

**POST DISTRIBUTION MONITORING AND SATISFACTION/EVALUATION SURVEY
EMERGENCY LIVELIHOOD SUPPORT THROUGH CASH FOR WORK PROJECT**

**Implemented by Living Earth Uganda, with support from UNDP funded by
UN Central Emergency Response Fund**



Submitted by

Dr Mugizi Wilson (PhD)

Survey Team Leader

C/o College of Education and External Studies,

Makerere University, P.O. 7062, Kampala

January 2019

Acknowledgements

Many people and institutions have contributed to the successful completion of this assignment. However, the Consultant may not be able to mention all and their specific contribution but we feel indebted to mention a few; the staff of Living Earth Uganda, in particular Mr. Swithern Tumwine, he Team Leader/Executive Director, Mr Christopher Amwiine the project operations and quality assurance technical expert, and Mr.Enoch Mutambi, business development technical expert, Moyo district. Our work would have been very difficult or impossible without all the technical and supervisory support provided.

We also deeply appreciate the support and cooperation of the district leadership, Managers and staff of the various partner organisations that we worked with during this Assessment. The wonderful co-operation demonstrated by all respondents that participated in this assessment at both household and community level. Last, but not least, we fully appreciate the dedication and commitment of the data collectors/Assessment Sub-teams for a job well done despite the challenges associated with tracing some of the beneficiary households; their commitment and interest in the work contributed to the accomplishment of the assessment.

Dr Mugizi Wilson (PhD)
Survey team leader

Table of Contents

List of tables.....	4
Acronyms.....	5
Executive summary.....	6
1.0 Introduction and Background.....	7
1.2 Project Description	8
1.3 Overall project Objective:	8
1.4 Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) and satisfaction survey objectives	9
2.0 METHODOLOGY	10
2.1 Survey Design and Approaches	10
2.3 Key Informant Interviews	10
2.4 Focus Group Discussions	10
2.7 Data Analysis	11
3.0 Evaluation Findings	13
3.1 Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents	13
3.2 Relevance of CFW	14
3.2.1 Reception of the project by the community	14
3.2.2 Addressing the priority needs of the community	15
3.2.3 National development plans.....	16
3.2.4 Strategic Plan	16
3.2.5 Major challenges encountered during the execution of the project	17
3.3 Effectiveness and efficiency	17
3.4 Efficiency	17
3.8 Benefits of participating in the Cash for Work Project.....	23
3.9 Impact	24
3.10 Challenges in Project Implementation, Lessons Learnt and Best Practices.....	25
3.10.1 Challenges in Project Implementation	25
3.11 Key Successes	26

3.12 Lessons Learnt	27
3.13 Sustainability.....	28
4.0 Conclusions and Recommendations	29
4.2 Recommendations.....	30

List of tables

Table 1:Summary of socio-demographic characteristics of respondents	13
Table 2:Why was your HH Selected to benefit from the CFW Activity.....	16
Table 4:Why was you household selected to benefit from CFW Activity.....	20

Acronyms

LEU	Living Earth Uganda
CFW	Cash For Work
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
PDM	Post Distribution Monitoring
OPM	Office of Prime Minister
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Scientist
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
KII	Key Informant Interviews
CERF	Central Emergency Response Fund
UN	United Nations
WASH	Water Sanitation and Hygiene
ReHope	Refugee and Host Population Empowerment
HHs	Households
NGO	None Governmental Organizations

Executive summary

This report is a post distribution and satisfaction/evaluation survey for emergency livelihood through Cash for Work project targeting 2250, (75% women and 25% youth), 70% refugees and 30% host community beneficiaries implemented by Living Earth Uganda with support from UNDP, funded by central emergency response fund. The project was implemented in Imvepi refugee settlement, covering zone 2 and 3 of refugee settlement and 4 parishes of Odupi sub county host communities in Arua and Palorinya refugee settlement zone 3 East and West of the settlement and 3 parishes of Ttula sub county host communities in Moyo district. It details the background and purpose of the survey, the methodology employed, the findings and discussion, conclusions and recommendations. The overall project objective is to provide emergency livelihood support to 2,250 refugees and hosting community members in target areas.

The methodology; The PDM/evaluation survey was a cross-sectional that used mixed research approaches involving quantitative and qualitative methods. The survey adopted a 4 way mixed approach method of household interviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussions and observations to collect data for purposes of complementarity, triangulation, and validation of responses.

The findings; shows that the community received the project positively as highlighted by their active participation in engagement meetings, mobilisation and trainings. The selection processes of beneficiaries was reported by over ninety five (95.5%) percent against 4.5% to have been fair and satisfactorily. The project considered the most vulnerable households in selection process of beneficiaries as indicated by respondents over sixty eight (68.3%) percent of the beneficiaries were considered because they were poor while 23.5% were vulnerable and the rest 8.2% were people with households of people with challenged persons/disabilities.

The survey further established that the respondents expectations were included in the project design by involving them at all stages of project implementation. They said that they were also consulted on the kind of projects they preferred and participated in monitoring and reporting on the project through periodic reflection reviews. The records further revealed that 100% of participants completed 30 working days and (98%) of beneficiaries had received their payments while only 2% indicated that they had not received the funds by the time of the survey this was attributed to technical error in registering the sim cards, and transferring funds by the service provider.

There was evidence of exceeding the target of planned activities with 207.7 kilometers of rehabilitated roads, 53.3 kilometres of new roads in Arua and Moyo district, 2.1 kms of drainage channel opened, constructed 1 community hall, 2 market shades with 32 stalls, 11 culvert bridge lines on 8 bridges, one sports recreation ground, 23 garbage pits and one valley dam for completion.

The challenges observed was unfavourable weather and unreliable rainfall conditions affecting the project areas. It was observed that the rain season in the area is not reliable after the month of September, this affected tree planting during the dry season that limits survival growth of the tree.

In conclusion, the survey team observed that the project was implemented within the timeframe of 5 months, and realized the project target, though we would recommend increase of timeframe to support mentorship of beneficiaries and create time space for reflection. There is a need to reduce the gender gap among the beneficiaries by increasing the male participants to at least 40% of beneficiaries. Lastly, the team recommended strong integration and promotion of advocacy skills by allocating enough time to support the beneficiaries psychosocial healing need to sustain the impact and outcomes of the project.

1.0 Introduction and Background

This report is a post distribution and satisfaction/evaluation survey for emergency livelihood through Cash for Work project targeting 2250 beneficiaries in Moyo and Arua district implemented by Living Earth Uganda with support from UNDP, funded by central emergency response fund. It details the background and purpose of the survey, the methodology employed, the findings and discussion, conclusions and recommendations. The survey was carried out in Imvepi refugee settlement and Odupi sub county host communities in Arua and Palorinya refugee settlement and Ttula sub county host communities in Moyo district. Thus, the findings highlighted in this report present the general picture of all the project beneficiaries in the two settlements and the respective host communities.

1.1 Background

Uganda has received an unprecedented influx of refugees since 2016 that by September 2017 the refugee population was nearly 1.35 million people. As of April 2018, a total of 1,462,886 refugees and asylum seekers are recorded in the country. Most of these refugees (1,061,892) came from South Sudan and are mainly settled in West Nile districts. Uganda has a progressive refugee protection policy, providing refugees with freedom of movement, the right to work and establish businesses, the right to documentation and access to national social services. The country pursues a non-camp settlement policy, by which refugees are allocated plots of land for shelter and agricultural production, stretching out over vast territories. However, the refugee caseload and new arrivals continues to put enormous pressure on the country's resources, in particular on land, basic service delivery systems (including health, education, water and sanitation), the humanitarian partners' capacity to respond to the crisis, and on the ability to maintain Uganda's generous refugee policy. Acute needs remain in protection, food assistance, shelter, health and nutrition, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) and emergency livelihoods.

To support the progressive Government policy, the UN and the World Bank developed the Refugee and host Population Empowerment (ReHoPE) framework, a comprehensive strategy to build the resilience and self-reliance of refugees as well as host communities. UNDP Emergency Response and Resilience Strategy for Refugees and Host Communities, based on the ReHoPE framework and in line with Uganda's second National Development Plan and the Settlement Transformative Agenda, seeks to strengthen the resilience of refugees, host community

members, district local government and relevant national institutions to cope with and recover from the impact of the large influx of refugees. The aim is to provide emergency support, while investing in existing national and local systems to ensure they can adequately serve both host and refugee communities.

1.2 Project Description

In 2018 UNDP received a CERF (Central Emergency Response Fund) grant to respond to life-saving livelihood needs of refugees and host communities. Through the CERF allocation, UNDP targeted to support 2,250 vulnerable households in Imvepi zone 2 and 3 refugee settlement and host communities covering 4 parishes of Odupi sub county in Arua and Palorinya, zone 3 East and West refugee settlement and 3 parishes of Ubbi, Parolinya and Legu, Ttula sub county in Moyo districts, to provide non-farming livelihood support through cash for work. The two settlements were recognised as the most underserved in terms of livelihood support, among all settlements hosting South Sudanese refugees. The refugee population in Imvepi settlement has reached a total of 128,249 refugees, while Palorinya settlement currently hosts 163,322 refugees. Living Earth Uganda implemented the emergency livelihood through cash for work project. This project was for a period of 5 months, implemented between July and December, 2018. In this project, each beneficiary completed 30 days of cash for work activities in the period of 4 months, resulting in an average of 7.5 days worked per month, at the rate of US\$ 4 per day in Arua and US\$ 5 in Moyo district. The cash transfers were undertaken through mobile money to ensure the safety and transparency of the cash transfers because of minimising the physical movement of cash. Over the course of the project, each beneficiary received Uganda shillings 450,000 in Arua and 600,000 in Moyo district.

1.3 Overall project Objective:

To provide emergency livelihood support to 2,250 refugees and hosting community members in Palorinya refugee settlement and host communities of 3 parishes of Ttula sub county, Moyo district, and Imvepi refugee settlement and host communities of Odupi sub county, Arua district, through cash for work activities.

1.4 Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) and satisfaction survey objectives

The Living Earth Uganda conducted post distribution monitoring and satisfaction survey/evaluation for cash for work project with the objective to;

1. Check whether the agreed amount of cash has been received by the intended beneficiaries and also to check whether diversion of cash or its re-distribution took place.
2. Assess whether the cash payments were the most appropriate type of assistance, and therefore whether cash should be adjusted or whether alternative assistance should be provided.
3. Identify and prevent protection risks: monitoring whether cash distributions created protection risks for the beneficiaries.
4. Assess the overall impact of the project intervention (changes in peoples' lives) of the project on the community, the appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project in terms of community needs, project design, implementation, activities and provide specific actionable and practical recommendations for focus on key sectors of the stakeholders.
5. Provide information on what worked, what did not work, why and whether the underlying theories and assumptions used in the project were valid.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Survey Design and Approaches

The evaluation was a cross-sectional that used mixed research approaches involving quantitative and qualitative methods. The mixed approach was adopted for purposes of complementarity, triangulation, and validation of responses. The main methods used to collect data in this survey were mainly four i.e., household interviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussions and observations.

2.2 Household Interviews

In total 400 household interviews were conducted in both the settlement and host communities of Palorinya and Imvepi. Of these HHIs, 67% were conducted in the settlement while the remaining 33% were conducted in the host communities. Households that were interviewed in each zone/village were selected randomly from the beneficiary lists. A household questionnaire was developed for this purpose. The HHIs were conducted by a team of trained research assistants conversant with Local languages spoken by refugees and host communities and other research assistants who were not conversant with local languages were supported by interpreters from Palorinya and Imvepi in Moyo and Arua districts respectively.

2.3 Key Informant Interviews

The consultant conducted key informant interviews (KIIs) with key people who were believed to have relevant information. In some cases, courtesy calls were made to some offices to obtain permission to interview some of their staff. Overall, 18 KIIs were conducted and the list of persons interviewed is appended to this report.

2.4 Focus Group Discussions

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were conducted with purposively selected participants mobilised with the help of cash for work supervisors and LEU field staff. Each FGD comprised of 6- 12 participants.

2.5 Field Observations:

Field observations were also used hence making inferences and judgments from what was seen. Relevant photographs of the phenomena were taken to give a visual impression of the CFW success cases of some of the beneficiaries that invested some of the money received after cash for work activity.

2.6 Sample Size

The sample size comprised 400 respondents including 275 refugees and 125 host communities and 18 key informant Interviews who were stakeholders including public civil servants and staff of implementing partners. The sample size was drawn from the population of 2,250 beneficiaries. The distribution of the sample was 200 refugees from Imvepi and 200 Palorinya refugee settlements in Arua and Moyo districts respectively and of this sample (400) 31% of respondents were from host communities. This sample was sufficient because it was above the minimum sample of 333 for the study population considering a confidence level of 0.95 and margin of error of 0.50. The sample of 18 respondents comprising other stakeholders other than refugees was sufficient enough for it achieved data saturation.

2.7 Data Analysis

Data entry screen was designed, entered and cleaned before being analysed. Data were analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings of the observations were analysed and are presented in descriptive tables, pie charts and graphs in this report.

2.8 Ethical Considerations

Throughout the whole survey evaluation process, ethical considerations were maintained including informed consent, confidentiality, compliance to the evaluation protocol and sensitivity to cultural norms, beliefs and practices. Due care was taken to ensure that informed consent was obtained from all respondents by explaining the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, the benefits and risks resulting from the survey. The respondents were granted the opportunity to ask questions and / or seek further clarification. Respondents were informed that they were free to refuse to participate in the study and this would not affect their right to benefit from LEU-CFW or their relationship with LEU-CFW Project staff. Confidentiality of all respondents was observed by ensuring that the respondents were not directly linked to the information provided

during the study and this gave them freedom to express their views frankly and freely. The respondents were interviewed in scheduled places while in the field to ensure privacy and confidentiality. All data records were kept in box files for safety and confidentiality during data collection and analysis.

3.0 Evaluation Findings

3.1 Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

The evaluation considered a few socio-demographic characteristics to describe the target population. The characteristics included status of the respondents, gender, age structure, marital status and gender of household head as presented in the table 1 below;

Table 1: Summary of socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

Category	Frequency	Percent
Status of the respondents		
Refugees	268	67
Host communities	132	33
Gender		
Male	95	24
Female	305	76
Age in years		
18-25	127	31.9
26-30	129	32.4
31-35	144	36.2
Marital status		
Single	34	8.5
Married	302	75.4
Widowed	33	8.3
Separated	31	7.8
Gender of Head of the HH		
Male Adult	192	48
Female Adult	193	48.3
Child headed	15	3.8

The status of the respondents from refugees were (67%) and host communities 33%, this was because the majority of the beneficiaries were refugees (70%), by gender, majority (76%) of the beneficiary households respondents were female while only 24% were male. This distribution was possibly due to the fact that most beneficiaries were female as the project design considered 75% of the beneficiaries are female while only 25% were male. Whereas gender of the head of

the household male adult was 48%, female adult 48.3% and child headed 3.8%. Over seventy five (75.4%) percent of the respondents were married while only 7.7% had separated. Slightly over eight (8.4%) of the respondents were single and widowed as presented in table1 above. By age, majority 36.2% (144) of the household heads were aged between 31 and 35 years, 32.4% were aged 26 and 30 years, 31.9% of the household heads were aged between 18 to 25 years. It is important to note from the findings that there are youth and child headed households and women affected by gender based violence a major factor considered selecting project beneficiaries.

3.2 Relevance of CFW

3.2.1 Reception of the project by the community

During the survey, all the respondents had knowledge about LEU/UNDP Cfw project. The community received the project positively as indicated by their active participation in engagement meetings, mobilisation and trainings. The survey team sought to know whether the selection of beneficiaries was fair and over ninety five (95.5%) percent of the respondents reported that the selection process of beneficiaries was fair while only 4.5% of the respondents were not satisfied and think that the selection process of respondents was not fair. The respondents who were not satisfied with the selection process indicated that the project did not give equal chance to all the beneficiaries of the project. This was due to a greater margin of female against male. The involvement of women was supported during the key informant interview with district secretary for community services.

“The CFW project was well embraced and the involvement of women has improved livelihood in the homes because women are better managers of money in homes. The project did not only improve the communities because of the projects implemented but also empowered them economically because of the money they received. People bought mattresses, goats, clothing for children since this was a festive season. Even some people gave me money to buy for them mattresses from Arua Town”. **Vuni Augustine Area Councillor Odupi Sub County/Arua District Secretary for Community Service**

The survey further established that the respondents expectations were included in the project design by involving them at all stages of project implementation. They said that they were also consulted on the kind of projects they preferred and participated in monitoring and reporting on the project. To a great extent, the local communities in the two districts were involved in

activities such as mobilisation, beneficiary selection, planning and reviews and trainings and had this to say;

“We were consulted as community leaders at the inception of the project we wanted to be in our community and we started consulting community members on the critical projects they wanted to be implemented in the community. They selected tree planting, valley tanks and road construction but eventually road construction were selected to be worked on”; (FGD with village community leaders of Dongo East zone III Palorinya refugee settlement in Moyo District).

“The roads fit in the framework of the district. However, they had not been worked on because the limited district financial resources. The CfW project provided relief. For instance, road from Dremundi to Lenwo which had been started by the sub county 10 years ago but was not worked on up to completion was this time completed because of the CfW. The roads link many service centres helping people to access services such as health centres, schools and markets. For instance, one road links Odupi health centre III and Odupi Main Market, another road links to Lenwo primary school and to the main road”. Vuni Augustine Area Councillor Odupi Sub County/Arua District Secretary for Community Service

“Collaboration existed and was crucial involving our agency, local leaders in host communities and the district. Different stakeholders came together to give their suggestions on how the project should go on”. Amitage, Camp Commandant, Imvepi refugee settlement, Arua

LEU staff invited us and we advised them on the people to select and showed them where these people could be found. There was also collaboration with the leaders including LCs. The leaders helped in identifying the people and mobilising to carry out CFW activities. The leaders were also the channel of complaints of the people especially on payment to LEU staff. Project Officer, Parolinya refugee settlement, Moyo district

Therefore, almost all the targeted beneficiaries participated in the project and fully embraced it. By implication, almost all the beneficiaries found the project relevant.

3.2.2 Addressing the priority needs of the community

The end of project survey revealed that the CFW project addressed community priority needs which existed in a bigger magnitude before the project commenced. The project considered the most vulnerable households in selection process of beneficiaries as indicated by respondents over sixty seven (68.3%) percent of the beneficiaries were considered because they were poor while 23.5% were vulnerable .The rest 8.2% of beneficiaries were people with disabilities as shown in table 2 below .

Table 2: Why was your HH Selected to benefit from the CFW Activity

	Frequency	Percent
Poor	273	68.3
Vulnerable	94	23.5
People with disability	33	8.2
Total	400	100.0

The relevancy of the project was further supported with key informants who said that the project was relevant to the government, the community members and other stakeholders.

CFW supplemented the effort of the sub county because the community access roads constructed and those maintained were in the plan of the sub county and the district, however, there was a challenge of limited funding in local government that affected the rehabilitation of the roads, for many years. Mawa Bernard, Parish Chief Ombokoro, Odupi sub county-Arua.

“There was cash flow helping to improve the lives of the people. The project also gave hope to the people because they earned some money. The project also provoked the people to plan and save money. Their families have improved economically and return reports have shown this. People saved money in VSLA, started small business and acquired household items that they did not have”. Amitage, Camp Commandant, Imvepi refugee settlement, Arua

3.2.3 National development plans

In any sovereign state, all projects by NGOs and any other project implementing bodies must fit into the national development plans, otherwise they might be considered disruptive or irrelevant to the desired response. The post distribution monitoring emergency livelihood support through cash for work Project was implemented in line with the national development plans namely; the Uganda’s refugee act of 2006, UNHCR guidelines on refugees among others.

3.2.4 Strategic Plan

The vision and mission embedded in the LEU strategic plan was availed to the consultants and it was discovered that the project was in line with LEU’s vision, the UN and the World Bank developed the Refugee and host Population Empowerment (ReHoPE) framework, a comprehensive strategy to build the resilience and self-reliance of refugees as well as host communities. UNDP Emergency Response and Resilience Strategy for Refugees and Host Communities and mission.

3.2.5 Major challenges encountered during the execution of the project

During the survey, some challenges were faced during the execution of the LEU PDM in the districts of Arua and Moyo as enumerated, these included high expectations from the beneficiaries, tight schedules of respondents most especially key informants engaged in number of assignments were difficult to get. However, LEU project management team made prior communication to specific people and undertook the necessary measures where possible.

3.3 Effectiveness and efficiency

The survey team findings revealed that LEU deployed qualified staff to implement the emergency livelihood response project through cash for work. All staff members on the implementing team were in possession of at least a bachelors and three years' experience in related disciplines.

Information gathered during the key informant interviews revealed that during the implementation of the project, LEU worked closely with other development partners including NGOs operating in refugee settlement, sub county leadership, district line technical departments, political leadership, OPM, UNHCR and others. There was evidence that key stakeholders were involved during the numerous reviews conducted over the project life span. In addition, the methods and processes (means) joint monitoring, conducting review meetings, forming volunteer committees, engaging the district and sub county technical teams to support the project and others used to implement project interventions caused the desired change. During the survey team interaction with the project staff and other key informants, it was evident that there was always internal learning, adaptation and continuous improvement. The design / operational issues that impacted heavily on implementation was cash for work activity.

“In collaboration with LEU, my involvement was to ensure that meetings were held with the community and mobilising the people to participate in the project. We moved through the villages and registered the people”, Andrew, Community Services Assistant and Focal Person from OPM, Imvepi refugee settlement, Arua

3.4 Efficiency

With regard to efficiency, the evaluation team noted that there was efficient utilization of resources to produce the desired quality of outputs/ outcomes. The records shows that the project exceeded the target of planned activities with 207.7 kilometers of rehabilitated roads, 53.3 kilometres of

new roads in Arua and Moyo district, 2.1 kms of drainage channel opened, constructed 1 community hall, 2 market shades with 32 stalls, 11 culvert bridge lines on 8 bridges, one sports recreation ground, 23 garbage pits and one valley dam for completion.

The project implementation team put in place systems which ensured that the quantity and quality of inputs were appropriate and obtained with due consideration for value-for-money. For instance the involvement of community leaders, and government officials in project activity implementation reduced the cost of operations and therefore enhanced project efficiency.

All the procurement of services (such as trainers/consultants) and goods was done through competitive bidding followed by rigorous negotiations. We noted that LEU has a fully-fledged procurement policy that is followed to ensure quality and value for money. The purchased items were always vetted by the procurement to ensure that they are of the highest quality at an affordable cost. In addition, whenever tools would be taken to the community, the group leaders had to append their signatures on the delivery forms acknowledging receipt of quality items. It was also noted that LEU worked with competent service providers that had been pre-qualified. Routine monitoring by the project officers and UNDP was also done to ensure that the right items were delivered to the right beneficiaries. In addition, the following measures were put in place:

- Support supervision/spot monitoring visits
- Verification of items before distribution
- Signed training attendance lists
- Signed distribution lists
- Timely delivery of inputs

The findings revealed that the beneficiaries were involved in monitoring the project activities and reporting about the project. Thus the project design and implementation approach had been well thought out by LEU and it did not meet any resistance from the beneficiaries due to its relevance to the needs of the targeted communities.

Despite the few shortfalls of timeframe, the actual performance exceeded the planned performance in terms of outputs produced for most indicators in terms of timing, quality, role of partners, participation/contribution of community and access to outputs.

“The speed at which was done was amazing. The roads were worked on a very fast speed and have really improved which have improved movement in the camp. The challenge is that the project has been for a very short time, the project at least should have been annual”. **Andrew, Community Services Assistant and Focal Person from OPM, Imvepi refugee settlement, Arua**

3.5 Beneficiary selection

The survey team sought to know how the beneficiary households were selected to benefit from the Cash for work project and they indicated that it was done through local leaders in consultation with the people in the community considering female and male youth between the age of 18 and 35 years as noted by community leaders during a focus group discussions. They also noted that a number of considerations applied to identify the beneficiaries i.e. those that had not benefited from other projects, the elderly, vulnerable households with challenged family members and people with disabilities and use of lottery method in some of the zones and villages. Over fifty seven (68.3%) percent of the respondents were asked on why their households were selected to benefit from the Cash For Work activity, they indicated that they were selected because they were vulnerable while 23.5% of the households indicated that they were selected because of being poor. The rest of the beneficiaries were selected because they were people with disability with challenged family members as indicated in table3 below. This was supported during the key informant interview.

“The selection of beneficiaries was done through consultation meetings in the communities. People selected were youth and vulnerable people like child headed families, households with challenged persons, people living with HIV/ AIDs and youth without work. The LC executive members from LC1 to LCIII and sub county officials like the parish chiefs and the sub county chief were involved”. **Mawa Bernard, Parish Chief Ombokoro, Odupi sub county-Arua.**

Table 3: Why was your household selected to benefit from CFW Activity

	Frequency	Percent
Poor	273	68.3
Vulnerable	94	23.5
People with disability	33	8.3
Total	400	100.0

Close to ninety four (95.5%) percent of the respondents were satisfied with the selection process and indicated that it was fair because it considered gender and the vulnerable poor to benefit from the project and they had this to say;

“The first criterion for one to benefit from CFW was being a youth between 18 and 35 years with female making 75 percent, women affected by gender based violence, families with challenged members and others. Due to the large number of qualifying refugees, those who participated in CFW were selected through the lottery method. Use of lottery method reduced conflicts as the beneficiaries. (FGD for local leaders in Palorinya west zone).

3.6 The effectiveness of tools for CFW

The survey team sought to know whether they had received any tools for use under the cash for work project and close to a hundred (99.2%) percent had received the tool while only 0.8% of the respondents had not received tools. At least ninety two (92%) percent of the respondents indicated that the tools were given in time while only 8% were not satisfied and felt that they were given tools late. Furthermore they were asked whether the tools were suitable for the work, Over ninety two (92.4%) were satisfied with the suitability of the tools for the work while 7.6% of the respondents thought the tools were not suitable for the work.

3.7 Cash distribution process

The survey team sought to assess the cash distribution process among the beneficiaries and respondents were asked whether Living Earth Uganda paid all the money they worked for during the CFW activity they indicated that close one hundred (98%) percent had received the money while only 2% indicated that they had not received the money by the time of the survey. Also interaction with village committee leaders in a FGD indicated that 99% of the beneficiaries had

received all their money while other camp leaders and other local leaders interacted with during the key informant interviews indicated that they had not received any complaint concerning CFW payments and thinks that all of them had received their money. Some of the views from FGDs had this to say;

Use of mobile money was a good procedure because it promoted security and enabled some people to save their cash on phones without fear of it being stolen from their homes.

The only challenge was that verification of telephone numbers was not effectively done and some people ended up not getting their money in time. This caused delays for some people and endless complaints against the leaders with people demanding for their money. The correction of telephone numbers of those beneficiaries whose telephone numbers were wrongly recorded took long to be corrected”.

The respondents in the survey were further asked on when they received the payment after completion of cash for work and the results indicated that more than half (53%) percent received their payment after two weeks while 47% indicated that they received the payment between 1-2 weeks. It is important to note that the payment frequency was as planned in the project design thus effective.

As to whether they incurred any transport cost to get to the place where they could collect cash, more than eighty eight (87.8%) percent of the respondents were affirmative while only 12.2% of respondents had not incurred any transport cost and interaction with village leaders says that the available service providers where they could easily withdraw money without incurring transport costs had limited float cash thus had to travel to Moyo, Arua, Yumbe and Adjuman town where some could spend between 5,000-20,000 thousand Uganda shillings as transport costs only. They also noted that in the process of registering for sim card some people who were outside the project were left out and had to incur transport costs to Moyo to be registered. When they were asked if they experienced any problem in getting their money, majority of the respondents 64.8 % had not, whereas 30.8% had experienced some challenges in accessing their payments. This was basically transport expenses incurred to access when the mobile money operators in the area run out of float cash. When the survey team asked for the recommendation of improvement, the

respondents suggested that mobile money service providers should make arrangement to bring mobile money van on specific days, no other major challenges were identified.

When respondents were asked on the preferred form of payment for work other than cash for work payment, over eighty seven (87.8%) percent of the respondents still preferred cash for work payment while only 11% preferred payment in form of physical items and least 1.3% were not decided thus Living Earth Uganda the preferred payment mode. When the beneficiaries were asked the reason for their suggested mode of payment, they said that cash can be used to obtain all what someone needs, can be used in emergency like sickness, it is a form of medium exchange, easy to manage, and to start a business, can also be used to pay school fees for children in time and others. This was supported by other key informants during the interview.

“Cash for work is a better method of paying people because even when they are given items and food, they still sell them because they need cash to do different things in their livelihoods”. **Arua UNHCR Construction Engineer Daniel Barungi.**

The survey team asked beneficiaries where they spent their payments, 52.5% of the respondents mentioned that they had spent the payments within the villages, 39.8% in the nearby market, 7.3% were yet to spend, this evidence shows that there was an increase of money circulation and purchase in the economy. When they were asked if they observed change in the market as the result of cash for work payment. over sixty six (66%) percent of respondents responded in affirmative, 22.5% said no change in the market was observed whereas 11.5% were undecided. When the survey team asked the beneficiaries to state the observed changes, they mentioned low supply of goods in the market, increase in purchase of clothes and goats, increase of prices of commodities, however, the increase was majorly attributed to Christmas festive season which attracts high purchases for a number of families.

Advocacy skills promotion

The survey team asked the beneficiaries if they had participated in the skills promotion of cash for work project, 69.3% confirmed to have participated, 26.8% had not participated, 4 % did not respond. When they were asked the skills acquired in VSLA, they highlighted acquiring

knowledge of buying shares in a SACCO, saving money in a group, how to join savings groups, budgeting for business, and others.

The findings shows that gender advocacy equipped the beneficiaries with skills to avoid girl child abuse, domestic violence, equity in human rights, stay peaceful with the husband, how to improve communication within the family, respect for one another and others.

In addition, the findings highlights that the HIV/AIDS advocacy equipped the beneficiaries with skills on how to be faithful, to create awareness, the spread of HIV, saving lives in case of accidents, faithfulness in marriage, maintaining self control , protection and to abstinence.

The First AID, advocacy skills equipped beneficiaries with skills to enable them help people at home and at work places, got knowledge of handling First Aid tools, attend to emergency in the community, and promote life savings in the community in case of an accident.

Lastly, evidence shows that the environment advocacy skills promotion equipped the beneficiaries with skills to create awareness about the dangers of overgrazing and bush burning, conserving the environment, improve the methods of farming that promotes environment, protecting the environment through afforestation, and others.

3.8 Benefits of participating in the Cash for Work Project

The survey team established that households who were the beneficiaries of cash for work project have benefited from participating in the Project. The highlighted benefits included;

- Infrastructure development increased access by the community
- Improvement of livelihood of the beneficiaries other than waiting for relief food
- People have already started business from cash for work money
- People were able to pay school fees for their children
- Other have bought livestock like goats, poultry and other domestic animals
- Beneficiaries have been able to pay for medical bills
- They have been able to buy household items for home use
- They have been able to build houses
- Waylaying of women by rapists reduced
- Unity in families increased as they worked together plan for the money from CFW

- People earned money out of cash for work project

“The roads benefited the people including those who did not get the CfW money because they use the roads that were constructed and those that were made more accessible. Livelihoods in homes improved as people were able to buy mattresses, goats, pigs and construct houses”.
Community Development Officer(CDO) Odipu Sub County, Arua

3.9 Impact

During the survey, key informants and focused group discussions highlighted the impact of the project to the community, refugee settlements and local government. The survey team noted the following changes had occurred in the lives of the target beneficiaries, their families and communities during the project period:

- Increased access to different sections of the settlements
- Improved wellbeing among the beneficiary households in terms of being able to pay school fees, medical bills and purchase of house hold items among others.
- There was evidence that the project had promoted community empowerment and capacity development in HIV/AIDS awareness, environmental issues, gender issues, first Aid support as well as promotion of village savings and loans association (VSLAs).

The evidence shows that the project over achieved the set target goals that included construction of culvert bridge line that contributed to access of socio services and free movement of community members. This was supported during the focus group discussion.

“The people constructed new roads and cleared bushy community access roads. Vehicles can now access every part of the settlement, visibility is high and this has reduced incidents most especially of rape against women going to collect firewood and fetch water as well as children going to school especially girls. Also, people’s welfare has improved including their diet as a number of people invested their money in activities that bring income to their households”. FGD leaders for zone 3 West, Palorinya

This was supported during key informant interview with *Arua UNHCR site planner Engineer Wadada Wilfred* said *“The CfW roads have done a lot to reduce accidents in the area which were rampant previously”*.

The advocacy awareness raising offered to the beneficiaries was good and came at the right time despite the fact that people were trained only for few days. Nevertheless, since the training, violence in homes has reduced. Also, some people now know their HIV/AIDS statuses, getting treatment. FGD leaders for zone 3 West, Palorinya

“The project improved household income and the lives of the people have become better. People bought mattresses and there was harmony in the families. A number of people

have injected the money in business. Some of those who benefited go to far markets and bring merchandise which they sell". Andrew, Community Services Assistant and Focal Person from OPM Imvepi refugee settlement

3.10 Challenges in Project Implementation, Lessons Learnt and Best Practices

3.10.1 Challenges in Project Implementation

During the survey, the beneficiaries and stakeholders were asked the key challenges faced during project implementation. During the focus group discussion and key informant interviews, it was established that the common challenges were;

- The settlement and host communities had a record of road networks in some of the areas but there was no record of distance per road to enable the beneficiaries make a timely plan for the distances to be worked upon, however, this was addressed through using a long tape measure to get the details of the distance to be worked on a daily basis.
- Unfavourable weather and unreliable rainfall conditions affecting the project areas. It was observed that the rain season in the area is not reliable after the month of September, this affected tree planting during the dry season that limits survival growth of the tree. This affected the planned tree planting interventions to project environmental degradation associated with influx population pressure on the environment.
- During the survey, it was observed that the project time frame was only five months with a big budget, and limited number of staffs, this exerts heavy work load during the implementation process and limits effective review and reflection.
- The survey team established big percentage of female (75%) to male (25%) ratio of beneficiaries. The beneficiaries most especially refugees experience similar challenges of accessing employment opportunity in the geographical area. This percentage promotes unfair distribution of opportunity and can be looked at as gender discrimination that can promote domestic violence. In addition, most of the selected activities needed the masculine men to support ladies, for example excavation of drainage channel and removal of soil using spades. These are heavy manual jobs suited for men and yet men were only 25% of the beneficiaries.

- It was also established that during the project implementation, the transport costs increased as a result of major breakdown of two project vehicle breakdown that resulted into high fares for public transport hire, this strained the transport budget.
- Lastly, during the interview with respondents, it was revealed that during the project implementation, the project was not able to support beneficiaries with gum boots during road opening, this was due to budget constraints, living very few with the capacity to purchase their own gum boots. However, the project procured first Aid boxes for emergency use in case of accidents.

3.11 Key Successes

Capture and documentation of key success of CFW involved a detailed documentation of the specific project success stories with regard to CFW activity in view of what the beneficiaries feel are so far great achievements; taking into account the situation before the project. The success stories that were captured derived from a retrospective review and narration of the situations before project interventions. Unfortunately not all of these have been integrated in this synthesised report, but those considered most fascinating have been provided below;

My name is Lokonga James from Imvepi refugee settlement village 10 zones 7. Am married with 6 children (2 boys and 4 girls) and a beneficiary of cash for work activity. Before cash for work activity my family did not afford basic needs and would only depend on handout from the distribution to refugees but after cash for work payments, I used part of my payments 300,000 Uganda shillings out of 450,000 Uganda shillings to start this shop two weeks ago. Now with this shop am able to buy soap, pay medical bills for my family and other basic needs in the house which was a challenge before cash for work. Generally my life has changed and how I wish such project would continue.

Christine Anite, 26, a refugee from south sudan is living in Imvepi refugee settlement-Arua, zone 2, she is married with 2 children, bought a tailoring machine at 380,000/= from the savings she made from cash for work, she is now making designs from her house where she is making average profit of 80,000 per two weeks, she is able to pay school fees for her children, buy soap, household items, like soap, salt, and thankful to UNDP and Living Earth for the opportunity.

Tabu Grace, 27, is a refugee from South Sudan, she is living in Imvepi zone 2, village 2, married with 2 children, out of the two children, she looks after an orphan, she participated in cash for work and received Ug 450,000, she used part of the money to start up a saloon where she is making 80,000 per week, she has been able to pay school fees for her children, buying books, buying household items and meeting medical care for the children.

3.12 Lessons Learnt

- During the survey, it was found out that the CfW intervention is a useful approach to vulnerable refugee and host community households. It provided the source of employment within the beneficiaries geographical areas which would have been done by external people. It also provided hard cash that gave an opportunity to most especially the refugee beneficiaries to meet other personal needs that are not provided by UNHCR and other development partners. It promoted working and participation on community projects by refugees and host communities in their respective areas which promotes sustainability and ownership as well as promoting refugees and host community integration.
- It was further established that the project implementation processes promoted joint monitoring by the stakeholders at different levels, the approach of joint monitoring by the stakeholders promoted checks and quality assurance that results into project implementation effectiveness, sustainability and ownership by the local government and other stakeholders for continuity.
- In addition, it was highlighted that the project conducted community leaders meetings and the beneficiaries to discuss and review the project implementation progress and any other matters that came out during project implementation. This approach promoted community based conflict resolution most especially during the land conflict related to opening new community access roads that may had affected some of the community members. This resulted to amicable solving of the issues raised without demanding for compensation since they all realised the need for the project and enabled timely completion of the activities.
- It was further established that during the stakeholder engagements, the district recommended Arua district planning officer and Odupi sub county chief, Moyo district

planner and Ttula sub county chief as project focal persons. This helped the quick decision making and integration of the implemented activities in the government plans for continuous sustainability.

3.13 Sustainability

During the key informant interview with the Arua district planner, it was revealed that the project approach involved the stakeholders, most especially the sub county leadership and the district planning unit. This involvement enabled sharing of the government strategies, priority needs and fast tracking of the implementation standards, this resulted into the incorporation of the implemented activities in the planning and budgeting processes for further maintenance after the project transition. This was supported by Odupi sub county district counsellor and secretary for community development during the key informant interview.

“The roads worked on under CFW have already been adopted in the district road network. Therefore, they will be in the planning of the district and if money becomes available the district will take care of them”. **Vuni Augustine Area Councillor Odupi Sub County/Arua District Secretary for Community Service**

It was further established that the project approach used a bottom up approach during the identification of activities and beneficiaries, promoted transparency and ownership where beneficiaries regarded the projects as their first beneficiaries. There was no significant social, political or religious rifts created, the method minimized conflicts, respected cultural values or priorities which limited threats to project sustainability.

The survey team established that most of the tools like pick axe, wheel barrows, rakes were handed over to the sub county and parish institutions for safe custody, during the selected community communal days, the tools will be given to the community to use for the communal work to carry out community road rehabilitation and maintenance most especially to facilities which will not be under the funding of the government due to limited budget.

4.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

- In conclusion, during the survey, there was sufficient evidence from the submitted reports correlated by the stakeholders responses including beneficiaries that the project was implemented within the timeframe, and realized the project target based on the reviewed minutes of the reflection meetings. This evidence was supported by the beneficiaries who had already established small scale businesses after receiving CFW funds that generates extra income to provide livelihood support for their households.
- During the review of project inception implementation guidelines, there was evidence showing that the project was implemented as per the commitment between UNDP and Living Earth Uganda. This is highlighted by evidence of achieving 100 % beneficiary target, disbursement of 100% payment to beneficiaries using MTN mobile money, each beneficiary receiving US\$ 4 Arua and US\$ 5 in Moyo district as per implementation guidelines. There is also evidence of beneficiaries starting small business which is improving their livelihoods.
- In addition, there is evidence of the project using participatory approach during the implementation of the project, the progress reports reviewed and reflection meeting minutes with attendance lists attached shows that there was high level involvement of all the stakeholders and discussing the project implementation progress. This was supported by respondents during the key informants interview with stakeholders, they said that the project involved all the relevant implementing partners i.e. the UNHCR, OPM and local leaders at different levels, starting from the district political and technical team, at the sub-county and village level leaders, through sector consultation or during joint monitoring.
- Finally, the project largely concentrated on cash for work activities, this was due to limited timeframe. Despite implementing the advocacy and awareness promotion of HIV and AIDS, gender issues, environment promotion campaigns, first Aid promotion and VSLA targeting all the beneficiaries within the project timeframe, there was a need for the project to mentor and oversee rolling down the advocacy and awareness promotion and to reach out to all the community members and create a bigger impact.

4.2 Recommendations

Following results from the survey findings and analysis of the issues presented in this report, the survey team proposes a number of recommendations in the key areas of Beneficiary Targeting, Stakeholder Engagement, and Awareness Creation among others.

- In future, such project should ensure a strong promotion of advocacy by allocating enough time to support the beneficiaries' psychosocial healing need to sustain the impact and outcomes resulting from CFW project interventions, and activities aimed at reducing household vulnerability, and increasing their resilience to respond to economic shocks. The more emphasis may include financial literacy training, formation, support and mentoring of village Savings and Loans Associations (VSLAs) and market linkages. By design, the interventions should have inbuilt elements of sustainability which need to be upheld for more effective results. The practice of building and working through already existing institutions is of advantage because of resources one can tap into to lessen the cost and burden of follow-up on the beneficiary households.
- In addition, the survey team had established the challenge of Unfavourable weather and unreliable rainfall conditions affecting the project areas. It was observed that the rain season in the area is not reliable after the month of September, this affected tree planting during the dry season that limits survival growth of the tree. The survey team recommends the advance planning to ensure that the tree planting will have been accomplished by the end of the rain season. This will help the community to address the critical issue of environmental degradation associated with influx population pressure on the environment.
- The survey team further observed the need to increase project time frame beyond five months, to be able to give implementing team enough time to carry out post implementation follow ups, mentorship of the beneficiaries and as well as increase number of staffs to enable effective monitoring of the project activities and conduct post implementation reflection reviews for sustainable purposes.
- The survey team established big percentage gap of female (75%) to male (25%) ratio of beneficiaries. The beneficiaries most especially refugees experience similar challenges of accessing employment opportunity within the geographical area, and they have similar problems. This percentage gap promotes unfair distribution of opportunity and supports

female beneficiaries, this can be looked at as gender discrimination which can promote domestic violence. In addition, most of the selected activities needed the masculine men to support ladies, for example excavation of drainage channel and removal of soil using spades. In future, the survey team recommends increase of the beneficiaries ration from to atleast 60% female to against 40% male.

- It was also established that during the project implementation, the transport costs increased as a result of major breakdown of two project vehicle breakdown that resulted into high fares for public transport hire, this strained the transport budget. The survey team recommended buying of the brand new project vehicles or budget for vehicle hiring to avoid the maintenance risks associated with using old vehicles on rough roads.
- Lastly, during the interview with beneficiaries respondents, it was revealed that during the project implementation, the project was not able to support beneficiaries with gum boots during road opening and rehabilitation, this was due to budget constraints, living very few with the capacity to purchase their own gum boots. However, the project procured first Aid boxes for emergency use in case of accidents. The survey team recommends increasing the budget to take care of the protection gear most especially gum boots to minimize to possible accidents.