



**FEED GOOD JOINT PROGRAMME FOR BUILDING
SUSTAINABLE FOOD SYSTEMS**

HUMUNDI – ILES DE PAIX – AUTRE TERRE

DGD

Managerial response to the Mid-term Evaluation

June 2025

Uganda



Belgique

partenaire du développement



Recommendation 1 - Improve synergies in program management and coordination, including through the RAAP (Regional Agroecology Actors Platform)

Opportunities:

Regarding the regional coordination around Rwenzori's territorial dynamics: the RAAP can serve as a central coordination mechanism for sharing best practices, aligning efforts across actors, and fostering joint advocacy.

Risks:

We need to avoid confusion between the coordination of the SIA program and the "regional" coordination mechanisms ensuring that our experiences can create multiplier effect. Our own steering committee should remain the central coordination mechanism for the SIA program, with a strong connection to the RAAP at Regional level

If there are not enough resources or if it is not truly owned by local actors, the RAAP may become "symbolic" without operational impact.

Answer :

The recommendation is relevant but is mixing two things: the coordination of the SIA program and the Regional Coordination of Rwenzori's territory.

Regarding the SIA Programme coordination: the SIA steering committee will strengthen the synergies from the design and the monitoring phases instead of putting efforts into it only in the implementation phase. That will allow us to build stronger coordination on SIA 3.

Also, communication channels between SIA partners could be improved. Further discussions will be necessary.

Regarding the regional coordination: Coordination among partners will be enhanced through clear governance and resource allocation to the RAAP.

Action

Ensure representation in the RAAP from the majority of the partners (all except maybe AFSA).

Plan financial support to the RAAP for the next programme formulation.

Strengthen coordination among the SIA steering committee.

Calendar

By end of 2026

Follow-up manager

IDP and Humundi local offices

Commenté [SL1]: Aren't we also planning to provide RAAP with technical support (in terms of governance, management, training, networking, etc.)?

Commenté [YF2R1]: I would say that's mainly PELUM and JESE's role, not our.



Recommendation 2 – Make sustainable production and marketing the central pillar of the future program		
Recommendation 4 – Support smallholder farmers in market access and strengthen market linkages		
<p>Opportunities: Strengthening production and marketing can improve incomes and increase adoption of agroecological practices.</p>	<p>Risks: Elevating production and marketing as the sole central pillar risks overshadowing other essential elements such as advocacy (local and national), financial inclusion, or territorial food governance. These components are interlinked and also play a critical role in sustainable food systems transformation.</p>	
<p>Answer: Partly accepted While we recognize the central importance of sustainable production and marketing in achieving impact, we do not intend to structure the future program around this alone. Other pillars—such as advocacy, financial inclusion, territorial governance—are also strategic priorities and will be maintained as key axes.</p>		
<p>Action When formulating the next programme, ensure complementarity between the production & marketing components and the other main pillars. Allocate resources and partner roles across all pillars.</p>	<p>Calendar During the formulation (2025-2026)</p>	<p>Follow-up manager IDP and Humundi HQ & local offices</p>

Commenté [LP3]: in specific cases this shift of focus could be more relevant than others. For example for those areas/subcounties where production support has been central during the previous program roll out this will be very relevant. In areas/subcounties where actions are more recent this shift can not be "complete" because of the risks mentioned.

Commenté [SL4]: We can remind you that we are seeking to act on all aspects of the food system, with an emphasis on territorial development around the Fort Portal area.

Recommendation 5 – Build on the potential of urban farming in Fort Portal	
<p>Opportunities: Urban farming is a reality as many people in this city already practice some kind of agriculture. Producing healthy food near consumers is a relevant driver for the sustainability of the food system.</p>	<p>Risks: Plots are often small and fragmented. With more pressure on urban planning this could even become worse. Pollution levels in and around the city are still considered to be rather low but could affect the health of the farming systems (and the food they produce).</p>
<p>Answer: We agree with the potential and have gradually increased the focus on this in our program activities. While developing future plans, we will take into account this potential and assess to which scale this can be taken.</p>	



Action: Continue the urban farming component and sustain the gradual growth of the actions. Continue assessing the impact and potential for upscaling. Use the lessons to assess potential to further uplift this component into the next phase.	Calendar During the formulation (2025-2026)	Follow-up manager IDP HQ & local office
---	---	---

Recommendation 6 – Strengthen financial support for agroecological practices		
Opportunities: Access to finance drives investment in sustainable practices and increases resilience.	Risks: Weak SACCOs could jeopardize sustainability and risk of over-indebtedness without proper guidance.	
Answer: We are currently already exploring how to better integrate agroecology production concerns into the support to SACCOs and VSLA. This focus will be increased in the next programme.		
Action Explore agroecology loans, agroecology products proposed by SACCOs, develop risk mitigation and sustainability mechanisms...	Calendar During the formulation (2025-2026)	Follow-up manager Humundi team

Commenté [SL5]: and before the end of the current program ?

Commenté [YF6R5]: Not sure to understand the difference?

Recommendation 9 – Enhance awareness and adoption of SFS and responsible consumption through a targeted and collaborative approach Recommendation 11 – Design an agroecology communication strategy that effectively reaches different types of target audiences		
Opportunities: These recommendations (9&11), together, could indeed increase reach, consistency, and impact of partner agroecology awareness raising and messaging. A strategic approach ensures better reach, message clarity and impact.	Risks: Coordination across NGOs can be complex – we can already see it with each NGO having her own strategic plan and priorities, different competences, cultures and communication channels as well as different timing on the process advancement.	
Answer: There are discussions to develop a joint SFS awareness strategy involving schools, CSOs, media.		



Action Continue the discussions on defining a common awareness strategy, with common messages and focus.	Calendar Formulation of the 27-31 program	Follow-up manager IDP & Humundi local teams
--	---	---

Recommendation 10 – Strengthen agroecology education activities and align their geographical targeting		
Opportunities: Yes, school-based learning is more likely to lead to behaviour change. Promotes uptake of Agroecology among the young people	Risks: Alignment of geographical targeting of schools could limit the spread of Agroecology (in schools) to other regions of the country.	
Answer: The interest in working with schools was confirmed in our last SIA workshop. It has been agreed to synergize more on this topic and it is likely that we will focus even more effectively on schools during the next programme. A working group including partners working with school clubs has already been established (2025) to champion the synergies On geographical targeting, whereas all partners work within Rwenzori region, they work in different districts and schools, with one of the partners having a national outreach to schools. National coverage comes with the advantage of cross-regional competitions, exchange and learning on agroecology. Alignment of approaches and joint actions are still possible with partners having different geographical locations.		
Action We will strengthen the coordination between the partners working with schools to exchange information, plan together (e.g Poem writing competitions) and jointly develop information resources. We also plan to look at the outreach to ensure efficiency.	Calendar Current programme (already happening) + next program formulation	Follow-up manager Partners and IDP/Humundi local teams

Commenté [LP7]: when the current actions lead to the development of adequate tools for the roll out of AE programs with a larger role for the school itself there will be potential for cost efficient upscaling.

Commenté [SL8]: Shouldn't we complete this sentence ? For example : Promoting the uptake of agroecology among young people would enhance the value of the farmer profession and create jobs in this sector for young people.

Commenté [SL9]: I'am not sure to understand this risk ;)

Commenté [YF10R9]: The recommendation is to focus on a limited geographical zone. This has advantages but it also limits the integration of AE in other parts of the country. If you look at ESAFF's agroecology clubs for instance, they are not all located in the same region but spread around the country.