Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Activity: Refugee Rights Programme (23-0001059)

Id	23-0001059
Date	29-07-2026
SAP application number	4000006770

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 8

Added value 9

Lessons learned 9

Durability 10

Gender 10

Climate change 11

Cooperation, harmonisation and alignment 12

Digitalisation 12

Additional remarks (if applicable) 12

Results **14**

Migration 14

Monitoring and evaluation **15**

Monitoring 15

Evaluation 15

Finance **16**

Budget breakdown 16

Earmarking 16

Prepayments 16

Available resources 17

Grant with a repayment obligation, loans, equity investment or guarantee 17

Audit opinions 17

Key data

Activity basics

Type	Standard
Short name	Refugee Rights Programme
Contract party	Kenya National Commission On Human Rights (Knchr) Nairobi (30016743)
Contract party	PKF Kenya LLP (30211783)
ODA	Yes
Amount and Currency	367175735 KES
Amount EUR	2456358.29
Start date	01-08-2023
End date	31-10-2026
Full name	Protection and Promotion of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms for refugees and host communities
Summary	Protection and Promotion of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms for refugees and host communities

Activity details

Date of receipt of proposal	24-03-2023
Proposal’s reference number	
Budget holder	Ambassade Nairobi (8221NAI)
Limit access	No
Related activity	

Accounting data

SAP application number	4000006770
Main funds center	Reception in region delegated (1704U0204)

Policy data

Cooperation modality	Other program-based aid
Technical assistance	Less than 10 % of the activity budget
CRS code	93010 Refugees in donor countries (non-sector allocable)
Policy Keywords	
Policy Markers	
Equality between men & women	Significant
Building institutions & capacity	Principal
Good Governance / participation	Principal
Human rights	Principal
Explain your choices	Human rights: This activity is primarily about promoting and protection of human rights of refugees and host community. It seeks to ensure there is a conducive rights regime (on policy and in practice) on the part of duty bearers in upholding rights and fundamental freedoms of refugees and host communities Building institutions & capacity: Majority of the activities planned aim to enhance the capacity of government authorities and other duty bearers to better understand the rights and duties of refugees as provided in law (Refugees Act, 2021) and other international obligations that Kenya has signed up on. It also seeks to support accountability within institutions (e.g the National Police Service and Judiciary) and better service delivery to refugees and host community. Good governance/participation: By empowering refugees and host communities to know their rights and to seek redress when violations occur, the activity enables good governance and better informed participation.

Beneficiary location

Beneficiary location	Country
Country	Kenya
Location type	
Specific location	

Policy Appraisal

Policy relevance

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

Strenthening Kenya's regional role on stability and human rights agenda: The proposed activity has direct linkages with the strategic objectives 5 & 6 in our Kenya Multi-Annual Country Strategy (MACs) which focus on: Strengthened cooperation on regional stability, multilateralism and climate action - strengthened partnership with Kenya on regional stability, in upholding the multilateral system and in fulfilling its international commitments on human rights and on the hosting of refugees.
Under these objectives in the MACS, an envisioned outcome is on: *Strengthened Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR) in its watchdog role in the area of human rights and in enhancing Kenya's compliance with national, regional and international instruments relating to human rights.*
Supporting reception in the region and burden sharing with Kenya's role in hosting refugees: Situation of forcibly displaced persons in the East and Horn of Africa region is poised to increase incrementally (both internally within states and across borders) - including to Kenya. This is attributed to the increasing fragility in Ethiopia, Somalia, South Sudan and recently in Sudan and Eastern DR Congo; as well as climate-related impacts. As indicated in the BHoS policy nota, NL will seek to "promote safe and humane reception of refugees in the region...by fostering self-reliance with programmes geared towards protection, education and training, mental health and employment." All these policy objectives or directives link very well with the outcome areas for the proposed project activities especially those related to protection, humane reception and mental health.
Linkage to Leave No One Behind (LNOB) Agenda: Additionally, a key strategic ambition in our MACs and Annual Plan is on the Leave No One Behind (LNoB) agenda and the premise that this is crucial for the stability and sustainable economic development of Kenya as discrimination and marginalization of groups not only erode citizens' equality and rights, but may also give rise to radicalization/extremism, conflicts and instability with potential negative impact on regional stability.

Rationale

- What issue/problem will be addressed by the activity

The proposed activity seeks to address a number of fundamental issues within the refugee hosting space in Kenya as relates to policy and practice that severely impact the full enjoyment of rights and fundamental freedoms of refugees and host communities. These issues are:
i) Policy incoherence and application of refugee law: the Refugees Act 2021 has accorded refugees and asylum seekers a number of progressive rights and freedoms including free access to Class M work permits, right to gainful employment, right to receive refugee ID documentation that has equivalent status to the foreign ID card. However, there is a disconnect between policy and practice. On access to work permits and documentation that would unlock the potential of refugees towards socio-economic integration, there are many administrative hurdles that hinder refugees from accessing these crucial documentation. There is also a dissonance in policy orientation between the national government and county authorities. The County Governments in Turkana and Garissa have been much more progressive and faster in adopting initiatives geared towards more socio-economic integration between refugees and host communities e.g KISEDP in Turkana County and GISEDP in Garissa County. At the national level, the progression has been much slower and stuck with the traditional view of an encampment policy.
ii) Securitised asylum approach: that limits freedoms of refugees and exposes refugees and asylum seekers to repeated risks and incidences of arbitrary arrests, detention and limited freedom of movement. Kenya has maintained a security-first approach in its management of refugees and has traditionally adopted a strict encampment policy, requiring refugees and asylum seekers to reside in either of the two camps: Kakuma, Kalobeyei settlement or Dadaab refugee complex.
iii) Limited awareness on rights & duties of refugees and asylum seekers: many of the duty bearers (e.g government officials, police, immigration, judiciary…) and stakeholders that interact with refugees have very limited knowledge on the rights and duties of refugees and asylum seekers as provided for by the Refugees Act, 2021. This often leads to refugees being arbitrary arrested, charged wrongly in court and detained. In other cases, refugees and asylum seekers end up not receiving proper assistance and access to servives from various government departments and non-state actors e.g many private sector players like banks and telco companies (Safaricom/Telecom) don't recognize or know that the refugee ID is an official document that should allow refugees to open bank accounts or open and transact MPESA account.
iv) Limited redress mechanisms and unaccountability of violations: despite concerted efforts over the years to enhance access to justice for refugees, asylum seekers and host communities, there still remains several barriers e.g limited avenues for reporting violations by refugees and host communities, proper documentation and follow up of rights violations, inaction by police to investigate cases of violations or human rights abuses against refugees and also limited trust and awareness on the part of refugees and asylum seekers on existing redress mechanisms available.
Additionally, KNCHR, RCK and other protection-mandated agencies continue to document increasing cases of SGBV, mental health issues (MHPSS) within refugee and hosting communities. There is also the use of traditional mechanisms by refugee & host communities, such as the *maslaha* by Somali refugees in Dadaab in dispute resolution – a practice that puts survivors of

SGBV at risk of being denied proper redress for violations against them. This makes the case for the need for proper rights-based alternative dispute resolution mechanisms (ADR). In addition, there is documented evidence of a subtle culture of unaccountability by the state and other duty bearers even in instances where refugees have been accorded legal reprieves by the courts e.g injuctions against detention, deportation or camp closure.

- Why does the activity help to address the issue/problem?

  For ODA activities over EUR 250.000, please explain the Theory of Change

Promotion of People-centered justice: The premise of this project is about enabling refugees, asylum seekers and host communities to be at the center and actively engaged as rights holders; a second focus is on removing any barriers that may be hindering them from accessing justice as well as contributing to the transformation of justice institutions so that they can benefit. This vision is what is the driving force for people-centered justice approach. By addressing the above explained problem issues within the refugee hosting space, this project will aim to promote a people-centered justice approach. An objective which is also well enshrined in our EKN MACS and Annual Plan.

Reinforcement of accountability and Kenya's regional role in stability and solutions to hosting refugees: A good share of the proposed project activities by KNCHR and RCK are geared towards entrenching a culture of accountability by various duty bearers that interact and provide services to refugees and asylum seekers as well as host communities. The rationale is that by contributing to a strengthened justice ecosystem and relevant institutions such as them Ministry of Immigration, Judiciary, Police/Security institutions; accountability of rightsm and fundamental freedoms for refugees and asylum seekers would be reinforced. Additionally, a strengthened justice and asylum eco-system for refugees and asylum seekers will support Netherlands ambitions to support Kenya's growing regional role as a best practice country as hosting nation and also linked to Kenya's role in bolstering solutions to refugees displaced within the region.

Support to new progressive policy dispensation - adopted Refugees Act 2021 and SHIRIKA Plan/Marshal Plan - alignment with strong Constitution of Kenya's focus on Bill of Rights and institutional reforms. The current policy dispension in Kenya in regards to hosting refugees affords a conducive environment to undertake such a project with a focus on access to justice and enhancing rights of refugees and asylum seekers. The new Refugees Act, 2021 and proposed Marshal Plan/SHIRIKA plan are commended for their respective progressiveness in relation to a number of rights-linked issues e.g expanding social economic rights for refugees; affording them opportunities to contribute to local economy; freedom of movement through the shift from strict encampment policy to integrated settlements or urban centers and obligation to the GoK to provide requisite identification documents to refugees and asylum seekers to enable them access different services and benefits - equal to foreigners. However, there are still concerns that some provisions within the Refugee Act are detrimental to refugee rights and freedoms. Examples include: expansion of definition of transit centers to include prisons, immigration detention centers and police stations which have potential to be abused by security agencies as well as instituting a *de jure* practice of detaining asylum seekers upon their arrival in the country to seek asylum; inclusion of the 'morality clause' (Section 19(2))- which provides powers to the GoK/Cabinet Secretary of Ministry of Immigration with powers to revoke refugee status and expel any refugees who goes against public morality. This is provision is very worrying especially in light of refugees/asylum seekers who are in the country and are LGBTIQ+ persons, as this clause may be interpreted that LBTIQ+ refugees are going against public morality code in Kenya as enshrined in our Penal Code.

Theory of Change (ToC):

IF the capacities of duty bearers & right holders is enhanced on rights and fundamental freedoms of refugees, asylum seekers and host communities; and **IF** legal aid assistance and policy advocacy is sustained to secure a conducive legal and policy asylum environment; and **IF** refugees and host communities are empowered to claim their rights, report on violations and access redress to mechanisms is maintained and **IF** MHPSS services are provided to refugees, host communities as well as duty bearers; **THEN** a culture of accountability(on the part of duty bearers), people-driven and centered justice will be promoted; and the foundation for equitable access to justice between refugees, asylum seekers and host communities will be secured; **LEADING TO** enhanced protection, promotion and realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for refugees, asylum seekers and host communities in Kenya. In addition, realization of rights and fundamental freedoms by refugees, asylum seekers and host communities will facilitate them towards durable solutions pathways and mental health and psychosocial well being.

Contextual analysis

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

The main target group for this activity are: refugees, asylum seekers and host communities both in the camp settings and urban areas. They are main beneficiaries of the project activities and envisaged outcome of an improved human rights regime and entrenched culture of accountability on the part of duty bearers. The other secondary target group include: duty bearers such as the national government authorities e.g Ministry of Immigration and thematic departments (Department of Refugee Service, Permits Department, National Registration Bureau); Judicial officers and other members of the Court User Committees and Media practitioners who will benefit from various targeted capacity building and training activities in the project.

- Who are the other main stakeholders?

The main stakeholders of this activity are categorised into: government/state actors (national and county); judicial and non-state actors.

-The government/state-related actors include: Ministry of Interior related departments - Department of Refugee Service (DRS); Permits Department; National Registration Bureau (NRB); other line ministries such as Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Water.
-Security officials including the National Police Service officials (regular and administrative police) and National Counter Terrorism officials. These are usually the first point of contact when asylum seekers/refugees arrive into the country or when they are in conflict with the law. Additionally, since refugee management in Kenya is admnistered through a security lens, it is important that these officials are appraised and trained on provisions of the Refugees Act, 2021 and rights and duties of refugees and asylum seekers.
-Judicial actors such as the Court User Committee (CuC) members - judges, magistrates, immigration officials, police officers, prison and probation officers, court clerks. These are also critical stakeholders as they interact with refugees and asylum seekers as relates to access to justice and enjoyment of different rights and freedoms.
- Members of Parliament specifically those from the Departmental Committee on Administration of National Security (DCANS) and Departmental Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs (DCJLA). These are critical stakeholders as they are involved in legislation and development of regulatory policies related to refugees. In the implementation period of this activity, KNCHR and RCK will be actively engaging in policy advocacy with Members of Parliament as relates to the adoption of the Regulations to the Refugees Act, 2021.
- Media (both mainstream and non-traditional media) partners are also critical stakeholders as they play the watchdog role and help sensitize the general public about the plight of refugees and asylum seekers. On the watchdog role, the media can help to bring accountability on the part of duty bearers on any violations of human rights against refugees and asylum seekers.

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

Both KNCHR and RCK have had continued and regular contact with the various stakeholders outlined above in their respective mandates. The input and formulation of this proposal is based on gaps and lessons learned from the continued engagements and programming within the refugee sector that both of these partners have encountered as relates to promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms of refugees and host communities in Kenya.

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

The intervention will be carried out in both the refugee hosting areas in Turkana (Kakuma, Kalobeyei) and Garissa |(Dadaab) counties as well as in other refugee urban hosting locations: Nairobi, Nakuru, Mombasa, Garissa, Kitale and Eldoret. The choice of these locations is informed by i) presence of refugees and hosting communities ii) new Government of Kenya policy shift towards an integrated settlement approach iii) confirment of municipality status to Kakuma and Dadaab

Added value

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

The Netherlands has been working and investing on Access to Justice in Kenya for many years through our Rule of Law programme and of which KNCHR has been a key partner. This existing partnership with KNCHR is an added value in that the planned activities in this project will leverage on the already existing investments within the access to justice sector and networks with various duty bearers - only that now the focus will be more on refugees and host communities.
The Netherlands has played an important convening and coordination role within the refugee space. Since 2021 - 2022, the Netherlands was part of the Chairship of the Kenya Refugee Donor Group (RDG) with our lead chairship role being in 2022. The Netherlands is currently the Chair of the Development Partners Group (DPG) - the highest coordination platform between development partners and the GoK executive. These two roles have provided the Netherlands Embassy with priviledged access and policy dialogue entry points with various GoK authorities as relates to matters of refugee hosting. In the current role as Chair of the DPG, the Netherlands is able to position critical advocacy issues of concern as agenda points for discussion within the DPG.
The Netherlands is also investing in the PROSPECTS partnership which is a complementary programme that seeks to enhance socio-economic integration between refugees and host communities in Kenya. This proposed activity

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

None

Lessons learned

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

Below are a couple of lessons learned from previous project activity funded by the Peace and Human Rights Division (PHRD) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, UNHCR's Evaluation Service Bureau and emerging learning from implementation of NL MFA's PROSPECTS Partnership:

- **Securing political will and commitment from national and county level authorities is critical for the success of policy advocacy on refugee-related rights:** The successful lobby for adoption of the fairly progressive Refugees Act, 2021 was enabled through consistent and targeted advocacy at key decision makers within national level (Ministry of Interior, Office of the President, Office of Attorney General and key Members of Parliament within the Departmental

Committee on Administration of National Seceurity). The lobbying entailed periodic trainings, informal engagements and sensitizations to these key actors to secure their political will to support the review and adoption of the Refugees Act. For KNCHR and RCK, they would be seeking to employ similar advocacy strategy in this project activity.

- **Policy advocacy and litigation on refugee-related issues requires a careful balance, patience and a problem-driven iterative approach (PDIA):** Different evaluations and reports acknowledge that in most asylum-hosting contexts like Kenya, refugee hosting is often politicised and managed through a security-first approach. In this regard, any project interventions, especially those focused on policy advocacy around refugee rights and litigation for their rights, must employ a lot of pragmatism and adaptive management. The reason being that careful balance must be had on when and how to institute public litigation as they may either work towards re-inforcing conducive rights environment or closing up space for policy dialogue with authorities. The recommendation from most evaluations is to first explore opportunities for consultative policy dialogue with the authorities before resorting to litigate on issues. This is a key recommendation that KNCHR and RCK will embrace for this project activity especially given the current, positive and progressive policy dialogue environment with the current regime and the GoK's policy shift commitment towards an integrated settlement approach.
- **Putting displacement-affected communities at the center, enhances their agency and prospects for sustainability of project interventions:** This is a critical lessons learned especially for a project activity like this with the focus on people-centered justice. This is also a key principle within durable solutions programming for displacement-affected people. The dividends are clear that by placing refugees and host communities at the center of project implementation, this enhances their own agency and voice as well as ownership of the project results and impact. Given the people-centered nature of this project, there will be intentionality by the project partners to meaningfully engage the refugees and host communities in all aspects of the project.

Durability

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

This project is premised on strong local ownership and capacity building of the agency of refugees and host communities to advocate for their rights and fundamental freedoms from duty bearers. A multi-pronged approach will be employed to ensure that the project outcome areas and impact will continue to be realized post the funding period of the project. The approaches supporting sustainability of the project include:

- Targeted institutional capacity building of duty bearers within the access to justice sector. The targeted institutional capacity building of duty bearers within national, county authorities, police/security actors and judicial actors will enable an entrenched culture of accountability in various institutions and authorities that deal with refugee issues.
- Adoption of a Training of Trainers (ToT) model in the capacity building activities. The training on human rights based approach and refugee law will be delivered through a ToT model, targeting duty bearers and representatives from Refugee-Led Organisations (RLOs). The trained ToT participants will have a multiplier effect as the knowledge will be retained within the various duty bearer institutions and RLOs. This knowledge and training acquired will also be further transfered and disseminated to other respective actors and refugee and host communities respectively.
- Use of paralegal scheme which includes refugee paralegals and scheme of probono advocates to deliver legal aid services. The trained refugee paralegals and probo advocate schemes will continue to offer legal aid services within the refugee community after the lapse of the project.
- Sustained engagement by project partners in their respective agency mandates. Both KNCHR and RCK have strong and tested operational capacities in their specific areas of influence within the access to justice sector. KNCHR, through their quasi-judicial mandate will continue to promote and protect the rights of refugees through the various instruments and powers at their disposal. In addition, KNCHR, by statutory edict, has representation on the Board of various agencies including the Refugee Status Appeals Committee, the Independent Policing Oversight Authority (IPOA), the National Council on Administrative Justice (NCAJ), Court User Committees (CuCs) in all the project locations and the Witness Protection Agency. RCK with their legal and advocacy mandate will also continue to champion the rights of refugees, asylum seekers and host communities. RCK is also the Secretary of the DRS-led Taskforce on development of Regulations to the Act.

Gender

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

No.

However, gender considerations remains a critical aspect of the project activities and design. This is incorporated into the proposal as below:

- Adoption of a gender and inclusion mainstreaming lens in all the project's activities. The project has endavored to ensure that women and men as well as special interest groups' concerns and needs are addressed and that their space for active participation in the entire project implementation is secured. For example, in undertaking trainings, the partners will ensure careful selection of participants with equal representation between men and women, consideration of the

needs of special interest groups like persons with disabilities and also special consideration in the selection of venues and timings of trainings or sensitization sessions

- As part of the gender and inclusion mainstreaming, the project design has been intentional in carving out specific interventions e.g GBV protection activities such as engagement with GBV recovery centers in Garissa and Turkana and support of gender desks at police stations. All of these are aimed at the promotion and protection of the rights of women and other special interest groups including persons with disabilities and LGBTIQ+ persons
- Disaggregation of project data. Data collected in the course of the project will be disaggregated along the categories of female, male, youth, persons with disabilities and sexual minorities. This will enable a gendered reporting and also support monitoring of specific gender-related indicators and outcomes within the project's results framework
- Designation of gender focal points. Both KNCHR and RCK have designated specific gender focal points who will champion gender and inclusion mainstreaming actions during the implementation period of the project.
- Periodic staff training on gender and inclusion mainstreaming. KNCHR has a developed Gender and Diversity Mainstreaming Policy and Action Plan for use internally and externally with its partners. During the project's implementation period, staff from both KNCHR and RCK will be trained periodically on the Policy and broader gender and inclusion mainstreaming.
- Does the proposal justify the target group's gender-specific interests and needs (and why)? Please explain.

Yes. Majority of the refugee population group hosted in Kenya comprises of women, youths and children. According to UNHCR Kenya (2023), 75% of the over 600,000 refugee and asylum seekers caseload hosted in Kenya comprises of women and children. Additionally, a World Bank survey (2021) estimated that nearly half the urban and camp-based refugee populations are youths between the ages of 15 and 35 years old, with urban refugees being younger than host communities. UNHCR Kenya also documents that there some estimated 800 LGBTIQ+ refugees living in the camp-settings and in urban areas.

All the above special interest groups face different and varying protection risks and gender-related violations that warrant the targeted gender and inclusivity mainstreaming. For example, there have been numerous operational reports by partners that have documented incidences of GBV, intimate partner violence (IPV) against refugee women in the camp and urban settings and application of cultural practices such as *maslaha* by Somali refugees to settle cases of rape or sexual violation; that go against a human-rights based approach. Recently, there has been increased protection risks, homophobic comments and threats against LGBTIQ+ refugees from members of host communities following the decision by the Supreme Court of Kenya to allow registration of NGO rights groups working on LGBTIQ+ issues. Additionally, the proposed Family Protection Bill also poses protection risks against LGBTIQ+ refugees as it contains clauses that could result in the refoulement of LGBTIQ+ refugees based on their sexual orientation and violation of public morality in Kenya.

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

Yes. As explained above, majority of the refugee caseload is women and youths. In the proposal, the partners have included these two groups as primary target beneficiaries of the project but also as important stakeholders to engage with from a people-centered justice champions.

Climate change

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

Yes to a limited extent. The proposal identifies climate-change related impacts as one of the contextual risk factors that may have an impact on the project. The proposal identifies that climate change impacts being experienced in Somalia, Ethiopia, South Sudan and the wider Horn of Africa region amy lead to increased influx of refugees and asylum seekers to Kenya. This increased numbers may continue to put pressure on the already limited humanitarian assistance and resources available within hosting areas in Turkana and Garissa counties. This may in turn lead to increase in tensions or conflicts over water or pasture resources between refugees and host communities. In addition, increased numbers of arrivals within the camp settings may lead to increased protection risks such as GBV.

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

Not directly. Primarily because the project is being implemented in Kenya only - yet majority of the refugees, for example from Somalia and South Sudan are displaced due to climate-related impacts and compounded by insecurity situations in their respective countries.

However, some of the project activities such as sustained policy dialogue with GoK authorities on ensuring a conducive asylum environment will promote continued hosting of refugees and asylum seekers in Kenya within the framework of Kenya's obligations under the 1969 OAU Convention (Article 1(2) which covers reception and hosting of refugees affected by "...events seriously disturbing public order in either part or whole of his country of origin or nationality..." This clause is what many have argued allows many African countries including Kenya to extend asylum to "climate-impacted refugees."

In addition, project activities related to policy advocacy on registration of new arrivals and awareness creation around GBV and MHPSS can also be considered as indirect activities that provide support to refugees and asylum seekers who have been impacted by various forms of climate-related shocks in their respective countries of origin.

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?

No

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

N/A

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

N/A

Digitalisation

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

No

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

NO

- Is data security guaranteed?

N/A

- Are digital solutions locally sustainable/relevant?

N/A

- Is duplication avoided?

N/A

Additional remarks (if applicable)

Results

Migration

1.2. Human rights based legal frameworks and policies

Governmental actors have the capacity to adopt and implement human rights based legal frameworks and policies on irregular migration and legal identity.

Indicators

1.2.a. Number of government officials and stakeholders provided with capacity building services (e.g., training, mentorship, and technical and/or resource support) for migrant protection incl. legal identity

Measurements: Baseline: 0 Target: 20000

- Individual result: 14184
  Comment:
- Individual result: 8880
  Comment:

Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring

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

The reporting methods will include: Annual Plans, Annual Narrative and Financial Reports, Mid and Endline Evaluation and Annual Audits.
In the reporting timetable annual audits are not an obligation to the implementing partner (KNCHR) as they are a semi-governmental organisation, hence EKN will commission an external auditor for this to audit both KNCHR and RCK.
KNCHR as part of their MoU with RCK will agree for RCK to undertake and submit Annual Audits to KNCHR.
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.
Below is the reporting table with timelines:

Report Type	Period	Submission Date
Annual Plan	01 August 2023 to 31 July 2024	Included in proposal
	01 August 2024 to 31 July 2025	01 May 2024
	01 August 2025 to 31 July 2026	01 May 2025
Annual Narrative and financial reports	01 August 2023 to 31 July 2024	31 October 2024
	01 August 2024 to 31 July 2025	31 October 2025
	01 August 2025 to 31 July 2026	31 October 2026
Narrative IATI	Quarterly	To be published in IATI, no later than two months after end of each quarter
Final Narrative and Financial reports	01 August 2023 to 31 July 2026	31 October 2026
End Project Review	01 August 2024 to 31 July 2026	01 December 2026

Evaluation

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

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

During the light ORIA discussions, KNCHR clarified that a Mid-Term Review will be undertaken but it will be an internal light process amongst the partners where KNCHR and RCK will organise a deep dive workshop to jointly reflect and review project implementation progress and emerging learning.
An Endline evaluation/review will be undertaken after the 3 years of implementation. The costs for these borne by the Embassy as this will be undertaken by an external consultant.

Finance

Budget breakdown

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

Total Overall Budget for 3 Years: **364.788.235**

Outcome 1	68.585.000
Outcome 2	54.255.000
Outcome 3	70.310.000
Outcome 4	45.081.500
MEL, Project Monitoring	20.152.000
Overhead (contribution to admin costs)	35.000.000
Project staff & Personnel costs	57.859.735
Assets (Laptops/Motor vehicle)	8.545.000
Total before audit = Contract value	**359.788.235**
External audit (commissioned by Embassy)	5.000.000
Total Project Budget	**364.788.235**

- Is the budget arithmetically correct?

Yes

- Are the amounts/rates in the budget acceptable?

Yes

- Briefly explain the structure of the budget.

The budget is structured around outcome areas. Each budget line is well explained factoring in the different locations and outputs expected. A high percentage of the budget is geared towards direct projects costs and outputs

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

Yes, what is included in the OH's is KNCHR programme admin costs / costs of managing RCK; salaries of support staff of RCK

- 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)

No

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

Yes, as it follows the systematic flow of Impact, outcome, output, key activities

Earmarking

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

No

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.

The payments will be registered as prepayments because based on the decision tree, the contribution will be made to a semi-public institution (KNCHR) which does not fulfil the criteria for LUMP sum payments

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

95% because KNCHR is a trusted partner and the risks identified on average are meduim. Given that KNCHR is lead and would need more funding to enable them implement.

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

Submission and approval of Annual narrative, Financial and audit reports (RCK)

Available resources

	Foreign currency	EUR
Implementing organisation's own contribution	0	0
Firm commitments by other donors (for each donor)	0	0
Dutch contribution	364.788.235	2.440.433.29
Total available resources	364.788.235	2.440.433.29
Budget needed	364.788.235	2.440.433.29
Still to be financed	0	0
Soft commitments by other donors (for each donor)	0	0
Uncovered balance	0	0

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

N/A

- 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. The Embassy will commission an external auditor to audit the entire project (KNCHR and RCK) on an annual basis, given that KNCHR is a quasi-government entity and that the project is implemented through a joint partnership between KNCHR and RCK an external audit would be recommended.

- 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)?

Yes. An Audit report and Management Letter would be required. Owing to reasons outlined above.