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Executive Summary

Northern Uganda has been in ‘transition’ for the past few years, with development partners focusing on stabilisation of economic, political and social environment after more than two decades of civil war. Strengthening the peace, establishing social safety nets, resolving land disputes and re-establishment of a local governance structure became the government’s top priorities. At the household level, families returned to their villages to re-establish lives and livelihoods that had been disrupted by the conflict.

In 2009, ACF started a two-year unconditional cash transfer programme that aimed to support returnee livelihoods and strengthen food security. At the end of the two-year programme, and drawing from experience and expertise in cash transfers, in 2011, ACF started another cash transfer intervention targeting women and aiming to reduce gender-based violence while strengthening livelihoods through increasing household assets and income diversification.

The evaluation used qualitative methods of inquiry – focus group discussions, in-depth interviews and consultative meetings with key stakeholders, supplemented by a review of literature and a review of the quantitative and qualitative monitoring information available in ACF’s data base. Two and half weeks were spent in the field sites in the three districts. The evaluator covered seven out of the thirteen targeted sub counties. A debriefing with key staff was conducted at every field site and a debriefing with ACF USA and ACF UK at the end of the field visits. There are a number of constraints to the evaluation. First, a consistent and experienced translator was not available – the evaluator relied on the help of ACF programme staff. Additionally, the voices and perspective of men or other household members (within the households of the cash transfer beneficiaries) were not recorded.

Considering that the programme tries to address two multi-causal and complex development issues, the programme has managed to improve, in the short term, the life conditions of targeted beneficiaries. Responses from focus group discussions and interviews provide anecdotal evidence of diversification of household assets, an increase in ownership of livestock, an increase in engagement in productive agricultural activities and establishment of small businesses. With the support of VSLA, there is also increased access to loans for emergencies or contingency and a slowly changing culture of saving among members. This is supported by monitoring data available from the programme.

Anecdotal evidence from women primary beneficiaries also show a decrease in fighting between couples that usually start because of financial pressures, increase in consultative decision making between couples and for some, a stronger social support system for occasions when couples do fight. Some women report a feeling of empowerment within the family. Monitoring data suggest significant positive changes in beneficiaries’ diversification of household assets and sources of income. Anecdotal evidence also suggests positive changes towards saving behaviour.

In terms of sustainability, ACF encourages recipients of the cash transfer to use the funds on productive assets that can have a longer-term effect on the household. As well, ACF created VSLA groups and encouraged cash transfer beneficiaries to join one to provide a safety net and access to loans for emergencies also increases the chances that the effects of the intervention will continue. Women’s groups that have been created have the potential for sustaining the changes in attitude and practice on reporting GBV incidents although there are
questions whether one-year mentoring and technical support for VSLA and women’s groups is enough to sustain them. The targeting criteria and selection process ensures that the most vulnerable are appropriately reached by the programme.

There is a need to strengthen integration of the programme’s two objectives in the two locations by harmonising activities, communication, staffing and monitoring systems. There is a wide geographic coverage and a wide definition of vulnerability. Because many types of vulnerabilities are included in the targeting criteria, there is an even greater coverage of beneficiaries with different life situations. The programme needs to consider the target beneficiaries not as a homogenous whole to see how the GBV and livelihood intervention affect different people differently. There are also two levels of effectiveness for the programme. On livelihoods, the programme is on track to meet the targets. For the GBV component, the local partners will need additional support, resources and technical guidance in order to meet the GBV targets. Some aspects of the programme such as the actual disbursement of the cash to the beneficiaries were implemented very efficiently. However, efficiency is weakened due to the wide geographic coverage with limited transport and human resource support, the limited resources of the GBV partners, and the changes in partners in Otuke.

Some of the challenges include the wide geographic coverage of the programme that puts a strain on logistical support for staff to achieve outputs, and a need for a stable partnership with an organisation to provide GBV trainings and support for a community-based referral system. The main recommendation is to strengthen programme integration of the two main objectives (GBV and livelihoods) by incorporating material from both into the trainings (for example using seasonal calendars), cross-training for staff, cross-training of the partners and hiring of a national programme manager for the GBV component. In addition, there is a need to strengthen partnerships with the GBV partner for a long-term engagement through providing technical oversight and additional financial and material resources as available. To improve efficiency, consider clustering the covered parishes to ease pressures on logistics and field staff.

ACF is in a very good position to contribute towards the limited understanding of the links between gender-based violence and economic empowerment through this programme that links both issues in a low-income, low-resource region experiencing a transition between humanitarian and development contexts. There is limited empirical data on how and to what extent economic empowerment of women, especially in low to middle income countries influences gender-based violence. ACF should consider how best to contribute to that body of knowledge and influence policy. One possible way to start is to restructure the monitoring information and data obtained through the post-distribution monitoring exercises to show disaggregated data for different population groups to allow for a more nuanced analysis of how the interventions affect different types of beneficiaries in different life conditions. ACF can also implement regular surveys to understand how and to what extent knowledge, attitudes and practices are changing and an in-depth study on the relationship between economic empowerment of women and gender-based violence.
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Background Information

In June 2011, Action Against Hunger (ACF-USA) in Uganda started a three-year programme funded by the Royal Norwegian Embassy called “Combating gender-based violence and enhancing economic empowerment of women in Northern Uganda through cash transfers”. The programme covers a total of 13 sub counties in three recently formed districts in northern Uganda, that have been adversely affected by the war with the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA). The districts are Otuke, carved out of Lira district in the Lango sub-region, and Amuru and Nwoya both carved out of Gulu district in the Acholi sub-region.

The programme has a two-fold aim, to contribute towards the reduction of incidents of gender-based violence in the target communities and to strengthen livelihoods in the targeted households through increasing household assets and income diversification.

This evaluation has been commissioned after the first year of implementation to assess strategies and processes that the programme is pursuing to achieve its overall objective. The evaluation also will seek to draw lessons learned and develop realistic recommendations that can help strengthen the next phase of implementation.

There are five major evaluation questions:
First, the evaluation will seek to answer if the cash transfer programme is on the right track to achieve its set specific objectives. Second, if the programme is relevant for the beneficiaries it is serving, third, if the implemented activities to influence GBV are relevant and successful and suggest other more productive or successful activities which could be included to bring about change in the GBV aspects of the programme. Fourth, the evaluation will ask if the collaboration with local partners are sufficiently and positively exhausted and lastly, outline lessons learned from the intervention and provide recommendations to strengthen the activities.

In addition, the evaluation will inquire as to the performance of the programme in terms of the seven DAC criteria of Impact, Sustainability, Relevance/Appropriateness, Coherence, Coverage, Effectiveness and Efficiency.

Methodology

The evaluation used qualitative methods triangulated by using focus group discussions (FGD), in-depth interviews (IDI), consultative meetings, review of literature, monitoring data, baselines and end lines and a short questionnaire. FGDs were conducted among primary cash transfer beneficiaries and VSLA (Village Savings and Loan Association) groups. In-depth interviews were among primary beneficiaries (some of whom were also VSLA group members and some of whom attended GBV training), ACF staff, local council leaders and the GBV partners CRESO and TPO.

A short questionnaire distributed among a random group of ACF FSL programme staff was also used to get indications of staff perceptions of how the programme fares in terms of the DAC criteria.
All three target districts – Otuke, Amuru and Nwoya – were visited. Stratified sampling of the targeted sub counties resulted in a geographic coverage for the evaluation that included 3 out of 5 sub counties in Otuke district, 2 out of 4 sub counties in Amuru and 2 out of 4 sub counties in Nwoya. See Annex 3 for the list of focus group discussions and interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-counties reached during the evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Otuke District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okwang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adwari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This evaluation uses a gender and GBV lens. This means looking at the distinct realities of women and men, analysing the differing participation and needs of women and girls, men and boys, and the relationships between men and women, trying to disaggregate experiences of the household and looking at different roles assigned to women and men. In this evaluation, the context will be the different assigned roles for women and men in livelihoods, agriculture and income diversification.

Although the evaluation tried to use the gender lens, there are a few limitations in the evaluation methods. First, the evaluator only interviewed women primary beneficiaries of cash transfers. The evaluator was not able to get a strong sampling of perspectives of male partners or other family members of the primary beneficiaries. The male perspective was represented through in-depth interviews with stakeholders and from male participants in FGDs among VSLA members. In future, however, it will be important to add this dimension to the evaluation and have a few FGDs solely among male respondents. Secondly, there were some minor translation issues as ‘GBV’ was almost seen as a western concept that did not have a direct translation into the languages – translators also did not necessarily have a standard way of translating the terms. In addition, the translators were ACF programme staff familiar with the programme jargon. In Otuke, the evaluator worked with the same female programme staff for all the field sites in Otuke district. In Amuru and Nwoya districts, one male programme staff worked with the evaluator in Koch Goma, Alero and Lamogi but was supported in two focus group discussions by another female programme staff in Amuru. Each translator had his/her own style but all of the staff tended to summarise the responses according to programmatic terms, e.g. ‘improved her livelihood’, ‘she spent it on IGA’, ‘she experienced GBV’, ‘she was vulnerable’, rather than translating responses verbatim.

Because there was a possibility that some participants experienced GBV, it was important to gain informed consent from respondents to guarantee confidentiality.

It is important to note ways of understanding ‘marital status’ in Uganda. In many parts of Uganda, many couples co-habit and have children without going through a ‘traditional marriage’ or a ‘church wedding’. A traditional marriage includes an ‘introduction ceremony’ where the families of the couple conduct elaborate rites that recognise the couple as married. Some also opt for a church wedding in addition to the traditional ceremony. Both traditional and church weddings require a lot of time and resources so many couples do not go through the ceremony. Many postpone the ceremony for many years and possibly even after the birth of a few children. The concept of being ‘married’ (and corollary, the concept of ‘divorce’) is not the same as the western concept of marriage, as many couples cohabit and may never go through the ceremonies yet still see themselves as ‘married’ to each other. The report uses the term ‘married’ in the same way as ‘cohabiting’.
Findings and Discussions

Two Parallel Programs in two different sites

The programme seemingly runs of two different tracks: the GBV track and the cash transfer (CT) or livelihoods track. The GBV track is implemented and mostly dependent on the effectiveness of a selected partner community-based organisation (CBO) with experience in GBV-related programming, and a livelihoods and economic empowerment track where ACF has institutional expertise and more control over design, implementation and monitoring. Additionally, there seems to be two parallel programmes in two different sites that are mostly integrated but with several areas open for greater integration in aspects such as communications, for example, in communicating selection criteria and training modules.

There are parallel activities ongoing in this one program; on the one hand there are a myriad of activities related to the second objective (livelihoods and economic empowerment) in the form of training, monitoring and learning (fund utilisation and post distribution monitoring), technical support of the cash transfer beneficiaries (through VSLAs) and on the other hand, training or awareness raising on GBV among overlapping or different beneficiaries in the target communities implemented by a local partner. As ACF has direct control over the livelihood aspect of the programme, the quality, frequency and monitoring of the activities are more sustained.

The activities are similar in all three covered districts and there are clear linkages between the two sites in that there is common criteria for targeting, common materials and approaches for sensitisation and training, common monitoring tools and common feedback mechanisms. Because the programme grew out of the LEARN programme that was implemented in Lira, similar tools have been used in both sites.

Synergies can be further enhanced by ensuring data is aggregated or disaggregated in the same way between sites, developing common sensitisation guides, e.g. how the target criteria are explained to the communities, encouraging the GBV partners to use the same baseline/end line tools, as well as the same GBV training manual. Regular reflection sessions between staff in the different sites and between GBV partners will also be helpful.

Concept of Vulnerability

Many of the participants volunteered information during the introductions of why they were chosen to be part of the programme. Some examples include ‘my brother mistreated me’, poverty, ‘vulnerability to GBV’, ‘my husband beats me’, ‘my husband chased me away’, widow, ‘my in-laws are mistreating me’, ‘my husband burnt our house’, person with disability, etc. One of the programme’s objectives is of empowerment and perhaps it will be good to transform the participants’ ways of identifying themselves (and programme staff’s ways of referring to beneficiaries) from a focus on vulnerabilities to capacities. Many interviewees said they experienced changes in their life as a result of the cash transfer and feel more empowered. Particularly in Otuke, where many of the women invested in livestock, women reported feeling increased respect from their family and community because animal ownership is highly regarded in that area. The process of empowerment will be enhanced by shifting focus from vulnerabilities to both vulnerabilities and capacities.
Another reason for combining the assessment of vulnerability with capacity is to ensure beneficiaries are able to convert the cash transfer into productive livelihood options.

“I didn’t feel bad (about being identified as ‘vulnerable’ because she is a widow, her husband killed by the LRA, is HIV+, and has 6 children), because I knew I had HIV and I didn’t mind people to know about it.” (IDI #1 Okwang)

“I was happy because I had a lot of problems and was very poor and felt motivated that others recognized my hardships.” (IDI #2, Okwang)

“...all the community knows how I am suffering and is aware of my situation.” FGD Adwari

“I would like people to know my situation because some people can help you and not all people will hate you.” FGD Adwari

One person said she did not feel comfortable about the fact that their life/personal situation is laid out for the whole community: “At some time I didn’t feel good because the community keeps on gossiping that I am HIV+.” FGD, Adwari

In an interview with the Food Security Programme Manager for the NRC in Gulu, he described how the NRC programmes in Nwoya had different packages for different categories of people in a programme that aimed to support sustainable return, improve access to food, improve livelihoods, agricultural production and enhance social safety nets. For those extremely vulnerable (e.g., elderly, very young, orphans, people with disabilities), the package included a monthly cash transfer of 90,000 Ugandan Shillings for 10 months that was used only for immediate needs. There was no expectation of turning the cash transfer into productive assets. They also provided basic needs and non-food items. For the able-bodied and labour-endowed with some basic skills, they provided agricultural support, focused on marketable high-value crops, trained on agricultural practices and provided seeds and tools. For those who needed social safety nets, but with capacities for productive labour, they provided 90,000 Ugandan Shillings for 4 months, and provided seeds and training. For a fourth category of people who had to undergo a participatory competitive selection and verification process they provided micro-enterprise development support. The comparable target for the ACF programme is the 3rd category of beneficiaries who may have identifiable vulnerabilities but are able to convert cash transfers to productive assets and who received four cash transfers plus seeds and training. The programme manager thought that for him, a promising practice that showed an increase in harvest, increase in production and increase in investment, is to provide the productivity safety net (90,000 UGX for 4 months) because this allows the farmer/beneficiary to concentrate on productive activities.

Anecdotal reports of changes in household intimate partner violence (IPV)

The participants speak more about the reduction of intimate partner violence (IPV) or domestic violence (DV) rather than a general reduction of gender-based violence (which includes rape, sexual abuse, forced marriage, early marriage, and harmful traditional practices such as female genital cutting). Intimate partner violence (IPV) as the term implies is any form of harm – physical, sexual, emotional, financial – that a person inflicts on his/her domestic or intimate partner. It is the most common form of gender-based violence but is only one form of gender-based violence. GBV, on the other hand is a wider term used to mean any form of harm – physical, sexual, emotional, financial – that someone inflicts on another based on her/his prescribed roles in society. GBV is often conflated with violence...
against women (VAW) because a large proportion of reported GBV incidents worldwide is violence of men against women. Anecdotal evidence from this evaluation points more towards the changes women experience in their relationships with their partner rather than a general change in how the wider community condones violence against women or how the women feel more or less safe and respected within the wider community.

In terms of the potential for economic empowerment of women to reduce intimate partner violence, literature suggests that when the potential benefits of the cash transfer, in terms of an increase in income, is such that it does not threaten the male’s concept of masculinity as a bread winner, then partner violence could be reduced (meaning the cash transfer should not be such that it will make the woman the most powerful in the family). Conversely, if the perceived threats to masculinity as a result of the women’s empowerment (due to the cash transfer) is higher than the potential benefits of the increased income or if the cash transfer will greatly increase the woman’s role in the household and marginalise a man’s role in the family, then partner violence could increase. As in many complex issues, with multiple causality and multiple influencing factors, more structured long-term evaluations are required to make valid and reliable assertions.

Many of the cash transfer recipients reported mutual understanding and joint decision making during the household action planning process (or ‘budgeting’ as some participants called it) and the feeling that their opinion mattered and was respected. Cash transfer beneficiaries report a greater feeling of empowerment within the household or with her partner after receiving the cash transfer and increasing economic potential. Participants note the reduction in fighting between intimate partners/cohabiters because they avoid fighting over scarcity of resources and competing demands on meager resources. The participants say that after the cash transfer (and the resulting increase in income when the funds multiply or at least revolve) there is reduced fighting over where to find money for school fees, medical bills or immediate needs. Some women also said they now feel they don’t have to beg their husband for some money to spend on their personal needs, whereas before they would have to beg their husband to spend for school fees, their personal needs and other immediate needs – and if there is not enough money to go around, fighting ensues. Women report that ‘fighting’ means verbal or physical violence. In this sense, the anecdotal reports point more to a reduction of IPV rather than a decrease in women’s vulnerability to other forms of GBV.

There are a few anecdotal reports of women recipients of the cash transfer who experienced partner violence after receipt of the cash transfer – however, participants of FGDs were always reporting cases that did not happen to ‘them’ but often ‘someone else we heard about, but not us’.

**Village Savings and Loans Associations (VSLA)**

One of the outputs of the ACF programme is to set up VSLAs in the same target areas as the cash transfer beneficiaries. For many VSLA participants, the association serves as access to supplementary funds for immediate needs, while for some it is a way to strengthen or establish a small business. Contributions are made towards a welfare fund and to build equity. Loans are taken out to pay for school fees, medical bills during illness, food, beans and seeds for consumption or resale, or set up a small business. Many groups report they will

---

1 Heise, Lori (2011). What Works to Prevent Partner Violence? An Evidence Overview, Working Paper 2.0. London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK.
continue the VSLA groups even after the ACF programme ends. Many report how being part of the VSLA changed their attitudes towards saving and spending, making sure they have some money saved to contribute towards the welfare fund and keep up their equity.

One male respondent in a FGD said that before he did not save any money but now he is forced to save and he has learned the habit of saving. (There were similar stories from the others, both male and female.)

One of the problems cited was that they sometimes needed to sell off some of their food or harvest in order to pay the weekly VSLA contribution. Although some members dream of being able to borrow money to buy an ox for animal traction, some are able to borrow small amounts to buy hand-held tools. Various VSLA groups have mentioned that one of the challenges of the VSLA is the limited loans available to members because individual contributions are also small. Other challenges of the VSLAs are the limited pool of funds for loans, limited capacity to save, limited savings and that the group is dependent on strong group cohesion to succeed.

The VSLA Kit

In the first year of implementation, ACF provided VSLA kits to the newly formed groups, consisting of a steel box with three locks, calculator, register book and participant record booklets. The evaluator was informed that for the second year of implementation, there are plans of taking away the support for the VSLA kit. This could be an unfortunate development because the kit, particularly ‘the box’ is a strong motivator for the establishment of groups. VSLA kits cost very little (in terms of overall programme funds) with very big potential for impact. The groups treat the box with much respect and establish ceremonies and traditions around the opening of the cash box. There is a risk of discouraging groups to form because the cost of the kit could mean a few months of saving for the whole group before any loans can be given out. Since most VSLA members do not have access to surplus cash, every shilling counts and the provision of the VSLA kit acts as a huge motivator for groups to form. It could also mean that some groups will decide to form without the security of a cash box with locks which in turn heightens the risk of theft and therefore a risk that the group will collapse.

VSLA in Koch Goma
FGD with 23 participants, 8 men, 15 women
The group started in December 2011 with the help of ACF. ACF provided the VSLA kits including the cash box, registers, notebooks, and pens and started them off with training on savings and loans. ACF met with them regularly and gave technical advice. Loans were used for school fees, farming needs, medicine, seeds (such as ground nuts and sim sim) or to set up a business. Some of the challenges for the VSLA group include the limited amounts that the group collects due to the limited capacity to save and the limited amount that can be borrowed by the members. At the end of the year their by-laws specify they should have the action audit but they also agreed as a group to keep 10% so that the VSLA will continue into the second year. Most of them appreciated the support of ACF in setting up VSLAs.

Literacy and Numeracy

In some of the FGDs conducted, the evaluator asked participants, who could read, write and do mathematics. In those FGDs, there were very few participants who could read, write and do math (often the same people). In one FGD, 2 out of 15 knew how to read and write and
all felt that it was very important. Some said that when buying or selling goods in the market, record keeping is a problem and they need to ask their children to help with accepting money and providing change. In addition, many said that they rely on their husband or children to assist them during trainings, for record keeping or to keep tabs of market transactions. The training manuals the evaluator reviewed also assume a high level of literacy among trainees – there is a lot of text, minimal pictorial representations and practical approaches. The training on business skills assumes participants already have basic reading, writing and numeracy skills. CT beneficiaries almost unanimously, when asked, say that literacy will help immensely. The evaluator asked in some FGDs for participants to raise their hands if they could read, write and do math. (It wasn’t always possible to clearly ask the questions) The following are the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Read</th>
<th>Write</th>
<th>Numeracy</th>
<th>Total number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okwang</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12 (Primary beneficiaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adwari</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23 (VSLA FGD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alero</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24 (VSLA FGD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamogi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15 (Primary beneficiaries)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baseline information in Gulu shows that 63.5% of respondents had not attained any formal education. Because of this, it could be a good idea for ACF to link with another agency that can provide adult literacy support to the VSLA groups.

**Communication**

During two FGDs with primary beneficiaries (Koch Goma and Amuru) participants revealed they thought there would be a third cash transfer. They claimed they were not specifically told the number of cash transfers though they were told that the programme would last one year. They received a first cash transfer in November and a second one in March. Since they were told the programme would last a year (until June), they assumed there would be a third cash transfer and were disappointed to hear after June that they were only two cash transfers. In the coming year, if the programme decides to give one transfer it is important to be very clear to the new beneficiaries (especially since the participants will be coming from the same sub counties) the rationale and mechanisms for the cash transfer.

**Links with alcohol abuse, land disputes, reproductive health**

Women brought up a number of issues that affect gender relations and have an impact on the level of domestic violence as well as livelihood options. The first is alcoholism in the household and in the community. In one FGD, after the evaluator asked about alcoholism, there was rapid chatter among the women simultaneously exchanging experiences about alcoholism and there was consensus that there definitely is alcoholism in the community. They noted that drinking joints have opened up in the area and that couples still fight over binge drinking of men. Some women said that their husbands try to find the money they have stashed away to buy alcohol. A second common issue raised is the fact that in northern Uganda many women are still not able to own land and have problems inheriting land when the husband dies. This affects women’s ability to use land for productive activities. Some women who do not/can not own land rent someone else’s land. A third cross-cutting issue that came up is the lack of control over child-bearing and reproductive health matters. Women have said they have little control over the number, spacing and timing of children
they will bear. They also talked about the risk of physical or verbal violence if they decide to use reproductive health or family planning methods.

Note on Translations

In the Langi region, “livelihood” is translated in Langi into “dero kech” which means, ‘granary’, ‘famine’, or ‘hunger’ and the programme is introduced in Langi as “manobedo program mederokech” or “this is the program for livelihoods”.

Evaluation Questions

Is the cash transfer programme on the right track to achieve its set specific objectives?

The programme has two objectives, (1) contribute to reduction of incidents of gender-based violence and (2) strengthen livelihoods in targeted households.

It emerged from the focus group discussions among cash transfer recipients and VSLA members that there were low rates of GBV training reach and low levels of understanding of the GBV referral system. The programme design is such that the same parishes where the cash transfer beneficiaries come from are also the same parishes targeted for GBV trainings and formation of VSLA groups. Many of the respondents in in-depth interviews and focus group discussions in Otuke district had not attended a GBV training conducted by the partner. In one FGD in Otuke, while all respondents had attended livestock, agricultural, and IGA trainings conducted by ACF, no one had attended GBV training. In one FGD, only the 3 (out of 25) attended GBV training and in another 4 out of 15. There were similar low rates of reach for GBV training demonstrated during other FGDs in Acholi region. Responses obtained during FGDs showed there is also low level of understanding of the GBV referral pathway, actions needed in case of a GBV incident and ways to prevent GBV. Consistent with the TPO GBV baseline report, awareness of the GBV referral pathway in the communities is basic, focusing on referral to the local council leader (LC1) or police and the possibility of mediation by local leaders or elders but there is very little awareness of the medical/physical implications of GBV (risk of contracting HIV, unwanted pregnancy, hepatitis, etc) and the need to refer to the health centre to receive post-exposure prophylaxis, emergency contraception or other medication, plus very little understanding of the principles of safety, confidentiality and informed consent.

According to the end line report of TPO, less than 1000 of the targeted 3000 beneficiaries were trained in GBV. Because TPO came on board as a local partner a few months after the commencement of the programme, TPO only had a few months of implementation in the first year. It was agreed with ACF in Uganda that because of the short time frame, TPO would target 5 parishes instead of 11 parishes thus only reaching a third of the target for the year.

For the first objective, monitoring reports show that the outputs for GBV trainings, number of women’s groups formed, mobilisation of men and boys for Year 1 were not completely achieved. There is also a risk of not reaching Year 2 targets, if a GBV partner is not selected urgently in Otuke² and if the GBV partner in Amuru and Nwoya does not add logistical and

² At the time of writing, ACF was finalising an agreement with a new GBV local partner in Otuke.
human resources. There are also differences between the two sites – with CRESO as a partner in Acholi region, there is a slightly bigger chance the GBV outputs will be achieved, although there are funding constraints. Some changes that could be implemented for year 2 include hiring a national programme manager with gender and GBV expertise (who can monitor and coordinate with the GBV partner).

Whether the programme will have a long-term impact on changing the vulnerability of women to gender-based violence is more difficult to predict, especially since programme locations move to a different parish every year and changing attitudes and practices take a long time. The programme design includes the formation of women’s groups in the targeted parishes. The women’s groups are formed with the aim of supporting women and their families in case of incidents of gender-based violence and to facilitate referral. The GBV partner provides mentoring and support to the women’s groups for one year, before going to different parishes in the next year. Mentoring and support should be strong and sustained for one year if the women’s groups will be able to continue even after the GBV partner’s pull-out from the parish after one year.

After a review of monitoring data for the second objective, it seems that the programme is on track to achieve outputs for the second objective (cash transfer and income diversification). In addition, based on responses from women beneficiaries of the cash transfer, it seems likely that ACF will achieve the second objective. More details are discussed in latter sections of the report.

There is an huge amount of data generated, linked to data bases, monitoring systems and tools created during LEARN 1 and LEARN 2 but some of the collected information is not really needed for the new CT/GBV programme whilst some of the data needed for the GBV component is not being collected. For example, the signed agreement with RNE shows the following indicators, for which no data is being collected:

a. Reduced incidence of GBV in the programme areas
b. Reduced GBV-related mortality and morbidity
c. Change in attitude towards gender equality amongst women, men and boys

GBV incidence, and GBV-related mortality and morbidity are difficult to establish without a systematic design for their measurement. Incidence is particularly difficult to measure because of the inherent risks of under-reporting by GBV survivors for reasons of safety and the risk of stigma. In addition, often as a result of strong GBV prevention and response interventions in the community, there could be a spike in reporting as women, their families and communities realise the types of gender-based violence, the health and safety risks of non-reporting, and as the communities start to establish an effective GBV referral system. For ACF to be able to report on changes in attitude toward gender equality amongst women, men and boys, there is a need to design and implement a KAP survey.

**Are implemented activities to influence GBV relevant and successful? What other activities are there which could be included to bring about change in the GBV aspect?**

Some interviewees and FGD participants report a reduction in domestic violence (DV) or intimate partner violence (IPV) as a result of their increased access to cash. Some also claim that ‘there is less GBV in the community’. When asked ‘what is GBV’, participants mostly cited quarrelling or fighting with the husband, far fewer said ‘rape’, ‘early marriage’ or
‘sexual abuse’. One gave an example of GBV as ‘when a married couple plants things together and after harvest he takes the money to buy alcohol and refuses to pay for school fees such that you fight and he beats you’. When asked if this happens often in the community, everyone readily agreed and there seemed to be consensus that this happens often in the community especially during harvest time.

Ways participants understand causes of GBV include lacking food to eat, drunkenness, alcoholism, when they have no money to pay for school fees, poverty in the house, physical violence, when a man wants to sell household assets and it starts a fight. Most of the participants’ understanding of GBV is conflated with domestic violence – husband beating wife – while a few recognise the wider types of GBV that include rape, early marriages, harmful traditional practices (women not being allowed to own land, widow inheritance). Approximately less than half of participants could recall the main causes and contributing factors of GBV and what to do in case of a GBV incident. A few said that the best way to prevent GBV is to keep quiet when your husband (or someone) is being aggressive and not to meet aggression with aggression. This shows that there is still a strong need for sustained sensitisation among beneficiaries and target populations in order to even start changing knowledge about GBV (not to mention changing attitudes and practices).

At the time of the field visits, some new ACF staff had not yet attended an ACF organised GBV training and had only basic knowledge of GBV principles. There is also minimal knowledge of GBV referral among programme staff. There is a marked lack of institutional knowledge and understanding about gender and GBV among the programme staff. One field staff could not remember the basic elements of GBV programming as discussed during the GBV training conducted in Gulu, and many staff could not define GBV, whilst conflating GBV with domestic violence or intimate partner violence. While ACF has a mission and mandate on nutrition, food security and livelihoods, once a gender or GBV dimension is added to a programme, it is important to have a minimum of expertise within the organisation to ensure technical accuracy for that component. In addition, there is very little discussion about ‘gender’ and GBV in the ACF training manuals, proposal, baseline and end line reports, annual reports, HAP, FUM, and PDM.

### Sampling of positive and negative comments about women empowerment in the community

- “Now people say women have the right to own property”
- “Men and women have equal rights to property”
- “Although I felt an increase in empowerment it was not completely. I still feel I need more livestock”
- “Before my husband would only decide on his own, now we sit together and decide to buy an ox plough”
- “Men overpower women, we have no say how they will change”

### Perceptions of how the cash transfer influenced intimate partner violence

- “We used to fight because we had nothing on hand, now with the goat, we do not fight anymore”
- “Money reduces fighting between husband and wife”
- “A satisfied man cannot fight”
- “But if we have money to pay school fees, the man will be happy”
Women have their own money to buy what she wants instead of asking her husband so there is no fighting”

“Now we have goats, some have given birth and the number of goats is increasing. Now I can sell one goat if I need money and I will have my own money and can make my own decision so now I am happy”

“For some, the goats die and then the husband continues to shout”

I can do everything today but with the money, my husband can buy alcohol (there were other comments like this but it seemed that the group would do self-censoring – saying things to the woman who said it, and then someone will say that not all men are like that)

Although important, ‘reducing GBV’ through an increase in household assets or household disposable income is just the start because this does not shift power dynamics between man and woman. The comments reveal more about the aim of keeping the man happy or avoiding fighting rather than changing the gender dynamics within the household.

Seasonal Calendars

The table below is an approximate sample seasonal calendar developed with FGD participants. Participants are able to show connections between the agricultural cycle and cycles of GBV. GBV incidence is reportedly highest during harvest season as couples fight over how to spend the income and men have more access to cash to use for alcohol. Participants also report that during land clearing, planting and weeding, couples are ‘too tired to fight’ and that ‘men have need for women to till the land so they are more amiable’. There are also reports that intimate partner violence increases when there is pressure to pay for school fees so GBV reports could also increase at the start of the school terms. However, in one FGD, a woman said that GBV is high from December to March (another said December – January) during harvest season, especially harvest of ground nuts which is a cash crop. Others say GBV also goes up in June and July during the ‘hunger’ period in between harvests and payment of school fees.

Some of the activities to strengthen the GBV component include:

1. Providing additional training or refresher sessions for the ACF programme staff on gender and GBV. Many have said the level of training received was not sufficient to understand gender and GBV. Ensure ACF programme staff are fully conversant with the principles of gender and GBV programming.

2. Integrating the GBV training and mobilisation with the ACF livelihoods training and vice versa, using examples as the seasonal calendar below.

3. Developing more comprehensive seasonal calendars, to more effectively schedule or target GBV-related prevention and sensitisation activities. Schedule GBV sensitisation activities during reported times that community members say there is a spike in GBV.

4. As mentioned earlier, consider the recruitment of a national GBV programme officer who can mentor the GBV local partner, ensure technical accuracy of the partner’s activities, and conduct workshops for ACF to get better understanding of gender and GBV.

5. Ensure the GBV partners are also fully conversant with the principles of livelihood programming.
Lastly, it is important that programme staff refrain from thinking this is NOT a GBV programme – it is unthinkable for a programme to have ‘GBV’ in the title and as one of the main objectives without considering it a GBV programme. It is not a ‘GBV programme’ in the sense of the ‘box’ of typical interventions for GBV prevention and response but it is not possible to simply ‘add’ the gender dimension or to ‘add’ women as the target without shifting the framework on which the programme has its foundations. As long as the programme aims to make a change in terms of the status of women and make a difference in terms of gender-based violence in the community, it is, as much a GBV programme as it is a livelihoods programme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start of 1st season</td>
<td>Rain starts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End of 1st season</td>
<td>Start 2nd season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End of 2nd season (up to Oct)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land clearing</td>
<td>Begin Planting: maize, millet, g-nuts, cassava, pigeon peas</td>
<td>Weeding after 1 month: g-nuts, millet, maize (after 2 weeks)</td>
<td>Begin planting: sweet potatoes Continue weeding</td>
<td>Harvest from March crops (until late July)</td>
<td>Start beans, sorghum or rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land clearing in swampy areas</td>
<td>Harvest in small gardens</td>
<td>Harvest in small gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased reports of GBV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased reports of GBV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased reports of GBV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased reports of GBV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need increased GBV sensitisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need increased GBV sensitisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need increased GBV sensitisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need increased GBV sensitisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of school fees, 1st term</td>
<td>Payment of school fees, 2nd term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payment of school fees, 3rd term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Hunger Period”, increased GBV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is collaboration with local partners sufficiently and positively exhausted?

With the GBV Partners

The programme relies on two community-based organisations to deliver outputs for the first objective. At the start of the project, ACF selected two partners following a competitive open and transparent process that included a call for proposals. This resulted in the selection of CRESO as the partner in the Acholi sub region to cover Amuru and Nwoya sub counties and FAPAD in Lango sub region to cover Otuke district. Unfortunately, the partnership with FAPAD did not fare well and the arrangement subsequently ended. ACF then needed to use targeted methods of selecting a partner for Otuke, seeking recommendations from district officials for a GBV partner and checking on references. An agreement with Transcultural Psychosocial Organisation (TPO) was then finalised, there was a collaborative process of setting targets and the partnership was cemented quickly with a sense of urgency to start GBV-related activities for the remainder of the first year. TPO and CRESO conducted GBV trainings in the target areas and TPO set up 5 women’s groups in 5 of the parishes. It must be noted that the partnership is with local organisations that do not necessarily have a surplus of administrative, logistical, financial and human resources. This means there is a limited capacity to reach all the geographic areas and potentially some difficulty reaching targets without additional logistical, financial, technical and staffing support. The partnership with TPO unfortunately will not continue into the second year due to budget and capacity constraints. This means there will again be a risk that the GBV-related outputs will not be achieved, although as mentioned above, at the time of writing, ACF was finalising an agreement with a new local partner in Otuke district.

One interviewee from TPO said “the main weakness of the programme was that it started late, had a short implementation time and ended abruptly. Otuke is wide, the geographic coverage is big and there are not enough human resources, we need more staff or we should concentrate only on one or two sub counties.” The GBV partner is also constrained in all the covered sub counties because not all areas have a complete referral system – there is a lack of service providers in many areas and it will take a long time to establish a functioning referral system in all the covered areas. There is also a need for logistical support for the partners – the funds provided don’t allow for purchase of motorbikes to cover all areas, additional computers, and all the training materials plus human resources.

There is also a need for greater field monitoring of the activities of CRESO and in future, the selected GBV partner for Otuke. The view should be long-term partnership ideally for 3 years with sufficient funding available to the partner to meet the set objectives.

The question was raised whether two GBV local partners are sufficient to meet the targets for the GBV component of the programme. The answer to this depends on whether additional local partners with the necessary logistical and technical resources are already present in the area and the amount of funding ACF has in the budget to ‘distribute’ among the different partners. If no additional funding is available to grant new partners, then there is a risk of spreading limited resources too thinly among several partners – who may all need motorbikes, bikes, computers, additional human resources, and others. One option to consider is solidifying the strategy of working with community-based trainers. These CBTs will require less material support because they have shorter distances to travel,
and are considered volunteers. At the time of the visit, the strategy was not yet fully rolled-out and the evaluator was not able to speak with any CBT in the parishes, however, based on known promising practices, this is can be an opportunity for more sustainable coverage.

**With other coordination structures**

There are no coordination structures and at present, no sector meetings in the relatively new districts of Amuru, Nwoya and Otuke districts. The evaluator met the sub county chief in Lamogi (Nwoya district) who is new in the job but is hoping to set up stronger coordination structures with agencies operating in his area. There seemed to be minimal formal coordination structures available to the team in Gulu with other agencies implementing other cash transfer, livelihoods or food security programmes in the region, such as Norwegian Refugee Council, Oxfam, ACDI-VOCA, Save the Children and CARE. However, the teams were very diligent about coordinating with the government administrative structures at all levels. It will be good to consider linking up with the needs identified in the district development plan (DDP). The Chief Administrator Officer (CAO) in Otuke said there was very good coordination with ACF in the field. The programme managers were also in close regular contact with other high level district officials.

**With other community-based structures**

The GBV partner in Otuke set up community women’s groups in 5 out of 11 target parishes. These are new community structures that need strong initial technical and morale support at the start but with the termination of the agreement with TPO in Otuke there is uncertainty if/how the women’s groups will continue. There is a need for an exit strategy including clear communication of what will happen next. The exit strategy can simply mean TPO and ACF going back to meet with the 5 women’s groups to explain the end of the agreement and discuss with them how best the women’s groups would like to continue given that TPO and ACF would most probably not be able to provide technical support and material resources to the group.

In future, ACF can review how the increasing number of women’s groups will continue to get support from the partner (each year, there is an expectation that the partner will set up new women’s groups in the new parishes that are targeted). As discussed in the previous section, ACF was rolling-out the strategy with community-based trainers. The assumption is that this community-based structure can help increase coverage and contribute towards sustainability because the CBTs will continue to stay in the parishes whilst organisations eventually terminate interventions. If another evaluation is planned at the end of the second year, it will be good to review the effectiveness of this strategy.

**DAC Criteria**

**Impact**

Although this evaluation is unable to generate compelling information on impact because the programme has not been running long enough to show significant and reliable changes in attitudes and behaviour among the beneficiaries and anecdotal evidence from FGD and interview participants need to be correlated and validated through other studies using other methods, many comments coming from the FGDs and in-depth interviews point to substantial
positive changes within the community and beneficiaries regarding consultative decision-making, increased savings behaviour, investment in productive household assets, establishment or strengthening of small business, and other behaviours.

There are two levels of impact that the programme seeks to understand: one area is the nature and level of GBV among the target populations and the second level on strengthening livelihoods through increasing household assets and income diversification.

**Impact on gender relations and improving understanding of GBV**

During the household action planning process (HAP) beneficiaries were encouraged to consult all household members and to show ‘mutual understanding’ between husband, wife and their families. Many FGD participants and interviewees said that during the HAP, they felt respected and there was mutual consultation within the household, while for those who were alone or didn’t have a partner, they said they were able to independently decide how to spend the cash transfer.

“Before my husband was tough but not anymore now, he did not even take anything from the cash and went and bought the goats (as we decided to buy goats).” FGD, Okwang

“I talked it through with my husband and we were advised to buy livestock that can multiply so we bought goats.” FGD, Adwari

In terms of attitudes and behaviour relating to GBV, comments made by the Local Council chairman in Alero are indicative: “the first impact was on GBV – when you are part of a VSLA, you can borrow from the VSLA for emergencies so there is less fighting at home. Within groups there are terms that hinder VSLA members from doing GBV at home. If there are GBV incidents within the areas, they call members of the VSLA and cash transfer and they can do counseling and dialogue with the fighting couple.” He added, “Among those who received the cash transfer you can see them in the evening doing their businesses and for many of them their goats have multiplied. These are changes I see as a leader. I have not seen any other viable project such as this in this area before.”

However, it is important to caution that while there is evidence that some people have changed as a result of the interventions, there were also comments about how the women’s situation has not significantly changed.

“If he (husband) wants to use the money to buy alcohol, it brings GBV because we cannot agree but we can try to convince him that there are children and hope he does not get angry.” FGD, Adwari

“Some people are jealous of me and tell me I am just pretending because I am still just a woman.” FGD, Adwari

“The last time I went to the hospital I came back and found all my household assets stolen so I went to the my in-laws to help but they refused to help. They still do not respect me but I know I have the right and I know how to protect it. If my clan members cannot respect me, I will go to the Local Council Chairman.” Widow, FGD, Adwari

“If a man wants to have sex and you complain every time, this will arise in GBV.” FGD, Adwari
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“When the baby is sick a man leaves the woman and he does not help.” FGD, Adwari

When probed about a partner’s use of the funds, the following comments emerged: “To keep the peace, we will not deny husband completely, will give 1,000 here and there for his alcohol”, “My husband took 1,000 for sugar and soap”, “We cannot deny immediate needs and we also need food, beans and maize.”

The programme seeks to improve understanding of GBV among community members. Comments from FGD respondents, and supported by the FSL End line data base3 from Otuke, show that understanding of causes, consequences and types of GBV is rudimentary with limited understanding of the GBV referral system. The data base shows that most respondents see GBV as fighting between husband and wife and the best way to address GBV is through referral to the Local Council Chairperson.

Unfortunately there is no quantitative information to show whether there has been an increase in the number and involvement of gender-based violence groups and associations. This is one area that can be added to ACF’s monitoring system. There are also no quantitative information on any changes in knowledge, attitudes and practices of GBV among women and men in the target communities. ACF can work with the local partners to gather this information through the course of the sensitisation work of the partners, or ACF can add the questions during the PDM exercise. However, a series of KAP studies, conducted at regular intervals among target beneficiaries will be the best choice to track any changes in knowledge, attitudes, and practices. ACF can reference KAP survey tools and outcome tracking tools developed by Raising Voices, a regional non-government organisation based in Kampala that focuses on community mobilisation for GBV prevention.4

**Impact on household diet diversity scores (HDDS)**

One of the indicators of the programme is % of targeted women and their families with increased access to food sources, increased availability and improved food utilisation. Although attribution is difficult to make between the intervention and the increase in HDDS, a count of the number of different food groups eaten in the past 24 hours, the end line report from Gulu at the end of the first year shows a higher household diet diversity score among the targeted populations. HDDS was calculated for each household and the study shows the total number of food groups consumed by members of the household went from 3.1 at the time of the baseline study to 4.3 at end line. In Otuke, the annual report showed a change in HDDS ‘from an average of 3.3 to 4.6, a 39% increase over the baseline. Consumption of cereals, vegetables, milk, honey, and oils and fats remained within one percentage point. Reductions were seen in the consumption of roots, tubers and pulses, which were not commonly available during the month of the end line. Increased consumption was seen for eggs (2% to 13%) and condiments/miscellaneous i.e. tea, garlic, spices (0 to 11%).’5

**Impact on livelihood diversification and income sources:**

Similarly, attribution to impact on livelihood diversification is difficult to make for the programme, but the end line report from Gulu at the end of the first year of implementation reveals interesting data. Findings show that (targeted) households with income sources

---

3 FSL end line data base (final version) from Otuke, June 2012 available from the Lira M&E officer.
4 www.raisingvoices.org
increased from 86.1% in the baseline to 98.8% at end line. Those who had no income sources went down from 13.9% to 1.2% at end line. Although income through crop sales went down from 27.4% to 15.5%, those earning income from animal sales went from 1.7% to 7.2% and from animal product sales from .4% to 6.4%, those earning income from petty trade went up from 4.2% to 8.1% and finally, those earning income from begging went down from 6.5% to 0.1%. This is supported by comments from the FGDs and in-depth interviews: “The money has changed my life. With the first cash transfer I bought 2 she-goats and 2 he-goats and with the second cash transfer I bought 2 pigs and one and a half sacks of beans. Half of the sack of beans was for food and the whole sack was for re-sale.” FGD Amuru

In addition, the ACF Annual Report submitted to the donor reports an increase in long term asset investment including livestock. This is affirmed by several participants of FGDs who tell of their purchases of livestock, particularly goats that have since multiplied. This information is also validated by the fund utilisation reports from both Otuke (Lira) and Amuru/Nwoya (Gulu) offices. The same report shows in Otuke, ‘during the baseline the major source of income was casual labour at 84%, this was lowered to 75% in the end line. Petty trade increased by 7% in the end line and sale of handicrafts (baskets, mats), increased by 4%, indicating the creation of more small or micro businesses. Sale of animals and animal products doubled from 3% to 6%, due to increase in animal ownership.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Otuke</th>
<th>Amuru/Nwoya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of households purchased livestock</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of HH who purchased goats</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% HH who purchased poultry</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% HH who purchased cows</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% HH who purchased sheep</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% HH who purchased pigs</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% HH who didn’t have livestock before the</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of HH who had less than 5 animals</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of HH who had 5-10 animals</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of HH who had 10-15 animals</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of HH who had 15 and More animals</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of HH who got their animals vaccinated</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each region had slightly different ways of aggregating data. Amuru and Nwoya show the following livestock ownership after the first and second Post Distribution Monitoring activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amuru and Nwoya</th>
<th>PDM1</th>
<th>PDM2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of HH who had less than 3 animals</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of HH who had 3-5 animals</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of HH who had 6-8 animals</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of HH who had 9 and more animals</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 ACF Gulu End line fact sheets, 2012. Available from ACF Gulu programme staff.
7 July 2012 Annual report to the Royal Norwegian Embassy, page 20.
In all three sub-counties, the PDM shows significant percentages of households purchasing livestock and increasing percentages of households that own animals.

**Sustainability**

There are also two levels of sustainability for each objective. ACF encourages recipients of the cash transfer to use the funds on productive assets that can have a longer-term effect on the household, rather than spending the cash transfer all on immediate needs. The focus on productive investments increases the likelihood that targeted households will sustain the benefits of the cash transfer. The creation of VSLA alongside cash transfers and GBV trainings to provide a safety net and access to loans for emergencies also increases the chances that the effects of the intervention will continue. A review of literature suggests that creating VSLAs alongside livelihood interventions contributes towards the sustainability of the intervention. However, it is unclear if the provision of technical support for one-year is sufficient to guarantee sustainability of the groups formed, and it also depends on the group cohesiveness and saving power. Comments from the FGDs, nevertheless point to the desire of group members to have longer support from ACF. To what extent it is needed, as opposed, to wanted, is unclear.

Comments on how the VSLA membership changed savings and spending habits among members:

“I have never been in a VSLA before and there are many advantages to being a member of VSLA for me there is one big advantage. Before I spent all my money on alcohol but now I save money and I didn’t used to budget but now I do and when I need to spend on immediate needs I can borrow while I can also save. I am a ‘boda-boda’ (motorbike) driver and I use this as my business for additional income.” Male, FGD participant, Alero

“Vulnerable people can get support from VSLA groups and ask for support to empower themselves to be more productive.” LC1 In-depth interview, Alero

“I used to have to do casual labour whenever I had to spend for additional household expenses but now I have access to loans.” Female, FGD participants, Alero

Part of the programme is to form women’s groups in the targeted parishes to ensure women have the support from women within the community. The women’s groups will be trained on gender and GBV programming principles and will act as referral points for women who may have experienced gender-based violence. Continuing mentoring and support for the women’s groups will be required if they are to reach a sustainable point of continuing even after the programme ends.

It will also be good to plan overlapping interventions among the target beneficiaries. This means, for example, the cash transfer beneficiary will also be participants in the mobilisation against gender-based violence, attend related training on livelihoods and GBV, be part of a VSLA and be linked with a women’s group. This way, there is a greater chance that the effects of the programme are multiplied and sustained. There are plans to develop a base of community-based trainers. This is a new operational level that can increase access to communities and coverage of the wide geographic area.
Relevance/Appropriateness

The selection process is similar in Otuke, Amuru and Nwoya and participants know they were identified based on their perceived vulnerabilities, such as formerly abducted women, widows with several dependants, care takers of orphans, survivors of gender based violence, persons living with HIV and AIDS and others. The participants did not seem to mind that their particular ‘vulnerability’ or personal situation became known to the community, many saying that in a small community nothing is a secret. Although this might be the general feeling, there can perhaps be a few select cases when women do not want their particular vulnerability to be known to the whole community and may cause safety issues. Several said they appreciated the fact that they were chosen and that they had the opportunity to get the cash transfer that helped to buy things and household assets.

In terms of targeting, although generally accepted programming principles emphasise that participants to a programme not be labeled based on their specific vulnerability (GBV survivor, HIV+) because of the risk of stigma and isolation, it seemed that most of the participants interviewed did not feel particularly hurt about being identified as ‘vulnerable’ or that the whole community knew about their personal situation that would cause stigma. In addition, according to Samson, et.al, “All programmes should also be aware of the gender impacts of targeting mechanisms. Recruitment procedures that claim to be gender neutral assume that men and women respond in the same way, but that cannot be taken for granted.”

The programme’s focus on the productive capacities of the household helps to ensure that even the most vulnerable will be able to benefit from the programme, such that even if the person herself is very vulnerable there should at least be someone in the household who can turn the cash transfer into a productive option.

There were questions about the relevance of the timing of the cash distribution as it can influence fund utilisation. Many people suggested one distribution can make a bigger impact to enable them to make larger asset purchases like an ox or an ox plough. There seems to be consensus that March is the ideal time for the cash transfer when beneficiaries can also purchase beans and seeds at the start of the second planting season. In addition, prices of goods are not high during that season. Corollary to that, many have said December is not a good month for the cash transfer as there are many expenses for immediate needs or celebrations and a higher risk that the cash transfer will be spent only on immediate needs.

In terms of the amount of the cash transfer, beneficiaries in general say it is sufficient as it allows them to purchase household assets, a few livestock or agricultural tools, pay for school fees and other immediate household needs while contributing to livelihood diversification. Some participants said it will be better to increase the amount so they can purchase a full bull with one transfer but ACF should determine the best level of support according to the objectives of the program as well as the funding available. If there is only one cash transfer beneficiaries said they will decide differently how to use the funds and it will be interesting to note any differences between fund utilisation in Year 1 and Year 2.

---

District and sub county officials recognise the relevance and appropriateness of the intervention in this context when communities need to stabilise and re-establish their livelihood after decades of conflict.

**Coherence**

The programme needs to be linked directly with the needs identified in the district development plan (DDP). It is also important to link with any coordination mechanisms in the district or sub county. The relatively new districts are still struggling to set up coordination mechanisms and in absence of those coordination mechanisms programme staff need to be proactive about consultative meetings with sub county and district officials and with other agencies implementing GBV and livelihoods programmes in the region. The context in northern Uganda has been changing the past several years and humanitarian actors have ‘left’ and new development partners are setting up interventions. Bilateral funding agencies send out calls for proposals amounting to several millions of dollars for multi-year funding and ACF can keep abreast of the new funding trends while influencing policy through research, advocacy and publication of lessons learned.

As discussed at the start of this report, the programme seemingly runs on two tracks for the two different objectives in the two different regions. Integrating GBV and livelihoods activities at field level can be strengthened through mobilisation by the field assistants or in future, community based trainers, attendance of GBV partners in ACF trainings and vice versa, integrating cash transfer messages, IGAs, agriculture into GBV training and vice versa. In addition, the programme can increase coherence by adding a gender lens to the programme, including conducting a gender assessment of agricultural roles in the production cycle and the seasonality of both livelihood options and gender-based violence. Some examples of gender roles in agriculture are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Opening’ the land</th>
<th>Women and Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weeding</td>
<td>Women (depending on the crop, such as cassava, men can also weed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvesting</td>
<td>Ground nuts – Women and Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sim sim at different stages: cutting by women, stockpiling by men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transporting by women and men, if with bikes, usually by men</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please refer to earlier sections of the Findings, particularly the section on Two Parallel Programmes, Communication, Links with Alcohol Abuse and Seasonal Calendars for additional discussion on coherence.

**Coverage**

There is a wide geographic coverage for the programme. The three identified districts are far from each other, and the identified sub counties and parishes are also a fair distance from each other. The cash transfer beneficiaries are usually in isolated pockets of the parishes. One way the team tried to overcome the wide geographic area was to cluster the beneficiaries and combine them for trainings and mobilisation. Field assistants were provided with bicycles and are based in the field but they need to use motorbike taxis to get to the more distant locations.

The target coverage of the programme is 5 sub counties over three years with different targeted parishes every year. This ensures a wide coverage for the programme. However,
there is risk of saturation within the sub county and care must be taken in targeting households in the third year of the programme.

The programme aimed to target the most vulnerable in the communities. This was done through a multi-stage process starting with identifying the most vulnerable parishes through consultation with district officials. After the most vulnerable parishes were identified, the staff worked with the local leaders to mobilise as many of the community members as possible to come to a community meeting where community members could self-nominate or nominate others who they thought were the most in need of the intervention. There is a predominance of comments that the programme reached the most vulnerable people in the community. There are some reports that some participants were not the most vulnerable but for the most part, it seemed from the comments that the targeting criteria had been met.

One of the limitations of the targeting criteria, however, is the potential to reach a very diverse range of individuals, all of whom are vulnerable in different ways. The targeting criteria include vulnerabilities to GBV or those who survived GBV (including rape, formerly abducted women/children, domestic violence), lack of social/family support, disabilities, lack of land, low ownership of livestock, low rates of literacy, low levels of economic activity, female headed households and child headed households. This means that the beneficiaries can be:

- an elderly widow living alone with no family support and who has a disability
- an able-bodied woman who experiences regular intimate partner violence but is married to an able-bodied husband with able-bodied children
- a child formerly abducted by the Lord’s Resistance Army who is poor and has not reconciled with her family but is able-bodied
- an able-bodied productive and entrepreneurial woman living with HIV but stigmatised by the community
- an elderly deaf woman who has children who take care of her.\(^9\)

The extent to which the cash transfer is converted to productive assets will be very different from one person to the next; even though they are all classified ‘vulnerable’ and all fit the targeting criteria. It is important not to see the whole target population as one homogenous whole and streamline the monitoring systems to allow for disaggregation by type of vulnerability plus capacity (ACF needs to define this). This way, ACF will have a richer analysis of the data and can identify potential areas for further research to interrogate different factors that influence each other.

For those who have multiple vulnerabilities, such as the elderly widow living alone, consider making regular monitoring visits (perhaps once every 6 – 8 weeks). For those who experience GBV but are able-bodied and with support within the family, consider encouraging her to join the women’s groups or refer to the women’s groups. This will require a lot of work because the target population run into the thousands, but this can be done for those with special or multiple vulnerabilities.

The programme intends to move to new parishes every year. After one year, the support for the women’s groups, VSLA and cash transfer beneficiaries ends. This ensures a wide coverage for the programme. However, ACF can consider how it balances this broad coverage with sustainability and maximising impact within the target communities. The wide

---

\(^9\) These are not hypothetical examples; they were part of the focus group discussions or in-depth interviews.
coverage can compromise the level of sustainability because if the trainings, activities, the local GBV partner, all move to new sites every year, there is a chance that the community groups are not yet ready to sustain themselves.

**Effectiveness**

It is clear from monitoring data and interviews with staff, beneficiaries and other stakeholders that the project is on track in terms of meeting livelihoods outputs. However, in terms of achieving the objectives, we can only make tenuous links between the increase in women’s economic empowerment and the reduction of GBV in the targeted communities. One difficulty is that often the GBV trainings are one-off, and the community members mainly talk about domestic violence or intimate partner violence; in addition, support for the GBV partner in the ‘current’ locations (as the programme will move to new parishes each year) is only one year and this timeframe may not be enough for the interventions in the community to take root.

The contract with the Royal Norwegian Embassy specifies only a few targets for the programme including 2500 women referred to institutions, 13,710 direct primary beneficiaries and 210 VSLA groups formed and supported. There are no specific targets for the other indicators such as number of trainings conducted on GBV, number of trainings conducted on business skills, number of productive assets, number of loans repaid. This gives a fair bit of flexibility for programme implementers. There is no specific target to reach 100% of all cash transfer beneficiaries for the training on business skills, GBV, agriculture and livestock. Training coverage was weak for several groups interviewed in FGDs. In one FGD only 5 out of 25 attended business skills training, almost all for agriculture and livestock training, 4 out of 25 attended GBV training and 16 out of 25 were members of a VSLA. In another FGD only 3 out of 23 attended GBV training and no one received business skills and agriculture training. In yet another, there were 3 out of 15 who attended the agriculture training and none who attended the livestock training. In this same group 3 out of 15 attended GBV training. There was weak recall of training displayed in some FGDs. Some participants said they could not recall ever having training on agriculture but had a general overview of the programme during the process for selecting of beneficiaries.

There is a need to make slight revisions in data collection or monitoring tools to gather information on all indicators. For instance, there is no data on ‘demonstrating increase in knowledge related to ACF training topics’ where ACF needs to conduct pre and post tests and for the indicator that measures changes in practice as a result of ACF trainings, consider using case studies.

**Efficiency**

One of the best things about the programme was the efficient disbursement of the cash to the targeted beneficiaries. The cash transfer process was done well through the use of mobile banking, there were very little complaints from the beneficiaries about the process, beneficiaries were encouraged to walk home together and there were no reports of security threats along the way or at the disbursement point. In addition, the cash transfer came when it was expected, the beneficiaries received what they were promised, and there was very good coordination between ACF and the bank for the opening of the bank accounts. There was a transparent process in the choice of the bank and the bank sorted out problems quickly.
There also was a very systematic process for the selection of parishes using a multi-stage multi-level participatory community selection process.

The score for efficiency is not the highest however, because several programme staff reported transport limitations and constraints presented by not having enough vehicles to move to all the locations. Distances that need to be covered by field assistants and team leaders are too far to effectively and efficiently monitor, mentor and supervise the VSLA, the cash transfer beneficiaries and the GBV partner activities.

At the time of the evaluation, a new management structure was being established to increase harmonisation and promote a leaner management system for the two offices in the north. A position was created for FSL Field Coordinator who would be responsible for overseeing the programme in the two field offices – Gulu and Lira, with frequent travel to the project sites in Otuke, Amuru and Nwoya. This position reports directly to the FSL Coordinator in Kampala. The Assistant Programme Managers in both offices will report to this new post.

ACF is also intending to consolidate the monitoring and evaluation staff into one unit based in Gulu. The M&E officer and data clerk will give direct support to the two offices. The programme has developed excellent data gathering tools and although the survey instruments are the same between the two target regions, there are some small discrepancies between the data management tools between Otuke and Amuru/Nwoya. The newly created post of FSL Field Coordinator can also focus on working with the M&E officers to synchronise the data management tools between the regions. Consolidating the M&E systems in the two sites is a big step towards greater integration and more efficiency. As this is a new structure, it will be good to review in about 6 months how the new structure has affected efficiency, harmonisation and integration.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Anecdotal evidence shows that cash transfer beneficiaries experience greater respect from the community as a result of acquisition of livestock and experience less fighting with their intimate partner as a result of greater access to cash. Verbal reports show intimate partner violence, a form of GBV, has been reduced in the short-term. On a wider scale, it is difficult to make assertions to what extent the ACF cash transfer programme contributes to reducing gender based violence in the targeted communities. There could be several reasons for this. There are multiple population groups that may or may not receive overlapping ACF programme interventions, with participants who may or may not be part of the different GBV trainings, VSLA support groups, and other ACF trainings. In addition, responses from participants may have been tempered by the fact that they know ACF is looking at levels of domestic violence as it relates to the cash transfer; the level of abuse at the household prior to the intervention, and how entrenched gender roles are within the particular household and community. Significantly, anecdotal evidence and programme monitoring information shows that there is increased livelihood diversity and household assets among the cash transfer beneficiaries.

Recommendations

1. PROGRAMME INTEGRATION: Consider strengthening integration of the two programme objectives in the two geographic locations through:
a. Training manuals – include GBV topics in the livelihoods training manuals and vice versa. If needed, the GBV partner might need to present the GBV aspects during the livelihoods training, or one programme staff can acquire additional GBV training to be able to discuss the topic well.
b. Use and develop additional seasonal calendars that can show the links between the agricultural production cycles and GBV
c. Involve the GBV partner in the ACF trainings and vice versa
d. Strengthen impact: Strengthen overlapping of programme interventions among beneficiaries for the cash transfer, VSLA, ACF training, GBV training, to ensure greater coherence. This means making sure that beneficiaries are reached for most/all of the aspects of the programme: cash transfer, livelihoods trainings, GBV trainings, VSLA, women’s groups, community based trainers.
e. Consider facilitating a sharing sessions between the two GBV partners to share experiences and expertise. Consider providing the GBV partners with the livelihoods training.
f. For the monitoring systems, the FSL Field Coordinator can work with the M&E teams in both sites to ensure data aggregation and disaggregation is the same, survey and data collection tools are the same, training on M&E is the same, and analysis is synchronised.
g. Ensure consistent and clear communications across regions and sub counties especially in terms of the number and nature of the cash transfer. This can be done by sharing communication tools and peer exchanges between programme sites. Consider more structured shared learning sessions between staff in different programme sites.

2. RECOGNISING VULNERABILITIES AND CapacITIES, SUPPORT FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF VULNERABILITY: Shift from a focus on vulnerability to both vulnerability and capacity in targeting beneficiaries. This means the need to recognise that the target population is not one homogenous whole – even if the targeting criteria specify ‘vulnerabilities’ there are different vulnerabilities and capacities among the beneficiaries.

a. Consider disaggregating data among the different categories of vulnerabilities and capacities to enrich the analysis.
b. Consider providing additional monitoring through regular visits (perhaps once every 6 – 8 weeks or to coincide with other monitoring trips) to those with multiple vulnerabilities.
c. Consider linking the extremely vulnerable to other agencies which may have interventions that can provide additional support, for example, for those with known power discrepancies in the household.

3. INCREASE INSTITUTIONAL KNOWLEDGE OF GBV

a. Strengthen the ACF institutional capacity for gender and GBV programming by hiring one national programme manager who will ensure consistent communications with the GBV partners, review technical fidelity of the work of the GBV partners on the ground, monitor the trainings and awareness sessions are actually happening, build the capacity of the partner. Related to this, it is important to strengthen field monitoring of the partner.
b. Partnerships – Strengthen focus on a long-term partnership with the GBV partners to avoid disruption, by providing technical oversight if needed and greater financial and material support as available. Consider stronger field monitoring of
the activities of the partner to ensure activities are ongoing and are technically sound. Local partners are small community based organisations that do not necessarily have a lot of financial, material and technical resources. Consider providing partners with a motorbike/s to increase coverage, computers and software to facilitate report writing and setting up data systems, regular technical training and mentoring. Institutionally, consider a review of the partnership framework within ACF to focus more on mentoring, capacity building and empowerment whilst balancing contractual obligations on both sides.

4. TRAINING: To increase uptake of training, consider:
   a. Avoiding scheduling trainings during the months of peak activity in agricultural production (opening the land, harvesting). Try to schedule trainings in the afternoon after the beneficiaries have come back from their fields.
   b. Use more pictorial representations of the training material. Many of the interviewees said they needed to ask their husband or children to attend the training with them because the hand-outs and flip charts did not mean anything to them. Many of the beneficiaries relied on their memory rather than writing anything on paper. Consider incorporating demonstrations and developing practical approaches rather than classroom-style training.
   c. Consider increasing capacity of the GBV partners and ACF programme staff on adult education methods including how to effectively communicate to non-literate training participants.

5. EFFICIENCY: Consider clustering parishes to increase efficiency of reach. If the programme is for 3 years, there is a chance that most parishes in the selected sub counties will be reached, so for greater efficiency and improved logistical support to the field staff, consider clustering targeted parishes.

6. VSLA
   a. Consider providing the VSLA kit – this encourages/motivates the formation of VSLA, while requiring very little amounts from the budget. If VSLA kits are not provided, there is a risk that less number of VSLA groups will form that can have an adverse effect on the safety nets available to the cash transfer beneficiaries.
   b. Consider addressing literacy and numeracy needs for greater empowerment of women. Link up with an agency that can provide this support for the CT beneficiaries or consider adding a short session on literacy every time the group meets with the field assistant.

7. EXIT STRATEGY FOR THE WOMEN’S GROUPS: There is uncertainty about the continuation of newly set-up community-based structures for women’s groups in 5 parishes in Otuke district. It is important for ACF Lira/Kampala to work with TPO, even if the partnership has already dissolved, to plan an exit strategy letting the women’s groups know if/how support through information and training will continue. This could simply mean meeting with the women’s groups to discuss options and to be transparent with them that there will not longer be material and technical support from ACF to TPO and subsequently, from TPO to the women’s groups. More widely, plan the exit strategy at the start of each year by ensuring clear communications on the duration and scope of the programme, and linkages between the community groups and local government structures are continuously strengthened.
8. **COORDINATION:** Tap into the coordination mechanisms at the district and sub-county levels. If the coordination mechanisms are not present, advocate for the establishment of those systems with the local government structures, or as available, the UN cluster system led by UNFPA, UNICEF and UNHCR. Ensure that activities are in line with priorities identified in the District Development Plan (DDP). Review the PRDP (Peace, Recovery and Development Plan for Northern Uganda) to ensure alignment with stated objectives in the document.

9. **FURTHER STUDY AND STRONGER EVALUATION DESIGN:** There is a limited body of knowledge and empirical data linking the economic empowerment of women and gender-based violence. ACF is in a very good position to contribute to that body of knowledge through action-oriented research by instituting stronger evaluation design and a long-term study that covers three years of this programme.

   Consider having a longer time frame and a more consultative process in developing the evaluation design. The evaluation design team can include the Learning Team in London, the Technical Team in New York, the field team in Uganda and the selected consultant/s. The design should include male members of the household, potentially a review of a control group, and tools that can gather information on any changes in knowledge, gender dynamic and relationship attitudes and practices. In addition, there is space to review the effectiveness of the strategy to use women’s groups and community-based trainers. At the time of this evaluation, both strategies were not yet fully operational but there should be more experience with these structures by the end of the second year of operation to allow for further investigation.

   ACF’s programme intervention reaching multiple locations in a transitional setting with two linked objectives in different sectors presents an opportunity to design a robust study of the effects of GBV trainings/sensitisation with cash transfers, VSLA membership and livelihoods or agriculture training using stepped wedge randomised trial designs.

   Some potential questions to explore are: To what extent do increasing income and livelihood options affect levels of intimate partner violence among women who receive a cash transfer? Are there differences between levels of vulnerability (ACF to define levels of vulnerability) and how do these levels of vulnerability affect experience of intimate partner violence? What are the factors that influence a woman’s enjoyment/non-enjoyment of economic empowerment? How do target groups define economic empowerment? To what extent does membership with a VSLA influence the effects of the cash transfer intervention?

   Refer to the suggested article below for more information on the evidence base linking intimate partner violence and economic empowerment programmes. On the evaluation process: For the next evaluation exercise, it could be beneficial to have at least a two-person team, one member with expertise in GBV and another in livelihoods.

10. **Annual facilitated reflection or learning session:** Consider an annual facilitated reflection or learning session among ACF programme staff in the two sites. It could also be possible to invite a few stakeholders to share experiences during the reflection session. Within the communities, consider annual exchanges between the community groups and feedback workshops between ACF, district authorities, community groups and beneficiaries.
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## Annexes

### Annex 1: Promising Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Multi-stage multi-level participatory beneficiary selection process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovative Features and Key Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>The ACF programme used a multi-stage process for selecting beneficiaries starting with a review of district statistical data identifying the poorest parishes. The programme was then introduced to the district officials followed by consultations with local leaders from LC 3 to LC1 to help in selection of parishes. The parishes were ranked according to vulnerability criteria and the parishes were selected. This was followed by a participatory community-based selection of specific beneficiaries. A community meeting was openly held with as many parish members mobilised by the LC1. ACF disseminated information on the selection criteria and during the community meeting, there was open and transparent nomination seconded by others in the community. The process also allowed for self-nomination. Verification was later done through actual visits by ACF to the nominated beneficiaries and a household-level assessment was conducted. A complaint line was also established to mitigate possible anomalies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practical and Specific Recommendations to Roll Out</strong></td>
<td>This is a labour-intensive long process but what helps is the sufficient staffing in the team to get it done. There are field assistants to mobilise the community, team leaders to monitor the field activities, a strong M&amp;E officer to analyse the data, the assistant programme manager or programme manager to liaise with the district officials and a dedicated ‘verification officer’ to do the household level assessment. In future, the team is looking to involve the sub county officials as well for greater ownership and oversight. It is important that the selection criteria are clearly defined and everyone in the community understands the criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Setting up VSLAs along side Cash Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovative Features and Key Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>The cash transfer alone does not guarantee beneficiaries can increase livelihood options and increase income diversification. This is because some part of the cash transfer is also used for immediate needs and some beneficiaries may not be immediately able to convert the cash into productive assets due to particular vulnerabilities. The VSLA serves as an excellent social and financial safety net for cash transfer beneficiaries as it can cover for immediate needs and small business options. The accompanying technical support provided the VSLA impart important knowledge about savings and loans and help the groups maintain the association through systematic processes, clear by-laws and material resources to keep records and funds safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practical and Specific Recommendations to Roll Out</strong></td>
<td>Programme staff can be technically equipped to roll out and support beneficiaries in household action planning, decision making and deciding to join VSLAs. Programme staff can then ensure VSLAs receive mentoring and support for at least one year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 2: DAC-based Rating Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>There are two levels of impact that the evaluation seeks to understand: one area is the nature and level of GBV among the target populations and the second level on strengthening livelihoods through increasing household assets and income diversification. Many women have reported changes in terms of their experience of intimate partner violence in the short term (while a few others have said there is no change) and monitoring data suggest significant positive changes in beneficiaries’ diversification of household assets and sources of income. Anecdotal evidence also suggests positive changes towards saving behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>ACF encourages recipients of the cash transfer to use the funds on productive assets that can have a longer-term effect on the household. As well, ACF created VSLA groups and encouraged CT beneficiaries to join one to provide a safety net and access to loans for emergencies also increases the chances that the effects of the intervention will continue. Women’s groups that have been created have the potential for sustaining the changes in attitude and practice on reporting GBV incidents although there are questions whether one-year mentoring and technical support for VSLA and women’s groups is enough to sustain them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance/Appropriateness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The targeting criteria and selection process ensures that the most vulnerable are appropriately reached by the programme. The intervention is in a context of transition in northern Uganda where unconditional cash transfers, livelihood diversification and addressing GBV is very relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>There is a need to integrate the programme’s two objectives in the two locations by harmonising approaches, activities, communication and staffing and monitoring systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is a wide coverage for the programme and the most vulnerable populations are appropriately targeted. However, because of the wide scope for the definition of vulnerability, there is an even greater coverage of beneficiaries with different life situations. The programme needs to consider the target beneficiaries not as a homogenous whole to see how the GBV and livelihood intervention affects different people differently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>There are also two levels of effectiveness for the programme. On livelihoods, the programme is on track to meet the targets. For the GBV component, the local partners will need additional support, resources and technical guidance in order to meet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the GBV targets. It’s also important to ensure that the data needed to report on the GBV targets are being collected.

### Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some aspects of the programme such as the actual disbursement of the cash to the beneficiaries were implemented very efficiently. However, efficiency is weakened due to the wide geographic coverage with limited transport and human resource support, the limited resources of the GBV partners, and the changes in partners in Otuke.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A random selection of ACF Programme staff were also asked to rate the programme according to the scale above. The results are below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Coherence</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Relevance/Appropriateness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unweighted Average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>Coherence</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Relevance/Appropriateness</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 3: List of focus group discussions and interviews

#### In-depth Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Description</th>
<th>Date/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okello Lily</td>
<td>Female, Cash transfer beneficiary, divorced, 4 children</td>
<td>Aug 22, Orum Sub county, Otuke district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Female, Cash transfer beneficiary, widow, 60 years old living alone</td>
<td>Aug 22, Orum Sub county, Otuke district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Female, Cash transfer beneficiary, widow, 6 children</td>
<td>Aug 23, Okwang sub county, Otuke district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Female, Cash transfer beneficiary, divorced, one child</td>
<td>Aug 23, Okwang sub county, Otuke district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Atala</td>
<td>Field Assistant, Olilim sub county, Otuke District</td>
<td>Aug 23, Lira district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Program staff, Transcultural Psychosocial Organization (TPO)</td>
<td>Phone interview Aug 24, Lira district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Female, Cash transfer beneficiary, divorced, 6 children</td>
<td>Aug 24, Adwari sub county, Otuke district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>Female, cash transfer beneficiary, married, 5 children</td>
<td>Aug 24, Lira district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filder Sharon</td>
<td>ACF Verification Officer</td>
<td>Aug 24, Lira district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Focus Group Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Date/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Combined VSLA and primary beneficiaries</td>
<td>15 participants, all female, mixed group of married and single</td>
<td>Aug 22, Orum sub county, Otuke district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Primary beneficiaries</td>
<td>12 participants, all female, mixed group married, single and widowed</td>
<td>Aug 23, Okwang sub county, Otuke district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Primary beneficiaries</td>
<td>12 participants, all female, mixed single, married, widowed, divorced</td>
<td>Aug 24, Adwari sub county, Otuke district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 VSLA members</td>
<td>23 participants, 2 male, 21 female</td>
<td>Aug 24, Adwari sub county, Otuke district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Primary beneficiaries</td>
<td>17 + 3 participants, all female, mixed widowed, divorced, married and single (11 widows)</td>
<td>Aug 28, Koch Goma sub country, Nwoya district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 VSLA members</td>
<td>23 participants, 8 male, 15 female</td>
<td>Aug 28, Koch Goma sub county, Nwoya district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 VSLA members</td>
<td>24 participants, 10 male, 14 female</td>
<td>Aug 29, Alero sub county, Nwoya district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Primary beneficiaries</td>
<td>13 participants, all female</td>
<td>Aug 30, Lamogi sub county, Nwoya district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Primary beneficiaries</td>
<td>10 participants, all female, widowed, married, divorced</td>
<td>Aug 31, Amuru sub county, Amuru district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 VSLA members</td>
<td>13 participants, 5 male, 8 female</td>
<td>Aug 31, Amuru sub county, Amuru district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Briefing and De-briefing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Description</th>
<th>Date/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frewengel Michael</td>
<td>ACF FSL Coordinator</td>
<td>Aug. 20/Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Ambroso</td>
<td>ACF Country Director, Security briefing, preliminary discussion</td>
<td>Aug. 20, Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthbert Aongat</td>
<td>FSL Coordinator Assistant</td>
<td>Aug. 20, Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semmy Aguti</td>
<td>ACF Field Assistant, Translator briefing, continuing discussions</td>
<td>Aug 21 – 24, Lira and Otuke districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Eichholz</td>
<td>ACF FSL Programme Manager, Lira, de-briefing and discussions</td>
<td>Aug 21 – 25 Lira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Yemane</td>
<td>ACF FSL Deputy Programme Coordinator, Gulu and Lira, de-briefing and discussions</td>
<td>Aug 26 – 31, Gulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Latigo</td>
<td>ACF Assistant Programme Manager, Gulu, translator briefing and continuing</td>
<td>Aug 27 – 30, Gulu, Amuru and Nwoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odong Walter</td>
<td>Sub county Chief, Lamogi</td>
<td>Aug 30, Lamogi sub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>ACF Team Leader, Nwoya district</td>
<td>Aug 31, Lamogi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Administrative Officer of Otuke district</td>
<td>Brief courtesy call</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annex 4: Essential reading**

L. Heise, December 2011. ‘What works to prevent partner violence? An evidence overview’, Working Paper (version 2.0) Centre for Gender Violence and Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK  
*(The Executive Summary and Chapter 5 are especially relevant to ACF)*