Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Activity: Community-Driven Rural Development (23-0000095)

Id	23-0000095
Date	24-10-2023
SAP application number	4000006717

Contents

Key data **3**

Activity basics 3

Activity details 3

Accounting data 3

Policy data **4**

Policy Appraisal **5**

Rationale 5

Contextual analysis 6

Added value 6

Lessons learned 7

Durability 8

Gender 8

Climate change 9

Cooperation, harmonisation and alignment 9

Digitalisation 9

Additional remarks (if applicable) 10

Results **11**

Monitoring and evaluation **15**

Monitoring 15

Evaluation 15

Finance **17**

Budget breakdown 17

Earmarking 18

Prepayments 18

Available resources 19

Grant with a repayment obligation, loans, equity investment or guarantee 19

Audit opinions 19

Key data

Activity basics

Type	Standard
Short name	Community-Driven Rural Development
Contract party	GIZ-Deutsche Gesellschaft Fur Int. Zusammenarbeit Eschborn (30018236)
ODA	Yes
Amount EUR	9000000
Start date	01-12-2023
End date	30-11-2027
Full name	Community-Driven Rural Development (CDRD) in South Sudan
Summary	The CDRD project is a part of the One World-No Hunger Initiative of the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development of Germany (BMZ). It contributes to improving living conditions and prospects for rural communities especially women and young people. The project follows a cross-sectional and integrated approach on strengthening local communities' capacities to implement rural development and disaster risk management (DRM) processes and measures. The project hopes to increase community resilience to shocks, increase incomes and agricultural production, and enhance sustainable land use. The project targets the rural population with a focus on agricultural house-holds in selected communities Yei and Magwi Counties of Central and Eastern Equatoria States. Additionally, local, agro-based MSMEs with especially young entrepreneurs and women will be supported. The project will work with local governments, structures and organizations as intermediaries to achieve results.

Activity details

Date of receipt of proposal	31-08-2023
Proposal’s reference number	MINBUZA-2023.1294212
Budget holder	Juba Embassy (8221JBA)
Limit access	No
Related activity	

Accounting data

SAP application number	4000006717
Funds center	JBA SS Food security grants (1702U01010028)

Policy data

Aid modality	Project support
Technical assistance	50% or more of the activity budget
Beneficiary location	Country
Country	South Sudan
Location type	Other
Specific location	Eastern and Central Equatoria States (Magwi and Yei Counties)
CRS code	43040 Rural development
Policy Keywords	
Refugees & host communities	Yes
Policy Markers	
Biodiversity	Not targeted
Climate change: adaptation	Significant
Climate change: mitigation	Significant
Desertification	Not targeted
Equality between men & women	Principal
Food security	Principal
Market access	Significant
Market development	Principal
Private sector development	Significant
Explain your choices	Market Development: Output 2 mainly encourages market systems for agricultural development. Biodiversity : The project primarily focusing of rural development doesn't directly target biodiversity although it might be targeted indirectly. Climate change: The project directly focuses on disaster risk reduction with a large emphasis on climate change adaptation and mitigation where necessary. Food security: The project primarily addresses the problem of food insecurity in South Sudan with objectives to increase agricultural production and productivity. Equality: The project understands the gender barriers and disparities within the targeted communities which principally affect the participation of women and youth in agricultural development and undertakes measures geared towards addressing these norms. PSD: The role of the private sector in agricultural development is key and the project acknowledges their significance relating to increasing agricultural production and productivity.

Policy Appraisal

Policy relevance

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

This activity will contribute towards the following policy objectives of IGG for food and nutrition security and SDG 2 with the following core objectives:

1. Increase community resilience to shocks and increase incomes by supporting and implementing community development plans in the fields of climate-resilient agriculture, value chain development, livelihood security and social cohesion.
2. Increase agricultural production among small scale food producers by supporting activities aimed at structural/systematic/temporary/partial improvement of their agricultural perfomances.
3. Enhance sustainable land use by supporting activities aimed at structural/systematic/temporary/partial improvement of agro-ecological sustainability.

The activity contributes to the MACS policy objectives for South Sudan namely; inclusivity of vulnerable and marginalised groups in the development cooperation in which women and youth are key actors. Furthermore, the activity also contributes to the MACS sectoral objectives for food security namely; commercialisation of agriculture and production for the market, and establishment of strategic partnerships.

The project is being implemented in areas emerging from conflict with a number of returnees and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs). The project will work to increase resilience of communities to shocks in collaboration with other actors in the development, humanitarian and peacebuilding sectors in line with the Triple Nexus programming.The CDRD will depend on information shared by humanitarian actors regarding IDPs populations and returnee reintegration to know the target beneficiaries suitable for support. Furthermore, the project will depend on security updates provided by humanitarian partners and the UN to make decisions relating to secuirity assesments for safe implementation of programs. To ensure conflict sensitive programming, the project has a component of peacebuilding which will closely interact with the GIZ local governance project and rural governance projects also implemented in the same locations to ensure peaceful co-existence amongst communities.

Rationale

- What issue/problem will be addressed by the activity

Food insecurity is a core problem affecting the populations of South Sudan with about 54% of the South Sudan population said to face acute food insecurity according to the Inter-Phase Classification. The project aims at contributing towards addressing food insecurity in the Country.

Furthermore, the activity will address climatic stressors in South Sudan which have affected livelihoods of farming and pastoral communities and contributed to the worsening food security in the country, jeopardized recovery and undermined development efforts. Additionally, the project aims at addressing the high poverty levels in South Sudan where about 82% of the population are living under the poverty line with an illiteracy level of about 60%.

Women and children are mostly affected with limited opportunities for economic growth and development. Also, only about 4% of the potential arable land in South Sudan is cultivated, with farming characterised by subsistence, rain-fed agriculture and pastoralism. Additionally, the decline in production and market demand resulting from the conflict have affected agricultural value chains and market development. This activity will contribute towards addressing these problems.

- Why does the activity help to address the issue/problem?
  For ODA activities over EUR 250.000, please explain the Theory of Change

The activity targets the rural population which constitues the highest percentage of small scale food producers. Mostly, these populations are characterised by low literacy rates, high poverty rates, limited access to services including finance, markets and information, and are highly impacted by climatic stressors since their livelihoods are highly reliant on agriculture. The selected target locations of Magwi and Yei are located within the green-belt and are primarily agricultural communities, however their activities were impacted by conflict. The relative stability in these areas, provides opportunity to revive the agricultural potential of these communities.

The project will address the stated issues/problems as follows:

1. Empower community structures to strengthen participatory planning and implementation capacities of subnational administrative and civil society actors relating to socioeconomic community development.
2. Strengthening the resilience of small scale food producers and value chain actors to shocks through application of agro-ecological agricultural practices to increase their productivity, production and incomes.
3. Improve market systems through working with micro, small and medium entreprises (mSMEs) value chain actors and agribusinesses such as agro-dealers, agro-processors and cooperatives to enhance market linkages, access and availability of agricultural inputs and produce.

4. Empower local actors to plan and implement effective Disaster Risk Management strategies and action plans which will contribute towards natural resource conservation and increase their resilience to external shocks.
5. Process strategic learning experiences relating to risk-informed, socio-economic development of rural communities which will provide strategic policy recommendations through the establishment of Public-Private Dialogue forums.

The activity draws lessons from past and current experiences of implementation of participatory community-led rural development programs to deliver this activity. Inclusion and engagement of communities while planning and implementing projects impacting their livelihoods has proven to attract acceptance and interest which increases chances of success. GIZ will build on its experience in the farmer business school approach, cooperative development,integrated planning and activities pogramming, and community rural development approaches to address these issues.

Contextual analysis

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

The project targets the rural communities with special focus on agricultural households in Yei and Magwi Counties of Central and Eastern Equatoria States. Additionally, the activity will target local agro-based Micro, Small and Medium Entreprises (MSMEs) with special focus on young entrepreneurs and women.

90% of the households in the selected rural communities rely on subsistence agriculture and are heavily dependant of natural resources for their livelihoods. Despite their strategic location within the greenbelt region characterised by fertile soils and reliable rainfall, a substantial amount of these populations face a crisis level food insecurity. The poverty index is at 76% for Central Equatoria and 93% for Eastern Equatoria. Women and young people are most vulnerable, with limited access to resources, employment and income opportunities. Youth constitute about 70% of the Country's population and women's access to agricultural land is constrained by gender norms and customary laws, yet they contribute the largets labor force across the agricultural value chain. Due to relative security in Magwi and Yei counties,there has been an increased record in the number of returnees. The percentage of female headed households among host households is 24% and 63% among returnees.

- Who are the other main stakeholders?

Decision makers and technical experts in authorities at sub-national administrative levels (payam, boma and county); Local community structures including development commitees and DRM committees; Producer Organisations including cooperatives and Civil Society Organisations of the target groups; Agricultural Extension service providers; and local agro-based MSMEs.

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

Other development agencies/organisations (International Fertiliser Develoment Center, IFAD, Cordaid, SPARK, The World Bank among others)involved in the agricultural sectors were engaged in the formulation of the proposal. Through these consultations, the activity identified other projects which would be complementary to the CDRD, and areas of potential collaboration. Communities and local authorities from the targeted locations were also consulted in the project design. With the proposition for co-financing, the project further consulted current project participants to draw lessons which would inform the next phase of the project which will be financed through joint partnership with the Netherlands (current proposal).

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

The intervention is aimed at Magwi and Yei Counties of Eastern and Central Equatoria States. These locations lie within the greenbelt region and highly agrarian communities with great agricultural potential. The relative stability in these communities which has encourged an upsurge of returnees promises the need for their reintegration through livelihood support. GIZ has along standing presence in these two locations with established offices and have built a good working relationship with the local communities and authorities over the years.

Added value

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

The Netherlands has a long-term objective to consolidate peace and stability and to enable all-inclusive sustainable development in South Sudan contributing in turn to increased stability in the Horn of Africa (MACS 2023-2026). As such, the Netherlands has enhanced a strong presence in South Sudan, even throughout the civil conflicts. GIZ and many other actors suspended their operations in South Sudan following the 2016 conflict maintaining just a minimal presence, however the Netherlands remained firm. Compared to the EU, The Netherlands is a more flexible donor with processes leading towards decision making for flexible programming, program adapatation and willingness to adjust relating to emerging contexts. This will be a clear value addition to this program. Also, The Netherlands is has a development cooperation with a strong technical expertise in development and resilience approaches including in Food and Nutrition Security, water, private sector development, rule of law and human rights. Particularly, the Netherlands will add value relating to output 2 on market systems and value chain development.

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

No. the recipients will contribute in-kind support by co-participating the project. Their contribution will be in form of their time and labour towards achieving the objectives of the project. The recipients will also act as sources of information to guide programming given their clear understanding of the contexts in which the project will be implemented. Where applicable, recipients will also contribute natural resources such as land for implementation of certain community action plans.

Lessons learned

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

Participatory community-led rural development: The participatory Payam/ Boma location selection is highly appreciated by all stakeholders from the county to the rural leaders. This was based on clearly defined criteria, explained during inception workshops attended by leading representatives of the Bomas, the Payam and the district authorities. Community engagement in the planning, design and implementation of their Community Development Plans (CDPs) is highly welcomed by the communities and the local population and is considered to be empowering, inclusive and unique. Communities have ownership of the process, since they are given opportunity for full participation in the project implementation. The cultural stereotype of women not being seen as credible leaders in the communities still exists with the women even unwilling to take up leadership roles in the local structures. Women are not seen as credible leaders not just by men but also their communities persists. Women are also reluctant to take on leadership roles in local committees. In order to break down cultural norms, a quota of women has been set (5 out of the 13 members are women) and measures to promote gender equality are being defined. Addressing the issue during the committee set-up process created already greater awareness and led to the election of some women as committee chairpersons.

Farmer business school approach (FBS): The preceding GIZ "Food Security and Agricultural Development project" (FSAD) introduced and adapted the FBS approach developed by the GIZ Agribusiness Facility for Africa. The main objective of the approach is to change the mindset of the Small Scale Food Producers and to utilise potentials in agriculture, not as a mere subsistence activity to ensure food security for the household, but also as a commercial activity. FBS is already being implemented by all GIZ projects in the agriculture bundle and is also integrated in an equally adapted way into the applied Farmer Field School (FFS) approaches. Participating farmers and farmers' groups, while also focusing on the special need of women farmers to be empowered, have developed a commercial view of the agricultural sector and have taken concrete measures to professionalise their agricultural activities, to improve them sustainably and to achieve higher incomes. The project also supports the selection of lead female farmers as ToT and their advisory work benefitting particularly other female farmer groups. In addition, since 2020, GIZ agricultural projects have already qualified three master trainers under the pan-African GIZ programme for FBS master train-ers (mainly university-educated persons) and 27 FBS trainers (model farmers, extension workers, advisors etc.) in the Equatoria region in order to sustainably implement and scale up the approach.

Cooperative development: GIZ has many years of experience in cooperative development, which it is expanding with the CDRD project. Before the crisis in 2016 (and subsequent eroding of the efforts), working with the World Food Programme "Purchase for Progress Project" to address local grain procurement, GIZ supported the establishment of ware-houses, trained farmers in the use of sustainable farming technologies in several cooperatives to increase their yields, and supported the pooling of grain as WFP provided the market for the grains in these cooperatives managing the warehouses. Under the FSAD project, activities to support cooperatives in Magwi have been taken up in six farmer cooperatives, which has had a lasting impact on these cooperatives, especially in Obbo. These now act as grain suppliers for PG3 Logistics, a major player in the grain market that supplies other regions with locally and regionally produced grain. CDRD is taking this approach and expanding it further in Yei and Magwi counties.

Integrated planning and activities programming: After 2016, almost all household livelihoods and means of production in CDRD project areas were destroyed. This also applies to the forests as natural resources of the communities, which are affected by uncontrolled deforestation. This contributes to noticeable climatic hazards in the areas designated as Green Belt. In Magwi and Yei, there used to be two distinct and sufficient rainy seasons. The duration and periods of rainfall are becoming shorter, and many unusually strong and destructive winds and down pours are occurring as natural barriers are gone. Many fruit trees previously planted by farmers have perished, primarily due to man-made fires. In addition to climate-smart farming practices in all GIZ agriculture packages, a DRM component has therefore been included which examines the root causes of disasters and proactively works with community DRM committees to develop and implement measures to adapt to the impacts of climate change.

Women constitute a greater proportion in some Value Chains (VC): GIZ's experience in the Equatoria region shows that women make up a larger share of the players in the grain trade. They are represented in all mainly informal segments of the VC, but especially in production and trade. However, they are only marginally involved in the provision of commercial inputs but dominate post-harvest trade in all forms of agricultural products. The CDRD ensures that the selected VCs are promoted in gender-responsive approaches whenever possible. Active steps have already been taken in the formation of the community development committees where at least 5/13 of the members should be women. This is to ensure that their perspectives and interests are captured and represented throughout the process of planning, selecting and implementing CDP and DRM action plans.

Young rural labour force is in sharp decline: The number of active and capable young people, and especially young men in the agricultural labour market is gradually decreasing. Many see farming as unattractive and prefer quick businesses such as boda

boda, have moved to the towns in search of other opportunities, or feel unsafe in rural areas due to ongoing insecurity. Support is therefore given in (commercial) agrifood activities aiming for youth entrepreneurship development and creating jobs for youth. Special attention is given to promoting the development of youth-led MSMEs in the agri-food sector, training in enterprise development and entrepreneurship. In addition, the promotion of adapted agricultural mechanisation is important for SSFP to make agriculture more economic and attractive, in line with the needs of climate-smart and ecological agriculture production techniques.

High local transaction and marketing costs strongly discourage and demotivate farmers and traders to engage in local production and trade: Traders in intervention regions prefer to import agricultural products from neighbouring countries than to buy from other states or even neighbouring districts. The reasons for this seem to be manifold: illegal taxes levied by the numerous uniformed checkpoints, high production costs, high transport costs, etc., which drive up prices. In the previous GIZ-FSAD project, regular dialogues and forums were held where agri-food actors could openly discuss their challenges, including with local fee collectors, resulting in a number of compromises. The CDRD project supports the systematic re-establishment of similar public-private dialogue (PPD) forums at the district level, involving state actors, and expands them thematically along the multifaceted challenges of the VCs.

Durability

- How will the results of the activity be sustained after its end date? What is the exit-strategy?

Structure-building capacity development approaches are adopted to strengthen sub-national administrative structures and the smallholder potential of the local population to enhance sustainability. The project approach principally focuses on strengthening community systems and strutures through capacity development and active leadership/engagement of the communities throughout their development processes. This will make the outcomes of the project less vulnerable to staff turn-over of government and political developments.
Furthermore, strategic partnership with other partners operational in the project locations especially the IFAD-SSRLP project is ensured to consolidatively enhance sustainability.

Gender

- Does the proposal include a gender analysis? If yes, what are the main outcomes? If no, why not?

Yes. A gender analysis for the CDRD project is included.
Across the areas visited, there was a main concern to address issues related to "stress“ at the family level and individual level of households, women and youth. The level of vulnerabilities has led to issues of increased GBV and other related human rights injustices faced by the vulnerable persons i.e women, girls, widows, and disabled persons. These persons require a lot of support including counselling, psychosocial support, as well as awareness raising.
Gender-based violence and protection violations in South Sudan are also driven by a culture of silence and stigma, masculine identity tied to cattle-raiding, bride-price, a lack access to legal recourse, and customary practices that favour compensation for crimes like rape. As a result many victims experience post -traumatic stress disorder symptoms, such as suicide, nightmares or memory loss, apart from the physical damage they suffer.
The current civil war has eroded the income generating streams at the household level, and has made most men unable to play the role as the sole financial provider in the homes. In the Yei River County context, due to the high number of displacements and loss of livelihood, both men and women seem to have “nothing to do.”
Youth across the two counties have voiced the issue of inclusivity and space. Many youths have the feeling of frustration of not being able to achieve their dreams. The lack of a platform for the youth to express their needs, exchange experiences, etc without being intimidated by government organs is currently lacking. With these limited democratic spaces, youth look for alternative spaces such as on social media and result into hate speech to vent their frustrations, incite to conflict and violence.
Women are crucial in the translation of the products of a vibrant agriculture sector into food and nutritional security for their households. When women have an income, substantial evidence indicates that the income is more likely to be spent on food and children’s needs. Women are generally responsible for food selection and preparation and for the care and feeding of children. Strengthening the governance mechanisms (group management and leadership) of the rural self-help groups’ or “village savings and loans associations”, would enable women and youth save more and offer loans to members. The VSLAs concept has so far been the most versatile approach of financial mobilisation and support at the rural level for most women.
Youth make up the bulk of the population in South Sudan, close to 70%, yet so far little focus has been directed to them in the past. Although the South Sudan National Youth Policy is yet to be finalised and published, efforts should be made to make youths more inclusive in the agriculture sector which is labour intensive.
The current trend now in South Sudan is to provide coordinated support. At present there are many institutions supporting resilience and agriculture activities in South Sudan. Co-ordinated support to the people displaced or returning to some conflict-affected areas to reconstruct their livelihood systems to meet their short-term needs (household coping mechanism) and long term needs, is cost effective.

- Does the proposal justify the target group's gender-specific interests and needs (and why)? Please explain.

Yes. The proposal stresses the specific interests and needs of women and youth. Specifically, women and young people are considered marginalised with limited access to opportunities of employment, access to resources, finance and income, and hence more vulnerable to poverty and food insecurity. Furthermore, the proposal emhasises the role of traditional gender norms and customary laws in limiting women's access to agricultural land, which impacts on their productivity and efficiency in the sector. The proposal also highlights the exposure of women to sexual violence and trauma due to the conflict.

- Have women and young people been included in the stakeholder analysis? Please explain.

The CDRD ensures that the selected Value Chains are promoted in gender-responsive approaches whenever possible. Active steps have already been taken in the formation of the community development committees where at least 5/13 of the members should be women. This is to ensure that their perspectives and interests are captured and represented throughout the process of planning, selecting and implementing Community Development Plans and Disaster Risk Mitigation action plans.

Climate change

- Does the proposal include an analysis of the possible effects of climate change on the activity or its results?

Under environmental impacts, the proposal includes an analysis of the possible negative unintended effects of the activity to climate change relating to environmental protection and resource conservation including the eventual use of chemical fertilisers and pesticides or climate-related risks. Relating to implementation risks, the proposal highlights the possible impact of natural disasters such as floods and desert locusts on achieving desired results.Recurrent natural disasters are also mentioned to potentially impact the sustainability of the project.

- Does the proposal include any interventions to combat these effects (adaptation/mitigation)?

Principally, the project is designed with a strategic objective to strengthen the climate risk management capacity of local communities to increase their resilience to climatic shocks, enhance conservation, protection and rehabilitation of natural resources. The proposal mentions the approaches it will adopt to minimise these impacts. The activity proposes community engagement as a key approach to adopt while to adapt to/mitigate these impacts.

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?

Yes. The activity outlines several programs funded by the Netherlands, EU, World Bank and other agencies that would align with the CDRD project and outlines areas of synergy. For example the South Sudan Livelihoods and Resilience Program (IFAD/NL/AfDB), Social Safety Nets Program (World Bank), the Accelerating Agriculture and Agribusiness in South Sudan Program (NL/IFDC).

- How does the activity contribute to harmonisation and/or multi-donor financing?

The project is currently funded by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). The Dutch contribution would be a co-financing towards the project. Investing into this project would contribute towards harmonisation among donor communities especially within the EU. Furthermore, the project has the potential to become a flagship project in the context of a planned second Team Europe Initiative: Human development, jobs and growth for a resilient stable society contributing to two key objectives: a more productive, sustainable and climate smart agri-food system ensuring food security in South Sudan, and job creation and economic diversification through value chain development to foster private sector development. This would call for more donors to join the project to promote more collaboration and harmonisation.

- What is the degree of (policy and financial) alignment?

The project highly aligns with the Netherlands policies for sustainable development with a strong contribution towards Sustainable Development Goal 2. It contributes to the fields of action of Agriculture and Food Security with measures to increase climate-resilient, diversified agricultural production, improved productivity for increased food and nutrition security FNS and reduced poverty levels. Furthermore, improved livelihoods, nutrition and incomes for small scale food producers are targeted to support agri- food activities that aim for youth entrepreneurship development and creating jobs for youth. The project strategically contributes to the Netherlands FNS indicators of; 1) Increasing agricultural production; 2) Increasing resilience to shocks; 3) Increasing household incomes and 4) Enhancing sustainable land use.

Digitalisation

- Have proposed digital technologies been developed or chosen in collaboration with end-users?

According to the proposal, Information and communication technologies (ICT) are increasingly used e.g., via the blended learning approach in qualifications and for professional backstopping. ICT equipment and digital formats are used for increased professional exchange and networking as well as information of the target groups (e.g. SMS-based weather data, natural disasters). The proposal however doesn't indicate whether these technologies were chosen in collaboration with end-users.

- Does the proposal include an analysis of the local digital ecosystem?

The proposal mentions that in rural areas, an effective digitalisation approach for the target group is only possible to a very limited extent due to insufficient infrastructure (internet, electricity connection), lack of equipment and capacities and the resulting low allocation efficiency.

- Is data security guaranteed?

From the proposed technologies, there don't seem to be data security risks as the proposal doesn't mention potential uses of technologies for sensitive data.

- Are digital solutions locally sustainable/relevant?

Digital solutions are locally relevant however their sustainability is highly dependent on a number of factors including availability of income for airtime, internet, electricity among others.

- Is duplication avoided?

N/A

Additional remarks (if applicable)

Results

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

Output 1: Participatory planning and implementation capacities of sub-national administrative and non-governmental actors with regard to socio-economic community development are strengthened.

The objective of Output 1 is to strengthen the capacity of subnational administrative and civil society actors in participatory planning and implementation for a sustainable and inclusive community-led rural development process. These are to foster local ownership that contributes to improved climate resilience and social cohesion in communities. Consequently, the project provides organisational and process advice and training to the subnational administrative units on the establishment of representative community development committees at Boma level.

Output 2: The demand-driven supply of inputs, services and markets for local actors in selected climate-resilient agricultural value chains is improved.

This output focuses on strengthening market systems within the agricultural value chains. The key actors targeted here include agribusinesses such as agro-dealers, processors, mSMEs and service providers such as extension services and cooperatives to improve the enabling environments for agricultural development. This will increase the productivity and production, and subsequently the living incomes of small holder farmers. Working with value chain actors on agriculture-based local economic development will also create employment opportunities and contribute to improved Food and Nutrition Security.

Output 3: Planning and implementation capacities of subnational administrative and non-governmental actors are strengthened with regard to comprehensive disaster risk management.

Output 3 aims to strengthen the planning and implementation capacities of subnational administrative and civil society actors with regard to comprehensive Disaster Risk Mitigation (DRM), so that they are able to identify and analyse climate-related and other DRM-related risks to design and initiate preventive measures. Empowering local actors to plan and implement effective DRM strategies and action plans contribute to the conservation of natural resources as the livelihood and production basis of the rural population, thus increasing their resilience to external shocks. To achieve this, it is essential that representative subnational DRM committees are established which foster participatory decision making processes and integrate the DRM strategies and action plans as part of the Community Development Plans (Output 1).

Output 4: Strategic learning experiences regarding risk-informed, socio-economic development of rural communities are available at State level.

Output 4 aims to process strategic learning experiences related to risk-informed, socio-economic development of rural communities and make them available at the State level. The participatory processing of the learning experiences and the development of strategic policy recommendations for action for authorities at State and national level leads to the broad-scale implementation of successful approaches to integrated community development planning. Central to this is the establishment of Public-Private Dialogue (PPD) forums at the county level with the involvement of State authorities. As institutionalised multi-stakeholder platforms with value chain actors from all sectors, they serve to improve coordination and communication, open up business opportunities and address challenges related to policy and regulatory frameworks.

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

- Capacity of communities in community-driven, income-generating, and risk-informed rural development measures is improved:

Sub-national community structures are capacitated to respond to both man-made and natural shocks impacting their agricultural productivity and agricultural value chain development. This will be achieved through close cooperation with community structures such as Disaster Risk Mitigation (DRM) committees, cooperatives and local governments.

2. Improved food and nutrition security of supported communities.

When agricultural communities' capacity to respond to climatic and environmental shocks, socio-economic shocks, and their access to agricultural services such as quality inputs, extention services and markets improved, their agricultural productivity and production will be increased contributihg towards their food security.

3. Area of farmland (in ha) under sustainable land use is increased:

When the enabling environments are availed for local commuities to engage in commercialised agriculture through capacity strengthening on good agricultural practices, response to environmental shocks such as pests and diseases, access to markets and agricultural inputs enhanced, the area of farmland under sustaibale land use will be increased.

- For the OUTPUTS and OUTCOMES mentioned above (or add snapshot from results application):
  - Specify the indicators if agreed upon with the contract party.
  - Specify the baseline values and targets if applicable.

Project objective (outcome) indicator 1.

105 community measures from the CDPs in the fields of climate-resilient agriculture VC development, livelihood security or social cohesion are implemented according to the action plans of the subnational development committees.

Baseline: 0 measures (no subnational CDPs with measures available).Target: 105 measures (03/2027); 70 measures (03/2026), 35 measures (12/2024)

Project objective indicator 2

7,200 of 9,000 smallholder households in the Counties of Yei und Magwi, 30% of which are women-headed households, have increased their income group by 1 group.

Baseline: 864 rural households in income group (1), 1,296 in (2), 1,656 in (3) and 3,384 in (4) (preliminary results).Target: 7,200 rural households, of which 2,160 are women-headed households in higher income group (09/2027)

Project objective indicator 3

63 collaborative measures from the subnational DRM strategies, of which 66 % improve climate change resilience, are implemented as part of the CDPs.

Baseline: 0 community measures (no community DRM strategies and CDPs available).

Target: 63 DRM community measures of which 42 measures on climate resilience (06/2027), 40 DRM community measures of which 26 on climate resili-ence (09/2026), 20 DRM community measures of which 13 on climate resilience (09/2025), 8 DRM community measures of which 13 on climate resili-ence (12/2024).

Project objective indicator 4

5 strategic learning experiences are elaborated as recommendations for policy actions regarding a risk-informed, socio-economic development of rural communities.

Baseline: 0 recommendations for policy action (no recommendations for policy action included)

Target value: 5 recommendations for policy action (06/2027)

6. **Output indicator 1.1**
   23 CDPs, prepared through participatory formats of community-based development planning, are available to the Yei and Magwi County administrations.
   Baseline: 8 CDPs (09/2023)
   Target: 23 CDP (09/2025), 14 CDP (09/2024)
7. **Output indicator 1.2**
   464 of 580 trained representatives of subnational administrative structures and civil society organisa-tions, 15 % of them women, have confirmed with 2 examples each that their capacities to implement gender-transformative, risk-informed, social cohesion and climate-resilience promoting measures from participatory community-based development planning have improved.
   Baseline: 0 representatives (no trained actors so far)
   Target: 464 representatives, 70 of them women with 2 examples each (10/2026)
8. **Output Indicator 1.3**
   55 of the 156 members of the 21 inclusive-composited community development committees responsible for planning and implementing the CDP are women.
   Baseline: no data
   Target: no data
9. **Output indicator 2.1**
   270 agricultural extension workers/ advisors, 15 % of whom are women and 40 % of whom are young people, and 50 agro-based MSMEs, 60 % of them led by young people, are qualified to provide train-ing on or services for good agronomic practices, climate-resilient and nutrition-sensitive agriculture production, improved market access or other busi-ness development services.
   Baseline: 0 agricultural extension workers/ advisors and 0 agro-based MSMEs (no survey among pre-viously trained agro-based MSMEs)
   Target: 270 agricultural extension workers/ advi-sors , 41 of them women and 108 young people 50 agro-based MSMEs, 30 of them led by young peo-ple (03/2026)
10. **Output indicator 2.2**

7,650 out of 9,000 SSFP, of which 30 % were headed by women, confirmed the relevance of agricultural extension or training for their climate-resilient, market-oriented agricultural production or income increase.

Baseline: 0 smallholder households (no survey among previously trained women and men farm-ers).

Target value: 7,650 smallholder households, of which 2,295 are headed by women (03/2025)

- **Output indicator 2.3**
  1,500 members of 2,000 members in 10 supported agricultural cooperatives or producer groups rate the development of their market linkage as positive with 3 or higher on a scale of 1 to 5.
  Baseline: 0 members of cooperatives or producer groups (no survey made yet on the satisfaction).
  Target value: 1,500 members of 10 cooperatives or producer groups rate the development of their mar-ket linkage as positive (06/2027)
- **Output indicator 2.4**
  9.6660 ha of farmland of the 9,000 SSFP directly reached with activities aimed at structural/ systemic improvement of

agro-ecological sustainability.
Baseline: 0 ha of farmland (no survey made yet).
Target value: 0 ha of farmland (06/2027)

- **Output indicator 3.1**
  23sub-national DRM strategies with action plans are available to the subnational committees.
  Baseline: 8 sub-national DRM strategies (09/2023)
  Target: 23 sub-national DRM strategies (03/2025), 14 subnational RRM strategies (06/2024)
- **Output indicator 3.2**
  188 of 235 trained representatives of subnational committees and non-governmental organisations, of which 15 % were women and 30 % young peo-ple, confirmed with 2 examples each that their ca-pacity to implement subnational DRM strategies has improved.
  Baseline: 0 representatives (09/2023)
  Target: 56 representatives, including 28 women and 56 young people (09/2026)
- **Output indicator 4.1**
  6 strategic learning experiences from processes of risk-informed socio-economic development of rural communities, 2 on climate resilience and 2 on women's empowerment, were documented with decision-makers in rural development at the state level.
  Baseline: 0 strategic learning experiences (no learning experiences so far derived from participa-tory community-based development planning and development of integrated DRM approaches)
  Target: 6 strategic learning experiences, 2 on cli-mate resilience and 2 on empowerment of women (03/2026)
- **Output indicator 4.2**
  The 2 PPD forums established in Magwi and Yei districts have each presented 2 position papers with strategic learning experience from promoting selected climate-resilient agricultural VCs to deci-sion makers at the State level.
  Baseline: 0 strategic position papers by PPDs available
  Target: 6 strategic position papers (12/2026)

B. Agricultural production - food producers:

- B.2.1. 9.000 of SSFPs directly reached with activities aimed at structural/ systemic improvement of their agricultural performance, disaggregated by sex and age.
- B.2.2. 10,000 of SSFPs directly reached with activities aimed at temporary/partial improvement of their agricultural performance.

C. Sustainable land use – area of farmland (in ha)

- C.2.1. 8.694 ha of farmland directly reached with activities aimed at structural/ systemic improvement of agro-ecological sustainability
- C.2.2. 9.660 ha of farmland directly reached with activities aimed at temporary/ partial improvement of agro-ecological sustainability

- What method will be used to gather and monitor the data?
- Semi-annual analysis of the protocols and monitoring reports on the action plans of the development committees at Boma and Payam levels of administration regarding the selection and implementation of community- or group-based measures in the fields of agricul-ture VC development, livelihood security or social cohesion.
- Analysis of the results of an annual, random survey, disaggregated by gender and age, of the supported smallholder households (SSFP) regarding their income increase (adjusted for inflation).
- Comparison of the data at the end of the implementation phase with a baseline survey (08/2023 with provisional data) at the beginning of the implementation phase.
- Analysis of the protocols and monitoring reports of the development committees at Boma, Payam and County admin-istration level with regard to the selec-tion and implementation of community, differentiated according to measures to improve climate resilience, e.g, fire prevention, erosion control, flood con-trol, agroforestry etc.
- Analysis of policy recommendations from coordination mechanisms, e.g. the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS), the Local Government Board or other bodies from the Federal State or County level in the fields of climate-resilient agriculture VC development, FSN, peaceful coexistence and social cohesion, DRM and climate resilience with regard to the inclusion of recommendations for policy action.
- Analysis of the minutes of the meetings of the development committees at the county, Payam and Boma administra-tive levels regarding the adoption of the CDPs, incl. the DRM action plans integrated into the CDPs; annual evaluation of the documentation of planning meetings and workshops of the development committees in the application of formats of gender, context and conflict-sensitive local development planning.
- Analysis of the documentation of learning objectives, contents, participants, disaggregated by gender, age and type of local actor (advisor, agro-based MSME etc.).
- Random, standardised survey of supported cooperatives/ producer organisations with the value 1) negative, 2) none, 3) tending to positive, 4) positive and 5) strongly positive market development means; assessment of results of additional focus group interviews with cooperatives/ producer organisations, differentiated by VC.

- Analysis of the minutes of the meetings of the subnational DRM committees with regard to the adoption of the strategies.
- sensitive and age-disaggregated sample survey of training participants, e.g., sub-national DRM committees at County, Payam or Boma level, staff of de-concentrated technical authorities, traditional authorities, representatives of organised civil society and the private sector regarding the improvement of their capacities to implement measures of subnational DRM strategies.

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 applicable).

Will be added once the activity is approved and agreed upon.

- Have these results frameworks been communicated with the contract party?

The FNS methodological framework for the Netherlands was shared with the contract party and also guided the review of the project proposal.

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

The indicators align with 4 Dutch indicators under section B: Agricultural production and C: Sustainable land use on which the ministry reports to the parliament.

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:

5. Planning versus realisation: tracking progress against predetermined objectives as laid out in the project proposal.
6. Performance and quality: checking relevance and appropriateness of the implementing organisation'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.

- Several mechanisms of monitoring will be employed to collect information which will include: stipulated annual progress reporting, field visits, annual plannings, quarterly meetings among others. Further, joint monitoring missions with other partners by EKN and IGG will also be conducted to enhance collaboration and coordination. An open communication will be ensured with GIZ outside of the set reporting obligations for the communication of emerging issues.
- Since the project is already entering its second year of implementation with the BMZ funding, there will be no requirement for an inception report. The necesary documentation for the inception phase including baseline survey (MINBUZA-2023.1315854), M & E plan (MINBUZA-2023.1294436), Gender analysis (MINBUZA-2023.1294407) have been submitted and are sufficient.
- Period of reporting will be aligned with the reporting year of GIZ which runs from 01 April to 31 March.
- Annual plans will be shared annually for the subsequent year. For the annual reporting, progress of achievement of results will be tracked against the planned targets according to the annual plans. Over/under achievement will require justification. This will further be tracked against the project planned/actual budgets.
- For every progress reporting, an updated risk analysis matrix and results framework will be mandatory.

While reporting, the Netherlands would like to have answers to some of these learning questions:

- What has worked well during the project implementation/ Achievements/positive developments and their enabling factors?
- What has not worked well/underachivements of the project and contributing factors?
- What unitended impacts has the project contributed to (positive/negative)?
- How will the current developments through the project implementation inform the future of the project/ plans for adaptation?
- How has the project engaged and/or encouraged locally led development and utilised local expertise in programming?

In the first four months of the project, the Netherlands will work together with GIZ to further strenghthen the logical framework to have more clear outputs and outcomes (easily meausrable) before a full project year cycle starts. This was discussed in the Quality at Entry and it is needed to have a unified monitoring framework .

Evaluation

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

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

A mid-term review and end of project / final evaluation are planned and will be conducted.The evaluations will be commissioned by GIZ in coordination and consultation with the Embassy of the Netherlands. All evaluations will be external, meaning conducted by consultants and not by GIZ itself. For this reason, these are part of the project budget. EKN will be consulted during the development of the Terms of References for these evaluations. GIZ will discuss the posibilities of having a reference group for the evaluations, whose role will be to perform a quality check and provide technical assistance through the process. The reference groups could also include other partner organisations in the same locations.

The reporting plan for the project will be as follows:

Report type	Specific requirements	Period	Submission by
Combined Narrative + Financial (N + F) Must include project progress, updated risk matrix, updated results matrix and IATI report.	Annual report 2023/2024 (N + F)	01-12-2023 to 31-03-2024	01-07-2024
	Annual report 2024/2025 (N +F)	01-04-2024 to 31-03-2025	01-07-2025

	Annual report 2025/2026 (N +F)	01-04-2025 to 31-03-2026	01-07-2026
	Annual report 2026/2027 (N +F)	01-04-2026 to 31-03-2027	01-07-2027
Combined Final Narrative + Financial (N+F). The final financial report must include a separate overview of the expenditures for the final period from 01-04-2027 to 30-11-2027.	Final progress report (N+F)	01-12-2023 to 30-11-2027	01-03-2028
Annual plans	Annual plan (N +F)	01-12-2023 to 31-03-2024	Approved within the project proposal
	Annual plan (N +F)	01-04-2024 to 31-03-2025	01-02-2024
	Annual plan (N +F)	01-04-2025 to 31-03-2026	01-02-2025
	Annual plan (N +F)	01-04-2026 to 31-03-2027	01-02-2026
	Annual plan (N + F)	01-04-2027 to 30 -11-2027	01-02-2027
Audit	Annual Audit report	01-12-2023 to 31-03-2025	01-07-2025
	Annual Audit report	01-04-2025 to 31-03-2026	01-07-2026
	Annual Audit report	01-04-2026 to 31-03-2027	01-07-2027
	Annual Audit report	01-04-2027 to 30-11-2027	01-03-2028
Evaluation	Mid-term review	01-12-2023 to 30-11-2025	01-03-2026
	Final Evaluation	01-12-2023 to 30-11-2027	01-04-2028

Finance

Budget breakdown

- Include an overview of the activity budget, including overhead costs.
- Is the budget arithmetically correct? YES
- Are the amounts/rates in the budget acceptable? YES
- Briefly explain the structure of the budget.

The budget structure provides a breakdown of costs for experts, travel, procurement of materials, financing and other costs but does not provide details of the actual activities for which the amounts will be spent. Explanation to budget structure has been provided: MINBUZA-2023.1318528.

7. Are overheads proportional to outputs? What is included? What is recharged?

Over 50% of the requested contribution has been budgeted for experts with the basis that the project qualifies as a technical assistance. A breakdown of the costing per year and per output has been provided. Overheads are acceptable and amount to approx 13%, according to GIZ structures as attached to MINBUZA-2023.1318528.

- 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)

N.A.

- Is the budget suitable as a management tool (linking outputs to budget)?

Yes. A budget breakdown per output and year has been provided. See snip under images for the budget per output. Hereunder the budget per year.

	Total Budget DGIS (Euro)	**Year 1 indicative**	**Year 2 indicative**	**Year 3 indicative**	**Year 4 indicative**
1. Experts *)	**5.205.969**	**1.301.492**	**1.301.492**	**1.301.492**	**1.301.492**
1.1 Experts assigned to the Action	1.176.110	294.028	294.028	294.028	294.028
1.2 Internal technical/ admin. services directly attributable to the Action	925.259	231.315	231.315	231.315	231.315
1.3 External personnel incl. travel expenses	3.104.600	776.150	776.150	776.150	776.150
2.Travel expenses *)	**368.160**	92.040	92.040	92.040	92.040
2.1 Travel expenses, international/ expatriate personnel	-	-	-	-	-
2.2 Travel expenses, national personnel	240.000	60.000	60.000	60.000	60.000
2.3 Travel expenses, project personnel in Germany	128.160	32.040	32.040	32.040	32.040
2.4 Travel expenses, development workers	-	-	-	-	-
2.5 Travel expenses, integrated experts	-	-	-	-	-
2.6 Travel expenses, returning experts	-	-	-	-	-
2.7 Other travel expenses related to projects	-	-	-	-	-
3. Procurement of materials and equipment incl. Construction *)	**416.198**	**104.049**	**104.049**	**104.049**	**104.049**

3.1 Procurement of goods and equipment, incl. consumables	416.198	104.049	104.049	104.049	104.049
3.2 Construction contracts and procurement of construction materials	-	-	-	-	-
4 Financing *)	**1.205.000**	**301.250**	**301.250**	**301.250**	**301.250**
4.1 Grants to partners	-	-	-	-	-
4.2 Local subsidies	305.000	76.250	76.250	76.250	76.250
4.3 Grants to other donors	-	-	-	-	-
4.4 Grants and subsidies (German and international)	900.000	225.000	225.000	225.000	225.000
4.5 Scholarship to participants in HCD measures	-	-	-	-	-
5. Training of partners *)	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
6 Other costs *)	**239.122**	**59.780**	**59.780**	**59.780**	**59.780**
6.1 Head Office costs	35.167	8.792	8.792	8.792	8.792
6.2 Preliminary costs for proposal preparation	-	-	-	-	-
6.3 Operating costs in country of assignment	132.000	33.000	33.000	33.000	33.000
6.4 Other external services purchased	71.198	17.800	17.800	17.800	17.800
6.5 Other expenses and revenues	756	189	189	189	189
7. Total direct costs of the Action	**7.434.448**	**1.858.612**	**1.858.612**	**1.858.612**	**1.858.612**
Total administrative overheads	**1.035.645**				
Estimated Budget	**8.470.093**				
VAT due in Germany	**529.907**				
Estimated Budget - incl. VAT	**9.000.000**				

Earmarking

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

The project is 'soft-earmarked'; the area is clearly chosen, and even though not every expenditure is earmerked, the activites are rather fixed. The project design and indicators align with the Dutch FNS indicators. A percentage of the achieved results will be attributed for reporting based on the Dutch contribution, however GIZ will provide a consolidated report of the entire project including the BMZ contribution.

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?

- YES, according to the decision tree prepayments (MINBUZA-2023.1409584).

- max 95% in advance, 5% after the final reports will be asessed and approved.

- Prepayments will be reconciled/closed on the basis of approval of the annual progress reports (narrative and financial), as well as the approval of the annual audit report. According to the new policy to stop the interim reconciliation of prepayments (from 2024) the final reconciliation will be done at the end of the activity.

Tentative prepayment schedule

Pre-payment will be made on basis of the liquidity request and paid in either Q4 or Q1 (Nov-Jan)

Date	Currency	Amount
1A. After signing decision (in 2 payments due to available cash budgets, first payment in November 2023)	**EUR**	**1.500.000**
1B. second part of first payment January 2024	**EUR**	**750.000**
2. January 2025	**EUR**	**2.250.000**
3. January 2026	**EUR**	**2.250.000**
4. January 2027	**EUR**	**2.250.000**
TOTAL	**EUR**	**9.000.000**

Available resources

	Foreign currency	EUR
Implementing organisation's own contribution	0	10.000.000
Firm commitments by other donors (for each donor)	-	-
Dutch contribution	0	9.000.000
Total available resources	**0**	**19.000.000**
Budget needed	**0**	**19.000.000**
Still to be financed	0	0
Soft commitments by other donors (for each donor)	0	0
Uncovered balance	0	0

- Are there any non-financial contributions relevant to implementation of the activity, such as deployment of volunteers, availability of buildings, materials, etc.?

No

- 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?

N.A.

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.

No

- 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.

No

Audit opinions

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

See Sophia MINBUZA-2023.1409584: according to the decision tree performance assessment, an auditors report, audit opinion, and additional measures are required. The additional measures are described in the risk paragraph. The audit opinion at activity level is required annualy (activity > EUR5M). GIZ normally has its own way of reporting through BMZ. therefore, they will need to execute an additional audit for the EKN activity separately.

- 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)? No

Budget for the Action (EURO)

Budget: DGIS 10/2023 - 09/2027
Project Name: Community-Driven Rural Development in South Sudan
GIZ Project No.: 21.2107.7

	Total Budget DGIS	Year 1 indicative	Year 2 indicative	Year 3 indicative	Year 4 indicative	Total Output 1	Total Output 2	Total Output 3	Total Output 4
1 Experts *)	5.205.969 €	1.301.492 €	1.301.492 €	1.301.492 €	1.301.492 €	941.162 €	3.264.782 €	563.067 €	436.958 €
1.1 Experts assigned to the Action	1.176.110 €	294.028 €	294.028 €	294.028 €	294.028 €	350.368 €	376.482 €	256.774 €	192.487 €
1.2 Internal technical/ admin. services directly attributable to the Action	925.259 €	231.315 €	231.315 €	231.315 €	231.315 €	323.559 €	304.746 €	202.773 €	94.211 €
1.3 External personnel incl. travel expenses	3.104.600 €	776.150 €	776.150 €	776.150 €	776.150 €	267.236 €	2.583.554 €	103.520 €	150.260 €
2 Travel expenses *)	368.160 €	92.040 €	92.040 €	92.040 €	92.040 €	121.003 €	130.301 €	83.244 €	33.612 €
2.1 Travel expenses, international/ expatriate personnel	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.2 Travel expenses, national personnel	240.000 €	60.000 €	60.000 €	60.000 €	60.000 €	86.400 €	81.600 €	48.000 €	24.000 €
2.3 Travel expenses, project personnel in Germany	128.160 €	32.040 €	32.040 €	32.040 €	32.040 €	34.603 €	48.701 €	35.244 €	9.612 €
2.4 Travel expenses, development workers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.5 Travel expenses, integrated experts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.6 Travel expenses, returning experts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.7 Other travel expenses related to projects	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3 Procurement of materials and equipment incl. Construction *)	416.198 €	104.049 €	104.049 €	104.049 €	104.049 €	134.231 €	220.107 €	41.240 €	20.620 €
3.1 Procurement of goods and equipment, incl. consumables	416.198 €	104.049 €	104.049 €	104.049 €	104.049 €	134.231 €	220.107 €	41.240 €	20.620 €
3.2 Construction contracts and procurement of construction materials									
4 Financing *)	1.205.000 €	301.250 €	301.250 €	301.250 €	301.250 €	180.000 €	125.000 €	900.000 €	-
4.1 Grants to partners	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.2 Local subsidies	305.000 €	76.250 €	76.250 €	76.250 €	76.250 €	180.000 €	125.000 €	-	-
4.3 Grants to other donors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.4 Grants and subsidies (German and international)	900.000 €	225.000 €	225.000 €	225.000 €	225.000 €	-	-	900.000 €	-
4.5 Scholarship to participants in HCD measures	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Training of partners *)	0 €	0 €	0 €	0 €	0 €	0 €	0 €	0 €	0 €
6 Other costs *)	239.122 €	59.780 €	59.780 €	59.780 €	59.780 €	67.040 €	89.765 €	40.000 €	42.316 €
6.1 Head Office costs	35.167 €	8.792 €	8.792 €	8.792 €	8.792 €	10.676 €	12.839 €	8.687 €	2.966 €
6.2 Preliminary costs for proposal preparation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6.3 Operating costs in country of assignment	132.000 €	33.000 €	33.000 €	33.000 €	33.000 €	47.520 €	44.880 €	26.400 €	13.200 €
6.4 Other external services purchased	71.198 €	17.800 €	17.800 €	17.800 €	17.800 €	8.572 €	31.789 €	4.752 €	26.075 €
6.5 Other expenses and revenues	756 €	189 €	189 €	189 €	189 €	272 €	257 €	151 €	76 €
7 Total direct costs of the Action	7.434.448 €	1.858.612 €	1.858.612 €	1.858.612 €	1.858.612 €	1.443.437 €	3.829.955 €	1.627.551 €	533.506 €
Total administrative overheads	1.035.645 €								
Estimated Budget	8.470.093 €								
VAT due in Germany	529.907 €								
Estimated Budget - incl. VAT	9.000.000 €								

*) This represents a budget heading. Sub-divisions under a budget heading are for reporting purposes only and not subject to the 20% rule stipulated in Art. 3 Special Provisions.