TEMPLATE FOR APPROVAL OF ODA ACTIVITIES FROM EUR 250.000

SECTION: Key data

Short name	Restoring Resilience
Full name	Restoring Resilience of highland farmer communities and agroecosystems in Uganda
Summary	Watersheds and livelihoods are under threat in the highlands of Uganda. Increased pressure on land and inappropriate agricultural practices, amongst others, lead to erosion and decreasing carrying capacity of the land. Many interventions to address these challenges are focussed on the fast solutions instead of long-term change based on stewardship by the communities. This project will start from the perception and vision of farmers to develop the smallholder agricultural sector in a sustainable manner-based restoration of resilience of highland watersheds and farming systems. This goal of the activity is: *to build resilient farmer communities and agrosystems based on sustainable farming systems, restored watersheds and improved marketing opportunities.*
Name of contract party	Wageningen University & Research (Environmental Research)
Number of contract party	30013190
Date of receipt of proposal	30 AUG 2022
Proposal's reference number	Corsa2210048
Activity type	Standard
Budget holder	KAM
ODA	Yes
Amount and currency	EUR 11, 521,939
Amount in EUR	11,521,939
Start date	01/11/2022
End date	30/04/2027
Anonymise Open data	No
Consultation with embassy / regional department / thematic department	Q@E: KAM and KIG, IGG: VZ and KL
Related activity	1. TIDE-ISDAP: smallholder dairy development 2. Hortimap: horticultural development. 3. Bright: Inclusive development of farming systems in the Ugandan Highlands (under preparation)
SAP application number	4000005947
Funds centre	1702U01010029
Prepayment	Yes

SECTION: Policy data

Beneficiary's country/region The **beneficiary country** is the target group's country of residence or country of origin. It is	Country (state the country concerned below) Uganda

the country that ultimately benefits from the activity. This is not necessarily the country where the activity is implemented. When the activity takes place in several countries in the same region, specify the region concerned using the regional classification (see Help). If not (multiple countries in multiple regions), select **worldwide**.	
Specify countries + distribution of the budget over those countries (if known). Only fill in this section the answer above was 'region' or 'worldwide'. Please state the relevant beneficiary countries and estimate what part (in %) of the total budget over the entire activity duration can be attributed to each country. If the distribution of part of the budget is as yet unknown, it can be recorded as unspecified.	Country X ..% Country Y ..% Country Z ..% Unspecified ..% Etc. (add more rows if necessary) ..% **Total 100%**
Location within the country/ countries (be as specific as possible) When the activity targets one or more specific locations, please specify the location(s) here.	Province Kigezi and Toro regions

Aid modality	Project support
Technical assistance	10<TA<25 Between 10% and 25% of the activity budget
CRS code	43040 Rural Development
Policy markers	Equality between men and women: Significant Climate change/ adaptation: Significant Climate change/ mitigation: Not applicable Biodiversity: Significant Desertification: Not applicable VdsZek-Food Security: Principal Equality between men and women: the progam starts with an inclusive household (hh) planning. At HH-level there is a strong focus on social norms, joint decision-making and sharing of tasks, proceeds and responsibilities. This includes access to resources. Climate: The project works to build resilient farming systems. Resilience of SHF to cope with shocks such as climate (such as drought and floods) and market shocks. By improving agricultural practices and restoring watersheds. Biodiversity: sustainable agriculture and farming practices and watershed management contribute to biodiversity. Food security: the project works on resilience and enhanced agricultural production, sustainable land-

	use and access to local markets. All these are important contributors to food security of SHF and local communities.

SECTION: Policy appraisal

Policy relevance

- What policy objectives, as set out in the annual plan, policy notes etc., will this activity contribute to?

Food security is one of the central thematic areas in the MACS for Uganda. In line with the policy developed by IGG; smallholder farmers (SHF) are at the centre of this activity. It will contribute to the three major objectives of the FSN results framework: increase the productivity/income of smallholder farmers, sustainable land use and nutrition.

Rationale

- What issue/problem will be addressed by the activity?

The food security portfolio in Uganda is composed of a number of value chain and farming systems oriented projects. Important lessons from earlier projects are that SHF are not necessarily benefitting from innovations in a specific value chain (VC) and that a single-value chain may not enhance resilience of SHF. Also, the attention for sustainable land use and climate smart agriculture was often limited to the plots under the specific crop, instead of broad sustainable land-use approach. Therefore, it is essential to look at the broader FS. SHF are taking decisions in a broader context and do not necessarily have access to innovations developed by larger farmers and research.

Secondly, due to population pressure and climate change, land use is under pressure; erosion and degradation of landscapes are increasing, contributing to the vulnerability of small farmers. Market access is also a limitation for many small producers, this may be due to distance, but also to low bargaining power.

The project will strengthen resilience of SHF households by stimulating sustainable land use, development of the farming system, stimulate diversification and market access, and by those, enhancing resilience for climate and market shocks.

- Why does the activity help to address the issue/problem? Please explain the Theory of Change.

The project has as goal to increase resilience of highland farmer communities and watersheds.

In the project document the connections between results, outputs and activities has been well elaborated in line with the findings of the Q@E.

The basic starting point of the project implementation is to empower farmers and communities to take their future in their own hands. By the particapotory and inclusive planning at household and community level, the quality of planning will be enhanced and will motivate all partners to be involved and play their role. This will enhance their receptiveness for technical input. In this way farmers hh, and communities will be empowered to plan and implement household (farm) and community plans for development and tackling environmental degradation.

This spirit and commitment will enhance their capacities and interest in developing their farms, land scape and access to markets. The project will implement strategies and activities to assist the HH and communities with developing and implementing their plans, both organizational, institutional and technical.

In other words:
If HH and villages are empowered
Then activities will be built on a sound basis and be more successful to:

- Improve financial wellbeing of smallholders
- Increase food availability, access and diversity
- Build cohesive and inclusive farmer communities
- Convert farmland to sustainable land use
- Manage watershed more sustainably
- Create inclusive and functional local markets
- Engage women and youth in income generating activities

Which will increase resilience of highland farmer communities and watersheds
See also Annex 1, the results chain.

Contextual analysis

- Who is/are the target group(s) and why?

In line with IGG policy, the main direct target group for the project are smallholder farmer households in two selected project regions in the Kigezi and Rwenzori highlands.

Given the project's focus on collaboration it is essential to take all types and strata of farmers in villages into account, and foster their collaboration for village and watershed development. The PIP approach (household level based planning of farmer and community development), special feature of the project, is inherently an inclusive approach reaching all types of farmers, but during the Inception Phase and after a first assessment in the watersheds/villages, additional strategic aspects will be defined to actively reach all kind of farmers.

Specific attention will be given to the inclusion of youth and women, already during the start of the project with the household level planning.

Market actors may be both target group and stakeholder. The improvement of the functioning of local markets may need specific attention for small traders. During the inception period this will be further developed.

- Who are the other main stakeholders?

Main stakeholders are market actors and local government authorities in the selected watershed and sub-watersheds (district, subcounty, parish and village levels).

Moreover, public authorities, such as Government line ministries (MAAIF, MLGSD, MTIC, MoFPED), Uganda Wildlife Authority, National Forestry Authority, National Environment Management Authority, commodity specific agencies (e.g. National Coffee Development Authority), National Research Organizations (NARO) and universities are seen as potential stakeholders.
The project will also closely collaborate with and draw lessons from other, similar development projects being implemented within the country or region.

The project will work closely with relevant other Dutch funded activities, such as Bright, TIDE, Hortimap, L@Scale, CRAFT, DIETS and Gain. Especially Bright offers ample opportunities for synergies.

- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in formulating the proposal?

The project is formulated based on experiences with the Mwares project in Mbale and projects in Kisoro and other countries in the region. The PIP approach developed by WUR/WENR is widely appreciated and promoted by colleague embassies in the Region and by the local governments in Mbale and Kisoro regions.

The government has not been consulted/informed at this stage directly but rather through review of policies and national development plans. The project needs to be developed in more detail and be more concrete in order to bring to the table of the relevant ministries (MAAIF, and the Ministry of Water and Environment). After the start of the inception phase details will be elaborated and the project will become more concrete, based on local demand/needs, and with the active involvement of local governments.

(Local) government will be consulted early in the inception phase. Furthermore, ISSD (project partner) has good relations, both with NARO and MAAIF, which are identified in the proposal as potential partners.

Discussions with other stakeholders will begin after the project is awarded. Discussions have already been initiated with BRIGHT.

- Is the intervention aimed at a specific geographical location, and if so, why?

The project is aimed at the Highlands in Western Uganda (Kigezi and Toro Regions). The highlands are prone to erosion and home to mainly SHF. Sustainable land use is at risk due to the geographical characteristics and the area is sensitive for climate shocks.

Earlier interventions funded by the embassy have clearly shown the need for the approach as presented by Restoring Resilience. Erosion and landscape deterioration are important the highlands. Earlier one-crop approaches have led to protection on small parcels only, which does not address the bigger issue at stake.The presence of other projects in the region's provide opportunities to build synergies.

Added value

- What is the added value of the Dutch government being involved in relation to other donors, the EU, NGOs and local authorities?

Added value: The Dutch government has funded agricultural activities in the highlands for the last 9 years. Significant knowledge and experience has been gained and has been used to improve the present project. NL involvement has a strong focus on SHF development and push for sustainable land-use. The focus on building resilience is well integrated in our policy and will help to develop sound programs with the involvement of, in this case, local governments (LG). Restoring Resilience builds on the experiences and lessons learned and is well aligned with the NL policy on FS.

- Are the recipients making an own contribution or co-participating in the activity, and if so, to what extent?

Own contribution by the implementing organizations WUR/WENR and ISSD is not foreseen. The costs for their activities/support has been budgeted and will be paid for by the embassy.

In case of grants for development of innovative activities relevant for the development of the farmers in the highlands, the recipients will contribute to the costs.

Non-financial contribution by the target group is large and crucial for the implementation and success of the project. The farmer households and the communities are the owner of all the hh and village plans that will be developed, based on their commitment and ambition. The project is based on the concept of "resilience-based stewardship" which means that stakeholders (farmers especially) take their responsibility to be good stewards of the land and its natural resources.

Lessons learned

- What lessons learned (from previous or comparable activities, published evaluations, relevant publications) will be addressed by the activity?

1. Market oriented approach can work, and create a sustainable market for quality produce
2. To reach smallholder farmers it is essential to include their challenges, opportunities and ambition, from the start of the design and in the value chain development.
3. To enhance resilience and climate smartness, it is important to look at the entire farming system and to the related risks/opportunities.
4. Promotion of a single crop may have unexpected adverse effects.
5. Environmental degradation needs attention from a broader perspective to increase resilience and enhance sustainable production

Therefore, in order to enhance resilience, farmers' productivity and market access, the project will look beyond one-crop based market systems and have a sustainable farming system as a starting point. The ambitions, aspirations and opportunities of the farmer HH and the villages will be the starting point for the development of the activities.

Gender

- Does the proposal include a gender analysis?
- Does the proposal justify the target group's gender-specific interests and needs (and why)?
- Have women and young people been included in the stakeholder analysis?

Inclusiveness is central to the approach. The project will start the activities on the basis of a household level planning process, in which the whole family will be facilitated to work together. This will enhance inclusive decision-making incorporating the perspectives of men, women, young and old. Fostering gender equality and improving relations in the HH is inherent to the PIP approach.

Beyond the HH level, the project will pay adequate attention to the involvement of women and youth in the development and implementation of Village Visions and Watershed Plans, in entrepreneurial groups and as trainers for the PIP approach.
Special attention will be given to employment opportunities for youth through creating improved income opportunities, entrepreneurship and off-farm employment.

Climate change

- Does the proposal include an analysis of the possible effects of climate change on the activity or its results?
- Does the proposal include any interventions to combat these effects (adaptation/mitigation)?

Yes, the proposal is clear on the potential risks of climate change. Actually, one of the major results sought is enhanced resilience for climate risks. The interventions are at the level of adaptation: through climate smart agricultural practices and sustainable land-use measures.

Cooperation, harmonisation and alignment

- Does the activity involve cooperation with Dutch organisations, the EU or other donors (including delegated cooperation), local organisations or other parties?
- How does the activity contribute to harmonisation and/or multi-donor financing?
- What is the degree of (policy and financial) alignment?

The project will closely work together with other projects funded by the embassy: BRIGHT, TIDE, Hortimap and central programs like Craft and L@ Scale. The embassy will stimulate their cooperation and design a joint monitoring of the projects.
Especially the Bright and Restoring Resilience projects do have similar features and geographical intervention areas. Both depart from the farmer perspective. Bright is stronger at the production and market components, while this project has the watershed as the core approach. The two projects will benefit from each other if well coordinated.
No other donors are involved, but they are aware and support the NL strategy and priorities in Uganda. During the implementation the project will build relations to other donor funded activities if relevant.

Local governments and national agricultural research centres will be involved in the implementation. They were involved as well in the earlier projects funded by the embassy and have at several occasions expressed interest in the continuation of the Dutch support and way of working.

Government alignment:

The project is in line with the National Development Plan (NDP) 2020-2025 both in the areas of Natural Resources, Environment, Climate (Chapter 9) and Community Mobilization and Mindset (Chapter 18). According to the NDP 2020, natural resource management and combating climate change are critical to the reduction of disaster losses, achievement of increased household incomes and improvement of quality of life of the population. Sustainable land management is critical for harmonizing environmental, economic and social opportunities for the benefit of present and future generations while maintaining and enhancing the quality of the land resource.

The NDP 2020 also notes that the environment is increasingly under threat from both natural and man-made drivers of change including, and that particularly fragile ecosystems, such as hilly and mountainous areas, are facing encroachment and degradation. Also, one of the objectives of the NDP is to increase the participation of families, communities and citizens in development initiatives and Restoring Resilience will contribute to this objective.

The NDP III (National development Plan III) of Uganda, has as goal: “To increase HH income and improve quality of life of Ugandans”. The activities of the project of increasing production, sustainable land-use, access to markets and enhancing resilience fit well under this umbrella.
The agricultural strategy, spearheaded by MAAIF (Ministry of Agriculture) is called Agro-Industrialization Program (AIP). AIP is aligned with agenda 2030 (SDGs 2 and 9), which has an aspiration to end hunger, achieve food security and promote sustainable agriculture. The AIP recognises the weak services (such as extension, research and input supply), the lack of access to finance, the lack of storage and processing, poor access to markets as factors that are challenging agricultural development. Climate vulnerability and environmental degradation are mentioned as factors that contribute to the vulnerability of farmers.

The key objectives of the AIP are increasing production, post-harvest handling and storage and access to markets. The project fits well to both the identified weaknesses and risks and contributes

to the key objectives by sustainable improving agricultural production, access to markets and resilience for climate and market risks.

Also, the National Food Systems Strategy, mentions as key factors that needs to be addressed: resilience to climate change, sustainable land use, input supply and smallholder's development

Restore Resilience (RR) is well in line with the different government policies and documents.

NL does not directly finance the government players. Indirectly through the projects we support their functioning and capacity. No financing of activities through government financial systems.

Digitalisation

- Have proposed digital technologies been developed or chosen in collaboration with end-users?
- Does the proposal include an analysis of the local digital ecosystem?
- Is data security guaranteed?
- Are digital solutions locally sustainable/relevant?
- Is duplication avoided?

The project has not yet given full attention to digitalization, because the end-users are not the farmers that usually have access to digital tools. The promising digital platform the project will explore is use of mobile phones, especially smart phones in sharing information among project stakeholders. However, with the smart phone use at only 16% in Uganda, which position may be much lower in the rural communities the project is targeting, the potential will be assessed during the inception phase. Then they will decide what is feasible/relevant (e.g. phone applications). For sure digital tools/applications will be used for the M&E of the project, hence also for the baseline.

The project will safely store the data in a digital database: data security and data management is a topic that gets full attention at WUR/WENR as well, and we will use data management plan templates and guidance from WUR/WENR when we start with the project.

Additional remarks (if applicable)

SECTION: Results

In annex 1 the result chain and the log frame are attached. This includes outcomes, results, outputs and indicators, During the inception phase the log frame will be finalized, including indicators and targets.

- What are the main OUTPUTS (services and products) that will be delivered through the activity? Describe briefly.

The main outputs of the project are:
Empowered and motivated households and communities
Better performing farming systems
Restored degradation hotspots
Improved watershed management
Improved market access
Households generating income from key commodities
Viable entrepreneurial groups

- What are the main OUTCOMES (changes and effects for the target groups) that will be achieved through the activity? Describe briefly.

Improved financial wellbeing of SHF
More cohesive and inclusive farm communities
Farm land converted to sustainable land use
Watersheds managed more sustainably
Inclusive and functional markets
Women and youth engaged in income generating activities

- For each OUTPUT and OUTCOME mentioned above, specify how it will be measured:
  - Specify the indicators if they exist.
  - Specify the baseline values and targets if they exist.

The indicators for outcomes and results/outputs have been mentioned in annex 1. Also the targets are defined as far as possible. Some work is still required to finetune the log frame, indicators and a baseline to set the remaining or finetune the provided targets.

Some indicators:
# of households whose livelihoods are more robust ; target 100,000
# of targeted hh that increase their income : target 100,000
# of hectares (has) with lower erosion rates ; target 12,500
% increase of quantity of agricultural produce harvested per household: target 30
% of hh adding value to their crop produce; target 20
# of entrepreneurial groups operating their business at a profit ; target 120

- What method will be used to gather and monitor the data?

The M&E framework will be further developed during the inception phase of the project. It will be developed in a way it can track the outputs and results and changes that are associated with the project.

For each indicator a brief protocol will be developed describing methods, frequency and defining the responsibilities within the project and partners. WUR/WENR will provide technical expertise to the development and implementation of the monitoring system. Some of the indicators will require in-depth research to come to a better understanding of the topic or for guidance for further interventions. For such indicators ad-hoc studies will be conducted.

Control group or reference data will be identified to be able to measure the impact of the project.

As some indicators are hard to capture by quantitative indicators alone, the MEL will use a mix of quantitative and qualitative data collection tools.

A baseline will be conducted in the inception phase and an endline towards the end of the project to collect data on the indicators. An external mid-term evaluation (end 2024) will be done, to contribute to adaptations of the project strategy, approach and activities.

- Record the following in **the results application:**
  - the thematic results frameworks that apply to this activity;
  - the relevant indicators (including baseline values and targets if they exist).

The thematic indicators of IGG are incorporated in the log frame. They are referred to by adding the number of the FSN indicator.

- Have these results frameworks been communicated with the implementing organization?

The IGG results framework has been shared with WENR.

- Do the indicators correspond to one or more of the 17 indicators on which the ministry reports to the Dutch parliament? If not, why?

Yes see above and in annex 1. (IGG indicators A1, B.1.a, B.1.b, B.1.c, B.2, C2

SECTION: Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring
Specify what reporting information is required for this activity, based on the activity analysis decision tree (see Help). Include the following elements:

- Planning versus realisation: tracking progress against predetermined objectives as laid out in the project proposal.
- Performance and quality: checking relevance and appropriateness of the implementing organization's performance based on key assumptions in the proposal and the outcomes of the risk analysis.

Pay attention to the method and frequency of monitoring and describe the roles and responsibilities. For further information, see Help.

The embassy will monitor the activity at a regularly basis. We will use the different reports as explained below. Apart of the annual report, the project will reflect in a reflection report halfway the year on the issues, challenges and opportunities the project is experiencing, and the way they will be addressed.

The embassy will visit project activities at least twice a year.
Additionally, the embassy will consider organising joint monitoring between the relevant projects. This will be every 6-months and the major relevant projects will participate. This will enhance learning between the projects and enhance collaboration. The participation in the embassy initiated monitoring exercises will be included in the contractual obligations.

The monitoring will focus especially on the relations with the government, the orientation to SHF, HH level planning, diversification, resiliencies, sustainable land use and market development.

Topics that all major projects (TIDE, Hortimap, Restore Resilience and Bright) are active on will be central in the joint monitoring. Craft and L@Scale are two central funded activities that may benefit from the joint monitoring and will be invited if appropriate.

Main responsibility for the monitoring is the project responsible officer (thematic). Other colleagues may be involved according to topic and interest. The embassy will facilitate the monitoring and make necessary resources available for the facilitation of the joint monitoring.

Evaluation
Describe whether a final evaluation and/or a mid-term review has been planned. If yes, state:

- who will commission the final evaluation and/or mid-term review (for options, see Help);
- whether the procedure and practical arrangements have been agreed on with the implementing organisation (for details, see Help).

There will be both a mid-term review and a final evaluation.
The mid-term review will be prepared and commissioned by WUR/WENR. The ToR will be approved by the embassy.
The final evaluation will be commissioned by the embassy. Funds for the final evaluation are foreseen in the bemo.

SECTION: Finance

Budget breakdown

- Include an overview of the activity budget, including overhead costs.
- Is the budget arithmetically correct?
- Are the amounts/rates in the budget acceptable?
- Briefly explain the structure of the budget.
- Are overheads proportional to outputs? What is included? What is recharged?
- Is implementation conditional on the budget being amended in an inception phase? (Specify the requirements that the budget must satisfy and the date by which the budget must be amended.)
- Is the budget suitable as a management tool (linking outputs to budget)?

The overall budget for this activity is Eur 11,521,939.- of which 100,000,- is meant to finance an external party to perform the evaluation(s).

The overhead- and personnel costs are in line with the Agreement Coordinated Management of June 2020. Specifically on the hour tariffs, the embassy liaised with IGG to confirm if the presented budget is in line with the agreement. The tariffs as presented in the proposal will be leading during the duration of the activity. This will also be included in the grant decision.

	Project pathways & instruments	Total Budget	Budget in EUR Y1 Budget 2022/23	Y2 Budget 2023/24	Y3 Budget 2024/25	Y4 Budget 2025/26	% of Grandtotal
P1	**Resilient Farming Systems**						
P1.1	Activities	**2,031,680**	477,560	696,260	562,700	295,160	
P1.2	Operational costs	**334,506**	156,530	58,785	59,325	59,865	
P1.3	Personnel	**422,239**	94,561	109,226	109,226	109,226	
P1.4	Contractual services	**567,500**	115,500	204,000	134,000	114,000	
	Subtotal	**3,355,925**	**844,151**	**1,068,271**	**865,251**	**578,251**	**29.4%**
P2	**Restored Watersheds**						
P2.1	Activities	**1,396,080**	127,700	230,300	555,500	482,580	
P2.2	Operational costs	**284,769**	137,208	48,647	49,187	49,727	
P2.3	Personnel	**208,696**	43,697	55,000	55,000	55,000	
P2.4	Contractual services	**412,480**	98,880	111,200	111,200	91,200	
	Subtotal	**2,302,025**	**407,486**	**445,146**	**770,886**	**678,506**	**20.2%**
P3	**Improved marketing**						
P3.1	Activities	**906,700**	189,770	253,930	253,930	209,070	
P3.2	Operational costs	**123,257**	66,954	18,228	18,768	19,308	
P3.3	Personnel	**104,487**	22,700	27,262	27,262	27,262	
P3.4	Contractual services	**316,500**	71,300	88,400	88,400	68,400	
	Subtotal	**1,450,944**	**350,724**	**387,820**	**388,360**	**324,040**	**12.7%**
P4	**Project / Administration**						
P4.1	Personnel	**892,580**	215,243	226,046	226,046	225,246	
P4.2	Operational costs	**358,135**	91,751	89,086	89,086	88,212	
P4.3	Travel costs	**72,773**	14,835	18,773	19,313	19,853	
P4.4	M&E and communication	**256,991**	58,623	66,123	66,123	66,123	
	Subtotal	**1,580,479**	**380,451**	**400,027**	**400,567**	**399,433**	**13.8%**
	Total budget ISSD Uganda (P1+P2+P3+P4)	**8,689,373**	**1,982,812**	**2,301,265**	**2,425,065**	**1,980,231**	
P5	**WENR-TA**						
P5.1	Personnel	**1,695,502**	404,818	421,727	430,177	438,780	
P5.2	Travel & material costs	**180,000**	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	
	Total budget WENR (P5)	**1,875,502**	**449,818**	**466,727**	**475,177**	**483,780**	**16.4%**
	Budget total (P1+P2+P3+P4+P5)	**10,564,875**	**2,432,629**	**2,767,992**	**2,900,242**	**2,464,011**	
	Overhead ISSD (5% of budget ISSD - line 33)	**434,469**	99,141	115,063	121,253	99,012	**3.8%**
	Unforeseen (4% of budget total - line 40)	**422,595**	97,305	110,720	116,010	98,560	**3.7%**
	Grandtotal	**11,421,939**	**2,629,075**	**2,993,775**	**3,137,505**	**2,661,583**	**100%**

Code	P5: WENR-Technical Assistance and Backstopping	Key role	Budget Y1	Budget Y2	Budget Y3	Budget Y4	Total
P5.1.1	Chief of Party	Scale III (fulltime)	168,667	172,037	175,484	178,994	**695,183**
P5.1.2	PIP – Community Empowerment Expert	Scale III (45 days)	38,923	39,701	40,496	41,306	**160,427**
P5.1.3	Farming Systems – Agronomy Expert	Scale III (45 days)	38,923	39,701	40,496	41,306	**160,427**
P5.1.4	SLM-Watershed Management Expert	Scale IV (40 days)	43,085	43,946	44,826	45,722	**177,578**
P5.1.5	Project Support WENR	Scale II (20 days)	13,709	13,982	14,262	14,547	**56,501**
P5.1.6	Agribusiness-market expert (WCDI)	Scale III (30 days)	25,949	26,467	26,998	27,538	**106,951**
P5.1.7	Adhoc expert WENR/WCDI	Scale III (25 days)	21,624	26,467	26,998	27,538	**102,626**
P5.1.8	Adhoc expert WENR/WCDI	Scale III (25 days)	21,624	26,467	26,998	27,538	**102,626**
P5.1.9	M&E expert WENR/WCDI	Scale IV (30 days)	32,314	32,959	33,619	34,291	**133,183**
	Subtotal WENR personnel		**404,818**	**421,727**	**430,177**	**438,780**	**1,695,502**
P5.2.1	**Travel & Material costs**						
P5.2.2	Travel		30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	**120,000**
P5.2.3	Materials (when not available in Uganda)		10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	**40,000**
	Subtotal travel		**40,000**	**40,000**	**40,000**	**40,000**	**160,000**
P5.3.1	Audit		5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	**20,000**
	Total		**449,818**	**466,727**	**475,177**	**483,780**	**1,875,502**

Rate 2022	Rate 2023	2023+2%	2024+2	2025+2
106	108.12	110.28	112.49	114.74
106	108.12	110.28	112.49	114.74
106	108.12	110.28	112.49	114.74
132	134.64	137.33	140.08	142.88
84	85.68	87.39	89.14	90.92
106	108.12	110.28	112.49	114.74
106	108.12	110.28	112.49	114.74
106	108.12	110.28	112.49	114.74
132	134.64	137.33	140.08	142.88

Earmarking

- Is the Dutch contribution to the programme earmarked (i.e. reserved for a specific purpose)? If so, specify the reasons why.

The Dutch contribution is meant to finance the Restoring resilience of highland farmer communities and watersheds in Uganda proposal.

Prepayments

- Based on the prepayment decision tree (see Help), do the payments need to be entered as prepayments and why? In the case of a lump sum, assess this against the applicable criteria and give the reasons for your choice.
- What is the maximum percentage that can be paid as prepayment, and why?
- Which are the reporting obligations on the basis of which prepayments can be closed?

According to the decision tree, payments will qualify as prepayments, for which audit statements and progress reports will provide the basis of accountability. Prepayments will be for a maximum period of 12 months. The maximum percentage that can be prepaid is 95%. The final payment (up to a maximum of 5%) will be based on the outcome of the final report.

Available resources

	Foreign currency	**EUR**
Implementing organisation's own contribution		
Firm commitments by other donors (for each donor)		
Dutch contribution		*11,521,939.-*
Total available resources		***11,521,939.-***
Budget needed		***0.-***
Still to be financed		***0.-***
Soft commitments by other donors (for each donor)		
Uncovered balance		***0.-***

The grant for WENR will be for 11.421.939. The additional 100,000 is for the final evaluation. (separate contract between EKN and external party)

- Are there any non-financial contributions relevant to implementation of the activity, such as deployment of volunteers, availability of buildings, materials, etc.?
- If there is an uncovered balance, how will this affect implementation of the activity (e.g. proportional reduction in outputs, omission of regions) and how will this affect the decision whether to fund this activity?

There is no uncovered balance as the proposal will be fully funded by the Dutch contribution.

Grant with a repayment obligation, loans, equity investment or guarantee

- Does the Dutch contribution take the form of a grant with a repayment obligation, a loan, an equity investment or a guarantee (either in whole or in part)? If yes, briefly set out the consequences for accounting and how correct processing in the financial records will be ensured.
- Are there revolving funds? If yes, please explain what will happen to any residual funds, how closure will take place and which agreements should be made.

The Dutch contribution is a subsidy grant (ODA). There is no repayment obligation nor revolving fund.

Audit opinion

- Is an audit opinion required for the activity (see Help)? Briefly explain.

- Should the audit opinion be accompanied by an additional auditor's report (for example, on the risks set out above, or on monitoring that the organisation carries out on its prepayments to other organisations)?

According to the decision tree, an audit opinion on the counterparty's annual accounts in which the activity is identifiably included is sufficient. As the activity will not be visible on the WUR/WENR annual accounts an annual audit opinion at activity level (on financial statements) is required. The financial statements must be accompanied by an audit opinion drawn up by an external auditor. the requirements will be set out in the audit protocol, annexed to the grant decision.