

A Review of the Alignment of the Republic of Uganda's Draft Agriculture Sector Strategic Plan with the Malabo Commitments with Regard to Food Security and Nutrition

Nic J.J. Olivier, Sheryl L. Hendriks, and Elizabeth Mkandawire

Background and Introduction

Dramatic change has been happening in Africa for at least the past decade. Agricultural transformation in Africa is leading to tangible impacts on economic growth, poverty reduction and reducing under nutrition. Much of the progress can be attributed to the revived focus on agriculture as a driver of inclusive economic growth through the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Program (CAADP). The CAADP was initiated through the 2003 Maputo Declaration on Agriculture and Food Security in Africa (AU 2003), and sought to achieve Millennium Development Goal One (MDG-1) to halve the turn of the century levels of extreme poverty and hunger by 2015.

The main goal of the 2003 CAADP is to help African countries attain higher rates of inclusive economic growth through agriculture, forestry and fisheries sector-led development that eliminates hunger, reduces poverty, food insecurity, and malnutrition, and enables the expansion of agricultural exports. Despite some progress, the growth has been unequal and not sufficient to significantly reduce food insecurity, malnutrition, and poverty. What is more, according to a review of progress (AU/NEPAD 2016), it was realized that, i. increased growth was not only dependent on the proportion of income allocated to the agricultural sector, ii. encouraging private sector investment and growing trade called for a favorable business environment that extended beyond the powers of the Ministry of Agriculture, and iii. multi-sectoral intervention and coordination were required to simultaneously remove constraints and barriers to growth and create an enabling environment for transformation.

In 2014, the 23rd AU Assembly adopted the Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods.

Key Points to Consider:

It is essential that NAIPs:

- Align to the SDGs, Agenda 2063, the Malabo Declaration and the long term national vision and medium term growth and development plan to ensure coherence in development efforts.
- Malabo CAADP NAIPs seek to move beyond production to encompass inclusive economic growth, poverty reduction and the creation of employment through agricultural transformation agendas to achieve food security and nutrition for all.
- Food security should be adequately conceptualized, including all four elements namely availability, access, nutrition and stability/resilience. Programs based only on production activities will not achieve the Malabo targets.
- Strong and streamlined coordination structures are essential for effective coordination of comprehensive programs for food security and nutrition.

Key messages regarding the zero draft of the Ugandan Agriculture Sector Strategic Plan 2015/16 – 2019/20

- The ASSP is reportedly the operationalization strategy for the National Agriculture Policy (NAP) and as it stands does not cover all the elements necessary for a NAIP.
- A disconnect in the positioning of food security and nutrition exists across the Constitution, the Vision 2040, the NDP II, the NAP and the ASSP.
- Coordination structures are unclear.



The enhanced 2014 Malabo Declaration reaffirms the central commitments of the 2003 Maputo Declaration, but shifts away from the single-sector scope of the 2003 Maputo CAADP. This 2014 Malabo-focused CAADP approach pays attention to irrigation, mechanization and post-harvest losses and waste, while including areas of infrastructure, natural resources, land tenure, trade and nutrition elements that go beyond the mandate of the Ministry of Agriculture. Rather, the Malabo-aligned country-specific NAIPs provide a prioritized set of strategic agriculture, food security, and nutrition-centered initiatives as part of, and within the framework of, a nation's broader economic and social development agenda.

Since the 2003 Maputo Declaration, the execution of CAADP's evidence-based planning and implementation focus has brought technical credibility to African development processes, both at the continental and country level, instilling greater confidence from public, private and international investors and leading to more targeted actions. The CAADP process involves i. stock taking of the current policies and programs in the country, and ii. an analysis of the trends with regard to development, whilst iii. identifying future growth opportunities that will help the country achieve both the CAADP and the nationally defined targets, and then determining the basket of interventions to achieve these. In this way, the second generation (2014+) Malabo-aligned NAIPs provides the vehicle to link national development frameworks to multi-sectoral action to:

- i. Further the commitment to the CAADP process;
- ii. Increase investment finance in agriculture, forestry and fisheries;
- iii. End hunger, improve food security and reduce malnutrition;
- iv. Eradicate poverty through agriculture;
- v. Increase intra-African trade in agriculture commodities and services;
- vi. Improve resilience to climate variability; and
- vii. Enforce mutual accountability for actions and results.

The Purpose of this Analysis

The Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Food Security Policy (FSP) seeks to conduct food security policy analysis and provide support to government policy and related reforms. This includes identifying a range of possible improvements with regard to agriculture, food security, and nutrition policies as well as to the design of

the CAADP NAIPs. This support is intended to increase the probability that countries will be in a position to deliver fully on i. the food security and nutrition (FSN)-related commitments flowing from the 2014 AU Malabo Declarations¹ and the Sustainable Development Goals (hereinafter SDGs), and ii. key FSN-related international, African, regional and Uganda's domestic policy, obligations and commitments.

Within this context, the team has developed: i. a methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of development planning in terms of the alignment and linkages of a) international, African and regional obligations and commitments and b) national transversal development imperatives, ii. a second methodology for assessing the quality of the NAIPs in attaining the Malabo and SDG2 targets related to food security and nutrition, and iii. a third methodology for assessing the gender equality components against commitments.

It is against this framework that the draft of the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) of the Republic of Uganda's Agriculture Sector Strategic Plan or ASSP (2015/16 – 2019/20), dated August 2017, was reviewed. The spirit in which the review is conducted, and the purpose of this brief is to provide an independent assessment of the ASSP from the perspective of food security and nutrition to assist the country team in finalizing the ASSP under the domestication of the Malabo Declaration CAADP.

- i. This policy brief reports on the findings of the review in order to provide: i. focused inputs into the finalization of the ASSP; ii. insight and lessons for other countries engaged in the design of their second CAADP NAIPs; and iii. a framework for the application of the above-mentioned evaluation methodology in Uganda and other countries in Africa. The policy brief is set out in four sections covering four areas: i. the conceptual framework; ii. content and programmatic areas; iii. governance and implementation modalities; and iv. monitoring and evaluation elements.

Please note that numbers in parentheses refer to the page in the ASSP. We use roman numerals for the Executive Summary and Arabic numbers for the text.

¹ This includes the Malabo Declaration on Nutrition Security for Inclusive Economic Growth and Sustainable Development.

Overview of the Uganda Agriculture Sector Strategic Plan (ASSP)

The ASSP was developed following a 2015 review of the Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and Investment Plan (DSIP) that formed the first generation NAIP for Uganda from 2010/11 to 2014/15. The ASSP is proposed as the vehicle for domestication on the Malabo Declaration. The term NAIP is not used in the document. However, the ASSP document is referred to as the investment strategy (p. iii).

The National Agriculture Policy (NAP) has six strategic objectives: i. Ensure household and national food and nutrition security for all Ugandans; ii. Increase incomes of farming households from crops, livestock, fisheries, and all other agricultural related activities; iii. Promote specialization in strategic, profitable and viable enterprises and value addition through agro-zoning; iv. Promote domestic, regional, and international trade in agricultural products; v. Ensure sustainable use and management of agricultural resources; and vi. Develop human resources for agricultural development.

Although an effort was made to align the long-term National Vision 2040, the medium-term National Development Plan II 2015/16 – 2019/2020 (NDP) and the NAP with the ASSP, gaps are evident.

The ASSP has four priority areas (p. iv), namely:

- Increasing agricultural production and productivity;
- Increasing access to critical farm inputs;
- Improving access to agricultural markets and value addition; and
- Institutional and enabling environment strengthening.

Twelve priority commodities (bananas, beans, maize, rice, cassava, Irish potatoes, tea, coffee, fruit and vegetables, dairy, fish and livestock (meat) and four strategic (export) commodities (cocoa, cotton, oil seeds and oil palm) are identified 'based on their contribution to household income and food security, among others' (p. 40).

Assessment of the Policy Framework

The documents reports (p. i) that the ASSP was designed to deliver on Uganda's Malabo commitments. However, the strategy only focusses on one of the Malabo commitments areas; namely to deliver on agricultural transformation and partnerships in Africa.

At the outset, the ASSP states that the following CAADP priority programs have been integrated into the ASSP (p. i): 'i. increasing agricultural productivity; ii. enhancing food security and nutrition especially for children under five years and lactating mothers; iii. increasing the contribution of agriculture and agroprocessing to economic growth and poverty reduction; iv. creating jobs, especially for the youth; v. enhancing the resilience of livelihoods and production systems to climate change variability; vi. boosting intra-African trade in agricultural goods and services; and vii. strengthening mutual accountability towards action and results as one of the core CAADP principles'. This relates to (but does not deliver on) the seven Malabo Declaration performance themes listed on page 1b. The four ASSP priorities (or objectives) do not reflect these seven Malabo themes and are not aligned, except that ASSP priority one is similar to the Malabo performance theme one (as listed on page i of the executive summary). This partially relates to performance theme four of Malabo that encompasses hunger, food security, nutrition, and agriculture as per SDG2 (also mentioned on page 1c).

No mention is made of the international right to be free of hunger, the right to food and related universally binding human rights frameworks, nor the international 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Reference is made to the SDGs and specifically to goals 1, 2, 6, 12, and 13 (p. 1b). With regard to the African context, there is reference to CAADP and the Malabo Declaration with specific reference to seven performance areas associated with the 'expanded CAADP' as set out in the CAADP Biennial Review (BR) Technical Guide (pp. 1 b and 1c). However, no reference is made to the BR in the text. No mention is made of Agenda 2063 and the First 10-year Implementation Plan 2014 – 2023, the priorities and indicators. No mention is made of the 1981 African Charter on People's and Human Rights, the 1990 African Charter on the Rights of the Child, and the 2003 Protocol on the Rights of Women in Africa. No detailed discussion is provided of regional frameworks such as the East African Community and COMESA except for a brief mention on page 36.

As regards the national context, no reference is made to the Ugandan Constitution that provides, amongst others, in its national and directive principles, that 'the state shall endeavor to fulfill the fundamental rights of all Ugandans to social justice and economic development and shall, in particular, ensure that ... (b) all Ugandans enjoy rights and opportunities and access to education, health services, clean and safe water, work, decent shelter, adequate clothing, food security and pension and

retirements benefits'. This sets out an obligation that is not referred to in the ASSP. Article 2 of the Constitution says that the Constitution is the supreme law of Uganda, which prevails over all other laws and customs. It needs to be noted that the Uganda Constitution provides the foundation for all policies, strategies, and programs.

The vision of the ASSP does not include food security (p. 21), although food security is part of the mandate of the ministry (p. 52a). This is an anomaly. The ten key functions of the ministry (Textbox 1, p. 52a) do not refer to nutrition and only refer to food security within the context of supporting 'the provision of stocking materials and other inputs to increase production and commercialization of agriculture for food security and household income'. Access to water and sanitation are mentioned, but these elements are not directly addressed by the ASSP as per the CAADP Malabo intent. Moreover, the linkages between the Agriculture Sector Annual Operational Plan and the 5-year ASSP are not clearly spelt out (p. 56).

No definition of food security is provided, making it difficult to gauge the accurate conceptualization of food security and the meaning in the minds of the drafters. It should be noted that the ASSP focusses on the production component of food security at the neglect of the other three dimensions (access, nutrition and stability or resilience), despite food security being mentioned in the Constitution. Child stunting (being short for age) is a target of the Vision 2040 and the NDP II, while undernourishment is an indicator/target of the ASSP.

No reference is made to food security and nutrition in the ASSP's discussion (p. 4) of the National Development Plan II (NDP II), although Table 2 (NDP II key development results and targets, p. 4 and 5) refers to 'child stunting as a proportion of under-5's' for the period 2012/13 with the expected baseline at the end of the NDP II (2019/2020) of 31%. Table 1 (p. 3) of the ASSP refers to the baseline status (2010) for child stunting as 33%. There is a discrepancy and lack of alignment of indicators. The 10-year target for the reduction of stunting is only 2% lower than the baseline and does not align with the World Health Assembly Targets, the African Regional Nutrition Strategy or the Malabo Declaration targets. The reported level of stunting from the 2016 Uganda Demographic and Health Survey is 29%. The data from this survey is not referred to in the text of the ASSP.

The ASSP indicators and targets are strangely lumped together in one column on page 64. In Table 15, the Logical Framework Matrix, stunting is not mentioned,

instead, the indicator/target listed is the proportion of children under five years of age who are undernourished (as per the NDP II target). No specification of the measure of undernourished is provided.

Although we recognize that more industrialized nations do have proportionally lower budget allocations to agriculture, the reduction reflected in Table 1 on page 3, shows an anticipated reduction in the proportion of funding allocated to agriculture as dropping from 22.4 % in 2010 to 10.4% in 2040. Although the 10% allocation aligns with the CAADP target, the corresponding reduction in agriculture labor force distribution from 65.6% to 31% is concerning given Uganda has a high proportion of youth and is a largely agricultural economy. Contrary to this indicated reduction, the discussion above this table in the ASSP relates to the increasing role of agriculture in the Ugandan economy. The anticipated shift to the services sector also raises a concern given that these jobs are typically low-paid, insufficiently protected, and would affect livelihoods and food security. The vision and targets do not seem to align with Malabo principles to increase employment opportunities.

Operation Wealth Creation (OWC) is mentioned as a national plan for the transformation of agriculture from subsistence to commercial levels with a view to raise household incomes (p. 5a). No specific reference is made in the ASSP discussion of this program to food security and nutrition although elements of this plan could well contribute to the reduction of food insecurity and malnutrition.

It is stated that the ASSP is to be aligned with 'NDP II and other national and international commitments and priorities that cut across a sectors' (pp. 5b – 6). A major flaw in the conceptualization of the ASSP is that the ASSP is reportedly the operationalization strategy for the National Agriculture Policy (NAP) and does not adequately align with the CAADP guidance for the drafting of NAIPs nor the recommended indicators (see <http://www.resakss.org/node/6515>).

No online version of the NAP could be found apart from a 2011 draft version. However, from the draft version, the overall objective of the NAP is to achieve food and nutrition security and the improvement of household incomes through coordinated interventions. There is a lack of mention of the coordination structure to achieve this in the ASSP discussion.

A disconnect was observed in the positioning of food security and nutrition across the Constitution, the Vision 2040, the NDP II, the NAP and the ASSP. Food security

(but not nutrition) is expressed as a Constitutional principle. Child stunting is a target for Vision 2040 and NDP II, with the NAP focusing on ensuring household food and nutrition security for all Ugandans as an underpinning principle and a cross cutting theme in the ASSP. The ASSP refers specifically to food and nutrition security as one outcome of agriculture-led growth and one of the nine guiding principles underpinning the ASSP (p. 5b), presenting a mismatch in the strategic framework underpinning the ASSP.

Specifically: i. the ASSP vision does not refer to food security and nutrition, while ii. the mission is interpreted as, amongst others, ‘ensuring household food security along the entire commodity value chain’, while no reference is made to nutrition; and iii. no reference is made to food security in the overall goal. However, on page 51, food and nutrition security is referred to as a cross cutting issue. No mention is made of the Uganda Food and Nutrition Policy (2005) nor of the Uganda National Nutrition Plan of Action (2011 – 2016).

Assessment of the Content and Programmatic Areas

The ASSP does not explicitly refer to nutrition and refers to food security only in the manner in which it interprets its mission and as one of the five key outcome targets. It would have been expected that food security and nutrition would run through all of these to strategically align with the Malabo commitments. Five cross cutting issues are tagged on at the end of the ASSP and include gender, youth in agriculture, environment and climate change adaptation, HIV/AIDs, and food and nutrition security.

While it is important to highlight crosscutting issues separately in the document, they should ideally be integrated into each priority area to ensure that they are indeed integrated. Some innovative *undertakings* are mentioned in Annex 4, where the annual plans are budget tables are presented, however, these activities are not discussed in the narratives and tied into the priority areas. No indicators for these crosscutting issues are listed, providing no clarity on how progress toward achieving these issues will be measured.

Only in the closing section of the actions is the Ministry of Health mentioned for the first time, setting out their responsibility to co-partner with the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries and civil society to disseminate nutrition knowledge and information in respect of ‘i. children under 5 years by ensuring that they get a minimum acceptable diet and improved dietary diversity to reduce stunting,

underweight wasting, ii. improve feeding practices for pregnant and lactating mothers’ (p. 51). This is a narrow focus on a few vulnerable groups at the exclusion of other vulnerable groups (children above five years of age, teenagers, the elderly, and people living with HIV).

Food security and nutrition are also not represented in the overall goal of the agriculture sector (p. 21). The four strategic objectives or priorities of this sector (see above) do not refer explicitly or implicitly to food security and nutrition. However, one of the six key outcome targets of the sector is to ‘increase food security and food availability in all parts of the country’. This may infer a limited interpretation of food security related to production at the neglect of nutrition. The Strategy does not consider the pathways available for nutrition-sensitive programs and the direct targeting of nutrition-sensitive interventions to vulnerable groups (such as infants and children).

Detail is missing as to how child nutrition will be reduced. This is reportedly dealt with under cross cutting issues (p. 51) but is inadequate. No targeting of children is indicated in the plan that focusses on production only. Only the section on bananas (p. 68) refers to mainstreaming the cross cutting issues, which include food security and nutrition.

Within this context, a number of food and nutrition security interventions are to be executed. Some of these include:

- i. The operationalization and implementation of the ministry’s responsibilities contemplated in the national Food and Nutrition Strategy.
- ii. The development and utilization of early warning systems for the prevention and mitigation of shocks affecting ‘nutrition and food security’.
- iii. Providing assistance to local governments as regards the prioritization of food and nutrition security in the relevant district development plans and concomitant budgets.
- iv. Improved food storage, value addition, marketing and distribution — to be effected by the private sector in order to facilitate access to food during times of scarcity.

The policy framework and institutional arrangements (such as public-private partnerships or PPPs) are lacking with regards to the improvement of food storage and distribution.

A number of early warning systems related to pests control and management are mentioned. However, the section on agricultural risk management (p. 37) does not

refer at all to issues relating to food security and nutrition and early warning systems for food security. No mention is made of the management of food reserves and the provision of contingency plans and funds for such events. These issues are mentioned in the still to be enacted 2009 Food and Nutrition Security Bill.

Gender issues are listed as crosscutting, but no mention is made of some key structural issues. For example, gender issues related to women's limited access to agricultural inputs and services related to priority 2 (increasing access to critical farm inputs). Similarly, there is substantial discussion on issues related to land and women's access to land. The ASSP highlights the importance of joint decision-making and planning at household level, recognizing the importance of gender roles, but then regresses by focusing only on issues related to women. While the ASSP promises to mainstream gender into budgeting and community-level programs, this misinterpretation of gender raises concern for how gender issues will be integrated.

Governance and Implementation Modalities

One of the lessons learnt from the DSIP was (p. 20, g) the need for proactive engagement with key stakeholders to ensure appropriate implementation and an emerging opportunity was identified as (page 20, f) the need for good relationships with development partners. However, the ASSP does not spell out a structured coordination mechanism to coordinate efforts.

No mention is made of the National Food and Nutrition Council (established in 1964) that was proposed in the yet to be enacted 2009 Uganda Food and Nutrition Bill as the high-level coordination mechanism for food security and nutrition-related programs. It seems the Bill was never enacted but the Council exists. The Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries is responsible for the Council.

Mention is made in passing (p. 5b) of the National Planning Authority but no role is ascribed to this entity in the ASSP. As regards the Uganda Investment Authority (pp. 30b – 31a), this is referred to within the context of the activity 3.2.2.5 (pp. 30b – 31), but not within the context of the creation and enhancement of appropriate policy and institutional conditions (p. 25). This may be a coordination issue related to hierarchies and the relationship between the ministry and other government institutions that are either autonomous or linked to other ministries.

Two sets of institutions are proposed (pp. 52a – 53b) to coordinate the ASSP interventions: (i) a Top Policy Management (TPM) structure consisting of policy managers responsible for the overall oversight and (ii) the agricultural sector working group (ASWG) responsible for planning, coordination, monitoring and evaluation, and reviewing the performance of the ministry. A caution is noted in the ASWG reviewing the performance of the ministry, which is itself part of the ASWG.

As regards direct implementation, a distinction is made between government and the private sector, development partners, civil society, academia, and farmers. Within the government context, the ministry has an extensive role in the 'formulation, review and implementation of national policies, plans, strategies, regulations and standards and enforcement of laws, regulations and standards along the crops, livestock and fisheries value chains'. Within this context, the ministry is responsible for policy formulation, supervision, regulation, and enforcement of standards.

The seven semi-autonomous agencies (p. 11) are responsible for technical and advisory services, while local government production departments must implement national programs at local level by means of the provision of extension as well as regulatory and enforcement services.

There is a lack of clarity with regard to the mandates of the ministry responsible for the ASSP and other related ministries. There is also a lack of clarity on the role of the Office of the Prime Minister, which according to page 52b, is responsible for 'specific agriculture initiatives focusing on special areas such as the role of other actors in ASSP'. Page 52b implies that the responsibility for agricultural activities of other Ministries vests in the Office of the Premier. However, this is not spelled out, nor does it align with the ministry's stated central responsibility of, amongst others, the implementation of national policies, plans, strategies, regulations and standards.

No coordinating structure is established and the role of the Food and Nutrition Council is not considered. The role of the Office of the Prime Minister is not in line with the framework provided (p. 52a – 53b), and, in addition, it is unclear whether the Office of the Prime Minister has supervisory and enforcement powers in respect of the other Ministries mentioned.

Eight Ministries are identified (p. 52b) for the implementation of complementary ASSP interventions.

It should be noted that the list of these departments does not include the Ministries of Health Services and the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development although these are referred to in the separate attachments as providing data for the log frame. The list of Ministries mentioned as part of composition of the agricultural sector on page 1b and the Ministries listed on page 52b as part of the institutional arrangement responsible for the implementation of the ASSP complementary interventions do not align. On page 1b, the following ministries are listed, but excluded from the list on page 52b: Ministries of Health, Gender, Labour and Social Development; Energy and Mineral Development; Education and Sports; Public Service; Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities. This constitutes a muddle in institutional arrangements and a lack of coordination across Ministries resulting in a number of key food security and nutrition-related Ministries having no specific role indicated in the ASSP and its complementary actions.

This ignores the institutional coordination arrangements set out in the NAP, which indicates that the Cabinet and Parliament will ensure implementation and coordination of the NAP. It is unfortunate that the ASSP does not provide for similar coordination mechanisms because the ASSP is claimed to be the implementation strategy of the NAP.

The private sector will be involved in the ASSP implementation by the means of establishment of PPPs ‘aimed at enmeshing/facilitating private investment in agriculture, agribusinesses and agro-industries) (p. 52b) and cooperating with government on the delivery of agricultural services (p. 53a). Specific reference is made in guiding principle six of the use of partnerships and alliances between government, trade, industry and cooperatives, the private sector, civil society and development partner actors (p. 5b). According to Table 10 (matrix of sector players and their roles), a sector-wide approach will be implemented consisting of the ministry, the seven sector agencies, other sector ministries, the production departments of local government, development partners, the private sector, civil society, academia and farmers (as beneficiaries and stakeholders).

Page 18 refers to institutional strengthening with specific reference to institutional reforms and human resources capacity in the ministry’s restructuring in accordance with the restructuring report of 2010. The ASSP acknowledges the severe shortage of staff, especially at the district and local government levels. Only 12% of extension positions are filled. A lack of monitoring and evaluation capacity is reported, as well as a lack of coordination and

organization between the ministry and the agencies (Public Entities). This has constrained the preparation of a baseline and midterm and final assessment of the predecessor to the current ASSP (the DISP 2010/11 – 2014/15).

An extensive list of necessary policy formulation, enactment, and implementation of concomitant legislation is reported throughout the sections of the ASSP. This presents a commendable intention to review, revise, and reformulate policies, laws, regulations, strategies, and standards. Many of these relate to and affect food security and nutrition, although this link is not made in the ASSP. However, no time lines, coordination mechanisms, responsibilities, and specific outcomes are indicated. The policy and legal elements gaps (p. 39) will need to be identified and bridged. The intended changes include:

- i. Biotechnology, including GMO and biosafety legislation laws and standards should be fast tracked (p. 22).
- ii. Mainstreaming agricultural support extension services, eliminating parallel extension services and the establishment of an advisory committee consisting of experienced stakeholders (p. 23).
- iii. The development of an agricultural extension policy and legal framework as well as a ‘strategic plans to guide and deregulate public and private sector extension services provision’.
- iv. An intent to establish strategic partnerships as ‘functional multi-stakeholder innovation platforms for purposes of joint implementation of research’ and ‘strengthen relationships between research, extension services, monitoring and evaluation and data systems’ (pp. 23 – 24).
- v. Strengthening policies, legislation, standards, and guidelines for pests, vectors, and disease control (p. 24).
- vi. A reference is made to the establishment of various institutions and services ‘all aimed at increasing incomes and food security’ (p. 24).
- vii. Review and formulation of new policies, laws and regulations and institutions for agricultural inputs (p. 25) such as seeds and planting materials.
- viii. ‘Strengthening the legal and institutional framework and enhancing sector capacity for developing water for agricultural production’ (p. 25).
- ix. Development of appropriate policy and institutional frameworks focusing on providing access to investment finance (p. 25), including the revival of the cooperative bank.

- x. Strengthening and rationalization of the regulation and certification for seed services, including the improvement of policies and program plans and implementing existing.
- xi. Legislation, including the Plant and Varieties Protection Act (PVP Act) as well as obtaining the International Seed Testing Accreditation (p. 28).
- xii. Strengthening policies, laws and regulations for agricultural inputs including seeds and planting material supply and use through, amongst others, setting of standards and benchmarks for the private sector and establishing punitive measures for non-compliance and developing a system of self-regulation for the private sector.
- xiii. Indication of a need for an improved policy environment subsequent to the development of the Uganda National Irrigation Policy as well as the development and implementation of strategies focusing on increasing access to available natural water resources. Numerous specific action steps are set out for the improved policy, legal, and implementation and institutional water framework (pp. 29 - 30a).
- xiv. Review of the national fertilizer policy and implementing regulations (p. 30b).
- xv. Mention is made of the commercialization fund (pp. 31b, 32 a) that is to be operationalized.
- xvi. Mention is also made of the need for involvement in bilateral and multilateral trade agreements and regulations as well as in the simplification and harmonization of cross-border experts.
- xvii. The Agriculture Sector Communication Strategy (ASCS) will be implemented (p. 34).
- xviii. The capacity for quality assurance, regulation, food and safety standards for outputs and products across the three sub-sectors will be approved (pp. 34, 39 - 40).
- xix. The establishment of new institutional structures within government is proposed (p. 35). No detail is provided about these new structures. Nor does the ASSP refer to the existing National Council for Food and Nutrition Security (2009).
- xx. Developing a sector ICT strategy (p. 37).
- xxi. Provision of technical backup for local governments to draft and implement by-laws.
- xxii. Policy framework for a competitive and commercial potato industry (p. 42).
With respect to the meat sector, reviewing of a number of outdated Acts, the expedited enactment of ten outstanding draft Bills, the approval of four draft standards and three guidelines, the fast tracking and finalization of

four draft policies, the operationalization of the 2003 Meat Policy as well as the Animal Feeds Policy (p. 45).

However, the ASSP does not mention the need to review the outdated Food and Nutrition Security Strategy (2005) and the fast tracking and enactment of the 2009 Food and Nutrition Security Bill.

A number of constraints are mentioned, for example on page 23, the ASSP refers to ‘inappropriate land tenure systems’. However, the interventions mentioned do not address the structural barriers underlying this problem.

The ASSP also focused on the establishment of PPPs with seed companies and the establishment of MSIPs (multi-stakeholder innovation platforms) linking farmers to climate change experts, business service providers, agricultural rural service providers, and agricultural advisory services (p. 29). This commendably reflects a distinguishing between various role players in the sector, recognizing their roles and potential contributions.

As regards priority three ‘improving access to markets and value addition’, mention is made of the promotion of private sector investment as public-private partnerships (PPPs) for value addition. Within this context, investment proposals will be taken up with the Ugandan Investment Authority (pp. 31b, 32a, 32b). However, no details are provided indicating the mechanisms to do this.

The ASSP acknowledges that ‘the outcomes and successes of the ASSP implementation will lie outside of the agricultural sector itself and, hence, the policies and strategies of other sectors and institutions will need to be taken into account in the implementation processes’. Reference is made to the ASWG and in addition, mention is made of the Agricultural Council of Uganda (the composition, powers, and functions are not discussed elsewhere in the document). The ASSP also indicates that the sector will have a ‘fully established and robust coordination mechanisms at central, zonal, district and sub-county levels’ (p. 56).

Assessment of the Monitoring and Evaluation Elements

Three impact indicators have been identified. These include (medium to long-term results) — poverty reduction, economic growth and rural transformation and five medium term outcome indicators — increased food security/improved household nutrition (p. 63) but these are not reflected in Table 15.

Supplementary documents were provided setting out the alignment of the ASSP with the Malabo Commitments and the BR but it is unclear how these will be integrated into the ASSP, as they are not currently part of the ASSP Appendices.

The log frame lists child undernourishment as an indicator. However, the two complementary tables provided by the AU include additional food security and nutrition-related indicators extracted from the BR. The ASSP states that new standardized monitoring and evaluation tools, guidelines and formats will be developed and disseminated.

The role of the ministry with regards to monitoring and evaluation include: 'a) the establishment of sustainable systems to collect, process, maintain and disseminate agricultural statistics and information; (and) b) monitoring, inspecting, evaluating and harmonizing activities in the agricultural sector, including local government. The latter is not a function of monitoring and evaluation. Such data may well assist in the streamlining and harmonization of the system.

The ministry states that it will improve the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems by refining and reviewing systems to provide for the production of quality monitoring and evaluation data and information on ASSP implementation (p. 34). In addition, existing institutional and organization capacity for M&E will be strengthened. Training of staff is acknowledged as a need.

Sector performance reviews will be held twice a year followed by a joint annual sector review which will also include the private sector, development partners and civil society organizations as well as other government departments (p. 38). However, no formal institutional structure is set out for the coordination of the strategy or its review.

The National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation (p. 62a) and the Agriculture Sector Results Framework with outcome indicators and targets will be established at the start of the ASSP implementation. Intermediate outcome indicators will have to be defined. Two intermediate outcomes are referred to in the existing M&E strategy: i. availability of timely and reliable M&E information on all ASSP performance indicators, and ii. the increased use of M&E information to inform program, policy and resource allocation and making decisions in the sector. M&E reports will be available to the public, policy makers, and program managers (p. 62a).

M&E technical working group meetings will be established. There will be two institutions for mutual accountability: i. the joint annual agricultural sector reviews consisting of government, private sector, development partners and civil society organizations, complemented by; ii. a biennial public expenditure review tracking the flow of public expenditure (62a). Reference is also made to the mid-term review and final assessment of the ASSP (p. 63-Table 14, Monitoring and Evaluation Schedule).

An incomplete and erroneously conceptualized logical framework matrix for M&E is provided in Table 15, pages 64 – 67. It is strange that the indicators and targets are placed in the same column. The separate documents provided are not aligned with Table 15 of the ASSP.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The ASSP is construed as the equivalent of a CAADP NAIP, but in fact, it is a sector-specific implementation strategy for the NAP. The drafters attempt to present the ASSP as Malabo compliant (p. 1c). However, the ASSP is limited to one element of the Malabo commitments, namely agricultural production and productivity. This is acknowledged by the drafting team, which mentions that the ASSP is the implementation strategy for the NAP (p. 5a).

No definition of food security and nutrition is provided and the related terminology is used inconsistently in the document. The focus is overwhelmingly on one dimension of food security (production). The ASSP document gives the impression that, although part of the vision and objective of many national policy frameworks, food security and nutrition was an afterthought, tagged onto the end of the ASSP text and phrased as a cross cutting issue that is not mainstreamed or integrated into the main document.

Apart from the weak trickle-down effects that the ASSP hopes to achieve with regard to food security and nutrition, other elements of the Malabo commitments are also ignored, including reduction of poverty, nutrition, and gender. An evidence-based approach is missing that justifies the selection of the priority commodities and programs to achieve the targets. This is particularly true with regard to the targets for stunting and the broader food security and nutrition impacts that CAADP sets out to achieve. A theory of change section would help bring clarity to the objectives, interventions, and potential impact of the ASSP on food security.

Many key binding international and African documents are not referred to. No mention is made of the binding Constitutional principles and the key role of related national policies and institutions such as the Office of the President, Prime Minister, and the National Planning Authority are not spelt out.

The document does not contain an annexure of the related policies, acts, strategies and programs affected by the ASSP as in the case of other countries (see for example, Malawi). However, a wide range of policies, strategies, and legislation are mentioned that need to be reviewed, finalized, approved and/or enacted. No guidance is provided on timelines, responsibilities, and implementation modalities. The M&E framework is poorly developed, containing a number of inconsistencies.

At the institutional level, there is no overarching supra national coordinating body mentioned despite the existence of the Food and Nutrition Council. The document proposes that the existing ASWG should be retained and reviewed as regards composition and functions. This supports the impression that the ASSP is by in large to be coordinated by the ministry.

The coordination and mutual accountability should rest with the National Food and Nutrition Council. The Council includes the Permanent Secretaries of the Ministries of 8 implementing, Local Government; Education and Sports; Health; Agriculture; Animal Industry and Fisheries; Trade, Industry and Cooperatives; Gender, Labour and Social Development; Finance Planning and Economic Development and the National Planning Authority. The mandate of the Council should be broadened to include the oversight and coordination of the ASSP. The Council should report to the President or the Prime Minister rather than the Minister. The ASWG is not an appropriate mechanism for the coordination of the implementation of the ASSP.

References

- AU (African Union). 2003. Maputo Declaration on Agriculture and Food Security in Africa (Assembly/AU/Decl. 7(II)). Addis Ababa: African Union.
- AU (African Union). 2014. Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods. Addis Ababa: African Union.
http://pages.au.int/sites/default/files/Malabo%20Declaration%202014_11%202026-.pdf
- AU and NEPAD. 2016. Country CAADP Implementation Guidelines under the Malabo Declaration. Addis Abbaba and Midrand: African Union and New Partnership for Africa's Development.
- Republic of Uganda. 2009. Food and Nutrition Bill. Kampala: Republic of Uganda.
- Republic of Uganda. 2011. Uganda Nutrition Action Plan 2011 – 2016. Kampala: Ministry of Health Services.
- Republic of Uganda. 2011. National Agriculture Policy. Kampala: Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries.
- Republic of Uganda. 2017. Agriculture Sector Strategic Plan 2015/16 – 2019/20. Kampala: Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries.

About the authors

Nic J.J. Olivier is Research Associate of the Institute for Food, Nutrition, and Well-being (IFNuW) at the University of Pretoria and Extraordinary Professor at North West University. E-mail: oliviern@mweb.co.za.

Sheryl L. Hendriks is Director of IFNuW and Professor in the Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development, University of Pretoria. E-mail: Sheryl.hendriks@up.ac.za.

Elizabeth Mkandawire is a Research Assistant with IFNuW at the University of Pretoria. Email: elimka23@gmail.com.

This research is made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) through funding to the Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Food Security Policy in partnership with the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System National Agriculture and Food Security Investment Plan Task Force. The contents are the responsibility of study authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID, the United States Government or the University of Pretoria.

Copyright © 2018, Michigan State University and University of Pretoria. All rights reserved. This material may be reproduced for personal and not-for-profit use without permission from but with acknowledgement to MSU and the University of Pretoria.

Published by the Department of Agricultural, Food, and Resource Economics, Michigan State University, Justin S. Morrill Hall of Agriculture, 446 West Circle Dr., Room 202, East Lansing, Michigan 48824.