Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Activity: KAM AGRIP (23-0002199)

Id	23-0002199
Date	10-04-2026
SAP application number	4000007075

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 8

Lessons learned 9

Durability 9

Gender 9

Climate change 10

Cooperation, harmonisation and alignment 10

Digitalisation 10

Additional remarks (if applicable) 11

Results **12**

Food and Nutrition Security 12

Monitoring and evaluation **14**

Monitoring 14

Evaluation 14

Finance **15**

Budget breakdown 15

Earmarking 15

Prepayments 15

Available resources 15

Grant with a repayment obligation, loans, equity investment or guarantee 16

Audit opinions 16

Key data

Activity basics

Type	Standard
Short name	KAM AGRIP
Contract party	Stichting Cordaid (30016397)
ODA	Yes
Amount EUR	27839341
Start date	01-11-2023
End date	31-10-2028
Full name	IMPACT No. : 23-0002199 : AGRIP
Summary	IMPACT No. : 23-0002199 : AGRICULTURAL GOVERNANCE RESULTS IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (A-GRIP)

Activity details

Date of receipt of proposal	29-09-2023
Proposal's reference number	MINBUZA-2023.1325300 | 1325309 | 1389984
Budget holder	Ambassade Kampala (8221KAM)
Limit access	No
Related activity	FS projects: BRIGHT, CG, ISDAP, Hortimap

Accounting data

SAP application number	4000007075
Funds center	KAM UG Food security grants (1702U01010029)

Policy data

Cooperation modality	Other program-based aid
Technical assistance	Less than 10 % of the activity budget
CRS code	31120 Agricultural development
Policy Keywords	
Refugees & host communities	No
Policy Markers	
Climate change: adaptation	Significant
Equality between men & women	Significant
Food security	Principal
Explain your choices	The project will finance local governments based on achieved results; deliver of services in the field of land tenure rights and agricultural services. The project will do that in collaboration with the main food security projects that work with the Local Governments. Food security, principal: the main outcome areas of the project are increased land tenure security and sustainable agricultural production by smallholder farmers. Equality between men and women: gender and broader equality concerns (rich/poor, close/far away from admin center, etc.) will be further analyzed in the inception phase (gender and social inclusion, and a political economy analysis). The results will be translated in the Project Implementation Manual (PIM) and in inclusion indicators and other relevant RBF tools. Climate, significant: the RBF has specific outcomes related to watershed management and sustainable land use, related to adaptation to climate change.

Beneficiary location

Beneficiary location	Country
Country	Uganda
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

The RBF project contributes to reaching the results as specified in the results framework of IGG, in particular:

1. Promoting inclusive anVd sustainable growth in the agricultural sector for SHF.
2. Realizing ecologically sustainable land use.
3. Strengthening the environment for food security in the areas of knowledge, land rights and policy.

One of the strategic focuses in the Multi Annual Country Strategy (MASC) of EKN in Uganda is the development of smallholder agriculture and sustainable land use. Central in the strategy is the sustainable increase in income and production of SHF and their increased resilience to climate risks and market shocks. The MACS emphasizes the role of government to attain sustainable development and refers to ways of supporting them by for example results-based financing. Moreover, the MACS identifies land tenure security as crucial to stimulating agricultural development.

The project fits well in the MACS and the project strengthens the role of LG in the four major EKN funded food security projects and thereby strengthens the coherence and synergies between the different interventions.

The project objectives fit well with the Uganda's National Development Plan III, the agro-industralisation program (AIP) and the National Food Systems Strategy.

The NDP III (National development Plan III) of Uganda, has as goal: “To increase HH income and improve quality of life of Ugandans”. The role of LG is crucial to increase production and the deliver extension and input related services.

The agricultural strategy, spearheaded by MAAIF (Ministry of Agriculture) is called Agro-Industrialization Program (AIP). AIP is aligned with agenda 2030 (SDGs 2 and 9), which has as aspiration to end hunger, achieve food security and promote sustainable agriculture. The **AIP recognises the weak services** (such as extension, research and input supply) as factor that is challenging agricultural development. Climate vulnerability and environmental degradation are mentioned as factors that contribute to the vulnerability of farmers. The key objectives of the AIP are increasing production, post-harvest handling and storage and access to markets. The project fits well with the identified weaknesses, risks and contributes to the key objectives by supporting the service delivery of LG, the regulation and inspection of input supply, and the sustainable protection of watersheds as a crucial way to reduce vulnerability to climate risks and environmental degradation.

Also the National Food Systems Strategy, mentions as key factors that needs to be addressed: resilience to climate change, sustainable land use, input supply and smallholders development. All aspects that are supported via RBF by the project.

Rationale

- What issue/problem will be addressed by the activity?
  - Land tenure insecurity and poor agricultural services by the government.
- Why does the activity help to address the issue/problem?
  - The local government (LG) is responsible for issuing land tenure certificates (CCO) and provide agricultural services. The LG is however underfunded and lacks capacity. The project will build the capacity and provide financing for providing the services. In collaboration with the other EKN funded activities the capacities of the local government will be strengthened, with the results-based financing modality those LG will be incentivized to implement.
- For ODA activities over EUR 250.000, please explain the Theory of Change
  - The overall objective is *Strengthened food security and resilient farming systems through increased accessibility, availability and quality of land tenure security and agriculture and natural resources management services.*
  - The ToC that leads to this objective is that:
    - by building the capacity of LG to perform its mandate to deliver land tenure, agricultural and natural resource management services (directly and by the partner EKN projects)
    - and by contracting results-based service delivery
    - by verifying results independently
    - and by rewarding achieved results financially:
  - Local Governments will be strengthened and deliver better services
    - So that households will have access to formal land certificates (CCO) that will protect them from land grabbing.
    - And that SHF have access to improved services for agriculture and natural resource management.
  - And those (land tenure security and improved services) will sustainably impact the SHF farming systems, food security and sustainable land use.

Contextual analysis

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

The final target group of the project are smallholder farmers (SHF) in five regions and 16 districts in Uganda. The direct target group are the 16 local governments that are providing services to the SHF. The project will strengthen the capacities of the relevant local government organizations and provide finance to perform their mandates and provide required services. The payments will be on basis of the services provided.
The project will be operational in 5 Regions: Kigezi, Rwenzori, Mbale, Lango and Busoga. The final choice of districts will be made in the inception phase, in close collaboration with the other EKN-funded projects.

- Who are the other main stakeholders?

The main stakeholders are:
District and sub-county: those departments involved in agriculture (DPM), natural resource and land (ENR). Also, the political (LC V) and administrative head (CAO) of the district and the district council are important stakeholders. The sub-counties, lower-level government, are responsible for certain aspects of land registration and agricultural extension.
The district is responsible for, amongst others, extenson services, certification of inputs and the issuing of CCO's. The sub-counties do most of the related work, through extension workers and Areal Land Committees.
The districts and sub-counties will be represented in a Regional Steering committee (RSC) that will be set-up in each region. Also the EKN funded project, and ZOA and GLTN in their capacity as Capacity Development partners for CCO's will be represented in tis committee. The RSC willoversee the implementation and provide general orientation. The exact mandate and role will be discussed and decided upon in the inception period.
National government: Ministry of Lands, the Ministry of Local Government and Ministry of Agriculture in their role as policy holders and regulators.
Community stakeholders: CBO's will play an important role in the verification of results achieved by the LG.
Partner projects and organizations: the four EKN funded projects (Bright, Common Ground, Include and Hortimap) will build capacity of LG and use their services to reach their objectives and beyond (outscaling). The partner organizations ZOA and GLTN, specialized in land tenure rights (CCO), will develop the capacities of districts and sub-counties on CCOs in coordination with the master trainers presently trained by GIZ.

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

The stakeholders have been actively involved.
In an earlier stage of the development of the project Cordaid had extensive discussions with the EKN funded projects on how the RBF would strengthen their activities. These projects are the basic partners for the components 2 and 3. This collaboration intensified over the last year. The development and elaboration of concrete indicators will be joint efforts. The projects will have a role in the verification.
The project intensively cooperated with ZOA, GLTN (Land @ Scale) and GIZ to develop the CCO component. For the capacity development of the districts, GIZ with the ministry of land (MLHUD) are training master trainers who will play an important role for the capacity development of the districts. The capacity development of the districts (and sub-counties) will be done by OA and GLTN, experienced organizations in this topic in Uganda. The MLHUD, responsible for land, is enthusiatic and fully on board.
At the start of the development process, EKN and Cordaid had a joint meeting with a number of districts to discuss on their challenges and opportunities and whether the modalities of RBF would fit. The districts (represented by the the LCV (political leader), Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) and District Production Officer (DPM) were very enthusiastic and saw the potential to strengthen their performance. Subsequently, Cordaid visited a larger number of districts during several scoping missions.

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

The project is aimed at the geographical regions where the other EKN funded food security projects are working, as the results-based financing builds on the activities of the projects. The relationship with the LG will change from input financing (presently done by projects to finance the involvement of LG in their activities) to financing of results. This will also facilitate outscaling of project activities beyond project geographic areas (mostly limited to a number of sub-counties and so not covering the full districts).

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 government is one of the major donors in the food security sector. The change in strategy from market-led to household-inspired development is creating broad interest with both donors, NGOs, and local authorities. The use of RBF to scale-up the issuing of land tenure certificates (CCOs) is followed with interest and attracted serious interest of other donors like GIZ (funding the master training) and WB.

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

The RBF finances results. The calculations on the prices for the different results will be based on actual costs that now impede implementation of activities by the LG. So, costs considered are mainly related to transport and field work, salaries are paid by the government.

Lessons learned

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

Land grabbing and other land related conflicts are on the rise. An increasing population and drive for large scale developments in agriculture, are threat for land tenure security. This has been acknowledged by the government and a cheaper form of land certificates have been developed: the Certificate of Customary Ownership (CCO). The procedures are developed and the mandate for implementation is at local government level, implementation started in 2011. The implementation is however limited to districts with concrete support by a donor or international organization like GIZ, ZOA or GLTN (L@Scale), and the numbers remain very low, due to the project approaches followed (a few thousands maximal in a district, and a project operates in 1 or 2 districts only). The Ministry of land reported in its report to parliament over 2021/22 only 8,245 CCOs issued in 9 districts. If we count with 4 million farmer households and an average of 2 plots, this 8,000 CCOs can be seen as a drop in the ocean.
In order to achieve impact, Cordaid and EKN has been reflecting on alternative approaches based on the mandate of the LG. This has led to the present proposed RBF modality in collaboration with the main actors in the land sector: MLHUD, the districts, GIZ, ZOA and GLTN.
Local governments are depending of projects to fulfil their principal role to provide services in the land and agricultural sectors. The FS-projects therefore often finance operational costs. This makes the LG very dependent on the projects, reduces the sustainability of results and limits the LG to expand the results of the projects. To RBF modality will allow LG to play its role (extension, certification of seed producers, developing and enforcing by-laws etc.) and to out scale the results of the projects.

Durability

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

The activity will be signed for a 5-year period. A longer duration to work on RBF of LG is however foreseen. Five years is an adequate period to develop and implement the modality, achieve significant and appealing results, start discussions with government to adopt a RBF modality to finance LG (as being done in the health sector in several countries) and to raise awareness of farmers and community-based organizations on the roles LG play and the services they are entitled to.
Regarding the CCOs; the RBF will lead to capacity at LG-level to implement their mandate. It will enhance the demand for CCOs and a push-factor by farmers and communities will "help" LG to perform. The RBF modality will enhance the availability of the service and lower the costs for CCOs. In the proposal it is indicated that prices will go down from 40 to 20 dollar per CCO. Over the 5-year period and in collaboration with other organizations, the project will continue to monitor the real costs and this may lead to further decreases. It is expected that the cost price will become affordable for SHF and that a self-financed modality may become feasible.
The results of the partner projects will become more sustainable as the LG will be able to absorb the activities and expand the results beyond the project geographical areas. Thereby, it strengthens the interest in, and the position of SHF. It helps create broader empowerment of SHF and their organizations.
The earlier mentioned awareness of farmers and communities of the services to be provided by LG, will create a demand that LG will have to consider.
The RBF modality may attract interest from other development partners as it provides a tool to work with government with reduced fiduciary and political risks; payment is only made for work done (results).

Gender

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

The proposal presents a gender and more broad inclusion analysis. During the inception phase a more in-depth analysis will be implemented. This analysis will be fed by both a gender and inclusion analysis, and a political economy analysis. As the project will implement a financing modality for LG to implement services related to land and the other EKN-projects, the gender and inclusion analysis and strategies of these projects will be considered.
The strong point of the project is that it looks at broader inclusion challenges as well (poor/rich, men/women, urban/rural, proxy/periphery communities, age, identity). These are factors that may weigh heavily in for example land rights and access to services.
Concerning gender, the present analysis shows the limited access to, and ownership of land by women. It also describes the challenges in the agricultural production and marketing for women. Equally so the roles and influence of men and women in the different activities in the household and the marginal position of women in economic decisions and thereby economic development.
These are well known factors on which the EKN funded projects build their activities. The A-Grip project and the RBF builds on these.
The deeper analysis's foreseen in the inception phase will lead to specific measures to enhance inclusivity, address barriers and gaps or to address abuse. This can be by, for example, specific indicators or process requirements.

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

The proposal explains and justifies well the specific gender interests. The need for joint ownership of CCO strengthens the position of women to take decisions in the household as the man is no longer able to sell the land without consent.

Improved services and targeting of the actual actors will strengthen the position of women in the decisions on production and marketing.
The strong point of the project is the synergy with the technical EKN projects in this area.

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

The main stakeholders described are government organizations that will implement the activities that will be financed by the RBF modality. For their activities, indicators and targets will be set in line with the expected results and processes. These will build on the experience and strategies of partner projects and the land tenure experiences. Farmer organizations are mentioned specifically as are SHF and women groups as they are the main actors in production and marketing.
The Q@E discussed the gender and inclusion aspects and concluded that the essential steps and processes are well developed to assure gender and broader inclusion aspects to be well integrated in the project.

Climate change

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

The project is not detailed on an analysis of climate change, which is logic as it concerns a financial modality to fund LG activities linked to EKN funded activities. Based on the activities of EKN projects however, there is a component on by-laws and their implementation. This concerns as well by -laws concerning land-use and watershed management; activities that are focused on sustainable land use and reducing the impact of climate change.
Also the extension services are incorporating climate change aspects, mainly to adapt to the changing context: for example, adaptation of agricultural practices and varieties.

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

The project envisages indicators in the components 2 and 3 that will enhance the implementation of activities of the other projects that work on adaptation by increasing sustainable land use and by improved seed and agricultural practices.

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 works closely with Dutch organizations (Cordaid, ZOA, WENR and SNV) and Dutch funded projects (Land@Scale: UNHabitat/GLTN, Bright: IFDC and Hortimap: Technoserve).
GIZ is an important partner in the discussions with government and donors, and in the implementation by their role on capacity development.
No delegated funding. We do coordinate in the Land Donor Group with EU, WB and Germany.
Local organisations: especially the local governments and MLHUD.

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

EKN and GIZ are advocating for a joint donor program for capacity development of LG country-wide, as this is an essential prerequisite for the roll-out of CCOs at even bigger scale. Although WB and EU are interested, they are not moving towards joint activity.
The WB and GIZ are working on further procedural aspects of CCOs, such as subsequent transactions (selling/buying) and inclusion in the National Database. Aspects that are important but do not hinder the activities at LG-level.

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

The project finances results of LG in line with their mandates. The project is fully aligned with the policy of the government to implement CCOs (first CCO was handed over by the President) and the mandated role of LG. The same for the role of LG in extension and creation of the proper food security environment.

Digitalisation

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

The proposed digital technologies i.e., ComCare, Python and Power Bi applications are drawn from Cordaid's RBF data management and invoicing system for RBF in primary education project in Burundi. These were developed in collaboration/ consultation with end users, a similar end-user consultative process will be undertaken under the project during the inception phase where the proposed digital applications are to be fully developed.

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

Only a basic desk-based analysis has been done at the proposal development stage. An in-depth analysis is to be conducted at the inception stage.

- Is data security guaranteed?

Yes, the proposed digital applications ensure data safety. All project staff will be trained on data integrity/ data security and their respective roles in ensuring this.

- Are digital solutions locally sustainable/relevant?

Yes, digital solutions are relevant. Increasingly, all government departments are exploring digitization of service provision and most importantly data. For example, the government of Uganda has recently announced that they will be digitizing land

registration processes country wide by next year. To ensure sustainability, the A-GRIP digital data component will be aligned to existing data management system by government to ensure linkage.

- Is duplication avoided?

The project will work in close collaboration with the already existing data management system of the government, it will be possible to avoid parallel data reporting lines/ duplication as the project data will directly contribute to the same district/government database. The project works closely with land tenure security partners such as GIZ and GLTN (UN-HABITAT) to ensure complementarity and avoid duplication.

Additional remarks (if applicable)

Results

Food and Nutrition Security

F. Land Rights

Indicators
F.1. Number of people who enjoy (more) secure tenure rights to land (disaggregated for male/female)
Measurements: Baseline: 18843 Target: 400000
- Individual result: 0
  Comment:

F.2. Number of (inter)national institutions that contributed to improved (sub)national land governance aspects
Measurements: Baseline: 3 Target: 232
- Individual result: 159
  Comment:

C. Sustainable farmland use

Indicators
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 Target: 20234

B. Productivity and Income

Indicators
Outcome B.1.1. Number of SSFPs (disaggregated for male/female) who progressively realize a living income
Measurements: Baseline: 0 Target: 300000

Reach B.2.1. Number of SSFPs directly reached with activities aimed at structural/systemic improvement of their agricultural performance
Measurements: Baseline: 0 Target: 500000
- Individual result: 59557
  Comment:

Reach B.2.3. Number of SSFPs indirectly reached
Measurements: Baseline: 0 Target: 2000000
- Individual result: 202494
  Comment:

E. Policy environment

Indicators
E.1. Number of reforms / improvements in major (inter)national FNS policies / laws / regulations, benefitting at least tens of thousands of undernourished people and/or SSFPs
Measurements: Baseline: 3 Target: 32
- Individual result: 0
  Comment:

D. D. Knowledge & Innovation Systems

Indicators

D.2. Number of FNS-relevant knowledge and extension institutions reached with interventions that aim to strengthen their capacity

Measurements: Baseline: 0 Target: 16

- Individual result: 48
  Comment:

Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring

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

Based on the activity analysis decision tree [MINBUZA-2023.1364461] an audit opinion + report of findings
additional measures part of performance assessment will be requested.
The project will provide an annual narrative and financial report per email.
The project will also report in IATI at an annual basis.
The project will provide an inception report after 6 months that will elaborate on the development of strategies and activities, organizational set-up, staffing, elaboration of RBF indicators, the GESI and political economy studies, risks related to fund flows and utilization of funds by the indicated levels of government, and relevant other topics as will be elaborated in annex 2 to the grant decision. This inception report will be considered the report of the first halve year and the annual plan for the year starting in July 2024.
Starting for the year 2024-June 2025, the project will submit an annual plan and budget.
Halve way the year the project will submit a reflection report (max 8 pages), this report will facilitate the discussions and reflections between the project and EKN to assure the project is on the right track and possible risks, challenges and oppotunities are debated timely. The report will not be part of the reporting obligations in impact.
After three years the project will submit a mid-term review that will be commissioned and financed by the project. The ToR and draft report will need approval by the embassy.
The project will submit a yearly report on the results achieved by the districts and analyzed by the project. This information will also be included in an informal report requirement . This will be a tool for EKN to discuss with the project on the progress and challenges the RBF is able to address, and which require more attention.
EKN will visit the project at least twice a year. The project will participate in other monitoring sessions EKN might organize together with the four EKN food security projects to enhance learning and synergy.
In the annual reports, the project will present the progress on the main indicators.
The project will elaborate in the inception period a procedure to follow the flow of funds to the implementing level, and on the use of funds. The process should help to assure that:

- Funds become available at the implementing level shortly after the verification.
- Funds flow directly from Cordaid to the LG and the different underlying organizations (DPM, ENR and Sub-counties).
- No funds are channeled to central level at the end of the year, or any other moment.
- The funds are used by the designed organizations.

The project will develop a monitoring tool to ensure that the RBF method does not reduce the efficiency of the partner EKN projects.
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.

Evaluation

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

- who will commission the final evaluation and/or mid-term review (for options, see Help);

The final evaluation will be commissioned by the embassy. The mid-term review by the project after approval of the ToR and draft report by the embassy. The final evaluation will be financed directly by the embassy.

- whether the procedure and practical arrangements have been agreed on with the implementing organisation (for details, see Help).

The baseline will be implemented by the project in the inception period.

Finance

Budget breakdown

- Include an overview of the activity budget, including overhead costs.
  See image
- Is the budget arithmetically correct?
  yes, arithmetically correct (see MINBUZA-2023.1390027
- Are the amounts/rates in the budget acceptable?
  Yes, the amounts/rates have been discussed during the Q@E and meetings with the IP. The IP has included the remarks in the final budget
  49% of the budget has been planned for RBF payments. EKN will push the IP to be as ambitious as possible on the RBF payments.
- Briefly explain the structure of the budget.
  The budget is detailed and presented using different point of views.
  There is a budget per geographical area and per annum. Showing the staff costs, office costs, investment, admin costs, RBF Payments, activities and other programme costs. The IP has forseen 2% contingencies and 7% Overhead (ICR)
- Are overheads proportional to outputs? What is included? What is recharged?
  The overhead is 7%; comparing the overheads to the Peers of the IP, overhead is reasonable. Overhead will not be used to accummulates funds, but is used for general costs for the global office
- 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, the budget can be used as starting point, EKN will request annual budget planning

Earmarking

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

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.
  Payment to be entered as repayments; Refer to MINBUZA-2023.1363090 for the prepayment decision tree.
- What is the maximum percentage that can be paid as prepayment, and why?
  95%, the last 5% to be paid after approval of last report; This reduces the risk of lengthy claim procedures
- Which are the reporting obligations on the basis of which prepayments can be closed?
  Prepayments will be closed based on the audit reports

Available resources

	Foreign currency	EUR
Implementing organisation's own contribution		0
Firm commitments by other donors (for each donor)		0
Dutch contribution		27,839,341
Total available resources		27,839,341
Budget needed		27,839,341
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.?
  The local authorities have to cooperate
- 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?
  No, there is no uncovered balance

EUR 200.000 will be reserved additionally for the final evaluation and the study/audit after two years. This will be committed under this bemo as an add-on.

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.
  The contribution does not take the form of a repayment obligation, a loan, an equity investment or a guarantee; It includes however incentives RBF to government
- 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 revolving fund has been foreseen

Audit opinions

- Is an audit opinion required for the activity (see Help)? Briefly explain.
  An audit is required. According to the analysis tree [MINBUZA-2023.1364461], an audit opinion + report of findings (+additional measures part of performance assessment); Additional measures are mentioned in the risk assessment (and reporting obligation)
- 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)?
  Not a specific check will be one the use of the project manual in a limited number of districts. this will ot be done in the form of a formal audit.