

Document: EB 2009/97/R.18/Rev.1
Agenda: 11(b)(ii)
Date: 15 September 2009
Distribution: Public
Original: English

E



Enabling poor rural people
to overcome poverty

President's report

Proposed supplementary loan and grant to the Republic of Uganda and modifications to the financing agreement

District Livelihoods Support Programme

Executive Board — Ninety-seventh Session
Rome, 14-15 September 2009

For: **Approval**

Note to Executive Board Directors

This document is submitted for approval by the Executive Board.

Directors are invited to contact the following focal point with any technical questions about this document:

Marian Bradley

Country Programme Manager
telephone: +39 06 5459 2326
e-mail: m.bradley@ifad.org

Queries regarding the dispatch of documentation for this session should be addressed to:

Deirdre McGrenra

Governing Bodies Officer
telephone: +39 06 5459 2374
e-mail: d.mcgrenra@ifad.org

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	ii
Recommendation for approval	iii
Map of the programme area	iv
Financing summary	v
I. The programme	1
A. Main development opportunity addressed by the programme	1
B. Proposed financing	1
C. Target group and participation	2
D. Development objectives	3
E. Harmonization and alignment	3
F. Components and expenditure categories	3
G. Management, implementation responsibilities and partnerships	4
H. Benefits and economic and financial justification	5
I. Knowledge management, innovation and scaling up	5
J. Main risks	5
K. Sustainability	6
II. Legal instruments and authority	6
III. Recommendation	6
Annex	
Financing agreement	7
Appendices	
I. Key reference documents	
II. Logical framework	

Abbreviations and acronyms

CAIP	Community Agricultural Infrastructure Improvement Programme
DDSP	District Development Support Programme
LGSIP	Local Government Sector Investment Plan
MOLG	Ministry of Local Government

Recommendation for approval

The Executive Board is invited to approve the recommendation for the proposed supplementary financing to the Republic of Uganda for the District Livelihoods Support Programme, and to approve modifications of the existing programme financing agreement as contained in paragraph 39.

Map of the programme area



Source: IFAD

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this map do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IFAD concerning the delimitation of the frontiers or boundaries, or the authorities thereof.

Republic of Uganda

Supplementary loan and grant for the District Livelihoods Support Programme

Financing summary

Initiating institution:	IFAD
Borrower:	Republic of Uganda
Executing agency:	Ministry of Local Government, and district councils and local governments of 13 districts
Total programme cost:	US\$51.17 million
Amount of IFAD supplementary loan:	SDR 11.60 million (equivalent to approximately US\$18 million)
Amount of IFAD supplementary grant:	SDR 1.29 million (equivalent to approximately US\$2 million)
Terms of IFAD loan:	40 years, including a grace period of 10 years, with a service charge of three fourths of one per cent (0.75 per cent) per annum
Original IFAD loan:	SDR 18.55 million (equivalent to approximately US\$27.44 million)
Original IFAD grant:	SDR 280,000 (equivalent to approximately US\$400,000)
Contribution of borrower:	US\$2.73 million
Contribution of beneficiaries:	US\$0.60 million
Appraising institution:	IFAD
Cooperating institution:	Directly supervised by IFAD

Proposed supplementary loan and grant to the Republic of Uganda for the District Livelihoods Support Programme and modifications to the financing agreement

I. The programme

A. Main development opportunity addressed by the programme

1. The District Livelihoods Support Programme (DLSP), approved in December 2006, builds upon the successful achievements of the District Development Support Programme (DDSP) implemented between 1998-2006, and is currently scaling up the DDSP's poverty approach in 13 districts.
2. The original IFAD loan and grant for the DLSP became effective on 24 October 2007, and the programme has been under implementation for 20 months. Benefiting from the experience of direct supervision, IFAD has been able to quickly respond to in-country circumstances by adjusting the programme design and providing supplementary funding.
3. The programme is implemented through the local government system and is expected to bring a direct improvement to the livelihoods of small farmers and poorer community members. The proposed supplementary financing will enable the programme to develop its targeting approach and improve the enabling environment for local economic development through the construction of rural access roads.

B. Proposed financing

Terms and conditions

4. It is proposed that IFAD provide a supplementary loan to the Republic of Uganda in the amount of SDR 11.60 million (equivalent to approximately US\$18 million) on highly concessional terms, and a supplementary grant of SDR 1.29 million (equivalent to approximately US\$2 million) to help finance the District Livelihoods Support Programme. The loan will have a term of 40 years, including a grace period of 10 years, with a service charge of three fourths of one per cent (0.75 per cent) per annum.

Relationship to the IFAD performance-based allocation system (PBAS)

5. The allocation defined for Uganda under the PBAS is US\$17.7 million per annum or US\$53 million over the 2007-2009 allocation cycle. This loan, together with the loan for the Community Agricultural Infrastructure Improvement Programme (CAIIP),¹ will support the successful activities being implemented by the Ministry of Local Government (MOLG) and utilize the remaining balance of the allocation.

Relationship to national sector-wide approaches or other joint funding instruments

6. The Ministry of Local Government is the lead ministry. In early 2006, the ministry prepared the Local Government Sector Investment Plan (LGSIP) to enhance decentralization in the country. The DLSP will support the objectives of the LGSIP by focusing, in particular, on local economic development through the improvement of community access roads and strengthening of local government structures.

Country debt burden and absorptive capacity of the State

7. External debt stood at US\$4.3 billion in late 2005, of which 93 per cent was owed to multilateral international financial institutions. Under the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative, total outstanding international debt was reduced to US\$1.5 billion in

¹ See document EB 2009/97/R.19, also being submitted to this Executive Board session.

2007, making Uganda ineligible for grant assistance from the World Bank. Between 1998 and April 2009, IFAD provided debt relief totalling SDR 12.73 million in net present value. Uganda has been regularly servicing its loans and is expected to continue to do so.

8. The MOLG has proved a competent implementation partner for IFAD's activities in Uganda. It has successfully implemented three interventions (now closed), with the IFAD loans recording disbursement of 95 per cent. Two ongoing interventions (the DLSP and CAIIP) are also making good progress. The current IFAD loan for the DLSP is 17 per cent disbursed, with commitments equivalent to about 12 per cent after 20 months of implementation.

Flow of funds

9. Loan and grant funds from IFAD will be deposited into the two existing special accounts in the Bank of Uganda. Drawdowns from this account by MOLG will be authorized by the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development in order to replenish the special accounts managed by the programme coordination unit, for subsequent replenishing of the district programme operating accounts. The flow of funds reflects lessons learned under the DDSP and other programmes implemented by the MOLG in Uganda.

Supervision arrangements

10. The supplementary loan and grant will be directly supervised by IFAD.

Exceptions to IFAD General Conditions for Agricultural Development Financing and operational policies

11. No exceptions are foreseen.

Governance

12. To ensure transparency in financial management, IFAD is supporting the introduction and/or upgrading of computerized accounting systems, training in financial management, and careful control of funds through defined advances to districts that are not replenished unless justifying documentation has been received. These measures are being closely monitored during IFAD supervision missions.

C. Target group and participation

Target group

13. Two principal target groups have been identified to benefit from the programme's household mentoring and agricultural development activities: (i) transitory poor households that are economically active but are not yet in a position to participate fully in market-oriented activities; and (ii) poorer households with limited assets and restricted livelihood options that do not currently participate in community activities and development initiatives. All households in the programme area will benefit from the building of community access roads.

Targeting approach

14. The DLSP targeting approach has been developed in compliance with the IFAD Policy on Targeting. From 2010/11, the programme's financial resources will be focused on the poorest 30 per cent of subcounties in each district (approximately three to four subcounties per district or a total of about 40 subcounties overall), based on the subcounty ranking exercise undertaken during the DLSP Parish Capability Study (November 2008). The DLSP will pilot a "household mentoring" methodology in which poorer households with potential are encouraged to examine their own problems and develop solutions, including addressing gender issues. As part of the household approach, household members will be encouraged to join clusters in order to build their confidence and gain access to services linked to mainstream development activities.

Participation

15. Household mentoring for the poorer and transitory poor households has been planned to help them overcome cultural and social barriers and to encourage their participation in programme activities. District local government will be empowered to carry out development activities.

D. Development objectives

Key programme objectives

16. The DLSP is contributing to two key thematic areas of the LGSIP: local economic development and service delivery by local governments. The goal of the programme is to improve the standard and sustainability of the livelihoods of poor rural households in the programme area. The two principal objectives are (i) to empower rural households to increase their food security and incomes; and (ii) to empower local governments to deliver decentralized services.²

Policy and institutional objectives

17. The programme supports the decentralization process and its implementation in newer districts, while aiming to ensure that poorer households benefit from local development activities. To address specific constraints that poor people face in participating in mainstream economic development activities, the programme will empower individuals and groups through household mentoring.

IFAD policy and strategy alignment

18. The programme supports the goal of empowering the rural poor to enhance their food security, incomes and assets as presented in the 2004 country strategic opportunities paper. It is also consistent with the IFAD Strategic Framework 2007-2010 by promoting the organizational capacity of poor people, developing human and social assets, and supporting economic activities.

E. Harmonization and alignment

Alignment with national priorities

19. The programme supports the Government's implementation of its Poverty Eradication Action Plan, and specifically the implementation of the LGSIP, which aims to strengthen decentralization and local economic development. The programme's agricultural activities reflect the objectives and approach articulated in the Government's Plan for the Modernization of Agriculture, which specifically focuses on value addition at the farm level.

Harmonization with development partners

20. The MOLG worked closely with donors in finalizing the LGSIP through the Decentralization Donor Working Group, and the DLSP is one of the programmes included within the LGSIP. The programme will be implemented through the ministry's structures at the district and subcounty levels. The supplementary loan has been discussed with donor partners.

F. Components and expenditure categories

Main components

21. The proposed supplementary loan is planned to finance community access roads. Including the supplementary loan, the financing breakdown of the components is: (i) community infrastructure (48 per cent of base costs); (ii) community development (8 per cent); (iii) agriculture and land management, including pilot land tenure activities (21 per cent); (iv) district and subcounty execution (11 per cent); and (v) programme coordination, including monitoring and evaluation (12 per cent).

² The programme's logical framework has been reworked to reflect the revised objectives and components (see appendix II).

cent).³ Funds will be disbursed within the original seven-year implementation period, ending on 31 December 2014.

Expenditure categories

22. The supplementary loan will finance civil works. The breakdown of expenditure by category is as follows: (i) civil works (48 per cent of base cost); (ii) vehicles, equipment and materials (9 per cent); (iii) studies, workshops, demonstration and training (16 per cent); (iv) contracted services and national technical assistance (7.3 per cent); (v) poverty grants (6 per cent); and (vi) recurrent costs (11.7 per cent). A preponderant share of the expenditure is expected to be made at the local level. The beneficiaries will contribute an amount equivalent to approximately 1.2 per cent of costs as financing towards enterprise grants.

G. Management, implementation responsibilities and partnerships

Key implementing partners

23. The MLOG will be the lead executing agency, while a programme coordination unit will be responsible for day-to-day implementation. Other implementing ministries (i.e. Finance; Lands, Water and Environment; Works and Transport; Gender, Labour and Social Development; and Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries) will be represented on the interministerial policy committee for the programme. The programme works with the National Agricultural Advisory Services Programme.⁴

Implementation responsibilities

24. The MLOG will have overall responsibility for implementation, and the districts will be responsible for field implementation. Implementation in the districts will be coordinated by the district planning unit, the finance office, the technical planning committee and the office of the chief administrative officer. The district planner will be designated as district programme coordinator, and will be responsible for monitoring and reporting. Operating modalities and conditions for implementation will be set out in district guidelines. Subcounty and district community development departments will be responsible for community development. Construction of community access roads is being undertaken by private contractors, overseen by parish and subcounty development committees and district works departments. District production and natural resources departments are in charge of implementation of agriculture and land management activities.

Role of technical assistance

25. Technical assistance to support implementation will be recruited nationally and locally in the amount of about US\$5.9 million, of which about 60 per cent will be financed under the IFAD loan, while the balance will be financed under the IFAD grant for household mentoring.

Status of key implementation agreements

26. Memorandums of understanding will be concluded between the MOLG and individual districts, and between districts and subcounties. The proposed programme will collaborate at the district level with the National Agricultural Advisory Services.

Key financing partners and amounts committed

27. The programme is firmly embedded within the LGSIP, and is supporting LGSIP activities in the areas of decentralization and local governance. It is estimated that total donor assistance to the MOLG stands at about US\$50 million per annum, of which the two IFAD-financed programmes are providing about one third. Cofinancing from the Belgian Survival Fund has not materialized, because in 2006

³ The principal design changes are: (i) infrastructure development is now preponderantly financing community access roads, which will be brought up to all-weather standards, while investments in water and sanitation have been eliminated after fiscal year 2009/10 as sufficient grant funds are available from other donors; and (ii) rural finance activities will no longer be covered by DLSP, but will be taken over by the IFAD-financed Rural Financial Services Programme as appropriate.

⁴ Cofinanced by IFAD with the World Bank since 2000.

the Human Development Index for Uganda surpassed 0.50, which is the cut-off point for eligibility for Belgian Survival Fund grant assistance.

H. Benefits and economic and financial justification

Main categories of benefits generated

28. The principal benefits will be enhanced asset status for households in the selected subcounties. About 200,000 households will benefit from infrastructure development, while about 50,000 households are expected to benefit directly from agribusiness development and food security grants.

Economic and financial viability

29. Family incomes are projected to increase by 50 per cent, assuming full adoption of programme recommendations. The economic rate of return for the programme is estimated at 16.3 per cent, and is robust when subjected to changes in costs, benefits and timing.

I. Knowledge management, innovation and scaling up

Knowledge management arrangements

30. Knowledge management focuses on field-level learning and dissemination. Under the IFAD grant, achievements and lessons learned from the DDSF have been compiled and shared with new districts. Regular inter-district dialogue, intensive quarterly review meetings, and district and national workshops will be the principal mechanisms for knowledge management.

Development innovations that the programme will promote

31. Intensive counselling will be undertaken using the household mentoring approach with the aim of ensuring participation of the poorest groups and women. This was a feature of the predecessor DDSF that is being refined under the ongoing programme. The programme is also one of the first IFAD-financed operations to make efforts to regularize unclear land tenure arrangements in line with new government policies.

Scaling-up approach

32. IFAD financed district support efforts in Uganda for five districts under the DDSF and has supported a similar but modified approach under the Area-based Agricultural Modernization Programme (cofinanced with the African Development Bank). The proposed programme expands the coverage from 5 to 13 districts. Lessons will also be shared through local development donor partner groups, so that the approach can be scaled up by other donors.

J. Main risks

Main risks and mitigation measures

33. The main risk lies in the challenge of promoting participation by the poorest groups in mainstream development initiatives. The household mentoring approach being put in place under the programme aims to promote the confidence and behaviour necessary for such participation within poor households, while also addressing gender issues. Another risk is posed by the weak local-level capacity to generate revenue and the inadequate fiscal allocation by central government to ensure sustainability in this area. There continues to be active dialogue both with the donor group and between IFAD and the MOLG to ensure the allocation of government funds.

Environmental classification

34. Pursuant to IFAD's environmental assessment procedures, the programme has been classified as a low Category B operation in that it is not likely to have any significant negative environmental impact.

K. Sustainability

35. Activities supported at the household and farm level should be self-sustaining after about 18 months. With regard to the Government's activities, its total recurrent costs are estimated at US\$1.3 million, or US\$100,000 per district, representing 5 per cent of annual district recurrent costs. These will be met by district revenue and government budgetary allocations. The programme will make a significant contribution to local revenue-generation.

II. Legal instruments and authority

36. A programme financing agreement between the Republic of Uganda and IFAD will constitute the legal instrument for extending the proposed supplementary financing to the borrower/recipient. A copy of the negotiated financing agreement is attached as an annex.
37. The Republic of Uganda is empowered under its laws to receive financing from IFAD.
38. I am satisfied that the proposed supplementary financing will comply with the Agreement Establishing IFAD and the Lending Policies and Criteria.

III. Recommendation

39. I recommend that the Executive Board approve the proposed supplementary financing in terms of the following resolution:

RESOLVED: that the Fund shall make a supplementary loan to the Republic of Uganda on highly concessional terms in an amount equivalent to eleven million six hundred thousand special drawing rights (SDR 11,600,000), and upon such terms and conditions as shall be substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions presented herein.

RESOLVED FURTHER: that the Fund shall provide a supplementary grant to the Republic of Uganda in an amount equivalent to one million two hundred and ninety thousand special drawing rights (SDR 1,290,000) and upon such terms and conditions as shall be substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions presented herein.

APPROVE that the existing programme financing agreement for the District Livelihoods Support Programme be amended to reflect the modifications contained in this report.

Kanayo F. Nwanze
President

Negotiated financing agreement

(Negotiations concluded on 31 July 2009)

Loan Number: _____

Grant Number: _____

Programme Title: District Livelihoods Support Programme (the "Programme")

The International Fund for Agricultural Development (the "Fund" or "IFAD")

and

the Republic of Uganda (the "Borrower/Recipient")

(each a "Party" and both of them collectively the "Parties")

hereby agree as follows:

WHEREAS the Borrower/Recipient and the Fund have entered into a Programme Financing Agreement dated 2 August 2007 (the "2007 Programme Financing Agreement") for the purpose of providing a loan (IFAD Loan No. 707 UG) (the "2007 Loan") and a grant (IFAD Grant No. 895 UG) (the "2007 Grant") (together the "2007 Financing") to finance the Programme; and

WHEREAS the Borrower/Recipient has requested further financial assistance and the Fund has agreed to provide a supplementary loan and grant to provide additional financing for the Programme.

Section A

1. The following documents collectively form this Agreement: this document, the Programme Description and Implementation Arrangements (Schedule 1), and the Allocation Table (Schedule 2).
2. The Fund's General Conditions for Agricultural Development Financing dated 29 April 2009, as may be amended from time to time (the "General Conditions") are annexed to this Agreement, and all provisions thereof shall apply to this Agreement. For the purposes of this Agreement the terms defined in the General Conditions shall have the meanings set forth therein.
3. The Fund shall provide a Loan and a Grant to the Borrower/Recipient (the "Financing"), which the Borrower/Recipient shall use to implement the Programme in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

Section B

- 1 (a) The amount of the Loan is eleven million six hundred thousand Special Drawing Rights (SDR 11 600 000).
(b) The amount of the Grant is one million two hundred ninety thousand Special Drawing Rights (SDR 1 290 000).
- 2 The Loan is granted on highly concessional terms.

3. The Loan Service Payment Currency shall be the US dollar.
4. The first day of the applicable Fiscal Year shall be 1 July.
5. Payments of principal and service charge shall be payable on each 1 June and 1 December, with payments of principal commencing on 1 December 2019.

Section C

1. The Lead Programme Agency shall be the Ministry of Local Government of the Borrower/Recipient.
2. The Programme Completion Date shall be 24 October 2014.

Section D

The Loan will be administered and the Programme supervised by the Fund.

Section E

1. The following are designated as additional specific conditions precedent to withdrawal: (i) disbursements under Category I will commence only once the category allocation for civil works under the 2007 Financing has been utilised up to 80%; (ii) disbursement under Category V(b) will commence only once guidelines satisfactory to IFAD have been prepared.
2. This Agreement is subject to ratification by the Borrower/Recipient.
3. The following are the designated representatives and addresses to be used for any communication related to this Agreement:

For the Fund:

(Name)
International Fund for Agricultural Development
Via Paolo di Dono 44
00142 Rome, Italy

For the Borrower/Recipient:

(Name)

This Agreement, dated _____, has been prepared in the (English) language in six (6) original copies, three (3) for the Fund and three (3) for the Borrower/Recipient.

For the Fund

For the Borrower/Recipient

Schedule 1*Programme Description and Implementation Arrangements*

The Programme description and implementation arrangements shall be the same as those set forth in the 2007 Programme Financing Agreement, as such may be amended from time to time.

Schedule 2

Allocation Table

Allocation of Loan and Grant Proceeds. The Table below sets forth the Categories of Eligible Expenditures to be financed by the Loan and the Grant and the allocation of the amounts of the Loan and the Grant to each Category and the percentages of expenditures for items to be financed in each Category.

Category	Loan Amount Allocated (expressed in SDR)	Grant Amount Allocated (expressed in SDR)	Percentage
I. Civil Works			
(a) Roads and Waterworks	10 000 000		100% net of taxes
(b) Buildings			100% net of taxes
II. Vehicles, Equipment and Materials			100% net of taxes
III. Training, Workshops, Audits and Studies			
(a) Paragraphs 3, 4 & 5 of Schedule 1		170 000	100% net of taxes
(b) Paragraph 6 of Schedule 1			100% net of taxes
IV. Technical Assistance			
(a) Paragraphs 3, 4 & 5 of Schedule 1			100%
(b) Paragraph 6 of Schedule 1		520 000	100%
V. Sub Grants			
(a) Paragraph 3.3 of Schedule 1			100%
(b) Food Security Production Grant (Paragraph 6 (e) of Schedule 1)		600 000	100%
VI. Incremental Operating Costs			
(a) Allowances			100%
(b) Supervision of Civil works and other Administration costs			100% net of taxes
(c) Vehicle Operating Costs			100% net of taxes
Unallocated	1 600 000		
TOTAL	11 600 000	1 290 000	

Key reference documents

Country reference documents

Uganda Agriculture and Rural Sector Review. AfDB, Agriculture and Rural Development Department 2005.

The Spatial Trends of Poverty and Inequality in Uganda: 2002-2005. J. B. Male-Mukasa,. Bureau of Statistics. Uganda

The Local Government Sector Investment Plan (LGSIP) 2006-2016. Ministry of Local Government. June 2006.

Support to Enhance Targeting under the Plan for Modernization of Agriculture. PMA Targeting Study. Draft Report on Needs Assessment Study of farmer categories and developing a differentiated strategy for a plan of action 2008.

IFAD reference documents

Uganda: Country Strategy and Opportunities Paper. IFAD _____, September 2004.

District Livelihoods Support Programme. Appraisal Report. Volumes I. and II. IFAD Report No.1879. Rome, Italy. May 2007.

District Livelihoods Support Programme. Manual for Implementation at Parish Level. Ministry of Local Government. Kampala, Uganda. December 2008.

District Development Support Programme. Achievements and Lessons Learnt. Ministry of Local Government. December 2006.

District Development Support Programme. Programme Completion Report. The DDS Liaison Office. Ministry of Local Government. March 2007

Area-based Agricultural Modernization Programme 2002 – 2008. Project Completion Report. Ministry of Local Government. December 2008

Area-based Agricultural Modernization Programme. Impact Assessment. Final Report. Ministry of Local Government. August 2008

IFAD's Performance and Impact in Decentralizing Environments: Experiences from Ethiopia, Tanzania and Uganda. Thematic Evaluation. IFAD Report No.1641. Rome, Italy. July 2005.

Performance Evaluation of National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS). ITAD Ltd. Hove, UK. June 2008

Impact Evaluation and Returns to Investment of the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS). Programme of Uganda. International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, USA, NAADS Secretariat, Kampala, Uganda, and Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa (ASARECA), Entebbe, Uganda. October 2008

Logical framework

Hierarchy of Objectives	Key Indicators and Targets	Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
Development Goal:			
Improved standard and sustainability of livelihoods of poor households in the rural areas within the Programme area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 200 000 HHs (equivalent to 1.2 mill. poor people) with increase in household asset ownership: (incl. physical, production, human, financial and social assets). 15% of HHs with improvements in household assets ownership index. 20% of HHs reporting increased food security. 10 % decrease in prevalence of child malnutrition (below the age of 5 years old) (h/a, w/a, w/h). 	RIMS Baseline Survey RIMS Midterm-Report RIMS Completion Report Programme M&E database.	Political stability maintained, security improved and consistent adherence to policy.
Purposes/Development Objectives:			
Empowering rural households to increase their food security and incomes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 90% of road beneficiaries/local communities reporting satisfaction (effectiveness and sustainability) with the access roads three years after completion 75% of the poorer mentored HHs attain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in household food security; Improvement in household assets; Increase in household income. Membership satisfaction analysis of benefit received from their institution. 80% FAL participants certified. 80% of members of farmer groups/production associations with increased yield and cash income from market-driven primary production and enterprises by 5-10%. 5% of HHs registered with land certificate at MTR and 10% at DLSP completion in the pilot sub-counties. 60% of Sub-county Development Plans have improved in their quality (reflecting community needs). 	HH Survey (questionnaire baseline and upon HH 'graduation'). Case studies. Farmer groups questionnaire (prior to obtaining grant and training and 2 years after). District Land Registry. Sub-county 3 year Development Plan. Districts' analysis of DLSP funded interventions.	Government continues to follow its proposed National Development Plan, LGSIP and decentralisation policies and ensures their adequate funding.
Empowering local governments to deliver decentralised services to rural communities.			
Main Outputs by Component:			
1. Community Access Roads: Construction and rehabilitation of community access roads.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 400 kilometres of community access road opened/rehabilitated for about 300 stretches of road. 300 Road Committees formed and/or strengthened. 75 000 people benefiting from improved road access. 	Construction contracts. District Contracts Committee minutes. Contract supervision/progress reports. Technical Department records, reports. AWPBs and Progress reports.	A sufficient number of reliable contractors are engaged to work on the community access roads; Their work is subject to sound supervision in order to ensure timeliness and a quality product; and Roads committees are able to mobilise local communities to participate in the maintenance of community access roads.
2. Agriculture Development: 2.1. Agriculture Production and Enterprise Development. On-farm demonstrations. Training in production technologies. Entrepreneurship training. Enterprise development grants for transitory poor groups. Food security production grants for poorer mentored HHs. Poorer mentored HHs trained in basic farming skills through their formed clusters. 2.2. Land Tenure. Strengthening Area Land Committees. Strengthening District Land Boards. Community's sensitisation in land tenure rights. Disseminating information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 312 on-farm demonstrations hosted. 15 600 farmers (equivalent to 624 farmer groups/producer associations) trained in entrepreneurship. 15 600 farmers (equivalent to 624 farmer groups/producer associations) trained in production and post-harvest. 624 enterprise development grant proposals prepared and approved. 17,280 food security production grants provided for individual poorer mentored HHs (40% hereof women). 17 280 poorer mentored HHs trained in basic farming skills through 3,456 clusters. (average of 5 per cluster) 39 Area Land Committees trained and equipped 13 District Land Boards trained and equipped. 25 000 individuals sensitised in land tenure rights. (equivalent to 312 communities with an average of 80 individuals per community meeting) 52 awareness raising events on land tenure rights (1 per pilot s/c per yr.) 	Sub-county agricultural component focal point – training records. District Production Coordinator and sub-county records. AWPBs and progress reports. Farm association register and records. Land Registers, District Land Board reports. AWPBs and Progress reports.	Farmer groups and producer associations are responsive to advisory services and market opportunities; Opportunities exist for establishing and developing viable businesses; The process for approving competitive matching grants is timely and effective; and Food security production grants are targeted to the poorer and inputs delivered in a timely manner; Sensitisation and practical actions will be appropriate to assist the poor, and women, to establish and formalise their land rights; and The registration of land use rights will be carried through without inordinate delay or obfuscation by the authorities; Government assures that its Land Policy, Land Use Policy and Domestic Relations Bill are approved and put into action.
3. Community Development: Community resource people trained. Mentoring of poorer HHs. FAL courses. Farmer groups/producer associations strengthened in group organisation and leadership skills.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 624 household mentors and 624 FAL instructors training and facilitated. 17 280 poorer HHs identified and mentored by the household mentors. 624 bicycles distributed to household mentors 46 800 FAL learners enrolled. (15 participants x624 FAL inst.x5yr.) 15 600 farmers (30% hereof women) (equivalent to 624 farmer groups/producer associations) trained in group organisation and leadership skills. 	Regional Programme Officer of the UCAA as well as district CDO contracts FAL records and certifications attained at sub-county level. Sub-county technical planning committee records. AWPBs and progress reports.	And
4. District, Sub-county Support. Local Government Departments enabled to operate effectively.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 13 Districts and 39 sub-counties equipped and mobilised. 65 district and sub-county officials trained in planning, M&E, accounting and HH mentoring methodology DLSP fund allocation and utilised according to DLSP's, Districts' and sub-counties' AWPBs. 	District DLSP accounts and register records District audit, meeting records District records. Supervision, progress reports	District, sub-county commitment to DLSP deliverables. DLSP preferential funds allocation formula in use for each district.

All results measures to be disaggregated by gender where possible

