both sides of the Kenya–Uganda border), Nyang’ia, Nyakwae, Jie Tepeth, Dodoth, Ik, Napore and Labwor. The Karamajong live in a very remote part of the country, which as will be seen later, is the least developed area of Uganda. Their life has been one of marginalisation, they have since colonialism unsuccessfully struggled for recognition and incorporation into mainstream Ugandan society.

To the Karamajong, cattle are everything they have in life; they depend on cattle for their livelihood and survival and also have a special cultural and spiritual attachment to it. They are constantly on the move within the region in search of pastures and water for their big herds. They do, however, engage in small-scale crop farming, an activity done mainly by women who remain behind when the men go out in search of water and pasture for the cattle. They live a communal life, land is communally owned and several tasks are carried out on a communal basis. The social characteristics are going to be described according to the original three old districts that comprised of Moroto, Kotido and Nakapiripirt. The remaining four have just been curved out of the above mother districts as indicated; Napak was curved out of Moroto, Abim and Kaabong curved out of Kotido and Amudat out of Nakapiripirit district.

4.1.1 Population

The population of the seven studied districts was estimated at 1,147,800 in 2010 and 1,218,900 in 2011 (UBOS projection). The population growth rate for Uganda is 3.576% for 2011. According to the FAO, the population growth rate for Karamoja is higher, from 3.8% to 4.2% even more. Generally, the population growth rate for Karamoja is estimated at almost 4% (UNOCHA, 2010). This is well illustrated
in the table 4 below which shows gender aggregated population of each district of the project area by sub-county.

**Table 4: Population of Karamoja districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HH Population</td>
<td>HH Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abim</td>
<td>11,952</td>
<td>25,600</td>
<td>29,600</td>
<td>12,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abim</td>
<td>3,391</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>3,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alerek</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>1,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotukei</td>
<td>2,961</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>3,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morulem</td>
<td>2,111</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>2,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyakwae</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56,500</td>
<td>101,100</td>
<td>18,492</td>
<td>60,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amudat</td>
<td>7,602</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>47,700</td>
<td>8,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loroo</td>
<td>4,032</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>4,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaabong</td>
<td>17,699</td>
<td>36,300</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>17,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaabong T.C</td>
<td>5,167</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>5,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalapata</td>
<td>13,644</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td>14,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapeko</td>
<td>9,492</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>10,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karenga</td>
<td>8,870</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>25,300</td>
<td>9,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathile</td>
<td>9,884</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>29,300</td>
<td>10,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolelia</td>
<td>6,560</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>6,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyoro</td>
<td>6,948</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td>7,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidok</td>
<td>6,223</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>6,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaabong Subcounty</td>
<td>16,535</td>
<td>31,700</td>
<td>48,200</td>
<td>17,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotido</td>
<td>204,600</td>
<td>40,686</td>
<td>245,286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kacherei</td>
<td>4,864</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>5,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotido</td>
<td>23,300</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>65,300</td>
<td>7,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotido T.C</td>
<td>4,051</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>4,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakapelimoru</td>
<td>4,341</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>4,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panyangara</td>
<td>11,791</td>
<td>29,400</td>
<td>41,300</td>
<td>12,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rengen</td>
<td>5,693</td>
<td>16,100</td>
<td>21,800</td>
<td>6,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroto</td>
<td>38,084</td>
<td>108,900</td>
<td>147,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katikekile</td>
<td>5,635</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>5,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>2010 HH Population</td>
<td>2011 HH Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadunget</td>
<td>7,760</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>8,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupa</td>
<td>8,128</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>37,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Division</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Division</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakapiripirit</td>
<td>26,875</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>72,800</td>
<td>143,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakomongole</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>14,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moruita</td>
<td>2,592</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>15,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakapiripirit T.c.</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namalu</td>
<td>9,287</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>49,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolachat</td>
<td>3,997</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>20,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorengedwat</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>9,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabilatuk</td>
<td>5,852</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>30,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napak</td>
<td>33,502</td>
<td>87,300</td>
<td>92,200</td>
<td>176,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iriiri</td>
<td>7,017</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>37,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokopo</td>
<td>4,163</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>24,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loiwe</td>
<td>4,013</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>22,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotome</td>
<td>7,999</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>36,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matany</td>
<td>6,119</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngoleriet</td>
<td>4,191</td>
<td>11,300</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>23,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Projected Households Population in the New Districts_ UBOS (2010-2011)

4.1.2 Ethnicity in Karamoja Region

Karamoja region is considered as extremely rich in terms of culture and beliefs. The region has two main ethnic groups: the Karamojong and the Jie in Kitodo. Other smaller groups include the Pokot (Amudat in Eastern Karamoja); Labwor (Abim in Western Karamoja); Ik and Dodoth (Kaabong); and Tepeth and Matheniko (Moroto), Pain and Upe in Nakapiripirit. Some groups are clearly separated testimony of a possible past Diaspora. All these groups are covered by the general Karamojong term. For this project the Karamojong are considered as vulnerable and marginalized given their unsuccessfully struggled for recognition and incorporation into mainstream Ugandan society. Furthermore the presence of the IK tribe in the project area triggers the World Bank policy OP 4-10 on the Indigenous peoples.
4.1.3 Indigenous Peoples in Project operational Areas (The IK Community)
The IK community, a small minority ethnic group in the Morungole highlands in Kamion Sub-county, also known Gatherers/Hunters The Ik people of Kaabong Mountains have a projected population of 15,000 people, about 3.8% of Kaabong population. They occupy the entire Kamion sub county and do not keep any livestock except a few poultry. They are a minority group recognised by the constitution of Uganda. Originally, they used to survive on gathering, hunting and collecting honey in the forests of Kaabong Mountains. It was therefore sometimes difficult to find adults in the community during the day as they were engrossed in gathering and hunting in the forests. Today, they now supplement gathering in the forests with a little farming on a very small scale (< 0.5 acre) where the major crops grown are maize, millet, sorghum, simsim and beans.

The influence of NGOs has introduced the growing of cabbages, onions, tomatoes and Irish potatoes in the Ik community, given their richer and more fertile soils in the mountains. They store their food harvests in granaries hidden in forests far from their homesteads for security purposes. Their major economic activity is trading in honey which they sell to their neighbours in Uganda and Kenya for income to buy food stuffs and tools for hunting/gathering and marriage. Honey is also an important commodity used as bride price in marriages which currently includes calabashes, hoes, spears, pangas and axes. Honey is measured in gourds and thus parents of the girl will ask for several gourds of honey. They have also been reported to trade illegally with Kenyan traders Marijuana, which they grow in the forests. They also cut grass used for thatching houses which they sell to their Kenyan neighbours in exchange for food or cash. They were also reported to be trading in grass (for thatching houses which is in high demand there) with a neighbouring small town in Kenya called Nabutosi in exchange for food or cash.

The Ik are reported to be living under threat from their ‘unfriendly’ neighbours whom they referred to as “our enemies”. They say that they live in what can be called a ‘cross fire’ zone whereby when their ‘enemies’, that is, the Turkana from Kenya to their north; Pokot in their east; the Dodoth in their south and; the Jie in the West carry out cattle raids, they suffer the consequences as the raiders pass through their community taking whatever little they possess. Consequently, an Ik will not accept bride price in form of cattle due to the danger attached to cows/wealth. Even if cows are given to them for free, they will not keep them because of the fear that the raiders would come and attack them. They cannot therefore accumulate and own any wealth since they are not warriors who fight and protect their property.

4.1.4 Gender Status in Karamoja Region
The Karimojong is a largely patrilineal community with almost all authority traditionally vested on the man who is ‘naturally’ taken as the head of the household. The man controls household productive resources and ‘owns’ his wife/wives once dowry has been paid. The girl child in Karamoja sub-region is disadvantaged right from birth as preference for boy-children is prevalent in the community. In unfortunate situations, a woman may even be forced out of the family if the husband died as his brothers come to inherit the property. According to the 2002 population census, women accounted for 52.45% of the district’s total population. In spite of more females in the district, school enrolment for girls is only at 66%. The literacy rate of women in the district is just 7% and as such women in Karamoja are limited in decision making processes regarding development and resource ownership in the district. This is well illustrated by the gender composition of the district workforce of 16% with no woman at the senior level. Similarly decision making in the traditional setting is the responsibility of the council of elders which is
composed of only men. The unfavorable gender circumstances in which women find themselves are mainly perpetuated by cultural restrictions, marginalization in decision making, and ignorance due to limited education.

The division of labour is such that women are charged with more non-monetized activities such as collecting firewood, child up-bringing and looking after the family, fetching water, tilling the land, and with the responsibility of food availability in the home leaving almost no time to pursue anything that may be of interest to her as an individual. Therefore almost all domestic chores are a responsibility of women and girls in the household. In the past, women were also responsible for constructing houses and fencing homes, Manyatas but now men have come in to help, as a result of sensitization and learning from other cultures. On the other hand, the men are the heads of households and own almost all factors of production and take nearly all important decisions in the households. Unlike the women in Karamoja, men have a lot of leisure time to socialize and pursue personal interests. The domain of Karamojong men generally rotates around the kraal raising their herds, building kraals but also opening up land for cultivation using the Ox-plough. In the past, men used to keep themselves busy entirely in the kraals but the trend is now changing. Men are now helping women with digging especially those who do not have Ox-ploughs. However, planting and weeding is left to the women and men join the women later on when it comes to harvesting.

Most important decisions are made for and on behalf of the women including reproductive decisions. It is important to note that society places a high premium on children but the woman has no say over their number or spacing, and would most likely be misunderstood if she suggested contraception. As a result the region has one of the highest fertility rates (4%) in the country. In an effort to address the gender issues, the districts have intervened mainly through Functional Adult Literacy (FAL) campaigns where about 90% of learners are women. The male youth usually go to the kraals and look after cattle while the female youth stay at home to help their mothers with domestic chores and small petty business like brewing to earn some income. However both male and female youth help in the gardens.

4.1.5 Land Use and Settlement
Karamoja region which is semi-arid savannah covered with seasonal grasses, thorny plants and occasional small trees and mountains with estimated 80% of its population living below poverty line. A majority of the population is leading a pastoral or agro-pastoral lifestyle, relying on livestock as the main source of subsistence. People of this region grow sorghum, millet, cowpeas, and groundnuts especially during years of adequate rainfall. They supplement their food supply by gathering wild fruits and vegetable and through hunting. However, most of people have adapted to this harsh environment by raising livestock (cattle, goats, sheep etc) with crop production taking more subsidiary role. Settlements are nucleated in manyatas which is an aggregation of huts each separated on household basis in an enclosure (Figure 7).

4.1.6 Livelihoods in Karamoja
Policymakers classify Karamoja into three distinct livelihood zones: pastoral, agro-pastoral, and agricultural. More specifically, Karamoja’s agro-pastoral and pastoral livelihood zones include the Karamoja Livestock, Sorghum and Bulrush Millet zone; the Central and Southern Karamoja Pastoral zone and the Northeast Karamoja Pastoral zone. Agriculture-based livelihood zones include the Eastern

\[2\text{Manyatas are Karimojong homesteads}\]
Lowland Maize, Beans and Rice zone; the South Kitgum-Pader-West Karamoja Simsim, Groundnut, Sorghum and Livestock zone; and the Northeast Sorghum, Simsim, Maize and Livestock zone.

The majority of Karamojong pursue a blended, dual subsistence strategy, meaning they combine livestock management and opportunistic cultivation (Gray et al., 2002), along with a diversity of activities including foraging, casual labour and seasonal migration.

4.1.7 Livelihoods and poverty in Karamoja

In this semi-arid and patriarchal society, the majority of the population subsists through agro-pastoral and pastoral livelihoods. The region suffers from cyclic drought which occurs every two to three years. The increase in poverty and vulnerability in recent decades is attributable to cattle raiding and the accompanying insecurity, proliferation of small arms and light weapons through the porous borders with Sudan and Kenya, lack of essential infrastructure, and climatic changes resulting in droughts and famine.

Dependence on natural resources for food and income is another common source of livelihood identified by the communities. Wild fruits are important resources for human consumption and nutrition – both from the fruits flesh and from seed oils – and for their role in rituals. Other wild foods such as honey and ants are also highly valued. Households and individuals are intensifying certain strategies, such as natural resource exploitation gathering of wild foods to supplement diets and in the sale of firewood, charcoal, and building poles for cash or food. Foraging is mainly done by women and girls to augment family resources. They collect wild vegetables and fruits (ebisinai, edwol, esoboli at, akeo, ebabui plus fruits like ngimongo, ngakalio, ngiru, ngacok, adilat) especially in times of poor harvests and loss of animal assets through raids. This activity is equally dangerous for the women involved. They also supplement their food supply through hunting which is done mainly by the youth.

Traditionally, Karamojong social and economic life is structured around the maintenance of livestock. Cattle are households’ most important assets, followed by sheep, goats and poultry. In Abim sub-county, some communities also raise camels, although these are uncommon elsewhere in the region. These animals are a critical source of food, but are also maintained as a safety net, a means of social exchange and a form of investment (Stites, 2010). For many traditional pastoral communities, raising livestock allows pastoral communities to take advantage of the land’s low primary productivity in an efficient manner. Milk is the most utilized animal protein by all age groups. The consumption of meat is relatively uncommon, except for ceremonial purposes or after an animal has died from natural causes. When necessary to supplement human diets, the livestock are bled.

Today, compared with other pastoralist groups in East Africa, the Karamojong engage in greater levels of cultivation and have taken on a more agro-pastoral livelihood (Gray et al., 2002). The degree to which households depend on own production of agricultural goods varies based on environmental conditions, the quantity and quality of livestock possessed and proximity to markets, among other factors. Some Karamojong today also engage in different forms of casual labour in urban and peri-urban areas. Young people seek these opportunities more than other age groups, and types of work normally differ by gender. Young men tend to serve as casual labourers, for instance transporting water or making bricks. Women usually take on more domestic tasks, such as washing clothes, cleaning houses, cooking or fetching water (Nalule, 2010; Stites et al., 2007a). The revenue generated from the sorts of activities listed above allows
individuals and households to acquire—through barter or purchase—supplemental foodstuffs, such as 
maize, sugar and oil, in an otherwise limited diet (Dyson-Hudson, 1989).

Figure 2 presents delineation between these different agricultural and pastoralists predominance zones 
within the whole of Karamoja (including Nakapiripirit and Amudat districts). The majority of the 
population in the region follows a pastoral or agro-pastoral lifestyle, relying on livestock as the main 
source of subsistence. People grow mainly sorghum, millet, cowpeas and groundnuts. They supplement 
their food supply by gathering wild fruits, vegetables, and through hunting.
Figure 2: Livelihood Zones repartition within Karamoja Sub-Region (Source: UNOCHA, 2010)
4.1.8 Poverty and Income Levels amongst the Karamojong

The UBOS Population projection of 2008 gave a total population of 1,017,400 for the region with an estimated 50% being female. It further provided that, an estimated 85% of the total population lives below the poverty line relative to the national average of 31% (UPPAP, 2005). Human welfare, living conditions and quality of life of the people in Karamoja have declined considerably due to a combination of factors such as harsh climate, insecurity, marginalization, illiteracy, poor region health, poor infrastructure amongst others. The Districts comprising Karamoja region have lowest Human Development Indices (HDI) of 0.183 as compared to the national average of 0.4491. The regions Human Poverty Indices (HPI) with Moroto districts is in the range of 63.5% as compared to the national average of 37.5%. In the entire region is reported to have the worst indicators for health nutrition, education, food security, civil security and poverty (Mubiru, 2010; Nalule, 2010, UBOS 2008 and UNDP, 2007).

4.1.9 Literacy Levels

Education is an important aspect for society because it sets a platform for skills transfer, knowledge sharing and enables individuals to ascend fast the social ladder. Skills and Knowledge (professional) are very important aspects that can be harnessed to deliver services that are required by the district to deliver its mandate. From the District Development Plans of the study area, it has been noted that;

- **Abim** district has got 40 primary schools, 4 secondary schools and 2 tertiary institutions with a total enrolment of 21,603 pupils in primary and 3,200 students in secondary schools. The dropout rates are still high, especially among the girls, due to negative cultural belief about girl child education. Some parents engage girl children in economic activities to raise income to support the boys’ education. The district has 64 latrine blocks each comprising 5 stances and the pupil: stance ratio is 60:1.

- **Kaabong** district has a total of 68 primary schools with an enrolment of 41,000 pupils. The district has 92 latrine blocks at the 68 primary schools with a pupil to stance ratio of 65:1. Poor primary school attendance is partly attributed to heavy rains, shortage of food and parents engaging children in cultivation.

- **Kotido** district has 26 primary schools with a total enrolment of 1,654 pupils. The primary school completion rate is low (10%). Among the 26 schools, there are 305 latrine stances and 20 water sources within 1km at the school site.

- **Moroto** and **Napak** districts have a total of 50 primary schools with an enrolment of 17,300 pupils. The primary school enrolment in Moroto and Napak districts is 28%. The primary school completion rate is 22%. The latrines are inadequate. There are 393 stances and the pupil to stance ratio is 44:1.

<p>| Table 5: Assorted primary Education Accessibility Indicator by District, 2009 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Abim</th>
<th>Kaabong</th>
<th>Kotido</th>
<th>Moroto/Napak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school pupil: teacher ratio</td>
<td>49:1</td>
<td>58:1</td>
<td>93:1</td>
<td>112:1</td>
<td>61:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school - Pupil: classroom ratio</td>
<td>68:1</td>
<td>82:1</td>
<td>132:1</td>
<td>88:1</td>
<td>54:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross primary school enrollment ratio</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>231.4</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Abim</td>
<td>Kaabong</td>
<td>Kotido</td>
<td>Moroto/Napak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net primary school enrolment</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: UBOS Statistical Abstract 2011*

### 4.1.10 Safe Water Coverage

The Ministry of Water and Environment Water Atlas 2010 indicates that Abim District has got a total of 193 water sources, and the Operational status of these water sources is 76%. Kotido district has got 283 water sources and the operational status is 82%. Moroto and Napak Districts have got 492 water sources and the operational status is 76%, Kaabong district has got 263 water sources and the operational status of water sources is 84%. This picture seems to apply throughout the Karamoja region with respect to safe water coverage.

![Existing Valley Dam at Kapakol in Rupa Sub county, Moroto District. The water source is reported for both for animal and domestic usage by the communities (Photo: Nelson Omagor, 2013).](image)

### 4.1.11 Protection and Conservation of Water Resources

Protection of the different water sources is a responsibility of the traditional water management structures, village water user committees, clan leaders, elders and the community at large. The traditional mechanisms for protecting water sources include fencing, planting trees around water sources, prohibiting of directly watering livestock from sources gazetted for human consumption and forbidding children from playing in water sources. In most Karamojong communities, a child found playing in water is publically
canned by the Karachunas/male youth. Water sources especially ponds for human consumption are also protected from being accessed by wild animals including black hyenas.

Customary measures for conserving water sources vary across ethnic groups and seasonality. Tree planting and campaigns against cutting trees and clearing vegetation as conservation measures for is reportedly common among the Bokora, Matheniko, Tepeth and Dodoth. However, during dry season, charcoal burning is common because it is regarded as a coping mechanism. Conservation of water sources among the different groups is also regarded as preventive measure against silting and contamination. Water sources for domestic consumption are protected by a group of traditional leaders and women purposely to avoid contamination by animals, children and non-community members. To ensure water quality especially for human consumption, water sources are cleaned and cleared by women in the morning.

4.1.12 Latrines Coverage
The household latrine coverage and the functionality of latrines at schools and health centres are as indicated in table 6 below.

Table 6: Household Latrine Coverage and the Functionality of Latrines at Schools and Health Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Household latrine coverage</th>
<th>Pupil to stance ratio</th>
<th>Availability of functional latrine Health Centres –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abim</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>1:51</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaabong</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1:60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotido</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>1:56</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroto</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1:46</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napak</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1:95</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: District Progress report September 2011)

The 2010 national latrine coverage is 69% (UBOS Statistical abstract 2011). According to the UBOS National Household Survey 2009/10, the household latrine coverage for northern Uganda indicates that 72.9% have pit latrines, 1.9% has ventilated improved pit latrines, 0.3% has flash toilets and 24.9% have no latrines.

4.1.13 Rangeland Management Practices
Due to increasing difficulties caused by sole dependence on livestock, cultivation by the pastoralist has increased and the Karamojong are largely semi-nomadic or practice transhumance pastoralism, supplemented with some sedentary agricultural mono-cropping especially in southern and western parts of the Karamoja region that border other districts. Agro-pastoralism and pastoralism systems are highly heterogeneous, but they have one outstanding commonality: mobility of livestock as an adaptive tool to the ecological conditions they reside in. In the drier belts as well as in mountain areas livestock mobility is the foundation of the pastoral system because it enables livestock to graze the diffuse and scattered vegetation of the regions’ rangelands, or to take refuge to more favourable sites during droughts.
4.1.14 Transhumance / Seasonal migrations
The rationale for traditional migrations was search of clean water and fresh pasture. Security also played a substantial part. One of the traditional mechanisms for spreading risks of livestock loss through disease or raiding was the distribution of livestock in different kraal units to act, as insurance for starting a new herd should calamity strike. The transhumance system in Karamoja involves seasonal livestock migrations between the wet and the dry season following the topographical setting and driven by search for water and fresh pasture. The system implies seasonal pasture management mechanisms whereby mountain grazing lands are allocated to the dry season while the plains are grazed during the wet season. Migrations in search of water and pasture by pastoralists also involve continuous and random movement of herds following locations with palatable species and rainfall patterns. For agro-pastoralists migrations to counteract pasture shortages are by seasonally alternating grazing on the crop residues/stalks after harvesting with grazing on distant pasture resources during the growing season. Generally, migrations are also meant for security and are a traditional mechanism for spreading risks of livestock loss through disease or raiding. In a study done by SALDO (2009), the main lesson from the two systems (traditional and protected kraal) practice is that both water and pasture must be sufficient to determine the distance and level of migration. In addition disease and security also contribute to movement.

4.1.15 Roles and Responsibilities in Rangeland Management and Decision Making
There are clear differentiation of rangeland management and decision making roles amongst the Karamojong communities which are according to gender and age groups. Women keep homesteads (Manyattas) and tend to crops and some livestock especially the calving cows and their calves. On the other hand the young men (Karacuna) are responsible for livestock movements and protection. Decision making matters, including rangeland management, are through an assembly of Elders (Akriketi).

Figure 4: “Akriketi” in a meeting / livestock productivity ritual
Customary decisions have sustained Karamojong livelihoods in the face of the challenging environment but changes are evident by post conflict security measures and Local Government structures which are influencing the grazing systems and livelihoods. With the advent of the protected kraals, the military took over decision making on some matters such as splitting herds, moving during dry season migration, daily grazing locations and duration, access to water points, and the sale of animals. Local systems for reducing vulnerability to drought and disease - such as splitting herds, moving frequently, and selling animals before they became too weak - may, therefore, become difficult to implement (UNOCHA, 2010).

4.1.16 Water Use and Access
Use and access to the different water sources is governed by both customary rules and practices and statutory provisions. Although, traditionally set rules are non-documented, they are still existent in the minds and hearts of the Karamojong and are effective in regulating water use and management. However, customary rules on use and access vary with seasonality and across clans and ethnic communities. During dry season i.e. September to March, some water sources especially water ponds are used only for human and domestic consumption thereby rendering livestock watering customary forbidden and sanctioned. Among the penalties for watering livestock in water ponds for human consumption during dry season include paying monetary fines and performing purification rituals. Purification rituals include making sacrifices to please the water spirits. Secondly, during the dry season, animals are watered in shifts on alternate days, locally known as Akigel among the Bokora and Dodoth”. Watering in shifts is intended to give all herders opportunity to water their livestock and be able to cope during dry spells while promoting social harmony and integration.

4.2 TESO REGION

4.2.1 Overview of the Teso Region
Teso sub region is located in Eastern Uganda, consisting of districts; Amuria, Bukeea, Katakwi Kumi, Soroti, Ngora, Serere, Pallisa and Kaberamaido as well as in the districts of Tororo and Busia in Uganda. They number about 3.2 million (9.6% of Uganda's population). Until 1959, they were the second largest ethnic group in Uganda. As of 2002 they were the fifth largest. The Teso sub region is known for subsistence agriculture, fishing on Lake Kyoga and animal husbandry which are the main economic activities. Over 63% of the population in the districts engages in livestock production as main economic activity. The remaining population engages in crop farming of cassava, millet, sorghum, groundnuts and sweet potatoes, cotton, beans and oranges. However, this social assessment is targeting only the four districts of Amuria, Katakwi, Kumi and Bukeea. The RPLRP project will only operate in the districts of Amuria, Bukeea, Kumi and Katakwi because they have cross-border activities and trans-boundary stock routes linking pastoral communities.

4.2.2 Amuria District
Amuria District Local Government is now making six years since it was created in July 2005 through a resolution of Parliament. It is made up of two counties namely: Kapelebyong and Amuria. The district was curved out of Katakwi district which was also at one time part of Soroti district. Amuria District is located in north-eastern Uganda and it is bordered by Katakwi in the East, Soroti in the South,
Kaberamaido in the West and Moroto and Lira in the North. The district total area is estimated at 2,613 square kilometres.

4.2.2.1 Population size and composition
From the 2002 Population and Housing census report, the two counties of Amuria district had a population of 180,022 people. By mid 2010 the population of the district was projected to be 344,200 people (Source UBOS Sub national projections report 2008-2012) and increased to 374,000 in 2011 as shown in the Table 7 below.

Table 7: Population of Amuria District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HH Population</td>
<td>HH Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male  Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amuria</td>
<td>73,745</td>
<td>160,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abarilela</td>
<td>7,684</td>
<td>15,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asamuk</td>
<td>8,797</td>
<td>21,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuju</td>
<td>8,185</td>
<td>20,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orungo</td>
<td>7,342</td>
<td>16,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wera</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>13,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morungatuny</td>
<td>8,669</td>
<td>18,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acowa</td>
<td>14,795</td>
<td>28,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapelebyong</td>
<td>4,641</td>
<td>9,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obalanga</td>
<td>8,025</td>
<td>16,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Projected Households Population in the New Districts_ UBOS (2010-2011)

4.2.2.2 Gender Dimension
Overall the level of gender mainstreaming in development programmes is low despite the efforts made previously. Therefore, the participation of women in developmental process is low. The communities in the district are largely patriarchal in nature. In Amuria like other parts of Uganda, the place of women and men in terms of their roles in the community can be largely be categorized into two; reproduction and production respectively. It is a practice that in more than 90% of the households and communities in the district, men hold sway in matters relating to control of resources and access to them. These resources mainly include productive assets like land, capital and finances. The males are by tradition the heads of households under the traditional clan systems.
4.2.2.3 Education
In the area of education, there are currently 120 primary schools in Amuria District though there isn’t any specifically for girls. Enrolment of both boys and girls in primary education has since improved following introduction of Universal Primary Education (UPE) for all school going children. Enrolment by sex in most schools is almost balanced, with boys constituting 51% and girls 49%. In general terms the current enrolment is 57,538 pupils with 29,829 boys and 27,709 girls. A number of factors such as the environment at school and at home explain the scenario. As girls reach adolescence they have special needs that accompany their adolescence and schools endeavor to pay attention to such needs, which has provided an enabling environment for girl child education in the district.

The provision of such facilities in schools to cater for needs of girls has improved with gender segregated toilet facilities and specialized teachers to address specific needs of girls and boys. Each of the schools has a senior woman teacher and a senior man teacher designated to attend to the special needs of girls and boys. In addition, the district has put in place the Gender Based Violence (GBV) working group that coordinates gender based violence issues in the district. For example, they have established a referral system where cases of the violation of the right of a girl child to education are handled. In terms of persons concerned with delivering school education in the district there are about 1,050 teachers in schools with about 725 males and approximately 325 females. There is one female primary teacher out of every 4 teachers in primary schools in the district.

4.2.2.4 Production
The dominant productive activity carried out in the district is farming which is practiced at a subsistence level. According to the Uganda Population and Housing Census 2002 report 68.31% of the labour force in the district is engaged in subsistence farming. The census report defines the labour force as ‘persons aged 10 years and above who are economically active (whose status is paid employee, self employed or unpaid family worker)’. According to the report 14,314 (47.1%) of the total labour force then was made up of women.

4.2.2.5 Health services
The health delivery system in the district comprises of the district health office, health sub district (HSD), the HC III and HC II units. The health care services are delivered by both government and private organizations and individuals. There are all together 18 health units in the district. Nine of these units are operated by the government and seven by private not for profit (PNFP).

4.2.2.6 HIV/AIDS Prevalence in Amuria District
HIV/AIDS has been recognized as one of the serious health problem countrywide and Amuria district is no exception to this. The incidence of prevalence in the district is estimated to be 6.4 % but accurate figures need to be worked out after thorough research. All the health units in the district are able to provide treatment of common illnesses and some of those other opportunistic infections that affect people infected with HIV. Other minimal treatment using antiretroviral drugs is available for a few at Amuria HC V where there is a medical officer who takes care of the programme.
4.2.2.7 Disease burden
Available Health Management Information (HMIS) records show that the major cause of sickness in the district is malaria constituting about 54% of the cases of the sick followed by acute respiratory infection (without pneumonia) which is responsible for up to 15% of the sick. The other common illnesses with the percentage of the sickness they are responsible are diarrhoea (non-bloody) 8%, intestinal worms 6%, trauma (general) 5%, skin infections 3%, eye infections 3%, uterine tract infection (UTI) 3%, ear infections 1% and diarrhoea (bloody) 1%. Much of other illnesses are related to the hygiene and sanitation conditions of the community. Diarrhoeal infections are common within the camps for IDPs where sanitation conditions are so poor.

4.2.2.8 Safe Water Supply in Amuria District
In general terms, Amuria district has no large surface water bodies that can be exploited for water supplies however the sub counties of Asamuk, Kuju Orungo and Morungatuny have swamps where the possibility of getting springs and perennial open wells that can be protected as shallow and deep. The sub counties of Asamuk, parts of Kuju, Wera, Orungo and Morungatuny have also potential for shallow wells that can be reliable, whilst Acowa, Kapelebyong and parts of Obalanga have seasonal sub surface water potential. The most difficult sub counties as regards having ground water potential are Orungo and Acowa. This is the sole reason why our predominant safe water sources are boreholes and shallow well with a few springs (protected).

4.2.2.9 Sanitation
There is no up to date information on the sanitation status in the district, however looking at the situation in general and making reference to some of the little available data, (which however is limited to some particular areas/ sub counties) collected by the NGOs in the sector, we can say that the sanitation coverage of Amuria still lies below 40%.

4.2.2.10 Poverty Status Poverty in Amuria
The economy of Amuria district is predominantly based on agriculture and livestock keeping. It is largely subsistence based agriculture with hardly any form of organized commercial farm production. Over 90% of the district population is engaged in agricultural cultivation and livestock keeping. The livelihoods of the communities depend on these activities which provide them with food, income, employment and other social benefits. However, the extent to which they practice this has changed in recent years. Over the late 1980s and early 1990s, there was massive loss of livestock due to cattle rustling by armed Karimojong from the neighboring districts of Karamoja. When considered on regional terms, Amuria, which is part of the Eastern region, has its population living below the poverty line in the range of 46%.

4.2.2.11 Marketing of Agricultural Produce
These are places where trade takes place on weekly basis and are scattered all over the district. These market places lack the required facilities including latrines and urinals. Trade takes place in makeshift structures made of grass and wattle. Rain and heat from the sun therefore affects both sellers and buyers. The types of business carried out in these places include sale of manufactured goods, agricultural outputs, eating houses, local brew, etc.
4.2.2.12 Animal Production

Accurate and up to date information on the census of livestock could not be availed because the department has not carried out a census however the recent census carried out by UBOS in 2009 will help in having amore close livestock populations as summarized in Table 8-10.

Table 8: Major Animals kept in Amuria District as of 2009 Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cross breed</th>
<th>Local (Estimate)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56,732</td>
<td>63,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43,454</td>
<td>63,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,611</td>
<td>27,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>5,251</td>
<td>11,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>150,732</td>
<td>150,732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: DDP)

Table 9: Animal Products 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Production level</th>
<th>Value (ushs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hides (kg)</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skins (kg)</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>1,402,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk (litres)</td>
<td>300,245</td>
<td>150,125,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs (number)</td>
<td>690,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat – cattle (kg)</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>65,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat – goat (kg)</td>
<td>20,320</td>
<td>40,640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutton (kg)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork (kg)</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>274,728,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Animal Marketing 2009 Records:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Value (ushs)</th>
<th>Main market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>6,240</td>
<td>1,248,000,000</td>
<td>Mbale, Soroti, Tororo and Palisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats and sheep</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>93,600,000</td>
<td>Mbale, Soroti, Tororo and Palisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>15,608,200</td>
<td>Soroti and Katakwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>40,820</td>
<td>104,680,000</td>
<td>Mbale, Soroti and Tororo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Mal-functional</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle dips</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth dams</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley tanks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary centres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding ground</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7: Veterinary Infrastructure**

4.2.3 **Bukedea District**

Bukedea district is estimated to have a population of 178,500 people of which; 86,100 are males and 92,400 are females which constitutes 48.2% for males and 51.8% for females. Basing on the 2002 Population and Housing census Bukedea District had 122,233 people i.e. 25,767 households, of which males were 58,598, while females were 63,835 with a growth rate of 3.2%. The Sub counties of Kachumbala, Kidongole and Bukedea are reportedly experiencing high population growth rate and this exerts economic and social pressure on the productive proportion of the population in terms meeting needs of a large young population. However, the population has since grown as shown in the Table 12.

**Table 8: Population of Bukedea**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HH</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukedea</td>
<td>35,843</td>
<td>82,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukedea</td>
<td>7,123</td>
<td>16,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachumbala</td>
<td>11,616</td>
<td>24,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidongole</td>
<td>4,713</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolir</td>
<td>4,972</td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malera</td>
<td>7,418</td>
<td>17,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Projected Households Population in the New Districts_ UBOS (2010-2011)*
4.2.3.1 Standard of Living
According to Uganda Bureau of Statistical Abstract 2009/10, the district poverty levels are reportedly at 54%, which is higher than the national average of 31%. Poverty is attributed to the large family size, floods, drought, insurgency, cattle raids, alcoholism, population explosion and lack of knowledge, inadequate food security, lack of food storage facilities plus poor distribution and marketing system. It is expected that, the marketing of agricultural products will likely improve when the railway line is rehabilitated and gets operational. Bukeeda district has reportedly HIV/AIDS prevalence rate of 4.3% which is slightly lower than the National HIV/AIDS prevalence rate of 6.7%.

4.2.3.2 Economic Activity
Over 82% of the households are engaged in agriculture, though mainly practicing subsistence farming. There is limited application of modern techniques of production which leaves farmers operating below their potential and depending solely on climatic conditions that determine their agricultural productivity. Besides crop farming, there is animal rearing and mainly local zebu cattle, goats, sheep, pigs and poultry are kept at local levels. Bukeeda has a potential in agro-based processing since the raw materials are all available. Therefore, possible re-opening of the railway line will link the district to the wider markets for their agricultural products.

4.2.3.3 Housing
Most rural houses in Bukeeda are of grass thatched roofs, with mud and wattle walls and rammed earth floors. Trading centres of Bukeeda, Kachumbala, Malera, Kolir and Kidongole are experiencing rapid improvement in physical structural development with more permanent and semi-permanent structures being constructed. Most houses are of grass thatched roofs with mud and wattle and rammed earth floors. In Kumi town and other upcoming urban centres the state of houses is steadily improving with more permanent and semi-permanent houses being built.

4.2.3.4 Energy Sources
The population in the three districts solely relies on wood fuel for cooking. The trends of energy use indicate that a large portion of the population - 57% uses firewood while 28% use charcoal and about 15% resort to dry plant stems and other herbaceous vegetation. While 0.02% of households use electricity or gas, and 0.07% use other services. Paraffin is main source of lighting used by 55.26% of households, 0.16% use electricity/gas, firewood 22.32% and 0.07% of households use other sources for lighting.

4.2.3.5 Gender Dimension in Bukeeda
Gender equality is the ultimate goal as a result of absence of discrimination on the basis of a person’s sex in opportunities and allocation of resources or in access to services. Empowerment is increased opportunity for both men and women to control their life e.g. power to make decisions.

4.2.3.6 HIV/AIDS Prevalence
HIV/AIDS prevalence rates stands at 4.2%, slightly lower than the national average of 6.2% according to the DDP report.. The population most at risk groups of HIV/AIDS include; married couples and young people in the age bracket of 15- 38years of age. The other category of people includes those who abuse drugs and alcohol.
4.2.4 Katakwi District

Katakwi District regained its district status in 1997 through an Act of Parliament. Its earlier status as North Teso District was cancelled in the 1970s. The District was curved out of Soroti District in 1997 and in July 2005 Amuria district was curved out of Katakwi district. Katakwi District is located in the North Eastern region of Uganda, lying between longitudes 33° 48' E - 34° 18' E and latitudes 1° 38' N – 2° 20' N. It shares borders with the districts of Moroto in the North, Nakapiripirit in the East, Amuria in the West & North-west, Soroti in the Southwest and Kumi in the South. The District Headquarters is situated at Katakwi Town Council, a road distance of about 380 km from Kampala, the National capital by the most direct route.

4.2.4.1 Socio- Economic Background and Population Livelihoods

The people of Katakwi District are partially traditionally pastoralists. They earn their livelihood through livestock rearing and crop production at subsistence level. This was so until 1986 when cattle rustling by the Karimojong intensified. In 1987 a civil strife broke out in the Teso region and this aggravated the situation. During this period a lot of lives and property were lost and many families got disintegrated. Most of the productive labour force was either destroyed or displaced. Animal traction, which used to be a major means of opening land for agricultural production became a thing of the past. The whole Teso region became impoverished as the economic base was completely depleted.

With the gradual return of peace in the early 1990’s the population began to resettle and engage in small scale production activities. Through individual and some NGO efforts, the economic recovery had begun to take shape with livestock and crop production levels rising. However, if the persistent cattle rustling continue, it will affect the economic recovery. If total peace and security is restored, there is no doubt that Katakwi district can attain sustainable levels of development. On average about 64% of the population of Katakwi falls below the poverty line (i.e. the population is spending less than US $ 1 per person per day on basic human requirements such as health, food, shelter).

4.2.4.2 Population Size and Distribution

The district population of Katakwi for the year 2002 final census results is 118,928 out of which 57,401 (48.3%) are male and 61,527 (51.7%) are female. Of the total district population, 2.38% are urban while 97.62% are rural based. However, over the population has since grown as shown in Table 13 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HH Population</td>
<td>HH Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katakwi</td>
<td>35,318</td>
<td>79,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapujan</td>
<td>3,132</td>
<td>6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katakwi</td>
<td>6,867</td>
<td>17,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DistrictHH PopulationHH Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katakwi T.c</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magoro</td>
<td>3,677</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngariam</td>
<td>5,085</td>
<td>11,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toroma</td>
<td>2,938</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usuk</td>
<td>5,586</td>
<td>12,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongongoja</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omodoi</td>
<td>2,827</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Projected Households Population in the New Districts UBOS (2010-2011)

### 4.2.4.3 Education information
The district has a total of 160 primary schools with 157 Government aided, 2 private and 1 community school. For secondary schools, the district has over 14 schools, 8 are government, 3 private and 3 community and there 12 Secondary schools.

### 4.2.4.4 Health Sector
The district has Government dispensaries (II), health centers (III) at county, health centers (IV) at sub-district and no hospital at the moment. More so, it has also private/NGO dispensaries and private health service centers as summarized in Table 15.

#### Table 15: Health Infrastructure, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Healthy Facility</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Private/NGO</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Centre IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Centre III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug shops</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.4.5 HIV/AIDS in Katakwi District
Insecurity and war in the region greatly affected food production, education, health and led to increased HIV/AIDS prevalence with incidence rates that stand at 17% compared to the national average of 6.1%. As a result, poverty levels in Katakwi have remained high with over 64% of the population living below the poverty line against the national average of 32%.

4.2.4.6 Energy Sector
Katakwi District has no Electricity supply. The District is earmarked to benefit from Uganda Electricity Distribution proposed 33 kV feeder power line from Soroti to Moroto and Kotido. A dispatch sub-station for the line location is in Opuyo near Soroti town a distance of about 52 km to Katakwi District Headquarters. The demand for electricity supply in Katakwi town is increasingly rising by the day. The heavy capital outlay anticipated seems to be the major constraint on the work on the proposed power line. At the district headquarters small generators and solar systems are used to power the equipment.

4.2.5 Kumi District
Kumi District is located in Eastern Uganda. It borders Bukedea district in the east, Soroti and Ngora districts to the West, Katakwi and Nakapiripirit districts in the North and North East and Pallisa district in the South. The district headquarters is in Kumi Town Council, a distance of about 305 kms from Kampala.

4.2.5.1 Economic information
The major economic activity in the district is agriculture, mostly subsistence farming with emphasis on (i) food crops: finger millet, groundnuts, sweet potatoes, cassava, sorghum, rice, cow peas, soya beans, bananas, sunflower and onions, (ii) cash crops: cotton. Other activities include fishing in both Lake Kyoga and the satellite lakes in the district. There is an expanding class of artisans in the Kumi. These include arts and crafts, carpentry, joinery and building. The predominant ethnic groups in Kumi district are the Iteso and the predominant language spoken is Ateso.

4.2.5.2 Population
The 2002 national population census estimated the population of Kumi district to be approximately 165,400 of this, 56% is within the unproductive age bracket which strains social service delivery as well as natural resources. The annual population growth rate in the district is given as 4.3% and if this trend continues the population is expected to double in about 20 years. The total fertility rate of the district is 7.6, with literacy levels standing at 73.9% and 52.3% for men and women respectively. Ethnic grouping is constituted mainly by Iteso about 98% while the remaining 2% is shared among other groups. However, the population in the district has since grown as shown in the Table 16.
Table 16: Population Trends in Kumi District 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2010 HH Population</th>
<th>2011 HH Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumi</td>
<td>46,399</td>
<td>113,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atutur</td>
<td>5,852</td>
<td>14,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyum</td>
<td>8,287</td>
<td>19,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumi</td>
<td>5,930</td>
<td>15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumi T.c</td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukongoro</td>
<td>8,624</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyero</td>
<td>5,753</td>
<td>15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongino</td>
<td>8,994</td>
<td>19,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Projected Households Population in the New Districts_ UBOS (2010-2011)

4.2.5.3 Gender Aspects

As in most districts in Uganda, crop farming for consumption and sale is the predominant economic activity of both women and men in the communities. A part from farm-based income, women are also engaged in brewing (beer and spirits), except for a relatively small percentage who are successful traders or owners and managers of service enterprises, such as bars and restaurants. On the other hand, men are engaged in a broader range of income activities most of which are physically demanding activities, such as collection and sale of forest products especially charcoal burning, and higher income gender-prescribed manufacturing activities, such as brick making and carpentry which rely on both physical strength and skills acquired through training or passed down informally. Such trainings traditionally favor men more than women.

Farm labor is also a common form of employment though often practiced periodically according to opportunity and need and is one of the sources of cash and in-kind income for poor and medium-income households. Generally, enterprises or activities falling into the lowest income bracket are performed by both men and women.

4.2.5.4 Gender empowerment and opportunities in Kumi

In many respects, the circumstances for women in Kumi rotate their empowerment being hinged on farming based income generating activities. However, the importance placed on farm based labouring both by men and women implies less concentration on non-farm activities, particularly amongst women who are already the predominant force in own-farm production. Brewing is the major female source of
off-farm income, with the benefit being that the working capital for brewing is only tied up for a short period of time (during the short brewing cycle), and are thus relatively easily available when cash is required for other purposes.

For example, if a household member falls ill, the profits from a small batch of beer can be used to buy medicine, and/or the working capital used for investment in health care or another needed service/commodity (Smith, 2010). Aside from brewing, there is reportedly a relative small, although potentially influential (unaffiliated) group of women who are progressively engaging in more capital intensive and fairly profitable predominantly service-based enterprises such as restaurants, bars, transport amongst others. The women have seized such opportunities against culturally prescribed norms, and are reportedly working hard to effectively build up such businesses or small enterprises.

It is also reported that, in Kumi, sometimes the source of income for initiating farm- and non-farm based enterprises is from loans from micro finance institutions with a few groups getting assistance through gifts from well-wisher institutions and groups. It is noted that, a number of women groups have received some trainings on enterprise management although the issue of defaulting on payment for services by men from women enterprises, notably beer, is rampant.

4.2.5.5 Education and health services
Kumi district has 33 secondary schools (9 Government, 24 private), 1 technical institution, 3 teacher training colleges and 1 university. The majority (73 %) of the secondary schools are private. The district has a total of 27 health facilities three of which are hospitals (2 are PNFP), 13HC III, 11 health centre II (5 PNFPs).

4.2.6 Land Tenure in Teso Region
In Teso region, the most common mode of land ownership is customary system, which is almost the same as customary law in other parts of northern Uganda. Under customary tenure in Teso, the clan elders have the responsibility for administering land, but this includes the right to say who can sell land and to whom. This is because, they have the responsibility to protect the land for all the clan, and to make sure that everyone in the clan is given rights to land. The family head manages the land on behalf of the family as the steward of the land. His rights to manage the land go together with the responsibility to look after the rights of others to use the land, and to make sure that the next generation will also be able to enjoy the land. Other people in the family also have rights over the land. Security of tenure over land always comes with land allocation, on condition only that a household is able to use the land. The family head is responsible for ensuring security of tenure, with clan authorities as the overall guarantor.

The clan on its part has therefore the responsibility for overseeing the administration of all the land. This means making sure that there are heirs appointed at household levels to manage the land and to oversee and authorize any land sales. The clan also owns land which is communally used, such as for hunting and grazing. It is responsible for ensuring proper use of the land and that, there are no trespassers. A son becomes head of household after marriage and is allocated land to hold and to manage for the good of his family. He is the steward of that land. His wives, children and other family members also have rights to that land, but he is the overall ‘manager’.
4.3 Sebei Region

4.3.1 Kween District

Kween District is bordered by Nakapiripitit District to the north, Amudat the northeast, Bukwo the east, the Republic of Kenya to the south, Kapchorwa District to the west and Bulambuli the northwest. The town of Binyiny, where the district headquarters are located is approximately 69 km (43 mi), by road, northeast of Mbale, the nearest large town. Together with Kapchorwa District and Bukwa District, it forms the Sebei sub-region, formerly known as Sebei District. The District is divided into two distinct geographical areas – the upper and hilly part and the lower plains of Ngenge and Kiriki sub counties. The upper area is densely populated and is prone to landslides while the lower part is generally flat and prone to floods in the rainy season.

4.3.1.1 Mt. Elgon National Park

Mt Elgon National Park covers an area of 1,279 km² and is bisected by the border of Kenya and Uganda with the Ugandan part covering about 1,110 km² while the Kenyan part covers 169 km². Elgon’s slopes support a rich variety of vegetation ranging from montane forest to high open moorland studded with the giant lobelia and groundsel plants. The vegetation varies with altitude. The mountain slopes are covered with olive *Olea hochstetteri* and *Aninguera adolfi-friedericii* wet montane forest. At higher altitudes, this changes to olive and *Podocarpus gracilior* forest, and then a *Podocarpus* and bamboo *Arundinaria alpina* zone. Higher still is a *Hagenia abyssinica* zone and then moorland with heaths *Erica arborea* and *Philippia trimera*, tussock grasses such as *Agrostis gracilifolia* and *Festuca pilgeri*, herbs such as *Alchemilla*, *Helichrysum*, *Lobelia*, and the giant groundsel *Senecio barbatipes* and *Senecio elgonensis*.

Of the 400 species recorded for the Park the following are of particular note as they only occur in high altitude broad-leaf montane forest: *Ardisiandra wettsteinii*, *Carduus afromontanus*, *Echinops hoehnelii*, *Ranunculus keniensis* (previously thought endemic to Mount Kenya), and *Romulea keniensis*. A total of about 112 tree species are known to occur in Mt. Elgon National Park out of which four are known to be endemic to the Ugandan side. Furthermore, 14 tree species exist only on the Ugandan side of the Park and on other mountains of eastern and north-eastern Uganda. *It is important to note that, parts of the park occur in Kween county in Kapchorwa.*

4.3.1.2 Ethnicity

The native people of Kween district are believed to be majorly the Sabiny and Bukusu tribes. Uganda being a free country overtime other tribes have since settled in Kween and these include the Bagisu, Karamojong and, Banyankole however, on the upper belt of the district are found the Ndorobo who live in greater Benet Sub-county. The Ndorobo are said to have lived in the protected areas of Mt. Elgon. The natives of Kween districts do still practice Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) and this is considered as key distinctive characteristics of the Sabiny people. Great efforts have been initiated by Government to stop this practice as it endangers the lives of girls and a lot of success has been registered and education and sensitization against this practice is still ongoing.

4.3.1.3 The Benet/Ndorobo in Kween District

The Benet indigenous people, who are part of the larger tribe called the Sabiny, are a pastoralist forest dwelling community who traditionally resided in the grassland and moorland areas of Mt Elgon forest.
There are mainly two groups namely; the lowland Sabiny people and the forest-dwelling Ndorobo people. Ndorobo are the indigenous Benets, the first occupants of Mt. Elgon. The Ndorobo indigenous people have four social groupings namely; The Benet, the Piswa, the Kwoti, and the Yatui clans. The Benet community is a historical term which was used to describe the contested area of Mount Elgon where Ndorobo and settlers currently reside. The terms ‘Benet’ and ‘Benet community’ were revitalized to describe the people in that area (both settlers and Ndorobo) for the purposes of pursuing the legal strategy.

Although the 1983 resettlement scheme was meant to remove the Ndorobo Indigenous people from the Mt. Elgon Forest Reserve, it was found expedient to resettle the lowland Sabiny people, who had been rendered landless by the fatal cattle rustling raids of the Karamajong and the Kenyan Pokots, together with the Ndorobo indigenous people. During the 1983 resettlement exercise, the two groups were resettled together in the present day Benet Resettlement Area and thereby adopting the generic term Benet people. Their population is estimated at 20,000.

The Benet communities were allowed to remain in the moorlands of Mt. Elgon Forest Reserve without residence documentation on an understanding that this was their home. The assumption was that the Benet community would remain a small community, practicing pastoralism, hunting and fruit and herbs collecting for their livelihood. Later on their population and number of livestock grew significantly, thus interfering with forest regeneration. In addition to other activities they took up subsistence agriculture, growing Irish potatoes. In so doing, they damaged the fragile ecosystem within the moorland, bringing sizeable chunks of the montane forest under agriculture, thus encroaching. These activities became increasingly damaging and incompatible to the fragile ecosystem.

4.3.1.4 Housing
According to the Kween District Profile Report 2012, the District has 60.5% of the housing units being of mud and wattle with grass roof and 39.5% were roofed with iron sheets (Figures 12-13). It is also reported that, are few permanent houses which are located in urban areas. In trading centers, there is no distinction between residential and commercial structures as they are used for both small businesses and dwellings.
4.3.1.5 Customary land ownership in Kapchorwa Region
In Kapchorwa region (including Kween), the most common land tenure system is customary tenure, which the Land Act recognizes as governed by customs, rules, and regulations of the community (Uganda, Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development 1998). Approximately 97 percent of the arable land in the region is owned under customary tenure (IFPRI, 2007). With high levels of population density, conflict over land in the region is frequent.

4.3.1.6 Agriculture
The main source of livelihood in Kween district is farming which accounts for 84.3 percent of the total households’ population followed by employment income (5.8 percent), then business enterprise (DDP, 2012). Crops grown include coffee, maize, beans, bananas, wheat, barley, cassava, Irish and sweet potatoes and yams. Apart from crop farming the people also keep some few cattle, goats and sheep (Figures 5-6). Millet is also grown, but on small scale and primarily for home consumption. Fertile land is always reserved for crops and the less fertile land and rocky places are used for grazing and provision for thatching grass. Some of the maize grown is used for brew known as “komek” in local language. Farming is essentially on small plots of land of 0.5-2 acres found around the homesteads. Livestock rearing supplements farming activities. Very few people depend on trade and paid employment. In hilly areas, farmers practice terracing as a way of protecting soils from erosion.
4.3.1.7 Transport
At the local level, the main mode of transporting produce is by use of donkey and trucks (Figures 7-8). Donkeys are major means of transport that manage the sloppy terrain of project area. They are mainly used to transport agricultural produce from the gardens and to the markets and also carrying water and fire wood. Almost every family owns a donkey which they use for transport. There are also public commuter taxis operating along the Kapchorwa-Suam road through during rainy season, the road is almost impassable and can only be used by trucks carrying both passengers and goods. The trucks carry goods as well as passengers who either stand or sit on goods at the same time.

Figure 7: Fields of wheat close to Kapchorwa-Suam road
Figure 8: Terraced hill side with fields.
4.3.1.8 Gender Dimension in Kween Areas

Like in all areas of Uganda and most African countries, there are specific cultural roles for men and women in project area. Generally, women are culturally assigned reproductive roles such as homekeeping which are concerned with general household welfare and community work whereas men take on productive roles associated with monetary gains. Grazing animals, ploughing, pruning, and thinning banana plantation where bananas are grown are considered to be men’s activities in the area. However, in the urban areas some women are responsible for looking after the livestock. Some men work and some do not. Some go with the women to the fields while others look after animals. Very few are in small businesses particularly in rural communities. During harvesting time for beans, maize and picking coffee, most men help their wives. As a rule men do not help in banana plantation weeding and in the planting of potatoes. These are considered strictly to be women activities. Fetching water and fire wood is done by the women (Figure 9).
Preparing food, bathing children, feeding children and cleaning the house are specific for the women in both urban and rural areas. Gardening, harvesting, weeding, picking coffee are shared between men and women. Providing food, paying for food family treatment, and paying children’s fees although regarded as a responsibility for both is mainly relegated to men particularly in the urban area. Daily activity profiles compiled for men and women indicate that women wake up earlier than men, do almost all the household chores and also participate in other gardening activities with men. Men are more concerned with gardening and grazing. Women work longer hours than men and are involved in more activities at both household and community levels where they get involved in community services such as weddings and funerals.

During harvesting time, mothers usually go to the gardens around 11.00am after making all preparations including those for supper. They come home from fields around 5.00 pm to prepare supper. All these indicate that women are more burdened than men as daily activities for women include looking after the children, preparing food, washing clothes and generally taking care of the house unlike the men whose activities apart from looking after animals and gardening (sometimes), are mainly supervisory.

4.3.1.9 Access, Ownership and Control of Assets
Marketing of produce, as the women participants narrated, is mainly the responsibility of men who also control the proceeds. Women may sell with permission from their Husbands but quantities are usually restricted. Women are required to declare the outcomes of their transactions and account for the money spent. A wife may be entrusted with money to keep but has no right to spend it unless the husband has permitted her to do so. Spouses were said to occasionally discuss family finances and spending usually
tied to needs, such as children fees, treatment, farm inputs, and so on. The community identified some of the assets they considered important. These included assets such as land, cattle (oxen), ploughs, donkeys, a house and some farm implements.

All productive major assets such as land, farm implements, livestock especially cattle are owned and controlled by men with women having access as long as they are married to such men. When separation or divorce occurs, women lose access to such assets. In the urban areas, land, a house and livestock (cattle, goats, and donkeys), and expensive assets such as television sets, radio, and a vehicle are controlled by men although they are accessed by women as well. Women on the other hand have more control over reproductive assets such as poultry, household utensils, and sewing machines help them to meet their reproductive gender roles. Cash money, furniture, and shops are known controlled by both husbands and women and the wife (see table below).

4.3.1.10 Water
One of reliable water sources in the district is from the rivers and streams that radiate from the foothills of Mr. Elgon ranges (Figure 11). However, these are beginning to dry up in the dry seasons. As such, the pastoralists in Ngenge and Kiriki sub counties have to travel for long distances in search of water during the dry season. Water harvesting from roof tops is not a common practice in the district. The district safe water coverage stands at 52.4%. There are 608 water sources in the district as indicated in Table 17 and the average household distance to a water source is 500m.
Figure 11: Part of R. Siti in Kween areas flowing from Mt. Elgon areas, it serves both domestic and livestock water supply needs

Table 17:10 Water sources in the district:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>%age</th>
<th>No of water points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring protection</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>452 springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravity Flow Scheme</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>123 tap stands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boreholes</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain water harvesting tanks</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand dug wells</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>608 water sources</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the rivers and streams are the major sources of water for production and domestic consumption in the district, no major interventions have been instituted to protect the these rivers and streams. No soil conservations measures are practiced within their catchments and cultivation is upto the river banks.

4.3.1.11 HIV/AIDS

Statistics compiled by the office of the District Director of Health Services for Kapchorwa for instance in 2008, reveal that a total of 12,000 people are HIV positive. This is despite the various efforts being put in
place by the district health office, The Aids Support Organization [TASO], Reproductive Educative and Community Health [REACH] and other NGOs in sensitizing the people about the dangers of the disease. Through tests done through voluntary counseling and guidance indicate that the prevalence rate stands at 6.8 per cent. Given the fact that the entire Kapchorwa population is about 200,000 people, the HIV/Aids statistics compiled by his office standing at 12,000 people infected indicates that one person in every 16 people in Kapchorwa is HIV positive. The prevalence rate of HIV/AIDS in Bukwo District is at 10 percent for Bukwo District (Bukwo DHO, 2006).
5 FINDINGS ON SOCIAL ASSESSMENT

5.1 Karamoja Region

5.1.1 Moroto District
Household interviews were conducted in randomly sampled houses in Katikekile Sub-county, Lia Parish Nabuin Village and Rupa Sub-county, Rupa Parish, Rupa Village. The purpose was to get an overview of the key populations, natural resource management strategies, market access and trade, livelihood support mechanisms and political, social and pastoral risks.

The native people of Moroto district are believed to be majorly the Karamojong of Matheniko and Tepeth lineage. Overtime so many other tribes have migrated to Moroto to do business and official work in the Public Service, International Organizations and NGO work. Therefore, Moroto is currently occupied by a mix of tribes including non-Ugandans. Common tribes in Moroto include; Bagisu, Iteso, Baganda who are mainly engaged in the day to day businesses. The key distinctive characteristics of these natives is that, Karamojongs themselves are pastoralists over 80% with a very small percentage 25% engaged are subsistence farmers which is mainly carried out in the rainy season on communally owned land. One peculiar characteristic of the Karamojong is their dress code which includes a long cultural woven suuka made by the Massai in Kenya which is tied on the shoulder sometimes with an under pant or none for the men and the women especially girls make skirts out of them which they keep swinging from one side to another as they walk.

Respondents were asked whom they considered being the most vulnerable and marginalized groups in the community and what makes them vulnerable. It was reported that the elderly (94%) were most vulnerable because they hardly can do anything to fend for themselves and remain at the mercy of God and relative. These are followed by children (80%) which is likely the elderly because even the children have nobody to look after them and many of them end up lingering around trading centers (including in Kampala) begging for food while those who remain at home are usually sent to look after calves and goats and depend on wild fruits which are not even available, the famine situation is also believed to be responsible for low schools turn up (Figure 12). Cattle rustling and insecurity have been blamed for the increasing numbers of orphans (73%) and widows (62%) this has left them more vulnerable especially when it comes ownership of assets like land. The women (60%) in this region are left with all the responsibility to fend for the family and even to build the houses makes them vulnerable given the general pathetic situation they are working in. The disabled (60%) have double tragedy because in the given circumstances they only depend on the mercy of the good Samaritans. The youths though still energetic are also considered vulnerable given the difficult atmosphere in which they operate in. There are no job opportunities for them and that is the reason they give for engaging in cattle rustling. It can therefore be concluded that all the indigenous people of this region should be considered vulnerable and marginalized and hence, be given affirmative action during the project implementation.
Figure 12: Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups (Source: Social Assessment Field Data August 2013)

Asked what they considered to be the major challenges that the communities are facing, almost all (97%) reported hunger (Figure 12 below), lack of food for survival which is as a result of the compounding factors which include; drought (85%) due to harsh climatic conditions and was said to be responsible for the continuous hunger, (74%) mentioned poverty which was blamed on the unfavorable weather which prevents them from farming, (67%) reported that of late land conflicts are rampant as communities have started demarcating and claiming for land, (62%) said insecurity, poor roads which make accessibility impossible in the rural areas was also mentioned as a big challenge (53%) and some (48%) reported floods especially during the rainy season which again hinders them from growing crops. Other challenges reported include, pests and diseases (77%) which affect mainly animals and make the foot rot and inadequate pasture (76%) especially during the dry season. In one of the community meetings, the participants emphasized that without collective efforts to effect behaviour change among the Karamojong in regards diversification in terms of production the region is destined for disaster forever.
5.1.1.1 Causes of conflicts

Given the scarcity of resources in this region, it is expected that conflicts exist among the communities as they struggle to survive. Respondents were asked to mention the existing forms of conflicts within the communities. Conflicts over water resources (87%) especially during the drought was reported as the most rampant, followed by land (80%), pasture (68%) and cross border conflicts in form of raids (60%) from especially the Turkana of Kenya (Figure 13).

Figure 13: Major Challenges faced by the Natives of Moroto (Source: Social Assessment Field Data August 2013)

Figure 14: Causes of Conflicts (Source: Social Assessment Field Data August 2013)
During the community meetings it was further mentioned that the Tepeth are heavily armed but do not attack their brothers the Matheniko however, they mobilize them to get man power to go and counter-raid the Turkana of Kenya. A few cases of cattle thefts among the communities were also reported as some of the conflicts.

Asked how these conflicts are normally resolved, several means are used but prominent of them are; by the use of the elders councils, harmonized meetings, interrelationships or marriages are as third party for mediation and the government structures.

One of the clan leaders in Rupa village gave an account of how the conflicts are resolved:

“These conflicts are always minimized through use of established systems of governance like the elders’ council and local councils. To that effect, a bye law was passed in April 2012 in the district and whoever steals an animal pays twice the number of what he/she has stolen. When the thief is unable to pay back the required number of animals their close relatives’ animals are taken to pay back. The elders and the community together with the LCs and councilors attend this meeting. The LC 5 Chairperson is normally invited to officially witness the handover of the recovered animals to the owner (s). A cleansing ritual is then performed where one of the animals from what is paid back is slaughtered and a meal is prepared to that effect. This takes place in the village where the crime was committed. This has minimized cases of animal theft in the district."

5.1.1.2 Natural resource management

5.1.1.2.1 Existing Communal Resources
Respondents mentioned that the existing communal resources include; land, pasture and water others also added trees, poles for construction, gardens and firewood as some of the natural resources they have. All these resources are shared with the neighbouring communities such as the Pokot from Amudat, Bokora from Napak, the Jie from Kotido and the Turkana from Kenya. The reason for sharing is that, during the dry season this place has pastures and water hence attracting other pastoralists who in search of water and pasture for their cattle.

Under normal circumstances, these resources would meet the needs of the community during the wet season but other pastoralists migrate to their area, cases of overcrowding at the water points fuelling conflicts. As the drought period progresses, and with the influx of other communities, these resources are rendered inadequate almost all the time dry due to over population and the long dry spells. However, at the dams water is adequate and even pasture grows around the dams the problems start when other communities come.

Asked what coping strategies they use for survival during the dry season, respondents mentioned that they also migrate to other regions such as the lower belt of Teso which has water and is rich in pasture. They also dig underground or river beds in search for water which is used for both animals and domestic. As they migrate to other regions they also experience and influx from outside their district and these usually happens in the dry season when immigrants come from as far Turkana in Kenya, Pokots from western Kenyan, neighbouring clans of the Matheniko, Bokora and Jie.
Community members were asked what the anticipated benefits from the RPLRP project which was planning construction of water tanks/valley dams, rangeland rehabilitation, training in sustainable management of resources and pasture seed distribution. From the smiles on their faces it could be guessed that the Karamoja are really yearning for the project and they believed that it would go a long way in relieving most of the problems they are facing.

The benefits mentioned in order of importance include:

- Adequate water both animals and domestic which will improve household income;
- Movement of animals during the dry season will be minimized thereby leading to increased productivity;
- Quality breeds of animals will be introduced with rangeland rehabilitation;
- Migration of pastoralists will reduce;
- Improved Milk production hence more income;
- Pasture for animals will be available;
- Disease spread will be minimized with minimal animal movements;
- Services will be brought nearer to the communities; and
- Hunger will reduce as families will use the water for farming.

Nevertheless, they retaliated that there is need to construct many water dams in almost every parish, to reduce conflict and struggle for these resources among the community members. Community members also requested to be made part of the project by involving them right from the beginning because many NGOs have started projects to help the Karamojong but because they were not involved right from the beginning most of those projects have been abandoned giving a wrong impression that the Karamojong don’t want development.

### 5.1.1.3 Market access and trade

Apart from Nakiloro which has some basic structures, the other markets in the district have no structures and are basically operated in open spaces and their fences were vandalized by the communities and in case of rain, they are not safe with their goods, there are no toilets. Those markets with a semblance of structures have very old toilets and the offices are in poor shapes. Apart from lack of structures other challenges experienced in these markets include; insecurity especially towards Nakiloro and Musasi where some traders are ambushed if they don’t move in big groups. They also have no structures like toilets, offices among others. The road networks to markets are also very poor hence making the distances to be longer. The traders also experience low prices for their products especially from the traders from outside Uganda due language barrier; stolen animals can also be re-sold since there are no check points.

The communities were asked the anticipated benefits of the new markets, laboratories, check points, new auction grounds and quarantine stations in that that the RPLRP project is planning to construct the following benefits were mentioned:

- There will be early diagnosis/surveillance and treatment of diseases
- Check points will help reduce spread of diseases
- The market will increase sales
- Increase the number of markets.
- Get better bargain for the animals
- Walk of long distance will reduce
- Prices for their animals especially from the new auctioning grounds.
- Increase production due to availability of markets
- Theft of animals will reduce

5.1.1.4 Livelihoods

The most common livelihood activities communities are engaged in include pastoralism (87%) which though most people are occupied in they don’t really depend on it for survival (Figure 15). Marble quarrying and carrying (69%) and sale of charcoal, firewood, thatching grass and reeds for fencing are some of the activities the communities depend on for survival. On small scale some communities are engaged in farming (48%) especially those near water sources, gold mining (32%) and bee keeping (27%)

![Livelihood Options](image)

**Figure 15: Livelihood Options (Source: Social Assessment Field Data August 2013)**

Since pastoralism is the most common activity communities are engaged in, it is prudent to know what services are currently being extended to communities in support of these pastoral activities. Respondents reported that, Government was mainly providing services of animal vaccinations, de-worming, spraying plus supply of some drugs as means of preventing and treating animal diseases. Community members also mentioned that they get training in from NAADs on both animal and crop husbandry with help of demonstration farms. Health workers were also reported to be training communities in better hygiene practices and disease control programs. In addition animal branding and dipping are of the services extended to the pastoral communities.

The most common diseases affecting livestock in Moroto district include; East Cost Fever (ECF) 78%, Peste des Petits Ruminants (PPR) 65%, Contagious Caprine Pleuropneumonia (CCPP) 50%, Contagious Bavine Pleuropneumonia (CBPP) 29%, others are skin diseases 15% and Otitis 10% (Figure 16). These diseases are believed to be spread by ticks, liver flukes and others through contact with infected animals.
Foot and Mouth disease was also reported to be common during the rainy season. Community members reported that the common way of controlling these diseases is through vaccination, spraying, dipping, treatment with drugs, de-worming and use of local herbs sometimes government introduces quarantine but this can only be effective within the country with less control over cross-border movement of the cattle.
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**Figure 16: Common Animal Diseases (Source: Social Assessment Field Data August 2013)**

All the cattle in the region are indigenous breeds but because the RPLRP project in its component 3 plans to address trans-boundary issues related to improved productivity and diversification, it was therefore important to get the perceptions of the communities in regards to the local breeds and improved breeds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Breed</th>
<th>Improved Breed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❖ They are not disease resistant easily attacked by disease such as liver flukes</td>
<td>❖ They are weak animals, lazy &amp; can’t move faster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Produce less milk</td>
<td>❖ Grow faster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Produce less beef</td>
<td>❖ Have better quality beef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Take long to grow hence multiply slowly</td>
<td>❖ Produce more milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Low in market value</td>
<td>❖ It will be good to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Hope they will be disease resistant</td>
<td>❖ Hope they can adapt to the harsh climate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above perceptions, it is clear that the communities are willing to embrace change therefore it can assumed that this project will not meet much resistance. The improved breed which is assumed to be of high productivity inform of increased milk and animals products plus high quality beef will lead to increased household income. It is also important to know the gender relationships in terms of ownership of natural resources (pasture, land, & water sources) and cattle and its products like milk & beef. It was revealed that men own all the assets the women own none they are only allowed to sell milk and its by-
products but not meat and the cattle. The women can only sell the milk and meat but not the cattle or land. “the women have no say over any resources” said one of the elders.

5.1.1.5 Pastoral Risk Management
Given the current harsh climatic conditions in the project areas, government has already put in place national early warning and response systems (EWRS), it was important to find out if the communities are aware and are using the EWRS. Asked if there are mechanisms of obtaining information for weather forecast, the district officials note that, data on weather is got from the Metrological Department at the district. Some other development partners such as the ACTED an NGO have automatic weather systems and they share this information with the district. This information is given monthly but also as when there is need. On the other hand the communities get information from the elders whom they really on heavily because they have enough experience.

According to the residents in Nabuin village they said; “At the moment the community also relies on the natural methods like the moon and stars, birds like the “elele” and horn bill for weather forecast. Particularly the horn bills are rare but when they appear then rains begin.”

5.1.2 Nakapiripirit District
Household interviews were held with randomly selected households in the Sub-counties of; Lolachete, Lorongori, Namalu, Kodike and Nakapiripirit Town Council. The ethnic groups found in Nakapiripirit include; The Tepehs occupy the sub-county of Moruita in Chekwii County, also within this county are the Karimojong Pian who are also found near Nabilatuk and Lorengedwat in Pian County. The Pian are believed to be the original natives of Nakapiirit district but like any other region in Karamoja, all other tribes of Uganda are more less all found in Nakapiirit District. The Tepeth and the Karimojong Pian are involved in both the growing of crops and the rearing of cattle since their location in the central part of the district receives relatively high rainfall well above 1000mm annually and this favours the growing of crops and at the same time as rearing of animals. It is a known fact that Namalu Sub-county is the food basket of Nakapiripirit district. The sub-county is endowed with very fertile soils and produce the following crops; maize, cassava, sorghum, bananas and vegetables.

5.1.2.1 Vulnerable and marginalized people
Community members were asked whom they considered to be most vulnerable and marginalized in the district and they reported that women (85%) are more vulnerable given the fact that they do not own any productive assets and yet are left with burden of fending for family including looking for house construction materials and physical building of huts (Figure 17). Others considered to be vulnerable include the elderly (71%), orphans (67%), children (50%) and youth (62%). Almost all the groups of people are vulnerable given the current social economic status in the district. Communities are said to be going without food and already some are dying of hunger. Therefore, for any intervention, it was advised by the district council that all people be considered because the situation is the same across board.
5.1.2.2 Major challenges facing the communities in the District

From Figure 17, it is evident that the three biggest challenges faced by the communities in Nakapiripirit are; hunger (91%), poverty (85%), and poor roads (80%) will keep these people marginalized for a long time if interventions are not put in place. Due to the poor terrain, construction of roads in the district is a very big problem coupled with heavy floods during the rainy season that keep washing away roads and bridges sometimes cut off this district from the rest of the country. Other challenges mentioned include; scarcity of pasture, cattle raids, poor communication, and livestock pests and diseases.

Figure 17: Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups (Source: Social Assessment Field Data August 2013)

Figure 18: Major Challenges faced by Communities in Nakapiripirit

Source: Social Assessment Field Data August 2013
This district is characterized by a prolonged dry season of five to six months’ duration extending from October to March. The rainy season starts shortly after the hottest period of the year. There is an intense dry, hot-winds period from the month of November to March during which the streams dry up.

5.1.2.3 Cases of conflicts
Conflicts are a common occurrence in the area given the scarce resources and it was reported that, there exists conflicts over land between pastoralists and agriculturalists in the wet belt especially during the dry season when the pastoralists move to the wetter belts in search of water and pasture. In the process, crops are destroyed by animals yet the owners of the animals are not willing to pay for the cropped eaten. There also exist conflicts between the pastoralists when they scramble for water and pastures during the dry season. Then the traditional conflicts due to cattle raids which is between the different ethnic groups in the region and from the Turkana and Pokot from Kenya. Some cases of cattle theft were also reported to one of the causes of conflicts. These conflicts are reported to be resolved through use of established systems of governance like, local councils and elders (clan leaders) when these two fail then one proceeds to courts of law.

5.1.2.4 Natural resource management

5.1.2.4.1 Existing communal resources
The existing communal natural resources include; grazing land (pasture), water, land, trees and firewood. These resources are all shared with the neighbouring communities like the Pokot from Amudat, the Turkana and poko from West Kenya, the Iteso and Sabiny from Kween, the communities also receive the Banyankole who come all the way from Ankole. The reasons for sharing are that during the dry season this place has pastures and water. These resources meet the needs of the community during the wet season but as the dry season sets in and other pastoralists begin to migrate to the area, the pastures and water points get depleted. Coping strategies for the scarce resources is mainly by shifting to the wet belts of the Teso region. The anticipated benefits resulting from the construction of water tanks/valley dams, rangeland rehabilitation, training in sustainable management of resources and pasture seed distribution will include;

a. Movement of animals during the dry season will be minimized thereby leading to increased productivity.

b. Conflicts will be minimized especially resulting from crop destruction

c. Quality breeds of animals can be introduced with rangeland rehabilitation

d. Increased animal productivity due to availability of water

e. Dam construction will enable people to plant trees

f. Increase in household income with better quality products from both animals and farming

5.1.2.5 Market access and trade
The existing livestock markets are in Nakapiripirit district include Namalu and Lolachat. These markets operate on Wednesday and Saturday respectively. These markets are accessible to the community especially during the dry season but in the wet season the roads are sometimes washed away. Like all other markets in the region, these markets lack structures they operate in open grounds. However, some residents are comfortable with the open grounds because they see very far and this reduces the risk of theft or ambushes. If any modernization is to be done then there will be need for sensitization of the
community or else the new markets may join the many white elephants projects in Karamoja that have been implemented without the involvement of the intended beneficiaries who are the communities. They are currently benefiting from these markets by selling their animals and buying the other household commodities which they need.

Community members were about the anticipated benefits from the new markets, laboratories, check points, new auction grounds and quarantine stations. They mentioned that the new project will help in:

a. Early diagnosis and treatment of diseases  
b. Quarantine stations and check points will reduce spread of diseases  
c. Markets will increase trade  
d. More animals will be exchanged without insecurity  
e. Cattle thefts will be minimized.

5.1.2.6 Livelihood support
Pastoralism and small scale farming in crops like sorghum and maize are the most common activities the communities engage in, some sell firewood, thatching grass, charcoal and food items and trade in animals. The services extended to the pastoral communities include; veterinary services like vaccination, animal branding, training on crop and animal production. The common diseases that attack animals include; the tick borne diseases, liver flukes, East coast fever. The common way of controlling these diseases was said to be through vaccination, spraying, and dipping. The challenges with the indigenous breeds of cattle are; low levels of productivity, prone to diseases it was reported that the local breeds are highly susceptible to diseases especially the East Cost Fever, take long to mature. However the perceptions on the new breeds are; high productivity inform of increased milk yields provided they can withstand the climatic condition, they are disease resistant, high productivity will lead to high household income.

5.1.2.7 Pastoral risk management
Given the current climatic conditions in the project areas government has already put in place national early-warning and response systems (EWRS), it was important to find out if the communities are aware and are using the EWRS. Asked if there are mechanisms of obtaining information for weather forecast, the district officials mentioned that data on weather is got from the Metrological department at the district. Some other development partners such as the ACTED NGO have automatic weather systems and have given phones to trained community members at parish level to deliver this data. they share this information with the district. However the process has been politicized and a cross section of the population does not receive the report. This information is supposed to be disseminated weekly from these people who were trained. The sometimes rely on radio stations from Kenya for weather forecast updates.

5.1.3 Amudat District
Households in Amudat Town Council and Kalita Sub-county were randomly selected and interviewed in Amudat District. The purpose was to get an overview of the key populations, natural resource management strategies, market access and trade, livelihood support mechanisms and political, social and pastoral risks. Household heads were asked who the indigenous or native people of Amudat district were and it was revealed that Amudat district is inhibited by mainly the Pokot people save for any other tribes
from different parts of Uganda who have moved in the district to do business and these include; the Pokot from Kenya, Karamojong, Bagisu, and so many others. Though considered as part of the greater Karamoja Region, the Pokot have distinctive characteristics which are completely different from the rest of the Karamojong in terms of culture and also their dialect is quite different from the Nga’karamojong. The Pokot practice Genital Female Mutilation and is strongly embedded in them, but the Government has employed all possible means to eradicate the vice. The Pokot like all the other communities in Karamoja Region spend most of their time looking after cattle and because of the poor climate farming is done on a very minimal level they grow mainly sorghum and maize. It can said that the Pokot lead a semi nomadic lifestyle. Some communities also depend on charcoal burning, selling firewood, and honey and alcohol residue. The Pokot were reported to be the Indigenous people of Amudat district.

5.1.3.1 Vulnerable people
Respondents were asked to mention whom they considered to be most vulnerable and marginalized in their communities. Widows (78%) were reported to be the most vulnerable and marginalized among the Pokots because; the community cherishes widow inheritance and the widows have no say but to simply accept any clan member who decides to inherit them as wives. These are followed by the Female, (75%) (women and girls) in the society because the community still upholds female genital mutilation (FGM) it was reported by one community member who did not wish to disclosed that girls are usually horded in a discrete place to prevent them from escaping and that, girls who are not circumcised are shunned by men in marriage. The women are taken as assets and are supposed to build houses, fetch water for the animals as well as look for food for the family. They also don’t own any asset but are only allowed to control milk and its products. Orphans (67%) were another lot considered to be vulnerable by the communities. Death of fathers is common in the district especially during cattle raids living behind widows and orphans, the widows are usually inherited but the orphans are left to fend for themselves. The disabled and children also pass for being vulnerable and marginalised as they are purely dependant on others for survival. The situation is illustrated in the Figure 19.
5.1.3.2 Major challenges facing the communities

Communities were asked what they considered to be the major challenges faced in Amudat district, drought (85%) was reported to be biggest challenge communities are facing to the extent that sometimes it kills almost half of the cattle (Figure 20). This is followed by pests and diseases (71%) which are also said to be contributing highly to the death of animals. High illiteracy levels (69%) was reported to be a big challenge as most children don’t go to school because of lack of food and also being engaged in looking after cattle. The road networks (65) in the district are also very pathetic especially the roads used by trucks from Tororo Cement Ltd which collect marble from the district. Sorghum and maize are the major crops grown but the birds do destroy them in the garden (48%). Community members also reported that most of the available cattle dips are non-functional coupled with inadequate pastures during the dry season are some of the major challenges being faced in the district.

![Main Challenges Faced by Communities in Amudat](image)

Figure 20: Challenges Faced by communities in Amudat (Source: Social Assessment Field Data August 2013)

5.1.3.3 Cases of conflicts

In areas where resources are scarce it is usually expected that communities scramble for them, the social assessment study was interested in establishing the main cases of conflicts, the causes and how these conflicts are resolved. Community members all agreed that conflicts do exist in the areas. The main causes of these conflicts were said the struggle for the limited natural resources such as water, pasture and land. This district being at border with Western Kenya, experiences a lot of Cross boarder conflicts in terms of raids from the Turkana of Kenya, Matheniko from Moroto and Pian from Nakapiripirit. However due to the disarmament exercise in the Karamoja region the raids are not rampant as it used to be before. Other cases of conflicts occur with Uganda Wildlife Authority over the Pain Upe Wildlife Reserve for during dry season when pastoralists move in there to look for pasture and water. The district also experiences minimal cases of cattle theft. These conflicts are resolved through use of established systems.
of governance like local councils and even the courts of law but the most prominent one is the elders’ council which are believed to be very effective. An interesting scenario is that: when one of the clan members causes a death of any person then the whole clan has to compensate for that death, and for each person killed 50 herds of cattle is lost. This has minimized cases of deaths resulting from reckless shootings.

### 5.1.3.4 Natural resource management

#### 5.1.3.4.1 Existing communal resources

The existing communal natural resources in Amudat district include; grazing land, pasture, water, trees and firewood. These resources are mainly shared with the Turkana and Pokots from Kenya, Pian from Nakapiripipt and Matheniko from Moroto of recent the communities have also experienced migrants of Banyankole from Western Uganda especially during the wet season. These resources are usually shared at the beginning of the dry season when most areas in Amudat are still green but as the drought progresses the communities keep moving further to Teso and Kween districts.

If it was not for influx of other communities from outside the district, these resources would have met the needs of the community during the wet season but as the other pastoralist migrate to the area, and as the dry season continues they get depleted forcing all of them to also begin migrating towards to Teso sub region in search of pasture and water. Other reasons mentioned for the inadequacy of these natural resources are; the existing dams are heavily silted, the few rivers and water sources are seasonal and the pastures are located in a few corridors however, in places where the grazing grounds have been divided into reserves, they are adequate.

The anticipated benefits resulting from the construction of water tanks/ valley dams, rangeland rehabilitation, training in sustainable management of resources and pasture seed distribution include;

- Movement of animals during the dry season will be minimized thereby leading to increased productivity in terms of animal products;
- Identification of sick animals will be easy;
- Order will be maintained in the market area;
- Cattle thefts will be minimized;
- Injuries that are sometimes attained during loading and offloading of animals from the trucks will be reduced once there is a loading ram;
- Quality breeds of animals can be introduced with rangeland rehabilitation;
- Communities will diversify to crop production through modernized agriculture hence increase in household income;
- Irrigation will be possible during dry season;
- Trees will be planted and this will help improve the climate;
- Cross-border conflicts with the Pokots and Turkans from Kenya will reduce.

#### 5.1.3.5 Market access and trade

The existing livestock markets in Amudat districts are located in Kalita Sub-county and Amudat town council. The market days are on Saturday and Friday respectively. Town Council livestock market is easily accessibility however, Kalita is about 36Kms away and access is a little bit difficult because of the
bad roads. All these two markets are on open grounds with no structures at all; even the demarcations are not evident. Some other challenges faced in these markets include; No security poor roads network hence long distances, Low prices, Infections (Diseases and pests) Markets are not enough and not constructed just open place without enclosure.

The communities are currently benefiting from existing markets by selling their animals and buying other commodities which they need including crop produce and clothes.

Asked about what the anticipated benefits would be from the new markets, laboratories, check points, new auction grounds and quarantine stations they reported that;

- More animals will be reared with controlled grazing land;
- Diseases will be controlled and checked before animals are sold;
- Reduce on animal injuries after all the structures are put in place;
- Access to safe animal drugs;
- Keep law and order;
- Security will be improved;
- Trainings on how to do livestock businesses, animal health and diversification to farming;
- Reduce on theft with organized markets;
- There will be early diagnosis/ surveillance and treatment of diseases;
- Good prices for their animals especially from the new auctioning grounds.

5.1.3.6 Livelihood Support
The services extended to the pastoral communities include; Veterinary services such as vaccination, Pesticides, animal branding, Construction of cattle crushes, NAADS training on crop and animal production, health education and Security.

The most common diseases affecting livestock in Amudat district include; East Cost Fever (ECF) 87%, Contagious Caprine Pleuropnemonia (CCPP) 60%, Contagious Bavine Pleuropneumonia (CBPP) 69%, others are skin diseases 15%. These diseases are believed to be spread by ticks, liver flukes and others through contact with infected animals. Foot and Mouth disease was also reported to be common during the rainy season. Community members reported that the common way of controlling these diseases is through vaccination, spraying, dipping, treatment with drugs, de-worming and use of local herds sometimes government introduces quarantine but this can only be effective within the country with less control over cross-border movement of the cattle.
Community members reported that the challenges with the indigenous breeds of cattle is that they have low levels of productivity, prone to disease infections and re-infection among animals, take too long to mature, produce little milk due to scarcity of water and pasture therefore animals are forced to move long distances. However the perception of the new breeds is that there the productivity will be high, resistant to diseases, can produce more milk and good quality beef.

5.1.3.7 Pastoral risk management

Given the current climatic conditions in the project areas government has already put in place national early-warning and response systems (EWRS), it was important to find out if the communities are aware and are using the EWRS. Asked if there are mechanisms of obtaining information for weather forecast, the district officials reported that they partner with ACTED through their early warning systems and collect data from the parish chiefs which is then published and shared on a monthly basis. The challenge though remains with dissemination to the village level However, at the moment the community also relies on the natural methods and the foretellers.

5.2 Teso Region

5.2.1 Bukedea District

Household interviews were conducted in randomly selected household in Bukedea Town Council and Kachumbala Sub-county. The ethnic groups found in Bukedea include; Iteso who constitute the majority, the others being mainly; Bagishu, Banyole, Langi and Banganda, Basoga, Acholi, Acholi Labwor, and Bugwere. Generally, Bukedea has diversity of ethnic groups though Iteso constitute approximately 85% of the population. The people of Bukedea are mainly engaged in both farming and cattle keeping at almost the same level. It is a common occurrence to find at least every household owning some cattle especially the bulls that are used for ploughing. The soils are fertile and any crop can be grown on it but the most common crops include; Maize, cassava, millet, sorghum, beans, sweet potatoes, groundnuts,
matooke, vegetables and citrus fruits. Bukedea district is famous for the production of the yellow type of sweet potatoes which is dominant in the Kampala market.

5.2.1.1 Vulnerability and Marginalization
From the consultative meetings during the study, it emerged that, the most vulnerable and marginalized groups in the district are the elderly (78%) who by virtue of their age, cannot manage to fend for themselves and hence, depend on their relatives for support (Figure 22). These were followed by women (72%) whom the respondents mentioned to have no voice at all especially on matters concerning land, cattle and marriage issues. During a marriage ceremony women are not allowed to participate in process of dowry decision making. Others considered to be vulnerable include the orphans (67%), widows (58%) because the Iteso still practice widow inheritance and this puts the widows at a higher risk of contracting HIV/AIDS. Children (50%) and youth (62%) are considered vulnerable because most children who go to school do not eat food at school especially UPE schools yet not all parents can afford to take their children to private school. The youth are vulnerable due to lack of employment opportunities this has led to early marriages and high rural urban migration in search of jobs.

![Figure 22: Vulnerable and marginalized groups in Bukedea (Source: Social Assessment Field Data August 2013)](image)

5.2.1.2 Major challenges facing these communities
From the discussions and literature review, the major challenges being faced by the communities that poor roads (84%) especially the main Mbale–Soroto road constitutes one of the key challenges in the district. This road has been under construction for the last five years and is currently in a very bad shape. It was reported that the state of the road is responsible for the daily accidents that are experienced. Poverty was rated the second biggest challenge (76%). Most household heads reported that life is very difficult these days that sometimes they have one meal a day. Teso generally and Bukedea in particular is located in the lower belts and the bigger part of it is flat land (plain), during the rainy season most areas in Bukedea experience floods (72%) and these destroy crops in the gardens and also houses. There are also
challenges of land (68%), due to the increasing population this has led to many conflicts among the communities. Other challenges mentioned include; scarcity of pasture (51%) for cattle as most land is used farming, and livestock pests and diseases (49%) which affect both animals and crops.

Figure 23: Major Challenges faced by Communities in Bukedea (Source: Social Assessment Field Data August 2013)

5.2.1.3 Cases of conflicts
With increasing population growth conflicts are a common occurrences in any given community. Respondents were asked if any cases of conflicts existed, all of them answered in affirmative. Conflicts over land were reported most, usually in the valleys, near permanent rivers and streams or near the lake in the case of Bukedea. However, such places too have established settlements who may not be purely pastoralists. This usually leads to resource conflict between the agro-pastoralist and farmers. Graze land is still used communally but due to land scarcity some people have started fencing off their land hence denying communities the right to use their land. Conflicts over animals eating or destroying crops are also very common for the same reason of land scarcity. This has led to households starting to adopt zero grazing especially those sub-counties near Bugisu region like Kachumbala. This may cope well with RLPRP project objectives of introducing improved breeds and modern ways of cattle keeping. Before the disarmament of the Karamojong region Bukedea district used to experience some cattle raids from the Karamojong and this has now degenerated to cattle theft.

These conflicts are reported to be resolved through use of established systems of governance like, local councils and police but when these two fail then one proceeds to courts of law. However, for conflicts within families clan leaders or elders are used.
5.2.1.4 Natural resource management

5.2.1.4.1 Existing communal resources

The existing communal natural resources include; grazing land (pasture), water, and firewood. These resources are all shared within the communities without much disturbance from the outside communities save for the dry season when the neighboring communities from Karamoja and Sebei come in search of water and pasture. It was reported that of recent, Bukedea district is experiencing influx of the Baynakole pastoralists who have invaded the swamps. The reasons for sharing these natural resources is that being semi-pastoralists the Iteso understand that when the dry season sets their colleagues from the upper belt come down in search of water and pasture. These resources meet the needs of the community during the wet season but as the dry season sets in and other pastoralist begin to migrate to the area, the pastures and water points get depleted.

The anticipated benefits resulting from the construction of water tanks/valley dams, rangeland rehabilitation, training in sustainable management of resources and pasture seed distribution will include:

a. Movement of animals during the dry season will be minimised thereby leading to increased productivity.
b. Conflicts will be minimised especially resulting from crop destruction
c. Quality breeds of animals can be introduced with rangeland rehabilitation
d. Increased animal productivity due to availability of water
e. Dam construction will enable people to plant trees
f. Increase in household income with better quality products from both animals and farming

5.2.1.5 Market access and trade

There are cattle markets located in almost all sub counties of the district. The most prominent ones are; Bukedea and Kachumbara markets. These markets operate every Monday and Saturday respectively, they are open gazetted places with no structure within the markets and they are not fenced off;

These markets are accessible to the communities and so many other traders since they are located along the Mbale – Soroti Highway. They are currently benefiting from these markets by selling their animals and buying the other household commodities which they need.

Community members were asked about the anticipated benefits from the new markets, laboratories, check points, new auction grounds and quarantine stations. They mentioned that the new project will help in;

a. Early diagnosis and treatment of diseases
b. Quarantine stations and check points will reduce spread of diseases
c. Markets will increase trade
d. More animals will be exchanged without insecurity
e. Cattle thefts will be minimized
f. An organized market will lead to collection of more revenue
g. Many people will be encouraged to produce more to sell
h. It will attract other investors who will build permanent structure
5.2.1.6 Livelihood support
Communities in the district practice both crop and animal husbandry, though crop production is more prominent; The crops grown includes crops like Maize, cassava, millet, sorghum, beans, sweet potatoes, groundnuts, matooke, vegetables and citrus fruits. Bukedea district is famous for the production of the yellow type of sweet potatoes. These crops are grown both for home consumption and sale especially the yellow sweet potato. Other items sold for survival are firewood, charcoal, local brew (Ajon).

The services extended to these communities include; veterinary services like vaccination, animal branding, training on crop and animal production. The common diseases that attack animals include; the tick borne diseases, liver flukes, East coast fever. The common way of controlling these diseases was said to be through vaccination, spraying, and dipping. The challenges with the indigenous breeds of cattle are; low levels of productivity, prone to diseases it was reported that the local breeds are highly susceptible to diseases especially the East Cost Fever, take long to mature. However the perceptions on the new breeds are; high productivity inform of increased milk yields provided they can withstand the climatic condition, they are disease resistant, high productivity will lead to high household income.

5.2.2 Katakwi District
Household interviews were conducted in randomly selected household in Katakwi Town Council and Omagoro Sub-county. The ethnic groups found in Katakwi include; Iteso who constitute the majority, the others being mainly; Karamojong, Kuman, Bagishu, Banyole, Langi and Banganda, Basoga, Acholi, and Acholi Labwor from Abim. Generally, Katakwi has diversity of ethnic groups though Iteso constitute approximately 90% of the population. The people of Katakwi are mainly engaged in both farming and cattle keeping at almost the same level. It is a common occurrence to find at least every household owning some cattle especially the bulls that are used for ploughing. The soils are fertile and any crop can be grown on it but the most common crops include; Maize, cassava, millet, sorghum, beans, sweet potatoes, groundnuts, vegetables and citrus fruits.

5.2.2.1 Vulnerable and marginalization
Community members were asked whom they considered to be most vulnerable and marginalized groups in the district and they reported that elderly (80%) by virtue of their age they cannot manage to fend for themselves and hence depend on their relatives for support. The communities who have returned from the IDPs (78%) are also considered vulnerable because they are starting from scratch because they cannot locate their original boundaries hence encroachment on public land. This has created a lot of conflicts with the government institutions. These were followed by widows (70%) most of whose husbands were killed during the Lords’ Resistance Army war in 2003/4. The Women (65%) were reported to have no voice at all especially on matters concerning land, cattle and marriage issues. During a marriage ceremony women are not allowed to participate in the process of dowry decision making. Others considered to be vulnerable include the orphans (60%), Children (55%) and youth (50%) are considered vulnerable because most children who go to school do not eat food at school especially UPE schools yet not all parents can afford to take their children to private school. The youth are vulnerable due to lack of employment opportunities this has led to early marriages and high rural urban migration in search of jobs.
5.2.2.2 Major challenges facing these communities

Respondents were asked to mention major challenges being faced; it is evident from the figure below that, land (89%) and poor roads (84%) were scored as the most prominent challenges (Figure 25). The hording of communities in Internally Displaced Camps during the LRA war in 2003/4 created a lot of distortions in terms of land ownership. The returnees have the biggest challenge as most of them have forgotten their original boundaries. Poverty (76%) is a big challenge with communities being unable to solve most of the problems. Floods (72%) have caused more problems in Katakwi. Other challenges reported by the communities include; pests and diseases, scarcity of pasture and alcoholisms which is said to have derailed most of the youths.
5.2.2.3 Cases of conflicts

With increasing population growth conflicts are a common occurrences in any given community. Respondents were asked if any cases of conflicts existed, all of them answered in affirmative. Conflicts over land were reported most, especially with the Karamojong over the land boundaries. Land wrangles between households especially with those who had been in the IDP camps and are now returning. Most of them cannot trace their original boundaries. Others conflicts over land are between communities/households and Government institutions. These conflicts are resolved through area land committees, for those which are land related. These area land committees operate at Local Council III level. Clan leaders resolve both household and land related conflicts. The Local Council I resolve more cases that any other. The police also play a very important role in abetting crime. Other established systems of governance like the courts of law are usually the last resort.

5.2.2.4 Natural Resource Management

5.2.2.4.1 Existing communal resources

The existing communal natural resources include; grazing land (pasture), water, swamps, Rocks and firewood. These resources are all shared within the communities without much disturbance from the outside communities save for the dry season when the neighboring communities from Karamoja and Sebei come in search of water and pasture. The reasons for sharing these natural resources are because they are public resources with open access. These resources meet the needs of the community during the wet season but as the dry season sets in and other pastoralist begin to migrate to the area, the pastures and water points get depleted.

The anticipated benefits resulting from the construction of water tanks/ valley dams, rangeland rehabilitation, training in sustainable management of resources and pasture seed distribution will include;
a. Movement of animals during the dry season will be minimised thereby leading to increased productivity;
b. Conflicts will be minimized especially resulting from crop destruction;
c. Quality breeds of animals can be introduced with rangeland rehabilitation;
d. Increased animal productivity due to availability of water;
e. Dam construction will enable people to plant trees;
f. Increase in household income with better quality products from both animals and farming.

5.2.2.5 Market access and trade

The existing livestock markets are open auction markets with no structures in place. These include; Toroma, Magoro, Ajelelana, Orungo, Ongongoja, Abaratakere and the most prominent one of Ochorimogin. It attracts traders from as far as south Sudan and Kenya. On a single market day, over 2,000 animals (cattle, Sheep goats) are traded. These markets operate on a weekly basis. Community members were asked about the anticipated benefits from the new markets, laboratories, check points, new auction grounds and quarantine stations.

Communities expect the project to help in matters of:

a. Early diagnosis and treatment of diseases;
b. Quarantine stations and check points will reduce spread of diseases;
c. Markets will increase trade;
d. More animals will be exchanged without insecurity;
e. Cattle thefts will be minimized;
f. An organized market will lead to collection of more revenue;
g. Many people will be encouraged to produce more to sell;
h. It will attract other investors who will build permanent structure.

5.2.2.6 Livelihood support

Communities in the district practice both crop and animal husbandry, though crop production is more prominent; The crops grown includes crops like Maize, cassava, millet, sorghum, beans, sweet potatoes, groundnuts, vegetables and citrus fruits. These crops are grown both for home consumption and sale especially. Other items sold for survival are firewood, charcoal, local brew (Ajon). The services extended to these communities include; veterinary services like vaccination, animal branding, training on crop and animal production. The common diseases that attack animals include; the tick borne diseases, liver flukes, East coast fever. The common way of controlling these diseases was said to be through vaccination, spraying, and dipping. The challenges with the indigenous breeds of cattle are; low levels of productivity, prone to diseases it was reported that the local breeds are highly susceptible to diseases especially the East Cost Fever, take long to mature. However the perceptions on the new breeds are; high productivity inform of increased milk yields provided they can withstand the climatic condition, they are disease resistant, high productivity will lead to high household income.
5.3 SEBEI REGION

5.3.1 Kween District
The native people of Kween district are believed to be majorly the Sabiny and Bukusu tribes. Uganda being a free country overtime other tribes have since settled in Kween and these include the Bagisu, Karamojong and, Banyankole however, on the upper belt of the district are found the Ndorobo who live in greater Benet Sub-county. The Ndorobo are said to have lived in the protected areas of Mt. Elgon. The natives of Kween districts do still practice Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) and this is considered as key distinctive characteristics of the Sabiny people. Great efforts have been initiated by Government to stop this practice as it endangers the lives of girls and a lot of success has been registered and education and sensitization against this practice is still ongoing. It was also reported the Benet Lobby Group (BLG) is playing a very important role in advocating for the rights of the Ndorobo peoples believed to the indigenous of Sebei, these are marginalised, were ejected from Mt. Elgon forest reserve and are land less.
The district is also divided into three belts and each with its unique features namely; the upper, middle and lower belt. The upper belt is mostly dominated the crop cultivators; the middle part is mainly dominated by agro pastoralism; and the lower part is mainly dominated by the pastoralists. The communities in Kween district are mainly engaged in pastoralism 70%, some also practise zero grazing 17%, subsistence farming 10% and bee keeping 3% which was reported to be practiced mainly by communities in the upper belt of Benet Sub-county.

Figure 26: Main Tribes In Kween District (Source: Social Assessment Field Data August 2013)
5.3.1.1 Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups
In Kween districts women 80% (Figure 27) are considered to be the most vulnerable and marginalized, for the reason that they have little say over bodies hence the continued manipulation of the girls into the FGM practice despite all the efforts to stop it. The women also have no say on property and are not allowed to own any property apart from milk. These are followed by the elderly 72% who given their age are not able to fend for themselves and only remain depending on the relatives for survival. The youths 67% are also considered vulnerable by many people in the community due the high unemployment rates in the district and difficult conditions of starting businesses because most of them do not have start-up capital. The children 43% and people with disabilities 39% are regarded as vulnerable and marginalized due their current status in society, they depend on their parents and able bodied people for survival, and they also do not have access to productive assets like land.

![Vulnerability and Marginalized Groups](image)

Figure 27: Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups In Kween District Source: Social Assessment Field Data August 2013

5.3.1.2 Major challenges facing these communities
Poor road network (79%) was reported to be the biggest challenge in Kween district, this was evident by the gaping valleys and the difficulty the consultancy team went through to reach the communities. The poor roads make transportation costs very high hence affecting the prices of all commodities (Figure 28). Drought (70%) which is getting prolonged due to climatic changes (40%) was mentioned as one of the challenges. At the same time during rainy season the district experiences floods (67%) especially in the lower belt. The floods sometimes completely cut off the district from the rest of the country. Pests & diseases (58%) that attack both the animals and crops were mentioned as among the challenges faced in the district. The FGM culture (60%) is still considered among the major challenges being faced in Kween district despite the efforts to eradicate it. Soil erosion (48%) given the topography of the district is one of the challenges still experienced in the district. Other challenges mentioned include lack of pasture during the dry season and wild animals from the Pain Upe game reserve destroy crops, kill livestock and sometimes even the people.
5.3.1.3 Cases of conflicts

Asked about any cases of conflicts experienced in the Kween district, participants mentioned that the main causes of conflicts include; destruction of crops by the animals especially those that take a long time to mature during the dry season when pastoralists from other areas come in search of water and pasture. Land wrangles in the arable land are experienced among the farmers especially in the middle belt. Competition for fish in River Greek with the Karamojong do causes some conflicts and minimal cases of cattle theft are also experienced amongst community members. These conflicts are minimized through use of established systems of governance like the local council and courts of law. However, before the cases are forwarded to government structures the communities try to resolve them through clan leaders. Fencing of farm lands is done to protect crops from destruction and for the fish in Greek River communities are advised to stay away.

5.3.1.4 Natural resource management

5.3.1.4.1 Existing communal resources

The existing communal resources available in Kween district include; grazing land (pasture), farm land, water from Greek River and trees. These resources are freely shared with the Karamojongs from Nakapiripirit district, Pokots from Amudat district, Turkana from Kenya and of late the Banyankole who have resettled in the district. These resources are shared because they are readily available and are within the region. Kween district usually experiences the drought later on long after all other surrounding district have had their pasture and water depleted. These resources meet the needs of the community during the wet season but as the other pastoralist migrates into the district, overcrowding is experienced at water
points. However as the drought period progresses, and with the influx of other communities, the pastures become inadequate.

Communities were asked about the anticipated benefits that will result from the construction of water tanks/valley dams, rangeland rehabilitation, training in sustainable management of resources and pasture seed distribution they gave the following benefits;

a. Movement of animals during the dry season will be minimised thereby leading to increased productivity;
b. Conflicts will be minimised especially resulting from crop destruction;
c. Quality breeds of animals can be introduced with rangeland rehabilitation;
d. Pasture seeds will help to feed the animals and this will control animal movement;
e. Valley dams will provide enough water for both animals and domestic use;
f. Increased production of milk will boost household income;
g. Communities will develop both socially and economically;
h. Irrigation during the dry season will enable production of food throughout the year;
i. Easy accessibility to water will reduce conflicts at water sources;
j. Dam construction will enable people to plant trees.

5.3.1.5 Market access and trade
In order to facilitate intra-regional trade of animals and animals products the RPLRP project plans to construct markets and improve on surveillance and control systems of trans-boundary animal diseases. The existing livestock markets in Ngenge Sub-county include; Ngenge, Pinyinyi. Other cattle markets accessed by communities are in Namalu (Nakapiripirit), and Mbale town. The nearest livestock markets to Kaptotyoy Sub-county are Mbale town and Kenya market. Some markets like the one in Ngenge is easily accessible to communities otherwise the rest are very as far as 50 Km and beyond and given the poor road network accessibility is a big problem. The communities sell their animals and buy the other commodities which they need from these markets.

5.3.1.6 Market Structures
These markets are just bear grounds with no structures; given very poor roads and the rough terrain sometimes people reach the markets when they are closed. This accessibility problem also makes the commodities very expensive since transport is already very expensive. In fact the communities have not benefited much from these markets since they are very far away.

The communities mentioned that they are anticipating to benefit from the new markets, laboratories, check points, new auction grounds and quarantine stations by;

a. Quarantine stations will control disease transmission hence increased animal productivity;
b. New market will improve market accessibility;
c. Laboratories will be used for animal diseases control and testing HIV status of the community members;
d. Trade will increase due to more markets;
e. Women will participate in trade when new markets are constructed;
f. Early diagnosis and treatment of diseases, and minimized cattle thefts.
5.3.1.7 Livelihood support

The most common livelihood activities people in Kween district highly depend on which belt they come from. The upper belt is mostly dominated the crop cultivators; the middle part is mainly dominated by agro pastoralism; and the lower part is mainly dominated by the pastoralists. Communities also engage in charcoal burning, planting vegetables, coffee, maize, soya and short term crops and animal trade. Asked which services are extended to the communities, they reported that the services extended to the pastoral communities include; vaccination, animal branding, dipping, NAADs training on both crop and animal production. The common diseases that attack animals include the tick borne diseases, liver flukes, East coast fever, foot and mouth disease. The main crops are mainly attacked by coffee berry bore and maize stalk bore. The common way of controlling these diseases is through vaccination, spraying, dipping however this one depends on the availability of acari-sides and hence it is not done frequently. For the coffee and maize stalk bore farmers are advised to spray the maize and destroy the affected coffee trees by the NAADs officers. The challenges with the indigenous breeds of cattle were reported to having low levels of productivity, being prone to diseases and taking too long to mature. However the perception of the new breeds is that there of good quality hence of high productivity leading increased milk yields and beef. Ownership of the assets is mainly by the men. The women can only sell the milk but not the cattle or land.

5.3.1.8 Pastoral risk management

ACTED trained CKWs who were given phones to pick weather information for their respective parishes however the process has been too politicized in that a cross section of the population does not receive the report once they are viewed to have differing political ideologies to the CKWs. This information is supposed to be disseminated weekly from these people who were trained. The sometimes rely on radio stations from Kenya for weather forecast updates.
STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT

Stakeholder consultations were used for highlighting the plan for free, prior and informed consultations and to kick start the continued consultation and participation of the indigenous, vulnerable and marginalized groups throughout the project cycle. The stakeholder identification was to ensure that the views, perceptions and suggestions of vulnerable and marginalized groups are identified and addressed in the project implementation. The Social assessment also sought views of other stakeholders who are influential and responsible for the overall implementation of the project in order to ensure that issues of the vulnerable and marginalized groups are incorporated in the project cycle. Stakeholders consulted will direct or indirectly participate in the project implementation and these include;

a. Communities which are likely to be directly and indirectly affected by the project. All together nine community meetings were held, two of them with the communities regarded indigenous (the Ik and Ndorobo) and the rest with communities in the project districts who are considered vulnerable and marginalized in the project area;
b. Local government authorities (districts; and
c. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s).

Objectives of the free, prior and informed stakeholder consultations were;

a. Inform affected vulnerable indigenous peoples about the proposed project;
b. Assess in a participatory manner the possible project benefits and adverse impacts; and
c. Agree on measures to enhance benefits or mitigate adverse impacts that will be incorporated into the project’s design.

The stakeholders consulted included officials from the Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE), Non-governmental organizations like (Uganda Land Alliance, Action Aid -Uganda), District Local Government Officials (District Veterinary officers, District Environment Officers, District Agriculture officers, Animal Husbandry Officers, Chief Administrative Officers, District Production Officers, District planners, district Entomologist, District Water Officers) and the local communities in Timu village (IK community), Lokinene village, (Kaabong District), Loletoi and Panyangara villages (Kotido district), Lochengeng ward (Amudat district), Ochorimongin (Katakwi district) Akumu village, Ongino, sub-county (Kumi District) and Chesimwo (Ndorobo community) village (Kween district). Among these were men, women, and the poor and most vulnerable groups.

6.1 Outcomes/Key Concerns Raised From Consultative Meetings

6.1.1 Water sources for livestock

Water for production is majorly from the several streams and rivers that cross the project area. A few of these streams and rivers flow throughout the year while the majority dry up during the dry season, which may last for as long as six months in the Karamoja region. As a result, the pastoralists have to walk for long distance during the dry season searching for alternatives sources. As a result, the livestock is emaciated and therefore fetches low prices on the market. There are dams and valley tanks in each of
the 12 project districts. Most dams are used for providing water for the livestock as well as water for domestic consumption. However, most of these were constructed over 40 years ago and have been inevitably silted over the years. It was revealed that most of these dams need to be rehabilitated and in some cases, new ones constructed.

The main problem associated with the existing water sources was siltation from the catchment areas. There has been indiscriminate clearance of vegetation from all watersheds in the project area. As such, flooding of fields is common after heavy down pour of rain. The water sheds are highly degraded, they have been encroached on to give way for activities like cultivation, establishment of settlements, charcoal burning, and firewood collection. The catchment activities have had a serious toll on the water resources. The agricultural practices are still poor, and soil erosion is enormous. From the consultations with the district officials in all the project districts, it was noted that the wetlands have been encroached on for farming, especially rice cultivation. This was emphasized in the Teso region, however, even the Karamoja region though not for rice cultivation, wetland have been encroached on for crop production since the Karamojong are now steadily shifting from pure pastoralism to agro-pastoralist due the climate change. In the Karamoja region, the farmers utilize the water as it comes and the farming is only during the rainy season when there is adequate water, otherwise during the dry season there isn’t intensive farming. During this time of the year, the farmers are mostly engaged in field preparations.

6.1.2 Capacity for Project Implementation at the District Level
It was reported by all district officials especially the Chief Administrative Officers and the District Production Officers that the production departments are under staffed, and that this could seriously impact on the RPLRP implementation. All the project districts, there is only one veterinary officer, usually assisted by an animal husbandry officer and community animal health workers. Most veterinary related work and Disease control and management is handled by community animal health workers, NAADS animal service providers and the animal cross border committees as sited in Nakapiripiti district. Under staffing has hindered effective meat inspections, meat inspections are only conducted in the major towns and town councils where the veterinary officers can easily reach.

In the works department in all the districts, there are trained staffs to handle dam rehabilitation and maintenance.

6.1.3 Veterinary laboratories and training schools
In the Karamoja region veterinary laboratories have been constructed under the Karamoja Livelihood Project (KALIP). However, the Teso and Sebei regions have not been graced with such an opportunity. This may significantly impact on the project implementation in these regions.

The former District farm institutes that were used as demonstration schools for farmers are all non-functional in all the project districts.

6.1.4 HIV/AIDS
Weekly cattle markets are major human collection centres in the project areas. People come from as far Southern Sudan, Kenya, Kampala Mbale and all the neighboring districts to trade in these markets. A lot
of money changes hands in these markets. Social activities such drinking, eating and dancing overtake the business activities in the evenings, this becomes fertile ground for the spread of HIV/AIDS. It is a well-studied fact that incidences of HIV/AIDS increase with migration. This makes the risk of HIV impact on the Project much higher.

It was observed and also revealed during the community consultations that there are no HIV/AIDS interventions in all these markets. “so many things take place on the market day, especially in the evening when people are drunk. You find that in the next day, LC chairman is busy handling cases of men beating their wives suspecting that they slept with other men in the market” (market vendor in Ochorimongin market)

6.1.5 Market structures
From observation, there were no established structures (holding grounds, slaughter facilities, sanitary facilities, waste disposal area, loading platforms) in all the cattle markets. All the markets were in open space without any form of fence. Those that were available in some markets were either very old or not utilized due to their poor state. In this status, its difficult to check and isolate diseased animals, hence abetting spread of diseases. Lack of waste disposal facilities for both animal byproducts and humans leaves the market places very filthy and unhygienic resulting in the spread of both human and animal diseases. Gate collection is also cumbersome encouraging tax evasion and accountability related problems, and yet this revenue would be useful in the maintenance and operation of the market facilities.

6.1.6 The Cost of Production
Farm equipment used by farmers in the project area are traditional; majority still use hand hoes, while some especially in Kween and Teso region use oxen. With household still using the traditional equipment, the hope for this project to boost household income is far-fetched. This is exacerbated by the small land holdings and the customary tenure systems in the project area that do not make it possible to engage in highly mechanized farming.

6.1.7 Social Aspects
In Amuria and Katakwi, it was noted that the biggest challenge is the syndrome of free things which the community got used especially during the insurgency when NGOs were providing almost everything for free. The same applies in the Karamoja region where communities are highly dependent on handouts from NGOs/international organizations such as World Food Programme.

Given the history of cattle rustling, Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) insurgency, and the effects of climate change, the whole project areas is categorized as vulnerable. However, it was proposed that the communities should get involved in project planning right from the beginning so that they have a sense of ownership to the project. Their involvement could be through the use of their unskilled labor so that they can own the facilities intended to be established.

6.1.8 Marketing
Marketing of the livestock, livestock products and other produce has been a challenge with middlemen dictating the price hence cheating the farmers. Farmers fetch low prices for their products because they sell their produce without any value addition. Farmers individually market their products in the weekly markets. There is no collective marketing of the products and this in away offers them low bargain for their products. It was proposed by the stakeholders that the project should include aspects of value
addition and marketing of the products from the region as a way of increasing household incomes. Stores for livestock products and other produce should be established and the products marketed collectively.

6.1.9 Resource Conflict
There is serious competition for resources especially water and pasture during the dry seasons. Due to the prolonged droughts, most of the streams and dams dry up thereby forcing the communities to graze the cattle far away from their established settlements. This is usually in the valleys, near permanent rivers and streams or near the lake in the case of Kumi and Bukeeda. However, such places too have established settlements who may not be purely pastoralists. This usually leads to resource conflict between the agro-pastoralist and pastoralists. Water and pasture are the main resources competed for yet majority is on communal land or land with limited or no restriction to access (open access). Punishing offenders becomes difficult as the ownership is not clearly defined or in some cases there no clear rules at all.

6.1.10 Natural Resources Issues
The project intends to address natural resource issues in the 12 selected districts through the following Sub-components;

- water resources development,
- pasture and land development;
- securing access to natural resources.

The project implementers should ensure that the management plans for these resources are developed and that the affected communities are fully involved in the formulation of these management plans. This will ease implementation and monitoring of all the planned activities in such management plans by the communities and other stakeholders. It was noted during the consultations that only Amuria and Kween districts had some natural resources management plans. In Kween, there is the Atara river basin management plan while in Amuria, they are implementing Omunyal wetland management plan.

During the project implementation, care should be taken not to destroy the indigenous trees and vegetation which is of high value to the communities.

6.1.11 Livelihood Diversification
The goal of the project is to improve livelihoods and enhance resilience of communities to drought by transforming the agro-pastoralist and pastoralist sector into a more profitable, integrated and resilient economic system thereby improving food and nutrition security. This can further be achieved by enabling farmers to diversify. This is already being practiced especially during the rainy seasons, farmers are engaged in crop production. With the availability of water resources and pasture throughout the year, production will then be viable continuously. The project should not only look at the provision of physical structures but also capacity building in better agronomic practices and diversification of farm activities. During the community consultations some members were interested in concentrating on value addition and transportation of their products as a way of diversifying from the farm, this should be encouraged.

6.1.12 Increased Income
Other than imported materials, construction will directly and indirectly inject money into local economies of project areas through supplies and wages to hired construction crew. Income from employment will lead to increased purchasing power in communities, with secondary benefits to small businesses and local
administrations by way of increased tax collection base. Project will spur local procurement through supply of food stuffs to workers’ camps.

Other benefits to local economies will be rental of houses/ hotels for workers not housed in camps, which will earn the local entrepreneurs considerable revenue. This impact can be enhanced by utilizing local labour and procuring local supplies or construction materials wherever practicable; however, the latter will be dependent upon engineering tests being positive for usage.

6.1.13 Health Impacts
Water in the dams acts as a breeding grounds for mosquitoes and other vectors hence causing malaria, bilharzias etc. Establishment of new dams in the area may imply establishment of new breeding grounds for vectors. Hence project implementers should provide for management of such diseases associated with dams and communities should be made aware of any such health risks. A baseline study should be conducted to establish the incidence of such diseases before the new dams are constructed. Provision of reliable source of drinking water must be considered during project implementation.

6.1.14 Management Options
Results from the consultations and household interviews conducted show that the stakeholders prefer the management of the water sources, rangelands and the markets to be by the communities (80%) while those for Government/Farmer were 20%. The district officials were also in conformity with this but emphasized the point of capacity building of farmers’ management skills and continued support from Government in terms of routine supervision and provision of technical and major repairs whenever need arises.

6.1.15 Local Knowledge of the Project by Stakeholders
Other stakeholders identified for the implementation of the project include: the Local Government Administration, the district production department, Non-Governmental Organizations, Traders, Pastoralists and community members. For successful implementation of the RPLRP project, it was important to seek the knowledge of the project among the stakeholders.
As seen from the figure 29 above, the level of the project awareness differed from group to group of stakeholders.

Despite efforts by MAAIF to create awareness through meetings called at district during district consultations and ministry national stakeholders meeting in Kampala. Only 39% of the district leaders in the 12 districts were aware of the RPLRP and the proposed physical interventions. This as well translated into very low awareness of the project at sub-county level was still very low. Majority (70%) of the district technical officials (DVOs, VOs, and production coordinators) in 12 districts were aware of the project through planning meetings organized by the Ministry. However the extension workers like Animal Husbandry officers whom form part of the technical extension staff at sub county level were not aware of the program. Only 31% of the pastoralists (livestock farmers) and 18% of the butcher men and traders were aware of the project. This was because the district technical extension workers had not sensitized the pastoralist about the project. Some NGOs like Mercy Corps, Samaritans Path, Action Aid, ACTED, Caritas, World Vision and KDA were aware of the RPLRP and the economic and social benefits to the pastoralists. However, district leaders are willing to provide all the necessary political support as they expect the different project interventions to benefit communities through increased livestock production and household incomes. The pastoralists expressed gratitude for the RPLRP project as they expected to benefit from different project activities to improve their livestock productivity and livelihoods. The traders expect new opportunities of business to open in both local and international markets and through associations, pastoralists are expected to benefit from new marketing strategies, value addition and increased prices of animal products in Uganda. The ordinary people are expected to benefit through improved access water by cattle and domestic use, food security and increase in household income.

Thought local knowledge of the project was found to be low, it does not mean that this is totally new project to the local communities because there are several efforts by Government, NGOs and
International Organizations already working in the project area in relation to resilience to pastoral challenges. Therefore for successful implementation of the RPLRP project, it is important to listen to successful experiences from the local communities so as to benchmark the positives and avoid the negative ones. Information flow from the implementers to beneficiaries is of paramount importance especially this particular project area where so much effort have put in place but less results achieved due to apathy of the project. It is therefore recommended that all stakeholders from top to bottom should be involved through sensitization about the project right from the planning design and implementation stages of the project cycle.

6.1.16 Other general issues noted during the consultations

- Sustainability of Project with regard to the geopolitical situation of the country;
- Land acquisition, equity and compensation issues(for dam construction, markets and other infrastructure);
- PAPs and engagement of legal experts and private valuation experts;
- Awareness creation and education of farmers and local communities on the Project;
- Training of farmers in pesticide handling, usage and management of pesticide containers;
- Siltation of dams and other water sources;
- Control of cattle movement in the area;
- Disease management and surveillance across borders;

6.2 Free, Prior and Informed Consultation

Free, prior and informed consultation were held with project communities who were found to qualify to be regarded as indigenous peoples found in the project areas to fulfill the policy requirements of the World bank operational guidelines and government of Uganda policy on equal opportunities commission. The policy requires that Indigenous Peoples benefit from the commercial development of natural resources. Therefore, the project must include measures to (a) avoid potentially adverse effects on the Indigenous Peoples’ communities; or (b) when avoidance is not feasible, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for such effects. Bank-financed projects are also to be designed and structured in a manner to ensure that the Indigenous Peoples receive social and economic benefits which are culturally appropriate and gender and inter-generationally inclusive.

6.2.1 The Ik Community

Public consultations were undertaken with the Ik community to get their views on the proposed RPLRP projects and their priorities. The Ik community was appreciative of government’s efforts to consider bringing the RPLRP project in their area. They were much interested in finding out how they can benefit from a project which they viewed as pro-pastoralists given the fact that they are mainly depend on farming. The Ik were concerned that the Timu forest which they depend on for their food and rituals was being encroached by other tribes especially the Dodoth and Turkana from Kenya who come to look for grass for their animals and also to hunt the wildlife in there. They therefore requested that their views be incorporated in the project design to help benefit otherwise most projects that are implemented in Kaabong do not bother to consult them as they are regarded few or little people who live in the mountains (Kamion Escarpment). Their priorities proposed for the RPLRP project to consider included the need for:
The Ik community requested to be given special considerations and not be buddle up with the other Karamojong people of Kaabong district because their livelihoods and lifestyle are totally different. Asked what special attention they needed, the Ik said for example if markets are to built one should be put close them somewhere near Kamion Sub-county. Currently they don’t go to any market because they are all very far and because they are surrounded by many hostile tribes, such as the Dodoth and Turkana warriors, these attack them knowing that are typically non-violent group of people.

They mentioned that the markets will help sell their produce especially food (maize, sorghum, beans, pumpkins and Irish potatoes) to other people who depend on pastoralism. This will enable them mix with others as they are usually segregated by other karamojong tribes. They will be able to get some money and buy other household items. (A look inside the Ik hut could reveal a very pathetic situation of simply a dry grass or skin used for sleeping and a few utensils (plastic caps & plates, pots & small saucepans) the Suuka used as clothing is the same used for covering at night.)

The Ik requested that if the project is bring improved stocks of cattle they should bring for also improved seeds because currently they are still depending on the indigenous seed they save from previous harvest for planting and this has really affected their harvests. They asked to be trained in modern agricultural practices but the only limitation here is the language however, they said that some of their children now can speak Nga’karamojong so they can translate for them. Or else they request the program to consider training them in their language of Iche’dot.

Community members complained that they suffer from frequent famine due to drought due to the geographical isolation, whenever aid is sent it doesn’t usually reach them as it is more directed to groups residing in the valley areas but for them up at the escarpment nobody bothers to them. They appreciated the efforts Government is trying to remember for the new RLPRP project.

The Ik community mentioned that they are in dire need of services such as better access roads, education, health care and some sort of protection of their lands to prevent them from raids that add to their losses from the frequent droughts. They are frequently pressured into relocating their communities to the valleys where governmental services are readily available, but they want to stay and have a future in their ancestral lands, thus, are in constant fear that they will be forced out of their homeland; The Ik who traditional agriculturalist said that they have witnessed the depletion of wild game in their areas due to the widespread use of illegal guns. The Timu forest in which they reside and also a center for their rituals and traditions is slowly reducing causing gathering methods to be more difficult as well as greatly minimizing their center for rituals and traditions.

Asked if they have any natural resources they share with other communities, the Ik community members mentioned that for them they depend on Timu forest but other communities like the Dodoth and Turkana from Kenya come sometimes forcefully to hunt in the forest, gather honey, grass for thatching and pasture for their cattle. The Ik said they experience conflicts especially with the neighbours who disregard them. They also sometimes get conflicts within themselves but they very minimal because of they are very religious and respect each other so much however, in case of a problem they resolve it amicably using the elders who are highly regarded.
6.2.2 The Benet
After receiving information about the proposed RLPRP project to the Benet community were very appreciative of Government for this initiative. They welcomed the project because the current rangelands utilized by the Benet indeed require rehabilitation. They said that right now they graze their cattle indiscriminately since after the eviction from the Mt. Elgon they don’t have enough land and when other people like the Karamajong come in especially during the dry season the resources are depleted. They added that with coming of this project it will help make official their continued existence in this place since previously they have been viewed as just resettlees.

Though appreciative, the Benet people are still bitter with Government about the eviction because kept mentioning that; “we used have enough land for cultivation and keeping of animals before eviction; we even used to do hunting in the forest; collect honey and fruits but now we were only given quarter an acre. This land is not enough and we pray Government considers adding us some more land.” They no longer resources especially honey and pastureland from Mt. Elgon National Park because UWA does not allow them to do so;

The Benet still believe that one day Government will honor the court ruling and return their land which is in a protected area. They wondered how they fully will participate in the RLPRP project activities since they have not been fully resettled. They said the land allocated to them is not enough and they are have not yet given them full ownership because they don’t have tititles. Some claim that the households were given only 3 acres each which is not enough to sustain them. They appeal to Government for more land which should be transferred to them officially otherwise they fear being marginalized another Government or even anyone can easily come up and again evict them from there.

Discussions with the Benet Lobby Group (BLG) a Non Government Organization which has been working very closely with the Benet for the last 37 years advocating for rights revealed that, the Benet still lag behind in so many things especially education. They said the Benet are still traumatized about that eviction so any project that is coming and is talking about land issues will meet some resistance. They advised that there is need for mobilization and sensitization of the Benet people for the project to succeed. They added that for the project to receive maximum support, any land acquired for project development should be adequately compensated for. They further mentioned that the Benet Lobby Group is willing and ready to work with the project implementation to help mobile and convince the Benet people to embrace the project.

Asked about any cases of conflicts experienced in the Kween district, participants mentioned that the main causes of conflicts include; destruction of crops by the animals especially those that take a long time to mature during the dry season when pastoralists from other areas come in search of water and pasture. Land wrangles in the arable land are experienced among the farmers especially in the middle belt. Competition for fish in River Greek with the Karamojong do causes some conflicts and minimal cases of cattle theft are also experienced amongst community members. These conflicts are minimized through use of established systems of governance like the local council and courts of law. However, before the cases are forwarded to government structures the communities try to resolve them through clan leaders. Fencing
of farm lands is done to protect crops from destruction and for the fish in Greek River communities are advised to stay away.

6.3 Recommendation from the Stakeholders’ Consultations

a. Efforts should be made to make use of, and incorporate, indigenous knowledge and local resource management arrangements into project design;

b. Special measures for the recognition and support of customary rights to land and natural resources may be necessary. This is particularly the case for sub-projects that support the development of management plans and other forms of land and natural resource use planning;

c. Special measures concerning women and marginalized sub-groups in the communities may be necessary to ensure inclusive development activities;

d. Capacity building activities for the indigenous communities to enhance their participation in project activities may be useful or necessary;

e. There could be an opportunity to engage some NGOs groups already successfully working with communities to implement some components of the project especially in Karamoja and Kween and with reference to Ik and Benet respectively;

f. MAAIF, as the executing agency, should ensure that the contractor employs the services of a health related organization to sensitize, treat and counsel community on HIV/AIDS.

g. Grievance mechanism taking into account local dispute resolution practices;

h. Monitoring and reporting arrangements, including mechanisms and benchmarks appropriate to each sub-project and affected communities. Participatory monitoring and evaluation exercises will be adapted to the local context;

i. Regulations should be developed and committees elected to oversee the management of the established developments like the water sources, markets. Money should be put aside to cater for operation and maintenance, to cater for attendants and minor damages. The farmers should agree on performing all activities at the same time and also on the amount to be collected especially from the markets;

j. For the sustainable management of the rangelands and watersheds, management plans should be developed in a participatory manner, involving the user communities as much as possible;

k. Women, children as well as the men, should be involved in consultation and awareness actions during project implementation;

l. Consultations will, as appropriate, be at times gender separate to enable women and children to freely contribute their own views;

m. Both men and women be given equal opportunity in terms of labor employment and participation during project implementation especially infrastructure construction works; and

n. Gender disaggregated monitoring data should be made a project policy in order to monitor impacts and mitigation actions as a result of the Project.
7 INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY

7.1 Institutional Arrangement for RPLRP Implementation

Project activities will be implemented at the regional, national and sub-national levels under the coordination of IGAD. The project has been designed in a way that will facilitate coordinated project work planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting by each of the three countries at decentralized and national levels, and by the countries and IGAD at the regional level. Regional Activities will be implemented by regional institutions (e.g. IGAD), with support from relevant national institutions. National Activities under the Regional Outputs will be implemented at country level under the coordination of regional institutions. The RPLRP will not create new parallel implementation structures but will rather build on existing ones and/or ensure consistency with those proposed in Uganda’s CPP. As much as feasible, the project will make use of the same implementation structures used by projects with similar objectives in the same project area.

7.1.1 Regional Level

IGAD will leverage coordination and implementation of the RPLRP on institutional arrangements detailed in the IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) Strategy. The IGAD Secretariat will coordinate the implementation of the cross-border interventions, and serve as a platform to provide technical assistance and support policy dialogue with countries. IGAD and other Development Partners will support the following areas that impact on the project activities: (i) development and adoption of the regional drought resilience policies; (ii) development and dissemination of Regional Information and Knowledge Management (RIKM) systems; and (iii) building the capacity of the participating countries through the support of regional consultations, workshops, training and cross-border collaboration. Operationally, IGAD will work with the countries through designated political and technical focal points and will also convene half-yearly Regional Project Steering Committee (RSC) meetings.

7.1.2 National Level

At the national level, MAAIF will be the lead executing agency responsible for coordinating the implementation of the four technical components by MAAIF departments and other key ministries/agencies. The main Ministries involved in project implementation are:

- Ministry of Water and Environment for Component 1;
- Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives for Component; and
- Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) will take charge of Component 4.

MAAIF will be responsible for the integration of the national interventions in the regional project. It will ensure the project funds are administered in accordance with the approved Loan Agreement, as well as the Government of Uganda and the World Bank’s policies and guidelines. The Ministry will also be accountable for authorizing and verifying project transactions and will work closely with the Bank’s Project Task Team, IGAD and the lead executing agencies in the other project countries. MAAIF will in
addition, establish the National Project Coordination Unit (NPCU) within the Directorate of Animal Resources.

7.1.3 National Project Coordination Unit (NPCU)

The NPCU will coordinate project planning, supervision, monitoring, evaluation, knowledge learning and management of the project activities. Specifically, the main responsibilities of the NPCU will include:

a. supervising the implementation of activities under all components;
b. preparing the project’s annual work plans and budgets (AWPBs);
c. operating the management information, M&E and reporting systems; contracting out, on a competitive basis as appropriate, the implementation of various project activities to implementing partners, service providers and technical assistance experts;
d. monitoring the progress of project activities and evaluating the performance of the different contractors;
e. coordinating and consolidating periodical reports from implementing units and implementing partners;
f. providing logistical, administrative and technical backstopping to implementing partners and district level implementing agencies;
g. serving as the secretariat to the National Steering Committee;
h. establishing and maintaining linkages with other relevant government ministries, development partners, civil society, NGOs, as well as with IGAD and the NPCUs and counterpart institutions in the other project countries;
i. carrying out financial management and procurement of goods and services;
j. reporting regularly to Government, IGAD and World Bank on project progress; and
k. Disseminating information about the project’s rationale, concept, content and progress to the concerned stakeholders and all interested parties.

The NPCU will be headed by the National Project Coordinator as the overall technical manager of the project and will comprise four heads of the project’s technical components (Natural Resource Management, Marketing and Trade, Livelihoods Support and Pastoral Risk Management). While these positions will be filled by Government staff through secondments, the following NPCU staff will be recruited on a competitive basis;

✓ a Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist,
✓ a Project Accountant, and
✓ Assistant Procurement Officer.

The NPCU technical staff will carry out quarterly supervisions of project activities in the 12 districts, and participate in/hold regular meetings at regional, national and district levels to plan for the project, review project progress and make decisions related to planning and implementation of project activities. They will also be responsible for the preparation of quarterly and annual project performance reports, project mid-term review, and for submission of relevant reports through the Permanent Secretary MAAIF to the World Bank.

7.1.4 National Steering Committee (NSC)

The main responsibilities of the NSC will include: (i) providing conceptual, strategic and political guidance to the NPCU for project design, implementation and coordination of project activities;
(ii) ensuring overall conformity with Government and regional policies and strategies; (iii) reviewing
project progress and performance; (iv) approving the AWPBs; (v) resolving any implementation problems
or conflicts; and (vi) assisting the NPCU in obtaining, whenever needed, Government support to the
projects. The NSC will meet at least twice a year, chaired by the Permanent Secretary from MAAIF and
the NPCU serving as secretariat. It will include representatives from all key Ministries/Agencies involved
in Project Implementation (see below), IGAD Focal Person in MAAIF, World Bank, as well as
representatives of (i) Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs) from Project Districts (2), (ii) Research
Institutions (2), Development Partners (2), NGOs (1), Civil Society Organizations (2) and the formal
private sector (1).

7.1.5 Technical Coordination Meetings
In addition to the half-yearly NSC meetings, there will be quarterly Technical Coordination Meetings,
with the aim to discuss specific technical and coordination issues and address any constraints that may be
identified. The meetings will be chaired by the NPCU and will involve the key implementing agencies as
well as other implementing partners of the four technical components.

7.1.6 Key Ministries/Agencies in project implementation

7.1.6.1 Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE)
Under the Ministry of Water and Environment, the key Departments that will be involved in the
implementation of the project will be:

7.1.6.2 The Directorate of Water Resources Development - under Water for production
Will provide technical support under Component 1, specifically in mapping water and water points and
rangelands for rehabilitations and in supervision of designs and construction of water dams and valley
dams.

7.1.6.3 The Department of Meteorology (DoM)
Will be involved in the collection of early warning, weather and climate change information and its
timely dissemination to the communities. It will take the lead in installation of weather equipment and
training farmers on how to manage weather equipment, data collection/analysis and dissemination.

7.1.6.4 The Climate Change Unit
Under the Department of Meteorology will provide resource persons in climate change trainings at district
and national level.

7.1.6.5 Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives
The Ministry will be responsible for technical guidance in animal and animal product trade, market
opportunities, market information, trade policies, market construction and support to value chain actors.
Training of informal and formal pastoral traders will be conducted under its supervision.

7.1.6.6 Office of the Prime Minister, Department of Disaster Preparedness, Management and
Refugees (DDPMR)
The DDPMR will be involved in training disaster management committees at all levels and members of
the National Early Warning Committee. It will also play a key role in project implementation as it serves
as the secretariat to the National Platform for Disaster Preparedness and Management which is the
Government’s main mechanism to coordinate drought resilience initiatives implemented by the various ministries and agencies. The DRR platform is comprised of focal point technical officers from line ministries, UN agencies, NGOs and other relevant stakeholders. The functions of the DRR platform will include monitoring and analyzing hazard, risk and disaster trends in the country, developing common preparedness, contingency and response plans, networking and sharing information, experiences and technical expertise nationally, regionally and internationally, and monitoring implementation of response strategies. The platform has structures in all tiers of government from national to the village level. However, the DRR platform has not been effectively utilized to-date and would require adequate resources and extensive capacity building to fulfill its mandate.

7.1.6.7 Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS)
The UBOS will support the NPCU in collecting information required for project implementation including baseline data on households, livestock population the livelihood options in the 12 project districts.

7.1.6.8 Serere and Nabuin Research Centers
These institutions are under the National Agricultural Research Organization (NARO) and will provide technical guidance on new technologies e.g. draught resistant animals and crops, post harvesting, animal breeding and water harvesting technologies. The centers will also train the pastoralists in the use of the new technologies.

7.1.6.9 Project Coordination at District Level
At the districts levels the project will be implemented under the following arrangements:

7.1.6.10 District Project Advisory Committee (DPAC)
At the district, a committee chaired by the CAO and comprising the District Agricultural Officer, Veterinary Officer, NAADS Coordinator, Production/Marketing Officer, Commercial Officer, Entomologist, Engineer, Water Officer/Engineer, Forestry Officer, Community Development Officer, Environmental Officer, a representative of Local Council Five, Secretary for Production, and the Resident District Commissioners (RDCs) will be formed to oversee the implementation of the project. The DPAC will also provide policy guidance and financial management of the project funds, and approve the district annual work plans and budgets. The CAO will serve as the overall accounting officer of the project activities and funds in the district.

7.1.6.11 District Coordination Unit (DCU)
The DCU will be established under the District Directorate of Animal Resources. It will be coordinated by the District Veterinary Officer as its District Project Coordinator. The district will recruit or identify an officer as Assistant M&E/Data officer, accounts assistant and extension staff. The DCU will coordinate the implementation project activities at district, sub-county and community levels. The District Project Coordinator and Assistant M&E officer will prepare district annual work plans and budgets - assisted by the NPCU, carry out district and community supervision of the project activities, produce monthly and quarterly reports, organize regular meetings, field visits and exchange tours across borders.
7.1.6.12 Project Implementation at Community Level

Project implementation at the community level will be undertaken by the existing Local Councils 1, 2 and 3. Local communities and all beneficiary groups (e.g. agro-pastoralists/pastoralists, traders/marketers, service providers) will be fully involved in the planning, appraisal, monitoring and evaluation of project activities at the local levels.

7.1.6.13 Capacity Building and Training

The Project will involve funding of subprojects which will have various levels of impacts on the social and general environment set up. This implies that in order to effectively operationalize the ESMF, the line agencies need to have basic skills and understanding of general environmental and social dimensions and with specific reference to the RPLRP aspects. This section focuses on the adequacy of the institutions to carry out their ESMF responsibilities.

Table 118: Summary of Institutional Capacity aspects for RPRLP Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies/Institution</th>
<th>Capacity issues</th>
<th>Strategy for capacity building</th>
<th>Targeted Persons/Intervention</th>
<th>Cost of intervention (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries</td>
<td>The Ministry has staff who handle gender and social aspects in the sector; The Gender and Social technical staff in the Ministry need targeted capacity building in specifics of the ESMF; There is shortage of equipment and transport for the existing specialists; There is dedicated Environmental Liaison Unit (ELU) to address environmental issues in the Ministry’s policies, plans and activities.</td>
<td>Ministry to create an ELU in its structure; On short-term basis, hire an Environmental and Social Specialist to manage implementation and compliance of ESMF in RPLRP; Provide facilitation in terms of computers and transport for staff handling ESMF related activities; Conduct tailor-made trainings relating to ESMF aspects to its staff involved in the project.</td>
<td>Establish an ELU in the Ministry’s Structure and staff it. Directorate Staff working on the project.</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is already provided for in the overall Project Budget. 20,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies/Institution</th>
<th>Capacity issues</th>
<th>Strategy for capacity building</th>
<th>Targeted Persons/Intervention</th>
<th>Cost of intervention (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives</td>
<td>There is no deliberate unit to handle environmental and social issues in the sector.</td>
<td>On short-term basis procure an Environmental and Social Specialist to take a lead in compliance of ESMF interventions.</td>
<td>Establish an ELU in the Ministry’s Structure and staff it. Recruit a short-term specialist</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Water and Environment</td>
<td>Has a Directorate for Environmental Affairs with 5 Departments; Its Department of Environmental Support Services (DESS) monitors, inspects and supervises environmental compliance in the districts; and Has environmental and social technical staff in its establishment. Its Climate Change Unit has on-going interventions in most parts of the country.</td>
<td>RPLRP to provide additional facilitation in terms of computers and transport. Provide additional support to the CCU</td>
<td>The interventions are part of the Project Budget.</td>
<td>The interventions are part of the Project Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Prime Minister</td>
<td>Involved in training disaster management committees at all levels and members of the National Early</td>
<td>There are social scientists who handle emergencies and disasters as well as aspects of refugees;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies/Institution</td>
<td>Capacity issues</td>
<td>Strategy for capacity building</td>
<td>Targeted Persons/Intervention</td>
<td>Cost of intervention (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies/Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NUSAF II has an Environmental Specialist who could conduct training of National Early Warning Committee on RPLRP.</td>
<td>Provide additional support to NUSAF 2 Environmental Specialist to oversee SIA aspects of RPLRP in OPM; and Provide facilitation for training of DDR staff on SIA aspects.</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Project Coordination Unit (NPCU)</td>
<td>Will serve as Project Coordination Unit with 4 heads of thematic components (Natural Resource Management, Marketing and Trade, Livelihood Support and Pastoral Risk Management) of the project.</td>
<td>The head of Natural Resources Management should include environmental aspects of ESMF and that for Livelihood Support should be responsible for social dimensions in ESMF as well.</td>
<td>The qualifications and job descriptions for both the Natural Resources Management and Livelihood Specialists should clear provide for environmental and social dimensions in the ESMF.</td>
<td>To be covered in the overall Project Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS)</td>
<td>UBOS has specialists for agriculture, livestock, environment and district statistics; and Work with line district departments in terms of data collection.</td>
<td>Use of existing staff at UBOS</td>
<td>Additional support to UBOS in terms of equipment and transport for UBOS staff for fieldwork.</td>
<td>Covered under overall Project Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Steering Committee (NSC)</td>
<td>Ensuring mainstreaming of ESMF provisions into RPLRP.</td>
<td>Sensitizations and workshops.</td>
<td>Members of NSC</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARO institutions (Serere and Nabuin)</td>
<td>Proper mainstreaming of ESMF provisions into their mandated activities under the RPLRP.</td>
<td>NARO as a statutory agency needs an in-house Environmental and Social Management Specialist; Conducting</td>
<td>Staff involved in RPLRP activities</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies/Institution</td>
<td>Capacity issues</td>
<td>Strategy for capacity building</td>
<td>Targeted Persons/Intervention</td>
<td>Cost of intervention (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sensitization and awareness trainings of staff.</td>
<td>DPAC members</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Project Advisory Committee (DPAC)</td>
<td>Proper mainstreaming of SIA provisions into their mandated activities under the RPLRP.</td>
<td>Conducting sensitization and awareness trainings of staff.</td>
<td>DCU members</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Coordination Unit</td>
<td>Proper mainstreaming of SIA provisions into their mandated activities under the RPLRP.</td>
<td>Conducting sensitization and awareness trainings of staff; Involvement Community Development Officers (CDOs) in DCU.</td>
<td>Communities and the local leaders.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementation at Community Level</td>
<td>Challenge of communities understanding and owning up ESMF aspects in the Project.</td>
<td>Conducting sensitization of communities and local leaders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.1.6.14 Capacity Building

The Capacity building will be required to implement the recommendations outlined in the RPLRP. The key areas of capacity building programme to include:

The social assessment process:
- ✔ Review of the document;
- ✔ World Bank Safeguards;
- ✔ Review of Resettlement Policy Framework Process in Uganda;
- ✔ Classification of project activities;
- ✔ Social Assessment Screening;
- ✔ How to prepare RAPs;
- ✔ Design of appropriate mitigation measures;
- ✔ How to monitor mitigation measures.
7.1.6.15 Training needs

Uganda’s environmental policy and legal framework mandates Environmental Liaison Units in sector ministries to handle sector-specific aspects of environmental management. An important aspect of the SIA will be to assess the extent to which this is functioning properly and to institute measures to address any problems through institutional reforms. As such, an institutional and training needs assessment will be carried out not only for DEOs and EFPs, but also for the principal implementers – i.e. NAADS, NARO and MAAIF. The assessment will be translated into a capacity building program (sub-project) and will outline in detail and cost the required capacity building actions to be undertaken.

Training programs will be coordinated and anchored at national level and District at local government level. Individuals experienced in environmental and social aspects of sub-projects will be called upon through a competitive process to develop and conduct short term trainings on various aspects of implementing the SIA guidelines.

Different groups involved in subprojects’ implementation have different training needs in terms of raised awareness, sensitization to the issues, and detailed technical training:

- **Awareness-raising** for participants so that they are able to appreciate the significance or relevance of environmental and social issues;
- **Sensitization for participants** to be familiar enough with environmental and social issues that they can make informed and specific requests for technical support; and
- **Detailed technical training** for participants who will need to analyze potentially adverse environmental and social impacts, to prescribe mitigation approaches and measures, and to prepare and supervise the implementation of management plans.

The training program for various role players will include:

- Orientation program on the RPLRP;
- Participatory Methodologies;
- Project Management;
- Using the ER checklist and assigning of environmental categories;
- Design of appropriate mitigation measures;
- Integrating environmental and social management aspects into the implementation of sub-projects
- Reporting;
- Subproject supervision and monitoring.

7.1.6.16 Overall Implementation

The implementation of the RPLRP will be the sole responsibility of the PIU under the supervision of NEMA and the respective District Environment Officers. Management of environmental issues will require long-term planning to ensure prevention rather than correction of adverse impacts. Depending on existing capacity, qualified professionals may have to be contracted to carry out periodic monitoring. This should include the assessment of critical parameters, such as air, soil and groundwater quality, or any other parameters deemed essential by the monitoring team. Environmental Audits should be carried and appropriate records maintained.
7.1.6.17 Monitoring
Monitoring will begin during the construction phase and must continue throughout all the phases of project cycle (cradle to grave). This will include regular reviews of the impacts that can’t be adequately assessed before the beginning of the project, or which arise unexpectedly. In such cases, appropriate new actions to mitigate any adverse effects must be identified. The Developer will maintain inspection and auditing records, while ensuring that incident reporting and emergency response procedures are established and enforced.

7.1.6.18 Grievance Redress Mechanism
Key public relations management will include:

- PIU shall establish and maintain good on-going public relations with interested and affected parties and Authorities;
- PIU shall establish Community Liaison Forums (CLFs) as the forums for communication between affected parties and PIU;
- Public comments and concerns shall be relayed via the CLFs to PIU;
- PIU will use the CLFs to provide feedback to the affected parties;
- Each CLF meeting will determine the frequency of required meetings.

7.2 Capacity Building Needs to Implement RPLRP

7.2.1 Institutional Capacity Assessment

7.2.1.1 MAAIF
Unlike other ministries, MAAIF has no Environmental Liaisons Office. MAAIF staff do not currently have sufficient experience and capability for dealing either with implementation of the environmental mitigation measures or monitoring of various environmental quality parameters. Hence, they will require training and expertise assistance to perform the environmental management and monitoring and to implement the environmental monitoring plan. An Environment Management Specialist (consultant) will be required to train the staff regarding, sampling, testing, analysis and use of environmental monitoring equipment. They will also be briefed about prevailing environmental legislation and standards. The other option is for MAAIF to hire an environmental consulting firm to oversee implementation of the ESMF.

7.2.1.2 Districts
All the 12 Districts have qualified Environment Officers to track implementation of the ESMF including supervision. However, they do not have enough resources to effectively monitor the projects on ground. They may therefore need facilitation which will be catered for in the costing of the ESMP.
8 POTENTIAL PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS

8.1 Potential Positive Impacts

- Infrastructure facilities are to be shared by different ethnic groups and this can help achieve peace building goals of increasing interaction and fostering cooperation;
- Better and hygienic environment for trade in livestock and livestock products will be established by the project which will be a large positive benefit to the communities and local governments;
- The implementation of the project will bring about employment opportunities for people in the community;
- The planned rehabilitation and construction of valley dams will provide sources of water for the pastoral communities which in the long run can bring about change of their lifestyles from pastoral to sedentary agriculture;
- The cattle markets once constructed will be sources of income for the local governments through collection of market dues;
- The cattle markets will also have good waste management facilities in their vicinity through the project such as toilets;
- The project plans to focus on supporting appropriate alternative income generating enterprises for the households. This has a very large positive impact in terms of socio-economic empowerment of the households and creating food security at household level;
- Demarcation of livestock routes will make control of diseases fairly easier as veterinary staff can then manage the movement of livestock in cases of livestock disease out-breaks;
- Training of DVOs, Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWs), kraal leaders and para veterinary staff will enhance skills for livestock health management in the communities. Therefore, the capacity building in the project will help to develop skill for modern agriculture in the districts and the communities for better delivery of services for social and economic transformation;
- The RPLRP areas will have better information on natural resources especially range lands which will help pastoralists adapt to changing and harsh climatic risks there by minimize loss of livestock;
- Some groups in the Project area are both agriculturalists and pastoralists who keep cattle, goats, and sheep. The new facilities including water points, markets, and rehabilitation of rangelands will improve upon their pastoral livelihoods and access to market in addition to recognizing their rights to natural resources especially watering points. Some of the Iks also look after cattle of their neighboring tribes as a form of employment. However, if such new facilities are constructed in their own land, that could be a motivation for the Iks to look after their own animals;
- Distribution of drought tolerant crops will provide the project beneficiaries with drought tolerant crop varieties to overcome famine one of their major problems. The groups will also benefit from extension services to realize sustainable food production to feed their communities. This will all enhance the agricultural skills of the project beneficiary communities thereby enhancing their sustainable livelihoods;
✓ Famine is an issue among the IPs and construction of storage facilities is likely to ensure safe storage practices to avoid losses due to storage pests;

✓ Conflict management with particular focus on cross-border issues is likely to promote peaceful coexistence, and to eradicate the discrimination and animosity that has existed amongst pastoral communities in the project area;

✓ Construction of pest management facilities such as spray races and dips will enhance tick management strategies in the districts covered under RPLRP;

✓ Upgrading of existing regional veterinary laboratories will further improve delivery of veterinary services and general better management of disease in the RPLRP districts;

✓ The project will put in place pesticide management facilities which will safeguard environment from pollution from such agrochemicals; and

✓ Revitalization of strategic animal check points and holding grounds under the project will ensure measures for disease control will be enhanced there by curbing aspects of disease spread and thefts.

8.2 Potential Negative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Valley dams’ construction potentially disturbs the landscape around the dam through site clearance, excavation, establishing areas for storage equipment and construction materials, establishing accommodation facilities and parking, access roads. Such works can have impacts on the integrity of the environmental settings around the area. This is to be mitigated through ensuring that, works are kept to the minimum and restricted to the sites designated for the valley dams and their support facilities. In addition, the contractors should stockpile the topsoil excavated for restoration and re-vegetation of the site after works which will allow for normal re-vegetation and prevent any subsequent erosion and siltation;

Dam construction creates borrow pits which degrade the environment through extraction of fill materials for embankments. The borrow pits if poorly restored can be breeding sites for malaria and other water based vectors. The contractors should restore borrow areas as part of their contracts and the obligation should be built in the contract and the District Environment Officers should certify to ensure compliance;

The excavation works for valley dams generates volumes of cut to spoil materials which will need to be disposed from the site. In addition, the cut to spoil materials generates loose soils that can silt the water sources. It is proposed that, the contractors will lease dumpsites for the cut to spoil materials and should be sited outside water sources. The sites be leased from landlords in the area after a negotiated payments for such sites;
The construction and rehabilitation works for the dams involves use of plant equipment whose storage and operations can have attendant impacts on environment in terms of noise and compaction of soil thereby affecting soil percolation ability. **Since RPLRP envisages to rehabilitate valley small dams, it means the construction process will involve fairly light equipment which will have minimum impacts on soils. Also, the works will be of short-term nature thus reducing impacts on environment;**

In addition, dam embankments can pose safety risk to both livestock and the communities. If the banks are high, safety of cattle to access water becomes an issue as well for the communities to draw water. In some instances, children can tempted to swim in the dams and may end up drowning. **Fencing the dams and reservoir may be required to prevent access to the embankment and its reservoir. This will serve to control access to deep sections. Secondly, sensitizing communities on the risks associated with the dams be done before they are operational. In all, provision be made for safe watering and collection of water by the communities;**

Construction based impacts arising from excavation works during construction markets and associated project infrastructures will generate dust and other health associated implications on the workers and neighboring communities. **This is to be mitigated through provision of Personal Protection Equipment (PPEs) and observing good engineering practices during construction;**

Potential relegation of traditional crop varieties in favor of projects high yielding varieties that will be developed by the project. The traditional varieties are adapted to the local environment. **It is suggested that, farmers be sensitized on the need to keep along their old crop varieties as well as NARO keeping such germplasm in their seed Banks;**

Operation of slaughter facilities will generate a host of public health issues that can compromise the quality of meat products. **It is suggested that, the Public Health Inspectors as well as Veterinary Officers at the District take charge in ensuring that, the operations of such facilities comply with the Public Health Act 1964;**

There can be instances when animals die in markets due to transportation or disease. In addition, some meat in the slaughtered in the market could be declared unsafe for human consumption. **Condemned meat in and dead animals could be disposed through use of special constructed pits in the vicinity where such carcasses can be disposed and waste engine oil poured on. Where resources allow, incinerators can be constructed or possibilities of use of existing incinerators in some of the health centers should be explored;**

Markets during their operations can have issues of crime triggered by alcohol consumption etc. **The area police and Local Defence Units (LDUs) will be available to maintain law and order in such areas;**

HIV/AIDS is one of the potential concerns resulting from operations and consumption of alcohol. **HIV/AIDS service providers to provide condoms in strategic locations in the markets. This should be done by the project through collaboration with existing HIV/AIDS service providers;**
Livelihoods interventions at households level can fuel instances of domestic violence against women by men over resources. It is common, when women get resources especially money; men tend to grab it for their needs. *This intervention ought to build in mechanisms to protect women;*

Operation of the cattle markets can bring about transmission of livestock diseases. *The area Veterinary staff will issue movement permits for cattle that are to be taken to the markets and this will be done after inspection of the animals to ensure they are healthy and fit for human consumption;*

Apart from meeting a basic human need, new water points in Karamoja could have a direct impact on the spread of livestock and human diseases since most water sources are shared in the region. *The Project will sensitize communities on risks of sharing water sources with livestock;*

If new water point construction does not take into account grazing patterns, it has risk of creating environmental degradation by promoting permanent grazing patterns in which, pastoralist tend to concentrate around water sources. *The project in its plan, has attempted to spread out its plan on water supply interventions to create evenness of water availability to avoid this concern;*

The plan to support alternative income generation enterprises at household levels will require careful planning and consultations to avoid gender based violence especially when husbands want to grab all the resources at the expense of the wives;

Increased agricultural production as a form of livelihood diversification and land use may come at the expense of use seasonal grazing areas. To ensure that RPLRP interventions are conflict sensitive, MAAIF will have to carefully monitor the impact of agricultural livelihoods development and rangeland use among groups within the communities. This will be critical to reduce the likelihood that expanding agricultural land use will further conflict among groups relying on rangelands access;

Seed and planting materials distribution programs can have a number of social risks, including creating dependency among communities for hand-outs, and limited crop performance when seeds distributed do not fit local contexts or do not reflect farmer variety preferences. In addition, free distribution of seeds can also create high expectations among recipients that, the project will continue to provide seed year in year out. To avoid creating dependency syndrome amongst the project beneficiaries, MAAIF will have to limit free seed distributions to a specific period and the project design should include a mechanism to inform and educate recipients about planning and savings for future seed purchases.
The impacts Identified per Component

Component 1: Natural Resources Development
- Water facilities to be rehabilitated in the communities of the project districts;
- New water facilities to be constructed in the communities of the project districts;
- Watersheds for the existing shared water facilities to be rehabilitated/developed in the communities of the project districts;
- Pastoral and Agro-pastoral rangelands/field demonstration schools to be established in the communities of the project districts.

Component 2: Marketing and Trade
- Livestock Markets to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
- Border Check Points to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
- Laboratories to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
- Slaughter Facilities to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
- Holding/Auction Grounds to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
- Trading routes to be demarcated;
- Grazing and strategic livestock feed reserves to be demarcated; and
- Watering points to be demarcated.

Component 3: Livelihoods Support
- Communal demonstration permanent crushes (galvanized iron) to be constructed;
- Crushes - Construction in selected sites (on average 5 per district);
- Pasture improvement (degrade range rehabilitation/reseeding, pasture seeds scheme);
- Field demonstration plots to be established; and
- Storage Facilities in the 12 districts to be constructed.

Identification of impacts includes positive and negative impacts, direct and indirect impacts, and immediate and long-term impacts, unavoidable or irreversible impacts.

Project Impacts and Mitigations Measures

The project will generate impacts which are summarized as follows:

Slaughterhouse projects impacts

Positive impacts
- Better and hygienic environment for livestock

Negative impacts
- Noise and emissions from vehicles transporting construction materials. The contractors to have tarpaulins on trucks to cover loose construction materials. Noise from trucks to mitigated through
limiting hours of works from early morning to 5:00pm to avoid disturbing sleep hours for the community;

- Loss of vegetation cover through site clearance will be mitigated through limiting excavations and general grass planting;
- Management of construction wastes will be through application of good construction practices;
- During operation of slaughter houses, there will be issues of public health. These impacts to be mitigated through involvement of public health inspectors in routine daily inspections of the slaughter houses to ensure good hygiene;
- Management of condemned meat should be through availing land for disposal of condemned carcasses and in the urban areas, incineration facilities be built Potential transmission of livestock diseases through movements in and out of districts. Should be addressed through institution of quarantines to restrict such movements; and
- Waste disposal especially horns, hoofs and bones can be a challenge in upcountry settings where by such wastes can accumulate and pose public health concerns. This is to be addressed through use of landfills in urban settings in the project areas and use of incinerators.

Impacts Relating to Rehabilitation and Operation of Cattle Markets

Positive impacts

- The project will put in place better cattle trading facilities for livestock;
- The cattle markets will be sources of income for the local governments;
- The cattle markets will also have good waste management facilities in their vicinity through the project such as toilets.

Negative impacts and their mitigation measures

- Site clearance works will lead to soil erosion, loss of vegetation and sedimentation of nearby water areas. This can be mitigated through restricting works to designated areas and planting vegetation after close of works;
- Accumulation and management of solid waste during operation of markets. This can be addressed through contracting out the operations and management of such markets by the area local governments;
- The cattle market can have issues of crime especially during its operations. The area police will be available to maintain law and order in such areas;
- HIV/AIDS is one of the potential concerns resulting from operations and consumption of alcohol. HIV/AIDS service providers to provide condoms in strategic locations in the markets;
- Operation of the cattle markets can bring about transmission of livestock diseases. The area Veterinary staff will issue movement permits for cattle that are to be taken to the markets and this will be done after inspection of the animals before issuance of such of authorization;
Rehabilitation and Construction of Dams and Valleys Tanks

Positive impacts
✓ Rehabilitation of valley dams and tanks for animal watering will improve production of livestock; and
✓ Rehabilitation of valley dams and irrigation ponds will provide water for the communities and this will make them settle in their areas thereby reduce their tendency to cross to neighboring districts in search of water with attendant conflicts.

Negative Impacts
✓ Excavation works will generate huge volumes of soils that can silt water sources;
✓ Heaps of excavated soils will be a nuisance to livestock during watering;
✓ In some communities, the local collect domestic water from valley dams and can risks of being knocked down by cattle during water collection process;
✓ During the operation of valley dams, cattle can trample on vegetation in the vicinity of the dam.

Component 1: Natural Resources Development
✓ Water facilities to be rehabilitated in the communities of the project districts;
✓ New water facilities to be constructed in the communities of the project districts;
✓ Watersheds for the existing shared water facilities to be rehabilitated/developed in the communities of the project districts;
✓ Pastoral and Agro-pastoral rangelands/field demonstration schools to be established in the communities of the project districts.

Component 2: Marketing and Trade
✓ Livestock Markets to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
✓ Border Check Points to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
✓ Laboratories to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
✓ Slaughter Facilities to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
✓ Holding/Auction Grounds to be rehabilitated/Construction in the communities of the project districts;
✓ Trading routes to be demarcated;
✓ Grazing and strategic livestock feed reserves to be demarcated; and
✓ Watering points to be demarcated.

Component 3: Livelihoods Support
✓ Communal demonstration permanent crushes (galvanized iron) to be constructed;
✓ Crushes - Construction in selected sites (on average 5 per district);
✓ Pasture improvement (degrade range rehabilitation/ reseeding, pasture seeds scheme);
✓ Field demonstration plots to be established; and
✓ Storage Facilities in the 12 districts to be constructed.
9 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 CONCLUSION
The estimated 87% of the population in the regions of RPRLP project areas depend on livestock as their main source of livelihood and 11% on crop farming and another 2% on other livelihood options. Furthermore, it is estimated that, a large of the communities in the project regions are traditional pastoralists who practice the traditional livestock production whose output in terms of animals and animals products are poor and depended on natural grazing and local breeds. The project investments have great potential to transform the lives of different groups of people including pastoralists, agro pastoralists, indigenous communities and marginalized people in Karamoja, Teso and Sebei sub regions through increased households income, livelihood diversification, early warning information and markets opportunities, modern production technologies, disease control and improved breeds of livestock. This will go a long way to guarantee sustainable livelihoods of the communities in the region.

Other outstanding social negative effects are expected on the land uptake for project facilities given that the main tenure system in the project area is customary. Implementation of project Components 1 & 3 that requires land acquisition will likely trigger social conflicts on the bona fide occupants of the land. Where land uptake challenges may occur, a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF), an Indigenous Peoples Plan Framework (IPPF), an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) that have been prepared for this project will be the instruments that can help guide the project address such issues.

Lastly, the project no doubt, will have large positive impact at household levels with regard to management and ownership of resources that the women can benefit from the project. The Community Development Officers at various levels will assist in managing such challenges as well as operationalizing conflict redress mechanisms in the RPF and ESMF documents.

9.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

9.2.1 Involvement of Indigenous People in Free Prior and Informed Consultation
It can be concluded that this Social Assessment has kick started the continued consultation and participation of the indigenous, vulnerable and marginalized groups throughout the project cycle. MAAIF through its Social Development Consultant should plan to continue with the process of free, prior and informed consultation with the affected Indigenous Peoples’ communities during project preparation to inform them about the project, to fully identify their views, to obtain their broad community support to the project, and to develop project design and safeguard instruments.

Preparation of Specific Indigenous Peoples Plans - the Indigenous Peoples Plan will outline and communicate how, within an agreed timeframe, any adverse impacts identified will be minimized, mitigated and/or compensated by MAAIF as well as how benefits are to be identified and shared with the affected indigenous community. MAAIF with support from World Bank will review and approve subproject specific IPPs and other measures addressing Indigenous Peoples issues. The IPP will include a description of the Indigenous Peoples affected by the project, a summary of the proposed project, detailed description of the participation and consultation process during implementation, description of how the
project will ensure culturally appropriate benefits and avoid or mitigate adverse impacts, a budget, mechanism for grievance redress, and the monitoring and evaluation system.

The two Indigenous People groups (Ik/Teuso and Benets/Ndorobo) in the project area present unique social characteristics which can be a challenge in the implementation of the Project. Their uniqueness is reflected in terms of their location, ways of lives, access and levels of education. For instance, the Ik people stay remotely inside the forest, they are cultivators and gatherers while the Benets are on hilly and rocky areas and do practice mixed farming. In all, access to their areas is a challenge due to poor and non-motorable roads. In such cases, delivery of services and infrastructures to these communities under the RPLRP needs serious considerations and planning. In light of these, RPLRP would include improvement of community access roads in one of its sub-components.

9.2.2 Capacity Building and Institutional Strengthening of Local Communities

Given the low level of project awareness among the intended beneficiaries, a lot more sensitization should be done to have all the stakeholders buy in, especially the communities for whom the project is intended for. To minimize adverse social effects, while mapping out the location of water dams, markets and holding grounds the local community participation is encouraged. This will lead to minimal displacement of people, destruction to property, sense of place, noise, dust or no destruction on the physical cultural sites.

In some RPLRP districts, there are some NGO groups implementing project interventions with success such as Mercy Corps, World Vision and OXFARM who have successfully worked with some communities in Karamoja region on farming activities. Amongst the Benets, Action Aid and Food for the Hungry are supporting a local NGO (Benet Lobby Group) to work on some livelihood interventions with the Benets. All these have reportedly had successful stories in their interventions and RPRLP could implement some of its activities through such groups. NGOs in the district should work closely with The District Project Advisory Committee (DPAC), in conducting sensitization and awareness trainings of staff of the District Coordination Unit, with the involvement of Community Development Officers (CDOs) in DCU. These will then conduct sensitization of communities and local leaders.

9.2.3 Community ownership of facilities

Communal grazing is major practice in the project area leading to movement of animals from one place to another in search of water and pasture. Other natural resources communally shared include; rangelands, swamps, forests, water points and dams. The communal way of managing natural resources makes it difficult to sustainably control the use of these resources leading over utilization thereby impacting the environment negatively like overgrazing, soil erosion, and deforestation. This also leads to spread of diseases beyond borders which may be difficult to control. Lack of community ownership for project infrastructures can result in facilities going unused or being abandoned “white elephant syndrome”. Experience has shown that, some huge infrastructure investments which have been completed without adequate local community input at their conceptualization, face a risk of poor usage and maintenance. Available information indicates that, some previous effort to upgrade infrastructure especially in Karamoja region in terms of water supplies, health facilities and schools have faced challenges of sustainability and optimal usage since their implementation was based on a top-down approach. In view of this, RPRLP should of necessity, operationalize its community mobilization and sensitization
framework on the project aspects so that, the communities are fully brought on board to own and participate in the project to build ownership and guarantee sustainability.

9.2.4 Land for Infrastructures

It has also been established that the project will impact on vulnerable and marginalized groups, if not given special attention the lives and livelihoods of these groups may become worse off than before the project was implemented. It is therefore important that the vulnerable and marginalized people framework and action plan that have been separately prepared are implemented.

One of the key challenges in the project will be the availability of land for the construction of some infrastructures. In all the districts, there are areas designated as markets and some of the markets already have largely makeshift infrastructures. The market areas are under the sub-counties and have been operated without any issue of land ownership issues being raised. However, since there will be construction of permanent structures in the earmarked markets, it is important that, Local Governments acquire titles of ownership over those areas.

As for valley dams, it is reported that, originally the Ministry of Water of Environment would sink valley dams without paying any compensation for the land. During consultations, it emerged that, communities have since began demanding compensation for areas where valley dams are to be located. This is likely to be an issue during project implementation which has to be resolved by the project implementers and the communities early to avoid delaying implementation.

In addition, after the eviction of the Benets from Mt. Elgon National Park by Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), Government temporarily resettled them in the areas of Kwosir, Benet and Kigwoi without any ownership rights over the land which equally makes provision of infrastructures under the project to be a challenge for the Benet community. The project Implementation Unit with supervision and approval of the of the World Bank should undertake to conduct Site specific Resettlement Action Plans (RAP) to ensure that the project affected persons are adequately compensation before the projects works start.

9.2.5 Cultural Aspects

The project area is rich in ethnicity and culture given diverse tribes affected by the project but most common to all the special value given to the “cow”. If the project is to be successfully implemented then serious attention should be given to the different views and their values are incorporated in the project. The people in the three sub regions have physical cultural sites like rivers, rocks and forests that they attach cultural value. It is advised that the RPLRP project activities not negatively impact on these physical cultural sites. It has been established that the project triggers OP4.11Physical Cultural Resources due to the numerous cultural resources found in the project areas. Before the project is implemented, an Environmental Impact Assessment should be conducted (EIA) in order to address impacts on cultural property. The plan should be consistent with the Uganda’s overall policy framework and national legislation, the World Bank OP 4.11 for Physical Cultural Resources, and should take into account institutional capabilities relating to the management and preservation of physical cultural resources.
9.2.6 Gender
Overall the level of gender mainstreaming in development programmes is low despite the efforts made previously. Therefore, the participation of women in developmental process is low. The communities in the project districts are largely patriarchal in nature. In Uganda, the place of women and men in terms of their roles in the community can be largely be categorized into two; reproduction and production respectively. It is a practice that in more than 90% of the households and communities in the districts, men hold sway in matters relating to control of resources and access to them. These resources mainly include productive assets like land, capital, cattle and finances. The males are by tradition the heads of households under the traditional clan systems. It came out clearly during the stakeholders’ consultations that women have no say in the society. She only has control on milk and its products.

During project implementation gender considerations should be adopted to have all; men, women, youth and elders participate. In instances where there will be need for committees to protect and maintain facilities the female representation of 1/3 a third of members should be adhered to. The district gender officers of Community Development Officers should be involved in the Social screening to establish the presence of the marginalized groups and plans of minimizing their suffering incorporated.

9.2.7 HIV/AIDS
During stakeholder consultations, it was reported that markets have become a big avenue of spreading HIV/AIDS, because on a typical market day after doing business people engage in alcohol drinking in the evening till late in night. This has brought about breakage of marriages. GoU has adopted a Multi-Sectoral Approach in its fight against HIV/AIDs in the county. The Approach obliges all sectors of economy to integrate HIV/AIDS mitigation measures into their plans and activities. To this end, RPLRP should integrate measures to address the scourge in its activities and will require procuring services of an HIV/AIDS Service provider to undertake this task. Original strategies of using existing framework do not of late work as the assignment will be an added role i.e. more less secondary to them. The intervention should not only look at during the project construction time where labour is sometimes brought from out but permanent measures should be put in place for the provision of a facility for Voluntary Counseling and Testing (VCT) in each market.
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SECTION 1 - AN OVER VIEW OF THE KEY POPULATION IN THE REGIONAL PROJECT AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>Who are the indigenous or native people?</th>
<th>(Write as mentioned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>Who are the most vulnerable people in the community?</th>
<th>a. Women</th>
<th>b. Children</th>
<th>c. Elderly</th>
<th>d. Orphans</th>
<th>e. Youth</th>
<th>f. Others specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Rank from the most important)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2.1</th>
<th>What makes them vulnerable?</th>
<th>(Write as mentioned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>What are the distinctive/characteristics of these people in your community?</th>
<th>(Write as mentioned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>What are the major challenges facing these communities?</th>
<th>a. Famine</th>
<th>b. Poverty</th>
<th>c. Drought</th>
<th>d. Insecurity</th>
<th>e. Poor roads network</th>
<th>f. Others specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Rank from the most important)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>What are causes of conflicts due to resource sharing in your community?</th>
<th>a. Water conflicts</th>
<th>b. Land wrangle</th>
<th>c. Pasture</th>
<th>d. Raids from Turakana</th>
<th>e. Others specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Rank from the most important)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.6 | How do you resolve conflicts? | a. Police  
b. Local councils  
c. Community meetings  
d. Inter-relationships  
e. Elders  
f. Politicians  
g. Others specify | *(Rank from the most important)* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |

**SECTION 2 - NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT**

| 2.1 | What are the existing communal resources? | a. Land  
b. Water  
c. Pasture  
d. Trees  
e. Others specify | *(Rank from the most important)* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |

| 2.2 | Do you share these resources with people from other communities? | 1=Yes  
0=No |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2.1</th>
<th>What are the reasons for sharing or not?</th>
<th><em>(Write as mentioned)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2.2</th>
<th>Which communities do you share with?</th>
<th><em>(Write as mentioned)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2.3</th>
<th><em>(No, Why)</em></th>
<th><em>(Write as mentioned)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 2.3 | How does the community cope with scarcity of these resources for the animal during the dry season?  
1. Water  
2. Land  
3. Pasture  
4. Tree /Firewood  
5. Others | *(Write as mentioned)* |

| 2.4 | During the dry season, do you experience a | 1=Yes  
0=No |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Where do these people who cause the influx come from?</td>
<td>(Write as mentioned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Does the community get adequate pasture for the animals from the existing grazing land?</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 If not, what are the reasons?</td>
<td>(Write as mentioned)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.8 What do you anticipate to be the benefit to you as an individual and the community when the following project activities are implemented; | (Write as mentioned)  
| 1. Dam constructed  
2. Range lands rehabilitated  
3. Communities trained in sustainable management of resources  
4. Pasture seed distributed to the community. |

**SECTION 3 - MARKET ACCESS AND TRADE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 What are the existing livestock markets?</td>
<td>Write as mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 What challenges do you face with the existing markets?</td>
<td>(Write as mentioned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 How is the community benefiting from the existing markets?</td>
<td>(Write as mentioned)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.4 How is the community going to benefit from the following;           | Write as mentioned  
| 1. New markets  
2. Laboratories  
3. Checkpoints  
4. New auction grounds  
5. Quarantine stations |

**SECTION 4 - LIVELIHOOD SUPPORT**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>What services do you extend to the pastoral communities (for district official)</th>
<th>Write as mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What extension services do you receive</td>
<td>Write as mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the common livestock pests and diseases in the community</td>
<td>Write as mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Which mechanisms are in place to control these pests and diseases</td>
<td>Write as mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>What are some of the challenges faced with the indigenous breeds of cattle</td>
<td>Write as mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Do women have much say regarding ownership of animals, pasture, water resources, land resources, land and sale of goods like milk, meat etc</td>
<td>1=Yes 0=No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>What are the common livelihood options people engage in?</td>
<td>Write as mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.1</td>
<td>Explain why?</td>
<td>Write as mentioned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 5 - PASTORAL RISK MANAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1</th>
<th>Do you have mechanisms of obtaining reliable information for the weather forecast?</th>
<th>1=Yes 0=No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, how?</td>
<td>Write as mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>How often do get this information and from who?</td>
<td>a. Annually  b. Monthly  c. Weekly  d. Daily  e. Others specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: Focus Group Discussion Guide

0.6 Date: ___/____/____
0.7 District………………………………
0.8 Sub County…………………………
0.9 Parishes……………………………
0.10 Village……………………………

SECTION 1 - AN OVER VIEW OF THE KEY POPULATION IN THE REGIONAL PROJECT AREA

1. Who are the most vulnerable people in the community?
   a. Probe (What makes them vulnerable?)
2. What are the major challenges facing these communities?
3. What are causes of conflicts due to resource sharing in your community?
4. How do you resolve conflicts?

SECTION 2 - NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

1. What are the existing communal resources?
2. What are the reasons for sharing or not?
3. Which communities do you share with?
4. How does the community cope with scarcity of the resources for the animal during the dry season?
5. Does the community get adequate pasture for the animals from the existing grazing land?
   a. Probe (If not, what are the reasons?)
6. What do you anticipate to be the benefit to you as an individual and the community when the following project activities are implemented?
   a. Dam constructed
   b. Range lands rehabilitated
   c. Communities trained in sustainable management of resources
   d. Pasture seed distributed to the community.

SECTION 3 - MARKET ACCESS AND TRADE

1. What are the existing livestock markets?
2. What challenges do you face with the existing markets?
3. How is the community benefiting from the existing markets?
4. How is the community going to benefit from the following?
   a. New markets
   b. Laboratorie
   c. Checkpoints
   d. New auction grounds
   e. Quarantine stations

SECTION 4 - LIVELIHOOD SUPPORT

1. What are the common livestock pests and diseases in the community?
2. Which mechanisms are in place to control these pests and diseases?
3. What are some of the challenges faced with the indigenous breeds of cattle
4. What are the common livelihood options people engage in?

   a). Prob (Explain why?)

SECTION 5 - PASTORAL RISK MANAGEMENT

1. Do you have mechanisms of obtaining reliable information for the weather forecast?

   a). Probe (If yes, how?)

2. How often do get this information and from who?
Appendix III: Guide For Stakeholder Consultations On The RPLRP Project

A. Component 1: Natural Resource Management
   1. At national level, how does the Ministry intend to map the major natural resources (water resources and rangelands).
   2. Is there a policy in place to guide the mapping of these natural resources?
   3. Which particular natural resources have been earmarked by the ministry or the district to restore?
   4. How are communities going to get involved in the mapping of these resources?
   5. What are the characteristic water points in the district, (their status/conditions, size)
   6. What is the state of the watersheds for these water sources
   7. What alternatives to the existing water sources can be suggested
   8. How does the ministry intend to handle the issues related to land acquisition during the mapping of these natural resources given the land tenure systems in the different parts of Uganda?
   9. This project is intended to empower communities in sustainable collective management of natural resources such as rangelands and water. However, these communities have already been communally sharing these resources. What new strategies do you plan to introduce in regard to sustainable communal management of these natural resources.

B. Component 2: Market Access and Trade
   1. Given the current state of the livestock market infrastructure especially in the project areas, how does the ministry/district intend to improve these structures?
   2. What other factors are responsible for the current state of cattle market structures?
   3. How successful has the government been in controlling animal diseases within the country? What surveillance and control systems are in place? Do you think this can be effective across borders?
   4. What are some of the available animal identification and traceability systems available in the country? Are these systems effective given the rampant cattle rustling within the project area?
   5. How have you been solving cross-border conflicts in the project area? Any lessons from previous efforts?

C. Component 3: Livelihood Support
   1. What are some of the existing and tested approaches/technologies developed for livelihood support in the project area? Any examples of established fodder/feed production technologies currently in place?
   2. Comment on the applicability of livelihood diversification given the difficult weather especially in the Karamoja region.
   3. Given the strong cultural attachment some of these communities have to cattle, how does the ministry/district intend to deal with it.

D. Component 4: Pastoral Risk Management
   1. What are some of the existing early warning systems in place? How effective are they?
   2. Have the Livestock Guidelines and Standards (LEGS) been implemented in the project area? Has it yielded any positive results? What lessons have been learnt?
3. What human resource capacity needs are there at the district/ministry and how do you intend to solve them?

Appendix IV: Community and Stakeholder Consultative meetings

In order to capture the views and concerns of the community members, eight community meetings were organized where various focus groups (targeting farmers, women, youth and community/traditional leaders) were invited. Local dialects (nga’karimojong, ateso and kukusabiny) were used in addition to the English Language during the engagement periods.

The following communities were engaged:

a. Timu village (IK community);
b. Lokinene village, (Kaabong District);
c. Loletoi and Panyangara villages (Kotido district);
d. Lochengeng ward (Amudat district);
e. Ochorimongin (Katakwi district);
f. Akumu village (Kumi); and
g. Chesimwo village (Kween district).

Among these were men, women, youth, elderly, the poor and other vulnerable groups.

The main objectives of the discussions was to find out the current production systems, existing water issues, gender issues, impacts related to the project, preferred management options and sustainability aspects.
Table 20: Issues raised at the Community Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Community Views and Concerns Raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impacts of the project</td>
<td>• Revival of better, well managed rangelands and water sources for livestock;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of indigenous knowledge and local resources;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Involvement of the communities, especially the indigenous people in project implementation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Land uptake and change of tenure in cases where structures will be developed like the markets, dams;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The communities members especially the youth expect to get employment in areas that are not very technical and the women expect to get engaged in sale of food items to the project workers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>Community Views and Concerns Raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Reduced movement by the pastoralists if water sources are provided near their settlements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Those with houses expect to gain through renting their houses to the project workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Options</td>
<td>● The project may spark off conflicts amongst neighboring communities, especially over use of natural resources. Neighboring tribes and/or communities in search for their improved rangelands and water sources;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● They communities prefer to manage their natural resources with supervision from the district and NGOs like the ones already in existence to assisting them in storage and marketing and marketing of their products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building Needs</td>
<td>● Sensitization of the participating communities on modern agricultural practices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● How will the indigenous people benefit or participate in project activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender issues</td>
<td>● Exclusion of women and marginalized sub-groups in the communities in the development activities of the project;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● The sharing of income from the livestock, livestock products and produce as the men always end up controlling all the proceeds;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● In Karamoja, women are prone to rape and even death as they travel long distances in search of firewood, water, charcoal, and wild fruits and vegetables;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Hunting and foraging by the men in the Karomoja region for natural products has reduced as a result of restriction on the movement of men by the military as part of the government disarmament programme;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>● There is improved security in all the 12 districts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Cattle raids that used to result into many deaths are no longer there;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● There is an advocacy group in Kween, (Benet Lobby group which advocates for their rights and likelihood improvement;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● The Group is advocating for a ban on female genital mutilation, land acquisition by the Benet, conducts livelihood improvement programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION FROM STEKHOLDER CONSULTATIONS

✓ Efforts should be made to make use of, and incorporate, indigenous knowledge and local resource management arrangements into project design;

✓ Special measures for the recognition and support of customary rights to land and natural resources may be necessary. This is particularly the case for sub-projects that support the development of management plans and other forms of land and natural resource use planning;

✓ Special measures concerning women and marginalized sub-groups in the communities may be necessary to ensure inclusive development activities;

✓ Capacity building activities for the indigenous communities to enhance their participation in project activities may be useful or necessary;

✓ If MAAIF does not possess the necessary technical capacities concerning working with indigenous peoples, the involvement of experienced local community organizations and NGOs may be appropriate; they should be acceptable to the affected indigenous peoples;

✓ MAAIF, as the executing agency, should ensure that the contractor employs the services of a health related organization to sensitize, treat and counsel community on HIV/AIDs.

✓ Grievance mechanism taking into account local dispute resolution practices;

✓ Monitoring and reporting arrangements, including mechanisms and benchmarks appropriate to each sub-project and affected communities. Participatory monitoring and evaluation exercises will be adapted to the local context;

✓ Regulations should be developed and committees elected to oversee the management of the established developments like the water sources, markets. Money should be put aside to cater for operation and maintenance, to cater for attendants and minor damages. The farmers should agree on performing all activities at the same time and also on the amount to be collected especially from the markets;

✓ For the sustainable management of the rangelands and watersheds, management plans should be developed in a participatory manner, involving the user communities as much as possible;

✓ Women, children as well as the men, should be involved in consultation and awareness actions during project implementation;

✓ Consultations will, as appropriate, be at times gender separate to enable women and children to freely contribute their own views;

✓ Both men and women must be given equal opportunity in terms of labor employment and participation during project implementation; and

✓ Gender disaggregated monitoring data should be made a project policy in order to monitor impacts and mitigation actions as a result of the Project.
Appendix V: Minutes of the Consultative Meetings with other Stakeholders

Meeting with Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) - Department of Water for Production Official

Venue: MoWE Headquarters

Date: 4/9/2013

Participants:
1. Henry Kizito, Principal Engineer
2. Moses Basoma
3. Mugenyi
4. Ms Grace Baalikowa

ISSUES THAT CAME UP DURING CONSULTATION

Water sources (Dams) in the project area
✓ In all the 12 districts of the project area, there are a number of old dams which need to be rehabilitated and in some instances, reconstructed because they are beyond repair. For instance in Amuru district alone, there are about 60 dams which have been earmarked for rehabilitation while in Katakwi district, there are between 40-50 dams which require rehabilitations.
✓ The Ministry (Department of Water for Production) is currently rehabilitating some dams in the project area but is constrained financially. Hence the coverage is still low;
✓ An attempt has been made to address the issue of siltation of the dams as a result of the catchment activities. However, the people’s perceptions on watershed management are still low in the project area. People still need more sensitization on tree planting and other restoration activities;
✓ Teso region dam rehabilitation funded through the Office of the Prime Minister, (Teso Affairs);

Land Acquisition

It was noted that land for dam construction used to be given out freely by communities to government without compensation once they identified the right location for the construction. However after the parliamentary directive in 2010, the issue of compensation of land for dam construction started. The directive compels government to compensate the land owners for the land acquired. Thus cash for land or land for land. Once government has identified a piece for land for dam construction, the concerned community is approached and negotiations are initiated.

The government valuer is used to determine the rates to be used. Each district has its own property rates and these rates are reviewed periodically.
Water source management

- Water user committees are elected by the community and these work directly with the project implementers right from the inception of the project throughout its operation. They manage the day to day running of the dam, set by laws and enforce them. They report to the district water office which later on transmits their reports to the ministry.
- The Ministry has taken charge of maintenance costs of dams considering the high costs involved.
- To ensure quick responses to emergencies on dams, the Ministry has entered into framework contracts with contractors and suppliers who supply materials or carry out any repair on the affected dams whenever called upon. This has helped the ministry to respond to emergencies in time without going through the normal procurement cycle which is long and bureaucratic.

Conflicts over water usage

- Conflicts have arisen especially during the dry season between those who want to use the water for their animals and those who want it for human consumption. However, where they have arisen, water user committees have been in position to solve such amicably;

Capacity building needs

- Communities lack the basic skill to handle the simplest repairs;
- Some districts have not attracted the required key personnel to date;
- Generally the country does not have enough trained personnel in dam construction and maintenance.

Recommendations

- Sensitize the communities about the benefit of the projects. For instance, planting of trees is still a challenge in Karamoja region, the karamojongs don’t value trees much;
- More dams should be constructed to meet the current demand, the ministry’s budget cannot meet the current demand for water for production in the project area;
- Fill up the current staffing gaps with right personnel;
- More interventions should be initiated in the catchment areas so as to minimize dam siltation

Meeting with Uganda Land Alliance

official

**Venue:** Uganda Land Alliance
**Headquarters - Kampala**

**Date:** 4/9/2013

**Participants:**
1. Achola Lillian- Legal Office Kotido
2. Moses Basoma
ISSUES THAT CAME UP DURING CONSULTATION

✓ The Karamojongs have started to feel the effects of climate change and are now turning away from typical pastoralist to agro-pastoralist.
✓ Pressure on land is increasing because of the mineral deposits in the area and its fertility in some areas, for instance mining companies have grabbed land from local communities for mining without even compensation. They claim they have explicit permission from Kampala, Ministry Energy and Mineral Development;
✓ In pastoralist area most of the land tenure is customary land
✓ Fertile land 22sq/km was gazetted thus Nabowale village for agriculture
✓ Administration structures are yet to be established, district don’t have facilities to handle.
✓ In Karamoja 80% are vulnerable
✓ To access water sources situated within the protected area thus under the national forest authority or the Uganda Wildlife Authority, permission has to sought, as such dam citing for the RPLRP should as much as possible avoid these protected area;
✓ Land is acquired through community land association;
✓ In Karamoja, there are village land committee which handle land disputes on a weekly basis and usually resolve land wrangles amicably;
✓ Uganda Land Alliance offers free legal services to the vulnerable groups in the project area, though; they have concentrated more in the Karamoja region because there are more vulnerable groups there. Nonetheless, their services can be extended elsewhere within the country upon request.

Way forward

The communities need to be empowered to know their rights, ULA carries out monthly sensitization about land rights, women rights, compensation (fair and adequate).

Meetings with Kween District Officials

Venue: Kween District Headquarters

Date: 22/8/2013

Participants:

1. Chemisto Samuel (Ag DNRO)
2. Dr Yesho Nelson (DVO)
3. Mungasho Robert (District Planner)
4. Moses Basoma
Issues that came up during the consultative meeting

✓ Water for production is majorly from the several streams and rivers that cross the district. However, most of them dry up in the dry season;
✓ No watershed management interventions in place save for River Atara under the Atara riverbank management project. However, this project only handles a small portion of the river bank for demonstration purposes only;
✓ Boreholes are used as sources of water for the animals during the dry season;
✓ Conflicts do exist between usage for production and water for human consumption;
✓ Cattle get emaciated because of walking for long distances and therefore fetch low prices on market;
✓ Soil erosion is enormous in the district;
✓ Cattle markets exist but without proper structures, not clearly fenced and no proper documentation to ascertain ownership;
✓ Four (4No.) slaughter slabs exist in the district;
✓ There are no veterinary demonstrations schools in the district but a non-functional district farm institute exist which can be turned into a demonstration school;
✓ Low staffing levels of the district veterinary office;
✓ The cattle markets house so many people from different parts of the country and from the Kenya, however, no HIV/AIDS interventions exist in these cattle markets;
✓ Because of the low staffing levels of the district veterinary office, disease control and management is problematic.

Recommendations & Suggestions:

- Need to institute water shed management interventions for all major rivers;
- Existing cattle markets need to be refurbished;
- Institute soil management interventions in the district;
- Provision of water for production in the district is very crucial (dams, gravity flow schemes);
- Institute HIV/AIDS interventions in the markets
- Staffing of the district veterinary office should be enhanced, to have at least a Veterinary officer at each sub county.

Meetings with Nakapiripiti District Officials

Venue: Nakapiripiti District Headquarters

Date: 23/8/13

Participants:

1. Tengei Mario Lokut (A DAO)
2. Dr Kathiya Dominic Lokeris (DVO)
3. Odeng Emmanuel (Ag. DEO)
Issues that came up during the consultative meeting

- Cattle water draw water mainly from the swamps in the dry season and from the streams and rivers during the wet season;
- The catchment for these rivers and streams has been greatly encroached on for cultivation;
- There are valley dams though these have been silted over time without major rehabilitations. Most of these dams are located on the western side of the district bordering Teso region;
- Generally, the watersheds are highly degraded;
- Surface run off in the district is high due to the topography of the district;
- The dry spell lusts for as long as six months;
- Boreholes dry up in the dry season and this usually triggers a conflict between water for production and water for human consumption;
- The road network in the district is very poor and some sub counties are inaccessible during the wet season;
- Pastoral field schools exist under KALIP;
- The district veterinary office is understaffed and most veterinary related work and Disease control and management is handled by community animal health workers and the animal cross border committees;
- The HIV/AIDS prevalence rate for Nakapiripiti is at 2.5% compared to 5.3% for the entire Karamoja region. However, there is no major HIV/AIDS intervention in the cattle markets;
- A laboratory has been constructed at the district headquarters abut has not yet been equipped

Recommendations & Suggestions:

- Existing dams should be rehabilitated and more new ones constructed;
- Institute watershed management interventions;
- Institute soil and water conservation interventions;
- Enhance staffing level of the district veterinary office;
- Community animal health workers should be given some formal trainings;

Meetings with Moroto District Officials
Venue: Moroto District Headquarters
Date: 26/8/2013
Participants:
1. Achula O (DPO)
2. Dr Orongo T T W (DVO)
3. Moses Basoma
Issues that came up during the consultative meeting
Several earth dams, ponds and streams exist and are used for watering animals;

Most of these dams are silted;

The pastoral communities live away from these water sources;

The water sheds are highly degraded, they have been encroached on to give way for activities like cultivation, establishment of settlements, charcoal burning, and firewood collection;

A laboratory is under construction by the Karamoja Livelihood Improvement Project (KALIP) which will also equip it;

Recommendations & Suggestions:
The most important issues that should be considered so as to improve pastoral livelihood resilience in Moroto district include the following;

- Provision of adequate and constant water supply to the animals’
- Improvement of the range land and the pasture in there;
- Controlling and management of livestock diseases’
- Management of wild fires;
- Elimination /management of resources conflicts.

Meetings with Katakwi District Officials

Venue: Katakwi District Headquarters
Date: 26/8/13

Participants:
1. Okwakol Lawrence (ACAO)
2. Dr Elungat J I (DVO)
3. Denis Mudoola Interviewer

Issues that came up during the consultative meeting

Major source of water for productions are the earth dams. However, they are highly silted. There are 9 sub counties in the district and at least each sub county has one functional dam. Water is drawn directly from these dams and no management regime is in place. The Agricultural Livelihood Recovery Project (ALREP) is currently rehabilitating 3 other dams;

The Local revenue is not insufficient enough to cater for the rehabilitation of these dams;

The other sources of water for production are the, boreholes, swamps. However, the swamps have been highly encroached on for farming especially rice cultivation;
There are five major cattle markets in the district. Ochorimongin is the largest of these. The markets operate on every Friday of the week. It attracts traders from as far as south Sudan and Kenya. On a single market day, over 2,000 animals (cattle, Sheep goats) are traded.

Meat inspection is on a daily basis in the town council of Katakwi while it’s only on the markets days in other sub counties;

There are only two staff in the district Veterinary office; thus; one Veterinary officer and one Livestock Hide Improvement officer. As such, disease control and management is still a challenge. These are assisted by the Animal Service Providers under the NAADS arrangement;

Most cattle dips are non-functional and hand spray pumps are commonly used. Drug shops are located in trading centers, other are mobile outlets as found in the cattle markets;

**Recommendations & Suggestions:**

Communities should be encouraged to harvest rain water so as to reduce the pressure on the existing water sources;

Other dams not considered for rehabilitation under the Agricultural Livelihood Recovery Project (ALREP) should targeted for rehabilitation under this project;

Cattle markets should be improved to provide the basic facilities for cattle markets, thus; holding grounds, waste disposal facilities, etc

There is need for improvement on tick control and management, rehabilitate cattle dips and crushes or construct new ones in the target project sub counties; Formulate and implement a pest and pesticide management plan for the project area

**Meeting with Amuria District Officials**

**Venue:** Amuria District Headquarters  
**Date:** 27/8/13

**Participants:**

1. Otim Charles (DNRO)  
2. Dr Opolot John (DVO)  
3. Moses Basoma

**Issues Raised:**

The major sources for water production are swamps, dams and valley tanks. There 59 dams in the district 6 valley tanks. However, over 80% of these are silted and only temporarily used during the rainy season when there is enough water;

A wetland management plan for Omunyal wetland has been developed and is being implemented, other wetlands continues to be utilized haphazardly;
80% of the households in the district have at least some livestock. However, they are not of very good quality. Farmers have not yet adopted improved breeds for fear of the labour associated with these animals.

There are no proper slaughter facilities in the whole district; the town council has a designated place where animal are slaughtered but without the basic structures. The waste at this place is poorly handled, and the skinning is done on the ground;

The district veterinary office is understaffed with only 1 senior veterinary officer and 4 Assistant Animal Husbandry Officer. Hence there is inadequate meat inspections, disease control and surveillance;

The district is not connected to the national grid as yet and therefore storage of vaccines is still problematic (No cold chain);

The livestock feed exclusively on natural grass.

There are 12 functional cattle crashes in the district and no functional cattle dip due to their high maintenance costs. Usually, cattle are sprayed using hand spray pumps to control ticks;

Acaricides are acquired by farmers themselves from drug shops in trading centres and cattle markets. The handling, disposal of the acaricides is poor

**Recommendations & Suggestions:**

All the dams and valley tanks need immediate rehabilitation to provide adequate water for the livestock throughout the year;

Develop and implement Wetland management plans for all other major wetlands so as to enhance their sustainable utilization;

Provide a better slaughter facility especially in Kapelbyong and Amuria town council, the land for such facilities has already been identified and allocated;

Farmers and the community animal health workers who administer the acaricides and other drugs need to be trained in basic Health, Safety and Environment techniques;

There is need to revive preventive measures for disease control for example; cattle dips, isolation units

**Meeting with Amudat District Officials**

**Venue:** Amudat District Headquarters

**Date:** 23/8/13

**Participants:**

1. Cheptilak Lonah (District Councilor)
2. Alungat Joyce (District Councilor)  
3. Dr Kaziro Micheal (DVO)  
4. Ms Deborah Alinga (DNRO)  
5. Lomwai Shadrack NAADS Coordinator  
6. Moses Basoma

Issues Raised:

- The major sources for water production are the seasonal rivers and streams, water ponds. The Kanyangaring river system and the Greek rivers are the major rivers where water is drawn;
- Generally, the watersheds and rangelands are degraded, cultivation, brick making, settlements, and charcoal burning are the major activates there in;
- Generally the district has enormous challenges and needs that require interventions from central government and development partners. We have very long periods of drought, hence making crop farming almost impossible. Our farmers still use the hand held hoes, and farming is not yet commercialized;
- If the project can also provide water for irrigation, it will be a welcome idea since our people are beginning to settle and want or grow crops on top of rearing animals;
- Farmers need sensitization on modern farming practices to enable them grows fast growing food crops and cash crops;
- The World Food Programme has always intervened in situations of drought with food aid. However, the communities should be further empowered to produce more of their own food;
- The Pokot in particular lack sustainable livelihood options mainly due to scarce natural resources and recurrent inter-tribal conflicts;
- There three prominent cattle markets in the district which operate once in a week. These designated open grounds without basic facility for a cattle market. The markets attract traders from both Kenya and Uganda and both Kenya and Uganda currencies are used in these markets;
- However, no HIV/AIDS interventions are undertaken in these markets;
- There are no slaughter facilities (abattoires) in the whole district
- The district has only one veterinary officer who is assisted by 3 anima health workers;
- The cross border animal health committees to a little extent help in disease surveillance but are more pre occupied in issuing cattle movement permits, which are issued at a fee;

Recommendations & Suggestions:

- Develop and implement watershed management plans for all major rivers and streams so as to enhance their sustainable utilization;
- Communities be sensitized, provided with improved planting materials and empowered to engage in crop farming on top of cattle rearing;
- Irrigation should be emphasized in the district;
- Provide a better slaughter facility especially in Amudat town council, the land for a such facilities has already been identified and allocated by the town council.

Meetings with Bukedea District Officials

Venue: Bukedea District Headquarters
Date: 4th Sept, 2013

Participants:

- Dr Ongelech Francis (DVO)
- Ongaba Steven (District Planner)
- Oluka Micheal (Senior Entomologist)
- Okul Micheal (AAHO)

Issues that came up during the consultative meeting

- The population of both humans and livestock in the district is increasing at an alarming rate and therefore the pressure on the rangelands is high;
- The poverty levels of the community is generally very high;
- Communities in the district practice both crop and animal husbandry, though crop production is more prominent;
- Some farmers especially in Kachumbara and Bukedea sub counties have begun rearing improved breeds of cattle. This is being encouraged by the HEIFER project and the response is good so far;
- Water sources in the district include dams, valley tanks, swamps and streams. There are three dams in the district, all of which are non-functional at the moment. All the valley tanks and dams have been silted over the years;
- The district does not have enough funds, let alone the expertise in dam rehabilitation;
- The swamps and some rangeland have been encroached on for cultivation, rice cultivation is the most prominent in the swamps;
- Most herds of cattle have been shifted to the sub counties near the lake where they are assured of water supply throughout the year. The owners of the cattle may not specifically reside in the sub counties;
- There are cattle markets located in almost all sub counties of the district. The most prominent ones are; Bukedea and Kachumbara markets. These are open gazetted places. There no structure within the markets and they are not fenced off;
- Pesticides, acaricides and other animal drugs are sold in these markets;
- The district had constructed wooden cattle crushes some time back, but these have since broken down;
- Farmers who are far away from the district are assisted by the NAADS animal service providers to administer drugs to their livestock;
- There is one senior veterinary officer, 3 veterinary officers and 3 animal husbandry officers in the district;
- No HIV/AIDS intervention within the markets nor under the entire production department;
- There are no veterinary demonstration schools and non-have been planned for by the district;
- The PRDLP is constructing a laboratory for the district at the district headquarters;

Recommendations & Suggestions:

- Range lands should be planned for and managed sustainably by the user communities;
Farmers should be encouraged to use improved seeds for crop production and improved breeds of livestock;
Existing water sources (dams) should be rehabilitated and even new ones constructed;
Cattle markets should be improved/upgraded;
Metallic cattle crushes should be constructed, these will last longer;
Some HIV/AIDS interventions should be initiated in the production department targeting the cattle markets. A lot of money exchanges hands and there is a lot of alcohol sold within these markets. The two are good catalysts for HIV/AIDS transmission.

Meetings with Kumi District Officials

Venue: Kumi cattle Market

Date: 6th Sept, 2013

Participants:
1. Ms Apolot Jane Francis AVO
2. Dr Onyaiti Alfred Opiede DVO

Issues that came up during the consultative meeting

- Common water sources in the district are springs, wetlands and dams. Kodukul dam in Ongino Sub County is the major source for most livestock in the district. The dam is currently being silted and requires desilting. It had broken down completely in 2004 but was later on renovated in 2008 with assistance from the Irish Aid;
- The largest population of cattle in the district is in Ongino sub county which is near lake Bisina
- Animals move from all the other sub counties to this dam or to the shore of lake Bisina during the dry season in search for water and pasture;
- The rangelands have open access, thus no restrictions on who enters and how long they stay or consume, this poses a management problem (Common good);
- Currently, the dam provides water for both production and domestic usage
- The wetland streams dry up shortly after the rains and most of them have been encroached for cultivation. Rice cultivation is the predominant crop in the wetlands. The district has not made any interventions in watershed management;
- Farming practices are still rudimentary and soil erosion is rampant;
- There are four major cattle markets in the district, thus: Ongino, Kumi, Mukongoro and Kanyuma. They are all open places, not fenced and without structures;
- Like elsewhere, the males dominate the market activities in these markets. Females are majorly engaged in the sale of food stuffs, clothes, and alcohol, while the males completely dominate the sale of livestock
- Livestock disease monitoring and surveillance is still poor in the whole district, farmers use their cell phones to communicate outbreaks of diseases;
✓ The response to the farmers’ call is not very good since the department is under staffed. There is only one veterinary officer, assisted by four animal husbandry officers. The NAADS staff is not supportive here. There are community health workers but these still have not been trained; and
✓ The department regularly receives students from Arapai agricultural college.

Recommendations & Suggestions:
✓ Construct more dams in other sub counties since the whole district has communities engaged in livestock rearing;
✓ Piped water system be constructed to draw water from lake Bisina, this water could be for domestic consumption so that the dam are relieved of some pressure.
✓ Management plans for the rangeland should be formulated, these should also provide for formulation of some by-laws to guide their usage.

Meeting with Benet Lobby Group
Venue: Mengya village,
Date: 22/08/2013

Participants:
1. Chelimo Bosco Programme officer (BLG)
2. Moses Basoma
3. A megenyi

Issues Raised:
The Benet is the location where the Nدورobo live. The indigenous people are called Nدورobo they now live in Benet, Kigwoi, and Kwosir sub counties in Kween district, upper belt. Their population is estimated to be 20,000 people. The formerly lived in the protected areas on Mount Elgon and have been evicted and resettled in the above sub counties.

The Benet Lobby group was formed to advocate for the rights of the Nدورobo who were believed to be land less then.

Other civil society organizations in the area include; Action Aid, and Food for the Hungry (schools and health centers).

There are two cattle markets in the area, Binyinyi and Bright, and these are without the necessary structures; (holding ground, slaughter facility, sanitary facilities etc)

They are agro-pastoralists and also hunters and gatherers.

They still practice female genital mutilation. However, with the Benet Lobby Group in place, a lot has been achieved and the practice is slowly dying out.
They are culturally organized in clans, headed by clan leaders who are used as advisors and also resolve conflicts within the clans. There are 15 clans for example; Kapros, Kaprotosis, Kapkoremge, Kapkwei, Kapbul. Conflicts involving other clans or tribe are referred the police and the Local council systems.

For the bent to fully participate in the project, they need to be mobilized and sensitized, by their lobby group.

Recommendations & Suggestions:

- The project should work very closely with Benet Lobby Group which has been in the project area for the last 35 years;
- There is need for mobilization and sensitization of the people for the project to succeed;
- Any land acquired for project development should be compensated for
### Appendix VI: List of Persons Consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr No</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>DESIGNATION</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Okwakol Lawrence</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ACAO</td>
<td>Katakwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Otim Charles</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DNRO</td>
<td>Amuria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dr Opolot John</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DVO</td>
<td>Amuria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Apolot Jane Francis</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AVO</td>
<td>Kumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dr Onyaiti Alfred Opiede</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DVO</td>
<td>Kumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ongaba Stephen</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>District Planner</td>
<td>Bukedea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dr Ongelech Francis</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DVO</td>
<td>Bukedea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chemisto Samuel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ag DNRO</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dr Yesho Nelson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DVO</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tengei Mario Lokut</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A DAO</td>
<td>Nakapiripiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dr kathiya Dominic Lokeris</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DVO</td>
<td>Nakapiripiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>IDITEMANY VICTOR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ADWO</td>
<td>Nakapiripirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LONYEE JOHN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SEC. WORKS AND TECH. SERVICES</td>
<td>Nakapiripirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IDITEMANY VICTOR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ADWO</td>
<td>Nakapiripirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Odeng Emmanuel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ag DEO</td>
<td>Nakapiripiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lomwai Shadrack</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ag DPO</td>
<td>Amudat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ariong Deborah Alinga</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DNRO</td>
<td>Amudat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dr Kaziro Micheal</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DVO</td>
<td>Amudat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Achula O</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DPO</td>
<td>Moroto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dr Orongo T T W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ag DVO</td>
<td>Moroto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dr Elungat J I</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DVO</td>
<td>Katakwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>OKUL MICHAEL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AAHO</td>
<td>Bukedea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>OLUKA MICHAEL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SENIOR ENTOMOLOGIST</td>
<td>Bukedea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ONGOM B. SILVER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DISTRICT PRODUCTION OFFICER</td>
<td>Katakwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Dr. Elungat. J</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>District Veterinary Officer</td>
<td>Katakwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lokakwa Geoffrey L.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Parish Chief</td>
<td>Moroto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nakiru Susan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Moroto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Dr. Onyait. A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DVO/AGDPC</td>
<td>Kumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Okalang Emmanuel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DNRO</td>
<td>Kumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Okiricu Alex</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DCDO</td>
<td>Kumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mubani Arapkissa</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ag.DAO</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Chepkurui Isaac</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>District NAADS Coordinator</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Dr. Yesho Nelson</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DVO/Ag.DPO</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Chebet Rose</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DCDO</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Okwakol Joseph</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>RDC</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Malinga Martin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Chelimo Stephen</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Cheerotin Patrick</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SNC Ngenge S/C</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mulaki Anthony</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chairman S/C Farmers’ Fora</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Chepsikor D. Juma</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S/C Chief Ngenge</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Kenyatia K. Alfred</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Kitiyo Moses</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Labu Habibu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sanya Labu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Councillor LC.III</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Chabang James</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Councillor LC.III</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Mande Jeremiah</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Kassaja Takwenyi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Cheptai Alex</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Amwenyun Duncan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Kween</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>ATEBENI SOLOMON</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KWEEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>MUTULEI STEPHEN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CHAIRMAN LC.I SOSHO</td>
<td>KWEEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>ACHOCHORO BECKY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>COUNCILLOR LC.V</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>SAGAL HENRY</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D/DISO</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>OGWANG CONSTANTINE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SAHO</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>UMA CHARLES</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEPUTY CAO</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>AJOK JANET</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AHO</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>NATYANG CECILIA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>SAGAL HENRY</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D/DISO</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>LOKWEE JOHN JUJAN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ACAO</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>BAATOM BEN KORYANG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DCEO</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>LOTINYANG FRANCIS FRANK</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DISTRICT VICE C/PERSON</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>NAKIRU LILLY GRACE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>COUNCILLOR LC.V</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>OGWANG JINO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ag.DPO</td>
<td>ABIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Dr. OLUGE PETER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DVO</td>
<td>ABIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>OJOK ANJELO KENNETH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ag. DAO</td>
<td>ABIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>LAMMY OYOLLO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SCDO</td>
<td>ABIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>ODONG ORYONO ROBBIN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DYC</td>
<td>ABIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>KAZIBA MOSES NANDHALA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>ABIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>OKONG PAUL MWANGA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DYC</td>
<td>ABIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>OCHEN SIMON PETER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>LEMUKOL PAUL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>LOCHUL INYASIO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>ASIYO ANTHONY</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>SAMALITA THOMAS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Sub County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>NAMONGIN JULIANA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>MACHU CECILIA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>BENGA TITUS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DNC</td>
<td>NAPAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>LOCHUNGOKOL JOHN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>NAPAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>KORYANG TICOCHY</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ACAO</td>
<td>NAPAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>RIISA JOSHUA JEFFERSON</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sub County Chief</td>
<td>NAPAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Dr. OPOLOT JOHN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DVO</td>
<td>AMURIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Dr. CHELI PETER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DVC</td>
<td>AMURIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>OLOIT MICHAEL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DCDO</td>
<td>AMURIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>EPAJU PIUS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>AMURIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>OBONG ALFRED</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NAADS Coordinator</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>LOGIEL ANTHONY ABBOT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>ASIO ANGELLA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AASP</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>LOSEKORI JOSEPH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Councillor of PWDs</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>CHEPTILAK LONAH</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chairperson Finance Committee, District Council</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>LOCHUL EMMANUEL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Male Youth Councillor</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>NANGIRO ROBERT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Naads Coordinator, Amudat Town Council</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>LOKONIOLO SAMSON</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>LONWAI SHADRACK</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AAG. DPO</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>LOKIRU PAUL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>YARAKORI LOKONG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>AMASILE AMOS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>LOGWE GABRIEL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>ACHAU PETER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>ABOL LOKOYA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>KEEM MATEO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>ACHAU ENIWA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>LONGOROK APAI</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>LOKOL TOODO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>DEDENG PETER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>IMADI GWARAKORI</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>ODEKE ROBERT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>LOMURIA KETE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>ADUPA DENIS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>LOKOL ALEX</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>LONIPE MARK</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>LOKONG SIMON</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>LOKIDING PAUL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>LONGOLI SAMSON</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>KALI CLEMENT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>MODING CHRISTINE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>ILUKAL MARIA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>LUKUYANA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>EKURE PHILIP</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>NAYAON PHILIP NERI</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>LOKORU PETER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>LEMU ROBERT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>LOJORE INYASIO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>CHILLA CHARLES</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>ILUKAL THOMAS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>LONGOLI PETER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>LOCHOM JAMES</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>ILUKAL MOSES</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>LOCHUL JACOB</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>NAMUYA N. FRANCESCA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ACDO</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>CHENANGAT PENINAH</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>LOROT SYLVIA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>AMUDAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>APEYO LOKWAMUDANG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Jie Elder, Kotido</td>
<td>Kotido I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>NALII ANNA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>LOMUSE LUCIA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>NGURA MARIA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>AMIN DADA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>ANGOLERE BEYE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>Kotido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>RIPLANGET MICHAEL FRED</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KWEEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>MASAU RASHID</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KWEEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>MAMA ESTHER</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KWEEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>KITIYO MARTIN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KWEEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>CHEKWEMBOI DIANA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KWEEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>CHEBOJUMA CAROLINE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KWEEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>KAPSOL TOM CHEROP</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KWEEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>LEMU ALICE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>ARIKO MATAN</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>LOKWANG MARK</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>LOKOL JOSEPH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KABONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>LOTEE ZADORY TWALA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ACDO</td>
<td>MOROTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>EJAJAWAI GODFREY JULIUS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AASP</td>
<td>MOROTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>OPOLOT JONATHAN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AASP</td>
<td>MOROTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>AKOL Y. LILLY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>OA</td>
<td>MOROTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>ONYANGA RONALD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td>MOROTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>ALANY FAUSTINO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LC I CHAIRMAN</td>
<td>MOROTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>LOPEYOK PETER</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ELDER</td>
<td>MOROTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>ODONG ALICE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>HOUSE WIFE</td>
<td>MOROTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>NACHUGE VERONICA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>HOUSE WIFE</td>
<td>MOROTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>LOCHORO MARIO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LC II CHAIRPERSON</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>ADOME LOLERE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>MUNYES JOSEPH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>LOKWI APAKAKEB</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>AWOT SIMON P.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>AKULLO SOPHIA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>KIYONGA MARTINA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>KORIANG NIGHT</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>ACHEN ROSE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>KOTIDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>ABONYO AGNES</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Youth, community Member</td>
<td>Kotido District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>ACHAYO GLORIA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Youth, community Member</td>
<td>Kaabong District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>AGUMA BETTY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Youth, community Member</td>
<td>Kotido District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>AKELLO IRENE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Youth, community Member</td>
<td>Kotido District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>AKOL ANNA GRACE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Youth, community Member</td>
<td>Napak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attendance List

**Location:** Panyangara - Kotido district  
**Date:** 02/08/13

### Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Contact Number</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logwir Gabriel</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>0777694962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achau Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel Lokoya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keem Mateo</td>
<td></td>
<td>0775966102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achiu Enwa</td>
<td></td>
<td>07793298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kengerek Akeu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowokk Kodo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besing PETER</td>
<td></td>
<td>0785716850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imadi Gwarathari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odice Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>0785626476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomuria Kete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTENDANCE LIST

### Location: AMUDA

### Date: 22/01/2013

### PROJECT: REGIONAL NATIONAL LEVEL ROAD RESILIENCE PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Acilochoro Beck In</td>
<td>Deputy Clerk - Personal Social Service</td>
<td>0787514254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Aluwaat Joyce</td>
<td>Deputy Clerk - Town Female Fia</td>
<td>0783805878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Lusekeri Joseph</td>
<td>Deputy Clerk of PWDs M</td>
<td>0753494369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Chepliax Lonyah</td>
<td>Deputy Clerk - Personal Social Service</td>
<td>0774544588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Lochul Emmanuel</td>
<td>Legal Clerk - M. Youth</td>
<td>0768411081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navire Robert</td>
<td>NHD Coordinator - Arua Town Council</td>
<td>0762850334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokwolde Sersay</td>
<td>Former</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokumui Gadrack</td>
<td>Former</td>
<td>0774886186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokiku Paul</td>
<td>Former</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaakorok Lokong</td>
<td>Former</td>
<td>0753854727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amasile Amos</td>
<td>Former</td>
<td>076309335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTENDANCE LIST

**Location**: Kasese District, Mganga Sub County

**Date**: 22nd/08/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenedi Kiryamu</td>
<td>Tutor of Farmer</td>
<td>0777771707</td>
<td>Kuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitiyo Moses</td>
<td>Farmer Worship</td>
<td>0772229196</td>
<td>Bramu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labru Habibu</td>
<td>Twana Farmer</td>
<td>0775673310</td>
<td>Hicci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammy Labru</td>
<td>Councillor LIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chebang James</td>
<td>Councillor IIIi</td>
<td>0787756254</td>
<td>Hixx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mande Serematu</td>
<td>Worship Farmer</td>
<td>0789732638</td>
<td>Eepestk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassapa Takweli</td>
<td>Anio-twali</td>
<td>0779733317</td>
<td>Si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choppa Alex</td>
<td>Kokubaha</td>
<td>0775807679</td>
<td>C Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Amweryin</td>
<td>Kapfundel</td>
<td>0789250115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abenia Solomon</td>
<td>Kapfuler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuli Stephen</td>
<td>Klimax</td>
<td>0785582678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ATTENDANCE LIST

**Location**: KWEEN DISTRICT  
**Date**: 22nd/07/2013

## PROJECT
RECDOAL PASTORAL LIVELIHOOD RESILIENCE PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUBAWI AARAPKUSA</td>
<td>AGI DAO</td>
<td>0772571676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEPKURUI ISAAC</td>
<td>DISTRICT NAADS Coordinator</td>
<td>0782507479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Yedino Nelson</td>
<td>AVO / Agy DPDO</td>
<td>0776634799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEBBE ROSE</td>
<td>DCDO</td>
<td>0782660040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKWAKOL JOSEPH</td>
<td>RDC</td>
<td>0772340034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALINGA MARTIN</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>0754561134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0722373095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHELSISO STEPHEN</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>0755231034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0756310134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEROI NTI PATRICK</td>
<td>SNCngo</td>
<td>0788262502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWAKI ANTHONY</td>
<td>CHAIRMAN SUB-COM-</td>
<td>0787976214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTI FARMERS FORA</td>
<td>0777469611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEPSIKOR D. JUMA</td>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>078237405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Opolot John</td>
<td>AVD</td>
<td>0772935817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Chebi Issac</td>
<td>Dir</td>
<td>0772669878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oloot Michael</td>
<td>D CEO</td>
<td>0772486178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ela-Sim Pius</td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>0772637677</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location:** Amuria  
**Date:** 27/8/2012
## ATTENDANCE LIST

**Location:** NADAK  
**Date:** 26/02/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DESIGNATION</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benga Titus</td>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>0756-544182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechengeol John</td>
<td>DMMO</td>
<td>0742-421230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konyango Turency</td>
<td>ACGO</td>
<td>0752-840080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Ondom John</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>842-828687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adupa</td>
<td>Denis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokol</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonipe</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokong</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokinding</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longoli</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kali</td>
<td>Clement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukal</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukuyana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTENDANCE LIST

**Location:** Basungabara / Loetio Parish  
**Date:** 22nd 08, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orchoro Mario</td>
<td>Luli Aikison</td>
<td>0773182356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Abilme Lokere</td>
<td>FARMER</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mupoyes Joseph</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lomuwi Ephraim</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Akoot Simon D.</td>
<td>0787606356</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Akullo Sophia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kitenga Martin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Korwang Night</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Achien Rose</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTENDANCE LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date: 26/07/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>BLPRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiplangat Michael Fred</td>
<td>Kapite</td>
<td>0781699362</td>
<td>Ny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musan Rashid</td>
<td>Kapite</td>
<td>0776760283</td>
<td>Ny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mama FS1438</td>
<td>Secho</td>
<td>0776666341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utivo Martin</td>
<td>Tuyobei</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chepkwoembii Diana</td>
<td>Secho</td>
<td>0776666341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesequina Caroline</td>
<td>Kapite</td>
<td>0781699362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapsoh Tom Cherop</td>
<td>Tuyobei</td>
<td>0776666341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTENDANCE LIST

**Location:** Ik Community, Kaabong District  
**Date:** 24/3/13

### PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ochen Simon Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemuel Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekul Inyasio</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiyo Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jomulita Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namongin Juliana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machul Cecilia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemu Alice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiko Matan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokwang Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokol Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ATTENDANCE LIST

**Location:** Loxinene

**Members:** Karbong

**Date:** 24-3-2013

## PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAMON PHILIP NERI</td>
<td>Village member</td>
<td>0755272544</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKURE PHILIP</td>
<td></td>
<td>0726272705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOKOOLE PETER</td>
<td></td>
<td>0773901476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEMU ALBERT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOKORE INNASIO</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THILLA CHARLES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILUKAL THOMAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOKOLI PETER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOKOM JAMES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILUKAL MOSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCUL JACOB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adupa</td>
<td>Denis</td>
<td>Villager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokol</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonipe</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokong</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokiding</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longoli</td>
<td>Samson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kali</td>
<td>Clement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molding</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukal</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukenyana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTENDANCE LIST

**Location:** Kotide District  
**Date:** 22/08/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sagai Henry</td>
<td>D1D150 ktd</td>
<td>0778 202592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogwang Walter</td>
<td>SAI NO</td>
<td>0782405109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anek Samuel</td>
<td>A11.0</td>
<td>0772959088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natyago Cecilia</td>
<td>For. CAO</td>
<td>0752146091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>