



## **Humanitarian Aid Decision**

**F9 (FED9)**

**Title: Improved Management of Humanitarian Aid in Northern Uganda**

**Location of operation: UGANDA**

**Amount of Decision: EUR 4,000,000**

**Decision reference number: ECHO/UGA/EDF/2006/01000**

---

### **Explanatory Memorandum**

#### **1 - Rationale, needs and target population.**

##### **1.1. - Rationale :**

Northern Uganda is suffering its twentieth year of armed conflict. The Government of Uganda is fighting against the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) in northern districts. Current IDP (internally displaced persons) caseload remains high with 1,5 million IDPs receiving food aid; the overall IDP population is estimated at around 2,0 million (OCHA CAP 2006). IDPs continue to live in substandard IDP camps where neither minimum services nor adequate protection are provided.

The nomination of Uganda by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC<sup>1</sup>) as a pilot country for implementation of the UN Cluster Approach in 2006 provides Uganda with a unique, welcome opportunity to improve both the co-ordination and management of humanitarian assistance. This approach is currently being piloted in Uganda. Improved service provision, especially protection, to >200 IDP camps (including decongested sites) is envisaged by this.

A 'cluster' is defined as a group of organisations and other stakeholders (e.g. UN agencies, NGOs) working together to address the needs in a 'sector' of humanitarian activity (for example, protection, health and water and sanitation). A 'cluster lead agency' is assigned to each 'sector'. UNICEF is, for example, currently the cluster lead

---

<sup>1</sup> IASC – Inter-Agency Standing Committee, background document no. 3; 24 April 2006.  
[ECHO/UGA/EDF/2006/01000](#)

for health in northern Uganda and UNHCR is the cluster lead for protection. The 'cluster lead agency' function exists at central and district level and interacts primarily with government, highlighting gaps in humanitarian assistance, enhancing the timeliness, predictability and quality of aid provision and ensuring a more effective response by mobilising agencies, organisations and NGOs to respond in a particular 'sector'. Furthermore, the 'cluster lead agency' is fully accountable for the sector it leads and answers to the Humanitarian Co-ordinator (HC).

So far, it has been noted that there is a distinct lack of coordination at camp level of the different services provided as well as the need to enhance the services provided themselves. Through the IASC Cluster Approach, gaps in the provision of humanitarian assistance can be filled and controls on service delivery at central, district and camp level, tightened. Most urgent would be the need to support the health, water and sanitation and protection sectors as well as the camp-management sub-sector.

This Decision will contribute to improving the quality, coordination and impact of service delivery to the IDP camps in northern Uganda. Field coordination at district level is much needed.

## 1.2. - Identified needs :

### **Basic Survival Needs**

Basic humanitarian needs in the form of health care, water supply and sanitation are not being systematically addressed and the overall humanitarian response can at best be characterised as uneven<sup>2</sup>. The joint WHO/UNICEF/MOH mortality survey from mid-2005 notes alarming crude mortality rate (CMR) of 1.54/10,000 persons/day (emergency threshold 0.9/10,000) and under 5 years mortality rate of 3.18/10,000 persons/day (emergency threshold 2.3/10,000). Recurrent, protracted cholera outbreaks testify to the lack of sufficient water supply as well as low-level hygiene facilities and suboptimal practices. One of the underlying reasons for the protracted epidemics is the poorly organised and managed IDP camps. In 2005, a cholera outbreak in Gulu district lasted from March till October even though all agencies involved made commendable efforts to contain it. Currently an ongoing cholera outbreak in ten camps in Kitgum district continues to spread and has so far infected more than 500 people.

### **Protection and Camp Management**

Management of IDP camps i.e. the coordination of the agencies and organisations providing aid to the camps is lacking. This has a knock-on effect, undermining other efforts to achieve minimum standards and it can compromise the monitoring of protection needs. The national IASC in Uganda has defined camp management as part of a wider IDP protection 'sector'. UNHCR is overall cluster lead for protection as well as sub-cluster lead for camp management. Other protection sub-clusters namely 'children' and the one for 'human rights' have been assigned to UNICEF to UNHCR as sub-cluster leads respectively.

---

<sup>2</sup> Highlighted in the Executive Summary (p. iv) to the Report on the Evaluation of Directorate-General for humanitarian aid (DG ECHO)'s Actions in Northern Uganda 2004-2005. "Government policy (on water provision to camps) is not clearly articulated whilst the technical capability of partners varies considerably."

In northern Uganda each 'sector' has traditionally been co-ordinated by UN agencies, such as UNICEF, for water, sanitation and health. Such 'sector' co-ordination has taken place at the district level but there has been an absence of cross-sectoral co-ordination within each of the IDP camps, resulting in uneven service delivery, duplication of activities, and poor camp management. There has been no comprehensive baseline information compiled on each IDP camp which helps to prioritise needs and highlight problems. Such traditional sector co-ordination needs to be complemented with camp specific co-ordination. This can be achieved through improved camp management.

### **'Return' Preparedness**

In addition to large, unaddressed needs in IDP camps, the near future may provide some possibilities for return to areas of origin that have been left uninhabited for a decade or more. Protection in the form of the restitution of land rights, for example, needs structured, systematic surveillance and monitoring in order to preserve IDP livelihoods.

In line with agreed IASC protection strategy, activities under this decision will concentrate on improving freedom of movement, supporting IDPs that can safely return as well as improving the conditions in camps identified as having poor management and service provision with few opportunities for return in the near future.

#### **1.3. - Target population and regions concerned :**

In 1996-7, the Government pushed the majority of IDPs in Gulu, Kitgum, and Pader into "protected villages", now described as "camps". These camps, particularly those in Kitgum and Pader, remain severely affected by arbitrary restrictions on movement and curfews and ongoing security incidents carried out by the LRA and unknown criminal elements. The population is largely dependent on humanitarian assistance.

Target population consists mainly of camp-based IDPs in Acholiland, covering the three core conflict districts of Gulu, Pader and Kitgum. The population is currently estimated at 438,765 in Gulu, 279,589 in Pader and 267,087 in Kitgum, totalling more than 1 million IDPs (Population Movement in Acholiland, UNHCR June 2006). To maximise impact in the areas of camp management it is envisaged that funding for this purpose will initially focus on one district of Acholiland and within that one district, target priority camps where conditions are worse.

In recent months, with less security incidents, the Government has made efforts to establish new locations for IDPs to access more land. Movement of IDPs to locations outside the existing camps has been sporadically monitored by UN and other humanitarian actors. There is no verified information on this movement from the camps in Kitgum, Pader and Gulu. Current information on IDPs is based on WFP food distribution statistics which are assessed as inflated. Assessments of movements and existing conditions and service provision for IDPs will be a core priority to ensure a return with dignity and safety. To the extent that a return scenario becomes feasible during the duration of this Decision, the funding provided under this decision will follow and support IDPs in their return process.

#### 1.4. - Risk assessment and possible constraints :

The LRA conflict has become further regionalised with the move of LRA into Garamba National Park in DRC. Levels of LRA-induced violence and insecurity in northern Uganda have, as a consequence, reduced. The IDP population in northern Uganda remains in a state of fear because of the nature of such brutal attacks and the volatility of the LRA insurgency.

It is unlikely that the LRA will totally withdraw from northern Uganda; the LRA conflict is more likely to linger on at a relatively low level characterised by occasional outbursts of extreme violence, sufficient to cause terror and ensure IDP 'captivity' in over-crowded camps for the months to come. Likewise, the longer the strained lines of command between the grass-roots and the senior LRA commanders, now in DRC, exist, the more they will engender fragmentation and banditry with additional incidents of uncontrolled violence being carried out against IDP populations.

The recent meetings between LRA and Sudanese People Liberation Movement (SPLM) in South Sudan may offer some hope for a forthcoming resolution to the conflict. The situation, however, may also become further entrenched as the Government of Uganda may or may not find it opportune to fully engage and commit with concrete action, to the press.

The protection and camp management strategies developed in Uganda emphasise among others 'freedom of movement'; 'area security', 'camp administration' and 'camp co-ordination' as important prerequisites for the improved protection of IDPs. These strategies house in-built flexibility mechanisms, enabling planning for returns even if not imminent, whilst at the same time, capitalising on returns as camps would automatically become less congested and therefore easier to manage in terms of co-ordinating services and administrating protection complaints and claims. There is also the challenge of deploying staff in a timely fashion.

## **2 - Objectives and components of the humanitarian intervention proposed:<sup>3</sup>**

### 2.1. - Objectives :

Principal objective:

- IDPs in northern Uganda receive a predictable, comprehensive assistance and protection package in camps and areas of return.

---

<sup>3</sup> Humanitarian aid operations funded by the Commission are implemented by NGOs and the Red Cross organisations on the basis of Framework Partnership Agreements (FPA) (in conformity with Article 163 of the Implementing Rules of the Financial Regulation) and by United Nations agencies based on the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA). The standards and criteria established in DG ECHO's standard Framework Partnership Agreement to which NGO's and International organisations have to adhere and the procedures and criteria needed to become a partner may be found at [http://europa.eu/comm/echo/partners/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/comm/echo/partners/index_en.htm)

Specific objective:

- IDP protection is enhanced through improved co-ordination and management of humanitarian assistance, including management of IDP camps, complemented with inclusive protection monitoring and response.

## 2.2. - Components :

As formulated in the IASC protection strategy, IDP protection in northern Uganda should concentrate on the following areas of interventions by the protection cluster in Uganda:

*Freedom of movement* – identification of return areas with IDPs and local security forces will build greater trust and decision making by IDPs to determine if and when to depart from camps. Increased voluntary movement from IDP camps to parishes of origin will increase production of food and improve health conditions, self reliance, and make more men active resulting in fewer incidences of SGBV and at the same time enable a gradual phasing down of food aid.

*Improvement of conditions in camps* – identification of priority camps and establishment of camp management with NGO partners will provide missing knowledge of camp conditions to make timely recommendations and interventions in all service provision sectors. Greater NGO presence with a monitoring and reporting mechanism will assist in the prevention of criminal acts and GBV and facilitate responses for survivors.

*Support for IDP movements from camps* – monitoring established in areas of IDP movement will ensure voluntary movement, the existence of basic humanitarian conditions, identification of situation specific needs and identification of vulnerable individuals.

Specifically cluster leads at country level should:

- Ensure identified and predictable leadership in key gap sectors/areas of response;
- Create stronger partnerships between UN agencies, the Red Cross Movement, international organizations and NGOs in critical gap areas of humanitarian operations;
- Strengthen the accountability of operational partners to the HC for different aspects of the humanitarian response where this is lacking;
- Improve strategic field-level coordination and prioritisation (IASC, background document no. 3; 24 April 2006).

When the above four points have been achieved in northern Uganda, the cluster approach would have added considerably value to the humanitarian response.

It is expected that the cluster approach will bring about the further nomination of lead agencies per camp and per sector. The camp/sector lead agency will be responsible for service provision in a particular IDP camp within one or more sectors. Camp/sector lead agencies will normally be NGOs. So far camp lead agencies have been nominated for the water sector in Kitgum district. This is proving beneficial

during the current cholera outbreak, where camp lead agencies have also been nominated in the health sector for the until now 10 affected IDP camps.

Cluster co-ordination will gradually replace OCHA facilitated sector co-ordination, so OCHA can focus on overall co-ordination with the DDMCs, provide information management to cluster leads and strengthening advocacy with government structures such as recently created JMC as well as existing structures such as the IATC created under the IDP policy.

In a return scenario camp/sector lead agencies would be expected to geographically expand their responsibility to sub-counties in conjunction with return to areas of origin.

### **Protection and Camp Management Sector:**

The Protection and Camp Management Cluster under the leadership of UNHCR involves four distinct areas of involvement:

Camp Co-ordination: Supporting and leading the development of plans to ensure that international standards are being applied and maintained through the identification and designation of service providers (mostly NGOs) as well as monitoring and evaluating the response. Advocate with international and national actors that such plans be followed and fully implemented.

Camp Administration: Obligations and responsibilities that normally fall under national authorities, including: overall supervision, security law and order, issuance of documentation (permits, licenses, birth certificates, etc.). UPDF is de facto the main provider of camp administration in northern Uganda, and the challenge for the cluster will be to advocate for further civilian camp administration.

Camp Management: Specific activities focusing on improving protection and assistance in a camp, including:

- Mapping and prioritisation of needs and vulnerabilities;
- Establish and continuously implement a monitoring and reporting system for protection;
- Review camp representation and administration;
- Support to IDP leadership committees;
- Review service provision and devise plans for infrastructure improvements;
- Where return becomes feasible downsize, reorient and/or reduce service and increasingly focus on livelihood assistance.
- Undertake regular monitoring of service provision.

### **Health Sector:**

- Scale-up service provision at primary/peripheral level by supporting the reactivation of MoH services. This might be supported through staff development, staff housing, drugs supply, replacement of equipment or expatriate coaching;
- Targeting of most vulnerable groups at camp level through continued support to the CORPS structure;

- Where return becomes feasible increasingly support existing or former clinics by re-establishing services and expanding geographical coverage.

#### **Water and Sanitation Sector:**

- Scale-up service provision at camps and/or parish level through a combination of hand-pumps and motorised systems;
- Where return becomes feasible reorient water supply to areas of former habitation and increasingly focus on operations and maintenance of water supply thereby enhancing sustainability;
- Emphasise participatory approaches to sanitation with large degree of self-help, and self-management. All sanitation interventions to be complemented with hygiene promotion and education.

### **3 - Duration expected for actions in the proposed Decision:**

The duration for the implementation of this Decision shall be 12 months. Humanitarian operations funded by this decision must be implemented within this period.

Expenditure under this Decision shall be eligible from **1 September 2006** as if return becomes feasible is it most likely to gain momentum after the rainy season where ample roofing material is available in northern Uganda.

Start Date: **1 September 2006**

If the implementation of the actions envisaged in this Decision is suspended due to *force majeure* or any comparable circumstance, the period of suspension will not be taken into account for the calculation of the duration of the humanitarian aid operations.

Depending on the evolution of the situation in the field, the Commission reserves the right to terminate the agreements signed with the implementing humanitarian organisations where the suspension of activities is for a period of more than one third of the total planned duration of the action. In this respect, the procedure established in the general conditions of the specific agreement will be applied.

#### 4 - Previous interventions/Decisions of the Commission within the context of the current crisis

List of previous DG ECHO operations in <b>UGANDA</b>				
Decision Number	Decision Type	2004	2005	2006
		EUR	EUR	EUR
ECHO/UGA/BUD/2004/01000	Global Plan	6,000,000		
ECHO/UGA/EDF/2004/02000	Non Emergency	6,620,000		
ECHO/UGA/EDF/2004/01000	Non Emergency	6,000,000		
ECHO/UGA/BUD/2005/01000	Global Plan		14,000,000	
ECHO/UGA/BUD/2006/01000	Global Plan			15,000,000
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>18,620,000</b>	<b>14,000,000</b>	<b>15,000,000</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>47,620,000</b>		

Dated : 06/06/2006

Source : HOPE

#### 5 - Other donors and donor co-ordination mechanisms.

##### Donors in **UGANDA** the last 12 months\*\*

1. EU Members States (*)		2. European Commission		3. Others	
	EUR		EUR		EUR
Austria		DG ECHO	15,000,000		
Belgium	700,000	DG DEV (A ENV allocations 9 <sup>th</sup> EDF 2003-2007)	267,335,900		
Cyprus		DG DEV (B-ENV allocations 9 <sup>th</sup> EDF 2003-2007)***	58,500,000		
Czech republic					
Denmark	2,962,466				
Estonia					
Finland	2,672,712				
France	1,378,619				
Germany	3,986,044				
Greece					
Hungary					
Ireland	2,909,052				
Italy	1,000,000				
Latvia					
Lithuania					
Luxemburg					
Malta					
Netherlands	6,749,600				
Poland					
Portugal					
Slovakia					
Slovenie					
Spain	200,000				
Sweden	4,792,527				
United kingdom	31,543,855				
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>58,894,875</b>	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>15,000,000</b>	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>0</b>
		<b>Grand total</b>	<b>73,894,875</b>		

Dated : 06/06/2006

(\*) Source : DG ECHO 14 Points reporting for Members States. <https://hac.ec.europa.eu>

Empty cells means either no information is available or no contribution.

(\*\*) DG DEV 9<sup>th</sup> EDF allocations run from 2003-2007.

(\*\*\*) DG ECHO has drawn EUR 14,620,000 of this amount in previous years.

#### 6 - Amount of decision and distribution by specific objectives:

6.1. - Total amount of the decision: EUR 4,000,000

## 6.2. - Budget breakdown by specific objectives

<b>Principal objective:</b> <i>IDPs in northern Uganda receive a predictable, comprehensive assistance and protection package in camps and areas of return</i>				
<b>Specific objectives</b>	<b>Allocated amount by specific objective (EUR)</b>	<b>Geographical area of operation</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Potential partners<sup>4</sup></b>
Specific objective 1: IDP protection is enhanced through improved co-ordination and management of humanitarian assistance, including management of IDP camps, complemented with inclusive protection monitoring and response	4,000,000	Northern Uganda	<p><u>Camp Co-ordination:</u> - designation of service providers (mostly NGOs) as well as monitoring and evaluating the response.</p> <p><u>Camp administration:</u> - overall supervision, security law and order, issuance of documentation (permits, licenses, berth certificates, etc.).</p> <p>- advocate for further civilian camp administration.</p> <p><u>Camp Management:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mapping and prioritisation of needs and vulnerabilities;</li> <li>- Establish and continuously implement a monitoring and reporting system for protection;</li> <li>- Review camp representation and administration;</li> <li>- Support to IDP leadership committees;</li> <li>- Review service provision and devise plans for infrastructure improvements;</li> <li>- Where return becomes feasible downsize, reorient and/or reduce service and increasingly focus on livelihood assistance.</li> <li>- Undertake regular monitoring of service provision.</li> </ul> <p><b>Health Sector:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scale-up service provision at primary/peripheral level by supporting the reactivation of MoH services. Staff development, staff housing, drugs supply, replacement of equipment or expatriate coaching;</li> <li>- Targeting of most vulnerable groups at camp level through continued support to the CORPS structure;</li> <li>- Where return becomes feasible increasingly support existing or former clinics by re-establishing services and expanding geographical coverage.</li> </ul> <p><b>Water and Sanitation Sector:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Scale-up service provision at camps and/or parish level through a combination of hand-pumps and motorised systems;</li> <li>- Where return becomes feasible reorient water supply to areas of former habitation and increasingly focus on operations and maintenance of water supply thereby enhancing sustainability;</li> <li>- Emphasise participatory approaches to sanitation with large degree of self-help, and self-management. - hygiene promotion and education.</li> </ul>	<p>- CROIX-ROUGE - CICR- ICRC - CH</p> <p>- DRC</p> <p>- UN - UNHCR - BEL</p> <p>- UN - UNICEF - BEL</p>
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>4,000,000</b>			

<sup>4</sup> COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR), DANSK FLYGTNINGEHAELP, UNICEF, UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM

## **7 - Evaluation**

In 2005 DG ECHO completed an evaluation of the DG ECHO-funded interventions in Uganda, over the period 2004-2005, using external consultants. The evaluation may be accessed at [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/pdf\\_files/evaluation/2005/uganda.PDF](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/pdf_files/evaluation/2005/uganda.PDF) In drafting this new decision DG ECHO has taken careful consideration of the conclusions and recommendations of the independent consultants. Their professional opinions have been complemented by the needs assessments contained in the project proposals submitted by DG ECHO's partners. Both the locally based DG ECHO technical assistant and the Brussels based operational desk responsible have reviewed the proposals for points of convergence and consistency, both between the proposals and against the evaluation report. As a result of this review DG ECHO has determined the funding priorities set out in the decision. DG ECHO reviews all projects at the liquidation phase for respect of the contractual objectives agreed to. These reviews are contained in master document records that are made available to external consultants at the dates of periodic ex-post evaluations.

More information can be obtained at:

[http://europa.eu/comm/echo/evaluation/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/comm/echo/evaluation/index_en.htm).

**COMMISSION DECISION**  
**of**  
**on the financing of humanitarian operations from the 9th European Development Fund**  
**in**  
**UGANDA**

**THE COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,**

Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community,

Having regard to the ACP-EC Partnership Agreement signed in Cotonou on 23 June 2000, in particular Articles 72 thereof,

Having regard to the Internal Agreement of 18 September 2000 on the Financing and Administration of the Community Aid under the Financial Protocol to the Partnership Agreement between the African, Caribbean and Pacific States and the European Community and its Member States signed in Cotonou (Benin) on 23 June 2000, in particular Article 25 thereof.

Whereas:

- (1) More than 1,500,000 internally displaced persons continue to live in substandard and overcrowded camps in the core conflict districts of northern Uganda;
- (2) Significant gains in living conditions can be made if humanitarian aid were better coordinated and internally displaced persons camps better managed;
- (3) An assessment of the humanitarian situation leads to the conclusion that a humanitarian aid operation should be financed by the Community for a period of 12 months;
- (4) It is estimated that an amount of EUR 4,000,000 from the 9th European Development Fund is necessary to provide humanitarian assistance to populations directly affected by the conflict;
- (5) The use of the 9th EDF fund is necessary as all the funds allocated for ACP countries in the general budget are entirely depleted;
- (6) The Commission has informed the EDF Committee set up by the Internal Agreement with ex ante information according to the criteria laid down in Articles 24.3a and 24.5 of the Internal Agreement.

HAS DECIDED AS FOLLOWS:

*Article 1*

1. In accordance with the objectives and general principles of humanitarian aid, the Commission hereby approves a total amount of EUR 4,000,000 from the 9th European Development Fund for humanitarian aid operations to assist vulnerable people directly affected by the armed conflict in Uganda.

2. In accordance with Article 72 of the ACP-EC Partnership Agreement, the humanitarian operations shall be implemented in the pursuance of the following specific objectives:

IDP protection is enhanced through improved co-ordination and management of humanitarian assistance, including management of IDP camps, complemented with inclusive protection monitoring and response in Uganda.

The total amount of this decision is allocated to this objective.

#### *Article 2*

1. The implementation of humanitarian aid operations funded by this Decision shall have a maximum duration of 12 months from 1 September 2006.

2. Expenditure under this Decision is eligible from 1 September 2006.

3. If the operations envisaged in this Decision are suspended due to *force majeure* or comparable circumstances, the period of suspension will not be taken into account for the calculation of the duration of the humanitarian aid operations.

#### *Article 3*

The decision shall take effect on the date of its adoption.

Done at Brussels,

For the Commission

*Member of the Commission*