Food Security

Organisation	Date	Reporting Period
Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Kampala (Uganda)	August 2014	2013

Activity		2013	Implemented by		Rio marker		Gender marker
Number	Name	Actual expenditure	Name Organisation	channel	mitigation/adaptation	significant/principal	significant/principal
23614	Support Fund Food S	90,003	Various	...	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
23615	Dairy value chain	2,500,000	aBi-Trust	NGO	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
23616	Catalist-Uganda	3,109,700	IFDC	Multilateral organization	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
23617	Seed development (ISSD)	900,000	WUR/CDI	NGO	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
23618	Agri-Skills 4 You	1,814,215	ICCO-reg office	NGO	Adaptation	Significant	Significant

Activity		2013	Implemented by		Rio marker		Gender marker
Number	Name	Actual expenditure	Name Organisation	channel	mitigation/adaptation	significant/principal	significant/principal
23619	TradeMark EA -Uganda	2,280,000	TradeMark EA	NGO	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
23620	Agri-policy action (PASIC)	688,000	IITA	Multilateral organization	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
25882	Financial inclusion	208,723	dfcu-Bank	Research institute and comp	Adaptation	Significant	Significant
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...

More activities

Result Area 1	Increase in sustainable food production					
Result Question 1.1a: How large has the increase in food production been?	The Uganda Bureau of Standards and the Ministry of Agriculture have not assessed the increase in production in 2013 as they did not hold the annual survey. The survey for 2014 has started and results will be available next year. The agricultural community represents about 20 million people (8 million permanent jobs and 4 million temporary) living in 4 million households and some corporate farms (for sugar and tea). About 25% of the aggregate households are organized in farmer groups and 30% also reported other economic activities. The growth in the agricultural sector is low and annual changes in production are related to changes in weather patterns. This will be an on-going concern with the anticipated variation in weather patterns associated with climate change. Any increase is likely due to opening up more land and not to sustainable intensification. Traditional farming systems in the highly-populated areas are not sustainable anymore and require replenishment of soil nutrients (fertilizers) and the introduction of machinery for higher labor productivity. Farmers in Uganda do not get much direct public support. The size of the agricultural budget (Euro 150 million - 4% of total budget) does not reflect the economic importance of agriculture in Uganda and the allocation is politicized. This results in a poorly performing public sector although research-output is considered stronger. The ministries for infrastructure, energy and for water invest in agro-supporting infrastructure such as (feeder)roads, rail, hydro-power and irrigation infrastructure.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
1. Marketable surplus of cereal equivalent from rice, cassava, Irish potato and sunflower (tons)	547,428	640,491	695,374	Not available		Uganda Bureau of Statistics / IFPRI
2. Total volume of processed milk milk traded by the formal sector (mln liters)	130	180	Not available	Not available		Dairy Development Authority
Indicator...						
Indicator...						

Result Question 1.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	About 25,000 farmers in 2013 benefited from the first year of the program: seed growers, buyers of the improved seed and crop farmers. These farmers jointly earned Ugx 3.3 billion (about 1 million or 40 per household). The seed and crop value chain projects produced an extra 7,356 mt of cereal equivalents, which corresponds to the annual grain intake of 37,000 people, assuming that 1 mt serves 5 people. The figures will increase considerably from the second full year of the projects. The Netherlands• contribution aims at increasing the income of commercially-oriented farmers -with particular emphasis on women and youth- which is a prerequisite for further investments in this sector. The EKN program started providing farmers with access to quality seeds, fertilizers, farm machinery (e.g. milk coolers) and technical advice, thereby enabling them to boost productivity or store products prior to sales. Simultaneously, organized farmers will be linked to local banks for credit and traders/processors for marketing their produce. The projects also target improvement of the public regulatory functions, such as the inspection of seed quality, protection of breeder rights (allowing importation Dutch seed potatoes) and the setting of standards.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
1. Additional food produced in mt cereal equivalents	0	165,000	0	7,356		IFDC, WUR/CDI and ICCCO
2. Quantity of milk marketed via coops of Uganda Crane Creameries Cooperative Union (mln liters)	47	72	47	64		UCCCU
Indicator...						
Indicator...						

More indicators

Result Area 1	Increase in sustainable food production					
Result Question 1.2a: How has the use of land, water, energy and labour developed?	The Uganda Bureau of Standards and the Ministry of Agriculture have not assessed the increase in production in 2013 as they did not hold the annual survey. The survey for 2014 has started and results will be available next year. Population pressure and over-cultivation have lowered the yields beyond sustainable levels. Ugandan farmers thought that fertilizers were not necessary but now see the need. The challenge is now to reduce the costs of fertilizers. Farmers for instance grow potatoes on the same field every year, thereby spreading diseases. Cassava yields are improving a bit thanks to the relative good weather in Northern part of the country and introduction of virus free cassava stems; no fertilizers are used. Yields in sunflower also improved thanks to introduction of improved seeds and commercial extension service, but fertilizers are not considered profitable and the purchasing companies rather buy from new areas once soil depletion occurs. Nevertheless, Uganda has the potential to transform towards a farming system that is commercially sustainable for people, planet and profit and resilient to anticipated climate change. Commercially and environmentally sustainable agriculture is especially important in the light of the huge number of youth (almost 3 million) seeking employment and income.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
1. Average yield of (irish) potato (tons/ha)	2.0	2.3	2.0	N.A.		Uganda Bureau of Statistics / IFPRI
2. Average yield of rice (tons/ha)	1.5	1.8	1.5	N.A.		Uganda Bureau of Statistics / IFPRI
3. Average yield of cassava (tons/ha)	1.7	2.0	2.0	N.A.		Uganda Bureau of Statistics / IFPRI
4. Average yield of sunflower (tons/ha)	0.4	0.9	0.5	N.A.		Uganda Bureau of Statistics / IFPRI

Result Question 1.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	In 2013 the implementing partners started their activities. Initial work included soil mapping for macro- and micro-nutrient deficiency, institutional arrangements and some training/exchange visits. With regard to potatoes, farmers tested that yields can double but they are yet to implement is. Potato stakeholder missions organized to Kenya and the Netherlands convinced Ugandan authorities to prepare the regulatory environment for the testing and commercial importation of seed potatoes. Rice already benefited from improved practices and fertilizer use. As concerns sunflower, the use of improved seeds and herbicides resulted in savings in labor costs. The use of fertilizers in sunflower further increased yields, but that is not commercially sustainable as fertilizer proved to be too expensive for this crop, warranting special attention to development of the fertilizer sector. With respect to dairy, the procurement agency awarded tenders for the distribution of milk cooling systems to the 100 dairy cooperatives to two Dutch companies who started in 2013. Additionally about 5000 members of the cooperatives received training. However, due to a long dry-spell in West Uganda the milk production per cow decreased, warranting investments in feeding. In this initial phase, the returns per labor day (labor productivity) did not significantly change, but the costs per unit of production seems to reduce drastically with commercially sustainable rice production which is very important as the East African rice market still is protected.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
1. Average yield of (irish) potato in Catalist (tons/ha)	6.8	20.0	No data yet	6.8		IFDC
2. Average yield of rice in Catalist (tons/ha)	1.6	5.0	No data yet	1.8		IFDC
3. Average yield of cassava in Catalist (tons/ha)	12.7	25.0	No data yet	12.7		IFDC
4. Average yield of sunflower in Catalist (tons/ha)	0.97	2.0	No data yet	1.3		IFDC

More indicators

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result area 1	Increase in sustainable food production
B. Results achieved as planned Reasons for result achieved:	The ambitious food security program has taken off in 2013 with the initial results becoming now available. It is still too early to assess whether economies of scale can be attained and commercially sustained. The first signs are encouraging however.
Implications for planning:	See country fiche for planning and the first annual status report with detailed achievements, trends and lessons of the program which will be communicated to the Hague and available on uganda.nlembassy.org.

Result Area 2	Better access to sufficiently nutritious food					
Result Question 2.1a: How large has the increase in availability of sufficiently nutritious food been?	In the MASPs 2012- 15 and 2014-17 for Uganda it has been decided that the embassy would not work on the nutritional aspects of food security (result area 2).					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator...						
Indicator...						
Indicator...						
Indicator...						

Result Question 2.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	In the MASPs 2012- 15 and 2014-17 for Uganda it has been decided that the embassy would not work on the nutritional aspects of food security (result area 2).					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Indicator...						
Indicator...						
Indicator...						
Indicator...						

More indicators

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result area 2	Better access to sufficiently nutritious food
Select results (A/B/C/D)...	
Reasons for result achieved:	
Implications for planning:	

Result Area 3	More efficient markets and an improved business climate					
Result Question 3.1a: Did business activity and trade increase and was it inclusive?	Although GDP grows at a 5-7% average rate, the per capita national income deteriorated in 2013, due to very high population growth. Crop farmers• income has improved significantly even corrected for inflation, although at very low levels. About 1.3 million farmers (one third of all farming households) bought improved seed; suggesting their integration into the cash economy (NB: it is too early to call it a significant increase as the data collection method changed). A significant increase in the value of agricultural banks loans with 35% in two years• time reflects the trend of agricultural transformation regarding higher labor productivity. Finally, the value of mobile money transfers has increased further, now at a level that exceeds the national budget, thereby contributing significantly to inclusive economic development.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
1. GNI per capita (in USD)	490	600	510	440		World Bank, Doing Business frames
2. GINI coefficient in the agricultural sector	0.6	0.5	0.6	No data		Uganda Bureau of Statistics / IFPRI
3. Annual per capita crop income (farm-gate), in 2005/06 constant UGX prices	20,266		25,436	No data		Uganda Bureau of Statistics / IFPRI
4. Number of people enrolled in agribusiness Business and Technical Vocational Education & Training	17,000	19,890	No data	No data		Ministry of Education survey

Result Question 3.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	In its first year of implementation, the program already is benefiting 25,000 farmers with increased production amounting to 7,356 mt of cereal equivalents and extra Euro 1 million income. The increase seems sustainable as 13,168 farmers (out of 18,000 Catalist farmers) of which 45% women, apply at least 2 elements of the commercially sustainable farming systems recommendations. Additionally, about 5,000 dairy farmers were trained and 7,550 people were enrolled in agri-skilling in Northern Uganda. Technical assistance to Rabo-DFCU is enabling this bank to expand agri-loans in the rural areas, thereby extending in particular the liquidity in several cooperatives.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
1a. Number of beneficiary farmers w increased income	0	80,000	Nil	25,000		IFDC, WUR, aBi-Trust and ICCO
1b. Total increased income (in million of Euros)		EUR 3,2 mln	-	EUR 1 mln		IFDC, WUR, aBi-Trust and ICCO
2. Jobs/employment …total number of extra labour days created	0			Surveys to be done		In consultation to be prepared with IFDC, WUR, aBi-Trust and ICCO
3. Number of youth (15-25) and farmers trained (% women) in relevant skills through AS4Y project	Y: 0 0	Y: 1500 12,400, 45%	Nil	Y: 310 7,250, 40%		AgriSkills 4 You

More indicators

Result Area 3	More efficient markets and an improved business climate					
Result Question 3.2a: How large has the increase been in international investments and international trade?	Uganda is one of the major investment destinations in East Africa, particularly in the oil, banking and agribusiness sectors. The annual FDI in last two years attained USD 1.7 billion. The total Netherlands investments in Uganda amounted to USD 90 million which is almost the target for 2015. Uganda's negative trade balance has reduced slightly. Uganda's intra-regional exports to the East African Community, South Sudan and DRC is steadily increasing to Euro 1.3 billion, and demonstrates the potential for Dutch investors to benefit from the regional trade from Uganda. The Netherlands export about USD 108 million to Uganda, up significantly from 2012. Uganda's exports to the Netherlands are fairly stagnant with Euro 100 million (mostly flowers and cuttings). Additionally, and not included in the figures, Uganda also attracts a very high number of Dutch tourists that contributes to business development. Uganda still has too many business regulations, and institutionalized corruption as is evidenced in the fall of the Doing Business ranking. However, Uganda is not doing worse in this field than competitors in the region. It is generally believed that the Uganda this years has implemented a major reform of in the 'trading across borders' parameter, which should be acknowledged in next year's DB scores.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
1. Value of FDI (in mln USD)	894	1500	1721	1700		World Bank / Heritage
2. Average value of Dutch FDI (in mln USD), and number of investors	9 5	100 8	210 8	90 8		UIA and EKN
3. Value of Uganda's imports from the world and exports to the world (mln USD)	I: 5630 E: 2159	I: 6000 E: 2920	I: 6044 E: 2357	I: 5818 E: 2408		ITC (www.trademap.org)
4. Value of Uganda• simport from the Netherlands and Uganda• sexport to the NL (in mln USD)	I: 99 E: 97	I: 100 E: 100	I: 60 E: 95	I: 108 E: 104		ITC (www.trademap.org)

Result Question 3.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?	The Dutch program facilitated about Euro 27 million Dutch investments, including Rabo Development in dfcu-Bank. Furthermore, the number of Ugandan companies with Dutch linkages and the number of businesses accessing Dutch business instruments are steadily increasing. In 2013, the Netherlands Government officially graduated Uganda to the so-called group of transitional partner countries for whom aid will be gradually phased out and investment/trade be zoomed in. Investors and traders can also benefit from the enlarged East African market that benefits from the work by TradeMark East Africa.					
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
1. Average value of FDI linked to program interventions (mln Euros)		EUR 14m	0	EUR 27m		EKN
2. Number of companies with Dutch relations that are registered in Uganda	70	120	80	91		EKN
3. % completion of border posts Busia (Kenya), Mutukula (Tanzania) and Mirama Hills (Rwanda)	Nil	3 posts modernized	Design & assessment	Land acquisition	B: 70%, M: 40% MH: 60%	TradeMark East Africa
Indicator...						

More indicators

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result area 3	More efficient markets and an improved business climate
B. Results achieved as planned Reasons for result achieved:	Reasons: The Dutch efforts in the area of economic cooperation are aimed at inclusive economic growth and business development in agribusiness, logistics and energy. The focus is on inclusiveness and responsible investments. This result area will benefit from more financial resources in coming years and through being the driving force behind public private partnerships, EKN will demonstrate its expertise and added value in the East Africa region and the regional approach by cooperating Dutch embassies in the Great Lakes region.
Implications for planning:	See country fiche for planning and the first annual status report with detailed achievements, trends and lessons of the program which will be communicated to the Hague and available on uganda.nlembassy.org.

Back

Result Area 1 (remaining indicators)	Increase in sustainable food production					
Result Question 1.1a: How large has the increase in food production been?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Result Question 1.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Back to result area 1

Result Area 1 (remaining indicators)	Increase in sustainable food production					
Result Question 1.2a: How has the use of land, water, energy and labour developed?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
5. Total use of inorganic fertilizers (kg/ha)	1	1.2	1	N.A.		Uganda Bureau of Statistics / IFPRI
6. Daily volume of milk produced per cow (liters)	1.6	1.8	2.7	N.A.		Uganda Bureau of Statistics / IFPRI
7. Number of youth (15-25) working in agri-sector, of which % female	2,262,308 48%	2,600,000 48%	2,847,790 47%	N.A.		Uganda Bureau of Statistics / IFPRI
Extra indicator...						

Result Question 1.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
5. Total use of inorganic fertilizers in Catalist (kg/ha)	7	50	No data yet	18		IFDC
6. Daily volume of milk produced per cow (liters)	4.9	8.0	No data yet	4.5		UCCCU
7. Returns per labour day in rice / potato (in UGX and euros)	4,500/ 4,500 EUR 1.33	7,000/17,500 EUR 2.25-5.60	No data yet	4,778/4,578 EUR 1.41-1.35		IFDC/JICA and Int Potato Center
8. Per unit cost of production of paddy rice / potato (in UGX/kg and euros)	432 / 450 EUR 0.14	216 / 225 EUR 0.07	No data yet	330 / 416 EUR 0.10-0.12		IFDC/JICA and Int Potato Center

Back to result area 1

Result Area 2 (remaining indicators)	Better access to sufficiently nutritious food					
Result Question 2.1a: How large has the increase in availability of sufficiently nutritious food been?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Result Question 2.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Back to result area 2

Result Area 3 (remaining indicators)	More efficient markets and an improved business climate					
Result Question 3.1a: Did business activity and trade increase and was it inclusive?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
5. Number of female/male farmers that uses improved seeds	147,152 / 611,184	742,000 / 2,038,000	387,890 / 924,040	No data		Uganda Bureau of Statistics / IFPRI
6. The value of agricultural loan portfolio (in billion UGX / million Euros) through banks and % of total	UGX 566 bn/ EUR 181m, 9%	UGX 900 bn/ EUR 288m, 12%	UGX 699 bn/ EUR 206m, 11%	UGX 837 bn/ EUR 246m, 11%		Bank of Uganda / Ministry of Finance
7. The value of mobile money transferred (trillion UGX and billion Euro)	-	UGX 20 trn EUR 6 billion	-	UGX 15 trn EUR 4,4 billion	UGX 18 trn EUR 5,3 billion	Ministry of Finance
Extra indicator...						

Result Question 3.1b: To what extent has your programme contributed to these results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
4. Number of farmers buying seed from local seed business groups	0	100,000 (tbc)	Nil	6,323		WUR-CDI/ISSD
5. Number farmers (o.w % women) applying at least 2 elements of commercially sustainable farming recs	0	88,000 (%45)	Nil	13,168 (45%)		IFDC
6. Number of beneficiary households in dairy project	0	18,000	Nil	5,000		UCCCU
7. Value of agri-loan portfolio (mln Euros) at dfcu-Bank and % of total dfcu loans	EUR 14m 7%	EUR 44m 12%	Before project	EUr 14m 7%		Dfcu-Bank, Rabo Development, GIZ

Back to result area 3

Result Area 3 (remaining indicators)	More efficient markets and an improved business climate					
Result Question 3.2a: How large has the increase been in international investments and international trade?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
5. Value of Uganda• sexports to the East African Community, DRC and Sudan (N+S) in mln USD	1,015	1,500	1,245	1,310		ITC (www.trademap.org)
6. General ranking on Doing Business index and the • TradingAccess BordersŽranking	G: 123 TaB: 158	G: 100 TaB: 125	G: 120 TaB: 159	G: 132 TaB: 164		World Bank / Doing Business
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Result Question 3.2b: To what extent has your programme contributed to this results? Which outputs and (intermediary) outcomes were achieved?						
	Baseline	**Target 2015**	**Result 2012**	**Result 2013**	**Result 2014**	**Source**
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						
Extra indicator...						

Back to result area 3

Extra Activities		2013	Implemented by		Rio marker		Gender marker
Number	Name	Actual expenditure	Name Organisation	channel	mitigation/adaptation	significant/principal	significant/principal
	M-BUZ client cert			...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...
				...	...	...	...

Digitally signed by M-BUZ client cert
DN: c=NL, o=M-BUZ, cn=M-BUZ client cert
Date: 2014.09.29 08:45:35 +02'00'

Go to result area 1