

# FEASIBILITY STUDY ON CLIMATE RESILIENCE FOR REFUGEE AFFECTED AREAS AND REGIONS OF UGANDA

## MISSION PREPARATION NOTE

06 October 2022

### INTRODUCTION

This Mission Preparation Note (MPN) provides an overview of key issues and the suggested approach relating to the field mission to Uganda in October 2022 as part of the feasibility study in support of the Royal Danish Embassy's (RDE) bilateral development programme formulation under Strategic Objective 2 (SO2): *"Support sustainable and durable solutions in Uganda as a country that host refugees from fragile neighbouring countries"* and Strategic Objective 3 (SO3): *"Promote sustainable, inclusive and green economic transformation in Uganda using innovative local solutions and Denmark's experiences in green transition to adapt to the global climate challenge"*.

The planned field mission in Uganda will take place between 24 October and 2 November 2022 and conduct stakeholder consultations in West Nile, Acholi and Kampala respectively. Due to limitations of the study, it might be necessary to conduct virtual consultations with some stakeholders prior to conducting the field mission and if deemed necessary the local experts in the team will continue consultations during November 2022.

The whole team will have the opportunity to visit Uganda again in January should the optional phase of the project be activated. Consultations will involve current partners as well as potential new stakeholders with a view to provide recommendations for ongoing engagements in Northern Uganda.

### BACKGROUND

Danish development cooperation in Uganda has offered long-term support to refugee-affected areas in Northern Uganda, most recently the Northern Uganda Resilience Initiative (NURI) 2018-2022. NURI is implemented in refugee and host communities to support Uganda's progressive refugee policy and the nexus between development and humanitarian action.

The upcoming bilateral development programme will continue supporting sustainable and durable solutions in refugee hosting areas and regions. One of these projects will focus on climate resilience for refugee hosting areas and regions and the feasibility of a new phase of NURI is to be explored.

The aim of a potential NURI 2.0 project will be to support and improve the resilience of small-scale farmers in refugee affected areas and regions to shocks and stresses associated with climate change, climate variability and extreme weather events. A number of possible interventions are already identified including increasing productivity, sustainability and resilience of farming systems of small-scale farmers; promote household food security and engagement with markets; promoting biodiversity and sustainable management of environment and natural resources; improving availability and resilience of agricultural infrastructure and water resource management; combining VSLA and agriculture training. Focus being on improving climate smart agriculture outcomes while taking into account the need for social cohesion and peaceful co-existing between refugee and host communities and ensuring active participation of women and youth.

## OVERALL STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

The study will be guided by the existing programme document for Northern Uganda Resilience Initiative (NURI) 2018-22 as well as the Uganda Strategic Framework 2023-2027 (USF) currently under development. The team will also consult relevant reports on the existing programme, including the NURI End of Programme Monitoring Survey Report 2022 and Uganda Programme Mid-term Review report 2021, review comparable initiatives and assessments of challenges and opportunities within the two thematic focus areas of climate change and refugees.

The ambition is to be able to identify and recommend interventions feasible for a NURI 2.0 programme building on needs, challenges and opportunities in refugee-hosting areas and regions, experiences and lessons learnt from existing NURI programme as well as other successful interventions in the region. In addition, the mission aims at recommending a new implementation modality providing an overview of potential implementing partners.

The ambition is also to ensure that the efforts are properly coordinated and aligned with national policies, local development plans and other interventions in the region.

## STUDY FRAMEWORK

The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the study provides a set of seven overarching study areas (SA) related to 1) Building on NURI; 2) Geography; 3) Refugees; 4) Coordination and alignment; 5) Climate change; 6) Operational sustainability; 7) Implementation modality. Gender is perceived as a cross-cutting issue. Opportunities and barriers for an increased effort to advance gender equality will be explored within relevant study area.

The study framework will also provide input into a brief problem analysis focusing on thematic areas within the study areas.

As preparation for the data collection a study framework was designed based on the study areas. In developing the study framework (see Annex A), the team has made no major revision to the overall structure provided in the TOR. However, some of the TOR sub-questions have been merged, as they were covered under several SAs. The team has added sub-questions where these have come up as a result of initial meetings and document review.

Justifications for the minor changes suggested by the team are described below.

### **SA2: Geography**

The team has added sub-questions to the study framework to guide the analysis.

### **SA3: Refugees**

The team has added sub-questions to the study framework to guide the analysis.

### **SA7: Implementation modality**

At this phase it is not deemed feasible to undertake a detailed capacity assessment of potential implementing partners. Reference will be made to the mapping of potential implementing partners (Annex C) as well as discussion on selection criteria.

## METHODOLOGY

Given the nature of the study, the main methods to be applied are a mix of in-depth, key informant interviews (KIIs) and desk/document review. If relevant, the team will conduct focus group discussions (FGDs). Data collection tools will be further developed prior to the field mission

The interviews will be carried out in a semi-structured manner, covering the seven study areas with sub-questions for each. Taking a point of departure in the overall study area questions defined in the study framework, interview guides will be developed for each stakeholder group with the option to

be adjusted for each interviewee by the team members.

The team will interview the internal stakeholders; RDE Green Economy team and NURI Coordination Facility team more than once to cross-check learnings, while external stakeholders, INGOs, Gov, and other development partners will be interviewed one time. The interviews will be a mix of virtual and face-to-face meetings.

If relevant and necessary, virtual meetings will take place with relevant stakeholders prior to the mission. This is done to ensure full efficiency of team members' time while in the field.

The mission will involve consultations with a range of relevant stakeholders both in Kampala and in West Nile and Acholi sub-regions. The team suggests the following list of stakeholders to be interviewed, most of them in the form of key informant interviews although some may be beneficial to include in focus group discussions based on geographical location and commonality of stakeholders. The following categories of stakeholders and thematic focus are envisaged:

- The team will consult current implementors for the NURI programme to learn from their experiences particularly in relation to future interventions, opportunities and challenges;
- The team will meet local district administration entities in West Nile and Acholi to learn from their experiences in relation to climate change adaptation activities and working in refugee hosting areas and to understanding challenges and opportunities in the districts;
- The team will meet with relevant stakeholders working with refugee to understand the current situation and short-and long terms challenges and needs. Stakeholders would include humanitarian actors such as ECHO, WFP and UNHCR as well as international NGOS, OPM and local CSOs;
- The team will meet farmer groups if feasible women's groups to understand needs, challenges as well as achievements under NURI.
- The team will meet with relevant stakeholders working within the area of climate change to understand the current context as well as challenges and opportunities. Stakeholders would include academia, development partners, local CSOs and private sector actors;
- The team will meet with international development partners to learn of similar interventions and explore opportunities for coordination and alignment for future activities;
- The team will consult with relevant national partners including ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs);
- The team will liaise with the RDE external consultant hired to support the embassy in closing down NURI as well as starting up a new structure to ensure alignment.

Due to the geographical scope of the mission, it is necessary for the team members to divide their time between West Nile sub-region, Acholi sub-region and Kampala respectively. Since all three areas are important for the feasibility study the team members will split up and divide the work at sub-regional level between them. This is to ensure the best possible utilisation of the time available for the field mission.

Towards the end of the field mission the team will gather in Kampala in order to debrief and conduct final meetings with members of the NURI Implementation and Monitoring Committee Mission that takes place in Kampala the week of 31<sup>st</sup> October 2022.

The mission programs will be developed during the first two weeks of October and shared with the RDE once drafted.

## OUTPUTS

The team will have a meeting with the RDE to discuss and agree on this mission preparation note. The mission will debrief prior to departure from Uganda with the RDE and NURI CF.

After the mission in October, the team will prepare a draft feasibility study report including additional deliverables in annex and a draft technical brief. The final version will be delivered in December after comments from the RDE. The final version will provide:

- Feasibility study report with recommendations from the RDE on a potential NURI 2.0 programme (see Annex B for preliminary table of content)
- Report on consultations with stakeholders. The document will summarise key information from stakeholder consultations undertaken as part of the field mission.
- Technical brief detailing key features of an intervention focusing on programme activities in refugee hosting areas and regions. The brief will support the design of NURI 2.0 in highlighting things to consider in terms of design, implementation and M&E.
- Mapping of potential implementing organisations (see Annex C for suggested format)



## Appendix 2 – Terms of Reference

Regarding Feasibility Study on Climate Resilience for Refugee Affected Areas and Regions in Uganda.

The Consultant must perform the Services in accordance with the Client's requirements.

The Consultant must also perform the Services in accordance with the Consultant's description stated in Appendix 3C.

### Background and context

A new country programme for Danish development cooperation with Uganda – Uganda Strategic Framework (USF) is currently being prepared within a budget frame of 650 million DKK for the period 2023-2027. The Danish Embassy in Kampala will submit a final draft of the USF to UPR in September 2022.

Denmark's new strategy for development cooperation has provided the overall guidance for the development of the USF 2023-2027. The overall vision is *a more democratic Uganda, upholding human rights, capable of adapting to the ongoing climate change crises by using the green economic transformation to create jobs, hope and opportunities, while continuing to play a stabilising role in an unstable region including by hosting refugees from neighbouring countries.* Consequently, the USF has three strategic objectives that contributes to the new strategy, thus:

- *Strategic Objective 1 (SO1): Strengthen democratic processes, good governance, accountability and protection of human rights.*
- *Strategic Objective 2 (SO2): Support sustainable and durable solutions in Uganda as a country that host refugees from fragile neighbouring countries.*
- *Strategic Objective 3 (SO3): Promote sustainable, inclusive and green economic transformation in Uganda using innovative local solutions and Denmark's experiences in green transition to adapt to the global climate challenge.*

It is the plan to formulate a bilateral development programme to respond to these objectives. Besides Denmark's Development Strategy, the Sustainable Development Goals, and the Government of Uganda's National Development Plan, will inform the programming of the Bilateral Development Programme.

The bilateral development programme will consist of projects that are designed to address the three strategic objectives. One of these projects will focus on climate resilience for refugee hosting areas and regions in a bid to respond to SO2 and SO3.

Denmark has supported sustainable and inclusive economic development in refugee-affected areas since 1998, with a focus on Northern Uganda. Currently, Denmark supports development in Northern Uganda through the Northern Uganda Resilience Initiative (NURI) 2018-2022 with a focus on climate smart agriculture, agriculture related rural infrastructure and water resources management. The current activities are implemented in both refugee hosting and non-refugee

hosting districts. A large number of reviews and studies have shown that these interventions have been relevant, effective, efficient and to some degree sustainable. For this reasons, it is the ambition to still support refugee-affected areas, taking the current NURI as a point of departure.

As such, the aim of a NURI 2.0 project will be to support resilience in refugee-affected areas and regions with strong focus on climate adaptation. Operationally, the implementation modality of NURI 2.0 will have to be different from the current NURI. Currently, the NURI is a decentralised management unit, something which Danida is phasing out globally. A consultant has been hired to support the embassy in closing down NURI as well starting up a new structure. The team involved in feasibility will work with this consultant, particularly if the option is invoked (see details below).

The Uganda Strategic Framework gives some pointers to the kind of interventions that will be supported, but a feasibility of these and other possible activities need to be determined. They include interventions that increase productivity, sustainability and resilience of farming systems of small-scale farmers, focused on refugees and refugee-affected communities, areas and regions. Interventions that promote household food security and engagement with markets; and promote biodiversity and sustainable management of the environment and natural resources are also mentioned as candidates, since they play significant role in the livelihoods of rural communities, and have significant bearing on social cohesion and peaceful co-existence between refugees and host communities. Interventions that improve the availability and resilience of agricultural infrastructure and water resources management on farmland and open landscape are also pointed out as they have the potential to improve climate smart agriculture outcomes. In the present NURI, the combination of savings groups (village savings and loan associations) and agricultural training has proven particularly effective. At a general level, NURI 2.0 will target interventions that improve the resilience of small-scale farmers to shocks and stresses associated with climate change, climate variability and extreme weather events. It is envisioned that a consortium of actors, led by a non-profit institution, identified through a call for proposal, will implement NURI 2.0 with the working title of "Climate Resilience for Refugee Affected Areas and Regions"

#### Core task and option

The assignment contains a core task and an option. The option must be included in the overall budget of the assignment. It is not necessarily to be implemented, but can be activated through a written procedure by email from the Embassy.

If the option is invoked by the Embassy, the details for the assignment will be agreed, in accordance with these TORs.

## Purpose

#### Core task: Feasibility study

The purpose of the consultancy is to support the embassy in assessing the feasibility of a future intervention that targets refugee affected areas and regions. The strategic objective is to increase the capacity of the areas and regions to absorb exiting and new refugee influx. The draft development objective is to increase resilience, raise incomes and build assets among refugees and nationals in refugee affected areas. One key outcome will be to strengthen agricultural resilience and productivity.

Therefore, the consultancy will assess challenges, opportunities and feasibility of interventions that can support sustainable and durable solutions in Uganda as a country that host refugees from fragile neighbouring countries and then possibly prepare a call for proposal for the project.

Option: Prepare the call for proposal

Supporting the embassy in preparing a call for proposal for an intervention in refugee affected areas and regions.

## Objective

The Consultancy will deliver on the following tasks:

Core task: Feasibility study.

Assess the feasibility of designing a programme that targets refugee-affected areas and regions, and adequately responds to SO2 and SO3. The study shall inform the embassy in deciding whether and how an intervention would be relevant. In that respect, it should inform the following decisions:

- Building on NURI: Which practices of NURI are important to preserve?
- Geography: In how many and which geographical areas (districts/sub-countries) should a potential project be implemented, and what other issues should be taken into account, in order to maximize the possibility of achieving outcomes and minimize risks? Only refugee affected areas should be considered.
- Refugees: How should a potential project balance between host communities and refugees as target groups to best contribute to durable solutions? How should the project interact with the humanitarian sector in the areas?
- Coordination and alignment: How to feasibly coordinate with other interventions and align to government priorities?
- Climate change: How can a potential project best contribute to enhanced resilience with a focus on environmentally sustainable agricultural methods and climate change adaptation, as well as mainstream reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.
- Operational sustainability: How can a potential project best contribute to structural change at scale through the promotion of either 1) sustainable business models or 2) building of lasting institutions with sufficient funding and capacity.
- Implementation modality: What is the capacity among potential implementing partners to coordinate and implement a potential project.

Option: Prepare the call for proposal

Support the embassy in preparing the call for proposal that responds to SO2 and SO3. The preparation of the call for proposal should take into account the decisions asked under the feasibility study:

- a) Using past experiences: A future project should to the extent possible use experiences from NURI.
- b) Geography: Interventions should be adapted to the needs of the areas chosen.
- c) Refugees: The project should balance between host communities and refugees as target groups and interact with the humanitarian sector in the areas in constructive ways.
- d) Climate change: The project should contribute to enhanced resilience with a focus on environmentally sustainable agricultural methods and climate change adaptation, as well as mainstream reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.
- e) Operational sustainability: The project should contribute to structural change at scale through the promotion of either 1) sustainable business models or 2) building of lasting institutions with sufficient funding and capacity.
- f) Implementation modality: Ensure that the Embassy uses the right criteria in selecting an implementing partner.

## Scope of work

### Core task: Feasibility study

Through a combination of desk and field analysis, the Consultancy shall complete the feasibility study by looking at the following issues, among others:

#### *Building on NURI: Experiences and lessons from the NURI engagement and similar interventions*

- a) Based on existing studies, reviews and reports, assess successes. Which relevant lessons can be learned from Previous Danida efforts in Northern Uganda, particularly those focusing on both refugees and host communities?
- b) Agriculture is at the core of NURI. Is it feasible for a future project to implement several thematic areas like NURI? Which areas are most relevant?
- a) Based on existing studies, reviews and reports, which relevant lessons can be learned from other similar previous and on-going interventions supported by Development Partners, including in Northern Uganda, including interventions that have focused on sustainable agriculture and adaptation to climate change?
- b) Geography: What is the feasibility of applying NURI experiences in 1) the same areas in a new phase or b) in other areas?

#### *Refugees: Status of refugee influx and caseload and their impact on relevant areas and regions.*

- c) Numbers: Where are the refugees, new and old
- d) Impact: How do they impact the areas in which they reside?
- e) Needs: What are the needs of these areas, the local communities and the refugees?
- f) How can the project best benefit refugees, host communities and other displacement-affected nationals?

*Coordination:* Similar programming in the areas and regions affected by refugees. Similar programmes include:

- a) World Bank
  - Development Response to Displacement Impacts Project (DRDIP)
  - Uganda Climate Smart Agriculture Transformation project
- b) European Union
  - Development Initiative in Northern Uganda (DINU)
  - European Union Trust Fund (EUTF) - Support Programme for Refugee settlements in Northern Uganda (SPRS-NU)
- c) IFAD
  - Project for Restoration of Livelihoods in Northern Uganda (PRELNOR)
- d) DFID
  - Northern Uganda: Transforming the Economy through Climate Smart Agriculture (NU-TEC)
- e) UNDP/FAO/UNEP
  - Reducing of Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+)
  - Climate Smart Agriculture Project
- f) GIZ
  - Promoting Climate Smart Agriculture project (ProCSA) in Northern Uganda
- g) FAO
  - Eastern Africa Climate-Smart Agriculture Scoping Study: ETHIOPIA, KENYA AND UGANDA



- h) Gulu University
  - Unlocking the Potential of Green Charcoal to Mitigate Climate Change in Northern Uganda (UPCHAIN)

*Climate change: Experiences and lessons on climate change adaptation as well as other projects*

- a) Which greening practices would be relevant to introduce, particularly climate adaptation?
- b) Which existing greening practices would be relevant to upscale, particularly climate adaptation?
- c) Which actors – including development partners (bilateral/multilateral), CSOs and Government of Uganda agencies, academic / training institutions – are involved in similar projects in refugee hoisting areas and regions, and which could be possible partners for the project?
- d) Which intervention approaches / design would be most suitable / fit for purpose?
- e) Walk the talk: Requirements for the implementing consortiums own operations.
  - i. Would it be feasible to ask a future project to account for its own greenhouse gas emissions in scope 1, 2 and 3 (see below) using a standard like the Greenhouse Gas Protocol. This would apply to the consortium’s cars, offices, staff and operations. How could this be done?
  - ii. Would it be feasible for a project to minimize waste, for example through minimising the use of plastic bottles and paper? How could this be done?

Scope	Explanation
1	Direct emissions from owned or controlled sources
2	Indirect emissions from the generation of purchased electricity, steam, heating and cooling consumed by the reporting entity
3	All other indirect emissions that occur in a entity’s value chain.

*Operational sustainability: How can a potential project best contribute to structural change at scale through the promotion of either 1) sustainable business models or 2) building of lasting institutions with sufficient funding and capacity.*

- a) Re-assess the short framework on operational sustainability from NURI.
- b) Identify methods to enhance operational sustainability, including the BRAC Graduation Method and the ideas mentioned in the NURI policy brief on the issue.
- c) Map similar attempts by NUTEC and DINU (the start fund).

*Implementation modality: What is the capacity among potential implementing partners to coordinate and implement a potential project.*

Assess the capacities needed to implement a large-scale project and map relevant implementing organisations, including, but not limited to:

- Danish NGO’s with strategic partnership agreements (SPA).
- A select number of international NGO’s with experience in the geographical or thematic areas. These should be selected on the basis of their size, experience in Uganda or experience with similar thematic areas.
- A select number of local NGO’s with experience in the geographical or thematic areas.
- A select number of businesses with relevant, scalable business models which could contribute to the

Option: Prepare the call for proposal

*Based on these TOR, the consultant with detail the preparation of the call for proposal (in a revised preparation note).*

*Building on NURI: Experiences and lessons from the NURI engagement and similar interventions*

- Maximise the probability of a future intervention integrating lessons, procedures and processing from NURI and predecessors. Make consolidation of NURI results an objective.
- Alignment where feasible with relevant GoU policies / strategies e.g. National Agricultural Policy, Agriculture Extension Policy, Climate Change Policy, Refugee Act. Special attention should be given to the Parish Development Model.
- Integration of cross cutting issues: gender, SRHR, youths, etc

### *Geography*

### *Coordination*

Ensure that a future project invests in specific coordination, at least, but not limited to:

- Ensure a particular focus on coordination with other Danish-funded programmes and projects: aBi Development, aBi Finance, Buidling Stronger Universities-project in Gulu, Danida Market Development Partnership project in Arua etc.
- Participation in relevant coordination fora.
- Design a grant model where other donors can join as co-funders and where extension and prolongation is possible.
- Ensure strong link with the decentralised public system: districts, sub-counties, parishes.
- Alignment with the comprehensive refugee response framework and its relevant sector response plans
- Engaging with humanitarian actors to bridge the humanitarian-development nexus and minimize handouts
- VSLA saturation and adapted interventions. Several current NURI implementation areas are saturated with VSLAs. A future project should in a feasible way establish or contribute to an inventory to ensure coordination.

### *Operational sustainability:*

- Bridging a deep outreach with high degrees of sustainable. Linking value chains, processors and commercially viable models for extension to rural agricultural work. The combination of savings groups (VSLAs) and agriculture should be particularly explored.
- Design the programme with scaling up into new areas in mind from the beginning.
- Using the purchasing power of the project to drive positive changes e.g. when buying seeds buy them locally to create a local market in Uganda.
- Employing a graduation model from the start, inspired by the BRAC Graduation Models as implemented in Ethiopia and other countries.
- Ensuring links with financial institutions, and fintechs

### *Implementation modality:*

- Localization: Ensure that local NGOs get preferential treatment in a consortium.
- Ensure that the call for proposal asks for an implementation model detailing staffing and training of staff. NURI make use of hundreds of community-based trainers, extension officers and supervisors. Simpler tasks allow for weaker staff. Proposals must answer: Who will do what? Which qualifications will the staff has at with level? Who needs which assets?
- How will the local private sector be engaged?

## **Deliverables (output)**

### Core task: Feasibility study

- a) A Mission Preparation Note (MPN) prior to the inception meeting between the consultant and the RDE of maximum 5 pages containing draft report structure and methodology. The MPN

can include a preliminary outline of tasks to be performed by the consultant in order to deliver on the agreed objectives.

- b) A report on consultations with stakeholders. Format: Recommendations (maximum one page), executive summary (maximum two pages), report (maximum 10 pages).
- c) A technical brief detailing how an intervention in the proposed areas has a thematic focus of programme activities on refugee or host communities or refugee affected nationals
- d) A feasibility study report for a development response to support refugee-affected areas and regions (NURI 2.0). Guided by the questions under "Purpose of consultancy" and based on specific recommendations, can inform the project under the BDP. The report should include different sections on Experiences and lessons from the NURI engagement and similar interventions and Experiences and lessons from the NURI pilot projects.

Format: 1-3-25. Recommendations (maximum one page), executive summary (maximum three pages), report (maximum 25 pages, excluding annexes).

- e) A mapping of potential implementing organisations.

Option: Prepare the call for proposal

- a) In collaboration with the embassy and the consultant supporting the closing of NURI, a format for the a) a **call for proposal advert**, b) an accompanying **Information Note** and c) a **vision document** with past experiences and guiding questions. These documents must guide the applicants responding to the call for proposal. To be agreed by the Embassy prior to continuation of the assignment. The format must take into account the implementation modality chosen by the embassy, most likely either a call for proposal or tender. Format to be based on
  - The MFA template for call for proposals to strategic partners.
  - The Danida programme template.
  - The EU call for proposal template and examples, as per the Practical guide.
- b) A draft set of documents to form the basis of consultations with relevant implementing organization.
- c) The organization of a workshop with potential implementing organizations, including a workshop report (maximum five pages).
- d) A second draft of the three documents for NURI 2.0. Format as agreed under a)

## Timing

Times are approximate. The time frames will be revised once the contract is signed.

The assignment includes options for the number of work hours. This allows the contract to be adjusted in order to accommodate tasks in addition to the outlined core tasks, and include tasks linked with the outputs referred above under the "Option". The contract will commence with an estimated 60-70 man-days covering the Core Tasks. Hereafter it is possible, pending developments in the assignment, to increase with up to an additional 45-55 man-days in case the "Option" will be activated. The distribution of the days on the different individual members of the team, for the core task as well as the option, must be proposed by the consultants.

Feasibility Assessment (Core Task)

Approximate timing	Activity	Deliverable
Late August	Desk-based work and initial drafting of report	<b>Mission Preparation Note (MPN) sent to Danish Embassy</b>

<b>Approximate timing</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Deliverable</b>
Early September	Field-based work in Kampala and refugee affected areas and regions of Uganda, starting with a discussion of the MPN at the Danish Embassy	
Mid September	Finalisation of feasibility report	<b>Draft report sent to Danish Embassy</b>
Late September	Comments on draft report are sent by Danish Embassy to consultant	
Early October	Comments are incorporated	<b>Final report is sent to Danish Embassy</b>

Option: Prepare the call for proposal

<b>Timing</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Deliverable</b>
Mid October	Desk-based work and initial drafting of report	<b>MPN sent to Danish Embassy</b>
Late October	Field-based work in Kampala and refugee affected areas and regions of Uganda, starting with a discussion of the MPN at the Danish Embassy	
Early November	Finalisation of project document	<b>Draft project document sent to Danish Embassy</b>
Mid November	Comments on draft project document are sent by Danish Embassy to consultant	
Late November	Comments are incorporated	<b>Final project document sent to Danish Embassy</b>

## Methodology

To answer the above questions, the Consultancy shall review relevant documents (Desk-based) and consult relevant stakeholders (field-based)

Core task: Feasibility study

*Desk based*

- a) Review of previous Danida engagements in Northern Uganda i.e. reviews, assessments, evaluations, etc.
- b) Identification and review of recent reports concerning challenges and opportunities in Northern Uganda, including in relation to host communities and refugees.
- c) Identification and review of other relevant development interventions in Northern Uganda

*Field based*

- a) Northern Uganda: Field assessment of challenges and opportunities, based on observations and interviews with relevant stakeholders (for example potential beneficiaries, District Local Governments, District Farmers' Associations, field offices of

the OPM and UNHCR, other development and humanitarian partners, aBi ZARDI, Adraa Agricultural College, NGOs/CSOs e.g. PALM Corps, CEFORD, etc)

- b) Kampala: Interviews with key stakeholders (World Bank, EU, FAO, IITA, MAAIF, UNHCR, OPM, MoLG, DFID, Danish Refugee Council, DanChurchAid, CARITAS, and others, as relevant) as well as key staff of the Danish Embassy in Kampala (Head of Cooperation Royal Danish Embassy, Team Leader – Green Economy, Programme Officer NURI, Programme Management Advisor NURI CF)

Option: Prepare the call for proposal

- a) Desk review and discussions with relevant stakeholders.
- b) Virtual and physical meetings in Kampala, West Nile and Acholi sub regions for direct interaction with the NURI CF, selected RAUs and implementing partners, as well as relevant development partners and donors and vocational training institutions active in the refugee-livelihood sector.

The following meetings are envisioned:

- a) An inception meeting with NURI CF and the Embassy two weeks before arrival in Kampala
- b) A meeting with the Embassy and NURI CF management upon arrival.
- c) Meetings with stakeholders and partners.
- d) Meetings to discuss draft deliverables.

All submitted proposals will be assessed based on a technical quality and price ratio. Quality will carry 80% while Price will carry 20%. In this case methodology will be weighted 20%. The technical quality assessment will consider the extent, to which the technical approach and methodology respond to the objectives of the assignment, is tailored specifically to the assignment, has identified special issues in relation to the assignment and includes effective solutions, and is flexible and easy to adapt to changes that might occur during implementation of the assignment.

## Qualifications and Competence of Staff

Qualifications and competence of staff will carry a total weighting of 80%. Each staff will have an individual weighting as stated below.

The team conducting the review will consist of three consultants, including a Team Leader (International).

### **Team Leader 40%**

- **General Qualifications (25%)**

- Minimum requirements
  - At least a master's degree focusing on political science, economics, development studies, refugees/forced displacement or similar;
- Wishes
  - At least 10 years' experience with development programmes, including in developing countries

- **Adequacy for the Assignment (50%)**

- Minimum requirements

- Extensive experience with formulating, implementing and/or reviewing development programmes focusing on enhanced resilience and equitable economic development
    - Very strong skills in writing concisely and clearly, and ability to structure logically written reports.
  - Wishes
    - Experience with durable solutions in relation to forced displacement and with bridging the gap between development and humanitarian efforts
    - Good interpersonal and interview skills.
- **Experience in the Region and Language (25%)**
  - Minimum requirements
    - Experience from East Africa.
    - Fluency in English (oral and written).
  - Wishes
    - Experience from Northern Uganda is an advantage.

***Agricultural Expert*      30%**

- **General Qualifications (25%)**
  - Minimum requirements
    - At least a master’s degree in development studies, sociology, agricultural studies, agro-economics, climate change, green development or similar
  - Wishes
    - At least 10 years’ experience with development programmes, including in developing countries.
- **Adequacy for the Assignment (50%)**
  - Minimum requirements
    - Extensive experience with formulating, implementing and/or reviewing development programmes focusing on commercial agriculture, small-scale agriculture integrating climate change adaptation and environmentally sustainable methods.
    - Very strong skills in writing concisely and clearly.
  - Wishes
    - Experience with programmes focusing on refugees, and/or forced displacement will be an advantage.
    - Good interpersonal and interview skills
- **Experience in the Region and Language (25%)**
  - Minimum requirements
    - Experience from East Africa.
    - Fluency in English (oral and written).
  - Wishes
    - Experience from Northern Uganda is an advantage.

***Gender Specialist*      30%**

- **General Qualifications (25%)**

- Minimum requirements
  - At least a master's degree in development studies, sociology or similar
- Wishes
  - At least 10 years' experience with development programmes, including in developing countries.
- **Adequacy for the Assignment (50%)**
  - Minimum requirements
    - Extensive experience with formulating, implementing and/or reviewing development programmes with relation to gender, women empowerment, gender transformation, intra-household dynamics etc
    - Very strong skills in writing concisely and clearly.
  - Wishes
    - Experience with programmes focusing on agriculture, refugees, and/or forced displacement will be an advantage.
    - Good interpersonal and interview skills.
- **Experience in the Region and Language (25%)**
  - Minimum requirements
    - Experience from East Africa.
    - Fluency in English (oral and written).
  - Wishes
    - Experience from Northern Uganda is an advantage.

Submitted proposals will be assessed for technical quality and consideration will be given to compliance with "wishes" as an advantage. The wishes will not be scored individually but as contributory to the overall assessment of technical quality

## Estimated budget and level of effort

The estimated budget for the assignment (core + optional part) is DKK 775,000. Deliverables are marked in bold in Tables 6.1 and 6.2 above. Total estimate budget must include fees and reimbursables for flights, hotels, per diems, audits, workshop costs etc. The Consultant will commence the contract with an estimated 60-70 man-days of not more than 8 hours per day, covering the Core Tasks. Thereafter it is possible, pending developments in the assignment, to increase with up to an additional 45-55 man-days of not more than 8 hours per day in case the Client decides to activate the "Option".

In relation to the estimated budget, the proposals will be assessed for price which will carry a weighting of 20%. The tender with the highest price-quality ratio will be deemed as the most economically advantageous tender and will be awarded the contract.

## Management

The consultant shall work under the supervision of and report to the Danish Embassy in Kampala, specifically, the NURI Desk Officer and the team leader Green Economy on contractual as well as technical matters.

The consultant will be responsible for internal management of the Consultant team.

## Background documents

### Cross cutting

- a) The World We Share, Danida Denmark's Strategy for Development Cooperation, August 2021
- b) Danida Draft Uganda Country Strategic Framework, 2023-2027
- c) Danida Guidelines for Country Strategic Frameworks, Programmes & Projects, November 2020
- d) Ultra-poor graduation methods and pilots: [Ultra Poor Graduation Pilots | Innovations for Poverty Action \(poverty-action.org\)](https://www.poverty-action.org/ultra-poor-graduation-pilots)
- e) Danida NURI Annual Progress Report 2021
- f) Danida NURI End of Programme Monitoring Survey Report 2022
- g) Danida NURI Programme Document 2018-2022
- h) Policy brief on operational sustainability in NURI
- i) Danida (RDE), VSLA Workshop Report on Financial Linkage, Digitization and Entrepreneurship Training, May 2022
- j) Danida Uganda Country Programme Mid Term Review Report, May 2021
- k) EU's Development Initiative for Northern Uganda programme (DINU) Programme Document
- l) OECD DAC Rio Markers for Climate Handbook
- m) UNDP Uganda Human Development Report 2015: Unlocking the development potential of Northern Uganda
- n) National Survey and Segmentation of Smallholder Households in Uganda

### Refugee related

- a) FAO, Food Security & Resilience. Pathways to self-reliance for refugees and host communities in Northern Uganda, 2019
- b) Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development, Jobs and Livelihoods Integrated Response Plan for Refugees and Host Communities, May 2021
- c) Ministry of Local Government's Implementation Guidelines for Parish Development Model (June 2021).
- d) Ministry of Water and Environment (2020), Water and Environment Sector Response Plan for Refugees and Host Communities
- e) OPM (2021), CRRF Strategic Direction 2021-2025.
- f) OPM (2022), Settlement Transformative Agenda II 2022-2025: Draft STA. January 2022.
- g) OPM, Report on the Evaluation of the Implementation of the Global Compact on Refugees and its Comprehensive Refugee Response in Uganda, March 2022
- h) Uganda: Joint Multi-Sector Needs Assessment Compares And Contrasts Needs Of Refugee And Host Community Households
- i) UNDP, Understanding Land Dynamics and Livelihoods in Refugee Hosting Districts of Northern Uganda
- j) UNHCR (2019), Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework: The Uganda Model.
- k) UNHCR (2019), Global Compact on Refugees: Indicator Framework
- l) UNHCR (2019), Uganda Refugee Operation: Participatory Assessment 2019 Report \_Final
- m) U-Learn, UKAID, CWG, Financial Services In the Uganda Refugee Response: An Assessment of User Perspectives, 2022
- n) USAID, Desk Review on Resilience Building and Self-Sufficiency among Refugees and Host Communities in CRRF Countries, February 2020
- o) World Bank and FAO (2019), Rapid Assessment of Natural Resource Degradation in Refugee Impacted Areas in Northern Uganda: Technical Report.



- p) WFP, UNHCR, REACH, Uganda Vulnerability and Essential Needs Assessment, October 2020

Climate change related

- a) ACET Discussion Paper. Leveraging climate-smart agriculture to address climate risk in Africa
- b) Danida, NURI 2018-2023 Extension Note, April 2022
- c) Danida, NURI, Assessment of CSA Extension Model Final Report, February 2021
- d) Danida, NURI, Climate Change and Vulnerability in Northern Uganda: A Rapid Desk Assessment Report, March 2022
- e) Danida, NURI, Quality Assessment of Rural Infrastructure and Water Resources Management Activities, March 2021
- f) Danida, NURI, Woodlots in Rural Infrastructure Activities Study Report, December 2018
- g) FAO, Success Stories on Climate Smart Agriculture
- h) FAO, Eastern Africa Climate-Smart Agriculture Scoping Study: ETHIOPIA, KENYA AND UGANDA
- i) IUCN 2020 Global Standard for Nature-based Solutions
- j) MAAIF, Agriculture Cluster Development Project (ACDP), 2012-2024)
- k) MAAIF, MWE. 2015. Uganda climate smart-agriculture country program 2015-2025
- l) MWE, GIZ, Development of Uganda's Long Term Climate Change Strategy. Future Climate Scenarios, September 2020
- m) MWE, Least Developed Countries Initiative on Effective Adaptation and Resilience (LIFE-AR) Project in Uganda, 2021
- n) Uganda Revised NDC
- o) USAID, CGIAR, CAFFS, CIAT Climate Smart Agriculture in Uganda, October 2017
- p) Vulnerability and adaptation options to climate change for rural livelihoods – A country-wide analysis for Uganda, 2019
- q) World Bank, Green Roads for Water: Guidelines for Road Infrastructures in Support of Water Management and Climate Resilience
- r) World Bank, Uganda Climate Smart Agriculture Transformation Project Document, 2021
- s) World Bank 2018 Scaling Up Climate-Smart Agriculture through the Africa Climate Business Plan

### ANNEX 3: STUDY FRAMEWORK

Feasibility Study on Climate Resilience for Refugee Affected Areas and Regions in Uganda Study Framework			
Study objective: Support the embassy in assessing the feasibility of a future intervention that targets refugee affected areas and regions based on needs and problems present. Consultant will assess challenges, opportunities and feasibility of interventions supporting sustainable and durable solutions.			
Study area (SA)	TOR Study Questions	KII Questions (divided by stakeholder group)	Data collection method
<p><b>SA 1: Building on NURI and similar interventions.</b></p> <p><i>Which practices of NURI are important to preserve?</i></p> <p>Experiences and lessons from the NURI engagement and similar interventions</p>	<p>1.1 Based on existing studies, reviews and reports, assess successes. Which relevant lessons can be learned from Previous Danida efforts in Northern Uganda, particularly those focusing on both refugees and host communities?</p> <p>1.2 Agriculture is at the core of NURI. Is it feasible for a future project to implement several thematic areas like NURI? Which areas are most relevant?</p> <p>1.3 Based on existing studies, reviews and reports, which relevant lessons can be learned from other similar previous and on-going interventions supported by Development Partners, including in Northern Uganda, including interventions that have focused on sustainable agriculture and adaption to climate change?</p>		<p><b>Source and method:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• KII NURI CF and implementing partners</li> <li>• KII RDE</li> </ul> <p><b>Analysis point:</b></p> <p>The analysis will highlight learnings from NURI in terms of activities and thematic areas as well as needs of local communities identified during implementation. Learnings, identified needs, challenges and opportunities from NURI and similar interventions will be drawn out leading to recommendations for a new phase.</p>
<p><b>SA 2: Geography.</b></p>	<p>2.1 What is the feasibility of applying NURI experiences in a) the same areas in a new</p>		<p><b>Source and method:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> </ul>

<p><i>In how many and which geographical areas (districts/sub-countries) should a potential project be implemented, and what other issues should be taken into account, in order to maximize the possibility of achieving outcomes and minimize risks? Only refugee affected areas should be considered.</i></p>	<p>phase or b) in other areas?</p> <p><i>Additional questions from the team:</i></p> <p>2.2 <i>What are the different features of the refugee-hosting areas and regions in Northern Uganda and SouthWest Uganda</i></p> <p>2.3 <i>Which geographical similarities and differences should be taken into account in order to achieve outcomes and minimize risks?</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KII NURI CF staff</li> <li>• KII RDE</li> <li>• KII government entities</li> </ul> <p><b>Analysis point:</b> The analysis will outline refugee-hosting areas and regions in Uganda with a view on similarities and differences, needs, challenges, and opportunities. Danida’s engagement in Northern Uganda to date will be included and recommendations on geographical areas with an eye on scale and potential risks will be drawn.</p>
<p><b>SA 3: Refugees.</b></p> <p><i>How should a potential project balance between host communities and refugees as target groups to best contribute to durable solutions? How should the project interact with the humanitarian sector in the areas?</i></p> <p>Status of refugee influx and caseload and their impact on relevant areas and regions.</p>	<p>3.1 Numbers: Where are the refugees, new and old?</p> <p>3.2 Impact: How do they impact the areas in which they reside?</p> <p>3.3 Needs: What are the needs of these areas, the local communities, and the refugees?</p> <p>3.4 How can the project best benefit refugees, host communities and other displacement-affected nationals?</p>		<p><b>Source and method:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• KII NURI CF staff</li> <li>• KII Donor group</li> <li>• KII government entities</li> <li>• KII humanitarian actors</li> </ul> <p><b>Analysis point:</b> The analysis will look at trends in refugee influx from geographical and political perspectives. Government policy and priorities will be highlighted and experiences with durable solution and HDP will be explored leading to recommendations for a new phase.</p>
<p><b>SA 4: Coordination and alignment.</b></p>	<p><i>Additional questions from the team:</i></p>		<p><b>Source and method:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KII NURI CF staff</li> </ul>

<p><i>How to feasibly coordinate with other interventions and align to government priorities?</i></p> <p>Similar programming in the areas and regions affected by refugees.</p>	<p>4.1 <i>NURI experience with coordination and alignment at different levels –learnings and cooperation?</i></p> <p>4.2 <i>Learnings from similar interventions including arenas for sharing experiences, promoting best practices, communication, etc.</i></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KII RDE</li> <li>• KII government entities</li> <li>• KII CSO, NGOs</li> <li>• KII Donor group</li> </ul> <p><b>Analysis point:</b> The analysis will show experiences regarding coordination and alignment for NURI and similar interventions leading to recommendations for a new phase including outlining of roles of the RDE and programme implementors respectively.</p>
<p><b>SA 5: Climate change.</b></p> <p><i>How can a potential project best contribute to enhanced resilience with a focus on environmentally sustainable agricultural methods and climate change adaptation, as well as mainstream reduction of greenhouse gas emissions?</i></p> <p>Exchange and lessons on climate change adaptation as well as other projects</p>	<p>5.1 Which greening practices would be relevant to introduce, particularly climate adaptation?</p> <p>5.2 Which existing greening practices would be relevant to upscale, particularly climate adaptation?</p> <p>5.3 Which actors – including development partners (bilateral/multilateral), CSOs and Government of Uganda agencies, academic / training institutions – are involved in similar projects in refugee hosting areas and regions, and which could be possible partners for the project?</p> <p>5.4 Which intervention approaches / design would be most suitable / fit for purpose?</p> <p>5.5 Walk the talk: Requirements for the implementing consortiums own</p>		<p><b>Source and method:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• KII NURI CF staff</li> <li>• KII RDE</li> <li>• KII government entities</li> <li>• KII CSO, NGOs</li> <li>• KII Donor group</li> </ul> <p><b>Analysis point:</b> The analysis will show challenges and need in terms of climate change specific for refugee-affected areas and regions. Main features of green practices proven relevant for the Ugandan context will be included to draw lessons and recommendations for a new phase.</p>

	<p>operations.</p> <p>i. Would it be feasible to ask a future project to account for its own greenhouse gas emissions in scope 1, 2 and 3 (see below) using a standard like the Greenhouse Gas Protocol. This would apply to the consortium's cars, offices, staff and operations. How could this be done?</p> <p>ii. Would it be feasible for a project to minimize waste, for example through minimising the use of plastic bottles and paper? How could this be done?</p>		
<p><b>SA 6: Operational sustainability.</b></p> <p><i>How can a potential project best contribute to structural change at scale through the promotion of either 1) sustainable business models or 2) building of lasting institutions with sufficient funding and capacity.</i></p>	<p>6.1 Re-assess the short framework on operational sustainability from NURI.</p> <p>6.2 Identify methods to enhance operational sustainability, including the BRAC Graduation Method and the ideas mentioned in the NURI policy brief on the issue.</p> <p>6.3 Map similar attempts by NUTEC and DINU (the start fund).</p>		<p><b>Source and method:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• KII NURI CF staff</li> <li>• KII RDE</li> <li>• KII Donor group</li> <li>• KII CSO, NGOs</li> </ul> <p><b>Analysis point:</b></p> <p>The analysis will discuss lessons learning regarding sustainability in NURI and similar interventions and recommend areas of relevance in terms of ensuring sustainability in a new phase.</p>
<p><b>SA 7: Implementation modality.</b></p> <p><i>What is the capacity among</i></p>	<p>Assess the capacities needed to implement a large-scale project and map relevant implementing organisations, including, but not limited to:</p>		<p><b>Source and method:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• KII NURI CF staff</li> <li>• KII Donor group</li> </ul>

<p><i>potential implementing partners to coordinate and implement a potential project.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Danish NGO's with strategic partnership agreements (SPA).</li> <li>- A select number of international NGO's with experience in the geographical or thematic areas. These should be selected on the basis of their size, experience in Uganda or experience with similar thematic areas.</li> <li>- A select number of local NGO's with experience in the geographical or thematic areas.</li> <li>- A select number of businesses with relevant, scalable business models which could contribute to the</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KII RDE</li> <li>• KII CSO, NGOs</li> </ul> <p><b>Analysis point:</b> The analysis will be based on a mapping of potential implementing partners (consortium lead only) and present a list of key features relevant for a new phase of NURI.</p>
--	---	--	---

# ANNEX 4: REPORT ON STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

## 1 INTRODUCTION

As part of the feasibility study stakeholder consultations were undertaken to establish a full overview of the context, opportunities and challenges for a new phase of the Northern Uganda Resilience Initiative (NURI). The study team undertook consultations with a range of relevant stakeholders both in Kampala and in the sub-regions of West Nile, Acholi and Southwest. The study team developed a list of stakeholders to be interviewed, most of them in the form of key informant interviews (KIIs) although some were interviewed in smaller groups based on geographical location and commonality of stakeholders. The following categories of stakeholders and thematic focus were included:

- implementors for the NURI programme to learn from their experiences particularly in relation to future interventions, opportunities and challenges;
- local district administration entities in West Nile, Acholi and Southwest sub-regions to learn from their experiences in relation to climate change adaptation activities and working in refugee hosting areas and to understanding challenges and opportunities in the districts;
- stakeholders working with refugee to understand the current situation and short and long terms challenges and needs. Stakeholders included humanitarian actors such as ECHO, WFP and UNHCR as well as international NGOs, Office of Prime Minister (OPM) and local CSOs;
- stakeholders working within the area of climate change to understand the current context as well as challenges and opportunities. Stakeholders included academia, development partners, local CSOs and private sector actors;
- international development partners to learn of similar interventions and explore opportunities for coordination and alignment for future activities;
- relevant national partners including ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs);
- the RDE external consultant hired to support the embassy in closing down NURI as well as starting up a new structure to ensure alignment.

Prior to the field mission in Uganda a study framework was developed to guide the desk review and prepare for the stakeholder consultations. The study framework was based on the seven focus areas mentioned in the TOR namely 1) Building on NURI; 2) Geography; 3) Refugees; 4) Coordination and alignment; 5) Climate change; 6) Operational sustainability 7) Implementation modality. Questions regarding gender equality were mainstreamed into the study areas. The framework guided the team in identifying relevant questions for development of the interview guides that were used during the KIIs.

Based on input from the Royal Danish Embassy (RDE) in Uganda as well as the documents reviewed relevant stakeholders were grouped into clusters. Data collection tools including interview guides and a qualitative data tracking form were developed.

All interviews were carried out in a semi-structured manner taking a point of departure in the overall study area questions defined in the study framework. Interview guides were developed for each stakeholder cluster with the option to be adjusted for each interviewee by the team members.

Attention was given to a proper introduction, so that participants in the discussions understood the purpose of the consultation and could adjust expectations accordingly.

The majority of KIIs were conducted during the mission in Uganda though due to issues of availability a few interviews took place virtually after the completion of the mission. Primary data collection was conducted in West Nile, Acholi and Southwestern sub-region as well as in Kampala during the period of the field mission from 24<sup>th</sup> October till 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2022. The sub-regions included in the field mission were identified by the RDE.

Interviewees including staff from NURI Coordination Function (CF) and RDE, implementing partners, national and international NGOs, private sector actors and international organisations/development partners. The identification of informants at district level was done jointly with NURI CF for West Nile and Acholi sub-regions and Danish Refugee Council (DRC) for Southwestern sub-region.

The study team conducted and captured interview notes for a total of 50 KIIs of which 12 took place at national level and 38 took place at district level. Below table provide an overview of clusters and number of interviews conducted per cluster. A detailed list of stakeholders consulted can be found in annex 5.

Interviews conducted	Cluster
12	Government - national and district level
8	NURI CF and IPs
13	NGOs – International and national
5	Private sector actors
2	Research institutes and universities
10	Development and humanitarian partners

Due to the geographical scope of the mission, it was necessary for the team members to divide their time between West Nile, Acholi and Southwest sub-regions. To ensure the best possible utilisation of the time available for the field mission study the team members had to split up and divide the work at sub-regional level between them. KIIs in Kampala were conducted jointly by all team members.

The study team used a data collection tracking tool to systematically record and analyse primary data collected to identify patterns that might highly convergence or divergence of opinion across regions, study areas and stakeholder clusters. The high number of KIIs as well reference to secondary data made it possible for the team to triangulate primary data collected. In addition to the analysis of interview data, the team also used secondary data from the desk review to help explain the results and triangulate findings from the primary data collection.

At the end of the field mission the study team conducted a debrief with staff from RDE and NURI CF to receive further comments and input regarding findings and way forward. Following the field mission, the RDE invited INGOs and NGOs in Kampala for a consultation meeting on December 8<sup>th</sup> 2022 to obtain input from a broader group of NGOs.

The remain of the document will provide an overview of stakeholder clusters and point of engagement.

### 1.1 LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

At district level five consultations were held at DLG offices in Nebbi, Koboko, Kitgum, Lamwo, Isingiro districts and involved several district officials including chairpersons, planning officers and technical officers such as engineers, agriculture, environmental and refugee liaison officers.



The five districts visited for stakeholder consultation with district local governments (DLGs) were very diverse in the sense that some were refugee hosting districts (RHDs), others were non-RHDs. The districts in Northern Uganda all worked with the NURI programme though entering the programme at different times, while the Isingiro district in Southwest did not have prior knowledge of the NURI programme. The similarities and differences in the districts allowed for triangulation of information and gave a broad picture of the situation of refugees seen from DLG perspective.

In districts of NURI implementation all participants in the meetings displayed a deep understanding of the programme and showed clear ownership of the programme. These districts reiterated appreciation for NURI and the great support they had received in terms equipment and capacity building. The work done with rural infrastructure and extension services to farmers were also mentioned as key achievements. The approach of NURI working according to the parish development model (PDM) and district development plans (DDPs) was highly appreciated. Challenges of district responsibility of maintaining of NURI infrastructure activities were mentioned as a concern that DLGs were working on addressing.

All consulted DLGs highlighted a need for further emphasis on livelihood and agricultural production with additional need for further research, creating market linkages, looking at options for value addition and focusing on water for production. The issue of WFP cut in food rations were mentioned in all five districts as a challenge, since the demand for locally produced agricultural products were increasing.

Non-RHDs stated that most significant impact of refugees was an increased pressure on social services such as schools and health facilities. Environmental impact was also noted since refugees were cutting tree to fulfil energy needs.

All DLGs emphasised their role as taken the lead in coordination of interventions in their district with a keen interested to take over the coordination role from OPM with more involvement of key stakeholders. Initiatives such as joint monitoring effort by NURI CF and IPs were complemented as best practice.

Impact of climate change were noted by the consulted DLGs with floods and prolonged dry spells mentioned and key areas for attention named as climate resilience building, waste management, protection of natural resources such as water sources, wood lots, tree growing and offering alternative energy sources. In addition, concerns regarding access to and quality of land called for off-farm skills introduction as requested activities. The issue of land was also brought up when discussing peaceful co-existence. Here the districts hold a key role in negotiations and sees inclusive and participatory processes as main tool for conflict mitigation.

In addition to DLG consultations, the study team met with OPM representatives in Arua, Lamwo, Mbarara and Nakivale. Information obtained from OPM was in line with DLG consultations with focus on needs within food security and livelihood as a means a nexus approach to durable solutions. Main challenges were seen in relation to access to land, impact of climate change and limited funding for long-term development projects. Appreciation for NURI activities were reiterated in meetings with OPM officials in NURI programme areas.

## **1.2 CENTRAL LEVEL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS**

At central level the study team met with key stakeholders at OPM and Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fishery (MAAIF). Once again appreciation of NURI programme was reiterated.

At national level OPM consultations took place with the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) secretariat and the OPM Department of Refugees. Discussions centred around policies,

alignment, and coordination according to the CRRF. From CRRF Secretariat as well as Department of Refugees the study team received information about the situation in Uganda as well as priorities in terms of refugee response relevant to the focus on a new phase of NURI.

At central level consultations with MAAIF and National Agriculture Research Organisation (NARO) took place in Entebbe. The decade long cooperation with Danida was emphasised as was the need to continue working with the agriculture sector and to ensure alignment with national policies and inclusion of research institutions.

### **1.3 NURI CF AND IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS**

The study team met with NURI CF at sub-regional and central level as well as with implementing partners (DRC, AFARD, PICOT and CARE). The organisations are well staff with strong technical capacities and notable the local organisations displayed a detailed understanding of the local context and needs on the ground. All stakeholders within this group confirmed the relevance of NURI and the ongoing needs of target populations.

Concerns regarding access to input for smallholder farmers were mentioned as were issues of access to markets and the need for a stronger focus on market systems. Methodology of inclusion and participation was highly appreciated as was the acknowledgement that sufficient time given at inception phase had a positive impact on implementation. The many challenges facing farmers regarding input and output markets were highlighted as were the impacts of climate change. Concerns for environment as a result of influx of refugees and lack of alternative livelihood options were raised. It was recommended that a future NURI phase build on the good results of the current NURI programme and focuses further on above mentioned issues. Gender equality was included in the discussion and stakeholders confirmed gender inequality in target population and limited success in addressing this during implementation.

### **1.4 NGOS – INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL**

The study team consulted several non-government organisations in order to learn of other interventions taking place in RHDs. The consultations focused on getting information about the situation on the ground, obtain perspectives of needs, opportunities, and challenges and to learn of new and innovative initiatives piloted by other development actors.

Topics for discussion included:

- Most feasible approach for working with refugees and host communities including working with host refugee ratios.
- How to enlist active participation and benefit for women and youth in the context of refugees and host communities.
- How to integrate sexual reproductive health and rights and women's empowerment into agriculture projects.
- Possibilities for development programmes focusing on durable solutions benefitting refugees and host communities – current and future gaps including working with private sector, youth and women.
- Opportunities and risks for development programmes working in refugee-affected areas.
- Experiences and lessons learned in terms of coordination, alignment and sharing of experiences
- Ways to ensure continuous research, learning and introduction of new technologies.
- Experiences with climate-smart agriculture (CSA) and ways to promote these now and over time.
- Experiences with sustainability and appropriate exit strategies.

The NGOs confirmed the needs of livelihood and climate resilience of host and refugee communities. NURI was a well-known and respected programme and the need to continue a long-term development programme with similar scope was highlighted. Opportunities and challenges for working with private sector were brought forward with sharing of experiences from the different organisations. One stakeholder emphasised the need to ensure organisational staff with technical skills from business sector as key to successful engagement with private sector along with the need for long-term cooperation starting at project design stage. Many of the consulted organisations mentioned the need for long-term engagement in environmental protection initiatives and that learning and experience sharing within these sectors would be beneficial. Working with gender equality was discussed and experiences shared with an emphasis on the need for gender expertise within the implementing organisation together with long-term approach to addressing gender inequality in target area. One organisation mentioned the need for donors to include specific budget for working with issues around gender.

For international NGOs additional questions regarding organisational policies on gender, green office policy and reducing and tracking greenhouse gas emissions were included to inform the mapping of potential implementing partner's section. Four of the consulted international NGOs confirmed having a green office policy whereas only two were currently tracking and mitigating emission in connection with operation. Donor initiatives to elevate emission tracking to a requirement was welcomed if specific budget line was allocated for implementation.

## 1.5 PRIVATE SECTOR ACTORS

The study team engaged with a number of private sector actors to gain an understanding of the perspectives of the private sector in terms of operating in RHDs.

The consultants focused on collection information on following topics:

- unique benefits and inherent risks of private sector engagement in refugee-affected areas.
- Ways to pilot and scale essential products and services in refugee-affected areas.
- Challenges encountered in terms of reaching new markets in refugee-affected areas (logistics, information, access, finance).
- Ability to build trust and network connections amongst local market actors in a refugee affected areas
- Working with development partners such as NGOs in reaching new markets.
- Way for development partners to engage more actively with the private sector in order to benefit refugee-hosting areas.

It should be noted here, the questions were expanded to from RHDs to refugee-affected areas in the acknowledgement that market-based activities of go beyond RHDs and into main towns in neighbouring districts.

The private sector actors confirmed an interest in further expansion of business in refugee-affected areas but also listed several barriers mainly linked to access to farmer groups and VSLAs as well as need for consistent demand and supply from farmers. Many of the consulted private sector actors confirmed experience in working in partnership with civil society organisations and considered this a feasible option when done from project design stage and with an eye on sustainable interventions.

## 1.6 RESEARCH INSTITUTES AND UNIVERSITIES

The study team had the opportunity to consult research institutions and universities at local and national level to understand latest research done in terms of climate change adaptation and mitigation as well as environmental protection initiatives. Focus was on learning about current trends and developments and to explore opportunities and challenges in terms of collaboration with development partners.

Since few stakeholders in this category was consulted a specific interview guide was not developed for this group. The consultations confirmed the presence of research initiatives focusing on new technologies which may increase resilience and mitigate some of the climate change challenges. There was a high appreciation of cooperation with Danida and there is an interest in and desire to continue this cooperation with implementing organisations to test and promote new technologies.

## 1.7 DEVELOPMENT AND HUMANITARIAN PARTNERS

KIIs with humanitarian and development partners (EU, ECHO, UNHCR, WBG, IFAD, WFP) took place at local and national level. Two of the consultations were conducted remotely online based on availability of stakeholders.

At local level focus was on understanding the situation on the ground while national level consultations focused on coordination and alignment, policies and priorities and opportunities for cooperation. Discussion on opportunities for increased nexus focus and working with a new phase of NURI was explored with this stakeholder group. Key topics for discussion included:

- Current situation of refugees in Uganda in terms of numbers, impact and needs.
- Main needs (short and long term) of refugee and host-communities and greatest gaps in terms of addressing those needs.
- Division of development and humanitarian assistance divided across the regions.
- Development programmes such as NURI, DINU, DRDIP benefitting refugees, host communities and other displacement-affected nationals.
- Opportunities and risks for development programmes working in refugee-affected areas.
- Experiences with systematically including gender equality in intervention designs – barriers and challenges.
- Development programmes contribution to HDP nexus.
- Coordination between development and humanitarian actors.
- Experiences of valuable coordination, experience sharing and learning across the HDN with other actors.

Development partners shared experiences from similar interventions such as DINU, DRDIP, PRELNOR and confirmed the need in RHDs for a new phase of NURI. Humanitarian partners gave an overview of the situation in terms of refugees and confirmed that a successful HDP nexus approach was conditioned by increasing long-term development funding. All consulted stakeholders in this cluster mentioned the imbalance in funding between North and West/Southwest as an issue that should be addressed.

Role of national and local government to lead coordination of activities was discussed with acknowledgement of structures in place leading towards greater alignment and coordination with involvement of all relevant stakeholders.

In Arua and Nakivale the study team was able to obtain a list of NGOs operating within the livelihood sector from UNHCR. These lists helped inform the mapping of potential implementing partners.

## 1.8 CONSULTATION MEETING WITH CIVIL SOCIETY

In December 2022 the RDE invited INGOs and NGOs in Kampala for a consultation meeting to obtain input from a broader group of NGOs. More than 34 organisations participated in the consultation meeting representing both international and national NGOs.

At the meeting the Danish ambassador to Uganda gave an opening speech setting the scene for the meeting and providing a brief overview of the process of the RDE in terms of programming for future intervention with special emphasise on a new phase of NURI.

A presentation of the current NURI programme was made by the NURI National Programme Coordinator followed by a presentation by the NURI Feasibility Study consultant on main findings of the consultancy.

The presentations were followed by group work where participants were divided into groups in order to discuss six topics namely; geographical scope, operational sustainability, climate change and biodiversity, gender, policy issues and youth.

Key points from the discussions are summarised below.

**Geographical scope:** Northern Uganda still relevant. Key to build on previous programmes to consolidate achievements. Northern Uganda is still experiencing poverty and a continuous influx of refugees, resulting in environmental challenges. There is vast land in Northern Uganda providing potential for agriculture, however, environmental degradation is a threat to e.g., community forests. Suggestion to consider Yumbe (Bidi-Bidi) as hosting large numbers of refugees. Match humanitarian/development nexus. Spreading to other areas risks causing a gap and decreasing visibility of impact.

**Operational sustainability:** A supply-led approach does not guarantee a market for products. A market-led approach favours market crops and can cause food insecurity at household level. The market system should aim at local consumption and promote locally demanded food. Value addition is important as well as timely delivery of quality inputs. Information systems and participatory approaches are important. Engagement of private sector in entire value chain and extension systems. Civil society organisations important to keep focus on social aspects and support private sector. Engagement of governments on land tenure. Support farmer institutions to grow into cooperatives. VSLAs should be linked to bigger financial institutions. Circular economy enhancing effectiveness of inputs (agro-ecology). Village model to engage youth e.g., through digitalisation. Farmer Family Learning Group (FFLG) approach (holistically connecting value chain players).

**Climate change and biodiversity:** Importance of livelihood diversification, land rights between refugee/host communities, and land use practice. Climate change particularly challenging in rural settings as few alternative livelihoods are available. Importance of income generating activities, VSLAs, soil and water management, agronomic practices and protection of wetlands and forestry. Need for a holistic landscape approach. In Climate-Smart Agriculture, seed variety is important – and not necessarily genetically modified. There is a gap in dissemination on weather patterns that affects productivity. Deforestation is a challenge – tree planting efforts needs engagement on tree species. Clean cooking is a pathway for climate action through e.g., solar stoves. Disaster and shock response and preparedness capacities need support. There is a need to address attitudes to poverty and climate adaptation. Finally, continued research is needed as climate change is dynamic.

**Gender:** Highlighted the importance of integrating gender issues from the beginning. Importance of inclusivity and attention to power dynamics, access and control of e.g., finance, resources, and land (also at policy level). Need for extensive gender analysis to address root causes. Family planning and effective integration of SRHR important. Need to include men to address gender norms.

Need to consider climate change impacts on women. Consider functional adult literacy.

**Policy issues:** Link to social protecting. Linking and implementation of refugee response plans at district level – to support existing DLG’s policies. Coordination at national level to establish joint learning and advocacy plans through existing government led thematic working groups. Strong donor and UN coordination. Integrated land use management policies are key for climate resilience. Linking w/ poverty alleviation. Contextualise in a bigger picture e.g., famine in South Sudan spreading to Uganda. Important to ask long term questions.

**Youth:** Defined youth as the age group 18-35 and highlighted the importance of the education sector, due to a high level of unschooled youth. Dropout levels for refugees are high particularly when they reach secondary school age of 13-18. It is mainly girls dropping out. Out of school youth experience lack of opportunities. Skills training is important and has been included in the formal curriculum for secondary school. Skills training needs to be practical and focused on employability. Funding for skills training is needed. Capturing the interest and pace of the youth was highlighted through e.g., e-farming, fast yielding crops (e.g. vegetable value chain). Additionally, the importance of linkages to the private sectors, age and gender segregated analysis, and research and learning was highlighted.

## 2 CONCLUSION

During the short period of the field mission in Uganda the study team was able to conduct consultations with 50 stakeholders divided into six stakeholder clusters and spread across three sub-regions of West Nile, Acholi and Southwest as well as in Kampala. The large number of consultations together with the diversity of stakeholders helped the team triangulate data and through analysis identify patterns that might highly convergence or divergence of opinion across regions, study areas and stakeholder clusters. Information obtained from stakeholder analysis linked with secondary data from the desk review informed the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the feasibility study. Across all stakeholder cluster and study areas the information was consistent with limited divergence.

The consultation session with INGOs and NGOs provided a good opportunity to further discuss findings of the feasibility study and to involve civil society in the process.

Thanks to the good reputation of the NURI programme, the NURI CF and the team at the RDE the study team was able to conduct the consultation with active engaging stakeholders in an open and transparent manner. Stakeholders willingly shared experiences, ideas and challenges with the team. This input has supported the team in making recommendations for a future phase of NURI.

## ANNEX 5: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS

Respondent Category	Organisation	Persons, titles	Location
Government - National and local level	District Local Government	Onencan Gilbert, CAO. Hon. Urombi Emmanuel, LC V. Evelyn Anenican, Water Engineer. Doreen Fualing, Natural Resource Officer. Charles Lemiza, District Education Officer.	Nebbi district
	District Local Government	Mr. Arwai Christopher Obol -LV5 Chairperson Kitgum, Hajj Welire Marijan - Deputy RDC Kitgum, CAO, Department Heads + Senior Technical Staff	Kitgum, Lamwo
	District Local Government	Wani Nelson, Agriculture Engineer. Alege Wadi, Environment Officer. Alongu Simon, PAS. Dhata Edward, Senior Planner. Samuel Abiyo, SAO.	Koboko district
	District Local Government	District Refugee Liaison Officer	Isingiro DLG Offices
	OPM	Mr Kyaligonza John Bosco - Ag Refugee desk Officer	Lamwo - Palabek settlement Camp
	OPM	Refugee Desk Officer, South Western Region, (Mbarara Desk)	Mbarara
	OPM Nakivale	Acting Commandant and Assistant Commandant.	Nakivale Base Camp
	OPM	Jenna Toma, Deputy RDO	Arua town
	CRRF DoR	Bafaki Charles	Kampala
	OPM Secretariat	Helen Bagaari; Director. Ismael Uganda; Senior Planning Officer. Vivian - Protection Advisor. Nauri - Intern	Kampala
	MAAIF	Mr. Mayanja Fred - Commissioner MAAIF Entebbe	Entebbe
NARO		Entebbe	
NURI and IPs	PICOT	Mukulia Robert, AEO. Charles Kupaju. AES. Akano Grace, Vice Chair Board. Bongo Patrick, Board Member. Emmanuel, VSLA Officer.	Koboko district
	NURI CF Arua	Ebinu Joseph Aston, National Programme Coord. Arubaku Jimmy, Supervising Engineer	Arua town
	NURI CF Kampala	Rilla, Joyce, Joseph, Marie	Kampala
	CARE Uganda	Phoebe Mutonyi, Judith Azakozu	Arua town
	AFARD	Dr. Alfred Lakwo, Executive Director. Robert Barkyalire, Director Programmes. Evans Dan Ugenmungu, CSA coordinator.	Arua town
	DRC	Martin Malinga, Project Manager. Andrew Ebic, Water Engineer. Ronald Luyera, MEAL coordinator. Hervert Atayo, Resilience Design Coor. Simon A, MEAL officer	Arua town



	NURI CF Kitgum/Lamwo	Otim Okello Francis - Regional Coordinator Acholi Region; Ochan Charles - Coordinator CSA Lamwo/Kitgum; Jerry Nyeko -Assistant Coordinator; Atimango Doreth- Agric Extension; Langoya Patrick - Agric Extension; Joel Okech - VSLA	Kitgum
	DRC	Silvano Baruku - Regional Manager; Omara Moses -Acting Team Leader - Lawmo; Denis Okello - Surpervising Engineer; Francis Kato Kasimingi- Team Leader DRC Kitgum; Ocheng Jimmy - Supply Chain Officer	Kitgum
<b>NGOs - International and national</b>	PALMS Corp.	Dr. Abbey Thomas Anyanzo, Executive Director. Jackson Awajobo, Field Officer.	Arua town
	DRC Nakivale.	Faith Atim - Project Officer	Nakivale
	Hunger Fighters	Benjamin - Project Officer	Nakivale
	Uganda Women's Effort to Save Orphans (UWESO)	Field Officer (Wilber Tirwomwe)	Nakivale
	WeltHungerHilfe	Robert Drabeu, Pro. Officer	Arua town
	Alight	Nakanwagi- Field Officer	Nakivale
	TPO	Augustine - Counsellor	Nakivale
	Refugee Welfare Committee	Marifa Junior, RWC III Chairperson	Nakivale, Base Camp
	Group meeting - DRC, Hunger Fighters, WFP, Finnish Church Council (FRC), UWESO, Action Against Hunger, Alight, TPO, RWC III	Partners working in Nakivale and Oruchinga Settlnments	Nakivale Base Camp
	LWF	Miss Prudence - Area Manager Kitgum	Kitgum
	DCA/CEFORD	Moges Temesgen, DCA Head of Operations. Simon, DCA. Vicky Onyait, DCA Livelihood Officer. Alaka, CEFORD Executive Director. Godfrey, CEFORD officer.	Arua town
MercyCorps	Edward Simiyu, Country Director	Kampala	
CRS	Nick De Goeij, Chief of Party, Land Restoration Initiative.	Kampala	
<b>Private Sector Actors</b>	St. Francis Sunflower Press , Ag Plutos, King of Kings Multi-investments, Shewa Agro-inputs dealer	Mr. Kidega Geofrey, Miss Oola Getrude, Mr. Alii Walter, Mr. Onek Denis	Kitgum, Lamwo
	Equity Bank	Richard Okwir, Business Growth and Dev Manager. Rasmash Alele, Relationship Manager retail/SME	Arua town
	Kitgum Savings and Credit Cooperative Organization (SACCO)	General Manager- Mr. Otto John Bosco	Kitgum, Lamwo
	Adraa Agriculture Center / Franciscan Brothers. Training center	Br. Charles Lagu, Principal. Kizito Onencan, Promotion Manager extension. Ronald Nyakaiah, M&E Officer	Arua town



	Equity Bank Mbarara -	Credit Officer officers Naiga Kalamantu and Onan Ayesigamukama	Mbarara
<b>Research institutes and University</b>	Gulu University	Professor Charles Okumu, Dr. Collins Okello Co-Project Investigator UPCHAIN	Gulu
	Abizardi (NARO)	Peace Ejua, Acting Director. Moja Sisto , Agronomist. Dickens Egama, Soil Scientist. Barole Isiko, Agro-forestry. Apele Bushira, Farm Manager	Arua town
<b>Development and Humanitarian Partners</b>	WFP	Cyridion Usengumuremyi, Head of Area Office, Caroline, M&E Officer. Francesca. Bryan.	Arua town
	EU	Roisin Carlos, Attache, EU Trust FUND and Refugee Response Sustainable Development	Kampala
	UNHCR	Team Leader - Cliff Winston Alvarico	Lamwo - Palabek settlement Camp
	WFP	Field Officer (Santos Asimwe)	Nakivale
	World Bank	Fatima Naqvi	Remote
	IFAD /PRELNOR	Pontian Muhwezi, Country Programme Officer	Remote
	UNHCR	Hope Michael Betahope, Ass. Pro. Officer. Eneku Gordon Adima, Ass. Environment Officer. Lanyero Paska, Field Associate.	Arua town
	ECHO	Morten R. Petersen, Country TA. Lilian Nyacheng, Programme Assistant	Kampala
	UNHCR	Field Officer	Nakivale Field Office
UNHCR	Vivian Oyella, Ass. CRR Officer. Erika Fitzpatrick, Senior Inter-Agency Coordinator Officer. Stephanie Dianne Perham, Reporting Officer. Carol Ann Spark. Lilian Achieng Otiego. Vitali Maslouski. Paul Kenya	Kampala	

# ANNEX 6: INTERVIEW GUIDES

## GOVERNMENT – NATIONAL AND DISTRICT LEVEL

Organisation:	Date and location:
Name(s):	Position(s):

### Introduction, Confidentiality, and Informed Consent:

Good morning/afternoon. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm part of a three-person team from TANA Copenhagen. We are conducting a feasibility study for the Northern Uganda Resilience Initiative (NURI).

As part of the feasibility study, we are meeting different stakeholders and as independent consultants we work with the highest degree of confidentiality. Our notes will not be shared outside the team.

At the end of our data collection phase, we will prepare a feasibility report and a stakeholder consultation report. All information will be aggregated and presented in a way that cannot be tied back to any individual or organization.

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us and for being willing to be interviewed.  
(*To be used with external stakeholders: Before we begin, would you kindly confirm that we have your permission to interview you for the study? Informed consent provided?*)

### Background

We are conducting a feasibility study on NURI support the Royal Danish Embassy in assessing the feasibility of a future intervention that targets refugee affected areas and regions. We are looking inward to at experiences from DANIDA engagement in the North as well as at context and learnings from similar interventions.

### Questions:

#### SA1: Building on Nuri

- 1.1. Kindly share with us the most successful interventions from the NURI programme and what made them successful? What were the key lessons learned?
- 1.2. Looking at the needs of refugee and host-communities where were NURI successful in addressing those needs and which gaps have you identified (gender, refugee/host)?
- 1.3. NURI has focused on engagement of community and local authorities. Which approach seems to be most feasible in this particular context for refugees and host communities?
- 1.4. What would be the best approach to enlist active participation and benefit for women in the context of refugees and host communities?

#### SA2: Geography

- 2.1. What ratio is used for development programmes in refugee-affected areas in terms of host:refugee?
- 2.2. On what basis is an area identified for interventions?

#### SA3: Refugees

- 3.1. How do you see the current situation of refugees in your area in terms of numbers, impact and needs?
- 3.2. How do you see the development programmes such as NURI, DINU, DRDIP

- benefitting refugees, host communities and other displacement-affected nationals?
- 3.3. What are some opportunities and risks for development programmes working in refugee-affected areas?

SA4: Coordination and alignment

- 4.1. In which ways (meetings, workshops, trainings, field visits) have you learned the most from the NURI programme?
- 4.2. In which areas do you feel that NURI has been able to align with government priorities? Is there anything you would like to see done differently?
- 4.3. What positive experiences can you share with us on coordination and alignment from engaging with other similar interventions such as DRDIP, DINU, etc

SA5: Climate change

- 5.1. How can you ensure climate smart agriculture practices and/or resilience design are promoted that make a difference now, and not just (maybe) over a couple of decades?
- 5.2. What would you advise other partners to do?

SA6: Operational sustainability

- 6.1. Looking at NURI as well as other development initiatives: what do you see as examples of successful exit of a programme – what is important in order to ensure activities continue and improvements are maintained?

**Any other information that you propose to be relevant for the study team?**

***Thank you for your input***

## NURI CF + IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS INTERVIEW GUIDE

Organisation:	Date and location:
Name(s):	Position(s):

### Introduction, Confidentiality, and Informed Consent:

Good morning/afternoon. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm part of a three-person team from TANA Copenhagen. We are conducting a feasibility study for the Northern Uganda Resilience Initiative (NURI) supporting the Royal Danish Embassy in assessing the feasibility of a future intervention that targets refugee affected areas and regions. We are looking inward to at experiences from DANIDA engagement in the North as well as at context and learnings from similar interventions.

As part of the feasibility study, we are meeting different stakeholders and as independent consultants we work with the highest degree of confidentiality. Our notes will not be shared outside the team.

At the end of our data collection phase, we will prepare a feasibility report and a stakeholder consultation report. All information will be aggregated and presented in a way that cannot be tied back to any individual or organization.

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us and for being willing to be interviewed.

### Questions:

#### SA1: Building on Nuri

- 1.1. Kindly share with us the most successful interventions and what made them successful? What were the key lessons learned?
- 1.2. Looking at the needs of refugee and host-communities where were NURI successful in addressing those needs and which gaps have you identified (gender, refugee/host)?
- 1.3. Agriculture is at the core of NURI, however, other areas such as VSLA, Rural infrastructure, Water Resource Management, SRHR, GBV have been components of the programme. What have been the added value of integrating these aspects? What are some of the challenges?
- 1.4. NURI has focused on engagement of community and local authorities. Which approach seems to be most feasible in this particular context for refugees and host communities?
- 1.5. How have considerations of gender and gender equality been considered in NURI? What are some missed opportunities?
- 1.6. How would the NURI project have done things differently if it had to design the project again?

#### SA2: Geography

- 2.1. In your opinion, in which areas should a new phase of NURI be implemented (which entry and exit parameters for communities are feasible to use for CSA / RI / WRM)?
- 2.2. What would be the possibilities and risks of replicating NURI components to other areas and regions?

#### SA3: Refugees

- 3.1. In which way do you see the influx of refugees as impacting the areas in which they reside? Needs, opportunities, challenges?

#### SA4: Coordination and alignment

- 4.1. Please share with us experiences of coordination and sharing of learnings, challenges,

- etc throughout the programme implementation.
- 4.2. Kindly share with us the coordination with local government in terms adhering to local development plans and/or plans? What are challenges and opportunities?
  - 4.3. How is the coordination between the different NURI CF and different partners been – also across the three outputs?

SA5: Climate change

- 5.1. How can you ensure those climates smart agriculture practices are promoted that make a difference now, and not just (maybe) over a couple of decades?
- 5.2. Share some of the successes as well as barriers in implementing CSA approach and technologies and/or resilience design?
- 5.3. What lessons to consider while designing greening project?

SA6: Operational sustainability

- 6.1. In experience of NURI and previous DANIDA engagements, what works and what doesn't work in term of sustainability and appropriate exit?
- 6.2. Do you see any room for improvement in the current design of the programme which could enhance the sustainability of the interventions?

SA7: Implementation modality

- 7.1. What would you consider an appropriate set-up for a new phase of NURI?
- 7.2. What do you see as added value and risks of a new implementation modality based on a consortium approach and without the NURI CF?

For IPs only:

- 7.3. Which organisational policy does your organisation have in terms of gender, green office policy, etc? How does your office work actively with reducing and tracking your Greenhouse Gas Emissions and minimize waste such as plastic bottles and paper?

**Any other information that you propose to be relevant for the study team?**

***Thank you for your input***

## NGOS, CSOS

Organisation:	Date and location:
Name(s):	Position(s):

### Introduction, Confidentiality, and Informed Consent:

Good morning/afternoon. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm part of a three-person team from TANA Copenhagen. We are conducting a feasibility study for the Northern Uganda Resilience Initiative (NURI).

As part of the feasibility study, we are meeting different stakeholders and as independent consultants we work with the highest degree of confidentiality. Our notes will not be shared outside the team.

At the end of our data collection phase, we will prepare a feasibility report and a stakeholder consultation report. All information will be aggregated and presented in a way that cannot be tied back to any individual or organization.

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us and for being willing to be interviewed.

*(To be used with external stakeholders: Before we begin, would you kindly confirm that we have your permission to interview you for the study? Informed consent provided? )*

### Background

We are conducting a feasibility study on NURI support the Royal Danish Embassy in assessing the feasibility of a future intervention that targets refugee affected areas and regions. We are looking inward to at experiences from DANIDA engagement in the North as well as at context and learnings from similar interventions.

Questions:

SA1: Building on Nuri

- 1.1. NURI has focused on engagement of community and local authorities. Which approach seems to be most feasible in this particular context for refugees and host communities?
- 1.2. What would be the best approach to enlist active participation and benefit for women in the context of refugees and host communities?
- 1.3. How best can SRHR issues be integrated in a similar programme?

SA2: Geography

- 2.1. Working in refugee-hosting areas and regions, what ratio is used for your development programmes?

SA3: Refugees

- 3.4. How do you see the current situation of refugees in Uganda in terms of impact and needs?
- 3.5. How do you see the development programmes focusing on durable solutions benefitting refugees, host communities and other displacement-affected nationals? Where are some of the current and future gaps?
- 3.6. What are some opportunities and risks for development programmes working in refugee-affected areas?

SA4: Coordination and alignment

- 4.1. What initiatives do you undertake to share learnings and experiences from your programmes with other stakeholders (horizontal and vertical)?
- 4.2. In your experience, where has coordination with other actors (both development and humanitarian) been most valuable?
- 4.3. What measure do you take to ensure continuous research, learning, introduction of new technologies?

SA5: Climate change

- 5.1. You have implemented CSA project in refugee affected areas, could you share some of the successes? What are lessons?
- 5.2. How can you ensure those climates smart agriculture practices are promoted that make a difference now, and not just (maybe) over a couple of decades?

SA6: Operational sustainability

- 6.1. In your experience, what works and what doesn't work in term of sustainability and appropriate exit?

SA7: Implementation modality

- 7.1. Which organisational policy does your organisation have in terms of gender, green office policy, etc? How does your office work actively with reducing and tracking your Greenhouse Gas Emissions and minimize waste such as plastic bottles and paper?

**Any other information that you propose to be relevant for the study team?**

***Thank you for your input***

## PRIVATE SECTOR

Organisation:	Date and location:
Name(s):	Position(s):

### Introduction, Confidentiality, and Informed Consent:

Good morning/afternoon. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm part of a three-person team from TANA Copenhagen. We are conducting a feasibility study for the Northern Uganda Resilience Initiative (NURI).

As part of the feasibility study, we are meeting different stakeholders and as independent consultants we work with the highest degree of confidentiality. Our notes will not be shared outside the team.

At the end of our data collection phase, we will prepare a feasibility report and a stakeholder consultation report. All information will be aggregated and presented in a way that cannot be tied back to any individual or organization.

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us and for being willing to be interviewed.

*(To be used with external stakeholders: Before we begin, would you kindly confirm that we have your permission to interview you for the study? Informed consent provided? )*

### Background

We are conducting a feasibility study on NURI support the Royal Danish Embassy in assessing the feasibility of a future intervention that targets refugee affected areas and regions. We are looking inward to at experiences from DANIDA engagement in the North as well as at context and learnings from similar interventions.

Questions:

- 1.1. Are you a social enterprise; local private business; large foot print company or new investor in these areas?
- 1.2. What are some of the unique benefits and inherent risks of private sector engagement in Refugee affected areas?
- 1.3. Can you highlight the ways in which you can pilot and scale essential products and services in refugee affected areas?
- 1.4. Do you see your business growing even with the current risks you are facing?
- 1.5. What are some of the challenges you encounter in terms of reaching new markets in refugee-affected areas (logistics, information, access, finance)?
- 1.6. How have you been able to build trust and network connections amongst local market actors in a refugee affected areas?
- 1.7. Do you work with development partners such as NGOs in reaching new markets?
- 1.8. How would you see development partners engage more actively with the private sector in order to benefit refugee-hosting areas?

**Any other information that you propose to be relevant for the study team?**

***Thank you for your input***



## DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS (EU, USAID, IFAD)

Organisation:	Date and location:
Name(s):	Position(s):

### Introduction, Confidentiality, and Informed Consent:

Good morning/afternoon. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm part of a three-person team from TANA Copenhagen. We are conducting a feasibility study for the Northern Uganda Resilience Initiative (NURI).

As part of the feasibility study, we are meeting different stakeholders and as independent consultants we work with the highest degree of confidentiality. Our notes will not be shared outside the team.

At the end of our data collection phase, we will prepare a feasibility report and a stakeholder consultation report. All information will be aggregated and presented in a way that cannot be tied back to any individual or organization.

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us and for being willing to be interviewed.

*(To be used with external stakeholders: Before we begin, would you kindly confirm that we have your permission to interview you for the study? Informed consent provided? )*

### Background

We are conducting a feasibility study on NURI support the Royal Danish Embassy in assessing the feasibility of a future intervention that targets refugee affected areas and regions. We are looking inward to at experiences from DANIDA engagement in the North as well as at context and learnings from similar interventions.

#### Questions:

##### SA1: Building on NURI

- 1.1. Looking at your experience with working with agriculture and adaption to climate change in refugee-hosting areas and regions, what are some of the key lessons learned (in terms of interventions, methodology, community, local government, national policies, sustainability, implementation modality, coordination, etc)?
- 1.2. Refugee-hosting areas and regions in Uganda are challenged by a number of different issues stretching across several thematic areas such as climate change, livelihood, refugee response, etc. Looking at the context as well as different government policies – what would you perceive as pros and cons of working across sectors/thematic areas?
- 1.3. In your experience, is gender equality systematically included in intervention designs? What are some of the barriers to this?
- 1.4.

##### SA2: Geography

- 2.1. Are you implementing your durable solutions programme in all refugee affected regions? Reason for choice, learnings from this?
- 2.2. How does your organisation define refugee-affected areas and regions?
- 2.3. What ratio is used for development programmes in refugee-affected areas in terms of host:refugee? What challenges and opportunities lies in this choice?

##### SA3: Refugees

- 3.1. How do you see the current situation of refugees in Uganda in terms of impact and needs?
- 3.2. How do you see the development programmes such as NURI, DINU, DRDIP

benefitting refugees, host communities and other displacement-affected nationals?

SA4: Coordination and alignment

- 4.1. What initiatives do you undertake to share learnings and experiences from your programmes with other stakeholders (horizontal and vertical)?
- 4.2. In your experience, where has coordination with other actors (development and humanitarian) been most valuable?
- 4.3. What measure do you take to ensure continuous research, learning, introduction of new technologies?
- 4.4. One challenge is to link NDP III (programme rather than sector approach) with SRP and DDPs. How should this be addressed?

SA5: Climate change

- 5.1. How can you ensure those climate smart agriculture practices are promoted that make a difference now, and not just (maybe) over a couple of decades?
- 5.2. Are you working with Nature-based solutions and the RIO Markers for Climate ? If so, how and where do you see this developing in Uganda in terms of policies and programmes?
- 5.3. What are some of the lessons learned?
- 5.4. In terms of climate change, one major impact is the population growth. How do you address this through your programmes?

SA6: Operational sustainability

- 6.1. In your experience, what works and what doesn't work in term of sustainability and appropriate exit?
- 6.2. What is required in order to reach a level of sustainability in development programmes in refugee-affected areas?

SA7: Implementation modality

- 7.1. In terms of working with CRRF and durable solutions in terms of livelihood and nature-based solutions, which partners do you see as being particular well placed for this?

**Any other information that you propose to be relevant for the study team?**

***Thank you for your input***

## HUMANITARIAN PARTNERS (ECHO, UNHCR, WFP)

Organisation:	Date and location:
Name(s):	Position(s):

### Introduction, Confidentiality, and Informed Consent:

Good morning/afternoon. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I'm part of a three-person team from TANA Copenhagen. We are conducting a feasibility study for the Northern Uganda Resilience Initiative (NURI).

As part of the feasibility study, we are meeting different stakeholders and as independent consultants we work with the highest degree of confidentiality. Our notes will not be shared outside the team.

At the end of our data collection phase, we will prepare a feasibility report and a stakeholder consultation report. All information will be aggregated and presented in a way that cannot be tied back to any individual or organization.

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us and for being willing to be interviewed.  
(*To be used with external stakeholders: Before we begin, would you kindly confirm that we have your permission to interview you for the study? Informed consent provided?* )

### Background

We are conducting a feasibility study on NURI support the Royal Danish Embassy in assessing the feasibility of a future intervention that targets refugee affected areas and regions. We are looking inward to at experiences from DANIDA engagement in the North as well as at context and learnings from similar interventions.

Questions:

#### SA3: Refugees

- 3.3. How do you see the current situation of refugees in Uganda in terms of numbers, impact and needs?
- 3.4. What are the main needs (short- and long-term) of refugee and host-communities? Where are some of the greatest gaps in terms of addressing those needs?
- 3.5. How do you see the division of development and humanitarian assistance divided across the regions?
- 3.6. How do you see the development programmes such as NURI, DINU, DRDIP benefitting refugees, host communities and other displacement-affected nationals?
- 3.7. What are some opportunities and risks for development programmes working in refugee-affected areas?
- 3.8. In your experience, is gender equality systematically included in intervention designs? What are some of the barriers to this?

#### SA4: Coordination and alignment

- 4.5. How do you see development programmes contribute to the HDN?
- 4.6. In what ways do you see increased coordination between development and humanitarian actors benefit refugee and host communities?
- 4.7. In your experience, where has coordination, experience sharing and learning across the HDN with other actors been most valuable?
- 4.8. Where do you see opportunities and challenges when working with CRRF and DLG?

SA7: Implementation modality

7.2. In terms of working with CRRF and durable solutions in terms of livelihood and nature-based solutions, which partners do you see as being particular well placed for this?

**Any other information that you propose to be relevant for the study team?**

***Thank you for your input***

## ANNEX 7: MAPPING OF POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

	Name of Organisation	Core business	Geography	Experience	Green Policy (Walk the Talk)	Int. Development Partners
1	DRC	Protection, Shelter & Settlements, WASH, Economic Recovery	Main office: Kampala. 9 Field offices: West Nile, Acholi, Southwest	Implementing NURI Output 2 +3 (using resilience design). Leading Uganda cash consortium. Budget 2020: In country: 10,8 mio USD. Experience as consortium lead with nationals, international, private sector and academia	Has a Green Policy but not tracking emission yet	Working with all major donors including DANIDA
2	DCA	HDP Nexus (refugee, IDP and host for self-reliance and sustainable livelihoods). Build resilience (access to land, value chain, climate resilience, green jobs, etc). Fight extreme inequality (social cohesion, gender justice, business and HR). Cross-cutting: Women and youth	Main office: Kampala. Field offices: Arua, Yumbe (West Nile and Karamoja sub-regions)	Turnover 2020: In country: EUR 5,79 mio. Globally: EUR 119,5 mio. 22 local partners. Experience as consortium lead with nationals, international, private sector and academia	Has a Green Policy but not tracking emission yet	Working with all major donors including DANIDA
3	CRS	Agricultural Livelihoods, Health, , Emergency Response and Recovery	Nationwide approach. Main office: Kampala	Experience as consortium lead working with INGOs, NGOs, private sector, academia and government	Track own emission and an active green policy with one electrical car in Kampala office	Working with major donors as well as private foundations and cooperate sector.

4	MercyCorps	Livelihoods, climate resilience, agriculture production, public health systems, empowering women and girls	Main office: Kampala. 9 field offices	Experience as consortium lead with nationals, international, private sector and academia	Tracking own emission.	Working with major donors as well as private foundations and cooperate sector.
5	ACCORD					
6	Action Against Hunger (ACF)					
7	ACTION AID					
8	ADRA					
9	African Humanitarian Action (AHA)					
10	ALIGHT					
11	BRAC Uganda					
12	CARE International					
13	CRS					
14	Engineers Without Borders					
15	Finn Church Aid (FCA)					
16	Food for the Hungry					
17	Finnish Refugee Council					
18	GOAL					
19	Humanity and Inclusion					
20	ICRAF					
21	IRC					
22	LWF					

23	Malteser					
24	NRC					
25	One Acre Fund					
26	OXFAM					
27	Sasakawa Foundation					
28	Save the children Alliance					
29	SNV					
30	Welthunger Hilfe					
33	WorldVision					
34	ZOA					

## ANNEX 8: TECHNICAL BRIEF – REFUGEES

This technical brief is intended to provide justification for decisions made regarding geographical scope of a new phase of the Northern Uganda Resilience Initiative (NURI) under the USF 2023-2027, choice of target group and focus sectors. It will link decisions of the Royal Danish Embassy in Uganda to the policies and priorities of the Government of Uganda. Finally, decisions regarding programme design in line with the strategic objectives of the Uganda Strategic Framework 2023-2027 will be justified.

### LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT ENGAGEMENT IN REFUGEE SETTINGS

Uganda is one of the largest refugee-hosting nations in the world. The vast influx of refugees is due to several factors in Uganda's neighbouring countries, especially war and violence in South Sudan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and associated economic crisis and political instability in the region.

Uganda has continued to experience an influx of refugees especially from the Democratic Republic of Congo and from South Sudan. At present, there are approximately 1,5 million refugees in Uganda,<sup>1</sup> a sharp increase from approximately 430,000 in 2016. Currently, there are 30 settlements spread out in 12 districts, including Kampala.<sup>2</sup> Some of the refugee hosting districts (RHDs) are among the most vulnerable districts in Uganda. Despite the scale of the concurrent emergencies, Uganda has been able to keep its borders open and maintain its village style settlements in a non-camp setting, where refugees live within host communities. This due to the progressive refugee policy of the Government of Uganda based on the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF).

The high influx of refugees since 2016 has placed environmental pressure on the limited and fragmented land, and eroded productivity, while at the same time there are missed opportunities for refugees to acquire skills and resources needed for sustainable livelihoods in Uganda and when they return.

Uganda's legal framework (Refugee Act 2006 and 2010 Refugee Regulations) grants access to refugees to key rights and social services including freedom of movement, the right to work, and access to national health and education services. Refugee response is also included in national development planning (NDP) as well as most sector response plans (SRP). The Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) and the Settlement Transformation Agenda (STA) have paved the road for addressing the needs of refugee and host communities with an increased focus on the humanitarian-development-peace (HDP) nexus. Invested focus on the practical application of the CRRF allows space for both the humanitarian coordination on life saving assistance while engaging line ministries and other key stakeholders in a longer-term perspective on key sectoral challenges underpinning the settlement model. The challenge before all stakeholders is to deliver longer-term development outcomes for Ugandan refugee hosting districts as well as refugees.

The Settlement Transformation Agenda (STA) strategy seeks to explore opportunities that benefit both refugees and the communities that host them, by bridging the gap between humanitarian and development interventions. STA represents a key building block of a comprehensive response to displacement in Uganda and a critical component in the application of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework. The Settlement Transformation Agenda is based on six pillars of:<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> UNCHR Operational Update, June 2022.

<sup>2</sup> Adjumani, Arua, Koboko, Hoima, Isingiro, Kampala, Kamwenge, Kiryandongo, Kyegegwa, Lamwo, Moyo, Yumbe

<sup>3</sup> Office of Prime Minister, Settlement Transformative Agenda II, Draft January 2022



- Pillar 1: Land management
- Pillar 2: Sustainable livelihood
- Pillar 3: Governance and rule of law
- Pillar 4: Peaceful co-existence
- Pillar 5: Environmental protections
- Pillar 6: Community infrastructure

Development actors are requested to support the implementation of the six pillars of the STA as a way of contributing towards the overall goal of durable solution. The support from the Government of Denmark in development programmes in the form of a new phase of NURI is considered highly suitable for this purpose with activities designed to address indicative results within STA pillars of sustainable livelihood, peaceful co-existence, environmental protections and community infrastructure.

### GEOGRAPHICAL FOCUS OF ENGAGEMENT

The current NURI programme operates with the broad definition of refugee-affected areas and regions without distinguishing between refugee hosting districts (RHDs) and districts not classified as RHDs. NURI has taken a similar broad approach in choice of implementation area looking at needs and opportunities within all districts of West Nile and Acholi sub-regions, presence of other actors and partners and Danida’s historical engagement in the region without distinguishing between RHDs and non-RHDs.

The USF 2023-27 works with an equally broad definition using the term refugee hosting areas and regions which provides valuable flexibility for programming. However, at project level it would be advisable to work according to the Government of Uganda’s definitions and policies for purpose of alignment and coordination.

The new phase of NURI provides an opportunity to refocus and strengthen the work done in RHDs. In these districts the needs are high, and the expertise developed during NURI would be particularly beneficial to the target population. The Government of Uganda is strongly promoting the operationalisation of the HDP nexus approach, bridging humanitarian and development dimensions in the refugee response. Danida will be supporting this approach by increased engagement in a long-term developmental response in RHDs by including both host and refugee populations.

However, it is important to note that there is a discrepancy at policy level where different SRPs define geographic scope and targeting of districts differently. At the same time, several stakeholders raise concerns about a lack of attention to refugee-hosting areas outside of these recognised districts, or where refugees reside outside of the settlements.

These areas can be classified as follows:<sup>4</sup>

Transit districts	When entering Uganda, refugees arrive in ‘transit districts’ and reside in initial reception centres before being allocated a plot in one of the formal refugee settlements in an RHD.
Secondary cities	While refugees are registered and assisted only at settlement level, there are pendular movements of refugees to and from secondary urban areas.

<sup>4</sup> CRRF, Report on the evaluation of the implementation of the GC, March 2022

Areas with self-settled 'refugees'	An unknown number of refugees are 'self-settled' in border areas; they arrive without being officially registered and are not residing in the refugee settlements.
Districts neighbouring the RHDs	Given the large size of the refugee settlements in Uganda, they may also impact those districts bordering the RHDs; for example, affecting the environment, labour markets, services, and infrastructure – in positive or negative ways.

It would therefore be necessary to include analysis of impact of refugee influx, needs and opportunities in neighbouring districts and areas with self-settled refugees to assess relevance of implementation of NURI core activities. Thereby saying that while NURI should focus on RHDs it should also be open to including neighbouring districts when justifiable.

### STRATEGIC FOCUS OF ENGAGEMENT

The new country programme for Danish development cooperation with Uganda – the Uganda Strategic Framework (USF) 2023-2027 has an overall vision of *a more democratic Uganda, upholding human rights, capable of adapting to the ongoing climate change crisis by using the green transformation to create jobs, hope and opportunities, while continuing to play a stabilising role in an unstable region including by hosting refugees from neighbouring countries.* Of the three strategic objectives (SO) of the USF a new phase of NURI will address:

Strategic objective 1: *Promote sustainable and durable solutions for refugees and support Uganda's stabilising role in the region.*

Strategic objective 2: *Promote a sustainable, inclusive and green economic transformation to adapt to the global climate crisis.*

Most activities within a new phase of NURI will contribute to achieving strategic objective 1 in support of sustainable and durable solutions in refugee hosting districts. As such activities aimed at increasing climate resilience and livelihoods among refugee and host communities will be reported as contributing to strategic objective 1. However, it should be noted that several activities under this part of the programme will support climate change adaptation since livelihood activities, including agriculture production, will include promoting biodiversity and sustainable management of environment and natural resources. It would be feasible though to request that implementing organisations report according to the Rio Markers and the IUCN Global Standards for Nature-based Solutions across all activities within the programme.

The Royal Danish Embassy in Kampala has been advised to include specific funding for implementing partners in support of strategic objective 2. Promoting innovative local solutions linking with Denmark's experience in green transition would support populations as well as private sector actors, district local government and research institutions. It is an opportunity to support the translation of the extensive policies of the Government of Uganda on climate change adaptation and mitigation into real-life tested approaches that could be promoted across the country. Investing in new innovative approaches implemented with a strong evidence-base would support the ambition of Denmark's strategy for development cooperation "The world we share" *to lead the fight to stop climate change and restore the balance to the planet.*