

Activity cycle memorandum (Activity Appraisal Document (BEMO))
(for ODA activities)

1.1 General information

Application number (required by FSO to register the activity and to make folders in Sophia for archiving as quickly as possible)	4000005227
Date of receipt of application (final document)	28 May 2021
Short name of application (clear, meaningful short name in English or French; must not contain budget holder code or abbreviations, max. 60 characters, this will be published in open data)	UNDP RSF Liptako-Gourma Region
Full name of application (maximum 150 characters, this will be published in open data)	United Nations Development Programme Regional Stabilisation Facility for the Liptako-Gourma Region
Description of application (5 sentences max. on the key components of the activity; this information will be entered into SAP)	<p>The Regional Stabilisation Facility is managed by UNDP and will scale up the existing facility established to support interventions in the Liptako-Gourma region (parts of Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger).</p> <p>The overall objective of the facility is to reduce the risk of violence in target areas, thus enabling the delivery of longer-term peacebuilding, recovery and development programmes. It seeks to contribute to ending the spiral of insecurity, forced displacement and conflict, and to strengthening social cohesion. Where possible, vulnerable populations such as Internally Displaced Persons, refugees and marginalised socio-ethnic groups will be integrated in the provision of support by the facility.</p>
Budget holder (the department or mission financing the activity)	DSH
Business partner's number (issued by FSO after form has been submitted)	30025593
Commitment in foreign currency (if applicable, give the currency for the contract; this can for example be USD, GBP or the currency of the country where the activity will be carried out)	N/A
Corporate rate (exchange rate used when entering commitment amount in SAP; normally fixed once a year - ask your Control Unit for advice)	N/A
Commitment in EUR (if the contract is in EUR, enter the amount here - if the contract is in another currency,	EUR 10,000,000

convert the commitment to EUR using the corporate rate above)	
Funds centre (budgetplaats, ask your Control Unit for this) Make sure that the funds centre corresponds with the financial instrument.	1704U03010002 DSH Legitieme Stabiliteit bijdrage
Activity start date (date given in the contract as start date for implementing the activity)	1 December 2021
Activity end date (normally one year after the contract end date to allow for the completion of administrative procedures, evaluation and external audit)	31 December 2025
Contract start date (this is almost always the same date as the activity start date)	1 December 2021
Contract end date (actual end date of the activity agreed with implementing organisation; after this, the implementing organisation can no longer enter into payment obligations but can finalise and pay outstanding commitments - agree with the implementing organisation when the last payments are scheduled in the contract)	31 December 2024
Is this a follow-up to a previous activity? (If so, provide the number of the previous activity)	Not a direct follow-up. It is similar in concept to the RSF in the Lake Chad Basin, which also covers Niger (4000003833).
Confidentiality activity (open data)	2. Activity is not confidential. Public bemo and all other activity related will be published unmodified.
Specific undertakings (State here if the activity to be financed is the result of an undertaking by a minister, an amendment by the House of Representatives or another reason. You should also state here if the activity is a fully confidential activity and should therefore be excluded from open data).	N/A
In case of PPB and EUR 25.000 or more, name program fund (PPB) and start at 2.2. the appraisal and use the policy instructions in het HBBZ: Policy instructions.	Choose an item.

1.2 Information for OESO-DAC

(Please refer to the [ODA Policy Data Guide](#) to help you provide the following information.)

<u>Aid modality</u>	Non-earmarked contributions
----------------------------	-----------------------------

Donor role	Lead or active donor											
Technical assistance	N.a. Not applicable											
<p><u>Beneficiary's country/region</u></p> <p>The beneficiary country is the (OECD/DAC) country where the target group lives and/or comes from. It is the country that ultimately benefits from the activity. This is not necessarily the country where the activity is implemented.</p> <p>When the activity takes place in more than one country, state the region concerned when all countries are taking place in one region according to the region classification in annex 2 of the ODA Policy Data Guide.</p> <p>If not (multiple countries in multiple regions), select worldwide.</p>	<p>Country (state the country concerned below)</p> <p>Mali, Niger and Burkina Faso (activities take place in the border regions called Liptako-Gourma, but this is not a region as meant in annex 2 of the ODA Policy Data Guide). Funds are allocated between countries on a rolling basis, depending on availability and needs. Allocation is administered via Steering Committees in which donors also partake. Thus, over the course of the project the detailed allocation per country window will become clear.</p> <p>At the outset, the same number of JAPs per country will be funded with the resources available. Subsequently and based on delivery capacity and speed, flexibility will be exercised in how resources are continuously allocated.</p>											
<p><u>Specified countries</u> + division of budget over those countries (in so far as this is known). Only fill this item when a region or worldwide has been selected in the item above.</p> <p>Please state here the relevant beneficiary countries. Give an estimation of the part (in %) of the total budget during the full duration of the activity that can be attributed to each country. When this is (partially) unknown, you can register (part of) your activity as unspecified. This can be adjusted during the monitoring phase of the activity.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Burkina Faso</td> <td>N/A%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mali</td> <td>N/A%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Niger</td> <td>N/A%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unspecified</td> <td>..%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </table>		Burkina Faso	N/A%	Mali	N/A%	Niger	N/A%	Unspecified	..%	Total	100%
Burkina Faso	N/A%											
Mali	N/A%											
Niger	N/A%											
Unspecified	..%											
Total	100%											
<p>Location within the country/ countries (be as specific as possible)</p> <p>When the activity targets (a) specific location(s), please state the location(s) here (mostly relevant for decentral activities).</p>	<p>Territory</p> <p>Burkina Faso: the Center-North, East, North, and the Sahel regions;</p> <p>Mali: the Mopti, Gao, Menaka and Tombouctou regions;</p> <p>Niger: the Tillabery, Tahoua and Dosso regions.</p>											
<p><u>CRS sector code (1 CRS sector code per activity)</u></p>	15220											
<p><u>Policy markers weighted 'principal'</u> (principal = the activity will not take place if the activity does not score on this marker)</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Gender (GkhMv)</td> <td>Not applicable</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Climate adaptation</td> <td>Not applicable</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Climate mitigation</td> <td>Not applicable</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Biodiversity</td> <td>Not applicable</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Desertification</td> <td>Not applicable</td> </tr> </table>		Gender (GkhMv)	Not applicable	Climate adaptation	Not applicable	Climate mitigation	Not applicable	Biodiversity	Not applicable	Desertification	Not applicable
Gender (GkhMv)	Not applicable											
Climate adaptation	Not applicable											
Climate mitigation	Not applicable											
Biodiversity	Not applicable											
Desertification	Not applicable											

		Explain your choices in section 2.1.
	Etc. (add more policy markers if applicable)	
	WrkJng	Not applicable
	PubSct	Not applicable
	InsOntw	Not applicable
<p><u>Policy markers weighted 'significant'</u></p> <p>(significant = the activity takes place anyhow, even if the activity does not score on this marker)</p>	Gender (GlkhMv)	Significant
	Climate adaptation	Significant
	Climate mitigation	Not applicable
	Biodiversity	Not applicable
	Desertification	Not applicable
		Explain your choices in section 2.1.
	Etc. (add more policy marker if applicable)	
	WrkJng	Significant
	PubSct	Significant
InsOntw	Significant	

2. APPRAISAL OF THE ACTIVITY

(For terms and concepts referred to in sections 2, 3, 4 and 5, see the [list of widely used terms](#))

2.1 Policy relevance (including digitalisation) and monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL)

Security and Rule of law



Outputs: 1.3.4 Support to programmes that offer vulnerable target groups and individuals alternatives to radicalization and guidance in choosing alternatives (pull factors)				
Indicators	Baseline	Target 2021	Target 2022	Target 2023
ST 1.3.4 a) Number of informal institutions strengthened in the field of human security				
Outcome medium-term: 1.3 Violent extremist groups/organisations have become less attractive to vulnerable groups - especially youth - because better alternatives are available.				
Indicators	Baseline	Target 2021	Target 2022	Target 2023
ST 1.3a Demonstrable changes in beneficiaries' perception and/or behavior regarding violent extremist groups/organizations				
Outcome medium-term: 1.1 Security providers (international/national/formal/informal) perform their tasks more effectively, accountably, inclusively and are more transparent and responsive towards local security needs				
Indicators	Baseline	Target 2021	Target 2022	Target 2023
ST 1.1.a Demonstrable changes in laws and policies that lead to more effective, accountable, inclusive, transparent and responsive security institutions				
ST 1.1.b Demonstrable changes in practices and behaviour of formal/informal security providers regarding their responsiveness to local security needs (e.g. increased trust, increased satisfaction with services)				
Long-term outcomes: 1. Reduced levels of violence and levels of fear experienced				
Indicators	Baseline	Target 2021	Target 2022	Target 2023

An updated results framework will be compiled by UNDP. In the arrangement, the reception of this revised version will be added as an explicit condition.

On a more local level, a baseline study will be conducted before the end of the year in every locality where the RSF will be active (so-called Joint Action Plan or JAP locations). Baseline studies will be done for every subsequent JAP site. While progress will be measured in each site, the data will also inform the progress of the planned outputs for the target region overall.

	Assessment
<p>Task</p> <p>In addition, assess the extent to which this intervention is relevant to policy.</p> <p>State how this intervention scores on the cross-cutting themes of gender, climate adaptation and climate mitigation. Ensure that this is in accordance with the policy markers selected in section 1.2.</p>	<p>The current approach taken by the G5 Sahel and its partners has thus far been unable to turn the tide of the Sahel's security crisis, which has gradually expanded to the Liptako-Gourma region. The region has experienced a proliferation of armed groups during the past three years and has become an epicentre of violence within the Sahel.</p> <p>These developments underline the importance of stabilisation efforts. UNDP aims to establish an accelerated and scaled-up stabilisation effort that creates access and manages to operate in fragile and unstable zones with a view to advancing the political framework required for long-term stability.</p>

Therefore, the RSF offers a timely, multi-sectoral approach that can contribute to positive changes in the region. These changes should in turn lay the foundations for longer-term recovery and development initiatives which cannot be delivered until now.

The objectives of the RSF correspond to the (sub) goals that are included in the BHOS memorandum, where the main objective of Security & Rule of Law is: "Achieving legitimate stability and lasting peace in conflict-affected areas as the basis for sustainable development". This program focuses in particular on sub-goal 1 "Human Security" and improving short-term stability.

In addition, the objectives of the RSF correspond to the Security & Rule of Law Theory of Change, particularly focus area 4.1 (Human Security), and more specifically 4.1.1. Security providers and national security policy.

Next to the relevance of this activity to the Security & Rule of Law Framework, the region is a priority both in the context of the BHOS and the GBVS policy note ("broader ring of instability") as well.

Policy markers

Gender: In the activity, women are identified as specific target groups and as part of inclusive platforms. Furthermore, women and youth empowerment is mentioned as one of the foundations for peace and with that it is a significant part of the intervention logic. However, gender is one element out of many. A specific gender analysis is missing and the indicators also do not disaggregate on gender.

Climate adaptation: The intervention intends to reduce vulnerability to the impact of climate change by focusing on natural resource management. The Facility includes capacity development of Liptako-Gourma Authority Early Warning (e.g. climate related risks). Furthermore, the intervention logic aims to strengthen natural resources management, as it is argued that the regulation and management of natural resources will strengthen trust of the population in state authorities. The Facility also envisions supporting or coordinating with other ongoing/future initiatives on, among other areas, mechanisms for equitable management of natural resources. However, climate adaptation is not a central aspect within the intervention.

	<p>WrkJng: The Facility also concentrates on stabilizing livelihoods through the provision of immediate income-generating activities, the rehabilitation of productive community infrastructure and the economic empowerment of women and youth based on identified community needs.</p> <p>Pubstct: The reliable and indiscriminate delivery of essential services is an important outcome envisioned of the activity, including rehabilitation of water systems, roads and bridges, schools and dispensaries as well as the establishment of off-grid solar-based electricity systems.</p> <p>InsOntw: Targeted capacity building to the Liptako-Gourma authority and key line ministries is an important element of the activity.</p>
--	--

2.2 Problem analysis and lessons learned

2.2.1 Description

Briefly describe the following points and give reasons why they apply (insofar as relevant):

- the problem the proposed activity addresses;
- the extent to which unequal gender relations and climate change are part of the problem;
- the extent to which the activity helps to solve the problem.

In recent years the Liptako-Gourma region (the border region between Mali, Niger and Burkina Faso) has experienced a significant increase in violent events and deaths, triggering suffering, displacement of populations, and interruption of livelihoods. Caused by a complex interplay of factors, the number of actors involved in violent conflict has dramatically increased and diversified. Organised transnational crime in border areas creates a climate of insecurity and violence, where borders are transit zones for weapons, munitions and drugs. Violence in these areas has contributed to popular distrust in local, regional and central authorities as well as perceptions of marginalisation of rural areas. Women and children are particularly vulnerable, with an estimated 50% of the cross-border population being under the age of 15. Climate change and related natural hazards such as droughts and floods, and more recently, COVID-19, just add to the effects of multi-dimensional poverty that result in vulnerabilities further aggravated by violent conflict.

At the same time, the Liptako-Gourma region has a strong potential and assets to address existing risks and vulnerabilities. The existence of common socio-cultural dynamics across the borders between the three countries can serve as key contributing factor of identity-building and cohesion.

Moreover, traditional mechanisms of conflict resolution, which were negatively impacted by the deterioration of the security situation, could potentially serve as a basis for peacebuilding and proactive natural resource management, thus providing a sense of security being re-established. Confidence in traditional and religious leaders to resolve conflicts is strong among all ethnic groups, for both women and men. The region is rich in groundwater and has important farming and grazing lands. Many dams have been built for drinking water supply, market gardening, irrigated agriculture, fishing or for livestock. With a functioning natural resources management system in place, these resources constitute key assets to overcome severe poverty. Faced with common issues and threats in the border areas, national authorities and regional bodies have also established formal frameworks to strengthen cross-border cooperation at all levels (institutional, legal and security), which can be scaled up and strengthened and constitutes a basis for regional integration.

The overall objective of the facility is to reduce the risk of violence in target areas, thus enabling the delivery of longer-term peacebuilding, recovery and development programmes. It seeks to contribute to ending the spiral of insecurity, forced displacement and conflict, and to strengthening social cohesion. Where possible, vulnerable populations such as Internally Displaced Persons,

refugees and marginalised socio-ethnic groups will be integrated in the provision of support by the facility.

An accelerated and scaled stabilisation effort that creates access and manages to operate in fragile and unstable zones with a view to advancing the political framework required for long-term stability is missing in the current approaches to the conflict; an effort that enables the reestablishment of state structures and basic services while fostering social cohesion through continuous inclusion and consultation. These interventions require a dedicated operational backbone, special risk management procedures and need to be implemented in close coordination with security and defence forces, while the speed and scale of interventions will determine the level of success of stabilisation efforts.

The Facility will coordinate activities at three levels. At the national level, the project manager, working with the stabilisation officer, will coordinate planning processes with line ministries to ensure that stabilisation activities are integrated into government plans for service delivery, social infrastructure, transportation infrastructure, etc.; and to keep line ministries informed of progress on the JAPs. At sub-national level, the project manager will regularly update the Governor on progress and monitor situation changes in the region, as identified and reported by the Security Forces Liaison Officer, which might require adjustments to plans. At the local level activities will be coordinated by a team composed of an area coordinator, support personnel and community volunteers.

The selection of target communities will be done jointly between national civil authorities, representatives of national defence and security forces and UNDP. In this context, the strategic axes specified in the final communiqué of G5 summit in N'Djamena of 16th February 2021 and the 22 priority areas identified in the February 2020 CAPI ("Cadre d'Actions Prioritaires Intégrés") of the G5S constitute an initial basis for consideration and coordination.

The facility is initially targeting 6 areas (2 in each country and one border corridor). During this initial phase, processes and systems will be further refined and a general proof of concept delivered. In two subsequent phases, target zones will be gradually increased to a total of 60 communities, subject to available funding. For each community, a Joint Action Plan (JAP) will be developed.

2.2.2 Appraisal

Assess the project's contextual analysis in the table below. If certain criteria do not apply, explain why. [Process in this paragraph and when applicable in other paragraphs the conclusions and recommendations from de Q@E.](#)

Task	Appraisal (Yes/No, plus reasons):
Assess the quality of the contextual analysis.	
The proposal and the contextual risks (see section 4) have been agreed with the mission(s) concerned.	Yes, the decision to agree to funding the RSF in the Liptako-Gourma region has been consulted and agreed upon with the embassies in Bamako, Niamey and Ouagadougou concerned.
The proposal is based on a careful and thorough contextual analysis (including a gender analysis) that results in a logical problem definition and objective.	Yes, the document provides a relatively short contextual analysis but does manage to tackle the diverse and complex interplay of factors causing the conflict in the region. It also acknowledges that women are particularly exposed to the challenges. Upon the contextual analysis of the crisis in the Liptako-Gourma region, the analysis points out that an accelerated and scaled stabilisation effort is missing amidst the current peacebuilding and development initiatives in the Sahel. The proposed intervention facilitates in filling this gap in the critical path to peace and security in the Sahel.

<p>Based on the problem formulated, the proposal explains in a logical manner why the intervention is aimed at the specified geographical location.</p>	<p>Yes, the security situation in the Sahel, and especially the Liptako-Gourma region, continues to present a significant challenge. Based on existing administrative divisions and in the context of the proposal, the sub-national regions concerned are addressed. Moreover, an additional conflict and needs assessment will be conducted of target areas and the population present in the target areas, including women, youth, displaced persons, ethnic groups, etc., based on UNDP fragility framework</p>
<p>The proposal justifies the choice of target group and the target group's gender-specific interests and needs.</p>	<p>Yes, the selection of target communities for immediate stabilisation will be done jointly between national civil authorities, representatives of national defence and security forces and UNDP. An initial conflict and needs assessment will be conducted of target areas and the population present in the target areas, including women, youth, displaced persons, ethnic groups, etc., based on the UNDP fragility framework.</p>
<p>The proposal sets out which relevant actors were involved in formulating the proposal and what influence they had on its content.</p>	<p>Yes. In the document UNDP explains that in the continued roll-out of the facility, it will use and build on the early achievements of the ongoing inception phase. This includes the needs assessments and analysis conducted in initial target areas as well as the communication channels established with local and sub-national authorities.</p>
<p>A stakeholder analysis (incl. women and young people) has been carried out and the results incorporated into the proposal.</p>	<p>No, which is due in part to the localised nature of the interventions. However, in the continued roll-out of the facility an initial conflict and needs assessment will be conducted of target areas and the population present in the target areas, including women, youth, displaced persons, ethnic groups, etc., based on UNDP fragility framework.</p>
<p>Insights and lessons learned from the following sources have been used in formulating the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • previous or comparable activities • published evaluations • relevant publications (academic, online, etc.). 	<p>Yes, the present project will bring to scale the existing stabilisation facility established to support interventions in the Liptako-Gourma region. It builds on the inception work achieved through the currently ongoing stabilisation initiation project funded by the German government. Furthermore, it builds on UNDP's operational experience, several identified trends and analysis reports. The document often refers to existing analyses or research without explicitly mentioning which reports. The amount of evaluations and/or publications mentioned in the project proposal are scarce. Upon request, additional evaluations used within the design of the facility have been shared by UNDP via separate correspondence, including evaluations of the facilities in Iraq, Yemen and the Lake Chad Basin. The lessons learned from these facilities feed into the approach UNDP takes in the RSF Liptako-Gourma.</p>
<p>In the case of technological solutions:</p>	<p>N/A, the activity does not concern technological solutions.</p>

- the added value and risks associated with the solution(s) have been considered carefully
- the most efficient technology has been chosen
- the technology has been developed with the users to reach a diverse user group
- an analysis of the local digital ecosystem (strengthening existing system, no duplication and not standalone).

2.3 Cooperation, harmonisation and added value

Task

Briefly describe:

- whether the proposed activity involves cooperation with, for example, Dutch organisations, EU (EU institutions and member states), other donors, local organisations or other parties;
- how this cooperation contributes to harmonisation, complementarity, joint financing, strengthened EU-cooperation, delegated cooperation and/or multidonor financing
- the added value of the activity in relation to other activities by donors, EU, NGOs and local authorities.

UNDP will ensure a carefully calibrated approach to partnerships with regional initiatives, host countries, development partners and the national development community in each country. UNDP has shared an extensive mapping of complementary initiatives, also outlining strategies to ensure synergy.

Through regular communication between the Coalition for the Sahel and the Facility, UNDP will inform alliance members of the facility activities and progress and seek to identify and facilitate points of cooperation.

Ownership of all activities of the facility rests with the host governments, and therefore there are a number of channels and platforms ensuring sustained engagement.

2.4 Channel and aid modality (including alignment)

Task

Briefly describe:

- whether the aid modality selected is appropriate and why;
- whether the degree of (financial and policy) alignment is substantiated; see the MACS risk analysis;
- whether the aid modality/channel has been chosen on the basis of a consideration of the available options;
- whether there is any contribution or co-participation from the recipients, and explain the level of co-participation.

The aid modality concerns an unearmarked funding of the facility, which functions as a Multi Donor Trust Fund. In the related RSF in the Lake Chad Basin region, of which Niger is also part, the modality has shown its value for the flexibility it offers. Most donors of that RSF contribute unearmarked funds. For those that do earmark (e.g. UK), difficulties have arisen in allocating the funds to the areas that are in most need. In the case of the RSF Liptako-Gourma, unearmarked funds have been dedicated by Germany, the EU and Denmark. Unearmarked funding is also in line with the general principles of Dutch development aid, and funding to this particular project is in line with the policy goals set out in the MACS Sahel.

As of November 2021, recipient countries have not yet contributed to the RSF. However, in the RSF Lake Chad Basin, two out of four countries contributed after two years. Seeing the positive first responses from authorities in the three recipient countries (Mali, Niger and Burkina Faso), they may in due course also contribute.

4. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

4.1 Monitoring (for details, [see the MEL guidelines](#))

Task

Briefly describe:

- whether there is sufficient time and capacity available for monitoring and learning;
- whether the relevant [BZ Theories of Change and results frameworks](#) and results frameworks have been communicated to the implementing organisation and whether these align with BZ standard indicators;
- whether the Theory of Change/intervention logic/logframe for the activity has been set out in sufficient detail in terms of inputs, outputs, outcomes, assumptions and context variables;
- how the implementing organisation will organise the monitoring and whether the implementing organisation will deliver a separate **MEL plan**.

UNDP has established of a dedicated monitoring and analysis capacity, including five M&E staff members in the central Dakar hub (working on multiple projects, so not full-time for this project) and an M&E associate in each of the three country windows. The M&E team in Dakar will develop tools and workshops together with the M&E colleagues from the 3 countries, to prepare for the implementation of the MEL-plan.

A continuous conflict monitoring mechanism is also established. A group of community volunteers will be selected, equipped and trained for this purpose, and will be connected with the facility's national and regional monitoring capacity.

UNDP is a long-term partner of BZ and is well aware of ToCs, results frameworks and other relevant documentation that form that basis of BZ policy implementation. The intervention aligns with BZ's Security and Rule of Law Results Framework, see for instance the indicators used in the results application (par 2.1).

Reporting will be provided both annually (via regular, required Annual Reports) and bi-annually (through additional Semester Reports). Reports will be based on output level data, which are gathered on a bi-annual basis. On the same basis, risks and conflict analysis as well as security perception studies are updated. A full overview of learning products is included below.

The continuous analysis and monitoring activities will inform learning loops that are organised every 3-6 months by the management team together with national counterparts. These learning loops serve to jointly monitor risks and possibly define additional mitigation measures and to identify needs for possible course corrections based on external situation changes and internal lessons learned.

As the project is still in an early stage, the results framework is still being finalised. Proper M&E and a clear connection between output and outcome indicators will be required, as is a baseline / narrative description for the outcome indicators. Over the past weeks, DSH has had intensive contact with UNDP and is confident that a robust

results framework will be delivered before the end of 2021, and that the M&E team is capable of implementing and monitoring it. In the arrangement, the reception of this revised version will be added as an explicit condition.

Product	Responsible Party	Date	Comments	
Annual report <i>Combines the 2nd semester and annual report</i>	National	Jan 31	One consolidated Annual report will be submitted to donors	Annual and semester reports will be based on progress output data. Annual and semester reports will include updated context and conflict situation overview as well as an updated risk matrix.
	Regional	End of Feb		
Semester report <i>First semester report</i>	National	31 July	One consolidated Semester report will be submitted to donors	Annual and semester reports will include updated context and conflict situation overview as well as an updated risk matrix.
	Regional	31 August		
Perception survey	National	June 10 and Dec 10	One consolidated and/or individual country Perception reports will be shared and published	Perception data will also inform semester and annual reports.
	Regional	June 20 and Dec 20		
Quarter report	National	April 10 and Oct 10	One consolidated Quarter report will be submitted to donors	Quarter reports will provide financial and activity updates. Quarter reports will include an updated context and conflict situation overview as well as an updated risk matrix.
	Regional	April 20 and Oct 20		
Learning loops	Regional and national	Within the first month after publication of Annual, Semester and Quarter Reports	Based on data, updated risks and context overviews, and encountered challenges and successes, a discussion will be held amongst all country windows on lessons learned and best practices. Based on this, changes might be proposed to JAP workplans, budgets and approaches to ensure efficiency, relevance and conflict sensitivity.	The learning loops after the Semester and Annual reports will include donors. They will be at a more strategic level, as they will be based on output progress data. After each learning loop session, a short document is prepared with the key points discussed, lessons learned and recommendations.
Mid-term review	External party	May 2023	Review of the pertinence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the Facility	A learning loop will be organised after the Mid-term review, including with donors, to discuss success and challenges, and decide on potential adjustments to the JAPs and the Facility management overall.
Final evaluation	External party	Oct - Dec 2024	Final evaluation pertinence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the Facility	

Final report	National and regional	Within 3 months prior to Dec 2024		
--------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--

4.2 Evaluation ([click here for the quick reference guide](#)) (for details, [see the MEL guidelines](#))

Task	
<p>Describe briefly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - worth EUR 5 million or more; or - of strategic importance; or - involving political risks/interests; or - for which evaluation has been agreed with parliament <ul style="list-style-type: none"> whether the implementing organisation has been informed about the MANDATORY FINAL EVALUATION and the procedure BZ follows in this regard; whether it has been agreed to include specific questions in the final evaluation. State the questions here. For all other activities, briefly describe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> whether an evaluation or mid-term review will take place and, if so, when. whether sufficient budget has been set aside and whether there is a timetable to ensure the evaluation procedure starts on time; who is going to organise the evaluation - this can be BZ or the implementing organisation that hires an evaluator; whether it has been agreed to include specific evaluation questions in the final evaluation. 	<p>The final evaluation will, similar to the mid-term review, cover the pertinence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of the Facility. They are currently budgeted at each 50,000 USD, which is deemed insufficient. However, UNDP has indicated that it has additional USD 100,000 available for the two evaluations combined, which can be used if the proposed budgets of external evaluators exceed the budgeted USD 50,000 per evaluation. Thus, UNDP can plan for 100,000 USD per evaluation, which is deemed sufficient.</p> <p>Planning of the two evaluations, both financially and in terms of content (specific questions to be asked), will be undertaken in close consultation with donors. Lessons learned from the RSF in the Lake Chad Basin can inform the setting-up of evaluations for this RSF.</p> <p>The publication of all MEL and knowledge products are produced in a clear timeline and will be published on the Knowledge Management Platform.</p>

6. IMPLEMENTATION AND AGREEMENTS

6.1 Budget

6.1.1 Breakdown of costs

The budget is clear and easy to read. Costs for monitoring, human resources and audits etc. are entered into a separate output, output 6. The budget for output 6 is adaptable in the sense that it will vary according to the total budget UNDP will spend on the activity we will finance. The budget is presented as a multi-year work plan, and is drawn up per year and per output. We can clearly see how high the costs per output per year are. In year 4 of the activity, only

monitoring and evaluation costs will be made (in addition to human resources and audit costs). In all, UNDP has foreseen to spend \$ 335,814,943 on this activity. Output 6 totals \$ 45,721,762.

6.1.2 Financing

The total costs for this activity will amount to \$ 335,814,943.00. GMS will amount to 8% of the subtotal of the costs per output, per year and this is consistent with our agreement in the general arrangement with UNDP.

Total budget (USD)		335,814,943
Implementing organisation's and partners' own contribution		
Firm commitments by other donors (itemise by donor)		
Germany (CR 0,85)	14,000,000	
EU (CR 0,85)	14,000,000	
Denmark	9,000,000	
Japan	15,000,000 [not final]	
UNDP	3,500,000	
Czech Republic (CR 0,85)	382.500 [not final]	
Dutch contribution (CR 0,85)	11,700,000	
Still to be financed		268,232,443
Soft commitments by other donors		
Uncovered balance		281,032,443
Evaluation costs If you are planning to carry out an evaluation on the activity, provide an estimate for these costs.		N/a (included in budget)

6.1.3 Other contributions

Task State what other – non-financial – contributions are relevant to implementation of the activity, such as deployment of volunteers, availability of buildings, materials, etc.	No other (non-financial) contributions will be given by the Netherlands.
--	--

6.1.4 Budgetary risks

Task If there is an uncovered balance, state how this will affect implementation of the activity (e.g. proportional reduction in outputs or omission of regions) and how this will affect the decision whether to fund this activity.	This activity regards an MDTF that is currently being set up. The uncovered balance concerns projects that UNDP plans to execute in the years to come. Together with Germany, Denmark and the EU, the Netherlands would be among the first donors of this fund. Therefore, the balance has not been fully covered. Firstly, UNDP has extensive experience (in the nearby Lake Chad Basin, but also in other countries and continents) with similar situations and similar MDTFs. This experience demonstrates that the organisation is well-equipped to adequately appropriate the available funds to the activity and that a (temporary) shortfall does not jeopardise the execution of the project as a whole.
---	---

Secondly, UNDP indicates that the facility will initially target 6 areas (2 in each country and one border corridor). During this phase of 12 months (from April 2021 to April 2022), processes and systems will be further refined and a general proof of concept delivered. In two subsequent phases, target zones will be gradually increased to a total of 60 communities, subject to available funding. Thus, locations are decided on a rolling basis depending on available funds. The total funds budgeted for 2022 (for six communities), for example, amount to USD 30 mln, whereas the funds for 2024 (30 communities) amount to USD 150 mln. Thus, with current commitments, UNDP already has enough funds to cover the first year.

Should there be limited resources, a programme realignment will be done to adjust budget to the prioritised JAPs. The local, national and regional Steering committees are mandated to conduct ongoing midterm assessment of the programme and effect a course correction. Donors are part of this process.

6.1.5 Statement on the budget presented

The budget presented does/does not satisfy the following requirements:

Budget is arithmetically correct	YES
Overheads are proportional to the outputs to be delivered. Please note: What is included? What is recharged? Are costs entered twice (e.g. as indirect costs and in the administrative cost allowance)?	YES
Are the other amounts/rates in the budget acceptable in relation to the activity?	YES
Is the budget suitable as a management tool (linking of outputs - budget)	YES
Implementation is conditional on budget being amended*	NEE

*** Specify the requirements that the budget must satisfy and the date by which the budget must be amended.**

Task Briefly describe any anomalies that were identified when assessing the budget and any changes made to the budget as a result.	No anomalies were found during the assessment of the budget.
--	--

6.2 Prepayments

6.2.1 Earmarking multi-donor activities

Task Is the Dutch contribution to the programme earmarked (i.e. reserved for a specific purpose)? If so, specify the reasons why. Are other donors' contributions earmarked? If so, explain how this will affect reporting.	The Dutch contribution will be unearmarked. Other donors' contributions are equally unearmarked.
--	--

6.2.2 Prepayment/no prepayment

Task Using the prepayment decision tree , assess whether the payments need to be entered as prepayments and give reasons for this. Give the outcome of this assessment along with a brief explanation in this section. <i>In the case of lump sum funding, assess this against the applicable criteria and give the reasons for your choice.</i>	Lump sum Our funding meets all three lumpsum-criteria and, in addition, we will be contributing with unearmarked funds (making prepayments redundant).
---	---

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

Task	Our contribution will not be paid as a loan, equity investment or guarantee.
-------------	--

Does the Dutch contribution take the form of a grant with a repayment obligation, a loan, an equity investment or a guarantee (either in whole or in part)?

Are there revolving funds? What will happen to any residual funds?

If so, briefly set out the consequences for accounting and how correct processing in the financial records will be ensured.

6.2.4 Accounting for prepayments

Task

Set out the reporting obligations on the basis of which the prepayment can be closed, such as an audit report (if applicable) or a financial statement issued by the organisation itself.

Choose an item.

N/A, our payments will be made as lumpsum payments.

6.2.5 Payment schedule

We will be paying once every 12 months, with the first payment being paid after mutually signing the grant agreement. Paying more often will violate our rules regarding liquidity needs. In addition, we cannot pay for more than 12 months in advance.

Milestone payment date	Milestone payment currency and amount
Size of first payment	€ 3.000.000,00
01-11-2022:	€ 3.000.000,00
01-11-2023:	€ 4.000.000,00
TOTAL	€ 10.000.000,00

6.3 Monitoring

For activities that fall under a framework agreement (UN, IFI) or when a multi-donor arrangement is in place, the activity analysis decision tree and the decision tree for determining the type of audit opinion can be skipped.

6.3.1 Narrative and financial reports

Task

Use the [activity analysis decision tree \(click here for the quick reference guide\)](#) to determine the required reporting information for this activity. Give the outcome and a brief explanation in this section.

Task

Set out any issues requiring special attention in terms of monitoring.

As is the custom with UNDP, we will be asking for yearly financial and narrative reports. The financial reports will show the financial position of the fund UNDP will be pooling the funds of all donors.

There are no issues requiring special attention in terms of monitoring.

Recipients of grants up to EUR 125,000 that fall under the Uniform Grant Framework (USK) must submit activity completion statements (P statements) rather than narrative reports.

In the event of additional criteria: specify what conditions must be set (e.g. greater payment frequency, substantive criteria, etc.). Indicate whether there is another way of gaining insight into the activity's implementation (e.g. participating in the board or the donor committee).

6.3.2 Audit opinions

<p>Task</p> <p>Use the type of audit opinion decision tree (click here for the quick reference guide) to determine whether an audit opinion is required for the activity. Briefly give the reasons in this section, along with the outcome of the decision tree. Will the auditor provide additional reports? Check the risks you set out in the risk section above. It may be desirable to have the audit opinion accompanied by an additional auditor's report on the risks set out above. You should ask your Control Unit for advice.</p> <p>If the organisation itself also makes prepayments you should ask the organisation's auditor to report on effective monitoring that the organisation carries out on prepayments.</p>	<p>We can skip the decision tree determining the audit opinion, following our own rules and guidelines. Also, we will receive a certified financial statement from UNDP.</p>
---	--

6.3.3 Annual plans and other reports

<p>Task</p> <p>State whether any other reports (annual plans, management assertions) are required in addition to the above narrative and financial reports.</p>	<p>We do not ask UNDP for annual plans or other reports.</p>
--	--

6.3.4 Reporting obligations

Set out the reporting requirements in the table below, to ensure they are accurately incorporated in the decision/agreement. Use the [activity analysis decision tree \(click here for the quick reference guide\)](#) to determine the required reporting information for this activity

Type	Any specific requirements*	Period	Submission
Annual plan	<i>N/A</i>		
IATI publication*	<i>N/A</i>		
Narrative report**	<i>Full calendar year</i>	<i>[01-12]</i>	<i>31-03-23, 24, 25</i>
Financial report	<i>Full calendar year</i>	<i>[01-12]</i>	<i>31-03-23, 24, 25</i>
Final narrative report***	<i>Entire activity period</i>	<i>project</i>	<i>30-06-2025</i>
Final financial	<i>Entire activity period</i>	<i>project</i>	<i>30-06-2025</i>
Audit	<i>N/A</i>	<i>[mm-mm]</i>	<i>[dd-mm-yy]</i>
Certified statement	<i>Full calendar year</i>	<i>[01-12]</i>	<i>30-06-23, 24, 25</i>

Mid-term review	N/A	First half of project	May 2023
Evaluation report ****	N/A	project	Oct-Dec 2024
Policy review	N/A		
Others to be included			

* An IATI publication in accordance with the IATI standard, as set out in the BZ publication guidelines.¹ The IATI Standard recommends data to be updated at least once a quarter. The ministry appreciates it if IATI data are regularly kept up to date. Legally, partners are required to update their IATI publication at least once a year, in order to allow for the annual assessment of the progress of the activities.
If applicable: describe any specific requirements or documents that should be added to the IATI publication (e.g. short narrative reports, Theory of Change, program documents, evaluation report, ...), certain results or standard indicators.

** Narrative report: reports on the contributions by third parties (inputs), outputs, outcome, sustainability and the spending of the Dutch contribution in accordance with the latest approved budget. If the partner provides a full IATI publication on the activity, the narrative report can be limited to those elements that cannot be availed in public, or cannot be expressed in the IATI standard. Please indicate whether the narrative report is submitted as a document in IATI or by email.

*** See also the results given in section 6.3.1; if any additional criteria are desirable, insert them here. Please indicate whether the final narrative report is submitted as a document in IATI or by email.

**** Only include evaluation report as a reporting obligation if responsibility for carrying out the evaluation falls to the business partner. In that case, BZ must approve the ToR in advance. Evaluations costs should be part of the activity budget. Please indicate whether the evaluation report is submitted as a document in IATI or by email.

<p><u>Task</u></p> <p>In case a waiver is given for an IATI narrative report for activities worth EUR 250,000 or more (click here for the quick reference guide), explain why. Also describe what has been agreed with the organisation in terms of implementation and what needs to be included in the contribution agreement or grant decision in this regard.</p>	<p>UNDP is publishing IATI data following the Guidelines of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands.</p>
---	---

¹ <https://www.government.nl/documents/publications/2015/12/01/open-data-and-development-cooperation>