

**REPORT ON  
CIVIL SOCIETY INVENTORY  
IN NEBBI DISTRICT  
2003**

**Prepared by:  
NEBBI DISTRICT NGO FORUM**

**With Technical Support of  
AGENCY FOR ACCELERATED REGIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT**

**And funding support of  
ACTION AID NEBBI**

**June 2004**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The Nebbi District NGO Forum is grateful, first and foremost, to Action Aid Nebbi for funding this study under the 2003 Partnership Framework. Similar thanks go to all the enumerators who collected the information; all the civil society organizations that provided information about themselves; to AFARD (Secretarial Bureau) for data entry and in particular to Alfred Lakwo of AFARD and Rose Atim of Action Aid for the invaluable inputs they made in designing the report write- up, and discussing the drafts.

To the Executive Committee of the Forum, I'm grateful for the coordination work you undertook in supervising the survey and in continuously following up the progress of the survey report.

The survey has been an eye opener to us all both in the desired skills for undertaking such a task and in ensuring that a constituency broader than the civil society enclave knows its content.

Finally, it suffices to point that this report is a summary version report. A full list of Civil Society Organisations operational in Nebbi district is not attached to this but forms a database that can be accessed anytime of needs and is produced in a separate report booklet.

James Owachi  
Chairperson, Nebbi NGO Forum.

## **ACRONYMS**

AAN	=	Action Aid Nebbi
UNFA	=	Uganda National Farmers Association
UCDA	=	Uganda Coffee Development Authority
CEFORD	=	Community Empowerment for Rural Development
CSO	=	Civil Society Organisations
AFARD	=	Agency for Accelerated Regional Development
NDNGOF	=	Nebbi District NGO Forum
NGO	=	Non-Governmental Organizations
CBO	=	Community based Organizations
FBO	=	Faith Based organizations

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	1
ACRONYMS .....	2
1.0 About the NGO Forum.....	5
2.0 Objective of the study .....	5
3.0 Processes of the study .....	6
4.0 Limitation of the survey.....	7
5.0 Findings .....	7
5.1 Number of and distribution of organizations .....	7
5.2 Type of Organizations .....	8
5.3 Year of Formation.....	8
5.4 The objective of organization formation .....	9
5.5 Activities organizations are involved in .....	9
5.6 Registration status.....	10
5.7 Presence of a Constitution .....	11
5.8 Regularity of meeting .....	12
5.9 Maintaining Records.....	12
5.10 Current asset value .....	12
5.11 Organization Beneficiaries .....	13
5.12 External Support sourced.....	13
5.13 Constraints .....	14
5.14 Assistance Capacity needs .....	14
6.0 General Observations and Recommendations .....	15
Annex 1: Distribution of groups by sub county, Nebbi district, 2003 .....	16
Annex 2: Type of organization by year of formation by county, Nebbi district, 2003. .	17
Annex 3: Objective of organization formation .....	18
Annex 4: Priority activity organizations are involved in.....	19
Annex 5: Availability of a constitution by sub county .....	20

## List of Tables and Figures

Table 1	Percent distribution of types of organizations by county, Nebbi district, 2003. ....	8
Table 2	Year of formation of groups .....	9
Table 3	Distribution of organizations by registration status.....	10
Table 4	Percent distribution of Asset by year of formation .....	13
Table 5	Target beneficiary of organizations in Nebbi district .....	13
Table 6	Assistance needs .....	14
Figure 1	Distribution of Organisations by sub county, 2003, Nebbi District .....	7
Figure 2	Distribution of organization by type by sub county, Nebbi district, 2003.....	8

Figure 3	Objective of formation .....	9
Figure 4	Organisational activities .....	10
Figure 5	Availability of a constitution by sub county .....	11
Figure 6	Constraints faced by groups .....	14

## **NEBBI DISTRICT NGO FORUM CIVIL SOCIETY INVENTORY SUMMARY REPORT**

### **1.0 About the NGO Forum**

Nebbi District NGO Forum (NDNGOF) is a platform through which Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in Nebbi network to access and share information, advocate for pro-poor policies, and legislation and equitable development. The guiding goal of NDNGOF is *'to develop civil society into an institution able to participate as effective partners in the conception of policies, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies, legislation and other aspects of development practices and processes in the district'*. Its objectives are:

- To increase mobilisation of, and networking among member organizations.
- To promote policy dialogue and advocacy with government, donors and other development stakeholders for pro-poor policies and programs.
- To share information and good practices in order to contribute more effectively to the development process in the district.
- To build capacity of MO's in order to engage in policy processes more effectively at all levels.
- To carryout any other activities that are legal, to further the objectives of the group.

To date, NDNGOF has a total membership of 233 registered organizations located throughout the district. It has also made considerable strides in establishing itself in all the 19 lower local governments – i.e., town councils and sub counties - of the district. The Forum is engaged in mobilizing membership, and enhancing public-CSO partnership especially through participation of CSO's in the Lower Local Government (LLG) planning processes.

In spite of the recognition attained, both within and without the district, the Forum do realize that its legitimacy lies in the strength of the collective voice of membership organizations. Yet, without knowing what and where the constituency is, it would be rather heard to mobilize its intended beneficiaries. Further, if the Forum has to deliver services to the needs of the members, the Forums product should be cognizant of needs of those various members. Finally, for the Forum to adopt a strategic position in ensuring that CSOs are active wheels of grassroot development, it is of paramount importance to understand the thematic focus of its members. These gaps, therefore, formed the cardinal basis for undertaking the baseline inventory.

### **2.0 Objective of the study**

The primary aim of this study was to establish a comprehensive database of Civil Society Organisations in Nebbi district. The inventory was thus designed to provide a start-up databank that would be continuously updated so that the Forum can have a one-stop center

for CSO information to development stakeholders in the district. From the database, it would be possible to know the size of the Forums constituency – already member groups and potential member groups- as well as their institutional position. To explore these, the study specific objectives were:

- To capture up-to-date information about the various Civil Society groups operational in Nebbi District.
- To discover what core objectives, and activities these groups were pursuing.
- To try and categorize the groups into specific thematic groupings, to enhance organizational and networking processes with them.
- To find out the constraints the groups were facing specifically focusing on capacity needs.

### **3.0 Processes of the study**

In undertaking this study, that is more of a census of CSOs operational in Nebbi district, the following processes guided the data collection.

- The first task undertaken was development of the data collection instrument. An open ended questionnaire was designed by the Forum's Executive Committee members in meetings aimed at teasing out what vital information was needed about the CSOs vis-à-vis the mediating roles of the Forum. Nebbi District Local Government department of community services provided helpful advice at this stage.
- A team of data collection enumerators was then drawn from the Forum's sub county executives. This selection was based on technical reasons. First, it was to provide the newly elected executive members opportunity to acclimatize themselves with their areas of service delivery. Second, it was due to the limited financial resources at the Forum's disposal that could not warrant hiring out professional field workers who demand twice the rate the executives were willing to take. Finally, it was convenient to work with an existing structure over which the Forum had a direct control. This reinforced quality assurance and commitment to work despite low pay.
- A 2-day training on data collection was conducted for the enumerator. This training, facilitated by CEFORD one of the core members of the Forum, focused on explaining the questionnaire, data collection ethics, and cross checking of entry errors, among others.
- Data collection was then carried out after the lower local government structures in the district, from the sub county down to the parish level, were contacted. The data collectors then moved in their respective parishes and enumerated all the existing CSOs.
- Data collection followed after all the batches of filled questionnaires were retrieved from the sub counties. AFARD Secretarial Bureau was contracted to enter the data after they were crosschecked by the Forum's district Executives for completeness.
- Data analysis was one of the critical stages that delayed the report generation. AFARD and Actiona Aid Nebbi finally as member organization, had to shoulder the process by providing technical support in delineating the database need and the report structure. Using SPSS software all the openended responses were re-coded, new data files created and simple statistical analysis done to suite the very objective of the study.

## 4.0 Limitation of the survey

The study design did not take into consideration gender and thematic aspects of who group members are and what focal activity classifications are required. In this way, it is unable to delimit the number of groups that are women groups as well as which groups are specifically involved in support for women.

The design also ignored the technical aspect of status. For instance, cultural institutions like the *Rwoths* cannot benefit the stratification used. Thus for our purpose they were considered as community based organisations although they cannot register with community development services sector nor with the NGO Board.

It can also be seen that in some areas the enumeration of the civil society organizations was incomplete. For instance, while in practice World Vision as an organization exists in Pakwach Town Council, it was excluded from the enumeration list. Even if the World Vision is phasing out in the area, the fact that it has not fully closed down and is continuing to deliver services warranted its inclusion. In the same vein, it can admitted that, even for the findings herein, there are some organizations that have not been included.


## 5.0 Findings

### 5.1 Number and distribution of organizations

The survey found that there were 633 organisations operating in Nebbi district. Of these, 41.1% are in Padyere county, 35.7% in Okoro county and only 23.2% are in Jonam county. This indicate that about 2/3 of the Forum's constituency are still not, but potential, member organizations.

By sub county and town councils, there are many groups in Kucwiny (10.4%) followed by Erussi (9.5%), Wadelai (7.3%), Kango (6.3%), Paidha (6.2%) and Panyango and Zeu each with 5.7% and Nyaravur and Pakwach each with 5.5%. The least number of groups are in Panyimur (1.9%) followed by Parombo and Pakwach TC (2.8%).

Figure 1 Distribution of Organisations by sub county, 2003, Nebbi District





## 5.2 Type of Organizations


Of the 633 organisations covered in the survey, 95.4% (n=604) were community-based organizations, 2.8% (n=18) were Faith Based organizations and only 1.7% (n=11) were non-governmental organizations. Padyere county has a lead in the overall number of all organizations and this is followed by Okoro and Jonam county has the least number as shown below.

Table 1: Percent distribution of types of organizations by county, Nebbi district, 2003.

		Type of Organisation			Total
		CBO	FBO	NGO	
County	Jonam	22.7%	.5%		23.2%
	Okoro	35.2%	.3%	.2%	35.7%
	Padyere	37.4%	2.1%	1.6%	41.1%
Total		95.4%	2.8%	1.7%	100.0%

By sub county, NGOs are only located in Nebbi TC (1.3%) that happen to be the district HQ and in Paidha TC, Parombo Sc and Nebbi SC (each with 0.2%). FBOs are not found in Atyak, Jangokoro, Kango, Kucwiny, Nyaravur, Paidha, Pakwach, Pakwach TC, Panyimur, Parombo and Wadelai. However, CBOs exists in all the sub counties with Kucwiny taking a lead with 10.4%.

Figure 2 Distribution of organization by type by sub county, Nebbi district, 2003



## 5.3 Year of Formation

Overall, most of the groups were formed from 1991 as shown in the table below. However, many groups (51%) in Okoro county were formed from 2001 on wards compared to those in Padyere 59% and Jonam 57% formed between 1991-2000.

Table 2 Year of formation of groups


		Frequency	Percent
Valid	Up to 1980	5	.8
	1981-1990	24	3.8
	1991-2000	329	52.0
	>2000	259	40.9
	Total	617	97.5
Total		633	100.0

Note total exclude 16 groups that did not state their year of formation.

#### 5.4 The objective of organization formation

By and large many organizations, 56.6% were formed by their members for poverty eradication. This is followed by reasons for improving farming systems, 8.7%, generating income 6.8% and promoting health 5.1%. The least reasons forwarded for the formation of organizations which account for less than 1% are cultural promotion, sharing experience, youth transformation, spiritual strengthening, promotion of unity, advocacy, promoting gender equality, and creation of employment. What this signal is that there are many virgin areas in which the community can (be) mobilize(d) to enhance the common good.


Figure 3 Objective of formation



#### 5.5 Activities organizations are involved in

Farming constitute the largest activity that many organizations (43.6% n=276) are involved in followed by savings and credit activities (18.2% n=115). This apply to all counties with farming engaging 49%, 55% and 30% and savings and credit 9%, 12% and 29% of groups in Jonam, Okoro and Padyere respectively.

**Figure 4 Organizational activities**



### 5.6 Registration status

The organizations were also asked about their registration status. It was found that groups have registered with CDO, sub county local government, Coffee Development Authority, Diocese, NGO Forum, Cooperative Office, Nebbi Farmers Association. Overall, only 38% were registered. While all NGOs were registered, only 35.2% of CBOs and 1.1% of FBOs were registered (chi. = 0.001). Further, 15% and 14% of groups in Padyere and Jonam are registered compared to only 9.5% in Okoro (chi=0.000). Meanwhile at a subcounty level mainly groups from Pakwach, Paidha TC, Nebbi TC, Nyaravur and Parombo are registered (chi=0.000). Although there is no significant relationship between age of a group and registration (chi=0.163), it is mainly groups that were formed from 1991 to date that are registered (1991-2000 account for 22% and >2000 14%). Similarly, there is no relationship between asset value and registration (chi=0.469) because 34% of groups with no asset now are the ones that are registered.

**Table 3 Distribution of organizations by registration status**


	Registration status		Total
	No	Yes	
Akworo	2.7%	.8%	3.5%
Atyak	2.8%	1.4%	4.3%
Erussi	7.1%	2.4%	9.5%
Jangokoro	3.9%	.9%	4.9%
Kango	5.4%	.9%	6.3%
Kucwiny	9.3%	1.1%	10.4%
Nebbi	3.9%	1.9%	5.8%
Nebbi TC	.6%	2.7%	3.3%
Nyapea	2.8%	1.1%	3.9%
Nyaravur	1.4%	3.9%	5.5%
Paidha	4.9%	1.3%	6.2%

Paidha TC	1.9%	2.7%	4.6%
Pakwach	1.1%	4.4%	5.5%
Pakwach TC	.8%	2.1%	2.8%
Panyango	2.5%	3.2%	5.7%
Panyimur		1.9%	1.9%
Parombo	.9%	1.9%	2.8%
Wadelai	4.9%	2.4%	7.3%
Zeul	4.6%	1.1%	5.7%
Total	61.8%	38.1%	100.0%

### 5.7 Presence of a Constitution

On the presence of a constitution, only 50.7% of the groups had a constitution. All NGOs and 47% and 2% of CBO and FBO have constitution respectively. Many groups in Padyere (19%), Okoro (16%) and Jonam (15%) have no constitution (chi=0.001)<sup>1</sup> just like all groups in Pakwach SC have no constitution. Besides, by objective, none of the groups involved in cultural promotion has a constitution compared to all groups promoting environmental protection, gender equality, youth transformation, and those furthering sharing of experience that have a constitution. Likewise, none of the group with the family as its beneficiaries had a constitution. Crosstabbed with registration status, there is a significant relationship between the two variables (chi=0.003). However, while 50.7% had a constitution, only 22.4% registered yet 15.6% of those registered have no constitution. This reflects the difference in registration demand by the various registering organization. Not all demand for a constitution as a prerequisite for registration.

Figure 5 Availability of a constitution by sub county



<sup>1</sup> Distribution of groups having a constitution by county

County	Constitution		Total
	No	Yes	
Jonam	14.5%	8.7%	23.2%
Okoro	16.0%	19.7%	35.7%
Padyere	18.8%	22.3%	41.1%
Total	49.3%	50.7%	100.0%

## **5.8 Regularity of meeting**

Asked about whether they had regular meetings, 96.7% responded that they did. Only 1% in Jonam and Okoro and 2% in Padyere answered no to holding regular meetings. All groups in Nebbi, Nyapea, Paidha, Paidha TC, Pakwach, Pakwach TC, Panyimur and Zeu hold regular meetings. This is also true of all NGOs and FBOs. It is groups pursuing poverty eradication, education promotion, and resource mobilisation objective (1% each) and those engaged in farming, functional literacy, and savings and credit (1% each) that do not meet regularly.

Although it is not certain what 'regularity' means – be it weekly, or monthly- it is assumed to be construed to be in line with what members wished. Although there is no significant relationship between having regular meeting and having a constitution ( $\chi^2=0.240$ ), 49.4% of 50.7% of the groups with a constitution meet regularly.

## **5.9 Maintaining Records**

Of the 633 organisations, 94.5% maintain records. All NGOs and CBOs keep records and only 5.5% of CBOs do not keep records. It is largely groups in Okoro (3.2%) and Padyere (1.4%) that do not keep records. On the other hand, all groups in Akworo, Nebbi, Nyapea, Pakwach, Pakwach TC, Panyimur, Parombo and Zeu reported keeping records just like those groups formed before 1990.

Although the survey did not delimit what kind of records, at least there is a significant relationship between keeping records and having a constitution ( $\chi^2=0.000$ ). While 50.7% have a constitution, 49.6% keep records and of the 49.3% without a constitution, 44.9% keep records. Further, although there is insignificant relationship between keeping records and being registered ( $\chi^2=0.073$ ), 57.3% of non-registered groups and 37.0% of registered groups keep records.

## **5.10 Current asset value**

Asked about the value of their current asset, 87.2% reported having no asset at all. While CBOs (83.1%) take a lead position, all NGO and 2.4% (of the 2.8%) of FBOs reported having no assets.<sup>2</sup> While all the groups in Jonam (23.2%) have no asset, 33.5% and 30.5% of those in Okoro and Padyere respectively have no assets. Only insignificant number of groups in Akworo, Atyak, Erussi, Kucwiny, Nebbi, Nyaravur, and Parombo reported having assets worth more than Ushs 1 million. Besides, in real terms, all groups formed before 1980 and 3.2% of the 3.9% formed between 1981-1990 dominate the no asset group category and it is groups formed between 1991 to date that have assets worth over Ushs 1 million. This confirms the strong relationship between asset possession and age of a group ( $\chi^2=0.006$ ).

---

<sup>2</sup> This raises a fundamental question of what 'current asset value' meant in the survey. Practically speaking, and by daily observation, then at the time of the survey, Action Aid Nebbi, CEFORD, AFARD, CARITAS, etc as NGOs had valuable assets.

Table 4: Percent distribution of Asset by year of formation

Asset value (ushs)	Year of formation				Total
	Before 1980	1981-1990	1991-2000	>2000	
0.00	.8%	3.2%	45.5%	37.4%	87.0%
Up to 100,000	.0%	.2%	1.1%	2.4%	3.7%
100,001- 500,000	.0%	.2%	2.9%	1.1%	4.2%
500,001-1,000,000	.0%	.3%	.6%	.2%	1.1%
Over 1,000,000	.0%	.0%	3.1%	.8%	3.9%
Total	.8%	3.9%	53.3%	42.0%	100.0%

### 5.11 Organization beneficiaries

The primary beneficiaries of the organizations in Nebbi district are organization members (41.5%) themselves, the Community (33.3%), and members and the community (21.5%). Women are targeted by 1.6% while those that benefit orphans, school children, and the family are few (each with 0.5%) as those for youths and the needy (each 0.3%). Primarily, in Jonam the target is community (20.2%) compared to Okoro, members (24.5%) and Padyere, community and members (20.7%). Such a trend is also evident in the target by organization type: NGOs target community (1.1%), FBO members and community (1.7%) and CBOs members (40.9%) explaining the broader mandate within which such an organization cover and its level of legitimacy.

Table 5 Target beneficiary of organizations in Nebbi district

Beneficiary	Frequency	Percent
Community	211	33.3
Family	3	.5
Members	263	41.5
Members and Community	136	21.5
Orphans	3	.5
School children	3	.5
The Needy	2	.3
Women	10	1.6
Youths	2	.3
Total	633	100.0


### 5.12 External support sourced

A number of the groups (79.3%) have not so far received any external support. The remaining 20.7% that have sourced support received them from ACORD, CAP, WEP, CARE, Government, Change Agent, AFARD, CEFORD, Action Aid, the Dioceses, the microfinance institutions, CARITAS, CRS, Private Sector, CUAMM, DANIDA, MS- Uganda, Irish AID, IVERE, NDFA, Technoserve, TASO, DED, UCDA, and the MPs.

### 5.13 Constraints

The most common constrains reported by the groups were inadequacy of funds (45.2%), skills (11.1%), and tools (10.1%). While to the NGOs, community attitude (0.8%) pauses a considerable challenge, to CBOs lack of means of transport (5.5%) and inaccessibility to markets (5.2%) is a considerable constraint. Likewise, to older groups – formed upto 1990 – problems related to leaders, member attitudes, office space, networking, land, and pest and diseases are reported.

**Figure 6 Constraints faced by groups**



### 5.14 Assistance needed

In view of the problems identified by the groups, they were asked for what they considered the priority support they needed. 78.4% identified training, 10.3% funds, and 5.2% tools. This needs trend apply to all groups by type, location, year of formation and asset holding capacity.

*Table 6 Assistance needs*

Assistance needed	Frequency	Percent
Funds	65	10.3
Improved breeds	3	.5
Land	1	.2
Learning materials	2	.3
Lobbying	1	.2
Market	2	.3
None	21	3.3
Office Accommodation	1	.2
Sensitization	4	.6
Tools	33	5.2
Training	496	78.4
Transport	4	.6
Total	633	100.0

## **6.0 Recommendations**

It can be seen from the overall report that:

First, there is unequal distribution of groups, especially those in the CBO category. This presents a challenge towards spreading civil responsibility among the citizens to take up their energies for their local development. It also indicate that where specific strategies to reach the grassroot will focus at local organizations, as is the trend with the current rolling-back of the state, distributional inequality will continue to persist. Consequently, the Forum can work in collaboration with community development assistants to create a zeal for self-group formation. After all, this will be in the interest of the Forum by expanding its both potential and actual constituency, which in the long run reinforces its legitimacy.

Second, the report indicates that the various existing organizations are at different stages of growth. While most of the NGOs are more seasoned and resourced, the FBOs and CBOs are limping with resource scarcity. Since the NGOs are part of the Forum fraternity, it could be one of the internal arrangements to lobby them to support the institutional building of the weaker segment. Besides, the Forum needs to design clear capacity building strategies for its members. For instance, it can be seen that issues related to constitution making, records keeping among the many facets of organizational strengthening are weak. Caution must however be taken that these capacities are clearly identified. For instance, it may be hard if not impossible for the Forum to provide means of transport but it can provide solutions to issues such as skills and linkage oriented. Thus, a detailed capacity assessment of the groups needs to be conducted such that instead of providing blanket skills training, for instance, such trainings are customized and delivered to the right organization that needs it most.

Third, the inability of the Forum to delimit the organizational objectives and activities within clear thematic framework is enough indication that the Forum itself has not established adequate basis upon which to redirect its efforts. This will call for setting clear focus in terms of themes like health, education, agriculture, and those that are cross cutting so that competencies and network benefits can be mapped and evaluated.

Finally, this inventory was a starter kit. It will require regular updating. It is recommended that in the process of updating, the database should be adjusted and expanded to clearly depict gender and thematic issues.



**Annex 1: Distribution of groups by sub county, Nebbi district, 2003**

Sub county	Distribution		Type of organization		
	Frequency	Percent	CBO	FBO	NGO
Akworo	22	3.5	3.2%	.3%	
Atyak	27	4.3	4.3%		
Erussi	60	9.5	9.0%	.5%	
Jangokoro	31	4.9	4.9%		
Kango	40	6.3	6.3%		
Kucwiny	66	10.4	10.4%		
Nebbi	37	5.8	4.6%	1.1%	.2%
Nebbi TC	21	3.3	1.9%	.2%	1.3%
Nyapea	25	3.9	3.8%	.2%	
Nyaravur	35	5.5	5.5%		
Paidha	39	6.2	6.2%		
Paidha TC	29	4.6	4.3%	.2%	.2%
Pakwach	35	5.5	5.5%		
Pakwach TC	18	2.8	2.8%		
Panyango	36	5.7	5.2%	.5%	
Panyimur	12	1.9	1.9%		
Parombo	18	2.8	2.7%		.2%
Wadelai	46	7.3	7.3%		
Zeu	36	5.7	5.7%		
Total	633	100.0	95.4%	2.8%	1.7%

**Annex 2: Type of organization by year of formation by county, Nebbi district, 2003.**

County	Year	Type of Organisation			Total
		CBO	FBO	NGO	
Jonam	Up to 1980	.7%			.7%
	1981-1990	6.9%			6.9%
	1991-2000	56.3%	.7%		56.9%
	>2000	34.7%	.7%		35.4%
	Total	98.6%	1.4%		100.0%
Okoro	Up to 1980	.9%			.9%
	1981-1990	3.6%			3.6%
	1991-2000	43.6%	.5%	.5%	44.5%
	>2000	50.5%	.5%		50.9%
	Total	98.6%	.9%	.5%	100.0%
Padyere	Up to 1980	.4%		.4%	.8%
	1981-1990	2.4%			2.4%
	1991-2000	53.4%	3.2%	2.4%	58.9%
	>2000	34.8%	2.0%	1.2%	37.9%
	Total	90.9%	5.1%	4.0%	100.0%

**Annex 3: Objective of organization formation**

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Advocacy	4	.6	.6
Better farming systems	55	8.7	9.3
Cultural Promotion	2	.3	9.6
Education promotion	26	4.1	13.7
Employment creation	2	.3	14.1
Environmental protection	8	1.3	15.3
Financial services	14	2.2	17.5
Generate Income	43	6.8	24.3
Health promotion	32	5.1	29.4
Improve standard of living	22	3.5	32.9
None	9	1.4	34.3
Poverty eradication	358	56.6	90.8
Promote Gender equality.	3	.5	91.3
Promote self reliance	8	1.3	92.6
Promote unity	5	.8	93.4
Resource mobilization	15	2.4	95.7
Share experiences	1	.2	95.9
Skills training	11	1.7	97.6
Spiritual strengthening	4	.6	98.3
Support the needy	9	1.4	99.7
Youth Transformation	2	.3	100.0
Total	633	100.0	

**Annex 4: Priority activity organizations are involved in**

Activities	Frequency	Percent
Advisory services to farmers	2	.3
Bee keeping	24	3.8
Brick making	17	2.7
Carpentry	6	.9
Community mobilization	8	1.3
Cultural activities	2	.3
Education talk	3	.5
FAL	23	3.6
Farming	276	43.6
Fishing	16	2.5
Health promotion	26	4.1
Herb promotion	2	.3
Knitting	6	.9
Lobbying	1	.2
Needy assistance	4	.6
None	11	1.7
Resource mobilization	5	.8
Savings and credit	115	18.2
Tailoring	3	.5
Trade	23	3.6
Training	8	1.3
Tree planting	52	8.2
Total	633	100.0

**Annex 5: Availability of a constitution by sub county**

Sub county	Constitution		Total
	No	Yes	
Akworo	2.1%	1.4%	3.5%
Atyak	1.9%	2.4%	4.3%
Erussi	7.0%	2.5%	9.5%
Jangokoro	1.4%	3.5%	4.9%
Kango	3.2%	3.2%	6.3%
Kucwiny	2.8%	7.6%	10.4%
Nebbi	.2%	5.7%	5.8%
Nebbi TC	.5%	2.8%	3.3%
Nyapea	1.3%	2.7%	3.9%
Nyaravur	5.4%	.2%	5.5%
Paidha	3.0%	3.2%	6.2%
Paidha TC	2.1%	2.5%	4.6%
Pakwach	5.5%		5.5%
Pakwach TC	.6%	2.2%	2.8%
Panyango	2.4%	3.3%	5.7%
Panyimur	.3%	1.6%	1.9%
Parombo	.8%	2.1%	2.8%
Wadelai	5.7%	1.6%	7.3%
Zeu	3.3%	2.4%	5.7%
Total	49.3%	50.7%	100.0%