Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Activity: NAI - Mercy Corps - RANGE (23-0002130)

Id	23-0002130
Date	06-11-2023
SAP application number	4000007174

Contents

Key data **4**

Activity basics 4

Activity details 4

Accounting data 4

Policy data **5**

Policy Appraisal **6**

Policy relevance 6

Rationale 6

Contextual analysis 7

Added value 8

Lessons learned 8

Durability 9

Gender 9

Climate change 9

Cooperation, harmonisation and alignment 10

Digitalisation 11

Additional remarks (if applicable) 11

Results **12**

Monitoring and evaluation **16**

Monitoring 16

Evaluation 17

Finance **18**

Budget breakdown 18

Earmarking 18

Prepayments 18

Available resources 19

Grant with a repayment obligation, loans, equity investment or guarantee 19

Audit opinions 19

Key data

Activity basics

Type	Standard
Short name	NAI - Mercy Corps - RANGE
Contract party	Mercy Corps Netherlands Den Haag (30061447)
ODA	Yes
Amount EUR	15000000
Start date	01-01-2024
End date	31-12-2029
Full name	Resilient Approaches in Natural Grassland Ecosystem
Summary	Resilient Approaches in Natural Grassland Ecosystems (RANGE), a 5 year, 15 million euro programme with the aim of strengthening communities to improve sustainable economic and social development in a well-managed landscape in the three ASAL counties of Marsabit, Isiolo and Samburu. RANGE is designed to reach small-scale pastoralists and agro-pastoralists, male and female, through producer associations, community structures, and women and youth groups, as well as government stakeholders, private sector actors and development partners. RANGE proposes integrated interventions that will: strengthen rangeland management and encourage regenerative practices, ensuring migratory and sedentary livelihoods can peacefully co-exist; improve herd management and market access for small-scale producers; strengthen the institutions and policy frameworks that govern the livestock sector, and prioritize the development of robust spatio-temporal data sets to help monitor impact of climate.

Activity details

Date of receipt of proposal	15-09-2023
Proposal’s reference number	NA
Budget holder	Nairobi Embassy (8221NAI)
Limit access	No
Related activity	L. Turkana Fisheries program; TnDT

Accounting data

SAP application number	4000007174
Funds center	IGG Ecological food systems grants (1702U01030002)

Policy data

Aid modality	Project support
Technical assistance	50% or more of the activity budget
Beneficiary location	Country
Country	Kenya
Location type	Other
Specific location	Marsabit, Samburu, Isiolo
CRS code	31163 Livestock
Policy Keywords	
Refugees & host communities	No
Policy Markers	
Biodiversity	Significant
Climate change: adaptation	Principal
Climate change: mitigation	Significant
Desertification	Significant
Equality between men & women	Significant
Building institutions & capacity	Significant
Environmental protection	Significant
Financial sector development	Significant
Food security	Principal
Good Governance / participation	Significant
Integrated water management	Significant
Market access	Significant
Private sector development	Significant
Research and knowledge	Significant
Youth employment	Significant
Explain your choices	The policy markers selected are informed by the key intervention areas of the program which are based on the context where the program will be implemented. The program has 4 broad key intervention areas that are focused on; rangelands restoration and management, livelihoods strengthening-also linked to alternative livelihood systems related to food production, community and government collaboration linked to lobby and advocacy, and evidence generation. Within and across these intervention areas activities will address; climate change adaptation, water resource management, private sector strengthening - also linked to financial access interventions, market access, accountability and policy influencing, and institutional setup/strengthening. Biodiversity conservation, gender and youth integration, are important components of the program.

Policy Appraisal

Policy relevance

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

The activity is well aligned to the 2022 Policy Document for Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation (BHOS): "Do what we do best". In particular, the activitiy will contribute to the aspirations outlined in chapters 2 and 3 on; development cooperation and Dutch solutions for Global challenges, respectively. Specific to the development cooperation chapter the four intervention areas of the activity contribute to the identified focus areas on; private sector development, climate action, food security, water, and gender equality/empowerement. Furthermore this chapter has outlined six methods to ensure maximum development impact of which the activity's approach closely complements particularly in regard to; leveraging private finance, engaging young people and working in difficult regions. Similarly for chapter 3 of the BHOS, the intervention areas of the activity link well with the identified focus areas on; sustainability and digitalisation transition in combination countries, achievement of the SDGs and the ambition of developing an Africa Strategy. Inline with these focus areas the activity's implementation approach is focused on making the livestock value chain more sustainable - this is reflected as one of the methods in realising a win-win situation that is envisaged under this chapter. In agreement with the BHOS, the activity will contribute to addressing root causes of poverty and instability in a fragile context.

Subsequent to and informed by the BHOS is the Netherlands-Kenya Multi Annual Country Strategy (MACS) 2023-2026. This activity is developed in accordance to the pillars and objectives of the mentioned MACS. The activity is aligned to the economic, stability and resilience, and leaving no-one behind pillars of the MACS and will specifically contribute to objective 2 of the MACS focused on improving stability and reducing inequalities. Furthermore the annual plan under the MACS has given attention to the kick off and implementation of this activity due to it's contribution to the realisation of the MACS ambitions.

The MACS is also informed by the relevant Kenya policy objectives. This activity will also contribute to the following relevant Kenya policy documents that support the stability and resilience pillar of the MACS. These include;

- National policy for the sustainable development of the Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands
- The Partnership Coordination Framework for Development of ASALs
- The Resilience Programming Strategy
- National Drough Management Authority Strategic Plan
- National Livestock Policy
- National Food and Nutrition Security Policy
- Th Agricultural Sector Transformation and Growth Strategy

The activity will also contribute to the relevant UN Sustainable Development Goals 1,2,5,8, 6,and 13 that the BHOS and the Kenya policy objectives are also aligned to.

Rationale

- What issue/problem will be addressed by the activity

Sustainable economic growth in the Arid and Semi Arid Lands (ASALs) - where the activity will be implemented - has remained a challenge due to the complex dynamics of shocks and stresses induced by frequency of droughts and floods, pests and diseases. Resulting in extending cycles of land degradation, threatening biodiversity, and in turn compromising livelihoods and productivity, and increasing triggers of conflict.

Climate change has had adverse impact on the ASALs and the frequency of the extreme weather events has risen significantly. These recurring climate related shocks and stresses have negatively impacted the resilience and livelihoods of the local population.

The resulting food systems in the ASALs are weak and do not fully meet the food and nutrition needs of the communities. At the same time the ASALs is experiencing a population bulge due to high birth rate. This has led to an increased demand for food and food production. Consequently a quickening pace of rangeland degradation is underway, accelerated by lower soil water, shorter regeneration periods, and ineffective natural resources management. These landscape management challenges are made worse by lack of data informed in coherent policy frameworks.

Livestock is the primary economic sector practiced through pastoralism. Poor herd management practices are widespread, resulting in low productivity for small scale pastoralists and constraining their ability to achieve financial and food security. Land as a foundational base of the pastrol way of life and of the livestock sector is affected by increasing trends in land use changes across the ASALs. This has contributed to loss of traditional livelihoods and social structures, due to shrinking land available for pastoralism, intensifying competition for resources and exacerbating conflicts.

Across the ASALs, inter-communal conflict is being exacerbated by climate and land use changes that are increasing competition over scarcer resources, including pasture and water, as well as also over land, worsened by commercialization and large mega projects that are driving land capture. Insecurity is further driven by arms proliferations in all three counties and spillover from regional dynamics, including conflicts and insecurity in Ethiopia, or the presence of Al Shabaab in Somalia and Kenyan border

counties. Violence begets violence, and many young people have grown up in situations where violence is normalised and where historical narratives are shaped around it.

- Why does the activity help to address the issue/problem?
  For ODA activities over EUR 250.000, please explain the Theory of Change

IF rangelands are sustainably and effectively managed in a manner which is inclusive and equitable, and IF small-scale producers are optimizing herd management through improved access to well-functioning input and output market linkages, and IF critical governance systems related to rangeland organization and access, mobility and peaceful collaboration are strengthened, and BASED ON an evidence base that supports continued, informed planning, THEN production, productivity and incomes will increase AND overall pastoral resilience to climate change will improve.
The activity is based around four critical objectives necessary for transformative change: 1) Strengthened rangeland management practices to provide an equitable base for pastoralists and their herds, particularly for small scale pastoralists, complemented by a focus on 2) strengthened and sustainable herd management practices and market competitiveness, underpinned by 3) an improved supportive and inclusive governance and policy environment, and backed by 4) a commitment to building a strong evidence base to increase success of interventions and enhance sustainability.
The activity interventions therefore help to strengthen rangeland management and encourage regenerative practices, ensuring migratory and sedentary livelihoods can peacefully co-exist; improve herd management and market access for small-scale producers; strengthen the institutions and policy frameworks that govern the livestock sector, and prioritize the development of robust spatio-temporal data sets to strengthen outcomes and help mitigate the impact of climate change and prevent further land and rangeland degradation. In the end resulting in strengthened resilience of the ASAL communities that contributes to sustainable economic and social development in a well managed landscape.

Contextual analysis

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

The main target groups of the activity will include:

1. The community; The activity will work with various community representation structures to strengthen their capacity on rangeland management, herds management and on alternative livelihoods, as well as on policy influencing.
2. Government; the activity will work with and through county government structures to strengthen the policy environment and institutional structures.
3. Private sector; The activity will work directly with select private sector partners on strengthening the livelihoods, market access component of the activity
4. Research institution; The activity will work with select local research/knowledge institutions on data and evidence generation.

- Who are the other main stakeholders?

The other stakeholders are mainly the complementary projects funded by other development partners being implemented in the same geograhic area. The activity will identify areas of synergy to collaborate and build on the learnings. These stakeholders include additional Mercy Corps projects such as ASAL ADAPTS funded by Google and Cisco; new and upcoming peace and social cohesion work; De-Risking, Inclusion, and Value Enhancement for Rural Economies in the Horn of Africa (DRIVE) and Horn of Africa Groundwater program funded by the World Bank; upcoming USAID Programmes in local food systems in the ASALs and STAWI (water); coordination platforms such as the Partnership for Resilience and Economic Growth (PREG), Resilient Arid Lands for Integrated Development (RAPID+); and collaboration with research institutes such as International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) and Kenya Agriculture and Livestock Research Organisation (KALRO).

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

At the initial proposal writing stage the main consulted stakeholders have been the relevant government institutions both at the county level and at the national level. A project design workshop toke place in August that brough together representation from the three counties where the activity will be implemented. Representation from the State Department of the ASALs as well as from the Agriculture Ministry Director of Livestock. Together the program goals were discussed, initiatives brainstormed, barriers to implementation coveredm ownership and support for the activity strengthened. All provided input and guidance on elements to be considered or taken on boarding when designing the project. There will also be an active inception phase that will further inform the formulation of the proposal.

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

The intervention is aimed at a specific geographical location. Implementation of the activity will take place in three main counties in the northern ASALs of Kenya. Marsabit, Samburu and Isiolo are the targetted geographical locations of the intervention. These locations fit the criteria of the ASAL agenda as defined by the food/water/climate cluster of the Embassy, that is counties vulnerable to climate change and prone to natural resource based conflicts, yet with high potential for economic growth and resilience building that can be explored and strengthened in an inclusive way that leaves no one behind. Under this ASALs agenda these areas have been prioritised. Furthermore the intervention has a focus on the livestock value chain which is predominately an economic activity in these selected areas. Under the leaving no-one behind agenda these selected areas have historically been under-developed, at the same time have been hard hit with the recent severe drought and will suffer adverse

effects from the anticipated El nino. All these compromise the resilience of the community and the environment. These are subjects that will be addressed by the interventions in these selected geographical locations.

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 contributes towards addressing development challenges in the complex and high risk context of the Northern ASALs, which can not be addressed by only a few stakeholders. Dutch involvement significantly contributes to the ASAL development agenda and the leaving no-one behind principle in the country of implementation. This is through various ways which include complementing the activities of other like minded partners in the ASALs, such as EU delegation, Denmark, World Bank, USAID, Switzerland and the UN who are supporting complementary activities on; rangeland management, value chain strengthening and social inclusion - with the aim of enhancing the communities resilience to climate related shocks.
Dutch involvement in the ASALs also adds significantly to the humanitarian-development nexus and transition . Whereby historically a majority of the interventions have been humanitarian/ emergency response. However to sustain the gains from the humanitarian work a developmental approach is necessary that is longterm and incremental, which is what this activity aims for, hence the added value of Dutch government involvement. In addition Dutch government involvment builds on the gains made and ongoing processes by its other funded activites in the ASALs working on water resource management' climate resilience and value chain enhancement with agropastoralists such as; LISTEN implemented by SNV, Catchment to Tap implemented by WWF, VEI and World Waternet, Integrated Climate Smart Innovations for Agropastoralist Landscapes (ICSIAPL) implemented by SNV and Financing Locally Led Climate Action (FLLoCA) implemented by World Bank where the Dutch government partners with Denmark and Sweden in co-financing the grant component.
The Dutch government's longterm programming to strengthen resilience building and economic potential in these selected ASAL locations is a key added value. Furthermore the focus on scaling what has worked and scaling existing successful initiatives in these locations is yet another added value of Dutch government involvement thus avoiding to reinvent the wheel in an area where several development partners are supporting interventions, hence strengthening synergies for greater impact. This is further reinforced by the approach taken in applying a systemic integrated landscape approach which is an effort to address the challenges from the root cause and not in isolation from each other and bringing all relevant stakeholders on board.

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

The implementing consortium does not make additional own contribution to the funding provided for project delivery. They will however work with key partners in the activity - county government, communities and private sector partners who will co-participate in the implementation of the activity. The co-participation will be firmed-up between implementing consortium and the key partners through signed MoUs and agreed terms of reference for commitment and accountability. By co-participating these key partners such as county governments are expected to co-finance certain interventions that require technology adoption by vulnerable communities. The private sector players will be required to co-finance interventions targetting private sector development that they are involved in.

Lessons learned

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

The following are some of the lessons learned that will be addressed by the activity. These lessons have been derived from the implementing partner's experience working in similar context and on comparable activities, from documented programmatic and operational studies from previous activities and interacting with key stakeholders in similar targetted locations ;
Local level/communities' initiatives need to be anchored into county-level structures and initiatives; for example, to be successful, Ward Development Plans need buy-in from County-level officials.
Good ward plans that are well-integrated into county plans are successful; good ward plans that are poorly represented in their county plans fail.
Work within existing structures or committees to layer on additional activities; when engaging people around naturally or locally occurring issues, sustained outcomes are more likely.
Regardless of the length of the program, approach design with a long-term mindset.
Be realistic about new technologies and pay special attention to issues of affordability and cost-effectiveness. Recognizing the challenging landscape of the ASALs, pair innovation with tried and tested approaches that deliver.
While policy development can be a difficult process, adoption, ownership and implementation are more challenging. Barriers to adoption include restricted knowledge on policy processes, high turnover of ministers and ministry officials, heavy protocol and slow political processes.
Focus on MEL from the start. RANGE will establish a clear learning agenda to ensure the right design, right questions and right research topics are chosen to inform and transform.

Durability

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

Institutionalisation of the activity interventions will ensure the sustainability of the results and at the same time is the exit strategy. In this way the results realised from the interventions implemented will be owned and sustained by the respective local organisations, systems and structures that have partnered in the implementation of the activity. During implementation of the activity various interventions will be rolled out that integrate sustainability measures to ensure the; financial, institutional, environmental, technical and social sustainability of results being realised. Among the measures applied to ensure that results are sustained will include;

- a focus on private sector models and strengthening market systems, centralizing a vibrant private sector as drivers of systems change and ultimately ensuring sustainability of Programme interventions, to ensure financial sustainability;
- emphasis placed on aligning with stakeholders' existing plans and priorities to embed interventions within existing structures, to ensure institutional sustainability;
- on the other hand a landscape approach that recognizes the reality that sustainable rangeland improvements can only be achieved at that level and that localized interventions are ineffective if not integrated into the larger landscape level will contribute to environmental sustainability;
- Extensive technical capacity building with local partners with the dual role of strengthening their ability to deliver on programme activities and to drive their own agendas forward that contributes to technical sustainability;
- Focus on community engagement that includes gender activities and goals, as well as, adoption of the do no harm principles will contribute to social sustainability

Exit strategy of the activity is addressed by working with and through the local institutions and strengthening them to sustain the results achieved through their involvement in implementation.

Gender

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

A preliminary gender analysis is included in the proposal. The context analysis as well as description of the interventions in the proposal have a strong gender focus mainstreamed. The context analysis presented in the proposal recognises the historic position of the woman in the northern ASALs of Kenya. The described interventions linked to the respective four outcome areas of the activity, each have specific gender strengthening components included. The main outcome is to ensure that the interventions are gender inclusive, to strengthen the voice and position of the woman in rangeland management and in the livestock value chain, and to bring about social behaviour change that elevates the position of the woman and recognises the contributions by women. It is expected that a deep-dive gender analysis will be done of the specific location where the activity will be implemented to reflect the recent/current trends and dynamics of that the gender interventions will be addressing. This deep dive analysis is expected to be done during the active inception phase and the study shared with the inception report.

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

The gender specific interests and needs of the target group are justified inline with the context and the four selected outcome areas that the activity will be implementing. The proposal responds to an inclusive and leaving no-one behind agenda which aims to pay attention to marginalised groups and the women in the ASALs are among the marginalised groups. The specific interests and needs will be further justified during the active inception phase of the project.

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

Women and young people have been included in the preliminary stakeholder analysis of the proposal as an important group of people for inclusion in the implementation of the interventions. These are a part of the demography that are often left behind in important decision making processes and economic opportunities. Since the activity is about influencing policy, strengthening decision making process and enhancing economic and social resilience in an inclusive way hence the reason women and young people have been included in the stakeholder analysis.

Climate change

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

An indepth climate risk and opportunity analysis will be done on the activity during the active inception phase. In the proposal climate change is recognised as a key threat to the implementation of the activity and sustainability of the results. The elaboration of the context analysis demonstrates that the selected region for the activity is vulnerable to climate change impacts and, has experienced adverse effects of changing and unpredictable weather patterns. Resulting in the degradation of the natural resources of the area, which in turn has impacted on the resilience of the communities as their livelihood sources get affected. As such climate adaptation measures are seen as central to safeguarding biodiversity, supporting ecological resilience, and promoting regenerative approaches.

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

The proposal integrates climate adaptation interventions into the respective four outcome areas of the activity. The overall aim of the four outcome areas is to strengthen the climate resilience of the communities and the environment. The following is a summary of these interventions:

Outcome 1:

Strengthened government and community responses to climate change

- Community and county land use planning as critical foundation for NRM goals and activities
- Promotion and improved access to sustainable water and energy initiatives
- Environmental and economic sustainability through business planning embedded into project support to stakeholders
- Organisation and ownership of grazing plans and resting the rangelands put in hands of the associations.

Outcome 2:

Prioritization of feed and fodder integrated into NRM, including invasive species control, drought resistant fodder varieties

- Climate early warning systems
- Assessing potential for ecosystem services
- Promotion of improved technologies and efficiencies in livestock and crop production and watershed and river-basin management
- Improving livestock market offtake through community managed market systems
- Improving water-efficiencies

Outcome 3:

- Collaboration and coordination between counties regarding grazing, land use, registration, and NRM policies
- Scaling-up and improved governance through Nexus and Landscape approaches at all levels
- Strengthening local conflict resolution systems resulting in safer grazing areas and more sustainable use of the rangelands
- Mainstream climate and gender issues into county policy making

Outcome 4:

- Longitudinal data to demonstrate changing rangeland, water, soil and vegetation conditions to allow informed, anticipatory planning
- Training of key stakeholders on spatio-temporal data for effective NRM
- Improved natural resource use through participatory mapping and land use plans
- Sourcing technology and innovations to improve efficiencies in market and rangeland management systems
- Strengthening coordination through improving the evidence-base

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?

Out of the three consortium members implementing this activity, one of them is ITC Twente. ITC Twente will bring geospatial expertise and experience relevant to support the evidence generation work of the activity. In addition the activity will work closely with SNV who is implementing the Embassy funded LISTEN project in two of the three counties targetted by this activity, this will entail learning from what has worked and not worked and taking to scale the idenfied gains made under LISTEN that complement the outcome areas of this activity.

In addition the activity will cooperate with the new Embassy programs being developed, that is the Think and Do Tank and the Lake Turkana programs as both of these programs will have overlapping geographic scope and themes such as on private sector development, water resource management and institutional strengthening interventions. This activity will also cooperate with the new Food Sytem Resilience Program by World Bank that is receiving funding from IGG.

Furthermore the activity will build on the gains realised by other complementary activities funded by USAID and the World Bank being implemented in the same region. In the implementation of interventions the activity will cooperate with local NGOs that represent the local communities inorder to strengthen community ownership. Some the local NGOs that the activity will cooperate with such as the Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT) receive substantial financing support from the EU delegation office towards rangeland management interventions.

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

The activity is financed by a single donor with an ambition to leverage on other complementary activities financed by like minded development partners in this way also contributing to the harmonisation of interventions in the northern ASALs region of Kenya. Some of these complementary activities are multi donor funded such as the World Bank FLLoCA program which this activity complements with contribution to climate resilience strengthening. In addition through the participation of the Embassy in the relevant development partners groups updates and information will be shared on the progress of the activity, with the intention to ensure harmonisation and explore opportunities for multi-donor financing. The activity will also be implemented in close collaboration with the county governments and in effect also contribute to harmonisation and multi-donor financing through participation in the development partners' coordination platforms that are managed by the county governments.

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

The activity is aligned to the relevant ASAL policies both at national and county government levels in the of the country of implementation. The activity does not provide budget support nonetheless it is aligned to the county integrated developed plans that inform the budget cycle of the targetted counties. Furthermore this activity is aligned to the Netherlands Foreign Policy 'Do What We Do Best' and will be funded from the Food Security budget line.

Digitalisation

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

The proposed digital technologies to be developed or chosen has been done in collaboration with the end user. At the same time most of the digital technologies proposed are not being developed rather are those that exist and have been proven to be fit for purpose. The only digital solution that will be developed is the establishment of a digital repository hub which will be hosted at FCDC. For all the digital solutions proposed the stakeholders will be trained on how to apply these technologies and adjustments to the identified digital technological solutions will be made when necessary to better align to the specific local context.

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

A comprehensive analysis is not included yet in the proposal as digitisation is not the overal aim to ensure succesful delivery of the targetted results by the activity. Nevertheless the proposal recognises the important role digital solutions will play in contributing to the technological sustainability of the project's interventions. In this regards, a deep-dive analysis will be done during the active inception phase to inform and reinforce the particular components of the activity that involve digital technology solutions.

- Is data security guaranteed?

Legal framework exist on data security in the country where the activity will be executed. Both the national and international rules and regulations around data security binding for the owners of the digital solutions and it is expected these will be adhered to. It is further expected that Mercy Corps and consortium partners will carryout due diligence on selected developers of digital solutions. The Embassy will also monitor this to ensure that data security is guaranteed where applicable.

- Are digital solutions locally sustainable/relevant?

Digital solutions are increasingly recognised and embraced locally as among sustainable approaches that can be applied to address identified socio-economic problems. For instance the use of Mpesa and other financial access digital platforms are used widely. Alot of the digital solutions have build on the successful adoption of the Mpesa. Similarly alot of information and awareness raising is being disseminated through digital solutions. Considerable efforts and attention is being given to ensure that these solutions continue to be inclusive and leave no-one behind and this is still work in progress.

- Is duplication avoided?

Duplication is avoided, in the case of this activity, mainly by building on existing digital solutions/technologies rather than creation of new solutions.

Additional remarks (if applicable)

Results

- What are the main OUTPUTS (services and products) that will be delivered through the activity? Describe briefly.

The main outputs to be delivered through the activity are the following for each of the four identified outcome areas:

Outcome 1:

- Formal and informal governance systems of land management, protection and restoration are strengthened;
  - The communal nature of much of the rangeland in the target counties requires the development and strengthening of governance frameworks, to ensure adherence to grazing plans and other avenues of land management and provides the foundation for many other interventions that depend on this Output.
- Rangelands are effectively managed to support food and nutrition security and promote livestock productivity;
  - Will prioritize optimal landscape management practices that incorporate the dynamic of whole ecology and take a pan-county/cross-border approach, ultimately maintaining availability of rangeland resources—primarily water and forage, enhancing productivity, improving nutrition for both animals and people, and increasing resilience and reducing conflict.
- Integrated Water Resource Management interventions are implemented at scale;
  - Will utilize an Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) approach that facilitates improved agricultural development and better access to water for livestock, building on IWRM Principles of ecological, institutional, gender, and economic sustainability.
- Programme stakeholders access green technology to improve support to livestock systems, strengthen land management and mitigate climate threats;
  - Will promote access to green technology, such as clean cookstoves or solarization for pumping and irrigation systems, working to stimulate local demand while engaging private sector providers to facilitate market entry.

Outcome 2:

- Livestock producers access and use improved private and public sector animal health products and services;
  - The limited effectiveness of animal husbandry, combined with open pasturing, increases the spread of transferable diseases leading to poor animal health and associated losses in production.
- Livestock producers use improved herd management and commercial livestock and milk production techniques;
  - Will train livestock owners on improved herds management and, build the capacity of private and public sector to support business growth. As well as identify technologies that reduce costs and risks.
- Access to appropriate services that promote financial inclusion strengthened;
  - Will focus on a broad array of products and services that address producers' needs for working capital, equipment leasing, savings groups, micro-loans, and livestock insurance.
- Livestock market actors engagement with domestic and international markets improved;
  - Will work with a range of small-scale market actors to improve their service offerings, expand their scale and reach, and improve their position within the livestock sector and associated value chains.

Outcome 3:

- Platforms for government-to-government engagement that enable collaboration on critical economic, environmental and social issues are supported and/or developed;
  - Will work with stakeholders to better adapt and operationalize policies and legal frameworks that underpin rangeland management and how communities produce and market their livestock, always paying attention to the incentives that constrain or promote policy development and adoption.
- Policies, legislation and budget allocations at the national and county level are influenced;
  - Will engage in policy and advocacy work to ensure that relevant policies, legislation and budget allocations align with ASAL counties development priorities, narrowing in on select issues where the activity will have the most impact, and seeking collaboration opportunities with other actors to support their initiatives.
- Private sector engagement and Public-Private Partnerships that encourage private sector investments in the ASAL counties are supported;
  - Collaborating with private sector actors will allow for the infusion of specialized knowledge and funding into key sectors, fostering sustainable growth and development.
- Government accountability and service provision through inclusive participatory planning is improved;
  - Will strengthen forward and backward advocacy and lobby linkages between communities and government for enhanced stability and sustained environmental, economic and social development.
- Conflict resolution and peacebuilding frameworks that promote communal and/or regional collaboration on conflict prevention and response are facilitated;
  - Will strengthen conflict management, prevention and response efforts in the activity's target communities and counties.

Outcome 4

- Research and learning implemented for programme adaptation;
  - Will ensure that intervention design is based on evidence and that systems and procedures are set up to effectively capture emerging data and learning to adapt activities as needed.
- Awareness and use of geospatial data and planning tools improved at ward and county levels;
  - Will use Earth observation and in-situ longitudinal data collection to ensure that government planning associated with RANGE domains use evidence driven data to inform policy development, including for Ward Plans and ADPs/CIDPs.
- Longitudinal data collection protocols are developed and effectively implemented throughout the three ASAL counties;
  - Will set up systems for varied data collection, both in-situ and with satellites, based on which relevant analyses are required and ascertaining complementarity to existing initiatives.
- Capacity, experience and knowledge of relevant stakeholders in research and learning is utilized and strengthened;
  - Will intentionally engage other interventions that are simultaneously being carried out in the same landscapes, and aim to be a model of open-source research and collaboration.

5. What are the main OUTCOMES (changes and effects for the target groups) that will be achieved through the activity? Describe briefly.
6. Outcome 1: Land and rangeland management, climate-smart agricultural approaches and improved governance that promote food and nutrition security and integrated water resource management initiated and achieved;
   a. Sustainable land management practices include good grazing management, biodiversity, watershed management and soil conservation; all practices that can restore degraded lands, mitigate the potential for conflict, promote improved economic systems and enhance the resilience of local communities.
7. Outcome 2: Sustainable livestock production and competitiveness of livestock markets strengthened within an improved policy environment;
   a. Uses market systems development approaches to create and/or expand sustainable, climate-smart livestock production and marketing opportunities.
8. Outcome 3: Improved linkages among and between communities and government structures to support collaboration on economic, environmental and social issues that promote stability and sustained development;
   a. Will develop a comprehensive, multifaceted strategy to strengthen the institutional backbone that is so vital to the livestock sector, improving linkages between communities and government entities through platforms for collaboration, influencing national and county policies, supporting public-private partnerships, enhancing government accountability, and facilitating conflict resolution.
9. Outcome 4: Strengthened research and evidence-based programming contribute to impactful project implementation, effective coordination, early warning and early action, innovation and learning for resilient ASAL communities
   a. will utilize a diversity of complementary tools, that lead to actionable information that can be applied to support programme implementation and strengthen systems across the target counties, as well as enhancing the capacity of local institutions for longer term forecasting and planning.
10. For the OUTPUTS and OUTCOMES mentioned above (or add snapshot from results application):
    a. Specify the indicators if agreed upon with the contract party.

The final version of the indicators will be agreed upon during the active inception phase. These will be documented and agreed upon in the inception report and monitored throughout the implementation of the activity. The following indicators are however proposed in the project document, including indicators from the relevant result frameworks:

Outcome indicators:

- Percentage of ecosystem resources and services maintained or strengthened.
- Degree of integrated water resources management implementation (0-10).
- Percentage of people who enjoy (more) secure tenure rights to land and safer access to grazing.
- Percentage of people with a more diverse and adequate diet
- Change in the Volume or Value of Livestock Products Sold in Domestic and International Markets.
- Number of legal or policy reforms implemented

Output indicators:

- Number of program participants trained on and implementing best practices in NRM management and restoration.
- Number of Agro-pastoralist association members trained and growing fodder based on business plans.
- Number of Sub Water Catchment Plans (SWCP) developed and implemented at county level. Specify the baseline values and targets if applicable.
- Number of people supported in projects for improved irrigation and drainage.
- Number of people supported in projects for improved watershed protection.
- Number of livestock producers accessing services and inputs from private sector (including associations)
- Number of livestock farmers trained on improved herd management and commercial livestock and milk production practices.
- Number of people accessing financial services increased through linkages to private sector .

- Number of financial providers or market actors providing improved financial products.
- Number of market linkages established between livestock producers and buyers or processors as a result of the Program intervention.
- Number of livestock traders linked to domestic and international markets as result of Dutch funding.
- Number of strengthened organisations and private sector companies contributing to a sustainable local business climate.
- Number of laws and policies blocked/ adopted/improved for sustainable and inclusive development as a result of CSO engagement.

Specify the baseline values and targets if applicable.

The baseline values have not been established yet at this proposal stage. These will be done at the active inception phase. The target values are not established for all indicators at this stage as some will be informed by the baseline. Both baseline and target values will be established and available by the end of the inception phase and these will be uploade on this platform and stored in Sophia.

- What method will be used to gather and monitor the data?

Both the implementing partner's methodology and the DGIS result framework methodology will be used to guide the gathering and monitoring of data on the indicators identified. This will entail participant surveys both at baseline and endline, attendance sheets, document reviews, data system reviews, etc

- Record the following in the **results application**:
  - the thematic results frameworks that apply to this activity;

The following thematic results frameworks apply to this activity: Food and nutrition security, water, private sector development and climate. The specific indicators (see below list) from these results frameworks that are applicable to the activity will be recorded in the results application.

FNS Indicators:

Number of people with a more diverse and adequate diet
Number of people with a more diverse and adequate diet producers who progressively become more empowered
Number of small scale livestock and/or food producers whose livelihood became more resilient to shocks
Number of hectares of rangelands under at least 2 conservation practices
Number of small-scale livestock and/ or food producers applying new technologies/practices that aim to transform food systems towards desirable outcomes
Number of FNS-relevant knowledge and extension institutions reached with interventions that aim to strengthen their capacity
Number of reforms / improvements in major(inter)national FNS policies / laws / regulations
Number of people who enjoy (more) secure tenure rights to land
Number of people directly/indirectly reached with activities aimed at temporary/partial improvement of their nutritional situation
Number of small-scale livestock and/ or food producers directly reached with activities aimed at structural/systemic improvement of their agricultural performance
Number of small-scale livestock and/or food producers directly reached with activities aimed at temporary/partial improvement of their agricultural performance
Number of small-scale livestock and/ or food producers indirectly reached
Number of hectares of farmland directly reached with activities aimed at structural/systemic improvement
of agro-ecological sustainability
Number of hectares of farmland indirectly reached

PSD Indicators:

Number of MSMEs that utilise business development services
Number of MSMEs gaining new or improved access to a value chain
Number of direct beneficiaries* supported to have raised incomes
Number of end users with access to new or improved infrastructure
Number of individuals that obtain financial services

Water Indicators:

Degree of integrated water resources management implementation (0-10)
# of river basin organisations targeted in the activity3
# of people supported in projects for improved watershed protection
*Climate resilience indicators will be included at the end of the inception phase

-
  - the relevant indicators (including baseline values and targets if applicable).

Selected indicators, baseline values and targets will be recorded in the results application at the end of the active inception phase when the final version of the MEL is available.

- Have these results frameworks been communicated with the contract party?

The relevant results frameworks have been shared with the contract party

- Do the indicators correspond to one or more of the 17 indicators on which the ministry reports to the Dutch parliament? If not, why?

Yes, some of the identified indicators correspond to the 17 indicators reported to the Dutch parliament.

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.

In accordance with the decision tree, the activity will be implemented by an organisation of adequate capacity. In addition, the activity cost is above 5Million Euros, and with related risks that are of high/moderate levels. Therefore an audit opinion report of findings -progress and annual plans, as well as mid and end evaluations will be part of the reporting obligations. The identified reports will help continuously check the performance and quality of the implementing organisation as well as monitor the progress of the activity. Below table summarises the reporting information.

Year	Report Type	Period Covered	Submission Date by Implementing partner	
	Activity Workplan and Budget	*Jan 2024-Dec 2024* *Jan 2025-Dec 2025* *Jan 2026-Dec 2026* *Jan 2027-Dec 2027* *Jan 2028-Dec 2028*	*01 Dec 2023* *01 Oct 2024* *01 Oct 2025* *01 Oct 2026* *01 Oct 2027*	
	Inception Report with Go/No-Go Moment	Jan 2024-Jun 2024	*01 Aug 2024*	Expected deliverables; Inception phase summary report on the following and annexed studies; climate risk analysis, gender analysis, stakeholder vulnerability analysis, conflict analysis, biodiversity analysis, outline of the the program modifier mechanism, updated risk analysis, updated program budget, updated MEL with established baseline information

	Narrative and Financial Progress	*Jan 2024-Dec 2024* *Jan 2025-Dec 2025* *Jan 2026-Dec 2026* *Jan 2027-Dec 2027* *Jan 2028-Dec 2028*	*01 April 2025* *01 April 2026* *01 April 2027* *01 April 2028* *01 April 2029*	
	*Narrative IATI**	*The organisation will report in accordance with the BZ publication guidelines on the IATI standards*	*On a quarterly basis*	Within 2 months after the end of each quarter
	Financial Audit	*Jan 2024-Dec 2024* *Jan 2025-Dec 2025* *Jan 2026-Dec 2026* *Jan 2027-Dec 2027* *Jan 2028-Dec 2028*	*01 April 2025* *01 April 2026* *01 April 2027* *01 April 2028* *01 April 2029*	
	Final Narrative and Financial project report	*Jan 2024 - Dec 2028*	01 June 2029	
2026	***Midterm review***	*Jan 2024 - June 2026*	*30 Sept 2026*	
2029	***Endterm project evaluation***	*Jan 2024 - Dec 2028*	*01 June 2029*	

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);

A mid-term and final evaluation of the activity has been planned and budgetted. These processes will be commissioned by the implementing partner in partnership with the Embassy.

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

The procedure and practical arrangemente will be worked out and agree on with the implementing organisation during the active inception phase.

Finance

Budget breakdown

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

Outcome 1	€ 1.705.668
Outcome 2	€ 1.293.469
Outcome 3	€ 2.135.377
Outcome 4	€ 2.139.168
MEL, Project Monitoring	€ 374.266
Program Staff incl. Overheads	€ 3.955.180
Support Staff incl. overheads	€ 2.158.338
HQ Overheads 9%	€ 1.238.534
Total Project Budget	**€ 15.000.000**

- Is the budget arithmetically correct?

Yes it is

- Are the amounts/rates in the budget acceptable?

Yes they are

- Briefly explain the structure of the budget.

The budget structure presents an annual breakdown of the program cost which has been broken down into the identified outcome areas, output areas and intervention areas of the program. The budget structure also presents the percentage uptake of the total cost by each budgetline.

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

The overheads are proportional to the outputs and include personnel costs, travel, equipment and supplies. At the same time this is being reviewed and will be updated in a revised budget.

11. 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)

The implementation is conditional on the budget being amended in the inception phase. The budget presented with the proposal is based on estimates which will need to be substantiated during the active inception phase. The adjustments that are made during the inception phase will result in a revised budget being submitted as an annex to the inception report on 1st August 2024.

Earmarking

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

The Dutch contribution is reserved for the full implementation of the activity as presented in the proposal and inception report. The contribuition has not been earmarked for specific components of the activity.

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.

Based on the prepayment decision tree the payments need to be entered as prepayments as the contribution is a general contribution made to NGO. Furthermore the contribution does not meet all the three lumpsum payment criteria.

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

The maximum percentage that can be paid as prepayment is 95% of the total activity cost. The reason being that the duration of the activity is long enough to spread out the prepayment and be able to monitor progress on results. Below is the prepayment schedule that will be informed by the received liquidity forecast from the implementing organisation.

Instalment	Submission date for updated liquidity forecast	Amount
1	01 December 2023	2,000,000

2	01 August 2024	2,000,000
3	01 August 2025	3,000,000
4	01 August 2026	3,000,000
5	01 August 2027	2,250,000
6	01 August 2028	2,000,000
7	01 October 2029	750,00

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

Prepayments will be closed based on the submision and approval annual progress narrative and financial , audit reports.

Available resources

	Foreign currency	EUR
Implementing organisation's own contribution		-
Firm commitments by other donors (for each donor)		-
Dutch contribution		15.000.000
Total available resources		15.000.000
Budget needed		15.000.000
Still to be financed		-
Soft commitments by other donors (for each donor)		-
Uncovered balance		-

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

Not Applicable

- 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?

Not Applicable

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.

Not Applicable

- 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.

Not Applicable

Audit opinions

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

Yes, we need an audit report with audit opinion on the project. We will add an audit protocol to the grant agreement, indicating an audit under ISA 805 as well as ISRS 4400. We need to be able to see (the follow up of) audit recommendations on the project.
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