Ministry of Foreign Affairs

# Activity: KIG South Kivu Food Security Project (23-0000778)

| | |
|---|---|
| Id | 23-0000778 |
| Date | 30-04-2026 |
| SAP application number | 4000006724 |

Contents

**Key data** ..... **4**

Activity basics 4

Activity details 4

Accounting data 4

**Policy data** ..... **5**

**Beneficiary location** ..... **6**

**Policy Appraisal** ..... **7**

Policy relevance 7

Rationale 7

Contextual analysis 7

Added value 7

Lessons learned 8

Durability 8

Gender 8

Climate change 8

Cooperation, harmonisation and alignment 9

Digitalisation 9

Additional remarks (if applicable) 9

**Results** ..... **10**

Food and Nutrition Security 10

**Monitoring and evaluation** ..... **12**

Monitoring 12

Evaluation 12

**Finance** ..... **13**

Budget breakdown 13

Earmarking 13

Prepayments 13

Available resources 14

Grant with a repayment obligation, loans, equity investment or guarantee 14

Audit opinions 14

Retroactive start date 14

# Key data

### Activity basics

| | |
|---|---|
| Type | Standard |
| Short name | KIG South Kivu Food Security Project |
| Contract party | Ministerie Van Buitenlandse Zaken Belgie Brussel (30015401) |
| ODA | Yes |
| Amount EUR | 10000000 |
| Start date | 01-04-2023 |
| End date | 31-03-2028 |
| Full name | IMPACT: 23-0000778 : South Kivu Food Security Project |
| Summary | IMPACT: 23-0000778 : Cooperation program between Belgium and the DRC 2023 – 2028. Component: Family farming and agricultural and rural entrepreneurship in South Kivu |

### Activity details

| | |
|---|---|
| Date of receipt of proposal | 20-01-2023 |
| Proposal's reference number | Intervention COD22022111 |
| Budget holder | Ambassade Kigali (8221KIG) |
| Limit access | No |
| Related activity | none |

### Accounting data

| | |
|---|---|
| SAP application number | 4000006724 |
| Funds center | KIG RM Food security contribution (1702U01010010) |

# Policy data

| | |
|---|---|
| Cooperation modality | Other program-based aid |
| Technical assistance | Between 10% (inclusive.) and 25% (exclusive) of the activity budget |
| CRS code | 31120 Agricultural development |
| Policy Keywords | |
| Refugees & host communities | No |
| Team Europe Initiative | No |
| Policy Markers | |
| Biodiversity | Significant |
| Climate change: adaptation | Significant |
| Climate change: mitigation | Significant |
| Equality between men & women | Significant |
| Building institutions & capacity | Significant |
| Environmental protection | Significant |
| Food security | Principal |
| Integrated water management | Significant |
| Market development | Significant |
| Private sector development | Significant |
| Explain your choices | 1. Agro-ecological approach will preserve and where possible enhance agricultural biodiversity.<br>2. Farm systems will be improved in such a way that they are more resilient to climate change.<br>3. Slash and burn agriculture will be reduced, thus mitigating climate change.<br>4. Application of gender-sensitive PIP approach and other measure improving gender relations will increase equality between men and women.<br>5. Local capacities will be strengthened and new local collaborative institutions will be put in place.<br>6. Farm households will be enabled to produce enough food and/or generate enough income to be food secure.<br>7. IWM will be practised in selected watershed areas.<br>8. Farm households will be supported in gaining market access.<br>9. Local entrepreneurship will be promoted through incubators and value chain development. |

# Beneficiary location

| Beneficiary location | Region |
|---|---|
| Region | Great Lakes region |
| Division of budget | |
| Congo, Dem. Rep. | 100 % |
| Total | 100 % |

# Policy Appraisal

**Policy relevance**

- What policy objectives, as set out in the annual plan, policy notes etc., will this activity contribute to?
  The project will be part of the Great Lakes Program intervention portfolio and will, as such, contribute to security and stability in the Great Lakes Region, which is the (overarching objective of the Multi-Annual Regional Strategy (MARS) 2023-2026 for the Great Lakes Region. The project will focus on food security and water, one of the three topics that are considered, in the MARS, to have most direct links to stability.

**Rationale**

- What issue/problem will be addressed by the activity
  The activity will address the improvement of economic and social stability by supporting agricultural development, improving food security and strengthening the social fabric.
- Why does the activity help to address the issue/problem?
  For ODA activities over EUR 250.000, please explain the Theory of Change
  The underlying Theory of Change is built on strong evidence provided by previous projects funded under the Great Lakes programme to the effect that increasing access to land water increases livelihood opportunities for local communities, thereby reducing conflicts over these resources and improving relations between groups and communities. At the same time, collaboration around land and water management and the development of local institutions for this purpose foster social cohesion. Finally, developing a broad economic environment will facilitate inclusion of all communities in economic development.

**Contextual analysis**

- Who is/are the target group(s) and why?
  The ultimate target groups are farming households and small entrepreneurs. Among them women, youth and marginal groups are considered to be most vulnerable. Agricultural extension agents are considered to be an intermediate target group as they need to be capacitated so as to be able to inform and advise the primary target group.
- Who are the other main stakeholders?
  Apart from the ultimate and intermediate target groups, main stakeholders are: farmer associations, provincial ministries and their bureaus, research institutes, banks, micro-finance institutes, partner NGOs, UN organisations and bilateral donors.
- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in formulating the proposal?
  The proposed project is part of the Bilateral Cooperation Program between the Kingdom of Belgium and the Democratic Republic of Congo for the entire country, and has, as such, been discussed and agreed between the two governments. The project is formulated in broad terms, which will allow stakeholders at the provincial and local levels to be involved in the operationalisation and programming of the project activities.
- Is the intervention aimed at a specific geographical location, and if so, why?
  The project aims at Walungu and Mwenga Territories in South Kivu province. Despite favourable conditions for food production, nutrition and food security in this province are precarious due to low security as a result of violent conflicts between armed groups. These conflicts disrupt agricultural production and access to food and lead to major population displacements, which contribute to exacerbating demographic pressure in urban centers. High demographic pressure on land in the province also calls for the intensification of agriculture and the creation of non-farming jobs.

**Added value**

- What is the added value of the Dutch government being involved in relation to other donors, the EU, NGOs and local authorities?
  The Dutch financial contribution under a silent partnership with Belgium will double the impact of the project. Belgium welcomes the Dutch contribution. The project will thus leverage the developmental capacities of local authorities, NGOs and others.
- Are the recipients making an own contribution or co-participating in the activity, and if so, to what extent?
  Apart from certain investments in infrastructure by the project, the project will essentially enable farming households and entrepreneurs to invest in their livelihoods and businesses by themselves, using resources that they will be able to access themselves or with the assistance of the project. Farming households and entrepreneurs will participate intensively.

**Lessons learned**

- What lessons learned (from previous or comparable activities, published evaluations, relevant publications) will be addressed by the activity?
  The project intends to make much use of locally available knowledge and past research to inform and formulate its interventions. The project will collaborate with a number of local and international research institutes to take stock of past actions and to identify models and approaches adapted to the local context. At the same time the project envisages using the PIP (Plan Intégré Paysan) self-advancement approach that has been applied successfully by Dutch-funded bilateral projects elsewhere in the region.

**Durability**

- How will the results of the activity be sustained after its end date? What is the exit-strategy?
  The project will take capacitate farming households in an self-advancement mode, which they will continue after the end of the project. Meanwhile, local agricultural services wills be improved and incubators will be key to self-sustained value chains. The provincial government whose capacities will also be strengthen is heavily involved as owner of the process.

**Gender**

- Does the proposal include a gender analysis? If yes, what are the main outcomes? If no, why not?
  The proposal does not include a gender analysis. Enabel's bilateral portfolio is made up of provincial sub-portfolios. The general and cross-cutting approaches and principles (including the gender strategy) are described in a "cap" document to which all the provincial sub-portfolios are attached and these approaches and principles are not repeated. in the project proposal. For gender a theory of change as well as specific indicators have been developed and each pillar and intervention must contribute to the achievement of these results. In addition, agricultural interventions, including that of South Kivu, use the "Women's Empowerment Index in Agriculture (IAFA/WEAI)" indicator as a specific objective indicator. The collection of data for this indicator will require a study and will make it possible to measure the changes obtained in the program. In addition, the project will apply the PIP approach, which has a strong gender orientation. The first phase of this approach includes a thorough participatory gender analysis in which households are led to inventory the ambitions and needs of all members in the households, of men and women alike, as well as the tasks carried out by each of them. Invariably, this brings out the unequal division of tasks between men and women. A farm and household planning process follows in which women and men participate jointly, whereby the aspirations of women are taken into account and efforts and benefits are equally shared between and women. This approach has proven its worth in improving gender relations and a stronger involvement of women in decision making wihin rural households in a number of Dutch-funded projects in Burundi and Uganda. It also contributed to a reduction of gender-based violence. The PIP approach is also applied in the TRIDE project which is also funded under the Great Lakes Programme.
- Does the proposal justify the target group's gender-specific interests and needs (and why)? Please explain.
  In the case of farming households the PIP approach will guarantee that gender specific interests and needs are identified, acknowledged and taken care of. Although not made very explicit in the proposal, Enabel's gender strategy will undoubtedly guide the project to ensure that gender specific interests and needs also receive sufficient attention regarding to access to resources and job creation. The promotion of women's land rights, however, is mentioned as a subject the project will specifically work on.
- Have women and young people been included in the stakeholder analysis? Please explain.
  As indicated above, the proposal has been formulated at the national level in consultation with the central government. It provide a general framework in which the project needs to be operationalised together in consultation with provincial and local stakeholders. These consultations will include women and young people, notably through the PIP approach.

**Climate change**

- Does the proposal include an analysis of the possible effects of climate change on the activity or its results?
  The need for climate change adaptation and mitigation is mentioned in the proposal. Possible effectsof climate change are generally known but will be further scrutinised in the agro-ecological analyses that are foreseen at the beginning of and during the project.
- Does the proposal include any interventions to combat these effects (adaptation/mitigation)?
  The agro-ecological approach with respect to farming will make farming households less sensitive to climate change as well as adapt to it. Moreover, the implementation of sustainable agricultural techniques supported by the project will contribute to the mitigation of climate change given that slash-and-burn agriculture is the leading cause of deforestation in the DRC. The agro-ecological approach will also strengthen agricultural biodiversity.

**Cooperation, harmonisation and alignment**

- Does the activity involve cooperation with Dutch organisations, the EU or other donors (including delegated cooperation), local organisations or other parties? The project foresees coordination and collaboration with several local and international development actors active in the area, including other donors.
- How does the activity contribute to harmonisation and/or multi-donor financing?
  The project will take a strong role, agreed upon by the DRC government, in supporting the coordination of development interventions by different actors in the area and will thus contribute to harmonization. The proposed silent partnership in itself is a form of multi-donor financing.
- What is the degree of (policy and financial) alignment?
  The project is fully aligned with the DRC's National Strategic Development Plan.

**Digitalisation**

- Have proposed digital technologies been developed or chosen in collaboration with end-users?
  The project envisages the digitalisation of the Provincial Agricultural Inspection in order to improve monitoring and evaluation of development interventions in the province. This will be undertaken in collaboration with the Provincial Agricultural Department. The nature, form and content of this platform are not fully understood at the time of writing this document. Access to information and a place for exchanges/consultation adapted to the target audiences are often a missing link. This aspect is therefore well taken into consideration and will be refined during the implementation.
- Does the proposal include an analysis of the local digital ecosystem?
  The idea is to build on what already exists and not to duplicate existing platforms, for instance the Access Agriculture Platform: https://www.accessagriculture.org/fr which brings together a capitalization of initiatives in the field of agroecology, the NGO SOS Faim https://www.sosfaim .be/en/homepage/ which develops communication materials in favour of family farming or the review of Inter Réseau Développement Rural: https://www.inter-reseaux.org/
- Is data security guaranteed?
  It can be expected that data security, where necessary, will be taken into account.
- Are digital solutions locally sustainable/relevant?
  The proposed digital platform is considered highly relevant for ensuring coordination and harmonization among different development actors active in the area.
- Is duplication avoided? See above.

**Additional remarks (if applicable)**

# Results

## Food and Nutrition Security

### C. Sustainable farmland use

**Indicators**
Outcome C.1.1. Number of hectares of SSFPs' farmland under at least 2 conservation practices
Measurements: Baseline: 0

- Individual result: 0
  Comment: Indicateur: [Output] Nombre de producteurs ayant adopté au moins une pratique agroécologique avec l'appui d'Enabel

  Rapport N 2023-2024, Page 14

Reach C.2.1. Number of hectares of SSFPs' farmland directly reached with activities aimed at structural/systemic improvement of agro-ecological sustainability
Measurements: Baseline: 0

- Individual result: 0
  Comment: Indicateur: [Outcome 3.2.1] Surfaces agricoles (ha) exploitées de façon durable avec l'appui d'ENABEL et/ou qui sont aménagées ou restaurées avec l'appui d'Enabel

  Rapport N 2023-2024, Page 11

### B. Productivity and Income

**Indicators**
Outcome B.1.2. Number of SSFPs (disaggregated for male/female) who progressively decrease the yield gap
Measurements: Baseline: 0 Target: 48000

- Individual result: 0
  Comment: Indicateur: [Outcome 3.3.2] % d'exploitations appuyées par ENABEL dont la productivité économique moyenne annuelle de la terre (marge brute/ha), ou du travail (MB/actif ETP), ou du capital (MB/$ investi) a été augmenté de 15%

  Rapport N 2023-2024, Page 12

Outcome B.1.3. Number of female SSFPs who progressively became more empowered
Measurements: Baseline: 0 Target: 22500

- Individual result: 0
  Comment: Indicateur: [Outcome 3.3.3] % des ménages agricoles appuyés par ENABEL pour lesquels l'Index d'Autonomisation des Femmes dans l'Agriculture (IAFA/WEAI) a été augmenté de 10%; 75% cible = 22,500 femmes.

  Rapport N 2023-2024, Page 12

Reach B.2.2. Number of SSFPs directly reached with activities aimed at temporary/partial improvement of their agricultural performance
Measurements: Baseline: 0

- Individual result: 0
  Comment: Indicateur: [Output] Nombre d'entrepreneurs agricoles ayant bénéficié d'un coaching pour renforcer durablement leurs performances économiques

  Rapport N 2023-2024, Page 16

## 2. Improving the performance, sustainability and resilience of smallholder farming systems

*Our 2030 target is to double productivity and income of 8 million small scale food producers and to convert 8 million hectares of farmland to sustainable land use.*

**Indicators**

Description how the activity contributes to the result area Improving the performance, sustainability and resilience of smallholder farming systems

Measurements: The activity will support small scale food producers in applying sustainable farming practices through extension services and investments.

- Individual result: No results have been obtained for the reporting period as the project implementation team was not yet established in Bukavu.  Certain preliminary studies have been launched, but no results were reported in the narrative report.
  Comment:

# F. Land Rights

**Indicators**

F.1. Number of people who enjoy (more) secure tenure rights to land (disaggregated for male/female)

Measurements: Baseline:  0

- Individual result: 0
  Comment: Indicateur: [Impact] Nombre de ménage ayant déclaré avoir des droits de propriété ou des droits garantis sur des terres agricoles / Nombre de ménage total) *100

  Rapport N 2023-2024, non rapporté

# Monitoring and evaluation

**Monitoring**

- Specify what reporting information is required for this activity, based on the activity analysis decision tree (see Help).

Include the following elements:

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

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

| Individual | Responsibilities |
|---|---|
| Policy Officer | - Field visits and meetings<br>- Recording results<br>- Participate in the Annual Donor Meeting |
| Control Unit | - Follow up payments |

Under the silent partnership the embassy will receive annual reports of the project. This will be stipulated in the agreement between the Belgian and Dutch embassies in Kinshasa.
Before the annual Donor meeting, the Lead Donor (Enabel) will submit for information a copy of the annual progress, financial, audit reports and the work plan and budget for the subsequent fiscal year.

**Evaluation**

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

- who will commission the final evaluation and/or mid-term review (for options, see Help);
  Enabel will commission all the evaluations. A budget of EUR 120.000 (Co-shared among the 2 donors) has been reserved. A mid-term and a final evaluation is foreseen.
- whether the procedure and practical arrangements have been agreed on with the implementing organisation (for details, see Help).
  The evaluation will follow in enabel procedures.

# Finance

### Budget breakdown

- Include an overview of the activity budget, including overhead costs.

The total project budget is EUR 20.000.000 of which 50% is the Netherlands embassy contribution and that is EUR 10.000.000 split as follow:

| Budget item | Budgeted amount ( EUR) |
|---|---|
| **A. Total résultats frais opérationnels** | **5.995.680** |
| A01. Les exploitations agricoles familiales améliorent leurs pratiques de gestion technique, economique et environnementale grace à des modèles agroécologiques et une meilleure intégration aux marchés | 1.873.638 |
| A02. Les entrepreneurs de filières agricoles et alimentaires ont accès à des services de qualité qui contribuent à l'emergence et au développement de chaines de valeur porteuses et inclusives | 1.376.200 |
| A03. Leas acteurs (locaux, provinciaux et nationaux) se concertent et mobilisent des moyens pour promouvoir un environment favorable au développement de systèmes alimentaires durables | 2.745.843 |
| **B. Moyens Généraux** | **2.004.320** |
| **C. Frais de personnel international** | **928.571** |
| **D. Coûts indirects (12%)** | **1.071.429** |
| **TOTAL** | **10.000.000** |

- Is the budget arithmetically correct?

Yes, budget formulas have been used and calculations are correct.

- Are the amounts/rates in the budget acceptable?Briefly explain the structure of the budget.

Yes, the budget is made of Direct costs (provided with enough details in the budget. see **MINBUZA-2023.875383**) and other operating costs according to Enabel policies.

- Are overheads proportional to outputs? What is included? What is recharged?

Yes, overhead is 12% which is acceptable, ENABEL recharges 12% to all its projects. See Niger project 4000005959.

- Is implementation conditional on the budget being amended in an inception phase? (Specify the requirements that the budget must satisfy and the date by which the budget must be amended)
  N.A no inception phase.
- Is the budget suitable as a management tool (linking outputs to budget)?
  Yes. The outputs are closely linked to the activities.

### Earmarking

- Is the Dutch contribution to the programme earmarked (i.e. reserved for a specific purpose)? If so, specify the reasons why.
  The project consists of three components. The Dutch embassy will cofinance the component food security in South Kivu province. There is no earmarking of Dutch funding within this component.

### Prepayments

- Based on the prepayment decision tree (see Help), do the payments need to be entered as prepayments and why? In the case of a lump sum, assess this against the applicable criteria and give the reasons for your choice.

Payments under this project will be recorded as lump sum as it meets the applicable criteria:
- It is a a general contribution to a multilateral organization based on a General arrangment on Cooperation between the Minister for Development Cooperation of Kingdom of Belgium and the Dutch Minister for Development Cooperation;
- The activity will be financed by more than one donor;
- The Dutch contribution is not earmarked and;
- The application and the allocation of the spending of funds will be regulated by an effective and reliable governance structure (Enabel which is Belgian Development Agency acting on behalf of the Belgium Government)

Payments will be made up to 12 months on the basis of the annual budget.

| Instalment | Submission date for updated liquidity forecast | Amount |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Upon signing of the arrangement | EUR 1.565.442 |
| 2 | 01-04-2024 | EUR 2.232.776 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 01-04-2025 | EUR 2.792.991 |
| 4 | 01-04-2026 | EUR 2.253.104 |
| 5 | 01-04-2027 | EUR 655.687 |
| 6 | After approval of the final reports (30-06-2028) | EUR 500.000 |

- What is the maximum percentage that can be paid as prepayment, and why?

95% is the maximum payment to be made to Enabel before the submission of the final report. The 5% remainining will be paid upon submission of the final report.

- Which are the reporting obligations on the basis of which prepayments can be closed?

N.A

### Available resources

| | Foreign currency | EUR | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Implementing organisation's own contribution | | 10.000.000 | |
| Firm commitments by other donors (for each donor) | | 0 | |
| Dutch contribution | | 10.000.000 | |
| **Total available resources** | | **20.000.000** | |
| **Budget needed** | | 0 | |
| **Still to be financed** | | 0 | |
| Soft commitments by other donors (for each donor) | | 0 | |
| **Uncovered balance** | | 0 | |

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

No

- If there is an uncovered balance, how will this affect implementation of the activity (e.g. proportional reduction in outputs, omission of regions) and how will this affect the decision whether to fund this activity?

N.A

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

- Does the Dutch contribution take the form of a grant with a repayment obligation, a loan, an equity investment or a guarantee (either in whole or in part)? If yes, briefly set out the consequences for accounting and how correct processing in the financial records will be ensured.

No

- Are there revolving funds? If yes, please explain what will happen to any residual funds, how closure will take place and which agreements should be made.

No

### Audit opinions

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

Yes, for the project budget is more that EUR 5.000.000 an audit report will be conducted by Enabel and the report will be submitted to the embassy.

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

No, as a delegated cooperation audit report, the embassy will accept the reports submitted by Enabel.

### Retroactive start date

The initial plans for a collaboration between DGIS and DGOS started back in 2022. Due to the internal processes at DGOS, KIG was informed later than planned about the final content of the proposal. After KIG was informed, DGOS fast tracked the appraisel of the project and started implementation as of 1 April 2023. The request by DGOS and the implementing organization was for KIG to start its contribution retroactively also at 1 April 2023. This is mainly due to the fact that both contributions are not earmarked and the initial plan was to share all costs 50/50 amongst both donors and it fits better for reporting purposes. Therefore, the contribution by KIG needs to match the start date of the initial contribution by DGOS (1 April 2023).
On HBBZ the following instructions are published for EU delegated cooperation:
*"Standaard wordt in het contract opgenomen dat de startdatum van de activiteit de datum is dat het contract is ondertekend. Het kan opportuun zijn om de startdatum met terugwerkende kracht op een eerdere datum in te laten gaan (bijvoorbeeld omdat dit beter aansluit met rapportages die al worden opgesteld omdat de activiteit aanhaakt op een lopend project). Ook een latere startdatum kan beter uitkomen om een periode beter af te bakenen (een startdatum op 1 januari komt rapportage-technisch vaak*

*beter uit dan een startdatum op 20 december). De EU stemt over het algemeen direct mee in met een latere startdatum. Een retroactieve startdatum moet echter goed worden onderbouwd."*
Source: (https://ssp.buzaservices.nl/catalog/service-detail.html?serviceid=5a40894c-c0c5-4d55-ae94-74f0b79a8f50&searchkeywords=retroactieve)
Although these instruction refer to delegated cooperation with the EU, it matches the situation at hand with DGOS. As all parties agree (KIG, DGOS and ENABEL), KIG decided to sign the arrangement with a retroactive start date of 1 April 2023.