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1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

Restless Development sought the services of the Overseas Development Institute, in association with the Uganda-based Community Development Resource Network, to provide an external and independent end-line evaluation of the Youth Empowerment Programme (YEP) funded by Comic Relief. This evaluation therefore covers the entire programme period from 2010 to 2013.

The Youth Empowerment Programme aims to ensure that young Karimojong live healthy, productive and peaceful lives, fully supported by their families, communities, government and civil society. It is operational in Moroto and Napak Districts in the Karamoja sub-region of Uganda. Two main approaches are used: firstly, equipping young people with the knowledge and skills required to engage in income generating initiatives, contribute to the development of their communities, and to make informed decisions about their sexual reproductive health; and secondly, supporting adult stakeholders to better understand young people’s needs and support their meaningful participation in decision-making processes at all levels. The programme targets in-school youth, out-of-school youth and adult stakeholders, with a focus on teachers, health workers, community liaison officers, civil society organisations and government.

The YEP is based on Restless Development’s innovative, youth-led development model. A selected number of young people are trained and supported as peer educators in their own communities and work to improve the livelihoods and sexual reproductive health of their peers while engaging adult stakeholders and advocating for youth concerns to decision-makers at all levels. They design, deliver, monitor and evaluate development initiatives with youth, community and decision-makers. This model of combining non-formal education and practical training while fostering increased interaction between youth, community and government aims to contribute to sustained impact in target communities.

This final evaluation of the programme has four central purposes;

- firstly, to enable understanding of the difference (in terms of results or outcomes) that the YEP has made on target groups;
- secondly, to develop an understanding of how these differences were achieved and therefore gives as much weight to the ‘process issues’ such as the inputs, throughputs and outputs, as to the outcomes and results;
- thirdly, to provide a basis for transparent and constructive learning. This aim necessitates looking forward as much as it does looking backward and goes beyond implementation and performance accountability to donors, partners, communities and individuals, toward a more reflexive learning approach that is central to the mission of Restless Development; and
- fourthly, to develop a dialogue on the findings with critical stakeholders as much as providing a basis for internal development of Restless Development. An essential component of this is the construction and maintenance of participatory processes that emphasise open and meaningful participation for communities as well as for actors in government, NGOs and CSOs throughout the evaluation.
Analytical framework and methodology

1.2 Evaluation plan and analytical framework

The plan for the evaluation draws on the outline of the seven point ‘Rainbow Framework’ as promoted on the community of practice website ‘Better Evaluation’\(^1\), the first of which concerns evaluation management. This exercise entailed ODI and CDRN having discussions with Restless Development about engaging relevant stakeholders early on in the process, securing appropriate resources, determining institutional support, capacity and decision-making processes, the standards required in relation to resourcing and final responsibilities on meta-evaluation (sign-off procedures for the evaluation itself amongst stakeholders). Capacities to conduct the evaluation given resource parameters and the timeframe allocated were also briefly assessed at this stage.

The second aspect centred upon defining what was to be evaluated – including programme theory, materials, and results. At this stage, Restless Development undertook a series of discussions with ODI to provide appropriate reference documentation focused at global, national and district level programming. Through these discussions the importance of assessing both intended and unintended programme outcomes (positive and negative) became apparent, with a core focus on programme objectives and outcome areas, namely:

“The Youth Empowerment Programme will empower young Karimojong to lead the development of their communities, breaking the cycle of conflict and poverty to build a peaceful future”\(^2\)

Outcomes:

1. To increase by 20% the proportion of out-of-school youth in rural Karamoja communities with improved livelihoods opportunities by August 2013.

2. To increase by 25% the proportion of in-school and out-of-school youth in rural Karamoja communities participating in conflict resolution decision-making processes by August 2013.

3. To increase by 50% targeted community stakeholders’ capacity to deliver youth-friendly interventions and to support youth by August 2013.

4. To increase by 20% the proportion of in-school and out-of-school youth in rural Karamoja communities adopting safe sexual practices by August 2013.

Through discussions with Restless Development and the review of Comic Relief’s guidelines it was also deemed necessary to assess the ‘process’ aspects through which outcomes were achieved. Consequently it was considered equally important to define evaluation criteria in relation to input, process, and outputs. Another way of expressing these categories is through recognising the different subsets of the DFID ‘3E’ (economy, efficiency and effectiveness) framework or ‘value for money’ approach. The evaluation aims were defined broadly across these areas to maximise the learning opportunities that could be applied across the programming cycle (diagram 1). While this is a highly essentialised representation of the programme cycle that overlooks potential complexity, it provides a basic premise through which to discuss findings.

---

\(^1\) http://betterevaluation.org/

\(^2\) Comic Relief Concept Note (2010)
Diagram 1: The DFID ‘3E’ Value for Money approach and the ‘linear’ programme cycle, based on DFID VfM approach (2011)

The third component of the plan sought to **frame** the boundaries of the evaluation, including high level questions, intended audiences, ultimate purpose of the evaluation and what ‘success’ looks like in different focus areas. This exercise served to emphasise the learning-focus and participatory nature of the evaluation, which had far reaching implications for evaluation design, methodology, write-up and communications – including adding a ‘user-generated evaluation’ design component that would contribute to community ‘buy-in’ and empowerment. The target audience was framed as Restless Development Programme staff in Uganda and other national contexts, but also partners at district and national levels in Uganda. The definition of ‘success’ was expanded to include a parallel assessment of performance in relation to the enabling environment for each of the objective areas. This understanding of ‘success’ therefore catered for the degree to which performance was in relation to a highly supportive or challenging policy and programming environment.

The fourth aspect of the plan focused on the **description** of programme activities, outcomes and context, which included the planning of the sampling framework, instrument design, data collection methods, the combination and sequencing of qualitative and qualitative data, analysis methods and data visualisation/communication. Given previous discussions, the evaluation was described as a rapid non-experimental participatory exercise, with a focus on qualitative methods and focus group discussions with both current and past programme participants (see methodology for further details). The related fifth aspect of the plan sought to **understand causes** and thereby looked into methods for confirming attribution of activities, outputs and outcomes of the programme, parallel programme activities from other actors, and exploring alternative explanations for a sequence of events provided by respondents and data (see instruments section for an explanation of the ‘attribute’ chart).

The penultimate component of the evaluation plan was to determine the method for **synthesis** of findings. It was agreed that the synthesis would prioritise the participatory and qualitative outputs of the evaluation, with a continued emphasis on learning opportunities and recommendations for organisational policies and procedures. The importance of quantitative inputs (‘economy’ aspects -
see diagram 1) were therefore relatively downplayed in relation to a synthesis that focused on efficiency, effectiveness and lessons from unintended effects.

The final component of the plan looked at **reporting and support for use**, which included discussions concerning timeframes, formats and media, accessibility and language, and the framing of conclusions and recommendations. These discussions highlighted the importance of using a youth-friendly approach throughout the evaluation while recognising the target audience for the final report. Given Restless Development’s’ continued interest in working on the YEP programme areas in Karamoja, it was also deemed appropriate to ensure recommendations were implementable given broad resource and time constraints, and that wider policy, programme and practice opportunities encountered through discussions were presented for further exploration. Therefore, to ensure maximum uptake of findings across target audiences, outputs will include a short executive summary aimed directly at youth sector audiences, as well as open discussions (as appropriate) with Restless Development staff during internal end-line assessments and meetings.

### 1.3 Methodology

#### Approach

This evaluation uses a non-experimental participatory approach, drawing on primary and secondary qualitative methods (i.e. literature and documentation), and a selected focus on quantitative indicators, outputs and outcomes. It primarily focuses on youth groups that have been directly reached by the programme – with adults included in the study often only peripherally involved in activities. For comparative purposes, it would have been useful to include a non-targeted district (e.g. Kotido, Kaabong) where the programme was not being conducted to assess the situation of young people, as well as the views and positions of decision makers and service providers as a form of a ‘comparison group’. However, the premise of such a comparative evaluative exercise focusing on the ‘with and without, before and after’ requires significantly more time and resources.

#### Instrument design and delivery

In order to incorporate a wide variety of knowledge sources and types, a number of research instruments were used. The first of which was a framework to assess the broader ‘enabling environment’ (the context in which the programme has been implemented) over the past three to five years that surrounded the programme activities and which would serve to help or hinder the achievement of goals. This instrument was delivered to the Restless Development programme staff in Karamoja and examined the economic, social and environmental contexts, each with respect to politics and policies, interventions (government and NGO) and observed context (climate change, social norms and behaviours, economic growth etc.).

A semi-structured **key informant interview (KII)** template was developed that provided guidance for 24 conversations with a range of government and NGO actors. This KII guidance included a focus on programme outcomes, processes, operations and sustainability, excluded groups and monitoring and evaluation. Specific guidance was also provided on each of the four programme areas that could be drawn upon if speaking to sector specialists or encountering particular experience and expertise. The following individual KIIs were conducted in Moroto and Napak districts:

- 7 Restless Development programme staff – including 2 peer educators (PEs)

---

3 A detailed list of interviewees can be found in annex
8 staff members from other NGOs working in both districts

12 district government officials and service providers, including district government Community Development Officers, Chief Administrative Officers, District Health Officers, District Education Officers, Production Officers, Gender and Child Protection Officer, sub-county Community Development Officers and Village Health Team personnel.

In order to go beyond tokenistic and extractive participatory methods, the draft evaluation plan was introduced to a broad spectrum of community participants which included both programme participants and non-participants in two locations (Narengemoru and Komaret). The evaluation purpose and plan was discussed with participants in detail in order to co-construct and ‘ground’ the methodology and instruments. This demand generated consultation (DGC) highlighted to the evaluation staff a number of logistical concerns and target audiences not previously given due attention, such as the importance of including community elders as much as adults in the focus group exercises, as well as including at least one Village Health Team (VHT) representative in the discussions4. Participants also outlined the importance of visiting implementation locations such as farm plots to confirm progress on livelihood activities. These facets were all absorbed into the final evaluation plan and procedural outlines.

With relevant changes applied, the Focus Group Discussions were undertaken across three locations in two districts of Karamoja: Lopeei parish and Lokudmo parish in Napak District; and Narengemoru parish and Komaret parish in Moroto District. A broad range of possible instruments were at the disposal of the evaluation team for this stage, and while some real-time adaptation did occur to cater for the context and target group, the tools utilised were open-ended time charts, issue prioritisation, and response-attribute tables. Six FGDs were conducted in each site - male youth, female youth and adults/elders (all current and associated participants) and male youth, female youth and adults/elders (ex-participants where possible)5.

The distinction between current and ex-participants proved to be uniquely useful for assessing the multiple determinants of why participants left livelihood groups. In practice, the majority of the youth participating in focus groups were out of school, and were also targeted for programming activities beyond that of the livelihoods component alone. While it was assumed that the research bias of interviewing largely current and alumni youth group participants at the expense of other community participants was negligible (particularly given many adults and elders were non-participants), the evaluation did not have the resources or remit to pro-actively seek out the specific engagement of Most At Risk Populations (MARPs) such as vulnerable orphans, widows, disabled individuals and persons living with HIV and AIDs.

In terms of the instruments themselves, the open-ended time charts were designed to draw-out a picture of the changes at the community level from the perspectives of different cohorts over the past three to five years. These were disaggregated into positive and negative changes over time. Groups were then asked to discuss and prioritise the most significant improvement and challenges in their community. This latter exercise was inter-changeable with a ‘problem tree analysis’ approach depending on the audience. Altogether, this first series of exercises principally aimed to capture the major concerns and interests of the community from an open-ended perspective in

4 A demand generated consultation is a participatory exercise to incorporate the views of stakeholders – primarily beneficiaries – into the evaluation process itself. This helps to ensure maximum effectiveness of the evaluation as more opportunities for constructive debate on indicators and broader frameworks are allowed. This serves to ‘ground’ the evaluation and improve potential uptake of lessons.

5 A breakdown of gender ratios and group profiles can be found in the annex.
order to compare and contrast with the established objectives of the YEP. It was also aimed at identifying how participants perceived the effects of the changes introduced by the YEP. Analysis of these outputs therefore enables the evaluation team to determine the degree to which the YEP is responding to the priority concerns not only of youth, but also male and female youth as individual target groups. The inclusion of adults/elders into this analysis also enables the evaluation team to assess the perspectives of power holders in the community with respect to young people and assess whether the YEP caters for potential dynamics with power holders.

The response-attribution table instrument had a more direct qualitative focus, with fixed questions on whether observed challenges or improvements in the community could first be categorised into the four YEP objectives areas. Secondly, the chart looked at the degree to which the YEP was linked to the given outcomes (planned or unplanned) as perceived by youths themselves. The chart then looked to discuss other contributing factors that may have assisted or hindered the work of the YEP programme. This includes environmental shocks or stresses, changes on district policy and interventions or parallel and significant NGO interventions that may have had dispersed impacts at community level. The final aspect of the chart was a triangulation component that asked for the relative contribution of the YEP to the individual objective areas. This instrument performed with mixed successes as it depended heavily on the community being widely familiar on all interventions taking place in and around it which was not always possible. In practice, communities in Karamoja are rarely engaged in intensive participatory and qualitative evaluations, and while the outputs for this tool are considered to be indicative at the individual community level, they do provide significant learning points at the aggregate level through analysis of broader patterns and gaps.

Sample design
The three fieldwork sites were selected using semi-purposive sampling. Locations were grouped according to observed performance levels (high, medium and low) and one site from each stratification level was then selected. Following this, each location was briefly profiled through discussions with Restless Development programme staff to ensure that the locations exhibited sufficient variation. For instance, the Naitakwae parish selection was replaced with Lopeei parish site given that Lopeei demonstrated a varied livelihoods profile due to its greater distance from the ‘Central and Southern Karamoja Pastoral Livelihood Zone’ compared to the ‘Livestock Sorghum Bulrush Millet Livelihood Zone’ (Levine 2010). Equal consideration was afforded to ensure that sites were not contiguous with each other, thereby enabling the potential for learning with a wider scope that catered for varied contexts and experiences.

Table 1: Localities where the evaluation took place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Napak District</th>
<th>Moroto District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lopeei sub-county</td>
<td>Ngoleriet sub-county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopeei Parish</td>
<td>Narengomeru Parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low performance</td>
<td>On-track performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 Performance levels as suggested by Restless Development programme staff

7 The Karamoja Livestock Sorghum Bulrush Millet Livelihood Zone stretches through the central part of Karamoja Region from the border of southern Sudan into the northern part of Nakapiripirit; it includes parts of Napakiripirit, Moroto, Kotido and Kaabong districts in Karamoja Region. The Pastoral Livelihood zone is bordered along the east by the Republic of Kenya (adjacent to the Turkana and the Pokot of Kenya); to the west lie Moroto and Nakapiripirit districts in Uganda; to the south one finds an agricultural zone in Karita sub-county; and to the north is the Northeastern Karamoja Pastoral Livelihood Zone in Kotido and Kaabong districts. Levine (2010)
Table 1: Selected localities for evaluation

| Nadunget sub-county | Komaret Parish | Over-performing |

Research ethics
Given that this evaluation focused on work with vulnerable adults, youth and children, a research ethics review was undertaken in the following areas: research quality and integrity (identifiable risks regarding accuracy of information and policy advice); terms of engagement (compromises on wellbeing of participants and informed consent), transparency and disclosure (confidentiality and access to information amongst all parties); and independence and partnership (an examination of congruence of these policies across the consortium/partnership). Consequently, particular efforts were taken to ensure that research participants were given sufficient information to enable them to take informed decisions whether they consent to being involved. In conducting the fieldwork, we aimed to minimize the potential costs for participants, by making the demands upon them (in terms of time and inconvenience) as minimal as possible while eliciting the information needed for the study. Data collected in the course of the evaluation is anonymized. Only key demographic information is retained in order to preserve the confidentiality of informants. Participants were informed of their unquestionable right to terminate interviews or participation in activities.

The Social Development Programme in ODI also follows detailed child protection in research guidelines that are enshrined in the principles of the UNCRC which prioritise ‘doing no harm’ to children, and provide avenues that can address allegations of child rights violations both internal to research programme activities, and those external to programme activities. This includes referral systems where deemed appropriate and not contradictory to the interests of the child.

Analytical process
The first stage of the analysis was a review of key programme documentation (proposal, planning, mid-term evaluation, ongoing M&E documents) as well as wider strategic papers, guidelines (such as handbooks) and procedural outlines. This review provided some indicative insights that were fed into the planning stages. In addition, a literature of contextual factors was undertaken in order to assess the enabling environment in each of the four programme outcome areas.

For the primary research component, detailed notes and recordings were obtained. The procedure for the textual analysis was as follows; review of notes and KII responses, coding and extraction (the allocation of responses to the appropriate areas in evaluation framework), pattern and gap identification and summarisation. These findings are then triangulated with the primary documentation and the background context research, and then synthesised for key lessons and recommendations.

2 Background and enabling environment
In order to provide a contextual overview of the supporting and limiting factors that affect the YEP processes and outcomes, a brief investigation was undertaken to examine each of the YEP outcome areas and related cross-cutting issues. This work serves to provide an additional level of analysis and programme assessment through which programme activities can be evaluated.

The Karamoja region has continual cyclical drought and extreme climate variability which is only likely to become more erratic in the future (GoU 2009). In 2013, high rainfall and fungal diseases
reduced crop yields substantially. As a result, households (as of September 2013) depleted stocks one to three months in advance of usual rates of consumption. Most crop-dependent households are meeting basic needs through market consumption, food assistance and the distress sale of minor assets. In terms of agro-pastoral responses, cash for work and food for work programmes - increasingly focused on vulnerable populations - are being supported under the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF II) being implemented by the World Food Program and several partners including the Danish De-mining Group and Samaritans Purse (FEWSNET 2013). There are also increasingly complex discussions on land-use provision, both with respect to biodiversity issues through the Uganda Wildlife Association, and through growing speculation from extractive industries.

In terms of policy responses, Levine (2010) outlines several ‘myths and facts’ about Karamoja that undercut most established thinking regarding coordinated response. These are that, a) Karamoja is extremely poor, b) livelihoods in Karamoja are vulnerable to frequent droughts, and c) pastoral livelihoods are not viable in the long-term. In contrast to these three apparent myths, support to livestock and animal health more generally is roughly 15 times less than that provided to crop agriculture (GoU 2009). Meanwhile, many authors declare that livestock activities should be scaled-up significantly in the agro-pastoral zone, and that failure on this front puts at risk increasingly vulnerable populations (Burns et. al. 2013, Levine 2010). Nevertheless, the institutional background context provided to crop-based livelihood options in Karamoja is considered to be relatively high and supportive.

In the second outcome area, which focuses on conflict and peace-building, the security situation has improved over the past three years and this has had a positive impact on production, mobility, access to markets and the local economy in general. Nonetheless, mobility and production are still hindered by outbreaks of conflict and the fear of conflict and criminality (Burns et. al .2010). However, despite the disarmament process having reduced the number of weapons in the region by 70 percent in recent years (Vaughan and Stewart, 2011), the unequal nature of the current disarmament campaign has actually increased the vulnerability of some communities in Karamoja (Stites and Akabwai, 2009). This is because communities are left without means of self-protection against neighbouring groups that still have their weapons.

Government-sponsored efforts to mitigate insecurity have been considerable and variable. These include livestock branding campaigns, amnesty deals for raiders, community sensitisation programmes, construction projects, sponsorship of local militias, punishment of local officials for failing to limit raiding and, most importantly, impounding cattle in protected kraals. Key policy references are in the Karamoja Integrated Disarmament and Development Programme (KIDDP), and the Peace, Recovery and Development Plan for Northern Uganda (PRDP). While evaluations of these activities are limited, it is clear that a significant budget and supportive environment exists for NGOs and CSOs acting in this area.

In outcome area three, promoting stakeholder capacity to engage youth effectively, the institutional enabling environment is more challenging. A UNDP baseline survey report (2011) found that only 36% of youth from Abim district, 35% from Moroto and 29% from Kotido declared any involvement in governance issues or engagement with stakeholders. The report found that the greatest number of youth participants engaged at the local level of governance linked to sub-county and parish structures closer to youth. Interaction with other levels was prevented by various social, structural and policy barriers.
For instance, there remains limited knowledge among youth about specific structures and contact points for legislative representation; limited knowledge of roles and responsibilities of youth – thus inhibiting participation; limited knowledge about representation and potential roles and powers that youth are granted; informal relations continue to influence formal governance structures where ‘age-set’ structures are in place. Current channels only allow for indirect participation and there is an information gap, i.e. limited platforms and resources for information. Other barriers include a broad lack of education and literacy; and limited documentation with government structures of youth-specific needs in different areas. Despite the presence of youth councils, these structures are not effectively used. Many of these points are echoed in both the government of Uganda’s (2001) ‘Policy framework for investment in youth issues’ and the new youth policy, ‘Unlocking youth potential for sustainable wealth creation and development’ (2013).

In addition, Banks and Sulaiman (2012) note that despite a growing interest from central government in the role of CSOs across Uganda, the inability of many CSOs to effectively mobilise for and represent the local community’s interests can be attributed to a range of factors that indirectly affect the degree to which youth-friendly approaches can be promoted. These include the disabling regulatory environment with cumbersome and elaborate procedures for registration and restrictions on what constitutes allowable advocacy activities; the desire to complement the work of government rather than questioning it; the difficulties in raising adequate resources from their membership; the inability to exercise internal democracy and accountability; the urban/elite orientation of most NGOs; and elite capture and central and district levels. This can make CSOs’ role superficial in facilitating community and resource mobilization for rural development.

As a result, the broader institutional context in this outcome area is considered to be one fraught with both short and long-term challenges. This is despite the fact that feedback from key informants in government positions greatly welcome and approve of the ongoing work of Restless Development in Moroto and Napak. Indeed, Restless Development was welcomed directly into the district governance systems in 2009 but as the governance challenges outlined above are considerably larger than individual district offices, it is understandable that entry-points such as these can only provide a limited range of impact in the short and medium term.

In the area of sexual reproductive health, burdens fall disproportionately on youth in Uganda, particularly young women. Discussions surrounding youth in Uganda often centre on their participation in risky sexual behaviours, such as multiple sexual relationships, ‘Something-for-Something Love’, limited condom usage and family planning methods (Banks and Suleiman, 2012). The twin demographic and health concerns of unprotected heterosexual intercourse together with the onward transmission of HIV to newborn and breast-fed babies, are most pronounced in Uganda (Bandiera, et. al. 2012). In addition, while the Karamoja region had the lowest prevalence of HIV/AIDs in Uganda at 3.5 compared in 2009 (compared to 6.5% at national level) (AIDS Alliance) 2013 – this rate has recently expanded significantly to 5.8% (IRIN 2012). Comprehensive knowledge of HIV/AIDS has traditionally been very minimal; 7% for women and 13% for men in 2008 (Walugumbe 2008).

Many policy interventions have focused exclusively on classroom-based education courses designed to reduce risky behaviours, or exclusively on vocational training designed to improve labour market outcomes among youth. As a body of randomized-control trials suggest, these single-pronged programmes have met with, at best, rather mixed success and it is thus more effective to follow a double-pronged approach (Banks and Suleiman, 2012). In addition to these problematic policy and programme responses, the fact that much SRH work focuses on changing
entrenched attitudes and behaviours amongst youth – many of whom are highly mobile – creates a challenging atmosphere for an intervention, including Restless Development activities.

3 Evaluation of outcomes

This section discusses the outcomes or ‘effectiveness’ (see diagram 1 above) component of the programme cycle by outcome area. It therefore looks mainly at participatory and qualitative measures that show whether a programme is achieving intended objectives – although it will also include space for unintended effects.

3.1 Outcome Results

Livelihoods
Irrespective of the ‘enabling environment’ in Karamoja, this programme area was largely considered by key informants, programme staff and communities as the most successful outcome area in which Restless Development was operating. Interviews with Peer Educators (PEs) corroborated this, as did a number of anecdotal observations from the PE final de-briefing workshop. However, looking at the four outcome indicators for this programme area, there are mixed achievements with a marked contrast between the notable successes on developing enterprising life skills, livelihoods skills and parental support in relation to lower magnitude gains on cash income and food security. Nevertheless, the quantitative information from the internal M&E datasets does reveal that there has been a marked impact as a result of the introduction of programme activities, although the magnitude of this change is not captured.

Figure 1: Outcome 1 achievement by indicator area
In terms of the first livelihood indicator area - household income - the interview and youth focus group outputs clearly highlighted a change in focus onto cash crops (perishable products such as tomatoes, onions, cabbage, aubergines etc.) as a result of YEP activities, although the relative size of these yields has been mixed. In Komaret parish, overall gains for one group was as low as 50000 shillings (2000 per person) over the course of the season. For another group in Lopeei results were better, with an overall yield of 62kg of onions which were converted into 248000 shillings at market rates (approx. 10000 shillings per individual). Another group in the parish benefitted from the introduction of a grinding mill in Lopeei county by Restless Development but it should also be noted that the Lopeei group was pre-selected on the basis of its performance potential alone. Further discussions regarding the differences in performance are outlined in the ‘process’, ‘conclusions’ and ‘recommendations’ parts of the evaluation as this section deals only with the levels of achievement of outcomes.

In almost all cases, income was well-managed to the extent that it was used in Village Savings and Loan Schemes, at a general rate of 10% return. The use of these loans were riskier for the low-income groups as they tended to extend the full profit from the group over into one loan rather than a range of Village Savings and Loan Association (VSLA) outputs while higher-income groups were able to consolidate income and spread risk. There were also a number of comments from focus groups suggesting that the majority of the loans were used to enable households to cope with health shocks, therefore providing indirect impacts on wellbeing.

The second indicator area is that of food security. In terms of primary impacts, this area was relatively less successful given the focus on perishable, high-value cash crops. The potential for converting cash income into high volume staples was also considered low given that high production yields were only achieved in concentrated areas given limited capital inputs. In turn, with attrition of crops considered, this led to limited outcomes in cash income. Groups also declared a sense of reluctance to re-invest or expend profits, preferring to retain capital for the purposes of VSLAs. This reluctance to re-invest is partly due to a culture of state and NGO dependence in the region, but also risk aversion.

While it is not centrally within Restless Development’s mandate to provide a high or consistent volume of material inputs, all focus groups consistently called for further support on seed provision and other kick-start materials. This is an issue which applies equally to the household income component above. It is also clear that providing selected material inputs (grinding mills, cereal banks, livestock) to high-potential groups had high direct and indirect outcomes for both participants and non-participants. Concrete examples of success were not obtainable given that these capital inputs were relatively new in the community, but feedback from YEP group participants as well as non-participants clearly showed that these additions to the production line had improved efficiency.

The third and fourth indicators area under livelihoods – that of promoting enterprising life and livelihood skills – were not only considered by many key informant and focus groups to be the major success story in this programme area, but often across the entire YEP as a whole. While the magnitude of material gains was generally low with some exceptions, the intangible gains in farming methods knowledge and entrepreneurial spirit were substantial.

For instance, in an exercise to attribute the relative inputs and outcomes of Restless Development’s livelihood activities in relation to other major actors, Restless Development would

---

8 Crop seasons usually extend from March (land preparation) to September (harvesting) (Levine 2010)
often be marked as second, third of fourth. However, when asked to re-prioritise this list with respect to the organisation that provided the most useful and consistent extension and knowledge support, Restless Development was almost universally re-allocated to the top position. Through sharing information and demonstrating organic methods to their peers, PEs gained respect in the community and helped youth groups develop in confidence. As discussed above, the degree to which this knowledge supported cash and food security is mixed due in part to the perishability of cash crops, and the limited start-up and maintenance capital that youth groups have to draw upon.

The final indicator area focuses on promoting increased support of parents and adults. There was anecdotal evidence from parents and other adults, including elders, which demonstrated indirect uptake and tacit support for the livelihood programme area. They approved of the farming methods knowledge provided to the youth which ranked highly in relation to the support from other NGOs and government actors. They felt it would keep youth in close proximity to the community rather than migrating and experiencing all the perceived health and personal risks associated with living and working outside of the community. Given a choice however, the majority of parents and other adults would prefer to have the youth fulfilling ‘traditional’ gender livelihood roles such as focusing on pastoralism (young men) and beer brewing (young women). This suggests there is still scope for addressing attitudes and beliefs of parents and other adults in this outcome area recognising that established gendered roles are hard to challenge. This is particularly the case with the older generation, so more targeted work to help transform these gendered perspectives regarding youth might be needed.

Examining the variation by parish was challenging given the difficulty in obtaining a clear record of outcome measures (written or verbal) from the groups themselves. It was nevertheless clear that the allocation of overall performance measures to each parish may prove problematic given that they do not differentiate by programme area. Lopeei parish, for example, is marked as the lowest performer, with Narengomuru as on-track and Komaret as overperforming. The observed outcomes in the area of livelihoods altered this ranking, with Lopeei first, Komaret second and Narengomuru third. The latter group in particular suffered from a leadership collapse and a resulting lack of initiative which led to the stagnation of activities. In terms of contributing factors, all parishes seem to be relatively similar in terms of distance to markets and micro-climates so it is likely that variations are largely explained by capital inputs and individual group capacity.

Civic participation
Based on the experience of the predecessor programme in Eastern Uganda, it was decided that the ‘civic participation’ element of the YEP should address a specific issue to support effective implementation. This served to focus the civic participation activities and enable monitoring through specific, measurable and attainable indicators. The issue selected, given the context in Karamoja, was youth participation in decision-making in peace-building processes. Overall success was considered to be a 25% increase in the proportion of in-school and out-of-school youth participating in peace-building and conflict resolution decision-making processes.

---

9 These actors varied and are dealt with in the individual sections, but regularly included the Danish De-mining group, Samaritans Purse, Wilte Hunger, and to a lesser extent Straight Talk and Save the Children.
The perception of performance in this outcome area in relation to the M&E quantitative data – figure 2, shows this area to be relatively successful in terms of outcomes. While groups from the qualitative dataset often struggled to provide clear attribution to Restless Development activities in the communities, there was generally a strong sentiment of positive outcomes in this dataset as well. This latter issue is considered to be a consequence of the vast array of actors working on conflict-resolution and broader peace-building activities in the Karamoja region and the fact that communities are not always fully aware of the district and sub-county actors undertaking activities in their communities, particularly when not related to fixed group activities as seen in the livelihoods outcome area.

As a consequence of attribution challenges, it was difficult to obtain clear qualitative evidence that directly feeds into many of indicator areas. The areas of assessing number of peace plans developed and connection to Restless Development activities over the past three and 12 month periods led to much conflation with parallel initiatives from other stakeholders. For instance, drama groups were established by Restless Development PEs but were also paralleled by similar activities by the Danish De-mining Group (DDG). In addition, communities could not provide any significant detail about the effectiveness of the groups, although the general consensus was clearly in approval of such activities. As a consequence, it was difficult to attribute any clear lessons for Restless Development on this indicator.
By contrast, one striking feature brought out through discussions was the relative prominence and familiarity regarding the ‘Sport for Peace’ days organised by the YEP across all communities – an issue raised by the young men, women, adults and elders. These events stood out strongly in relation to other activities as attributable to Restless Development, as well as their distinct focus on generating dialogue and harmony amongst youth in different clans. Particular successes were difficult to draw-out from discussions, although youth were clear in articulating the benefits of socialising with youth from distant sub-counties. These informal meetings enabled by the event served to reduce negative perceptions of ‘others’ and reinforce a growing sense of a wider community and regional identity.

The indicator area that focuses on **assisting partners to increase commitment to youth in their peace-building activities** was considered by respondents to have clearer positive outcomes. For instance, this area was closely related to outcome three (building stakeholder capacity for youth programming more broadly) which led to several combined outcomes. Feedback outlined that Restless Development has led the way in combining both young women and men as target cohorts in their peace dialogue exercises, while some government and stakeholder activities allegedly have a tendency to focus on male youths as the locus of the problem.

Looking at **variation across sub-counties**, it appears that in Narengomuru (on-track) Restless Development generally had the highest perceived ranking in relation to the peace-building activities of other NGOs particularly from the perspective of young women. The perception in Lopeei parish (low performing) and Komaret parish (over-performing) put Restless Development in the lower orders most likely due to intensive parallel efforts of DDG and the government in these localities. It may very well be that the YEP was part of these activities, but the lack of a clear identity and branding may have prevented clear attribution from the communities.

**Stakeholder capacity**

This programme area focuses on stakeholder capacity to deliver youth-friendly interventions. Excluding the issue of the relative enabling environment, key informants and Restless programme staff routinely saw this area as the lowest performing in terms of outcomes. Feedback from focus groups at community level was difficult to elicit as the goal area is by definition focused on institutional and organisational activities and largely outside the day-to-day experience of participating groups, although some outcomes were documented. It may be considered that part of this perspective is due to the difficulty in mapping systemic change at any level and that the relative complexity of this exercise leads to hindering identification of attributable outcomes.

In practice, it was only at community level where this difficulty was clearly observed. There were, by contrast, several high level impacts from this work across the indicator areas – with most successes witnessed in expanding government capacity to engage young people. The quantitative M&E data – though subject to gaps – reveals a corresponding narrative with most sub-goals achieved apart from the area focusing on increasing the capacity of uniformed personnel (although targets were achieved in January 2013 and then were subject to a decline).
The first indicator area looks at **partners**, which concerns activities of NGOs in Moroto and Napak districts. This indicator received the least amount of supporting evidence in terms of outcomes but it was clear that Restless Development had supported some NGOs directly (Marie Stopes) and indirectly (BRAC) to enhance their youth-friendly approaches. For Marie Stopes, their increased targeting of youth was enabled through a mutual and growing partnership with Restless Development. There were also opportunities to develop active and productive partnerships with the Makarere University Joint AIDS Programme (MJAP), Save the Children (both in the Transforming the Youth Sector Programme but also additional forthcoming research collaborations), and the Riam-Riam CSO umbrella network. This provides good scope for the YEP to liaise in different fora – for example, the District Youth Sector Working Group is fixed at Moroto District level discussions, whereas Riam-Riam acts as a co-ordinating body across the whole Karamoja region.

The second indicator area examines the degree to which **young people were able to identify increased presence of youth-friendly programmes** in their communities. In terms of responses from focus groups, there is argued to be an increase in youth focus in the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) in Lopeei parish. Many of the other livelihood focused NGOs and bilateral organisations are seen to exclude youth as a target cohort – either explicitly or implicitly. The DDG and Straight Talk regularly include youth in their participatory activities but attribution to Restless Development is very unlikely given the lack of observed connections between these organisations apart from in Lopeei parish, where DDG has collaborated informally with YEP activities. In general, youth groups and PEs are highly unfamiliar with this outcome area. This may largely be a symptom of the broader enabling environment and history of interventions in Karamoja, but also direct messaging challenges to PEs who have limited capacity (in terms of knowledge of governance matters) and previous engagement with other stakeholders and civic
participation processes. This is unsurprising given that PEs are not centrally involved in this outcome area.

The indicator area regarding the outcomes in relation to service providers shows greater up-take of messaging and outputs. District officials in both Napak and Moroto declared a wide and deepening expansion of capacities to engage on youth issues.

“We are now refocusing and recognising youth as a productive group and are beginning to understand the different responses. Before it was adults, men, women, boys and girls, and you all together as one target group.” [district official]

These changes are recognisable when appreciating that NAADs has dropped registration fees for youth groups down from 50000 shillings to 25000 shillings as a result of discussions with Restless Development. Some budgeting procedures at district level have also apparently shifted to allow the voices of youth to filter through although definitive examples of this process could not be obtained.

A major and unexpected win in this area - as espoused by a number of key informants and programme staff – is the development and maintenance of the Moroto Sector Working Group (SWG) on Youth, which parallels the success of Restless Development’s national activities. This SWG is considered to be well attended and one of very few working groups at district level that focuses on a particular cohort rather than a sector. The observed implications of this is that the SWG allows a range of actors and initiatives to be communicated and coordinated, thereby significantly enhancing the potential for integrated youth programming in the region. Standalone impact arising from the development of the SWG was unobtainable from key informants, other than the fact that continued presence and dialogue maintained through the SWG was sufficiently testament to its ongoing success. Notes from the February (2013) Programming Monthly Progress Report provide more detail;

‘Restless Development working in partnership with community based services – established a District Youth Sector Working Group. The first of its kind in Moroto District and Karamoja region, the meeting attracted partners like Concern World-Wide, GIZ, BRAC, WECOP, MADEFO, and Straight talk foundation, C&D, DRC-DDGG, and Arelimok. The District Community Development Officer applauded the partners who turned up. He said having this coordination structure is an achievement and pride to Community Based Services and he will update the District technical Planning committee about this new development. He committed that his office will spearhead the coordination through the CDO to ensure that the meetings take place as planned just like other sector meetings’

There is also evidence of outcomes in the education sector where there is anecdotal feedback from a sub-county official that certain schools have sought the sensitisation services of Restless Development in schools, and have become more comfortable with the idea and practice of either allowing Restless Development to work through school curricula, or having teachers provide this service themselves. In terms of changes in policy however, there have been no observed shifts.

There is also expanding connectedness between sub-county and district officials on youth issues. Sub-county officials increasingly request lists and access to Restless Development networks at local level in order guide their own mobilisation and outreach activities. Prior to this, local officials were largely relying on the services of the Village Health Teams (VHTs) for this, often paying a stipend in the process. Some local officials also declared increased capacity to focus on other priorities as a result of having been freed from many of the detailed registration challenges for youth groups who are increasingly empowered to undertake such administrative activities
themselves. There is also much demand for Restless Development to engage more consistently and constructively with local youth councillors (elected youth leaders at sub-county level), as these relationships have up until now been rather ad hoc and sub-county budgets for civil engagement activities are almost non-existent.

Finally, the indicator of engaging in activities to increase the **capacity of uniformed personnel and civil society organisations** reveals more mixed results. Initial outreach to civil society organisations and service providers proved problematic given training relied heavily on extracting individuals from their institutional environment and training them en masse. This model shifted in 2013 toward an ‘in situ’ training programme which showed more promise in that it ensured delivery to a number of actors in one setting, rather than relying on a standalone ‘champion’ to communicate core messages. Major successes were witnessed through the formalisation of ties with Riam-Riam, an umbrella CSO network in Karamoja that provides considerable access to CSOs for Restless Development, and remains a key strategic partnership for the organisation.

**Sexual Reproductive Health**

The aim of this programme area is to increase the proportion of rural youth in Karamoja that are adopting safe sexual practices and making informed decisions about their sexual reproductive health (SRH). The feedback from programme staff suggests that, excluding the broader enabling environment, this area has encountered the most challenges alongside outcome three (stakeholder participation). For example, feedback from key informants and focus groups demonstrates that there is a distinction between performance on indicator areas one and four (**youth adopting safe sexual practices and possessing core life skills to engage in safer sex**), and indicators areas two and three (**youth reporting refusing sexual advances and engaging in transactional cross-generational sex**). Some of these narratives are echoed in the M&E quantitative data – such as the limited impact on the percentage of youth engaging in transactional/ inter-generational relationships.

![Figure 4: Outcome 4 achievement by indicator area](image-url)
There is clear and observed fatigue from the communities on the issue of safe sex and HIV/AIDS prevention – most likely due to the continued focus on HIV/AIDS in the region given growing infection rates over the last decade. However, it was clear from almost all the focus groups that the messaging regarding critical importance of testing status before engaging in sexual activity was received and retained. The fact that Restless Development provided condoms and training on their use was also widely recognised, as was their focus on other sexually transmitted diseases.

Youth in target schools (19 of the 25 schools in Napak and Moroto) and those participating in the Restless Development youth groups (out of school) were familiar with this knowledge (non-participating out-of-school youth were not a target cohort and therefore limited familiarity of these activities within these cohorts is understandable). There were challenges encountered in addressing target audiences in schools when school-feeding programmes are scaled-down – given that attendance is often largely dependent on food supply programmes. In addition, key informants from district offices in Napak noted a decline in attendance of out-of-school participants. However, the creation of seven youth resource centres has enhanced access to information. These centres are located across the districts and although the original YEP plan was to develop more of these, limited resources prevented scale-up. It is unclear how the success of these centres is measured.

Progress in development of knowledge around core life skills was considered to be greater than actual adoption of safe sexual practices. For instance, the importance, familiarity and use of the STD testing process was clearly vocalised in almost all focus group discussions. However, feedback confirmed observations from the key informants that many of the youth – particularly men – continue to refuse contraceptive practices. There were a very limited number of comments from the focus groups about women being sufficiently empowered at an individual level to ensure the use of contraception. Part of the broader attitudinal context, which reduces the likelihood for increased safe sexual practices, is feedback from adult focus groups which identifies contraception to be a key driver of promiscuity and prostitution. However, there are pockets of successes (e.g. Lopeei sub-county) where the SRH activities have had significant impacts in promoting the visitation of young girls to health centres – albeit causing some tensions with men in the community. This issue was raised by a Napak district Community Development Officer and although further information on this success was limited, it may warrant investigation.

By contrast, indicators two and three (youth reporting refusing sexual advances and engaging in transactional cross-generational sex) is an indicator area that has limited outcome evidence. Only one focus group (of fifteen) was able to clearly demonstrate having received specific advice and life skills on protective practices against sexual harassment – in this case, harassment from employers. For young women in particular, the lack of prevention and/or post-incident protection knowledge is considered a major safety concern when migrating in the dry seasons. This knowledge may include support explaining or facilitating access to information on labour and legal rights, location of legal advice centres, psycho-social support, the location of safe houses and support during the construction of police statements.

In terms of variation across parishes, it was observed that there was the least uptake of SRH knowledge and practices in Lopeei parish (under-performing), while there was a marked increase in the knowledge and adoption of safe sexual practices (use of condoms as well as testing) in Narengomuru and Komaret parishes – including a greater variety of knowledge on SRH issues in general. Explanations behind these varied outcomes was difficult obtain, therefore can only be potentially attributed to the presence and effectiveness of particular Restless Development PEs

10 Note that this SRH activity occurred in another parish in Lopeei sub-county, not in Lopeei parish itself.
who emphasised this component, and/or the result of combined interventions from other actors. One potential (low cost) area that Programme Staff can at least investigate in this regard is the degree to which PEs concentrate on one particular programme area at the expenses of others – in these parishes as well as more broadly.

4 Evaluation of processes

This section discusses programme input, process and output areas – or economy and efficiency aspects (see diagram 1 above) by outcome area. It therefore looks at participatory and qualitative measures that show how and why the programme is achieving intended objectives – although it will also include space for unintended effects.

4.1 Programme process performance

Livelihoods

Overall, the inputs and processes around the livelihood outcome area have been strongest in the area of developing entrepreneurial capacity and livelihood skills. Ensuring that this increase in knowledge and skills translates to an increase in income and food security has proved challenging – largely due to the limited potential for providing capital inputs but also to structural and governance challenges in the youth groups. There also remains considerable opportunity for the harmonisation of services and information with actors providing livelihoods support across the region.

Looking at the inputs and processes regarding the income and food security indicator areas, it is clear that the youth groups are provided with adequate training and support in book-keeping management, cash security and the construction and maintenance of VSLA systems. In terms of the identification of target groups, it is largely the more economically successful that are selected – average capitals assets being c. 80000 shillings. This brings into question the challenging negotiation of seeking out those groups with capacity constraints and MARPs, in relation to the groups that already demonstrate significant economic earning potential. Programme staff, PEs and focus groups could not outline any specific outreach activities that targeted the earning potential of more vulnerable groups.

Feedback did indicate that some youth groups encountered significantly more structural and capacity challenges than others, but there was limited evidence to suggest that these groups were systemically targeted specifically for the purpose of supporting groups with less experience. Finally, the overall strategy for income generation was on perishable cash crops and VSLAs rather than staples which are considered to require greater inputs. The approach of issuing livestock and veterinary training was also observed to be minimal, again due to high input costs.

Processes and structures of support to youth groups tended to differ between in-school and out-of-school locations. In school locations for instance, there were a number of occasions where ex-group participants outside of school declared that they had encountered attrition due to high migration. They therefore struggled to maintain motivation and momentum in the project – partly due to the fact the participants who had migrated for the purposes of seeking other opportunities were seldom allowed to return to group activities (they were considered to have abandoned their responsibilities). It can be speculated that in school environments, committees and teachers served to support the groups to circumvent or overcome such challenges.
The third indicator area focused on the provision of enterprising life skills. The major contribution from Restless Development in this area is with respect to supporting the registration process of groups, being consistently present at community level to provide innovative information on farming methods and relieving the work pressures of sub-county Community Development Officers (as discussed under ‘outcomes’). However, there remain challenges in managing the compositions of groups – such as gender and age balances. In practice, the majority of groups tend to be gender balanced with a youth majority but there are occasions where the group is highly unbalanced and includes adults and elders which may contribute to a power differential in the groups. Feedback from programme staff outlined that the process of handling these tensions were ad hoc, and that there were limited guidelines or policies (these issues are dealt with under the heading exploring knowledge management documentation in section 6.4)

Guidelines as well as programme staff and PEs were also unclear on the participatory nature of livelihood option selection, adding market value, and the broader definition of ‘alternative livelihoods’. In terms of livelihood options, many focus groups were either unclear regarding the degree to which they were able to guide the livelihood focus of the groups, or regarding additional viable options. On the other hand, there was one case where a focus group of young women managed to maintain support for beer brewing – an area of work which Restless Development does not officially support. Secondly, while training on ‘market education’ is provided to groups, it is only given at the outset of the initiatives. In practice, activities such as cost-benefit analysis regarding the selling of cash crops in district centres (and paying for additional transport) versus selling in sub-county or parish market centres, or the development of broader co-operatives, are rarely undertaken.

Thirdly, while the term ‘alternative livelihoods’ is often referenced in programme literature and practices, there is limited understanding amongst staff and PEs as to what this refers to precisely. In practice, the livelihood focus area does provide alternatives to youth groups, but these are often in the area of agricultural alternatives, rather than opportunities in alternative vocations. Livestock management itself, while a ‘traditional’ livelihood method, can nevertheless also be considered an alternative for youth in some respects – particularly in dry seasons when the majority of youth migrate to urban centres. This is equally the case with other potential trades or vocations. In practice, previous YRDP income generating activities show such activities have taken place (Restless Development 2010), such as brick laying and stone quarrying. While these were not identified in the evaluation exercise, this may be due to the limited scope of time to assess multiple sites and obtain a wider perspective on activities.

The process of supporting livelihood skill development is comprehensive and effective – supporting previous discussions on livelihood outcomes. There do however remain some issues about potential for scale-up, improved co-ordination and, as before, definition and discussion of ‘alternative livelihood’ options. The provision of knowledge extension services through the PE model is highly effective, and focus groups are able to demonstrate and vocalise detailed agricultural technologies – partly due to the continued presence of PEs in communities, and that PEs themselves seem most confident in this area of work. The fact that youth are able to construct and maintain these plots with severely limited assets (including no fertiliser and pesticides given the focus on Sustainable Organic Farming Techniques (SOFT)) is also testament to the economy and efficiency of inputs and processes.

In terms of scale-up, and in addition to previous points about adding market value and alternatives, is the issue about land use. In some focus groups, it was revealed that securing plots proved
challenging for some youth given their doubly low position as low-income earners and being young. Dialogues on these matters can be challenging for youth and in some cases elders demanded payment (cash or in-kind) that young people were not able to challenge. Adults and elders were themselves concerned that youth would permanently annexe their land.

Finally, with respect to co-ordination processes, Restless Development has undertaken informal collaborations with the NAADS office. This initiative was to determine the variety of technologies used in NAADS implementation practices and look at national and district agricultural priorities. However, limited evidence of any other opportunities in which Restless Development could engage in were encountered – either in terms of co-ordination or sector meetings at district level in Moroto and Napak. This is demonstrative of a broader vacuum of interaction in the area of livelihoods development in the districts. This limited harmonisation or awareness of activities is also clearly discernible at community level. For instance, focus groups often noted the disconnect between Restless Development’s provision of consistent knowledge services and limited capital inputs in contrast to the activities of NAADS, Samaritans Purse and the DDG which provided extensive capital inputs and direct services without any additional knowledge service provision whatsoever.

**Civic participation**

The successes for Restless Development in negotiating outcomes in this area have been making themselves known for their work on peace education with youth at district, sub-county and parish levels in an increasingly crowded environment of actors working on similar issues with different cohorts. The main challenge here therefore is mapping the tensions in the broader region and co-ordinating with existing initiatives and actors at district level.

For instance, the processes around **developing and accessing peace plans for youth** have focused on education rather than any mediation or direct conflict resolution services. The general level of focus has been at inter-community level (as per the Sports Day event discussed in the outcomes section). Feedback from programme staff and key informants emphasised the likelihood of community tensions remaining in the target communities despite a decade of disarmament and peace-building. With this in mind, some actors – DDG in particular - have undertaken a comprehensive mapping of the varying tensions across the region in order to better locate and nuance their initiatives. As Restless Development focuses on education rather than mediation per se, it is not significantly obliged to work at this level of detail. However, some programme staff have suggested that Restless Development explore this area as it is believed that the organisation does encounter varying tensions at community level and currently gathers information on such matters informally – either through discussions with PEs and/or key contacts at district level.

As stated in the outcome section, given that it was challenging to obtain information from focus groups regarding how Restless Development undertook conflict education activities in the parishes, it is difficult to provide indicative examples of success. Nevertheless, triangulation from key informants and programme staff indicates that there is a high presence of parish-level actors and groups in this area – including government peace committees, a community support committee and a drama group (both associated through the DDG) as well as informal peace groups apparently setup by Restless Development PEs. Collectively, these efforts have reached a significant number of young people in the sense that almost all focus groups are familiar with the work of DDG, Restless Development and government outreach activities and reporting **increased participation in peace-building activities**— although definitive attribution is blurred.

Such overlaps can produce positive outcomes if handled appropriately. For instance, Restless Development and DDG were at one stage both working in Lopeei parish. These activities were
unplanned and were originally considered to be a duplication of efforts, but it was then realised that the work was complementary and reinforcing – thereby directly adjusting the programming procedures of DDG in the parish (DDG partnered with Restless Development in this instance but details are unclear). Mixed proactive coordination is also occurring at district level as well as parish level. For instance, the majority of key informants working on peace-building activities have not encountered Restless Development staff in the Peace Actors Working Group, while on the other hand Restless Development has supported youth councillors to engage in selected meetings at district level (although youth remain inadequately represented in meeting minutes).

Stakeholder capacity

The processes around achieving this outcome area are closely associated with the broader concept or main strength of the entire programme in that it is also bridging service providers and youth. It is clear that a number of actors are utilising Restless Development as a matchmaker between institutional levels, i.e. utilising their connections with PEs and community members for research and mobilisation purposes. Both UNICEF and Save the Children for instance, recognised the niche competency of Restless Development in communicating with appropriate audiences at community level given their close relationships with PEs.

Another of the leading activities supporting this outcome is the ‘Youth Sector Transformation Programme’ (YSTP) focused on organisational structures rather than individual youth. In the first two years Restless Development focused on generic organisational development training (i.e. staff-led delivery of modules like financial management, programme cycle management, strategic planning etc.). In the final year, the decision was made to revise the focus and mode of delivery of activities based on learning from the previous two years. A dual focus was introduced: 1) build the capacity of the CSO in the focus areas 2) mainstream youth participation in the focus areas. With this in mind, three modules were developed: M&E, programme cycle management and advocacy. In addition, Restless Development adopted a new ‘Training of Trainers’ (TOT) model for mainstreaming youth participation in which young alumni are trained as trainers and then lead the training and follow up mentoring for the CSOs. Restless Development piloted this model in Eastern Uganda first and then adapted it to Karamoja. In terms of broader processes though, while substantial appetite for collaboration still exists at high levels, formalisation of partnerships has stalled. Part of this temporary pause is due to the development of a ‘blue-print’ Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) that did not adequately cater for the variable capacity needs of NGO and CSO participants in the training workshops.

Local government actors are also aware of the side benefits of Restless Development’s communicative activities between parishes, sub-counties and districts. A number of key informants at district level emphasised that they had limited capacity to routinely reach out to sub-county officials to ensure that institutional support structures were being maintained. Consequently, Restless Development provides an informal ‘watchdog’ service in addition to its stated objectives as it works fluidly across these levels in its focus locations. It was however stated that more could be done to support district youth councillors given that they have no delegated resources at that level.

Sexual Reproductive Health

Despite suggestions from Restless Development programme staff that the SRH programme area is one of the main challenges in terms of outcomes, the processes and activities demonstrate significant successes – although more could be done in terms of communication and partnering with organisations. At district level for instance, Restless Development is participating in planning meetings on HIV/AIDs, and providing inputs into the HIV/AIDs work plan. It also assists the district
health office to assign responsibilities in order to avoid duplication, i.e. who is doing what and where, whilst also bringing programme experience into discussions. There have also been successes in co-ordinating with the Mulago-Mbarara Teaching Hospitals’ Joint AIDS Programme (MJAP) and Marie Stopes as previously discussed. There is also further opportunity in the latter activity as Marie Stopes has expressed an interest in continued and expanded collaboration on SRH education outreach.

Despite these successes, there are some perceptions that programme staff could add more value through their attendance at district Health Coordination Group meetings. This would update NGOs and government officers on activities and also develop opportunities for partnership and co-learning. Finally, some key informants recognised that working on SRH sensitisation and cultural change brings its own challenges (cultural resistance, limitations on short-term impact, varied approaches and messaging) and suggested that Restless Development could take advantage of its broad programme portfolio to take advantage of this. For instance, any activity looking at socio-cultural change that is seeking long-term and effective impact requires an integrated programming approach that draws on efforts to support economic empowerment and improved governance. In some respects, the YEP programme is structured in a way (multiple and mutually reinforcing goals) that provides significant potential for added-value. In practice, programme staff understand integration and the causal mechanisms that link the goals in different ways. This is dependent on staff role, specialities and experience, rather than stipulated in an overall guidance document.

4.2 PE support by outcome area

This section explores retrospective observations of PE activities and forward-looking opportunities for PE actions, divided by outcome area, drawing on feedback from programme staff, PEs themselves (interviews and feedback in the de-briefing workshop) and focus groups. Broader human resource and organisational management of PEs is addressed in section 7.

As outlined in section 5.1, the livelihoods outcome area is the one in which PEs demonstrate most knowledge and confidence, although a detailed understanding of a variety of ‘alternative’ livelihood options outside of cash crop small-scale agriculture was rarely visible. This is not a performance concern per se, given that Restless Development priorities match this focus – it is only a matter for consideration in discussing scale-up options and future exploration of the definition of ‘alternative livelihoods’ in future programme activities. More significant challenges exist in the degree to which livelihood activities are truly participatory – given that many focus groups declared that they had little choice in deciding precise income generating activities – i.e. the type of crop and/or other non-agricultural methods of income generation. This is of course a difficult line to tread, as many groups suggested beer-brewing which is against the values and principles of Restless Development, or would suggest high capital input activities such as livestock rearing.

Another issue worth investigating is the degree of dependency that youth groups have on management structures and PE support in out-of-school settings. Two focus groups declared that they had encountered issues with PEs abandoning project support and migrating out of communities. In these cases, the youth groups felt disempowered and unable to seek redress to either Restless Development PEs in other groups or authorities;

'We dug the garden and then we were stranded. When this person left [PE], nobody came to check on us so we left it. We didn’t feel we could go and speak to the VPE in the next operation – we thought that that VPE would reject us and tell us to go back' (Focus Group Discussion – ex-participants)
This situation occurred despite the fact that Restless Development has a ‘replacement’ PE scheme in place for such eventualities. While this type of situation rarely takes place, it does perhaps demonstrate that there is some work to be done in training and follow-up exercises that emphasise broad ownership of initiatives in the youth groups, and that PEs provide an ‘open-door’ service for consultations and support.

In the outcome area of conflict-resolution and decision-making, the evidence of outcomes and processes, while limited with respect to PEs, indicates that they appreciate a broad perspective on their role as peace-builders – including intra-household, intra-community and inter-community roles. There was however some blurring of allocated responsibilities in terms of the balance between neutral education roles, and active mediation roles. In practical delivery of support services, this distinction is itself blurred, but PEs were nevertheless unsure of top-line guidance in this area. There were also numerous accounts from focus groups that PEs were delivering a gender-sensitive service by supporting young women as well as young men to participate in discussions – an activity overlooked by many of the other actors working on similar issues at parish level.

The outcome area of stakeholder participation is considered the one that was most challenging for PEs to undertake. During the de-briefing workshop it was clear that the majority of PEs were more comfortable providing feedback on more tangible outputs in the other outcome areas, while the more intangible process-based issues in outcome three seemed to stall effective dialogue and communication on (non)achievements and lessons. Feedback from focus groups did reveal however, that many PEs had undertaken informal relationships with VHT personnel to setup referral systems. In some cases, this stretched as far as leading sensitisation activities as communities mistrusted or ignored the activities of VHTs. While this is a clear example of supporting the capacity development (or in some instances perhaps the ‘crowding-out’) of youth friendly services, PEs would acknowledge this activity more as a component of outcome four (SRH) rather than outcome three. Similarly, PEs declared increased personal skill development in the area of ‘conducting meetings with sub-county officials’ and ‘leadership’ but the connection of these areas of work to outcome three appeared to remain unclear. This is understandable given that outcome three activities were largely led by Restless Development staff rather than PEs, but there are perhaps some points here for broader strategic discussion - particularly in the area of capturing outcomes from PE activities that can be classified under outcome three, but may be lost due to limited PE familiarity of broader programmes and M&E structures.

Outcome area four (SRH) can be considered, alongside the livelihoods component, the area in which PEs feel most confident in terms of knowledge and skills gained from training, as well as in terms of implementation process and outcome achievements. This may partly be due to the tangible nature of the outcome area and related knowledge concepts, i.e. technical information (like farming methods) is more ‘objective’ irrespective of cultural or social context. As discussed in section 5.1, the indicator areas regarding awareness-raising about the risks related to transactional sex and inter-generational relationships appeared to be off the agenda in de-briefing discussions, as well in terms of familiarity amongst recipient groups. Indicator areas on safe sexual practices and related life skills were much more central to the core understanding and approaches used by PEs in outcome four.
4.3 Issue prioritisation

As outlined in the methodology, each of the focus group exercises aimed to capture the major concerns and interests of young people in the community from an open-ended perspective in order to compare and contrast with the established objectives of the YEP.

The outputs in table two (see annexe) demonstrate that the YEP programme is largely addressing the priority needs of the community. The most highly ranked causes and consequences of ‘challenges’ in each parish are firstly associated with hunger, drought and unemployment, secondly; peace and security, and thirdly, diseases (HIV/AIDS). These correspond to responses in the YEP programme through outcome areas one, two and four (livelihoods, peace-building and SRH). The issue of stakeholder capacity to engage youth (outcome three) is more of an up-stream process issue and is completely absent in discussions.

An additional point of interest is in the presentation of migration as a major issue, closely related to drought, hunger and unemployment. Migration was raised as a topic in its own terms (including the need for vocational training and skills for young people to be better prepared as they migrate) but it was also often considered in association with wider drivers of vulnerability. As a consequence, migration as a response to shocks and stresses, as well as an area in need of support, was clearly voiced in the focus groups.

Finally, there was little observed variation across cohort groups and parish locations aside from the different types of issues raised, unsurprisingly, by young women in relation to young men. For instance, young women mentioned concerns over sexual abuse, gender-based violence, health and reputation in the community, while young men completely omitted these issues. In terms of the latter point, young women attested that adults and elders considered most youth in the community to be HIV+, leading to unique forms of discrimination such as lack of support during childbirth due to fear of infection. An interesting point in relation to this is that adult and elderly women did not raise gender-based violence as an issue in any way. These suggest important areas for more gender responsive action. Similarly, alcoholism and associated violence was not considered by any cohort to be an issue worth prioritising, despite it being a common problem in communities.

4.4 Performance rankings

The following table provides a breakdown of performance rankings by outcome area based on the rankings provided by programme staff as well as an assessment of performance in the outcomes and process discussions above. This analysis serves to broadly demonstrate where YEP strengths and weakness lie - both with respect to achievements themselves, but also how these achievements reflect in the wider enabling environment. Rather than a definitive diagnostic, this assessment is designed to generate constructive debate and dialogue on the meaning of relative successes.

Table 2: Summary of outcome performance rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance ranking by thematic focus – as perceived by programme staff and observed outcomes</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification for ranking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Livelihoods
- Significant promotion of enterprising life and livelihood skills – including knowledge relevant for community impact (VLSAs, capital investments etc.)
- Only organisation supporting this area targeting youth
- Gender egalitarian nature of group profiles and management structure
- Maintenance of small but intensive plots with severely limited asset inputs – usually only knowledge, skills and motivation

2. Stakeholder capacity
- Partnerships developed despite complexity of issue and intangible nature of outcomes
- Spread of outcomes in district level (SWG) as well as NGOs and CSOs - including regional level presence
- Outcome area can draw upon a variety of successes in other goals not hitherto considered relevant
- YEP providing matchmaker service for research and mobilisation amongst other actors
- Transforming the Youth Sector Programme shifted focus to mainstreaming youth participation in CSOs rather than OD support with wide participation observed

3. Civic participation
- High familiarity on ‘Sport for Peace’ activities
- Collaborations with DDG and interest from UNICEF in South Sudan
- Focus on education rather than active mediation
- Inclusion of both young men, women, adults and elders – where others focus on males
- Limited branding and presence at community level given large number of parallel interventions

4. Sexual reproductive health
- Limited focus or outcomes on indicator areas of sexual advances and engaging in transactional and cross-generational sex
- Young women insufficiently empowered to apply knowledge gained from the YEP (e.g. contraception)
- Significant successes in partnership development and coordination
- Potential for more systematic focus on targeted integrated programming for women in particular

Table 3 provides some additional insights about the performance of the YEP across the different thematic areas, in light of the enabling environment.

Table 3: Performance of thematic areas in light of enabling environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance by thematic focus in light of enabling environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stakeholder capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Significant success in partnership development despite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenging policy and programming environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Achievements despite baseline capacity of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation in the region being extremely low, with multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sexual reproductive health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- YEP one of only a few programmes working on SRH directly at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community level and therefore a key player</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- YEP one of few organisations with aims for integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programme response including SRH, despite implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenges based on challenging working environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Significant achievement in partnership development and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaboration with district officials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The degree to which these outcome areas interacted was difficult to obtain in concrete terms from programme staff, key informants and focus groups alike. One of the few examples that clearly demonstrated this linkage was the fact that a number of groups declared that VSLA funds were often being borrowed by individuals with the express purpose of paying health costs. Another area where notable overlaps were noticed was in relation to outcome three (stakeholder capacity). For instance, and as discussed elsewhere, Restless Development support to help profile and register youth groups has allegedly freed-up the capacity of CDOs significantly as this was both a time-intensive activity to undertake, and one that CDOs were not always familiar with. In this way, a number of activities can be seen as supporting stakeholder capacity component.

Theoretically, there are a number of other value-added possibilities across other outcome areas, and while these might have occurred on an opportunistic basis, it was not clear whether there was a significant overlap in target groups or PE training methods to greatly increase the chances of integrated impacts. For instance, efforts on outcome four (SRH) had a tendency to extend most resources in schools, while outcome one (livelihoods) focused on out-of-school participants – thus reducing the potential for mutually reinforcing messaging and/or capital inputs.

4.5 Performance since mid-term review

The mid-term review (2012) raised a number of issues that were considered opportunities and challenges that were in need of following-up. These consisted firstly of the need to identify practical ways to involve young people in decision making; secondly, considering investing more resources in tracking of peer educators as they progress in life; thirdly, exploring alternative livelihood options, including through entrepreneurship and business networks; and fourthly, better addressing gender and social exclusion throughout programme.

With respect to the first area, there is recognition that there is a need to explore other avenues and a number of activities have initiated. Some of these actions have been more ‘up-stream’ in order to change institutional approaches to youth participation – such as the development of the Transforming the Youth Sector Programme which is reaching out to a number of NGOs and CSOs working in Napak and Moroto. Restless Development has also approached the NGO Concern to work on engaging youth councillors in selected meetings at district level, and shifted other activities away from work with UPDF toward training youth councillors more directly.

The focus is also to provide capacity support for youth to engage at sub-county level. This activity is both an end in itself (promoting more meaningful participation for youth) but also a means to promote the acceptance of youth participants in local governance consultations. Feedback from key informants suggests that while these activities are taking place, there are some initiatives (such as the Restless Development annual stakeholder meeting) which youth councillors feel alienated from. Finally, Restless Development also has recognised that participation on certain
issues (e.g. domestic violence) only has a certain amount of potential traction at sub-county and district levels and have therefore shifted such efforts toward, for example, parental guidance on SRH and the role of community participation.

In terms of tracking and maintaining links with PEs, Restless Development has taken steps to ensure that training workshops and communications with PEs emphasise procedures for ‘close-down’ and ‘next steps’. The 2013 debriefing workshop for instance, included new sessions on developing a CV, utilising the experience with Restless Development for best effect, and potential continued involvement with Restless Development itself as either alumni associates, or capacity building staff.

On following up on private sector and entrepreneurial expansion opportunities, Restless Development has taken substantial and promising steps. Initial efforts focused on scaling-up selected youth groups that showed demonstrable capacity to expand. One group per sub-county was selected (a total of six) for capital investments such as cereal banks, grinding machines and livestock. The wider concept behind this approach was that despite the focus on specific youth groups, any successes would provide increased public goods at the local level – such as access to services (cost-effective grinding, output storage and cheaper credit through larger VSLAs). In addition, Restless Development is reaching out to microfinance institutions. Initial conversations with the Centenary Farmers Bank proved to be challenging given that the administrative functions were not particularly youth-friendly (requiring detailed group constitutions, letters of support from service providers and large capital collateral (200000 shillings). Efforts have shifted toward the Moroto Credit and Saving Association in the past year, and indicative discussions suggest there is potential for Restless Development to build a constructive relationship.

The fourth issue, the degree to which Restless Development has expanded efforts to address gender and social exclusion throughout programme activities will be addressed in section 6 (Cross-cutting).

Overall, a number of additional examples of success in relation to these and other outcome areas can be found in the ‘Progress toward YEP Key 2011-2012 Learnings’ internal document that Restless Development retains as a reference guide.

4.6 External engagement and development

This section discusses performance, challenges and emerging opportunities in relation to various forms of external engagement across activities in the YEP. This can be broken down into policy-oriented and awareness raising activities such as dissemination, communication and advocacy on the one hand, and programmatic issues, such as partnership development, co-ordination and harmonisation on the other hand.

In terms of the former, the dissemination and communication of programme activities to stakeholders has been effective toward targeted government districts and stakeholders. District officials and a number of NGOs were familiar with the YEP programme activities. Central district officials for instance, confirmed that Restless Development staff routinely passed through district offices to announce their current and forthcoming activities in the areas. As previously discussed, programme staff also regularly appear in district sector working groups to disseminate and communicate YEP activities – most obviously in the Youth Sector Group, but also most notably in the Moroto Education and Health Sector groups. These continued engagements confirm that Restless Development is committed to shared learning as noted in its strategy but feedback from key informants suggest there are still areas where such activities can be improved.
For instance, dissemination and communication in terms of both written and oral materials and face-to-face presence could be more systematically undertaken to reach remaining district offices. A number of key informants attested to the fact that they were either unfamiliar or not up to date on the YEP activities, and did not receive quarterly reports and/or planning materials. This partial gap occurs not only laterally (across communication channels at district and sub-county level) but also vertically (district officials becoming familiarised on YEP activities via discussions with sub-county officials).

There is also a potential opportunity for the YEP to expand oral materials by taking advantage of radio air time in Karamoja. A number of district officials were familiar with Restless Development’s youth-driven newspaper outputs, and suggested that significant outcomes might be achievable through similar activities in local radio stations. An example in point being the Moroto District Health Office, which sends out regular ‘Health Choice Programmes’ which is effective in outreach and addressing target cohorts.

By contrast, the advocacy environment at district level in Moroto and Napak is somewhat closed. Restless Development programme staff are able to promote initiatives at the Youth and Sector Working Group level, but key informants from government offices also agree that opportunities for structural change are limited. The reason for this is firstly that discussion and policy agenda are often already pre-established, and secondly, the discussion space to debate these agendas is mostly set at national level. The fact that Restless Development has been able to establish and support the SWG on Youth at district level nonetheless demonstrates significant momentum for government to discuss and address youth issues within existing budget and policy constraints. There is also an element of concern espoused by programme staff that they have neither the expertise and capacity to map and critically address policy gaps and opportunities.

In the area of partnership development, co-ordination and harmonisation, many of the aspects above that refer to dissemination and communication also apply given that events used for dissemination and communication also act as venues share lessons and harmonise activities. For instance, key informants declare that the SWG on Youth and other SWGs offer more straightforward dissemination opportunities (verbal updates, networking etc.), but also act as spaces for co-ordination and harmonisation. The section on ‘partners’ under outcome three discussed above also reveals a number of existing and growing partnerships with GOs and CSOs that enable access to information and dialogue at both district and regional level.

Finally, a minority of district officials remain unclear on YEP activities as attendance to sector working groups is selective. It is uncertain whether this selectivity is a strategic choice made by programme staff. There are also requests from district officials to be more actively engaged in upstream strategic planning – with corresponding opportunities for joint implementation and monitoring. With this in mind, Restless Development’s attendance is also well-received in annual district planning meetings, where presentations on overall aims and objectives are shared.

---

11 The EKOI Bulletin is a publication developed by the Karamoja Youth Action Research Team, supported by Restless Development and the Pastoralist Communication Initiative.
5 Cross-cutting

A variety of important cross-cutting issues are relevant for the purposes of this evaluation. Particular attention will be given to issues concerning gender dynamics, Most At Risk Populations (MARPs), migration dynamics and integrated programming more generally.

With respect to gender analysis and responsive programming, feedback from programme staff and from observations of written materials and guidelines suggests that the YEP is largely aimed at addressing women’s ‘practical gender needs’, rather than their ‘strategic interests’ (Moser 1989). This does not necessarily mean that Restless Development is under-performing in this area, only that it may not currently have the planning and expertise capacity, nor the institutional scope to branch-out into gender-specific programming measures that have long-term transformative potential for the empowerment of women. For instance, the YEP does address the needs of young women directly in its livelihoods outcome area, civic participation/peace-building outcome area, and to a greater extent its SRH outcome area. While gender is therefore considered by programme staff to be mainstreamed across the outcome areas, there is no formal standalone policy documentation or manual that goes into great depth on gender analysis and programme responses that which might achieve more transformative outcomes for young women, such as how to improve their ability to manage relationships within the household or the community.

In practice, the PE training exercises have received increased focus on gender issues, with discussions regarding the difference between biological definitions of sex, and social definitions of gender. The profile of the PEs themselves however is unbalanced – with roughly one in five PEs being a young woman – although numbers have been growing annually. Feedback from programme staff explained that this is largely due to relatively fixed gender stereotypes about the potential leadership and representative roles that young women can engage in. While Restless Development declared that they had worked hard to reach out to communities to expand the number of PE applications, the lack of any broader gender strategy, in particular an affirmative action policy as well as clear plans to integrate gender as one of the dimensions in which they work with partners to transform the vision of young people (so that the perception of women as leaders can be transformed, particularly amongst young people), prevented this exercise from being fully effective. There is also testimony from a district official that Restless Development could potentially be more active in the Gender Working Group and informing stakeholders on gender-related outcomes and activities.

Meanwhile, there is good evidence from focus groups and PEs that the youth groups are largely composed of a balanced membership of young women and men – even in the management committees of these groups. As previously stated, the YEP has also been one of the few NGOs to recognise young women as key players in the peace process and thereby very much included them in outreach and consultative activities. As it stands in the YEP documentation however, this is where measurements of success end with regard to the empowerment of young women. In other words, it is assumed that increased female representation necessarily leads to empowerment, whereas in practice a large variety of barriers may still remain at individual, household, community and state policy level. It is clear from interviews that programme staff recognise gender as an area of work that would ideally have a higher profile, but broader institutional and project priorities prevent further expansion or investigation into this area.
The need to more specifically target socially excluded and vulnerable groups (Most At Risk Populations) was raised as learning point in the 2012 Mid-Term review. In effect, the MARPs in this case refer to youth isolated in kraals and away from parish centres, the disabled and commercial sex workers. In keeping with good practice, PEs and programme staff do not undertake high profile outreach for sex workers for fear of stigmatisation. In practice, the partnership with Makarere Joint AIDs Programme (MJAP) is partially designed to seek out persons living with HIV (‘Positive Living’ component) and it is assumed that many MARPs will be part of this cohort. With no baseline or data however, it is difficult to refer to any successes in this area.

Restless Development demonstrates relevant adjustments to more proactively target MARPs in its inclusion of a MARP category in participatory outreach exercises. As in the discussion above concerning gender, it has also sought to proactively gain applications from disabled individuals during the PE recruitment process. It has nevertheless achieved limited results given the considerable resource challenges of proactively finding and promoting applications from young people with disabilities – many of whom have limited capacities to apply themselves. Further, additional thought would need to be given about how to ensure the livelihood alternatives promoted are well fitted for young people with disabilities. This is a re-occurring challenge in participatory programming, and one that is not unique to Restless Development. The fact the YEP formally recognises it as an ongoing challenge is a considerable achievement in itself.

As briefly outlined in previous discussions, the issue of migration routinely emerged as a key concern factor for youth (both male and female) as well as adults. In the dry seasons, between 60-80% of youth are venturing outward to nearby urban centres, as well as larger cities – including Kampala. There is also evidence that there is considerable internal movement of youth to the agricultural zones in the South West of Karamoja and the district officials are seeking to reorient service delivery accordingly. Discussions with IOM revealed that organised trafficking is a major issue in Karamoja, affecting youth and children, with major corresponding protection issues. Adults and elders confirmed that they preferred youth to remain in the vicinity as there a strong perception of risk in external environments – very much associated with vulnerability to HIV infection.

The YEP does not directly address this issue but does provide support services by aiming to reduce agricultural risk and thereby drought effects, which is considered to be the main driver of outward migration. In terms of unemployment issues that are ‘off-farm’ or ‘non-farm’, Restless Development has considered the possibility of response mechanisms focused on vocational training. These discussions are in their infancy, and are being informally undertaken with Concern Worldwide. This opportunity does indeed show notable promise given that Concern have had successes in the area of carpentry, mechanics and sewing with youth as a target cohort. Programme staff report that part of the issue that has prevented earlier discussion in this area is that the area of ‘livelihoods’ was never clearly defined. This also has implications for expenditure on the PE model, as increased focus on more technical aspects of vocational support to youth would imply a reduction funds elsewhere (e.g. a reduced number of, or limited engagement with PEs), and hence wider community outreach with respect to other outcome areas. Overall, while these are complex issues, the YEP is beginning to explore how to address these internally and through external partnerships.

The final cross-cutting issue concerns the integrated nature of programme responses in the YEP. This issue was been raised briefly in section 5, but is worth isolating as a key point given that the YEP programme is one of the few NGO programmes with such a broad cross-cutting focus.

12 Key informant interview, District Officer
particularly given the overall focus on youth. This issue is also often recognised by district officials and focus groups;

“RD should continue to focus across all four – because all are relevant to the youth. They are all mutually reinforcing.” [Youth group participants]

“Socio-cultural sensitisation only works so far. This needs to be accompanied by literacy and education with retention – as well as adult literacy programmes” [District Official]

The YEP systems facilitate opportunities for such integrated practices by providing a ‘management for impact’ section in its work plans. These are checked by Restless Development staff in planning meetings, and the aim is for them to be connected to the organisation’s National Strategic Framework (NSF). While this is a good start, programme staff recognise there is limited guidance on how combinations of outcomes link together in terms of maximum impact. For instance, the written procedures and processes of inputs and throughputs in outcome area four do not currently provide a detailed account of how integrated programming processes could support the outcomes in other areas.

The NSF does indicate that these outcome areas eventually lead into broader top-line goals, but it is the ‘in-between’ steps that are allegedly missing. In practice for instance, programme staff and key informants recognise the importance of integrated programming and do take steps to ensure that synergies are maintained. However, these activities are opportunistic and dependent on the knowledge and placing of individual personnel rather than a systematic process that demands attention through monitoring and evaluation.

It is also an area in which the YEP can demonstrate particular integrated models to district officials. For instance, as it stands, all of the district and sub-county sector officials interviewed in the evaluation were largely familiar with the work of Restless Development in the area they had an interest in. The YEP is uniquely placed to reach out to ‘silied’ government personnel and introduce case studies and best practices from its programming. YEP activities could thereby reveal that integrated programming can provide value-added that is more than the sum of its parts.

6 Organisational capacities

6.1 Monitoring and Evaluation

A number of lessons and opportunities emerged during the evaluation regarding the construction and maintenance of M&E systems in the YEP. During the Demand Generated Consultation (DGC) phase of the methodology for instance, the community presented two interesting insights that, despite being too far-reaching for the evaluation exercise itself, might nevertheless prove useful for future M&E exercises. The first was the idea of determining the ‘most successful’ youth group out of all 50 participating groups. The YEP would then work with this group intensively to determine success factors and from there scale-up or replicate these conditions where possible. In practice, this activity could be conducted by undertaking a broad ‘Most Significant Change’ analysis with all VPEs – most likely during de-brief phases – or as a separate research exercise.

---

13 This space provides an opportunity for programme staff to report on the integrated or collective result of outcomes
The second issue raised in the DGC had wider implications that problematized the locus of change in the programme, as well as the definition of a livelihood output. A small number of community participants requested clarification on why the measurement focus in many of the programme sub-objectives were aimed at household level, when in fact much of the outcomes would most readily be applicable at either the individual or group levels, and that assessing or disaggregating the multiple inputs, outputs and outcomes at household level can be highly problematic. In relation to this, a small number of participants also suggested that it might be worth shifting the focus of attention away from changes in income, toward where and how income was being spent (i.e. changes in consumption patterns). In essence, this thinking is largely captured in the growing exploration of Household Economy Analysis (HEA) approaches popularised by Save the Children, which emphasise the importance of assessing livelihood and coping from shocks and stresses, including seasonality, and responses such savings methods approaches and intra-household bargaining (Boudreau 2008).

More broadly, feedback regarding the construction and use of the programme logframe has been mixed. Generally, programme staff felt that the logframe requires a high volume of performance information down to the individual level through monitoring capacity building and training workshops with PEs. This level of reporting detail was considered by some to overwhelm potentially more fruitful M&E indicators, such as those that focus on process issues. It seems therefore that the donor M&E approach has a tendency to prioritise quantity over quality of outputs and tangible over intangible change.

Part of this detailed reporting pressure also serves to complicate and reduce efforts into real-time monitoring of programming activities\(^\text{14}\). For instance, during the evaluation programme staff were asked to report on performance issues relating strictly to the outcome areas but were not encouraged to map or categorise performance by location in any detail. Rather, the categorisation of target parishes into over-performing, on-track and under-performing was largely developed informally by programme staff in an attempt to adjust on-going resources and focus accordingly. In practice, this exercise proved challenging given that a headline definition of ‘over-performing’ actually raised several difficult questions about the aggregate performance across each of the outcome areas. Staff would have preferred to invest more resources into generating an M&E system focused on real-time learning, rather than detailed upward accountability output measurements – though this would need to be an activity developed in collaboration with adjusting donor M&E methods accordingly as well.

Aside from these issues, the organisation’s monthly programme progress reports (PMPRs) provide significant detail generated from the programme officer staff and PEs. Each of the PMPRs allocates space to remark on previous action points, milestones toward targets, and other learning points. This is a comprehensive M&E tool that provides a wide and sufficiently deep mechanism to capture progress. The bottle-neck in terms of the real-time monitoring of the YEP remains the institutional capacity to assess and organise this broad base of information given that other, parallel reporting demands exist. A related issue may be the quality of M&E training and related capacity of PEs to provide useful data for this purpose. For instance, while programme staff recognised that the YEP had to lower the standards and qualifications for entry for PE volunteers,

---
\(^{14}\) Real-time monitoring methods provide an overview or indicator of progress toward input, output or outcome achievements that does not rely on infrequent reporting procedures (yearly reports or reviews etc.). RTM therefore provides more immediate (i.e. monthly) guidance to policy and programme staff regarding the performance of a project. This allows a more reactive and flexible approach to project management, and takes into account change as and when it happens, rather than ‘after the event’ (by which point it is too late to provide any corrective measures in programme responses)
the de-briefing workshop demonstrated that some PEs were having difficulty communicating the core goals of the programme, and thereby categorising related performance feedback.

The **managerial and guidance support from Comic Relief** has created space for discussions on continuous learning and reflection throughout the YEP. In this manner, the YEP has managed to re-orient some its activities in accordance with shifting priorities at community level, as well as emerging opportunities at district level. The section on ‘performance since mid-term review’ (section 5.5.) discusses many examples where Comic Relief allowed space for reflection that provided new programme avenues – cases in point being the Youth Sector Transformation Programme through the Training of Trainers model, and the re-allocation of assets for income generating activities. Restless Development itself works in congruence with this approach as it also has a strong learning-focused approach, including having the luxury to explore and be open to ‘failure’ and thereby build better interventions as a result.

While this flexibility is welcomed, programme staff felt that feedback from Comic Relief in relation to annual and mid-term reports was too minimal, and that support on systems and tool development may have provided more opportunities for innovation. Despite the fact that feasibility assessments were undertaken for the project, some YEP staff were nevertheless unfamiliar with these and felt that they had therefore been forced into a position where certain activities (such as the original outcome five, life skills) had to be subsumed into other goal areas or redefined entirely. A more positive perspective on this experience is that the YEP has consciously taken a ‘learn-by-doing’ approach which is much more effective in dealing with consistently changing and complex programming environments, and in keeping with Restless Development principles.

Programme staff also suggested that the development of a longitudinal study or a comparison with a ‘control’ community would have enabled a more scientific approach to M&E and evaluative activities, as opposed to the current assessment of case studies and Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice (KAP) surveys. Ultimately though, such intensive control-type M&E systems require significant investment and resources in both time and technical capacity development and therefore benefits need to be carefully considered.

### 6.2 Strategising and Organisational Management

This section reviews some of the methods used to strategise and manage the YEP on a number of levels, including the development of conceptual and implementation plans, knowledge management arrangement and human resources.

The YEP has a comprehensive, overarching goal structure linked with internal systems at the national and global level. Linkages between the NSF (2011-2015) and the operational plans for the YEPs in Eastern and Northern Uganda are clear and show clear lines of outcome flow to the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) Matrix. Despite much criticism, LFA approaches continue to be used in development and humanitarian planning contexts given that they provide a useful way of demonstrating causes and consequences. The LFA does have a tendency to prioritise quantitative data, restrict adaptation and focus on single-ended outcomes rather than unintended effects. The use of LFA is often an un-negotiable as donors often demand and understand accountability measures to be predictable. In practice, Restless Development has balanced this approach with adaptability at regional level that nevertheless has taken advantage of emerging opportunities (e.g. shifts in Youth Sector Transformation Programme, adjustment of outcome five etc.) and has an emphasis on behavioural change. This demonstrates that Restless Development is actually
unconsciously leaning toward an ‘Outcome Mapping’ approach, while also being partly constrained to the LFA approach. More broadly, the YEP in the North was designed and adapted from work conducted through the YEP in the East, as well as the pilot Youth Recovery and Development Programme (2009-2010). This planning demonstrates that Restless Development has taken aboard the successes and challenges in these activities and adapted them to the Karamoja context. In terms of peer educator recruitment and training for instance, Restless Development recognised the need to lower enrolment rates for participants given lower educational attainments in the region. Programme staff recognised that while projects require a fixed focus to some extent, some would be interested in exploring additional issue areas that may drive and support change, such as the role of law and order services, gender-based violence and associated factors such as alcoholism. Staff also suggested that an overall ‘theory of change’ would be helpful in mapping-out such parallel issues, as well as the activities of other stakeholders in order to situate the work of the YEP in a wider trajectory of change. This would also therefore more clearly articulate the role of the programme within a wider context of change.

In terms of knowledge management, the YEP draws upon a series of issue-specific guideline and manual documents – such as the Peace-building manual (2013), Civic Participation manual (2013), and Simplified Livelihood Guide (2013). These documents are thematically comprehensive – dealing with an array of relevant technical and applied ‘everyday’ content. They are written in a youth-friendly manner with case studies and templates, and also have sections which outline how to manage power differentials and cater for MARPs – including young women. While these provide a broad and useful resource for PEs, feedback from focus groups has demonstrated that certain aspects of the manuals have not filtered through comprehensively to target audiences. For instance, while detail about cash-crop farming methods have had demonstrably significant up-take, familiarity with down-stream issues such as market assessment, value-added and other marketing components are almost universally absent. This is a structural challenge given firstly that there are a number of parallel work streams and that PEs therefore only have a fixed capacity in time and space to educate youth groups. In addition, this is often the first time that youth groups have participated in any income generating activity, and the overall familiarity of cash-crop marketing methods are low in the communities as a whole given the historic focus on food security and staples. The challenge for Restless Development therefore remains how to educate youth groups and communities in the future on market dynamics and scale-up, while continuing to recognise structural constraints.

The main issues around the human resources aspect of the YEP organisational strategy are arguably in the area of PE management. The PEs are invited to a training workshop at the outset, mid-term and final de-briefing stages of the programme. As discussed in the cross-cutting section, there remain some issues concerning the proactive engagement of young women volunteers but this is also due to wider socio-cultural barriers in the region and is an issue that was recognised even in the pilot YRDP activities.

PEs submit Monthly Progress Reports to Programme Officers which are jointly reviewed at monthly meetings with a focus on assessing progress against targets. The feedback is used to re-direct activities and provide support as required to ensure targets are met. PEs did however request more direct contact support and a corresponding calendar of intended activities that could be

---

15 Outcome mapping focuses on secondary impacts of project activities, with emphasis afforded toward ‘the ends’ with ‘the means’ (including outcomes) remaining extremely flexible. This approach appreciates the complexity of intervention and the fact that attribution is often impossible to comprehensively assess.
discussed with sub-county officials but given current resource constraints it is understandable that YEP programme staff are more or less only able to visit and support communities on a monthly basis. PEs also suggested that reimbursable funding for travel expenses may be re-appropriated to an investment in a fleet of bicycles which, while not supporting travel to district centres per se, would improve inter-community communications potential.

Finally, through the initial foundation training PEs are introduced to the organisation’s safety and security policy designed to ensure the welfare of volunteers. This policy helps to respect of rights of programme participants and therefore the ‘do no harm’ approach promoted by Restless Development. What appears to be missing in the documentation is something akin to a child protection component that serves to guide PEs and groups. Such procedures would provide an outline of steps and procedures to both prevent and respond to observed protection violations ‘internally’ (i.e. transgressions by PEs and youth group participants) but also ‘externally’ (i.e. transgressions observed in household and community settings). Such guidelines would assist PEs in dealing with referral mechanisms, such as ‘how’ and ‘when’ to intervene where abuse and violence are witnessed.

7 Sustainability

The issue of sustainability can be considered a combination of cost-effectiveness (or value for money) alongside achievement of outcomes. At a global and national level, Restless Development is rapidly expanding its understanding of value for money and seeking to develop a formal approach that addresses this issue systematically. This began in 2010 with the development of the ‘strategic review research cost effective and cost effective analyses’ and has since progressed into the ‘Value for Money’ concept note (2011-2012) and the ‘Value for Money Action plan’ (2011-2012). These concepts and processes have currently not filtered down in terms of implementation activities in the YEP as they are still being developed strategically. Despite this, programme staff informally recognise the difference between economy dimensions, and the issue of effectiveness. This is broadly seen in terms of a cost-benefit type approach, but remains dependent on individual staff perceptions.

Having said this, very useful programme planning documents do exist that help to ground value for money and sustainability concepts into practice. The ‘YEP Minimum Sustainable Standards’ document for instance, provides an overview of proposed minimum standards (e.g. the development of a youth desk in the NAADs office), how this will contribute to longer-term impact, and how achievement toward this minimum standard will be managed and monitored. This includes guidance on closing-down areas of work in relation to human resources, stakeholder communications, general programme information, finance and administration management, assets, contracts, and M&E.

A final key issue relating to sustainability, as raised by YEP staff, key informants and focus groups, relates to the continued presence of PEs at community level both during and after interventions have taken place. The PE model has a number of advantages; firstly, activities are much more likely to be ‘grounded’ in the language and concepts of community beneficiaries or participants. As PEs live in the communities themselves, they are also more likely to experience a form of ‘lateral accountability’ i.e. a form of peer review feedback from respondents who they value as fellow community members. There is also a strong efficiency argument in paying only cost
reimbursements and minor stipends for such a close and active connection with target communities.

This close connection has improved Restless Development’s work internally (e.g. mobilisation and issues raised above) but also externally (e.g. a number of NGOs have relied on the YEP networks to assist them in the development of their own mobilisation activities) – as well as in terms of ‘grounded’ approaches, as discussed. For instance, the PEs feedback to, and have check-ins with Programme Officers. These activities are undertaken to draw connections between community reality and organisational objectives. Finally, the support provided to PEs during debriefing – such as advice on exiting the programme, writing CVs and seeking further opportunities – have provided PEs with access to the skills and knowledge they need to ensure they continue on their trajectory of personal and professional growth. Indeed, during the de-briefing workshop, PEs consistently declared a greater sense of self-confidence, expanded skillsets, respect in community affairs and hopefulness for the future. The evaluation did not however undertake any systematic review of PE experiences and outcomes to provide any more detail.

8 Conclusions

This evaluation drew on rapid non-experimental participatory approaches using qualitative research methods, with a focus on key informant interviews and focus group discussions, to assess processes and outcomes of the YEP programme with both current and past programme participants. The evaluation is both retrospective and prospective in nature – looking at experience and applying this to lessons for future programming and policy concerns at the regional, national and global level. It therefore emphasises direct accountability with respect to plans and goals, but also with respect to a more open-ended learning approach that is in keeping with the principles of Restless Development.

The overall aim of the YEP was to ‘empower young Karimojong to lead the development of their communities, breaking the cycle of conflict and poverty to build a peaceful future’. Assuming that ‘empowerment’ in this case can be taken to mean the enhanced potential for the realisation of choice and capabilities (Sen 1999) then it is clear from the evaluation research that the YEP has been extremely successful in achieving goals in the majority of indicator areas that have led to a higher number of choices for young women and men which they are able to utilise for the development of their own wellbeing. The quantitative data reveals a promising picture in this regard, while the qualitative data (by nature) adds more caveats to these observed successes.

In terms of the outcomes and process as they relate to each of the outcome areas, the YEP has performed best in achieving outcomes in the area of livelihoods support and stakeholder participation, while performance could be strengthened with respect to peace-building and conflict resolution, and SRH. By contrast, taking the wider context into account, it is suggested that the programme has performed best in building ‘stakeholder participation’ and has significant potential, with the SRH component also a leading component. In general, these successes have been attributed to a ‘wide’ target audience – with most respondents benefiting from one or two activities, but more rarely all three.

- In outcome area 1, (Livelihoods), there has been significant promotion of enterprising life and livelihood skills – including knowledge relevant for community impact (VLSAs, capital investments etc.). It is also notable that the YEP is the only organisation
targeting youth in this area. However, there has been limited achievement on tangible outcomes in relation to intangible outcomes (income and food security gains versus knowledge, skills and confidence gains).

- In outcome area 2, (Civic Participation and Peace-building) there has been high familiarity and interest from communities on ‘Sport for Peace’ activities, and useful collaborations with parallel stakeholders at community level, while the focus on education rather than active mediation has enabled the YEP to retain a high degree of impartiality in conflicts. However, there has been limited branding at community level given large number of parallel interventions, and presence of YEP staff in sector relevant sector at district level has been missed.

- In outcome area 3, (Stakeholder participation) significant partnerships have developed despite the complexity of issue and intangible nature of outcomes. Outcomes have been witnessed at district level, such as the Sector Working Group, as well as within NGOs and CSOs, and via activities at community level. The YEP has also made in-roads with umbrella groups that have regional presence.

- In outcome area 4 (SRH), the YEP is seen as one of only a few programmes working on SRH directly at community level and therefore a key player. It is also one of few organisations with aims for integrated programme response via SRH activities. There have been implementation challenges due to the challenging working environment which have limited the application of knowledge (e.g. adoption of contraception) and the programme has struggled to undertake interventions to address the spread cross-generational sex.

Overall, the fact that the YEP has multiple thematic foci (health, peace, livelihoods) has enabled it to expand its involvement in activities with a wide number of actors at multiple institutional levels – including at ‘grassroots’ level via the PEs. This has provided Restless Development with unique and unparalleled presence in the region, particularly when taking into account the relative magnitude and scale of programme resources compared to more established international NGOs.

The major top-line challenges for Restless Development for future activities in the region is firstly deciding on an approach that continues to invest in multiple youth audiences (in-school and out-of-school including youth group participants) and seeing benefits from integrated programming where possible in a more opportunistic sense, or shifting focus to one larger target group (i.e. in-school youth, or an enlarged youth group, i.e. larger than 25 members – perhaps up to 40) and then applying a more systematic, integrated response. Ideally, it would be best to do both (continue to focus ‘widely’ but ‘deepen’ the value-added impact through integrated responses) but this is a decision that is largely dependent on resources and internal capacities.

Such initiatives also require a parallel interest in supporting the PE model in order to take maximise its benefits, namely the close community connection enabling an effective brokering role, holistic approach, and the ability of PEs to closely tailor activities to local context. The major challenges here are addressing some of the current organisational weaknesses that affect the model, such as lack of expertise in gender sensitive programming, limited experience in supporting a range of livelihoods pathways and need for better articulation of the strategy to build youth civic engagement including in peace-building processes.

The methodological approach adopted in the evaluation was developed with the participation of Restless Development and YEP staff, as well as through the participation of communities in the form of Demand Generated Consultation exercises. Suggestions from these dialogues were
captured in the form of a revised evaluation plan. Major successes in term of delivery of the methodology were the wide variety of internal and external stakeholders visited (28 KIIs), targeted focus groups with adults, young men and women (18, each of which consisted of 4-8 individuals for the youth, and 6-12 individuals for the adult groups), the variety of sites visited (different performance characteristics across three parishes) and the review of a broad array of internal documentation. An additional context review of the programming and policy environment was also conducted. The central methodological challenge encountered was determining attribution of outcomes to YEP activities at community level, as participants would sometimes provide mixed messages – particularly with respect to outcomes two (conflict resolution, peace-building and civic participation) and outcome three (stakeholder participation).

The review of the enabling environment with respect to the focus outcome areas revealed mixed conclusions. For outcome one (livelihoods), the literature was often contradictory – demonstrating vociferous debate about the state of the Karamoja region and future livelihood prospects. The natural environment for crop-based livelihoods was considered to be very disabling, while the institutional environment provided to crop-based livelihood options was considered to be relatively high and supportive. Similarly, while robust evaluations of conflict-resolution and peace-building activities (outcome two) in Karamoja are limited, it is clear that a significant budget and supportive environment exists for NGOs and CSOs acting in this area. By contrast, outcomes three and four (stakeholder capacity and SRH) were both areas considered to have both short and long-term challenges, particularly outcome area four.

The major success in terms of outcome and process achievements, as revealed across the resource materials and discussions, was firstly the delivery of farming methods knowledge and skills to communities. This knowledge was widely regarded at community level and was being well implemented in both in-school and out-of-school environments. With respect to peace-building, the major success is considered to be the delivery and resultant awareness of community ‘Sport for Peace’ days – which were routinely cited in focus group discussions as highly productive events. In terms of stakeholder participation, the development of the Sector Working Group on Youth was considered to be the foundational achievement in the YEP, while the SRH component showed great promise delivering messages within school curricula and reaching a wide target area (19 of 25 schools) despite confronting the most significant disabling environment.

Major challenges for processes and outcomes remain in the area of enabling participating youth groups to scale-up activities relating to income generation and food security, given the limited achievements in producing cash-crops at scale and generating value-added through market analysis. For the peace-building component, the critical challenge is enhancing community-level identity and perceived presence, even if activities are abundant at that level. In the stakeholder engagement outcome area, the central challenge is connecting intangible activities undertaken by PEs with the M&E system that has a tendency to prioritise quantitative monitoring, whilst also developing more robust real-time project management M&E systems that can assess ‘high’ versus ‘low’ performing target communities. Finally, in the SRH outcome area, the major gap is in the delivery, communication and up-take of life skills knowledge regarding defence against sexual advances as well as cross-generational and transactional sexual relationships.

In the area of PE support, the volunteers showed most familiarity and comfort in the livelihood and most SRH (with the exception of cross-generational sex) outcome areas, most likely due to the fact that these have more tangible processes and outputs in relation to the other outcome areas which have a tendency to prioritise intangible dimensions. Thus, while some strengths can be built upon,
there is also a possibility of including in future PE-focused training activities discussions around intangible dimensions of change. In addition, there is space for PEs to develop targeted efforts aimed at building an increased sense of ownership and confidence of participants in the livelihood youth groups.

Since the mid-term review, Restless Development has undertaken several measures to redress observed challenges – particularly in the area of developing entrepreneurial potential in youth groups. The exercise on issue prioritisation from focus groups demonstrated a strong congruence with YEP outcome areas – although the issues of outward migration and gender-based protection (sexual abuse, gender-based violence) were also raised. These concerns are echoed in the discussion about cross-cutting issues, which reveals that Restless Development would benefit from an over-arching gender strategy and examination of related concepts in programming. There are also a number of protection (including gender related) implications concerning migratory patterns in the region that Restless Development can build into forthcoming activities. For instance, discussions with stakeholders on formal and informal vocational training initiatives would address some of the concerns raised in focus groups, whilst also expanding the currently problematic definition of ‘alternative livelihoods’.

Finally, the discussions around organisational capacities show a number of strengths and emerging opportunities. The external engagement and collaboration dimensions have been areas in which the YEP has excelled – achieving many of its outcome successes (outcome area three) and process achievements (development of partnerships to harmonise and synergise for particular outcomes). However, channels of written communication (reports, newsletters, updates) could be more systematically regulated. The flexibility and capacity to adapt demonstrated by YEP staff is considered to be a significant factor that has contributed to the overall success of the programme, despite the use of the rigid Logical Framework Approach that continues to be promoted by donors and NGOs alike globally. In terms of M&E, there are a number of procedures and methods that concur with best practice (e.g. use of KAP survey baseline, congruence with broader strategies etc.) but challenges remain in the capacity to undertake real-time monitoring and the fact that some indicators are aimed at household level which is considered by some community participants themselves to be problematic.

Knowledge management measures, in the form of internal guidelines and external manuals are shown to be comprehensive – the major challenge being delivery and maintenance of updated materials rather than the development of appropriate articles. There are also calls from programme staff for greater emphasis in strategic planning at district level, whether through the development of a ‘Theory of Change’ or the inclusion of project feasibility studies. Finally, the consistent and increasing internal emphasis on value for money and sustainability is promising, the key lesson – a concern not isolated to the YEP programme of Restless Development as a whole – is how to put into programming practice the issues discussed in the concept notes.

9 Recommendations

Livelihoods programming

- With limited successes in the area of household income and food security, Restless Development should focus more on scaling-up and diversifying current definitions of ‘alternative livelihoods’ and livelihoods approaches. This can be done by expanding on-
going conversations with Concern Worldwide and branching out to other actors to consider informal vocational training programming approaches – particularly in the area of basic mechanics, textiles and sewing, beekeeping, crafts, carpentry, and basic veterinary practice (as suggested by Concern Worldwide). Ultimately, the definition of ‘alternative livelihoods’ will need to be generated via a wide participatory process, and will likely result in a number of options depending on the questions ‘alternatives to what?’; ‘alternatives to who, and from whose perspective?’ and ‘at what time?’.

- Given the relative shock and stress resistance of the pastoralist sector in the region, it could prove worthwhile to expand research, training support and capital inputs into pastoralist activities – as identified in consultation with youth groups. Initial discussions on this process can be undertaken with actors and communities to assess feasibility. The major challenge is likely to be approval from district officials as the regional policy focus remains cash crops and staples.
- Restless Development would be best placed to provide youth-friendly agricultural extension services to major actors working on food security in the region, e.g. DDG, Samaritans Purse and Wilte Hunger. This may be conducted through a youth-led TOT model, or direct collaboration.
- Any agricultural scale-up up of cash and staple crops should consider a strong focus on adding market-value through market analysis, improving access and consolidating outputs through the development of broader umbrella co-operative groups. Such activities should be aware of risks surrounding ownership and land tenure discussions with adults and elders which have proved pose challenges in the past, and also support an improved sense of ownership in youth groups.

**Civic participation**

- Given the high-profile of community ‘Sport for Peace’ days amongst community members and district officials alike, it appears that such standalone large scale events can have considerable impact in the region – largely in the area of developing a shared sense of community, but also in expanding and solidifying the presence of Restless Development as a credible actor at grassroots level. While costly, they could replace community-focused initiatives. Standalone events also offer an additional opportunity for confirming attribution of work and isolating M&E activities in an already crowded peace-building environment.
- If a focus on peace-building at community level is retained, future efforts can focus on presenting ‘unique-selling points’ or other forms of identifiers that raise the familiarity and profile of Restless Development in activities. One such USP may be the access that Restless Development has to grassroots networks and knowledge – including up-to-date knowledge. This can be, and as has been seen to be, a critical resource that is valued by NGOs in and outside the region. Another USP may be the role that Restless Development can play in demonstrating the value of holistic or integrated programming to both government departments and NGOs that are familiar with the logic, but unclear about practical responses and policy implications.
- The YEP has peace-building and conflict resolution guidelines and a brief historical overview of tensions in the region used at strategic level. It is currently unclear whether this

\[\text{16 There is no fixed definition of ‘alternative livelihoods’ but the term is related to discourses on environmental biodiversity and resource management, as well as illicit crop management.}\]
documentation sufficiently caters for the principle of ‘doing no harm’ at community level, which requires an understanding of existing tensions across communities. As Restless Development provides broad education activities this may not be an issue. It may nonetheless be worth pursuing increased participation in the Peace Actors Working Group and/or entering into conversations with DDG who are the regional leaders in mapping community peace-building and tensions.

**Stakeholder capacity**

- As stakeholder capacity development emerged as the leading performance in relation to the enabling environment (see Table three), Restless Development can discuss how it has made significant in-roads in this area, despite programme staff considering it to be a low-performance area. Recognising these successes internally and externally may give Restless Development more momentum and confidence to affect change in this area. Part of the issue is due to the fact that measurement of success in outcome three does not necessarily include observed successes – such as partnerships with Riam-Riam, MJAP, the District Youth Sector Working Group Youth and relieving heavy workloads of sub-county officials in terms of supporting youth groups.

- While YEP staff have been regular participants in a range of sector working groups, they have also been seen to be absent in others (for example, the gender and family protection group, peace actors group). While these may or may not be strategic focus areas, associated communication with district officials would improve support at district level and improve Restless Development’s political capital. There are also opportunities to build and develop stagnant sector working groups (e.g. the agricultural/NAADs group).

- The Youth Sector Transformation Programme and associated Training of Trainers model was previously well-attended at district level. However, progress has stalled as Memorandums of Understanding with participant actors took a ‘blue-print’ approach and were considered to be insufficiently consultative. Future TOT activities can take advantage of existing momentum in the scheme by undertaking conversations with strategically relevant stakeholders and adjusting MoUs accordingly.

**Sexual Reproductive Health**

- Given the important position SRH has in the analysis of performance criteria in relation to the effect of the enabling environment (see Table 3), Restless Development should appreciate that socio-cultural and behavioural change is one of the programmatic areas which present the most complex and long-term resistance to change. The fact that knowledge at least (although not necessarily adoptive practice) is being registered and retained at community level is cause for investigation and potentially scale-up.

- Including adults and elders in focus groups was not witnessed as a component of community sensitisation programmes. As the Demand Generation Consultation exercise itself revealed, these actors are crucial for gaining entry into communities and cementing social change. This is all the more crucial given the findings that some adults and elders considered these activities to be promoting promiscuity and prostitution.

- The area of SRH offers a unique entry-point for Restless Development to advertise its programming advantages in terms of integrated programming. As it stands, many sector-specific district officials are often involved in programming that affects only their sector remit. As the YEP can draw on practice linking livelihoods, SRH, and peace-building, it can
generate innovative learning that may be absent at district level. In order to do this however, it needs to develop a series of appropriate case studies that reflect best practice.

- The YEP should recognise that the messaging around protection issues such as life skills and empowerment to negotiate sexual advances, as well as cross-generational transactional sex, have largely failed to reach community level via the PEs. As these issues are relatively high on the priority list of young women, future activities can assess where and why this line of communication was either de-prioritised or lost in outreach activities, or consider shifting programme activities toward informing and adjusting the attitudes and behaviours of men and youth, in association with other stakeholders that might be working in such ways.

Strategising, Organisational Management and External Engagements

- In terms of the PE model, it is clear from community focus groups that this provides unique access to the realities of communities ‘on the ground’, and while no other stakeholders have similar access and community buy-in of this type, other stakeholders are utilising these networks. Restless Development can advertise and perhaps maximise this ‘convening’ or ‘brokering’ function at district and even national level which will simultaneously improve programme coordination and harmonisation. Opportunities with Plan International and Save the Children already exist in this regard.

- In terms of external engagement and programme outreach at community level, feedback from VHT and other community level actors attested to the difficulty of maintaining involvement without the presence of any incentives. Given such participation fatigue, future Restless Development engagements may consider reserving community sensitisation or consultation activities for major events (such as ‘Sports Days’ as discussed above).

- There is currently a difference in terms of face-to-face and written external engagement and programme outreach at sub-county and district levels. Face-to-face time at meetings is largely very good – most obviously in the Sector Working Group on Youth and high profile planning meetings. Written communications, despite the activities of the youth-driven EKOI bulletin, are more limited. Restless Development could consider developing more comprehensive email and/or newsletter lists to ensure that government officials remain in the loop of activities throughout the entire project cycle. In terms of more critical outreach, some resources could be placed into educating programme staff on influencing and advocacy strategies as these are currently ad hoc and opportunistic.

- In areas that are cross-cutting, the issue of improved gender analytical capacity is worth considering. Gender is an issue that is mainstreamed informally in the YEP – but would benefit from standalone guidance – perhaps requiring the introduction of gender specialist at national level, or the utilisation of gender-specific technical capacity at global level. There also remains an issue around affirmative action policy targeting young women PEs. With a clearer policy around the inclusion of women PEs, programme staff would feel a stronger sense of guidance and support which could then translate into more equal representation of PEs. This would also be enhanced by incorporating strategic gender sensitisation in engagement with stakeholders and young participants, so as to slowly shape the perception of women as leaders, which would also enable young women to seek to become PE. Finally, as migration emerged as a strong driver and response factor of challenges at community level, Restless Development could consider both programmatic responses
already discussed (e.g. vocational support, protection life skills) but also institutional engagements to enhance awareness (such as developing connections with IOM).

- In terms of M&E Restless Development can look into formally recognising its core abilities to adapt reflexively and effectively to change at district, sub-county and community levels through either challenging existing dependencies of Logistical Framework analysis or considering innovative planning methods that reflect current practice (such as Outcome Mapping methods). In tandem, such an overhaul might improve the ability to filter and digest information that feeds into real-time evaluation of outcomes at parish level. This can be conducted through ‘crowdsourcing’ and put into practice through the provision of mobile phones and/or credit to key individuals/groups, but also undertaken by programme officers and/or other partners with parallel but complementary information interests.

- Finally, overarching strategic management guidelines in the form of a broader ‘theory of change’ would assist programme staff to make informed programme and policy choices at critical stages of the project cycle. Such guidelines can be developed in association with suggested M&E actions – particularly through a focus on outcome mapping methods.

10 Opportunities

This section outlines ad hoc opportunities that were observed during the evaluation.

- A new gender and child-protection working group has been formed at district level in Moroto. Restless Development engagement in this activity would serve to provide a light entry-point into any potential discussions surrounding gender mainstreaming reform, and would also provide a useful resource for the development of a child protection policy that currently appears to be absent in YEP policy.

- UNICEF is considering drawing on the VPE-community networks developed in the YEP, as well as the guidance of Restless Development, in constructing a peace-building mentorship programme in South Sudan. While current hostilities prevent any further advancement on this idea, UNICEF remains open to this opportunity and consequent dialogue with Restless Development.

- District officials have announced a shift in service delivery toward the ‘green belt’ agricultural zone in the west and south of Moroto and Napak districts. Large rural-rural migratory patterns have emerged in recent years and there is consequently much interest in shifting services accordingly. Restless Development may want to consider this dynamics in upcoming planning and targeting assessments.

- Conversations with District Health Officers and other health-focused actors showed that many sensitisation activities take advantage of local radio services – which have a range across Moroto and Napak districts. A number of personnel suggested that Restless Development activities would benefit greatly in such forms of media outreach – particularly if youth were actively involved in the design and delivery of programmes.

- District Health Officers and other health-focused actors suggested that Restless Development is uniquely placed to interact in mutual capacity building activities with government health workers at sub-county and parish levels given that the last formal training undertaken in the region was three to four years ago. There may therefore be an
opportunity for an easy and also potentially high impact win for Restless Development to foster youth-friendly health approaches to government actors.
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### Issue prioritisation table

#### Napak District – Lopeei Soub-county- Lopeei and Lokudmo Parish – underperforming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current participants</th>
<th>Ex-participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Napak District - Ngoleriet sub-county – Narengomeru parish – On track performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current participants</th>
<th>Ex-participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Moroto District - Nadunget sub-county - Komaret Parish – Overperforming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current participants</th>
<th>Ex-participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults:</td>
<td>1. Disease (HIV/AIDs), 2. Hunger, 3. Lack of education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Women:</td>
<td>1. HIV/AIDs, 2. unemployment, 3. raids, 4. drought</td>
<td>1. Forced marriage, 2. unemployment (education, lack of jobs), 3. NGO favouritism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Men:</td>
<td>1. HIV/AIDs, 2. unemployment, 3. raids, 4. drought</td>
<td>1. Forced marriage, 2. unemployment (education, lack of jobs), 3. NGO favouritism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Key informants

**Moroto District**
- District Community Development Officer
- District Health Officer
- District Education Officer
- Community Development Officer – Gender and Child Protection
- NAADs officer

**Napak District**
- Chief Administrative Officer
- District Community Development Officer
- Youth Councillor Representative
- District Health Officer
- District Education Officer
- Sub-county Community Development Officer
- Village Health Team Officer

**NGO and CSO actors**
- UNICEF
- Samaritan Purse
- Concern world Wide
- Marie Stopes
- Save the Children
- International Organisation for Migration
- Danish Demining Group (x 2)

**Restless Development Staff**
- Programme Manager
- Regional Programme Manager
- Monitoring Evaluation, Research and Learning Manager
- Capacity Building officer
- Programme Officer
- Volunteer Peer Educators (x 2)
- VPE de-brief (observational)
- The KIIs were individually conducted with 7 Restless Development programme staff – including 2 volunteer peer educators (VPEs), NGO staff (8), district government officials (community development officers, chief administrative officers, district health officers, district education officers, production officers, family support staff, sub-county community officers and village health team personnel (12)) in both Moroto and Napak districts.

**Fieldwork activity sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity /Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 27th August</td>
<td>The team travelled to Karamoja – Moroto district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Restless Development office in Moroto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 28th August</td>
<td>Conducted an FGD with Restless Development staff members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducted KIIs with some of the Moroto district local government officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 29th August</td>
<td>Secured KII appointments for the following day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducted more KII with Moroto district local government officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducted KII with some of the Restless Development staff members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travelled to Napak district headquarters in the afternoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducted all KII with Napak District Local Government Officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 30th August</td>
<td>Grounding of the evaluation plan i.e. conducted two FGDs in Narengemoru and Komeret Parishes to seek views of community members on how the evaluation could be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narengemoru profile: 19 participants – 11 involved in RD, 5 under 24, 7 under 31, 10 women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Komaret profile: 15 under 24, 5 are older, 20+ are involved in RD activities – 14 of which involved in productive activities, 12 women, about 25 men, PEs x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Each of the FGDs with youth were gender disaggregated, with group numbers between 4 and 8. Adult groups involved both males and females, with a consistent gender balance of between 40% and 60%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducted mobilisation for the following day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KII with two VPEs of Komeret Parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 31st August</td>
<td>Held 3 FGDs with current participants/ beneficiaries of Restless Development in Lokudumo Parish i.e. female youths, male Youths and Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st September</td>
<td>Held 3 FGDs with Ex- participants/ beneficiaries of Restless Development in Lokudumo Parish i.e. female youths, male Youths and Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd September</td>
<td>Held 3 FGDs with current participants/ beneficiaries of Restless Development in Narengemoru Parish i.e. female youths, male youths and adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KII with the Village Health Team leader of Narengemoru parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd September</td>
<td>Attended the debrief meeting for all VPEs and Restless Development staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KII with Program Staff - Restless Development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secured appointments for Thursday’s KIIIs with NGOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4<sup>th</sup> September | Held 3 FGDs with Ex- participants/ beneficiaries of Restless Development in Narengemoru Parish i.e. Female Youths, Male Youths and Adults  
Conducted a KII with Juliet – Program Coordinator Restless Development. |
| 5<sup>th</sup> September | Conducted KIIs with NGOs i.e. UNICEF, Samaritan Purse, Concern world Wide, Marie Stoppes, Save the Children, IOM and DDG.  
Conducted mobilisation for the following day. |
| 6<sup>th</sup> September | Held 3 FGDs with both current and Ex participants/ beneficiaries of Restless Development in Komeret Parish i.e. Female Youths, Male Youths and Adults. |
| 7<sup>th</sup> September | The team travelled back to Kampala. |