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1.1 INTRODUCTION

Based on consultations with the Government of Uganda, the United Nations, the non-governmental community and donor representatives, the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) decided in August 2010 that the humanitarian situation in Uganda would no longer warrant a Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP) in 2011. Instead, it was agreed that an Inter-Agency Working Group, with participation of the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), should develop a humanitarian profile for Uganda as a tool to guide decision on humanitarian action in 2011. The HCT further noted the opportunity to support the Government’s Peace, Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP) thereby boosting the ongoing recovery and development efforts in Karamoja, Acholi and Teso regions that have been targeted by the CAP in previous years.

In Acholi and Teso regions, the some 92% of the formerly 1.8 million displaced people have returned home or identified new villages within to settle. Challenges remain to allow those still residing in camps and/or transit camps to freely opt for return, local integration or settlement elsewhere as provided for by the Uganda National Internally Displaced People (IDP) Policy and to ensure the achievement of durable solutions. For those who have left the camps and returned, reintegration is still an ongoing and fragile process that will need time and support in order to consolidate and achieve durable solutions. Inadequate access to water, scarce livelihoods opportunities, minimal food security, remote health and educational services and insufficient law and order structures in areas of return, as well as disputes over land and property continue to affect return movements and the sustainability of reintegration.

In the impoverished Karamoja region, improvements have been registered in the overall food security condition as a result of relatively favourable rainfall in 2010. However, food security remains extremely fragile due to crop pests and diseases which affected crop yields in some areas, as well as livestock diseases (CCPP – Contagious Caprine Pleuro Pneumonia). Concerns related to safety and security, human rights violations, as well as scarce livelihoods opportunities continue to challenge the ongoing efforts to achieve sustainable solutions for the approximately 1.2 million people living in the region. In Western Uganda, 150,000 Sudanese, Congolese, Somali and Rwandan refugees live in camps and depend on continued humanitarian assistance until durable solutions can be found.

While this paper strives to cast an analytical light on the humanitarian context in Uganda, it neither constitutes a needs assessment nor a common humanitarian action plan. Rather, the Uganda Humanitarian Profile, which will be updated by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) on a regular basis throughout the year, will provide the humanitarian and donor communities together with the Government of Uganda the possibility to develop a common understanding of what are considered the key humanitarian issues in the country as well as their implications. The Humanitarian Profile is a dynamic paper that takes into account possible events in the country as well as in the region that could have humanitarian implications and which would require proper planning and preparedness. Therefore, early warning indicators in regard to these events will be closely monitored by the humanitarian community while contingency plans are properly developed.

1.2 2010 IN REVIEW

1.2.1 Security and Access

Northern Uganda has remained stable and secure in the four years following the signing of the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement.¹ No sightings/activity of the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) has occurred in the region since June 2008. The LRA remains active in neighbouring Sudan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), as well as in the Central African Republic (CAR). Joint military operations against the group have been carried out in Sudan and the DRC, while Ugandan and the host forces also continue joint pursuit within the CAR.

¹ Although both parties (Government of Uganda and LRA) agreed to end hostilities in August 2006, a final peace agreement remains unsigned by the LRA.
Karamoja region is therefore the only part of the country where the security situation remains unpredictable and volatile. Hostility from illegally armed groups, cattle raids, banditry, killings and clashes between the Uganda People’s Defence Forces (UPDF) and raiders dominated security incidents in the sub-region during 2010. Despite ongoing UPDF disarmament operations - forcibly conducted since 2006 - and regular road patrols, road ambushes remained a major concern. The year witnessed increased UPDF cordon and search operations marked by complaints over alleged human rights abuses by communities, local leaders and human rights organizations. By September, the Army had reported recovering 30,000 guns in the region, and announced an animal branding scheme to aid livestock identification. In February, the Government, with the support of the police, re-designed the disarmament strategy aiming at involving local populations more directly in the process than before. An improved police presence was registered during the third quarter of 2010 with a total of 3,800 personnel, out of which 2,400 are Probation Police Constables and 1,400 Anti-Stock Theft Unit (ASTU) personnel. A significant number of police, however, have equally been withdrawn from the region to undergo training in preparation for the upcoming election period, prompting concern over the potential for further human rights violations.

Despite its volatility, the security situation in Karamoja has not further limited humanitarian access. While nothing at this point suggests that the humanitarian/development community is a direct target, continuing threats of road banditry and the risk of being at the wrong place at the wrong time exist. Apart from within town areas, Karamoja is the only region in Uganda requiring the use of military escorts for UN movements, with Kaabong, Kotido and Moroto categorized by the UN Department of Safety and Security under Phase III and Abim and Nakapiripirit under Phase II. The vast majority of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) do not.

From April to September 2010, Karamoja and Teso sub-regions have experienced exceptionally heavy rains, which caused further deterioration of road conditions and affected access to most locations, besides affecting crops (see Section 1.2.4, below).

1.2.2 Political Situation

Tension continued to characterize the relationship between the Buganda Kingdom and the Government of Uganda during 2010, having flared into violence in September 2009. A further strain on the fragile relationship was the suspected arsonist attack on the cultural burial grounds for Buganda kings at the beginning of the year. While a full rapprochement remains elusive, the Government’s decision to re-open the Kingdom-affiliated Central Broadcasting Services (CBS) in October 2010 might re-ignite and hasten dialogue.

The growing threat of trans-border terrorism was starkly demonstrated by the twin bomb blasts in Kampala on 11 July 2010 that killed over 70 people. The Somali militant group, Al Shaabab, claimed responsibility for the bombings, highlighting its opposition to Uganda’s peacekeeping involvement in Somalia. In response, the Government arrested a score of suspects, expanded the presence of security personnel across Kampala and other major towns, and heightened the terrorism alert level. Additionally, a Regulation of Interception of Communications law (popularly referred to as the phone-tapping law) came into effect in August 2010. Some human rights groups have expressed fears over the law’s perceived susceptibility to manipulation by politicians or abuse by security agents as well as concerns over due process in regard to some of the terrorism-related arrests. Human rights also remained a key concern with the disarmament process in Karamoja (see section 1.4) and with the wider pre-elections process.

Ahead of the presidential, parliamentary and local council elections scheduled for February 2011, primaries and nominations were held in the second half of 2010. Eight candidates will contest the presidency, up from five in the 2006 elections, suggesting broad interest and confidence in the democratic process. Yet, the Electoral Commission remains the object of strong criticism from pro-democracy groups who question its credibility amid reports of constant harassment and intimidation of
opposition groups.\textsuperscript{3} The threat of pre- and post-election violence, while minimal, also remains of concern.

\subsection*{1.2.3 Economic Situation}

With its consistent market-oriented stance and policies, Uganda has experienced sustained economic growth averaging 7\% annually over the past 15 years.\textsuperscript{4} In 2010, the economy grew at about 6\% while core inflation remained impressively low, falling to 2.5\% by the beginning of the final quarter. Due to its limited inter-connectedness with the global system, the country’s economy has been only marginally affected by the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis.\textsuperscript{5} However, ties with regional economies continue to expand within the framework of the East African Community (EAC), which launched a Common Market in July 2010. Uganda’s domestic exports to the bloc have more than doubled in the last few years, rising from about $78 million in 2005 to $177 million in 2008, with cotton, fruits, tobacco and animal fats and oils comprising the main products.\textsuperscript{6} At $567 million as of 2008, Uganda’s imports from EAC countries have resulted in a sizeable trade deficit. In addition, the country’s strong dependence on Kenya for both its exports and imports leaves the country in a very vulnerable position and highlights the imperative to diversify both output products and destinations as well as import channels.\textsuperscript{7}

Worth noting is Uganda’s rapid population growth rate – one of the highest in the world – meaning real gross domestic product (GDP) growth per capita remains modest at 3.4\%.\textsuperscript{8} More than half (50.8\%) of the population is below 15 years of age leaving the country with the highest dependency ratio in the world.\textsuperscript{9} Growth and poverty reduction are further undermined by pervasive corruption,\textsuperscript{10} which has adverse implications on the delivery and quality of basic services.\textsuperscript{11}

Foreign Direct Investments (FDIs) and remittances remained a major source of capital in the economy during 2010, with the country maintaining its top earner position in the region.\textsuperscript{12} Inflows surpassed $1 billion for the first nine months of the year, potentially creating 65,000 new jobs.\textsuperscript{13} With the oil industry moving toward commercial production, FDIs are expected to further increase in the coming years. Yet, the bulk of such inflows have targeted real estate, business and financial services. Given that 90\% of Ugandans make a living from agriculture, questions remain regarding the potential of the FDIs to catalyze the country’s full productive capacity and lift out of poverty the one-quarter of the population subsisting on less than a dollar a day. Paradoxically, given the predominance of agriculture and livestock for livelihoods, Uganda remains among the world’s most hunger-prone countries.\textsuperscript{14} A new development framework and strategy, the National Development Plan (NDP) launched in April 2010, recognizes agriculture as a “primary growth” sector, alongside manufacturing, mining, oil and gas, tourism and information and communication technology.\textsuperscript{15} An erratic climate pattern (with dry spells and excessive rains both affecting crop yields), difficult access to agricultural productive means, poor post-harvest handling practices, difficult access to markets, as well as a serious loss of skills (almost obliterated in some cases by decades-long displacement) all negatively impact on agriculture, food security and livelihoods.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{3} See e.g. Margaret Sekagya, Uganda Election Report, Open Society Initiative for Eastern Africa, October 2010.
\item \textsuperscript{4} IDA, Uganda: Maintaining Growth – Moving Toward Structural Transformation, 2010.
\item \textsuperscript{5} According to the IMF, Uganda was the only country in East Africa that did not need to borrow from the Fund during the crisis (see “Why the Crisis Did Not Hurt Uganda,” interview with IMF Senior Representative, New Vision 4 November 2010).
\item \textsuperscript{6} East African Community Trade Report 2009.
\item \textsuperscript{7} Fuel prices, for instance, increased by over 40\% in 2010 due to scarcity, in part caused by delays and interruptions at Mombasa Port in Kenya, which accounts for more than 80\% of all of Uganda’s imports. During the post-election violence of 2007 in Kenya, supplies of essential goods to Uganda were significantly interrupted.
\item \textsuperscript{8} IDA, Uganda: Maintaining Growth.
\item \textsuperscript{9} Draft Uganda National Housing Survey (UNHS) 2009/2010.
\item \textsuperscript{10} Uganda was ranked 127\textsuperscript{th} out of 170 in the Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2010.
\item \textsuperscript{11} According to a 2005 World Bank estimate, Uganda loses about $250 million per annum due to corruption in the tendering process alone.
\item \textsuperscript{12} UNCTAD, World Investment Report 2010.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Uganda Investment Authority Quarter Statistics – July to September 2010.
\item \textsuperscript{14} IFPRI, Global Hunger Index 2010.
\item \textsuperscript{15} See National Development Plan (2010/11 – 2014/15.)
\end{itemize}
Within the general context of sustained economic growth, some regions (particularly Northern Uganda and Karamoja) have experienced lesser growth, due mainly to the long-term effects of conflict, displacement, return and reintegration of over one million IDPs, food insecurity, scarce access to services and livelihoods opportunities (particularly for the returnees). Within a generally improving humanitarian context these areas and their communities will remain relatively more vulnerable and will need specific support to consolidate the important but still fragile recent gains.

1.2.4 Natural Disasters

Disaster preparedness and response remain central to humanitarian concerns in Uganda. Across the country, natural disasters continued to pose serious threats to life and livelihood, tragically demonstrated by the landslides and floods in Eastern (Bududa District) and Western Uganda (Kabale District) at the beginning of March 2010. In Bududa, more than 10,000 people were affected and some 300 died as a result of the landslides. Heavy rains also affected Karamoja (in particular Nakapiripirit and Amudat districts) and Teso (Katakwi and Amuria districts) causing flooding and severe water logging seriously affecting crop yields.

Vulnerability to epidemic and epizootic disease outbreaks also remains worrying. A Cholera epidemic since April 2010 has hit four Karamoja districts, infecting 1,419 people and killing 34 as of November. Additionally, Karamoja has been affected by outbreaks of Hepatitis E (540 cases and 15 deaths) since August 2009 and of goat plague (Contagious Caprine Pleuro Pneumonia) in Abim District resulting in the death of at least 2,400 goats since September 2010. Despite being declared free of the virus in 2006, Uganda has suffered two consecutive outbreaks of polio in the last two years – in the northern district of Amuru in 2009 and in the eastern district of Bugiri in October 2010.

Animal health is also of serious concern, particularly in those areas where livestock constitutes the sole pillar of the communities’ livelihoods. Goat plague (Contagious Caprine Pleuro Pneumonia) in Abim District resulting in the death of at least 2,400 goats since September 2010.

As the result of climate change and environmental degradation due to human activity, drought has had the largest impact on life and livelihoods in Uganda over the past quarter of a century. Since 1982, at least six drought events affected in excess of 500,000 people each, at times affecting over 700,000 people. The chronic nature of food insecurity in Karamoja is largely attributable to this hazard. A multi-sectoral approach should be encouraged for a better risk assessment and planning in a coordinated manner.

1.3 Key Humanitarian Developments in 2010

By November 2010, the CAP for Uganda was funded at only 44%, despite representing a substantial reduction from the preceding appeals. At the mid-term review in June, it was concluded that the humanitarian context in Uganda remained largely unchanged and thus the strategic objectives for the CAP would continue to be valid throughout the remainder of 2010.

---

Progress was made towards the further return of IDPs in the LRA-affected areas in Acholi and Teso regions. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), a total of 11,790 IDPs remained in four camps and an additional 135,515 IDPs in seven transit sites in Acholi sub-region as of October 2010.\(^\text{17}\) Of the original IDP population in Acholi sub-region, nearly 92% have now returned to their communities of origin or settled in locations closer to home. Other sub-regions hosting residual populations displaced by the same two decade conflict are West Nile (about 10,000 IDPs in Adjumani district) and Bunyoro (an additional 20,000 IDPs in Kiryandongo district). Approximately 10,000 IDPs remain in Teso, mostly comprising of extremely vulnerable individuals (EVIs). But, although Northern Uganda is now transitioning away from humanitarian assistance to recovery and development, many basic needs remain poorly addressed. With humanitarian efforts substantially reduced, populations formerly residing in camps remain without sufficient basic services in their return or resettlement areas. The quest for durable solutions, particularly in terms of food security and livelihoods, will need continued support to allow for the consolidation of recent progress and for the sustainability of the IDP reintegration process. In Northern Uganda, food security is still fragile due to difficult access to agricultural inputs, poor post-harvest practices, plant pests/diseases and animal disease, erratic climate factors, serious erosion of the basic agricultural skills for IDPs who have spent decades in camps, difficult access to markets, and difficult access to alternative livelihood opportunities.

In Karamoja, despite substantial improvement in the overall food security situation resulting in a significant reduction in food assistance since 2009, food insecurity remains a concern for a sizeable percentage of the population that continues to require food, agriculture and livestock assistance. In spite of the recent improvements, mainly induced by a favourable rainy season in 2010, food security is still affected by plant pests/disease and animal disease, erratic rains (dry spells, flash floods), difficult access to markets and to agricultural implements, poor post-harvest practices and localized insecurity (including cattle raiding). Those that are unable to cope suffer from persistent malnutrition, particularly among children, or migrate to urban areas and resettlement sites within the region or to other parts of the country. The result, among others, is often increased exposure of women and children to violence, abuse and exploitation.

The Government is developing a policy on pastoralism and has requested its development partners for financial support to this process. In response, the Northern Uganda Recovery and Development (NURD) working group in September 2010 approved a draft policy paper on pastoralism in Karamoja prepared by the Karamoja Working Group. The policy, which currently awaits comments and feedback from the Government, highlights the views of development partners on pastoralism and agro-pastoralism and how to support livestock and crop production for a successful transition from humanitarian aid to long-term food security and sustainable development in Karamoja. In February, the Government approved and launched the Karamoja Action Plan for Food Security (KAPFS) in an attempt to address food security through a long-term and comprehensive approach aimed at breaking the dependency on recurrent external food aid.

A number of other steps have been taken which, over time, are expected to impact positively on the humanitarian situation. A final draft of the National Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management, which awaits Cabinet approval, underscores the need to tackle disasters in a holistic manner with more emphasis on disaster risk reduction in line with the recommendations of the 2005 Hyogo Framework for Action. In August, the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) convened a Joint Emergency Preparedness and Response Planning Workshop facilitated by the World Health Organization (WHO), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), World Food Programme (WFP), United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) that brought together technical participants from line ministries, NGOs and UN agencies. The workshop agreed on a number of recommendations to be implemented over the coming year in order to significantly enhance the preparedness & response capacity of the Government. Complementary to this effort, the OPM, supported by OCHA and other agencies, assisted all districts in Karamoja and Acholi regions in the development of district-specific contingency plans.

---

\(^{17}\) Joint IDP Profiling Service (JIPS), Assessment of Durable Solutions in Northern Uganda, September – December 2010
plans based on scenarios for identified major natural hazards. The contingency planning exercises, which aimed at enhancing the districts’ preparedness & response capacities, were preceded by two regional planning workshops that took place in October and December respectively in Karamoja and Acholi.

1.4 ANALYSIS OF KEY HUMANITARIAN ISSUES IN UGANDA

1.4.1 Karamoja Sub-Region

Insecurity, historical marginalization and climate change have left Karamoja with the highest poverty and lowest development indicators in Uganda. Over 80% of the sub-region’s population live below the poverty line, compared to 31% nationally. Acute gaps in access to basic services are widespread across the region, while decades of under-development have resulted in extremely weak local government structures. Food insecurity is exacerbated by the impact of climatic factors (erratic rains, including frequent dry spells as well as occasional late or excessive rains), plant pests/disease and animal disease, limited farming, livestock improvement and water management skills, poor pasture, weak post-harvest handling practices, difficult access to agricultural and livestock inputs, difficult access to markets, persistent cattle raiding and inter-communal conflicts. All these factors have contributed to the population’s high vulnerability to food insecurity as well as outbreaks of diseases such as Cholera and Hepatitis E.

Issues such as safety, rule of law and justice are largely handled by the military due to a combination of insecurity and limited civilian structures. Human rights concerns remain prominent over the UPDF’s disproportionate use of force and violations during cordon and search operations associated with the disarmament programme.

More than 40 years of reliance on some kind of food assistance due to inadequate response to the underlying risk factors for food insecurity has undermined self-reliance among the populations in the sub-region. The General Food Distribution (GFD) supported by the WFP peaked in 2009 with 1.15 million individuals – an estimated 90% of the entire population – receiving 70% food rations. As a result of some improvement in the overall food security condition, GFD was scaled down to 608,000 extremely vulnerable and food-insecure individuals, with a balance of about 300,000 people assisted under a conditional food transfer programme in which households have to work community assets in order to receive food. Owing to further improvement in the food security outlook for 2011, GFD will only continue to be provided to approximately 139,000 most vulnerable individuals who are unable to cater for themselves (about 11.5% of the population). Additional 400,000 - 450,000 individuals will receive food assistance (food or cash) conditional on participation in projects aimed at creating priority community assets. The change in the food assistance strategy as well the reduction in the scale of GFD is consistent with the Integrated Food Security and Humanitarian Phase Classification (IPC) – coordinated by MAAIF (Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fishery) with support from FAO – for the period August 2010 through January 2011, which indicates that the majority of Karamoja is now classified in Phase 2 – moderate/borderline food-insecure. At the same time, efforts to strengthen local mechanisms in support of food security are ongoing and will need to be stepped up in parallel with the change in food assistance strategies. These include broadening and consolidating agricultural and pastoral skills through farmer field schools (FFS) and agro-pastoral field schools (APFS) through which the FAO targets over 6,000 farmers’ households in 2010 and plans to scale up to around 10,000 households in 2011. In addition, support to water management (both for agriculture and livestock), pasture improvement, strengthening market linkages, improving post-harvest handling practices, and controlling crop pests/disease and animal disease will all be crucial elements in reducing food insecurity.

1.4.2 Acholi Sub-region

For more than 15 years, the Acholi sub-region in northern Uganda bore the brunt of the LRA’s hostile activities, resulting in the internal displacement of some 1.1 million people. In the last couple of years, IDPs have steadily left the camps and moved to villages of origin or transit sites. But, according to UNHCR camp mapping data from November 2010, some 70,000 IDPs were estimated to still be residing in camps and former camps, with another 70,000 in transit sites. Of particular concern is the
fate of extremely vulnerable individuals/persons with specific needs (EVI/PSNs), including older persons, female/child-headed households, persons with disabilities, and the chronically ill. Northern Uganda has arguably the highest incidence of persons with disabilities in Uganda as a result of landmines, explosive remnants of war and other war-related injuries including mutilation by the LRA. The unique circumstances of EVIs/PSNs, an estimated 3,500 of who are stuck in the camps, means that without an effective extension of social protection programmes to cover their needs, durable solutions will remain a pipedream.

Further hampering IDP return is the presence of landmines and unexploded ordnance (UXOs). As many as five IDP camps in the newly created Lamwo District continue to host a significant number of IDPs due to the presence of such devices in return areas. Demining has been slow, mainly on account of concerns over accidents and limited reporting on the described activities. Land conflicts, inter-clan disputes, rising crime and Karamojong cattle raids have also grown in prominence as factors hindering return in districts like Kitgum, Agago and Pader. Consequently, at least a dozen IDP camps are expected to remain active in 2011.

For the majority of the population now living in return areas, access to basic services represents one of the crucial dividends of peace. Yet, inadequate health infrastructure, for instance, has left populations susceptible to epidemics, as demonstrated by the persistence of the Hepatitis E outbreak in Kitgum or the re-emergence of polio in Amuru. Compounding the situation is the poor water and sanitation coverage, with latrines only accessible to 31% of the population on average, while safe water distribution is uneven, varying from levels at par with the national average (Pader and Gulu) to levels twice worse (Lamwo and Amuru). In the Health Sector, an increase in the number of facilities thanks to funding from the PRDP is yet to be matched by an increase in staffing and equipment to make any meaningful mark on access statistics. A higher than average human immuno-deficiency virus (HIV) prevalence rate of 8.2%, second only to rates in Kampala, raises fears over the potential for the disease to explode into a pandemic in the absence or weakness of testing, treatment and counselling services. Surveillance systems, particularly for nutrition, will also need to be operationalized or strengthened across the sub-region.

Food security and livelihoods are a crucial component of durable solutions in the area. Farming skills have been seriously eroded by decades of displacement in camps; access to agricultural implements and to markets is limited; climatic factors (including erratic rains); crop pests/disease and animal disease; poor post-harvest handling practices; land access and insecurity of tenure; and poor water management are all limiting factors for food security in the area. Access to alternative livelihoods is often scarce or absent.

1.4.3  Eastern Uganda (Elgon and Busoga sub-regions)

In addition to endemic poverty, poor infrastructure and limited basic service accessibility, Eastern Uganda is susceptible to a number of hazards, the most common of which are landslides and floods. A very limited NGO and UN presence in the region is further compounded by the absence of functioning District Disaster Management Committees (DDMCs), save for Bududa whose DDMC was re-activated following the landslides in March 2010.

The land/mudslides buried three whole villages along with 300 people, destroyed property and left over 10,000 people affected. Many households were forced to move downslope into an IDP camp. Subsequently, the Government began a resettlement programme to relocate at-risk communities from this region to Kiyandongo District. The camp in Bulucheke was closed at the beginning of November 2010 when the final group of IDPs was resettled to Kiyandongo. The Government’s plan is to ultimately resettle the wider population living in areas considered to be at risk. However, given the voluntary nature of the resettlement, it is possible that some community members will be unwilling to relocate from their original homes. Moreover, protection-related concerns are bound to rise, especially in regard to family separation resulting from a situation where some members prefer to move while others choose to remain in the camp and/or surrounding villages.

In the resettlement site located in western Uganda, the population, which is expected to reach 4,000, will require humanitarian assistance such as food, shelter and non-food items (NFIs) – much of which is currently provided by the Government. According to the OPM resettlement plan, the settler population will be assisted for at least six months, after which they will be expected to become independent and subsist on their own. While medium-term self-sufficiency may be possible for able-bodied individuals (in the best case scenario), it might be impossible for vulnerable groups to achieve that state within that timeframe. Support in the domain of food security and livelihoods, as well as basic services, may be needed for a longer period.

In terms of disaster risk reduction for future occurrences, improved integrated watershed management, as well as strengthened soil and water conservation practices and improved forestry management (including community forestry), will play a pivotal role.

1.4.4 Western Uganda
Western Uganda remains of relatively little humanitarian concern. According to UNHCR, the region hosts 137,528 refugees, mainly from DRC (83,540), Rwanda (15,502), Sudan (7,227), Burundi (6,074) and Kenya (1,839). An estimated 20,000 IDPs who fled the two decade old conflict in the Acholi sub-region remain in Kiryandongo district. While Rwanda has achieved stability within its borders and political violence in Kenya has ended, conflict continues in the east of the DRC. The Congolese refugees are, therefore, unlikely to return home in the near future. In fact, fresh influxes are likely should the conflict continue or deteriorate.

1.4.5 West Nile
The political instability in neighbouring countries has also led to a significant number of refugees seeking asylum and assistance in West Nile. Refugees from Sudan (12,525), Rwanda (1,430) and DRC (536) are hosted in four settlement sites in the sub-region. The two decade-long conflict in the North also forcibly displaced inhabitants in Adjumani district. About 10,000 IDPs remain within Adjumani district who have yet to achieve a durable solution. The signing of the Sudan Comprehensive Peace Accord in 2005 opened the way for Sudanese refugees in West Nile to return home leaving only a few behind. Apart from a projected new influx in the event of a disruptive South Sudan pre-/post-referendum period, rebel (LRA) activities in the DRC might also displace people and prompt a significant movement across the border into West Nile. In the past, West Nile has also been susceptible to disease epidemics such as meningitis and cholera; the region actually lies along the so-called African meningitis belt.

The WFP currently provides food assistance to some 10,766 Sudanese, Congolese, Kenyans and Central Africans in order to reduce or stabilize acute malnutrition for those who have limited access to cultivable land. Some 1,052 are considered extremely vulnerable. The support to refugees is determined by Joint Assessment Missions (JAM) undertaken by WFP, UNHCR, OPM and other partners initially done on an annual basis but since 2009 it is done biennially. The findings of the JAM inform decision on whether the refugees need food aid as well as determine the percentage of the Recommended Daily Allowance (RDA). Broader food security, livelihood and natural resources management support may be needed, particularly in areas around former refugee camps.

1.4.6 Teso region
Teso has suffered from a prolonged series of conflicts and natural disasters primarily in the form of incursions and cattle raids by the Karamojong along the border areas of Katakwi and Amuria districts. In addition, the LRA incursion in 2003 resulted in the destruction of schools, health centres and other infrastructure. The sub-region is also still recovering from the extensive floods of 2007. All of these events resulted in the displacement of over 143,000 people, leading to the establishment of 61 IDP camps and 12 transit sites. Due to these series of shocks, Teso continues to be one of the least developed areas in the country.

19 According to WHO, the recommended average energy requirement is 2100 Kcal/day.
At present, all, but one IDP camp (Amootom Original IDP Camp) have been closed, leaving only the transit sites. An estimated 95% of the IDPs have returned home, but approximately 8,200 are still living in camps and former camps. While it may be said that the internal displacement crisis has ended, Teso has since 2009 begun to experience the negative consequences of climate variability manifested in unreliable and unpredictable weather patterns. This has had a negative impact on the food security of people at the community and at the household levels in specific geographical areas. The current food security situation, while reportedly better than in previous seasons, is fragile particularly in the water logging-prone areas of Amuria, Katakwi, Kumi and Bukedea districts.

Key humanitarian actors and the respective districts have begun to address these issues through incorporating disaster risk reduction strategies and practices into their programming (capacity-building-training of trainers (ToT) for staff on disaster risk reduction management (DRR/M), greater coordination and participation in District Disaster Management Committee (DDMC), Hazard profiling and improving Post-harvest handling infrastructure/market linkage). However, as the unexpected heavy rains in mid-2010 have clearly demonstrated, the DRR activities already in place are inadequate. Consequently, as of October 2010, a large number of communities are once again affected by serious water-logging and flooding that has caused crop failures and hampered service access and delivery.

As is the case in the Acholi sub-region, the sustainability of IDP returns and the achievement of durable solutions are jeopardized by fundamental gaps in basic service sectors, specifically in relation to boreholes, health centres, community schools and community access roads. In addition, lingering food insecurity and lack of livelihood opportunities also significantly impair the quest for durable solutions. Alongside with water logging, other factors negatively affecting agriculture and livestock include difficult access to productive means, difficult access to markets, poor post-harvest handling practices, plant and animal diseases and other pests, as well as a weak knowledge base on some key areas including farming, water management and livestock keeping.
PART 2: HUMANITARIAN APPROACH

2.1 ONGOING AND STRATEGIC HUMANITARIAN FOCUS

2.1.1 Disaster Risk Reduction

Although the general humanitarian situation has improved in recent years, Uganda is repeatedly exposed to natural disasters such as drought, floods and epidemic and epizootic outbreaks of disease, as well as pests/disease affecting crop yields. The most vulnerable regions are often caught in a vicious cycle of high vulnerability and constant humanitarian need. In order to break the vicious reactive cycle, it is necessary to create linkages between relief and development to ensure that the root causes of vulnerability are addressed in the long-term while humanitarian needs are met in the immediate term. Creation of a more coherent and strategic approach to DRR must be prioritized in order to achieve sustainable development. Of necessity is also greater political commitment as well as availability of financial resources.

The Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) adopted by Member States in 2005 has identified five priority actions that in their joint approach seek to promote a holistic and more proactive way of dealing with disaster risk reduction. Uganda’s draft National Policy on Disaster Preparedness and Management and the institution of a National Platform for disaster risk reduction are both initiatives that comply with the recommendations of the HFA.

A momentum has thus been created, which is important to sustain. However, these initiatives are yet to take root at the district level, where there is limited understanding of how to apply a disaster risk reduction approach in planning and coordination processes.

The main natural disasters affecting Uganda are exacerbated by climate change. Adaptation strategies are therefore necessary, such as hazard mapping and risk assessment, rural energy management and skills enhancement. In terms of drought impact reduction, strengthening early warning systems (and the related IPC), dissemination of appropriate dry-land farming practices, rangeland management, and improved soil and water management will be crucial. Integrated watershed management, forestry management (including community forestry), soil and water conservation practices will need to be strengthened.

2.1.2 Durable Solutions

“A Durable Solution is achieved when IDPs no longer have specific assistance and protection needs that are linked to their displacement and such persons can enjoy their human rights without discrimination resulting from their displacement”20

The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) endorsed the Durable Solutions Framework as the guiding conceptual piece for defining the end of internal displacement in December 2009. This Framework acknowledges that individuals mitigate the impact of displacement differently. Consequently then, potentially significant ongoing humanitarian needs may prevail past the point when the affected population has largely decided upon where they will settle, as is the case in much of Northern Uganda – the Acholi Region in particular.

The progress towards achieving Durable Solutions for the majority of IDPs in Northern Uganda is clear and tangible. Indeed the vast majority have decided on where they would like to live. This success, however, renders the remainder of the Durable Solution difficult to support and monitor. The Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) requires mechanisms that are finely tuned to these increasingly unique needs. Failure to respond to this change is to risk that large populations will simply fall between the cracks of macro-level analysis.

Several key indicators presented in the framework which are relevant for the Northern Uganda context include:

- Enjoyment of an adequate standard of living – meaning available, accessible, acceptable & adaptable
- Access to livelihoods & employment
- Effective and accessible mechanisms to restore housing, land and property
- Family unification
- Access to effective remedies & justice

In addition, food security and appropriate natural resource management strategies are a fundamental component of any durable solution, as is land access and tenure.

Some of these areas may well venture outside the classical humanitarian scope, but in the absence of mechanisms to address and monitor these criteria situations will arise where clear humanitarian need will be muted or remain unheard.

Currently an inter-agency assessment on the progress towards Durable Solutions is being conducted, the results of which will inform clear immediate programming needs. Some specific indicators include access to health care, safe water, medical services for survivors of gender based violence (GBV), and efficiency and consistency in resolving land conflicts.

2.2 POSSIBLE HUMANITARIAN CONSEQUENCES OF EXPECTED EVENTS

2.2.1 Presidential / Parliamentary / Local Government Elections

National elections are scheduled between 13 February and 9 March 2011. Concerns exist that the pre-election processes, which began with nominations in October 2010 and is now in the campaigns phase, could negatively impact coordination and response functions in the districts. While the humanitarian community does not expect major humanitarian repercussions (e.g. displacement) from the elections, there will be a need for continued monitoring for violence and human rights violations throughout the process.

2.2.2 Natural Disasters

Uganda’s susceptibility to natural hazards remains high. These hazards include drought (Karamoja and Teso); flooding/water logging (Teso, South Karamoja); landslides (Elgon and Western Uganda); severe storms (Acholi, Teso and Karamoja); human and animal epidemic diseases (Karamoja and Acholi); food security-related hazards such as crop pests (Karamoja and Teso) and earthquakes (Western Uganda).

Climate change is likely to increase the frequency and intensity of hydro-meteorological disasters like El Niño. Uganda is currently emerging from a moderate El Niño, which caused some damage to crop fields and hampered access to a few areas, especially in Teso and Karamoja. Another occurrence of the phenomenon would lead to flooding and water logging in these vulnerable sub-regions as well as in Elgon and Western Uganda, exposing the lack of preparedness and response planning, and negatively affecting food security. Forecasts for the October-December 2010 period, however, indicate a moderate La Niña event in the East African region. While the phenomenon typically brings below-normal rains in much of the region, in the very vulnerable Ugandan regions like Karamoja it is likely to cause off-season rains. According to FEWSNET, such rains “are likely to extend to February/March 2011 and will lessen the severity of the dry season from October 2010 to March 2011 in Karamoja.”

2.2.3 South Sudan

The referendum to determine the future status of South Sudan is scheduled for 9 January 2011. The direct impact on neighbouring countries including Uganda is considered limited, including possible conflict at border areas. There is potential for inter-tribal conflict in Eastern Equatoria in and around...
Toorit, which may impact on Lamwo and Kaabong. The Western and Central Equatoria conflicts that had driven significant displacement into West Nile in the past have now dissipated. In Central and Eastern Equatoria there is some evidence of competition among tribes to access the road networks running into Kenya and Uganda to participate in the economic benefits of trade, but this is not considered a major conflict driver at this juncture.

The challenges for Uganda are likely to come from a cascading effect caused by population movements from North to South Sudan, from people moving away from potential conflict zones in the North-South border areas, and those fleeing from localized violence. The refugee planning scenario for Northern Uganda anticipates up to 30,000 refugees in the first phase and a further 70,000 in the second post-referendum phase according to UNHCR. In advance of any refugee movements, Uganda could see considerable population movements across the border as people take the precaution of moving vulnerable family members in the pre- and post-referendum period (December-July), or resettle with extended family temporarily.

Based on the experience from previous influxes from South Sudan to Uganda, it is reasonable to assume that entry points located in West Nile (3) and in Northern Uganda (Kitgum in Acholi (1) and Kaabong in Karamoja (1) sub-regions) will be used. Capacity, logistics, location and coordination challenges will greatly impact humanitarian access. The Government of Uganda has continuously expressed readiness to maintain the borders open and offer accommodation in the event of any Sudanese influx.

Irrespective of the referendum, an escalation of LRA activities in South Sudan could trigger fear amongst current and former IDPs in Uganda, negatively impacting the full and complete recovery and return process in Northern Uganda. This particularly would apply for the nearly 12,000 IDPs remaining in camps and the 135,500 who currently reside in transit locations.

2.2.4 Instability in Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo

Activities of the Ugandan rebel Allied Democratic Forces (ADF) and the LRA combined with lawlessness in the DRC have contributed to a significant influx of Congolese refugees into south-western Uganda over the past decade. Indeed, Congolese constitute the largest group of existing refugees and new influxes in Uganda. An escalation in the DRC Government’s offensive against insurgent groups in the east of the country is likely to lead to further influxes into Uganda.

---

22 Scenarios and planning assumptions are based on inter-agency consultations both within Uganda and with partners and counterparts in the region, involving UNHCR, RCO, OCHA, WFP, UNMIS, UNICEF and NGO partners among others.
### 2.3 Triggers and Early Warning Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Triggers</th>
<th>Early Warning indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **South Sudan**              | - Excessive delay of Referendum.  
- Delayed release of referendum results and other malpractices.  
- Disagreement over referendum results/refusal to accept results.  
- Increased negative attitudes and comments from Senior officials from Sudan and South Sudan towards the referendum process. This could affect confidence in the process and create early conflicts even before the referendum.  
- Unnecessary community incitement and irresponsible undertones that could negatively charge the environment of the referendum. | - Increased population movement internally in Sudan during pre- and post-referendum periods, with an increased influx of IDPs towards the border areas.  
- Early signs of unrest.  
- Scattered and isolated incidences of violence in Abyei area and parts of South Sudan. |
| **Presidential / Parliament / local government elections** | - Candidates playing on ethnicity.  
- Unnecessary community incitement and irresponsible undertones that could negatively charge the environment of the elections.  
- Delayed release of election results and other malpractices.  
- Refusal by the ruling party to concede defeat in case the opposition wins. | - Scattered and isolated incidences of violence in most parts of Uganda.  
- Early signs of unrest amongst the population due to charged political environment. |
| **Natural disasters**        | - Heavy rains in flood-prone Teso and land slide-prone Elgon regions.  
- Contamination of main water sources in flood-prone communities of Teso and Karamoja regions.  
- Drought.  
- Increased and/or continuing incidence of animal disease and of pests/disease affecting crop yields. | - Continued rains in the highly vulnerable regions of Karamoja and Elgon region (floods, landslides).  
- Increased appearance of cracks on steep mountain slopes.  
- Increased incidences of reported water-related diseases.  
- Delayed onset of rains, a warning for drought.  
- Recurrence of transboundary animal diseases (TADs).  
- Livestock mortality. |
2.4 Monitoring and Preparedness Plans

Close monitoring of key indicators, including pre- and post-election security and possible humanitarian consequences of potential unrest, impact of insecurity across the border of DRC and southern Sudan is essential to ensure a ready and appropriate response capacity.

As lead agency, UNHCR has worked closely with the Government on developing a contingency plan for reception of potential refugees from South Sudan that closely monitors the evolving situation. In response to natural disasters, the OPM with support from OCHA and other UN agencies has assisted the districts in Acholi and Karamoja regions to develop district contingency plans. Specifically in Karamoja, pilot early warning systems for drought are currently being implemented within district structures with support from FAO and Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED) with the potential for replication elsewhere in the country.

2.5 Coordination Arrangements

As the ultimate coordinator of all actions involved in emergencies, the Government of Uganda holds the responsibility for disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response and early recovery. The Government's preparedness & response strategy at the national level is soon to be based on the National Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management, led by the Directorate of Relief, Disaster Preparedness and Refugees within the OPM and assisted by the relevant line ministries. The draft Disaster Preparedness and Management Policy mandates all districts to have a DDMC; however, in practice very few DDMCs have proven functional. Those considered functional are mainly in Acholi, Teso, Lango and Karamoja regions. For other parts of the country, DDMCs remain non-functional with district officials citing lack of resources and limited guidance from the national government level on how to set them up.

The DDMCs are mandated to coordinate any disaster-related activities in their respective districts in a holistic manner, i.e. preparedness, response, recovery and development. The DDMCs are chaired by the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) and comprise of heads of technical departments from the districts (i.e. Production, Health, Water/Sanitation, Probation/Social Services, Education, etc.), the District Police Commander, UPDF and representatives from UN agencies and the NGO community including the Uganda Red Cross. The effectiveness of the DDMCs varies from district to district. In general, the structures are weak including the management and coordination linkages between district and central government level and in between districts. Continued support to the capacity-building of the DDMCs is therefore required and remains an important priority to ensure effective coordination of disaster management.

The National Emergency Coordination and Operations Centre (NECOC) within the OPM deals with sudden onset emergencies and is responsible for the effective coordination and networking of the various emergency response institutions of government such as the Fire Brigade, Police Rapid Response Units, UPDF Emergency Support Units, Uganda Red Cross, hospitals emergency units and the private emergency firms.

In 2008, the Government established the National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in compliance with the recommendations of the 2005 Hyogo Framework for Action. Led by OPM, the National Platform invites humanitarian and development partners to work with the Government on the management of disaster risk reduction. The DDMCs are accountable and report to the National Platform in Kampala on actions related to disaster risk reduction.

The cluster system for coordinating humanitarian action was established for Acholi region in early 2006. With a steady decrease of humanitarian needs and a likewise increasing responsibility by the Government to lead the continued humanitarian and recovery efforts, the cluster approach will come

---

23 The Policy on Disaster Preparedness and Management was scheduled for Cabinet approval on 11 October, but due to the pre-elections, the approval has been postponed until further notice.

24 The DDMCs are to be renamed DDMTCs (District Disaster Management Technical Committee) according to the new national policy on disaster preparedness and management.
to an end by 31 December 2010. A process on cluster adaptation has been ongoing since 2009 that aims to hand over all coordination functions to the Government.

In the absence of new humanitarian emergencies, the OCHA country office will reduce its presence substantially and gradually merge into the Resident Coordinator’s Offices in Kampala, Gulu and Moroto in form of a Humanitarian Support Unit supported by the OCHA sub-regional office in Nairobi.

To ensure UN effective and efficient coordination in Northern Uganda, the UN Country Team (UNCT) in April 2010 introduced an integrated coordination system at field level under the leadership of a UN Area Coordinator (UNAC) who reports to the Humanitarian/Resident Coordinator. While the UNAC function is yet to be established for West Nile region, UNACs are already operational in Acholi under the leadership of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and in Karamoja under the leadership of UNICEF. In both Acholi and Karamoja, OCHA staff will support the UNAC in coordinating disaster risk reduction and humanitarian response efforts. Under the concept of ‘delivering-as-one’, the UNAC will provide support to the districts with particular attention to fostering coherence amongst international aid efforts, acting as liaison between government leadership and international aid efforts within the sector strategy and supporting capacity-building of the district government sector lead in coordination responsibility.

2.6 RESOURCE MECHANISMS TO RESPOND TO EMERGENCIES

With no collective resource mobilization mechanism in place for Uganda in 2011 to address chronic humanitarian needs, humanitarian agencies are ultimately left to coordinate and conduct their own respective fundraising. Work towards integrating humanitarian action into recovery and development frameworks has become a strategy that is adopted more by the Government and development agencies. Rather than maintaining a single humanitarian focus and agenda, donors are largely encouraged to support integrated strategies where humanitarian action is secondary to - and more in support of development goals and objectives.

Although the humanitarian community is scaling down its response capacity, there remain, however, potential hazards – threats of drought, floods, diseases outbreak, and displacement - which may require an urgent and immediate response. In addition, the termination of some typically humanitarian mechanisms, such as the CAP and cluster coordination, will still leave a range of humanitarian and early recovery needs to be considered, including the consolidation of progress in finding durable solutions for the reintegration of returnees, as well as strengthening local capacity, preparedness and resilience in the most vulnerable areas of the country. In such circumstances, a number of resource mechanisms are available for the Government and the humanitarian community.

2.6.1 Government Funds

While UN agencies, the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement and international NGOs internally have financial reserves that quickly can release funds in case of large-scale emergencies, nationally in Uganda, such Government fund does not exist. The OPM currently relies on emergency releases from Ministry of Finance that are authorized by a Cabinet sitting during an emergency. This process is time consuming, bureaucratic and unable to provide timely and effective response to save lives. However, establishment of a contingency fund to be managed by Department for Disaster Preparedness under OPM was a recommendation from the Emergency Preparedness and Response (EP&R) Planning Workshop held in August (see also section 1.3.)

2.6.2 Emergency Response Fund (ERF)

The ERF was established in June 2009 in Uganda by the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) to support rapid response at the onset of a new emergency. With a financial ceiling of $1 million, the ERF provides NGOs with an opportunity to access funds up to a maximum of $150,000 per project. In lieu of a Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP) and in support of OCHA’s transition strategy for Uganda, the ERF will be further expanded to address residual humanitarian needs to avoid relapse in the humanitarian situation and disaster preparedness activities to support Government efforts and policy in its promotion of DRR. In line with OCHA’s transition strategy and reduced OCHA presence, OCHA
will continue to perform the overall secretariat function for the management of the ERF on behalf of the HC/RC until the Fund’s closure at the end of 2011.

2.6.3  Flash Appeal
In case of a large scale emergency, the humanitarian community under the auspices of the HC/RC will be able to launch a Flash Appeal, which is a tool used for structuring a coordinated humanitarian response for the first three to six months of an emergency. It provides a concise overview of urgent life saving needs, and may include recovery projects that can be implemented within the timeframe of the Appeal. Government ministries cannot appeal for funds directly in a Flash Appeal, but may be partners in UN or NGO projects. For more information: http://ochaonline.un.org/tabid/5839/language/en-US/Default.aspx.

2.6.4  Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)
The CERF is a humanitarian fund established by the UN to enable more timely and reliable humanitarian assistance to those affected by natural disasters and armed conflicts. CERF grant component has two windows; one for rapid response and one for under-funded emergencies. The CERF is funded by voluntary contributions from Member States around the globe, private businesses, foundations and individuals. The Fund is managed by OCHA in New York and allows the UN and International Organization for Migration (IOM) to react immediately when a disaster strikes by making funding available for life-saving activities. For more information: http://ochaonline.un.org/cerf/CERFHome/tabid/1705/language/en-US/Default.aspx.

2.6.5  Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF)
The DREF is created by the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) to ensure that immediate financial support is available for Red Cross/ Red Crescent response to emergencies. Allocations may be made as start-up funds in the case of large-scale disasters and also to cover the costs of response to small-scale emergency operations and preparedness activities in the case of imminent disaster. For more information: http://www.ifrc.org/what/disasters/responding/drs/tools/dref.asp.
3.1 OVERVIEW OF ONGOING NEEDS ASSESSMENTS IN UGANDA

In Northern Uganda, an IDP durable solution assessment steered by UNHCR and a task force of the Gulu DDMC has rolled out in the Acholi sub-region. The assessment aims:

1. to assess the level of local integration, return and resettlement and determine the status of Durable Solutions.
2. to advise the competent and relevant authorities on the gaps, challenges and needs towards the achievement of durable solutions.
3. to inform the stakeholders on further realignment of priorities and programming to address humanitarian, recovery and development needs.

The Assessment of Durable Solutions is expected to:

4. provide overall status of achievement of Durable Solutions in the sub-region, disaggregated by residential group, location, gender and age;
5. improve the availability and quality of quantitative and qualitative data;
6. provide a more accurate estimate of the returnee and resettled population, disaggregated by gender and age;
7. provide a dataset of information on the return process, dynamics and push- and pull-factors, disaggregated by gender and age;
8. assist government, humanitarian and development actors to prioritize their interventions and plans in line with the findings.

WFP in partnership with UNICEF and UNHCR and in close coordination with counterpart Government Institutions are undertaking food security and nutrition assessments in Acholi, Teso and Karamoja Regions as well as among refugee populations in Southwest and West Nile sub-regions of Uganda. The results are expected to be available in November-December and will inform the design and adjustment of programme interventions for 2011 in the respective areas.

FAO, with support from the European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department (ECHO), commissioned a Household Economy Analysis study in Karamoja in May 2010. The exercise drew participation of the OPM, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, FEWSNET, Save the Children (SC) and Samaritans Purse (SP). As part of the exercise, a Karamoja livelihoods strategy report and baseline profiles for the three livelihood zones were generated. To explore further on specific questions relating to livelihoods and food security, five complementary studies were further commissioned. This was followed up with an HEA-based seasonal assessment carried out in October – November. The reports provide vital empirical evidence that can inform future programming in the region.

3.2 OVERVIEW OF STRATEGIC PLANS

3.2.1 National Development Plan (NDP) for Uganda

The NDP is a medium-term development strategy for the Government of Uganda following the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP). The NDP, that covers the period 2010-15, includes sector specific targets, with an overall theme of “Growth, Employment and Prosperity for Socio-Economic Transformation” and has the following objectives:

- Increasing household incomes and promoting equity.
- Enhancing the availability and quality of gainful employment.
- Improving stock and quality of economic infrastructure.
- Increasing access to quality social services.
- Promoting science, technology, innovation and information communication technology (ICT) to enhance competitiveness.
- Enhancing human capital development.
- Strengthening good governance, defence and security.
- Promoting sustainable population and use of the environment and natural resources.
Within these objectives, priority actions are required in:

i) industrialization and value-addition.

ii) development and promotion of the tourism industry.

iii) accelerating agricultural growth.

iv) improving the stock and quality of physical infrastructure.

v) human resource development.

The conceptual framework for the NDP encompasses four clusters, namely, the primary growth sectors, complementary sectors, social service sectors and enabling sectors.

3.2.2 Peace, Recovery and Development Programme (PRDP) for Northern Uganda

The PRDP is a three-year programme within the NDP that commits the Government with support and contribution from partners to stabilize and recover Northern Uganda through a set of coherent programmes in one organizing framework following more than 20 years of conflict and instability. The PRDP provides the framework specifically for Northern Uganda. The PRDP was launched in 2007 and began implementation in July 2008.

The programme seeks to contribute to community recovery and promote an improvement in the conditions and quality of life of IDPs in camps, completing the return and reintegration of IDPs, initiating rehabilitation and development activities among other resident communities and ensuring that the most vulnerable are protected and served. The ultimate outcome is to ensure cessation of armed hostilities, restabilizing the rule of law, enabling the judicial and legal services to become functional, protection of human rights and strengthening local governance. The programme has four core strategic objectives: i) Consolidation of state authority; ii) Rebuilding and empowering communities; iii) Revitalization of the economy; and, iv) Peace-building and reconciliation. It has a total budget of approximately $600 million.

3.2.3 Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Programme (KIDDP)

The Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Programme (KIDDP) is a Government programme (- and an elaborative component of the PRDP) that aims to contribute to human security and promote conditions for recovery and development in Karamoja. The programme has formulated a strategy that defines interventions by Government and other stakeholders necessary to achieve a comprehensive and coordinated disarmament to enhance sustainable peace and development in Karamoja. While the PRDP mostly focuses on peace, recovery and development, the KIDDP is primarily intended to create a ‘gun-free’ environment, which will create parity between Karamoja and the greater North of Uganda, in order for the PRDP to become sustainable.

A revised version of the programme, covering the period 2007-10, tries to engage all stakeholders and affected communities in a participatory process to achieve effective and sustainable disarmament. The following components are identified as priority objectives:

- Ensure adequate security for the entire population.
- Establish law and order.
- Ensure delivery of basic social services.
- Support to development of alternative means of livelihood.
- Undertake Stakeholder mobilization, sensitization and education.
- Enhance coordination and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems.
- Cross-cutting Issues.

3.2.4 The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

Through the UNDAF, the UN system in Uganda supports national efforts and capacities to ensure that growth, prosperity and social transformation as envisaged in the National Development Plan (NDP) will be equitable, inclusive and sustainable in a manner that will contribute to reaching the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and enhance peace, recovery and development in the North.
In line with the UN reform on ‘delivering-as-one’, the UNDAF has been accorded joint programming and joint programmes as a means of implementation and to joint institutional arrangements for management and review of progress and results. Together with the Government, the UNDAF has adopted three expected outcomes for the period 2010-14:

1. Capacity of selected Government Institutions and Civil Society improved for good governance and realization of Human Rights that lead to reducing geographic, socio-economic and demographic disparities in attainment of Millennium Declaration and Goals.

2. Vulnerable segments of the population increasingly benefit from sustainable livelihoods and in particular improved agricultural systems and employment opportunities to cope with the population dynamics, increasing economic disparities, economic impact of HIV&AIDS, environment shocks and recovery challenges.

3. Vulnerable populations in Uganda, especially in the north, increasingly benefit from sustainable and quality social services.

3.2.5 The United Nations Peace Building and Recovery Assistance Programme (UNPRAP)

In support of the Government’s efforts to promote peace and recovery in Northern Uganda, the UN system in 2009, in close collaboration with partners, developed the UNPRAP - a three-year common strategy for the UN's operational activities for the transition from humanitarian relief to recovery and long-term development in Northern Uganda. The UNPRAP is aimed at aligning UN interventions with mainly the PRDP and KIDDP, as well as facilitating the UN system’s goal to ‘deliver as one’ in Uganda. The UNPRAP will serve as a joint planning, coordination and monitoring tool for UN assistance programmes in Northern Uganda.

The UNPRAP has identified four areas in which it can complement and add value to achievement of the PRDP strategic priorities and which will frame its recovery assistance in Northern Uganda: i) human rights, justice and reconciliation; ii) local governance; iii) social services (education, health, nutrition and HIV/AIDS, water and environmental sanitation); and iv) livelihoods and socio-economic safety nets. The UNPRAP addresses these priorities in the geographic areas of North Central Uganda, North Eastern Uganda (Karamoja), and Northwest Uganda (West Nile), where the UN has existing presence and capacities on which to build.

3.2.6 The United Nations Joint Programme on Climate Change (JPCC)

The JPCC is a five-year cooperation agreement between the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) and the UN (FAO, Human Settlements Programme [UN HABITAT], OCHA, United Nations Capital Development Fund [UNCDF], UNDP, United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA], United Nations Environmental Programme [UNEP], United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], WHO and WFP). The Joint Programme organizes its activities through the UNDAF and supports the Government’s priorities on climate change, as outlined in the new NDP. In alignment with the UNDAF, the central focus of this Joint Programme is to increase national capacity to respond to climate change challenges. The interventions pursued are those in which the participating UN agencies have a comparative advantage to deliver on both adaptation and mitigation.

3.2.7 The Karamoja Action Plan for Food Security (KAPFS)

The KAPFS is a five-year Government action plan for implementation of the livelihood component in the KIDDP for the period 2009-14 (launched however in February 2010). The Action Plan is an outcome of consultations at both local and national levels, and intensive situational analysis of the food and livelihood zones of Karamoja and provides a strategic framework for interventions towards reducing food insecurity and dependence.

The objective of the Action Plan is to ensure sustainable food security and increased household income in Karamoja through increased crop production and productivity, improved livestock production and productivity, increased functionality of existing water for production facilities (dams and valley tanks), improved post-harvest handling and storage facilities and improved access to markets. The plan also supports value addition, restoration and revitalization of the degraded environment and strengthening of capacities of the community and stakeholders. It has a total budget of approximately $40 million.
I. ELGON AND EASTERN UGANDA PROFILE – NOVEMBER 2010
II. **West Nile Profile – November 2010**

West Nile Profile - November 2010

- **Summary**
  - Mortality rate: 0.5 (per 10,000)
  - 10-week incidence: 12,190 (per 10,000)
  - 20-week incidence: 25,910 (per 10,000)

- **Water Access**
  - Distance to water points: 1.5 km
  - Water points functionality: 100%

- **Legend**
  - Lake/ Rivers
  - Refugee Settlement
  - Size Yielded according to population
    - OCP
    - SDF
    - UNHCR

- **Current of Infection Phase**
  - Generalized
  - Isolation
  - Contact

- **Risk of Worrying Phase**
  - High risk of complication

- **Data Source**
  - IHS 2010
  - WHO

- **Map Details**
  - Legends: Lake/River, Refugee Settlement
  - Scale: 1:100,000

- **Disclaimer**
  - This map is a tool to guide. Please consult with UNHCR for possible on-site adaptation.
III. West Uganda Profile – November 2010

West Uganda Profile - November 2010
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IV. Teso Profile – November 2010

**Summary**
- Acute Malnutrition: CRAs: 14.4%, SAPs: 1.2%
  - (national averages: CRAs 6%, SAPs 2%)
- Latent Coverage: 93%
- Primary school gross enrolment rate: 57%–60%
- Water source: Reduction in water sources attributed to river diversion and land use
- Civil Instability: Threats of famines and fights continue to exacerbate conditions
  - (Ankole and Karamoja)

**Legend**
- Flooded and Water logged areas Sep 2010
- % Population accessing water
- % Latent coverage

**Risk of Worsening Phase**
1. High risk of going to phase 4
2. Moderate risk of going to phase 3
3. High risk of going to phase 3
4. Moderate risk of going to phase 4

**Current or Imminent Phase**
- 1. Generally Food Secure
- 2. Generally Food Secure
- 3. Borderline Food Insecure
- 4. Acute Food and Livelihood Crisis
- 5. Urgent/Immediate Humanitarian Catastrophe

**Data Source**
- OCHA, Uganda
- 22/01/2011
- 09/10/2011
- Data from UNOCHA
- Integrated Phase and Technical Framework Classification
- OCHA
- World Food Programme
- FAO
- Crisis Centre
- Humanitarian Response

**Map Description**
- This map is a result of a project. Who is the person behind this map? And how it came to be? Official assessment of impact and scale is not yet available for consent by the United Nations.
V. **Karamoja Profile – November 2010**

**SUMMARY**
- CMR: 0.716,000/day (National average: 0.25% to 0.000/day)
- US MR: 0.8/10.000/day
- GAM: 11.3%
- SAM: 1.6%

- **Stunting:**
  - General Stunting: 46.2%
  - Moderate Stunting: 32.5%
  - Severe Stunting: 17.4%
  - National average: 35%

- **Latrine Coverage:** 17%
- **Water Coverage:** 24%
  - Accessing water within 2km
- **Health Center Coverage:** 29%
  - Accessing a Health Center within 5km
- **Education facility Coverage:** 15.6%
  - Accessing a School within 2.5km

---

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-County</th>
<th>CMR</th>
<th>US MR</th>
<th>GAM</th>
<th>SAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbaa</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agago</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agago</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apac</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroto</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graphs:**

- **Water Source Accessibility**
- **Health Center Accessibility**
- **Education facility Accessibility**

---

**Legend**
- **Current or imminent Phase**
  - IA Generally Food Secure
  - IB Generally Food secure
  - Moderate Borderline Food insecure
  - Acute Food and Livelihood Crisis
  - Humanitarian Catastrophe

**Risk of Worsening Phase**
- 1a High risk of magnitude worsening
- 2b Moderate risk of magnitude worsening
- 3a High risk of going to phase 3
- 3b Moderate risk of going to phase 3
- 4a High risk of going to phase 4
- 4b Moderate risk of going to phase 4

**Data Sources:**
- 2010 Statistics: UGSC, 2010
- Current Security and Food security Phase Classification: OCICAT
- Central Food Security/Stabilization Analysis
- OCICAT: OCICAT Project data: May 2012
- OCICAT: OCICAT Project data: May 2012

**Map Source:**
- Uganda Ministry of Health
- UHC Program Uganda
- Uganda Health Sector Development Project
- Uganda Health Sector Development Project
- Uganda Health Sector Development Project
- Uganda Health Sector Development Project

**Map Features:**
- This map is a work in progress. Please consult all sources for latest possibly corrected data.

---

**Map Distance:**
- Kilometers
- Map Distance
- Coordinates: 0.000000, 0.000000
- Coordinates: 0.000000, 0.000000
- Coordinates: 0.000000, 0.000000

---

24
VI. ACHOLI PROFILE – NOVEMBER 2010
## ANNEX II: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTED</td>
<td>Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development <a href="http://www.acted.org">www.acted.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADF</td>
<td>Allied Democratic Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APFS</td>
<td>agro-pastoral field schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTU</td>
<td>Anti-Stock Theft Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Chief Administrative Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Consolidated Appeal or Consolidated Appeal Process <a href="http://www.humanitarianappeal.net">www.humanitarianappeal.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Central Broadcasting Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>Contagious Caprine Pleuropneumonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERF</td>
<td>Central Emergency Response Fund <a href="http://cerf.un.org">cerf.un.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDMC</td>
<td>District Disaster Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDMTC</td>
<td>District Disaster Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREF</td>
<td>Disaster Relief Emergency Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR/M</td>
<td>disaster risk reduction management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>East African Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP&amp;R</td>
<td>Emergency Preparedness and Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF</td>
<td>Emergency Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVIs</td>
<td>extremely vulnerable individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations <a href="http://www.fao.org">www.fao.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFS</td>
<td>farmer field schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDIs</td>
<td>Foreign Direct Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEWSNET</td>
<td>Famine Early Warning Systems Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>gross domestic product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFD</td>
<td>General Food Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Humanitarian Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT</td>
<td>Humanitarian Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
<td>household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFA</td>
<td>Hyogo Framework for Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>human immuno-deficiency virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee <a href="http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc">www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>information communication technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP(s)</td>
<td>internally displaced person (people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFPRI</td>
<td>International Food Policy Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td>International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPC</td>
<td>Integrated Food Security and Humanitarian Phase Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAM</td>
<td>Joint Assessment Missions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPCC</td>
<td>United Nations Joint Programme on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPFS</td>
<td>Karamoja Action Plan for Food Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIDDP</td>
<td>Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRA</td>
<td>Lord’s Resistance Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAIF</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fishery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWE</td>
<td>Ministry of Water and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NECOC</td>
<td>National Emergency Coordination and Operations Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>National Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>National Eligibility Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>non-food item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURD</td>
<td>Northern Uganda Recovery and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPM</td>
<td>Office of the Prime Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAP</td>
<td>Poverty Eradication Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRDP</td>
<td>Government’s Peace, Recovery and Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSNs</td>
<td>persons with specific needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>Recommended Daily Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TADs</td>
<td>transboundary animal diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToT</td>
<td>training of trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations [<a href="http://www.un.org">www.un.org</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAC</td>
<td>UN Area Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCDF</td>
<td>United Nations Capital Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCT</td>
<td>United Nations Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCTAD</td>
<td>United Nations Conference on Trade and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF</td>
<td>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme [<a href="http://www.undp.org">www.undp.org</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environmental Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [<a href="http://www.unesco.org">www.unesco.org</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund [<a href="http://www.unfpa.org">www.unfpa.org</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees [<a href="http://www.unhcr.org">www.unhcr.org</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPRAP</td>
<td>United Nations Peace Building and Recovery Assistance Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDF</td>
<td>Uganda People’s Defence Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UXOs</td>
<td>unexploded ordnance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme [<a href="http://www.wfp.org">www.wfp.org</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization [<a href="http://www.who.int">www.who.int</a>]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>