



Diagnosing Policy Coherence for Food Systems Results from Uganda





Food Systems Policy Coherence is the alignment of policies that affect the food system with the aim of achieving health, environmental, social, and economic goals, to ensure that policies designed to improve one food system outcome do not undermine others and, where possible, take advantage of synergies across policy areas to achieve better outcomes for all.¹

The Food Systems Policy Coherence Diagnostic Tool offers a practical methodology to assess food systems policy coherence and provide actionable recommendations for enhancing it. It was applied to Uganda in 2026 with support from the Agri-Food Systems Accelerator via an extensive document review of policies and instruments, key informant interviews, and an in-person workshop.

Structures & Mechanisms

The first module of the tool examines whether there are structures and mechanisms in place that would increase the likelihood of achieving policy coherence. The results for Uganda, shown below, indicate that Uganda's food system policy landscape is strong in providing the framework documents to guide food system transformation and that these are backed up by robust political commitment. Inclusivity and

1. Adapted from Parsons & Hawkes. 2019. Policy Coherence in Food Systems.

stakeholder engagement is a particular strength, with key strategies having been designed through inclusive processes. However, there are areas to strengthen in terms of capacity and implementation, coordination, and monitoring and accountability. In particular, strengthening

monitoring, for example by establishing interim milestones and annual reviews for the 4th National Development Plan (NDP IV) and enhancing analytical capacity within government agencies, could help to support progress toward food system goals.

Uganda's Structures and Mechanisms in Support of Food System Policy Coherence

Domain	Analysis and Recommendations
Framework Documents	Uganda's National Development Plan IV (NDP IV) sets priorities for action, such as raising food and nutrition security from 71% to 85% by FY2029/30, with measurable goals dedicating 15% of the national budget to agriculture and creating 60,000 annual agro-processing jobs. Developed through an inclusive, multi-sector process, the plan integrates agriculture, health, trade, and other sectors, featuring a 2030 vision, results framework, and monitoring and evaluation system.
Political Commitment	Uganda demonstrated a high level of political commitment to food systems transformation during the UNFSS process, with the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Frank Tumwebaze) making pre summit and summit statements.
Capacity and Implementation	Uganda's NDP IV has been formally adopted and integrated into national planning, with the National Food Systems Coordination Committee (NFSCC) housed within the Office of the Prime Minister to oversee implementation. Uganda has strong food systems planning and investment frameworks, including NDP IV, the NFSCC, Uganda Nutrition Action Plan (UNAP), and Food and Agriculture Organization investment cases: a \$350M climate-smart agriculture project, and a 2025 investment conference. However, a critical gap remains: no government-led, cross-sectoral plan exists for civil servant capacity building on integrated food systems approaches, with existing training being project-based and unsystematic. Developing a certified training programme on integrated food systems approaches for mid-level and senior civil servants across all relevant sectors is recommended.

Domain	Analysis and Recommendations
Coordination Structures	Uganda has strong national coordination for food systems through the OPM-led NFSCC and key ministries, with designated champions and NDP IV for compliance. However, subnational engagement remains partially functional, as the Parish Development Model (PDM) is not yet fully operationalised for food systems, and local feedback does not consistently inform national policy. The Office of the Prime Minister and Ministry of Local Government should jointly develop guidelines for integrating food systems priorities into District Development Plans and PDM implementation.
Inclusivity, Stakeholder Engagement and Voice	Uganda excelled in stakeholder engagement, holding 19 dialogues before the 2021 UNFSS and using an inclusive process to develop NDP IV. Ongoing mechanisms through the NFSCC, Office of the Prime Minister, and Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries regularly consult academia, research bodies, civil society organisations, and citizens, with workshop participants confirming these inputs are taken seriously in policy formulation.
Monitoring and Accountability	Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is the weakest domain in Uganda's food systems governance. While NDP IV includes key performance indicators and an M&E framework, it lacks clear interim milestones, standardised methods for assessing cross-sectoral policy impacts, and any public progress reports on food systems transformation. Recommendations include establishing annual reviews and a mid-term assessment, mandating food systems impact assessments for new policies, publishing annual progress reports, and building dedicated analytical capacity within the National Planning Authority and Uganda Bureau of Standards.
Note: Green shading indicates domains where systems are highly supportive of coherence; yellow where they are moderately highly supportive; orange where they are only somewhat supportive, and red where they are generally not supportive	

Policy Conflicts & Synergies

Module 2 of the tool considers the conflicts and synergies between existing policies across six sectors (shown in the columns of the table below) and the achievement of key goals of food systems transformation, drawn from the United Nations Food Systems Summit process and shown in the rows of the table below.

Results for Uganda are shown in the shading of each cell in the table, following the legend shown below the table. For example, the light green shading in the first cell indicates that agriculture policies reviewed are somewhat coherent with the goal of increasing the supply of main staple crops, which contributes to achieving zero hunger. In contrast, health policies

are shown to be neither coherent nor incoherent with the goal of reducing food loss and waste.

Policies in most sectors examined were found to be somewhat or highly coherent with most food systems goals. This was particularly true of industrial, economic and monetary policies, which strongly supported most goals examined. The

analysis also identified several areas of incoherence, where policies in the health, trade, and industrial, economic and monetary sectors were found to be inconsistent with the achievement of some food systems goals. Policymakers and other stakeholders can consider the potential for accelerating progress through policy adjustments in these areas.

Coherence between Uganda's Policies and Key Food System Goals

		Agriculture	Health	Environment	Trade	Social	Industrial, Economic & Monetary
Zero Hunger	Increased supply of main staples						
	Affordable prices for main staples						
Climate Resilience	Adaptation						
	Climate change mitigation						
Healthy Diets	More nutritious food consumption						
	Less unhealthy food consumption						
	Reduction of Food Loss & Waste						
Decent Work	Adequate wages for food system workers						
	Effective nutrition-sensitive social protection						
	Empowerment of Women & Girls						
LEGEND		Highly Coherent	Somewhat coherent	Neither coherent nor incoherent	Somewhat incoherent	Highly incoherent	Not assessed
Policies reviewed in this sector were very much in line with achieving this goal				Policies reviewed in this sector were generally not in line with achieving this goal			



Industrial, economic, and monetary policies are coherent with zero hunger, climate

resilience, and healthy diets goals, showing strong support for staple crop production and nutritious food consumption and establishing financial incentives for climate mitigation and adaptation. In contrast, adequate wages for food system workers is an area of incoherence: Uganda does not have a national minimum wage policy, and food system workers often lack leave arrangements due to their employment in the informal and subsistence sectors.



Agricultural policies are coherent with food system goals including zero hunger and adaptation to climate change, but

neither coherent nor incoherent with goals related to climate change mitigation and less unhealthy food consumption. They promote the empowerment and inclusion of women and girls through provisions such as gender-responsive extension services and promotion of women's access to farm inputs, but budget allocations for women's empowerment and monitoring of gender-related targets could be strengthened.



Environment policies are mostly coherent with key food system goals, with strong support for

climate change adaptation, reduced consumption of unhealthy foods, and reduction of food loss and waste, among others. For example, policies promote waste-to-value projects which support converting food waste to renewable energy. However, environmental policies are neither coherent nor incoherent with the goals of affordable prices for main staple foods, more nutritious food consumption, and mainstreaming adequate wages for food systems workers.



Social policies are generally coherent with the key food systems goals but are strongest

when it comes to effective nutrition-sensitive social protection, adequate wages for food system workers, and empowerment and inclusion of women and girls. They are less supportive of goals related to affordable prices for main staples, adaptation to climate change, and facilitating healthier diets. For example, although social protection policies support climate adaptation by providing cash transfers during natural disasters, coverage is limited due to resource constraints.





Health and nutrition

policies support healthy

diets by advocating for more nutritious food consumption amongst Ugandans. They also promote inclusion and empowerment of women and girls as well as effective nutrition-sensitive social protection. However, the alignment of health and nutrition policies with climate goals varies. Policies are highly supportive of climate change adaptation, such as through interventions to control vector-borne diseases and to build preparedness and response capacity for climate related emergencies. But health and nutrition policies are largely silent on climate change mitigation and do not promote dietary shifts to lower-emission foods.



Trade policies are generally

coherent with goals related to climate resilience, reducing consumption of unhealthy

foods, and advocating for a decent work environment, but are somewhat incoherent with increasing the supply and reducing prices of main staple foods. This is mainly due to the high tariff measures imposed on the exchange of staple foods across the country's border. Non-tariff measures also limit imports and have the potential to raise domestic food prices.

Conclusion

There are some caveats to this analysis. First, this application was conducted at the national level. Relevant region- and division-level policies and initiatives thus are not reflected, which may under- or overestimate the level of coherence. Second, policy is complex and dynamic, and the goals of food system transformation are numerous; this analysis considers only a limited number of food systems goals and policies at one point in time. In addition, it is not necessarily the case that areas of incoherence in policies should be seen as 'bad'; there are some cases where incoherence may make sense, such as due to prioritisation across goals or political economy necessities.

Still, policy incoherence can sometimes lead to inefficiency and lower likelihood of achieving policy goals, as well as missed opportunities for leveraging synergies across policy areas where they exist. While achieving perfect coherence among all food-related policies across all outcomes is unlikely—and potentially undesirable, given the costs associated with coordination and alignment—by identifying and managing critical synergies and trade-offs, Uganda's government and the stakeholders who support it can better align efforts towards achieving key goals.



You can access the tool and supporting resources here:



This work was produced through the Agri-Food Systems Accelerator, a multi-partner initiative platform jointly funded by



The findings, ideas, and conclusions presented in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect positions or policies of GAIN or any of the agencies mentioned above.