



**Global Food Security Strategy
(GFSS)
Uganda Country Plan**

September 2018

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Section 1. Food Security and Nutrition Context in Uganda.....	5
1.1 Country Priorities	5
2.2 Recent Trends and Current Status	5
3.3 Partnership Landscape.....	7
Section 2. Targeting	8
2.1 Global Food Security Strategy Zone of Influence (ZOI).....	8
2.2 Cross-Market Functions and Value Chain Categories.....	10
Section 3. Program Components	11
3.1 Guiding Principles	11
3.2. Theory of Change and Areas of Investment	13
3.3. Links to Other USG investments.....	15
Section 4. Stakeholder engagement platforms.....	16

Executive Summary

The Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) Country Plan for Uganda was co-written by the USG interagency involved in food security and nutrition after extensive consultation with from government ministries, private companies, universities, research institutes, and international and local NGOs and organizations. As a living document, it is intended to be updated as needed in consultation with those parties over time.

The GFSS Country Plan serves as an overarching framework for integrated food security and nutrition programming in Uganda and has defined three objectives that guide USG investments in 38 districts:

Objective 1: Inclusive and Sustainable Agriculture-led Growth

Objective 2: Strengthened Resilience Among People and Systems

Objective 3: A Well-Nourished Population, Especially Among Women and Children

The plan is intended to describe the key drivers of food insecurity, malnutrition and poverty. These key drivers stem from a complex set of underlying conditions that exist at the individual, household, community and system level. At the design and procurement stages, the targeting, results framework and program components will require further refinement to operationalize integrated and holistic approaches. Interventions at all levels will need to work in complement to each other to sustainably tackle food insecurity, malnutrition and poverty. In particular, the most vulnerable and poor populations do not have sufficient assets, skills, and capabilities to participate in market operations. These populations will need to be supported to develop capacity over time to participate in value chains so that they can become a viable livelihood option. As GFSS programming is refined through the design, procurement and implementation processes, selected value chains will explicitly prioritize inclusive growth and interventions will include support to the most vulnerable and poor populations to enable them to graduate into selected value chains and benefit from the GFSS-supported livelihoods and market development.

The Uganda country plan is informed by performance, impact, and population-based data and analysis of the first phase of Feed the Future; market analysis of the targeted agro-ecological zones and socio-economic factors impacting poverty, nutrition, and resilience; and stakeholder consultations. The GFSS Country Plan for Uganda adopts a market systems approach to improve the functioning of the agricultural market to achieve its three objectives. Targeted beneficiaries include a range of actors involved in market activities. While women, youth, the ultra-poor, landless, and other marginalized groups face varied and multiple constraints to engaging with the agricultural market, a key tenet of the Feed the Future approach is that they are all market actors, and exist somewhere on the continuum of market engagement. Feed the Future recognizes that the most vulnerable and the extreme poor do not have access to sufficient assets, skills and capabilities to fully participate in market systems and will need to be supported to develop capacity over time to participate in value chains so that they can become viable livelihood options for them. Feed the Future uses tailored interventions to meet marginalized actors where they are along the continuum. Feed the Future prioritizes activities that have a potential for transformative effects on wider numbers of beneficiaries, leveraging other partners to have a larger impact with USG resources. Keeping market facilitation at the core of its methodology, Uganda's Country Plan places local actors at the center of action and places much of responsibility for achieving the growth outlined in the GOU's various development plans on those actors themselves. In so doing, Uganda's Country Plan not only supports Uganda's journey to self-reliance, but actually elevates it as the only path to achieving our shared goals.

Budget assumptions for interagency contributions to this plan reflect the FY 2017 Estimate and FY 2018 President's Budget, based on information publicly available at the time this document was prepared. Out year budget assumptions reflect a straight-line to the FY 2018 President's Budget. Any funding beyond

FY 2017 is subject to the availability of funds, as determined by the President's Budget and a Congressional appropriation. Budget assumptions may require revision in the future, based on future appropriations.

Section 1. Food Security and Nutrition Context in Uganda

1.1 Country Priorities

The last fifteen years of agricultural growth in Uganda has been modest and not resulted in the gains Ugandans need to transform their economy. Uganda has sought to bring about the transformation of the agricultural sector from one dominated by subsistence farming to one that is competitive, profitable and sustainable. Both the Second National Development Plan 2016-2020 (NDP 2) and Vision 2040 identify agriculture as a major contributor to economic growth and employment for the country and fundamental to achieving the goal of transforming Uganda from a low income country to an upper middle income one by 2040. The Government of Uganda's (GOU) Agriculture Sector Strategic Plan 2016-2020 (ASSP) and the Uganda Nutrition Action Plan (UNAP) align with both the NDP 2 and Vision 2040. The ASSP is also the main vehicle for implementing the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) in the country, while the UNAP provides guidance on country-led interventions with the goal of improving the nutritional status of all Ugandans.

The ASSP identifies four priority areas to support agriculture sector growth, contributing to the national goals of poverty reduction, economic growth, employment generation, expansion of exports, and improving the nutritional status of Ugandans everywhere. The programs are: 1) increasing production and productivity; 2) increasing access to critical farm inputs; 3) improving access to agricultural markets and processing facilities; and 4) strengthening the institutional and enabling environment. Despite the existence of these plans and objectives, leadership for the agricultural sector is fractured among many different ministries and agencies; and use of evidence and analysis for decision-making need strengthening. Feed the Future aims to support the GOU in aligning its various plans and strategies under the mandate of a well-informed and strategic Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry, and Fisheries (MAAIF).

Uganda also continues to contend with the challenge of malnutrition, and progress in addressing it has been slow. Recognizing this, the GOU developed the UNAP to meet the nutrition challenges in the NDP 2. It embraced a multi-sectoral approach to food and nutrition security programs with the UNAP as the overarching framework guiding nutrition interventions. Efforts will target reducing the incidence of morbidity and mortality across sectors, including scaling-up critical nutrition interventions, especially for children below five years old. The GOU established sector and district Nutrition Coordination Committees to operationalize the UNAP and a common results framework to monitor progress towards achieving the UNAP goal and objectives of: 1) improving access to and utilization of services related to maternal, infant and young children; 2) enhancing adoption of diverse diets; 3) protecting households from the impact of shocks and vulnerabilities that affect their nutritional status; 4) strengthening policy frameworks, and capacity to plan, implement, monitor, and evaluate nutrition programs; and 5) increasing national commitment to improving and supporting nutrition programs in the country.

2.2 Recent Trends and Current Status

Hunger and Malnutrition

Although the country has seen sound economic growth and poverty reduction over the past 20 years, population growth has caused malnutrition rates to remain high and tempered other economic gains. The proportion of children receiving a minimum acceptable diet (MAD) is rising but remains very low; between 2011 and 2016 MAD moved from 6% to 14% (Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS 2017). Over a five-year period from 2011 to 2016, stunting levels fell from 33% to 29% and the prevalence of underweight children was reduced from 14% to 11%, and wasted children from 5% to 3.6% (DHS 2016).

Childhood mortality has fallen over the past 30 years, from 177 deaths per 1,000 live births in 1988/89 to 64 recorded in 2016 (UBOS, *op. cit.*). Causes of child malnutrition in Uganda include a high disease burden, inadequate maternal and child care practices, poor access to safe water, suboptimal sanitation and hygiene practices and inhibiting environment/policy factors. In addition, there remain significant differences in the nutritional status of children, depending on whether they live in rural or urban areas, the socio-economic status of parents, and the education levels of their mothers (UBOS, 2017).

Over 30 percent (6.35 million) of the total population faced some level of chronic food insecurity in 2015 (IPC, 2015). In particular, the dry northeastern region of Karamoja has suffered chronic food insecurity punctuated by acute drought shocks and a prolonged conflict resulting in recurrent emergency-level food needs for many decades. Even in the absence of a drought, it is estimated that 73% of Karamojong households suffer from moderate to severe hunger. Nearly 1.4 million refugees, over 1 million of whom have arrived in the past three years, are placing additional strain on social service systems, markets, and the environment. Meanwhile, even areas with high productivity and access to nutritious foods have high rates of malnutrition. This is true, for example, in the southwest, where poor water management and sanitation, coupled with poor feeding practices, create a serious nutritional challenge. The interaction between food insecurity and nutrition is important in the context of nutritional resilience. Poor nutritional status leads to and/or exacerbates susceptibility to disease, especially in areas with poor water and sanitation and high communicable disease burdens, particularly malaria.

Poverty

Over the past 15 years, Uganda has been viewed as an African success story, with extreme poverty reducing faster than in most other countries on the continent. The proportion of the population living below \$1.25 per day¹ fell from 62.2% to 27% from 2003 to the present. This was the result of the restoration of peace and stability over much of the country, economic reforms, and favorable weather. Unfortunately, in recent years economic growth has been sluggish – only 4% in 2016/17. Nevertheless, data has demonstrated that since 1970 about 70% of Ugandans made less than \$2.50 per day with little fluctuation. This signals chronic vulnerability across the country and persistent backsliding back into poverty due to low resilience from shocks, particularly related to health and drought. For every three people who move out of poverty, two fall back as the result of shocks, such as prolonged exposure to drought or the onset of pests that undermine agricultural productivity.

The high level of vulnerability means that the majority of Ugandans fight an uphill battle to stay healthy, earn money, and provide for their children's education. The average family has six children, lives in a rural area, and relies on subsistence farming for its livelihood. Families contend with a wide variety of vulnerabilities such as access to clean water and hygiene, an inability to mitigate and manage risks, and the pervasive weakness of systems, particularly those related to education, health, and economic development. Successive shocks and stressors overwhelm a household's ability to cope and cause them to fall further into poverty. Even households that are not vulnerable initially may not be able to adapt to major shocks and gradually slide into poverty from which they may not recover. Community and household gender relations influence sustainable poverty escapes, and causes of backsliding and factors for sustained poverty escapes vary between female and male headed households and households of varying size (Scott, Diwakar, & Okech, 2016). Thus, pockets of vulnerability and poverty exist throughout Uganda, throughout various catchment areas, even within households.

¹ The GOU set the poverty line at \$1.25 in 1993 and has not updated it since. In contrast, the international extreme poverty line is \$ 1.90 per day. As a result, the Ugandan poverty line is extremely low by international standards and is not an accurate measure of the magnitude of poverty in Uganda today.

Meanwhile regional variations in welfare are also increasing: as of 2013, the GOU poverty line of \$1.25 per day stood at approximately 31% in the North, 43% in the East, and 60% in Karamoja, and less in the Western and Central regions, where the figures stood at 19% and 23%, respectively. However, USAID/Food for Peace (FFP) survey data indicates a much higher level of poverty in Karamoja than official statistics portray. The surveys show that in Karamoja there are an estimated 94% of people living in poverty and an average household expenditure of only \$0.56 per person per day, equal to a depth of poverty of 68% below the poverty line. Over the past decade, the USG alone has spent an estimated \$210 million in humanitarian assistance to protect the lives and livelihoods of Karamoja's estimated 1.2 million people.

Agriculture

Agriculture is the foundation of Uganda's economy. It contributes to 25% of the GDP and one-half of foreign exchange earnings. Incorporating its forward and backward linkages in the economy, agriculture accounts for more than 50% of GDP. It provides the main source of income for all rural households, particularly for the poorest 40% of households. Furthermore, it is the source of raw materials for the agricultural-based industrial sector in Uganda. Within agriculture, crop income dominates, with maize, beans, and bananas accounting for half of the total value of crop sales nationally. Uganda is the largest regional supplier of grains, contributing more than 70% of intra-East African Community trade. Grain exports include maize, sorghum, millet, and pulses.

Uganda registered robust growth in crop incomes in the years for which the most recent data are available (2006-12). This varied substantially across the country, with much higher levels of growth recorded in western Uganda, and the lowest levels in the North. Changes in production practices have been gradual, and rates of input use remain surprisingly low. In 2012, approximately 24% of households used fertilizer, 12% used pesticide, and 28% used improved seeds (Hill & Mejia-Mantilla, 2017). In 2013, only 12% of households received agricultural extension services. This low-input farming system is the product of the generally poor rural infrastructure, inadequate extension, the high cost and prevalence of counterfeit inputs, and the undercapitalization of farmers. Post-harvest losses are estimated to be high, while the quality of both foodstuffs and export commodities is generally poor.

3.3 Partnership Landscape

The GOU agreed to increase inter-ministerial cooperation and embrace a multi-sectoral approach to agricultural development in accordance with its Malabo commitments. At present, cooperation among agriculture sector ministries and between government and private sector and civil society organizations (CSOs) needs to be strengthened in order to leverage resources and expand the potential to achieve GOU goals such as those articulated in Vision 2040, and the NDP-2. The MAAIF convenes joint annual reviews of the sector (JASAR), involving all interested parties, as well as regular sector working group meetings with donors and civil society. Uganda held its 7th JASAR in September 2017. Representatives from the GOU, the private sector, civil society, and the development partners actively participated in the meeting. The GOU held a Post-JASAR Review in December to evaluate the event and to detail areas where improvements could be made. The participants enumerated and discussed commitments made by each of the stakeholder groups, and plan to hold further discussions during the scheduled quarterly Agriculture Sector Working Group meetings. USAID/Uganda will continue to work with the MAAIF and other relevant ministries and parties in strengthening the JASAR process, including the Biennial Review process. CSOs are active in agriculture, both in the field and in policy analysis and advocacy work focused mainly on monitoring the country's commitments under the CAADP process. Private sector interests are well-represented on commodity-based stakeholder platforms. Partnerships for the advancement of nutrition outcomes are represented through relationships between the USG and the Office of the Prime Minister, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Local

Government, the Ministry of Trade and Cooperatives, civil society and private sector partners. Meetings among development partners ensure coordination between the respective development partner country programs of assistance.

Still, even with a broad level of commitment to seeing sustained agriculture growth and increased food security in Uganda, there are constraints related to the partnership landscape that must be acknowledged. Government of Uganda ministries and agencies remain critically under-funded and under-staffed, creating a disconnect between the many well-conceived strategies, plans, and working groups such as the NDP, ASSP, and the JASAR and the reality of government investments and implementation. Compounding budget and staffing shortfalls is the fact that basic mandates concerning the agriculture sector are dispersed across GOU Ministries and military institutions working in the distribution of agricultural commodities. This complicated network of roles and responsibilities presents challenges to MAAIF's leadership in the sector. A fundamental goal of Uganda's Country Plan is to support the MAAIF and the entire GOU in meeting its commitments to the sector, supporting robust private sector engagement, and clarity in roles and responsibilities.

Section 2. Targeting

The GFSS Country Plan for Uganda adopts a market systems approach to improve the functioning of the agricultural market to sustainably reduce hunger, malnutrition, and poverty, as well as to increase the resilience of people and systems. Targeted beneficiaries include a range of actors involved in market activities. While women, youth, the ultra-poor, landless, and other marginalized groups face varied and multiple constraints to engaging with the agricultural market, a key tenet the Feed the Future approach is that they are all market actors, and exist somewhere on the continuum of market engagement. Feed the Future recognizes that the most vulnerable and the extreme poor do not have access to sufficient assets, skills and capabilities to fully participate in market systems and will need to be supported to develop capacity over time to participate in value chains so that they can become viable livelihood options for them. Feed the Future uses tailored interventions to meet marginalized actors where they are along the continuum. Feed the Future prioritizes activities that have a potential for transformative effects on wider numbers of beneficiaries, leveraging other partners to have a larger impact with USG resources.

2.1 Global Food Security Strategy Zone of Influence (ZOI)

The GFSS ZOI for Uganda was determined by a variety of factors including: USAID/Uganda's Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) geo-focusing regions; areas with high levels of vulnerability, including high prevalence of stunting; areas of high private sector and local government partnership potential; locations of other USG investments, such as Food for Peace, the President's Malaria Initiative and PEPFAR; strategic opportunities for leveraging other donors' and GOU investments; geographies near protected areas and/or areas of high levels of biodiversity. This confluence of vulnerability, need, and partnership in the ZOI represents an enormous opportunity to reduce poverty over the long term, improving nutritional outcomes, and increasing the resilience of Ugandans.

GFSS investments are relationship-building, facilitative market systems development mechanisms that drive improvements in nutritional status, income generation, and increased resilience. As such, the market actor relationships formed under both the GFSS and Feed the Future are designed to continue and thrive even after an intervention ends. The GFSS Country Plan ZOI does not include eleven of the original Feed the Future districts. Feed the Future activities have phase out plans that ensure that tools and models, such as the Village Agent Extension Model, transition to local actors, including private sector and local and central government entities, for oversight. These actor-based, facilitative approaches allow GFSS

Southwestern: Isingiro, Mbarara, Ntungamo, Kabale, Rubanda, Kisoro, Kanungu, Rukungiri, Mitooma, Sheema, Bushenyi, Buhweju, Rubirizi, Ibanda, Kamwenge, and Kasese

Around 15% of the population in the Southwest lives under the poverty line. This belies the serious challenges facing the region in nutritional outcomes. Together with Karamoja, many parts of the Southwest also suffer from low dietary diversity. Kisoro and Kabale suffer from the highest rates of stunting in the entire country. The region is known for producing a wide variety of crops and for selling that produce to both Congo and Rwanda. This may account for the region’s lack of dietary diversity. Although it can increase tensions, a large refugee population in Kamwenge also presents new opportunities for growth and productivity. **Predominant value chains:** maize, beans, coffee, livestock, tea, potatoes, livestock, and dairy.

Coverage

The GFSS country plan for Uganda proposes to reach approximately 39% of the population in the ZOI, approximately 10.6% of the national population. A further breakdown of proposed coverage is in the table below.

Uganda's population	37,450,000
GFSS ZOI Districts' population	10,118,600
GFSS ZOI population / national population	27%
GFSS Activities' beneficiaries' population	3,967,079
GFSS Activities beneficiaries' households	809,608
GFSS beneficiaries / total GFSS ZOI Districts' population	39%

2.2 Cross-Market Functions and Value Chain Categories

The Country Plan prioritizes investments that have the best potential to improve performance of a wide breadth of agricultural value chain actors, including the most vulnerable and extreme poor. Under the first Feed the Future strategy, investments drove reforms in a select group of value chains, due to a need to focus and demonstrate impact. From the lessons learned under the first five years of Feed the Future, the USG has a greater understanding of where systemic changes need to take place in order to have a lasting impact on the sector and the country. Building on gains made in the maize, beans, and coffee value chains, the next five years’ investments will focus on inclusive growth across the entire agricultural sector. Feed the Future prioritizes investments in cross-market functions in order to have an impact beyond the ZOI and regardless of the dominant production system in a particular area. Feed the Future uses a rigorous evidence-based approach and maintains an active feedback loop with and among its partners in order to learn and make changes based on changing circumstances and new information. This also allows for better integration and partnership across activities and actors, including value chain-specific investments made by development partners and the government. What follows are five categories of cross-market functions against which investments will be made to drive inclusive, systemic impact:

1. **Agricultural Inputs:** Focus agricultural inputs include: seeds, agricultural chemicals, small equipment such as spray pumps or small irrigation kits, and larger equipment such as hullers, shellers or tractors. USG investments will address critical elements in the marketplace that enable importers, manufacturers, dealers, and farmers to produce, buy, or stock quality, certified inputs, namely: fighting counterfeit inputs by supporting private sector-led quality certification and consumer protection schemes such as E-Verification and AgVerify; supporting harmonization with East African Community and the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) standards and regulations; and promoting demand for quality inputs, as well as

linking access to inputs to access to finance so that farmers can purchase improved seed and other inputs.

2. **Services:** Business development services, financial services, extension and veterinary services, and information services (including weather, climate, market and early warning systems).
3. **Processing:** Transformation and upgrading of agricultural commodities including commodity conditioning, agro-processing and manufacturing; value addition and post-harvest storage and handling with actors at different levels, from the household to the medium-size trader/aggregator to larger industrial actors.
4. **Enabling Environment:** Policy, legal, and regulatory reform as well as enforcement, advocacy and civic engagement; establishing industry-led standards and quality control mechanisms; access and availability of energy; and improving infrastructure.
5. **Agricultural Research and Development for Innovation:** Research, product development, and commercialization of new technologies.

Feed the Future interventions pursue opportunities under three broad value chain categories, selecting different categories depending on the region(s) of interest, the population targeted, and the objectives of the intervention. The value chain categories are:

1. **Commodity Value Chains:** Crops/livestock with high income-generating potential, particularly those traded regionally and internationally. Investments in commodity value chains, particularly at downstream (agro-processor, exporter, etc.) level stand the greatest chance at driving changes in regulation, trade, and income generation at the firm and household level.
2. **Staple Crop Value Chains:** Crops and livestock that are both consumed at the household and produced for the market. The end market for staples is local and regional. Advances in staples value chains will generate increased household incomes and food security for many Ugandans.
3. **Nutritious Foods Value Chains:** Crops and livestock that are produced primarily for the market, but have high nutritional benefits to the producing household or end consumer. Investments strengthen the marketplace to make available enough variety and quantity of nutritious foods for consumer demand year-round.

Section 3. Program Components

3.1 Guiding Principles

The GFSS Country Plan is defined as much by how its objectives will be achieved as it is by what those objectives are. Uganda's Feed the Future program is intended to be adaptive to changing demands or opportunities for partnership and investment. Accordingly, the Country Plan incorporates the following guiding principles, which are aligned with the USAID/Uganda CDCS 2016-2021:

Employing a market facilitation approach: A market facilitation approach will improve food security outcomes for Ugandans. If the USG leverages the roles and behaviors of current players within the marketplace, supporting them to continue doing what they are doing better or to change their behavior, it will strengthen the systems and relationships among the various market actors, including the farmers. The USG mitigates risks and provides incentives for efficient, inclusive, and resilient market behaviors to occur, which ultimately leads to a strengthened system that is able to sustainably deliver goods and services to all market players.

Collaboration, learning, and adapting (CLA): CLA is a fundamental tool to improve effectiveness of Feed the Future in Uganda. CLA prizes working together, testing and iterating new approaches, and

sharing timely lessons learned with stakeholders. Feed the Future Uganda uses CLA to make continuous improvements to the program. Employing the CLA approach will also help build capacities in Ugandan counterpart organizations to face their challenges without the need for our assistance.

Pursuing integrated approaches: Feed the Future supports integrated approaches with tailored innovations that are evidence-based, adaptively managed, and infused with the idea of inclusive development. Some integrated approaches will have a regional focus, based on contextually specific evidence to address local challenges in households, communities, and systems.

Improving trade for food security: Trade can stimulate increased food production and improve nutrition outcomes for the population. Through relationships with district-level governments and MAAIF's Directorate of Agricultural Extension Services, USG investments will support the domestication and dissemination of regional standards and policies such as via COMESA to enable farmers, traders, and exporters to effectively participate in local, regional, and international markets. Feed the Future investments complement USG and other investments that improve cross-border and domestic trade to stimulate food production, create more opportunities for employment and growth, and meet the diverse nutritional needs of the population.

Seeking partnership as the default approach: Feed the Future champions local ownership and sustainability through two guiding principles: "Ensuring broad and inclusive stakeholder engagement throughout the life of an investment" and "Prioritizing partnerships that enable Ugandan-led development." The plan leverages partnerships to improve results, sustainability, and local systems. Feed the Future will strengthen partnerships with the GOU and other sector stakeholders through mutual accountability processes such as the Joint Annual Agricultural Sector Reviews and quarterly sector working group meetings. Meanwhile, private sector partnerships are central to employing a successful market facilitation approach.

Women's and girls' empowerment: The median Ugandan is a fourteen year-old girl living in a poor and rural family, vulnerable to economic, health, and environmental shocks and stresses, and she is highly vulnerable to early marriage, pregnancy, and leaving school. The country plan's emphasis on systems and cross-market functions should improve her family's ability, her community's ability, and her own current and future abilities to engage in and benefit from agricultural systems. Gender-responsive programming in market systems development, resilience enhancing activities, and nutrition will promote gender equity, including the power dynamics between and empowerment of women, men, girls, and boys. Programming will seek opportunities to address the other factors that affect adolescent girls' ability to thrive such as early marriage, health needs, early school dropout, and other systemic factors.

Environmental sustainability: Feed the Future activities combat desertification and improve natural resource management, including increasing soil and water conservation, promoting farmer-managed natural regeneration or complementary tree-planting in crop land, encouraging adoption of improved varieties, and supporting diversified livelihoods opportunities in and around protected areas that support biodiversity conservation. Feed the Future pays particular attention to the different impacts of climate change in different regions in Uganda.

Promoting science and technology: The Country Plan takes an expansive look at science and technology, supporting grassroots innovations such as managing crops, pests, and diseases, developing the latest improved seed, and building the most advanced digital platforms for farmer profiling and financial inclusion. Activities implemented under the plan aim to improve the efficiency and inclusiveness of the market place and improve the food security of Ugandans.

3.2. Theory of Change and Areas of Investment

If Feed the Future, together with the Government of Uganda, the private sector, and civil society, take a sector-wide approach to strengthening the agricultural market system, improve the resilience of the population and systems, and bring about an increase in the consumption of nutritious food and the adoption of healthy behaviors among key populations in selected districts, then poverty, hunger, and malnutrition in Uganda will significantly decrease.

Given the relatively developed status of Uganda's government systems, the country's place as a leader in policy design, and the existence of a dynamic market supported by a highly entrepreneurial society, Feed the Future investments can create sustained reductions in poverty, and improvements in nutrition and resilience.

Uganda's place on the graduation-towards-sustainability spectrum of development makes the facilitative approach to development especially appropriate. As articulated in the Malabo Declaration, a sustainable agriculture sector requires a multi-sectoral approach. Accordingly, Feed the Future engages MAAIF, other public sector partners, and the private sector to invest in, collaborate on, and advocate for the changes they want to see. This engagement must rest on a shared foundation of evidence and data for decision-making. Feed the Future investments deepen that evidence-base and the public and private sector's capacity to act on that information. The country is close to realizing significant gains in food security and nutrition. Greater market organization to ensure greater and more inclusive access to nutritious foods as well as accompanying social and behavior change and capacity building are needed to solidify gains.

Areas of Investment

Feed the Future categorizes its investments as "pull" or "push". Pull investments – such as investments with agro-processors or exporters – promote development of market systems to expand the quality and diversity of opportunities poor households have for market participation and benefits. These investments do not adhere to district boundaries or limits of the ZOI. Instead, they respond to the needs of the private sector and follow their influence. Pull investments drive sustainable, high impact results in the zone of influence. Push investments, on the other hand, build the capacity of people to engage in and benefit from the marketplace, adopt behavior changes to drive nutritional outcomes, and increase resilience. Push interventions help people build resilience to recurrent crises such as in Karamoja, or help long term refugees become self-reliant. They help vulnerable populations reap the rewards of Uganda's agricultural-led growth. Push and pull investments at all levels will complement each other to sustainably tackle food insecurity, malnutrition, and poverty. Selected value chains will explicitly prioritize inclusive growth and investments will include support to the most vulnerable to enable them to graduate into selected value chains and benefit from the GFSS supported livelihoods and market development.

The areas of investment listed below are not exhaustive. Rather, Feed the Future will be agile and responsive to investment opportunities, push or pull, as they present themselves and as new opportunities arise.

Objective 1: Inclusive and Sustainable Agriculture-led Growth

Illustrative Pull Investments:

- Engage agro-processors and exporters, and attract investments to promote value-added processes that transform and upgrade agricultural commodities;
- Create opportunities to increase foreign investment in the sector;

- Improve trade facilitation and border management; simplify administrative/procedural barriers and enhance integration of one-stop border systems;
- Support the demand for and provision of hybrid, public-private models of extension under MAAIF, including a focus on private sector veterinary services for the livestock industry;
- Support MAAIF to improve the connection between its annual plans and its budget request, more effectively advocate for resources, and fulfill its role as lead ministry for agriculture;
- Improve the capacity of MAAIF to use agricultural data for decision-making and measuring results;
- Support a sector wide approach to agriculture and mutual accountability by stakeholders in line with GOU Malabo commitments;
- Support private sector-led quality certification and consumer protection schemes, such as E-Verification and AgVerify;
- Support harmonization with COMESA and the East African Community standards, particularly in seed policy and fighting counterfeit inputs;
- Invest in electric power, such as increasing affordable energy for agribusiness' use and increasing the overall power generation and supply in Uganda.

Illustrative Push Investments:

- Capacity building for producer organizations and cooperatives to improve governance, management and operations;
- Capacity building in value addition from basic processing to semi-industrial product transformation in order to open up new markets;
- Capacity building and linking access to inputs with finance to promote use of quality inputs;
- Strengthen life skills such as financial literacy, and a savings and investment mindset;
- Give farmers access to networks and information to connect to inputs, extension, and markets;
- Farmer capacity development on climate-smart practices, post-harvest handling and storage, natural resources management, and using flood and drought early warning systems.

Objective 2: Strengthened Resilience Among People and Systems

Illustrative Pull Investments:

- Reinforce trader-village agent networks to include information and inputs for the livestock sector;
- Work with higher level value chain actors to create demand in the marketplace for high value crops and livestock products that can be produced by people with little access to land;
- Work with mid-level millers and traders to extend their reach to underserved regions;
- Encourage broad growth in the livestock value chain to capitalize on untapped opportunities in the sector, like provision of forage and veterinary services;
- Support for a national climate change policy, as well as finalizing systems and guidelines for climate change mainstreaming in development planning;
- Research on new drought/disease resistant crop varieties and encouraging uptake of already developed varieties;
- Work with government and the private sector on short-term weather forecasts, agricultural data, and market information, for farm-level decision making;
- Build demand for veterinary services in support of the livestock sector;
- Work with financial service providers to develop financial products that disenfranchised segments of the population can access;
- Support watershed level planning and governance structures in Feed the Future ZOI.

Illustrative Push Investments:

- Develop new opportunities for off-farm and other rural livelihoods;
- Promote high-value crops and livestock production that can be produced on smaller tracts of land;

- Work with the ultra-poor to smooth income, while building livelihoods skills and assets;
- Work with traders to create village savings and loan associations within their farmer networks;
- Work with communities and households to increase investments in their well-being and health, improve aspirations, empower individual agency, and reduce negative coping strategies;
- Capacity building to improve access to and use of early warning systems to improve timing of response and reduce asset depletion;
- Promote income diversification to decrease risks associated with climate or weather shocks, increases in pests and diseases, price fluctuations, or other market changes;
- Capacity building on new opportunities in the livestock sector beyond primary production;
- Investments in water resource management at the farm and household level with micro irrigation kits being provided through village agent schemes;
- Assist communities with catchment level land use planning and encourage climate sensitive agricultural practices;
- Introduce systems of farmer managed natural regeneration to complement cereal production.

Objective 3: A Well-Nourished Population, Especially Among Women and Children

Illustrative Pull Investments:

- Work with market actors to increase the availability of nutritious foods in the marketplace year-round, including exploring opportunities to support maize and soy flour fortification efforts and production of complementary and therapeutic foods;
- Work with traders to bulk horticulture for sale to local and national markets;
- Social and behavior change (SBC) on increased purchase and consumption of nutritious foods including animal products leading to greater availability at local and regional market centers;
- Support implementing the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Policy;
- Support and invest in GOU information systems for nutrition analysis, monitoring, and outreach.

Illustrative Push Investments:

- Community and facility-based nutrition specific and nutrition sensitive interventions;
- Targeted nutrition service delivery;
- Provide nutrition, food safety, and water, sanitation and hygiene SBC to farmer groups, mothers/fathers groups and others alongside other goods and services;
- Harmonize nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive SBC across objectives and investment areas;
- SBC on optimal feeding and care practices.

3.3. Links to Other USG investments

Water and Development Plan for the Global Water Strategy: Uganda is a high-priority country under the USG's Global Water Strategy, which aims to increase the number of people with access to improved and sustainable water, sanitation and hygiene services. The USAID/Uganda Water and Development Plan seeks to do so by: 1) Stimulating demand for improved sanitation and hygiene through a comprehensive behavior change strategy; 2) Increasing access to financial products and private sector led support for sanitation products and services; and 3) Strengthening the enabling environment to promote water and sanitation for all. Layering and sequencing nutrition investments with USAID/Uganda's Water and Development Plan will help drive improvements in nutritional outcomes.

President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR): The number of Ugandans currently living with HIV/AIDS is estimated to be 1.35 million. While the country is making significant progress towards achieving its 90-90-90 goals (90% of the population knowing their HIV status, 90% on treatment, and

90% showing viral suppression), the threat of HIV/AIDS remains real and undermines the health outcomes and productivity of the entire country.

Power Africa: Uganda is part of the Power Africa initiative and is a focus country for increasing electricity access through both on- and off-grid solutions. Collaboration with Power Africa will mean identifying those areas where new energy connections can be leveraged to boost production or improve nutritional outcomes. This will lead to new business opportunities in value addition processing and production that were impossible before the advent of electrification.

Refugee assistance: Uganda hosts the largest refugee population in Africa, and is widely recognized for its progressive policies that include land allocation to refugee households for farming. Uganda is implementing the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), established under the New York Declaration in September 2016, to provide a more predictable and sustainable response that benefits both refugees and their host communities. The aim of the CRRF is to engage in long-term planning and approaches to provide protection, assistance, and durable solutions for refugees; engage a broader array of non-humanitarian stakeholders, including local NGOs/actors, development and international finance institutions, and the private sector; and, embrace external investment and innovation in refugee responses. The USG is the largest donor of humanitarian assistance to refugees in Uganda, including food assistance. Over 75% of the USG contributions in FY2017 were locally and regionally procured commodities, sourced in large part from Ugandan farmers. Three districts included in this strategy host a significant number of refugees: Lamwo, Kamwenge, and Isingiro.

Power Africa is leading the Smart Communities Coalition with Mastercard to provide connectivity, digital tools, and access to electricity for selected refugee settlements and surrounding host communities. Pending availability of resources, Feed the Future will pursue synergies where appropriate both within and outside the defined ZOI, in particular in Yumbe district that currently hosts the largest refugee settlement in the world, Bidibidi.

Washington/regional investments: USAID's integration of programming with regional and Washington-based programs like the USAID East Africa Trade and Investment Hub, Trademark East Africa, Innovation Labs, and research and support from the U.S. Global Development Lab ("the Lab") are critical to success of the Country Plan. Knowledge of regional and centrally-funded programs operating in Uganda influences country-level investment decisions, and regional and Washington investments in agricultural research, trade, and policy and regulatory reform/enforcement are the priorities.

Digital Development for Feed the Future: Among the many potential benefits of digitizing market systems, there is a particular opportunity in Uganda for digital solutions to improve feedback between market actors, strengthen farmer and system resiliency, and extend the reach of advisory services. Digital Development for Feed the Future is a USAID Bureau for Food Security-Lab collaboration that focuses on promoting and testing digital solutions in agriculture. Feed the Future is pursuing a new phase of investments that will integrate and expand the use of digital financial services among farmers and traders/processors.

Domestic Resource Mobilization (DRM): A key challenge facing agricultural growth and food security in Uganda is a lack of funding for relevant line ministries concerned with the sector. Increased public investment arising from the DRM interventions will encourage productive private investment.

Section 4. Stakeholder engagement platforms

The Country Plan supports platforms for citizens to engage with their leaders at local and national levels; and helping to strengthen the constructive engagement of government officials and citizens. Meanwhile, Food for Peace programming closely coordinates with the Ministry of Karamoja Affairs and the Office of the Prime Minister, among others. In addition, activity level programming incorporates mechanisms for participatory-decision making, focusing on marginalized groups, particularly women and youth. Feed the Future may also provide small grants to facilitate targeted interventions that address capacity gaps in some of these platforms.

Feed the Future devotes significant resources to consultation with stakeholders to inform project design, monitoring, and management. For example, USAID coordinates a robust interagency engagement that includes Peace Corps, Department of State, and the U.S. African Development Foundation. To date, the USG has hosted two key stakeholder engagement events around the Global Food Security Strategy. In March 2017, Feed the Future hosted a 3-day workshop to map the agricultural market system with over 100 participants from the Government of Uganda, development partners, and the private sector. In September 2017, Feed the Future convened 50 stakeholders to discuss the Country Plan, both ensuring maximum buy-in and consensus around the investment priorities highlighted in this plan.

Throughout the life of Uganda's GFSS plan, the GFSS team will continue to reach out to relevant public and private players to validate results and successes, and to discuss course corrections, as needed. This will be done through our continued support to the Agriculture Donors Working Group, and our continued engagement with GOU and private sector players who influence the areas we work.

