<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Annex</th>
<th>Action title</th>
<th>EU contribution (EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ii) strengthening and promoting governance and capacity at the global, continental, regional and national level, for all relevant stakeholders</td>
<td>EUR 37 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inclusive and Sustainable Value Chains and Food Fortification</td>
<td>EUR 105 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>National Information Platforms for Nutrition (NIPN)</td>
<td>EUR 20 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>iii) supporting the poor and food and nutrition insecure to react to crises and strengthen resilience, including to the impacts of climate change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pro-Resilience Action -PRO-ACT</td>
<td>EUR 65.25 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Support Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Support Measures 2015</td>
<td>EUR 1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total EU contribution to the Annual Action Programme 2015 part 2 and Annual Action Programme 2016 part I</strong></td>
<td>EUR 228.25 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 1

Component 2: Strengthening and promoting governance and capacity at the global, continental, regional and national level, for all relevant stakeholders

### INFORMATION FOR POTENTIAL GRANT APPLICANTS

**WORK PROGRAMME FOR GRANTS**

This document constitutes the work programme for grants in the sense of Article 128(1) of the Financial Regulation (Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012) in the following sections concerning calls for proposals: 5.3.1 (Cameroon, and Ghana) and in the following sections concerning grants awarded directly without a call for proposals: 5.3.4 (Colombia, Guinea Bissau, Sudan, transversal support project, support to ILC)

| 1. Title/basic act/CRIS number | EU programme to support responsible governance of land tenure by promoting the VGGT, CRIS number: DCI-FOOD/2015/38099  
Support to land regularization in selected States of Brazil, CRIS number: DCI-FOOD/2015/38100  
Improved land tenancy in Sindh, Pakistan, CRIS number: DCI-FOOD/2015/38101  
financed under Development Cooperation Instrument |
| 2. Zone benefiting from the action/location | The action shall be carried out in all developing countries with a particular focus on following locations: Africa: Cameroon, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Sudan and Uganda. Asia: Pakistan. Latin America: Brazil and Colombia. |
| 4. Sector of concentration/thematic area | Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture |
| 5. Amounts concerned | Total estimated cost: EUR 39 560 000  
Total amount of EU contribution EUR 37 000 000  
This action is co-financed by potential grant beneficiaries for an indicative amount of EUR 2 560 000. |
| 6. Aid modality(ies) and implementation modality(ies) | Project Modality  
Direct management:  
- Procurement of services and supplies: Brazil  
- Grants – call for proposal: Cameroon, Ghana,  
Indirect management:  
- Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH: Uganda  
- Agence Francaise d'Expertise Technique Internationale (AFETI): Land Matrix Initiative  
- FAO: Transversal support  
- FAO: Colombia, Guinea-Bissau, Pakistan and Sudan  
- IFAD: Support to International Land Coalition (ILC) |
7. DAC code(s) 31110

8. Markers (from CRIS DAC form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General policy objective</th>
<th>Not targeted</th>
<th>Significant objective</th>
<th>Main objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation development/good governance</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to environment</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality (including Women In Development)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Development</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive, Maternal, New born and child health</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIO Convention markers</th>
<th>Not targeted</th>
<th>Significant objective</th>
<th>Main objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological diversity</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat desertification</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change mitigation</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change adaptation</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC) thematic flagships

EU initiative on pro-poor land governance

SUMMARY

Responsible governance of tenure ensuring secure access to land, in particular for female and male smallholder farmers is considered a critical issue for inclusive, pro-poor agricultural development and for sustainable management of natural resources with positive impact on environment biological diversity. It also contributes to the overall aim of improving food and nutrition security, which are key EU development objectives.

In 2012, the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) adopted the "Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security" (VGGT). The VGGT constitute a globally respected document on how tenure and access rights to land, fisheries and forests should be addressed within specific national context. The European Commission is committed to promote the application of the VGGT at country level for interested developing countries with the aim to contribute to responsible land governance. To this end, the European Commission will fund 8 in-country projects (Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia, Guinea Bissau, Ghana, Pakistan, Sudan and Uganda) helping governments and land users to address challenges they face regarding land governance. In respect of local requirements and by promoting the principles of the VGGT, the programme will improve the governance of tenure with a particular focus on female and male smallholder farmers, forest users and fishers. This will be achieved by improving the legal, institutional and administrative framework for land governance, contributing to the recognition of formal and customary land rights, empowering local stakeholders to voice and defend their interests, implementing capacity building measures for all relevant stakeholders and addressing land issues in post-conflict context, where appropriate. Systematic exploration of experiences made with the aim to improve the further use of the VGGT and the visualisation of results are equally addressed by the transversal component of the programme. The International Land Coalition (ILC) will ensure via its new strategic framework 2016/20 complementary actions by addressing cross-cutting issues (e.g. gender justice, transparency and accountability and
inclusive decision making) and by influencing national land policy processes through multi-stakeholder platforms. Supporting the Land Matrix Initiative will contribute to transparency and accountability in decision making over land and large-scale land-based investments by monitoring independently competition over land constituting an important source of information for fact based responsible governance of land tenure.

1 CONTEXT

1.1 Sector/Country/Regional context/Thematic area

The greater public recognised that responsible and transparent governance of land is a critical issue for many developing countries. It has a direct impact on secure and predictable access to land, in particular for the poorer section of the rural population and especially for women who provide the bulk of the agricultural work force in many developing countries. Insecure access to land and the risk of being expropriated have a negative impact on agricultural production, food security and nutrition, and infringe basic human rights. It undermines the sustainable use of limited natural resources, such as arable land, fisheries and forests, and can contribute to their destruction with irreversible consequences for environment and biological diversity in general.

The increasing demand for agricultural land in response to the food price crises and the constantly augmenting demand for food stuff and agricultural raw material - often driven by foreign investment for rent seeking - are additional challenges requiring solid and rights-based land governance systems.

The overlapping of customary and formalised rights, together with temporary rights for pastoralists and the right to use particular land-based assets, such as tree crops, constitute often a very complex "land tenure fabric".

This situation causes significant governance problems for many countries. If not addressed, inappropriate land governance may constrain economic growth and obstruct in particular the poorer section of the rural society from participating in economic development. Inappropriate and in-transparent land governance may contribute to internal conflicts and civil war and encourage the misuse of political power and corruption, often to the detriment of the poorer population. Moreover, countries have taken strong commitments in the context of multilateral environmental agreements (biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation) for which sound land governance at national level is indispensable. Addressing these diverse and intertwined issues surrounding land governance requires a holistic, well-coordinated approach that is firmly grounded in a human rights based framework.

1.1.1 Public Policy Assessment and EU Policy Framework

The action will be implemented in 8 different countries. The policy environment relevant to land governance differs from country to country. Countries such as Colombia with very complex and compartmentalised policies face challenges by overlapping of institutional responsibilities and restricted technical applicability. Other countries such as Guinea-Bissau have basic land governance policies available but so far were unable to implement them due to protracted internal conflicts or lack of required human resources capacities. Most of the policies in the partner countries are incomplete. They leave out important aspects to be
considered for responsible land governance, such as protecting user rights and contributing to a vibrant and inclusive rural economy.

With the endorsement of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) by the Committee on World Food Security in 2012, a comprehensive reference document became available to guide interested parties (e.g. national governments, development partners and Civil Society Organisations) in contributing to responsible land governance. The United Nations General Assembly requested in the resolution on agriculture development the speedy dissemination and promotion of the VGGT. The implementation of the Guidelines was further encouraged at the Rio+20 meeting and the 5th Berlin Agriculture Ministers' Summit.

The African Union (AU) adopted a Declaration on Land Issues and Challenges in 2009 and developed the African Framework and Guidelines (AF&G) on land policy through the African Land Policy Initiative (LPI), a joint programme of the AU, Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) and AfDB. The AU Declaration on Land and its AF&G are consistent with and support the VGGT. The land governance agenda is also supported by NEPAD Planning and Coordination Agency (NPCA) and CAADP (Sustaining the Momentum).

The International Land Coalition (ILC), a multi-stakeholder association created in 1995 is a major defender of pro-poor, people centred land governance. ILC supports the VGGT and focuses particularly on more cross-cutting issues (e.g. gender equality, rights of indigenous people, transparency and accountability) with an increasing emphasis on influencing policy formulation at national level (e.g. multi-stakeholder platforms). Further, the Land Matrix Initiative is a global and independent land monitoring body collecting and documenting information on large-scale land investments. The initiative hence contributes to increased transparency and accountability of global land transactions and facilitates informed decision making¹.

Promoting the governance of land and natural resource tenure is recognised as an important objective by the programming document 2014-20 of the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI) under the Thematic Programme Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC). It is considered a prerequisite for food security and nutrition as well as a means to facilitate responsible private investment into the agricultural sector, but has also an influence on other sectorial policies (e.g. fisheries and forests). In this context, the promotion of the VGGT as well as capacity development, support of civil society and supra-national initiatives as well as actions increasing transparency and accountability in decisions over land, are identified as possible actions to improve the many aspects of responsible land governance.

1.1.2 Stakeholder analysis

The stakeholders involved in the projects in each country consist of a variety of actors:

- Government services on central, regional and local levels, ministries and specialized agencies involved in land governance and related topics (forestry, fisheries, mining etc.), decentralized administrative structures

¹ http://www.landmatrix.org/en/
Customary institutions and traditional land governance actors such as local chiefs, customary authorities (religious leaders, council of elders etc.).

Civil Society actors including CSOs promoting the rights of female and male small-scale farmers and land users, farmer's associations and other professional organisations

The poor rural population, in particular female and male smallholder farmers, and natural resource users as the beneficiaries and target groups for the project

The private sector

International Organisations and the donor community

Research institutions, universities, expert knowledge

During the final formulation of the 8 country-based projects, further analysis will be conducted confirming more accurately the range of stakeholders and beneficiaries at country level. Where appropriate, multi-stakeholder platforms will be promoted as encouraged by the VGGT (Art 26.2) as well as the use of inclusive, participatory and gender-sensitive processes for sustainable land governance.

1.1.3 Priority areas for support/problem analysis

The 8 countries considered by this programme were selected following a call to all EU Delegations in developing countries to submit concept notes for possible projects to address land governance. Selection was done by applying a set of selection criteria (e.g. rational of development context and problem analysis, logic in the description and feasibility of proposed actions as well as possible complementarity with other actions) with the assumption that the full project proposals will be formulated by the concerned Delegations after the decision to fund this programme is taken by the Commission.

The 8 selected countries face very different challenges. Some of them are in a post-conflict situation where responsible land governance was neglected over years (e.g. Guinea Bissau and Sudan). Many countries face capacity problems on administrative and technical levels hampering the practical application of land tenure procedures and regulations (e.g. Brazil and Cameroon). There are also countries (e.g. Colombia and Ghana), where insufficient governance structures jeopardise the sustainable use of natural resources such as forests and fisheries, which are also covered by the VGGT. In most countries covered by this programme, the rights of land users and in particular of smallholder farmers are not sufficiently respected. These groups hence lack participation and influence with regards to land governance issues, which undermines their livelihoods and economic opportunities.

For each of the 8 countries, a specific problem analysis was conducted and tailor-made responses were formulated. Consequently, all projects are different in focus but address various chapters of the VGGT. All projects respond to country-specific needs and provide a basis for operationalizing and implementing the VGGT, from where 'lessons learned' can be crystallized for future land governance programmes.
## 2 Risks and Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Risk level (H/M/L)</th>
<th>Mitigating measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some countries such as Sudan and Colombia are facing instability or even conflict, which may hamper the implementation of the operations.</td>
<td>M - L</td>
<td>The formulation of projects for such countries is taking into account this particular risk. They are focusing more on capacity building and sensitisation to prepare the ground for more comprehensive land governance actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land governance is of high political sensitivity and different socio-economic groups may have conflicting interests</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>The project design considers local circumstances, hence reducing this risk. The risk is also mitigated by empowering socially disadvantaged groups and by gender-sensitive design. However, a certain degree of risk needs to be accepted and addressed during project implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to land governance is wide-ranging and required capacities (e.g. institutional and technical) are limited for sound project implementation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Almost all projects address the limited availability of human resources capacities as part of planned actions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assumptions

Even after the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) endorsed the VGGT officially the Guidelines remain non-legally binding, soft laws leaving it to individual countries to apply them. An increasing numbers of developing countries are acknowledging problems caused by weak land governance; even those in conflict (e.g. Somalia and South Sudan). FAO as well as AU sensitised governments on many occasions to utilise the VGGT when addressing land governance. Therefore, it is assumed that there is sufficient political will and commitment to drive the practical use of the VGGT. The support to the VGGT by various stakeholders is enhancing this assumption.

## 3 Lessons learnt, Complementarity and Cross-cutting Issues

### 3.1 Lessons learnt

The 2011 review of EC support to land issues and policy reform concluded that access to land and tenure for smallholder farmers are of concern in almost all countries the EU has financed respective programmes and projects. In many of these countries, these concerns are so grave that they create political instability, violence, population displacement, famine and environmental destruction, which could significantly undermine or prevent successful implementation of many EU programmes and projects. In other worlds, responsible land governance is indispensable to achieve or at least to contribute to core development goals of the EU, such as food and nutrition security, socio-economic stability and respect of basic human rights as well as economic growth and sustainable management of natural resources.

Many donors including the EU have addressed land governance in the past, but predominantly as a technical and procedural issue often overlooking the complex tissue of customary and overlapping rights on land.

The international community and many developing partner countries are recognising the importance of responsible land governance in securing access to land especially for the poorer section of society and with a particular focus on women. This increased acknowledgement of responsible land governance can be demonstrated by various studies and is depicted at numerous conferences.
With the emergence of the VGGT in 2012, a comprehensive and recognised manual has been made available to address the complex issue of land governance while respecting local specificities and requirements.

3.2 Complementarity, synergy and donor coordination

The present programme will further expand EU engagement in support of the VGGT approved in 2013 and complement land governance actions foreseen under the national indicative programmes of 30 developing countries.

Further, the programme is building upon the Global Food Security Governance contract with FAO, which includes, besides other actions, support to the FAO "Global Programme for the Application of the VGGT" 2012-2015.

The programme will be aligned to the African Land Policy Initiative (LPI). LPI aims to implement the African Union Framework and Guidelines (AF&G) on land policy, which promotes the application of the VGGT. The EU contribution to LPI is currently being evaluated and an additional financial contribution might be proposed.

Of particular importance is the work of the International Land Coalition (ILC), a multi-stakeholder alliance promoting secure and equitable access to and control over land. The EC aims at fostering complementarity and synergies with ILC through the present programme by providing EUR 5 million to co-fund the new 2016-20 strategic framework of ILC.

The Land Matrix Initiative, operational since 2012 is producing data on land acquisition. This is of importance to all stakeholders for transparent and accountable decision making and indispensable to recognise and defend rights to land in particular of less empowered stakeholders.

3.3 Cross-cutting issues

Contributing to good governance and securing/improving human rights with regards to access to land are the main cross-cutting issues of the programme. Responsible land tenure has an undisputable influence on sound, productive and sustainable use of land as the basis for agricultural production, which may benefit in particular female and male smallholder farmers as well as disadvantaged sections of populations. More secure tenure rights will benefit also the environment contributing to sustainable management of forest and marine resources.

The programme will pay particular attention to women and the promotion of gender equality and takes into account that in many societies, women contribute the bulk of agricultural work force.

Responsible land governance considers fisheries and forests and the implementation of the VGGT programme will help to address governance issue related to fisheries and forests (e.g. EU FLEGT initiative: Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade and Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing) with expected positive impact on the environment and biological diversity.
4 DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

4.1 Objectives/results

The overall objective of the programme is to contribute to improved food security, improved livelihoods and poverty alleviation as well as sound management of natural resources, in particular for female and male smallholder farmers and other users of natural resources, such as fisheries and forests.

The project purpose is to improve the governance of land, fisheries and forests in line with the VGGT and with a particular focus on female and male smallholder farmers and other disadvantaged sections of populations.

4.2 Results and main activities:

The entire programme is composed of 8 in-country projects, support to the International Land Coalition (ILC) and the Land Matrix Initiative as well as the transversal project. All projects aim at contributing to responsible land governance by promoting different chapters of the VGGT. The 8 in-country projects are responding to particular needs of their respective countries identified during the preparation of the concept notes. These projects vary strongly in their activities according to the different challenges they face, in particular with regards to the tenure of land, fisheries and forests. In fact, some projects operate in post-conflict countries, where land is often a particularly sensitive issue. The International Land Coalition (ILC) as a consortium of different civil society and intergovernmental organisations. ILC is addressing cross-cutting issues, promotes advocacy and accountability and aims to defend the rights of those who live on and from the land on country levels. The Land Matrix Initiative provides data on land deals accessible to all stakeholders for informed decision making. The transversal project will technically assist the implementation of the 8 in-country projects, ensure that progress is monitored and experiences shared and broadly visualised. Given their specificity each project will contribute only to some of the results mentioned below, but taking them all together they will ensure that all results will be addressed so that the envisaged project purpose will be reached. Moreover in its totality the programme is expected to provide valuable evidence for policy/political dialogue of EU Delegations with local governments in the field of land governance.

R1: Legal, institutional and administrative framework for responsible land governance including environmental aspects is implemented by considering local requirements

Activities:

- Analysis of current tenure rights, customary rights and formal and informal institutional and administrative provisions.

- Provision of legal and administrative tools to clarify user rights.

- Promotion of participation of local stakeholders in preparatory actions and decision making.

- Advocacy on political level for responsible land governance.
• Assistance in transparent and accountable formulation and approval of legal and administrative provisions for conclusive and rights-based land governance.

R2: Systems recognising and administering formal and customary land rights are operational

Activities:

• Development and application of tools and methodologies for land demarcation/registration and administration.

• Assistance in the collection and classification of land rights.

• Introduction and support of the use of advanced technologies to speed up data collection and processing.

• Support to the processing and management of rights-based land titles.

• Advocacy for local participation in formalisation of land rights ensuring that local needs and requirements are respected in preparatory processes.

• Provision of the technical means and equipment for sustainable storage of land titles.

R3: Local stakeholders, female and male smallholder farmers are capacitated and empowered to voice and defend their rights and interests

Activities:

• Implementation of awareness campaigns about land user rights on local level.

• Establishment of mechanism and transparent procedures allowing communities and individuals to take active part in land governance and to defend their legitimate rights and needs.

• Provide data and information on land acquisition and transfers to all stakeholders for better informed decision making.

• Ensuring that disadvantaged parts of the population and women in particular are empowered and better equipped to demonstrate and defend their rights.

• Contribution to the establishment and functionality of independent land governance surveillance bodies.

• Strengthening of non-state mechanism for land tenure through traditional practices where appropriate.

R4: Relevant stakeholders (public administration, technicians, local institutions and Civil Society Organisations) have the capacity to contribute to transparent and rights based land governance

Activities:
- Strengthening of administrative, legal and institutional capabilities required for sound land governance.

- Support and assistance to Civil Society Organisations to take active part in land governance processes.

- Provision of trainings for improving advocacy and defence of the rights of minorities and disadvantaged populations.

- Improvement of the technical capacities for land registration and administration.

**R5: People in post-conflict countries benefit from more secure access to land**

**Activities:**

- Support of transparent and participatory inventories of local land rights.

- Technical and methodological assistance of the mapping of community resources.

- Revival or creation of local level multi-stakeholder platforms addressing and solving land conflicts.

- Development of mechanisms and procedures to address grievances regarding land access.

- Development of mechanisms for land restitution and reintegration of IDPs and compensation if required.

- Strengthening of non-state mechanism for land tenure through traditional practices.

**R6: Information and data on land deals is accessible to all stakeholders for informed and transparent decision making to contribute to responsible land governance**

**Activities:**

- Expand and enrich in qualitative and quantitative terms the unique data base established by the Land Matrix Initiative

- Disseminate of data and knowledge generated in a user friendly manner

- Train stakeholders in the use of data and information

- Expand land observatories at national levels

- Develop software for this purpose and train local stakeholders to use this software

**R7: Lessons learned and experiences made are systematically explored and visualised**

**Activities:**

- Development of a common reporting framework and identify/confirm core progress indicators.
• Implementation of regular trainings and capitalisation workshops to bring together all in-country projects.

• Provision of feedback on challenges encountered and proposal of solutions, if possible, for general application.

• Presentation of the programme in international events and contribution with appropriate visualisation material.

• Capitalisation of experiences made in order to contribute to the operationalization of the VGGT.

5 IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Financing agreement

In order to implement this action, it is foreseen to conclude a financing agreement with Brazil and Pakistan and it is not foreseen to conclude a financing agreement with the other partner countries (Cameroon, Colombia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Sudan and Uganda, referred to in Article 184(2) (b) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012.

5.2 Indicative implementation period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 4.1 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 108 months from the date of entry into force of the financing agreement or the adoption by the Commission of this Action Document.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission’s authorising officer responsible by amending this decision and the relevant contracts and agreements; such amendments to this decision constitute technical amendments in the sense of point (i) of Article 2(3)(c) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014.

5.3 Implementation components and modules

5.3.1 Grants: call for proposals for Cameroon and Ghana (direct management)

(a) The Objectives of the grants, fields of intervention, priorities of the year and expected results

All projects and initiatives to be funded by this action are contributing to the objectives and results described in section 4 of this action document.

In-country projects:

Cameroon:

Grants to NGOs (call for proposals): "Ensure effective and transparent mechanisms for the governance of tenure and the beneficial and peaceful coexistence of diverse rights-holders in the forest areas". Inform and sensitize actors on legal and policy instruments regarding forest tenure and enhance collaboration among stakeholders. Institutionalise principles of responsible forest management from the economic, social and environmental points of view.
Clarify and recognise the forest rights of various stakeholders and assist competent authorities in their functions by providing required equipment and technical advice.

(b) Eligibility conditions

The applicants should be local or international NGOs.

Subject to information to be published in the call for proposals, the indicative amount of the EU contribution per grant is EUR 4,000,000 and the grants may be awarded to sole beneficiaries (mono-beneficiaries) and to consortia of beneficiaries (coordinator and co-beneficiaries). The indicative duration of the grant (its implementation period) is 48 months.

(c) Essential selection and award criteria

The essential selection criteria are financial and operational capacity of the applicant.

The essential award criteria are relevance of the proposed action to the objectives of the call; design, effectiveness, feasibility, sustainability and cost-effectiveness of the action.

(d) Maximum rate of co-financing

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for grants under this call is 80% of the eligible costs of the action. This rate may be higher if the auto-financing capacity of the targeted beneficiaries is weak.

In accordance with Articles 192 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012, if full funding is essential for the action to be carried out, the maximum possible rate of co-financing may be increased up to 100%. The essentiality of full funding will be justified by the Commission’s authorising officer responsible in the award decision, in respect of the principles of equal treatment and sound financial management.

(e) Indicative timing to launch the call

First semester 2016.

**Ghana:**

Grants to NGOs (call for proposals): "Ensure greater environmental sustainability and social equity in Ghana’s fishing sector". Mainstreaming of VGGT principles in the fishery sector, empower coastal communities depending on fisheries and especially women to articulate their interests in tenure rights processes, provide alternative livelihood options to fishers and fish processors affected by current capacity reduction efforts.

(b) Eligibility conditions

The applicants should be local or international NGOs.

Subject to information to be published in the call for proposals, the indicative amount of the EU contribution per grant is EUR 3,300,000 and the grants may be awarded to sole beneficiaries (mono-beneficiaries) and to consortia of beneficiaries (coordinator and co-beneficiaries). The indicative duration of the grant (its implementation period) is 48 months.
(c) Essential selection and award criteria

The essential selection criteria are financial and operational capacity of the applicant.

The essential award criteria are relevance of the proposed action to the objectives of the call; design, effectiveness, feasibility, sustainability and cost-effectiveness of the action.

(d) Maximum rate of co-financing

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for grants under this call is 80% of the eligible costs of the action. This rate may be higher if the auto-financing capacity of the targeted beneficiaries is weak.

In accordance with Articles 192 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012, if full funding is essential for the action to be carried out, the maximum possible rate of co-financing may be increased up to 100 %. The essentiality of full funding will be justified by the Commission’s authorising officer responsible in the award decision, in respect of the principles of equal treatment and sound financial management.

(e) Indicative timing to launch the call

First semester 2016.

5.3.2 Procurement (direct management)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject in generic terms, if possible</th>
<th>Type (works, supplies, services)</th>
<th>Indicative number of contracts</th>
<th>Indicative trimester of launch of the procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2.1 Technical Assistance</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2.2 Supply of equipment for land registration</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.3 Indirect management with a Member State

5.3.3.1 Indirect management with the Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer International Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

Part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 This implementation entails the implementation of the component concerning Uganda "Improving land governance with the aim to increase the productivity of small-scale farmers on Mailo-land". This implementation is justified because GIZ has recognised experience in land management in the region and is already involved in land management in this particular region and would be best suited to ensure complementary of actions contributing to aid effectiveness.

The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-implementation tasks: Procurement of goods and services, contracting of partners for the implementation of the activities in the mentioned country. This includes launching calls for tenders and for proposals; definition of
eligibility, selection and award criteria; evaluation of tenders and proposals; award of grants and contracts; concluding and managing contracts, carrying out payments, recovering moneys due etc.

5.3.3.2 Indirect management with the Agence Francaise d'Expertise Technique Internationale (AFETI)

Part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with the Agence Francaise d'Expertise Technique Internationale in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012. This implementation entails the implementation of the component concerning the "Land Matrix Initiative". This implementation is justified because Agence Francaise d'Expertise Technique Internationale is already involved in the Land Matrix Initiative and has significant insight managerial experience in supporting this initiative.

Based on past experiences the Land Matrix Initiative will continue to provide data on land deals, increase the data in quality and quantity and make them accessible to all stakeholders for informed decision making.

The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-implementation tasks: Contracting of partners for the implementation of the Land Matrix Initiative, which includes award of grants and contracts, managing contracts and performance monitoring, carrying out payments, recovering moneys due etc.

5.3.4 Indirect management with an international organisation

5.3.4.1 Indirect management with FAO in Pakistan

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with FAO in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012. This implementation entails to "improve and formalise land tenancy, especially for women and vulnerable groups by adhering and promoting the principles of the VGGT in the province of Sindh". In a predominantly feudal environment formalising land tenancy agreements, gathering evidence of economic advantages of improved access to land and assisting government to improve the land policy framework are major tasks of FAO in collaboration with local stakeholders. This implementation is justified because FAO is already operating in the area and is well versed in carrying out budget-implementation tasks. The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-implementation: procurement of services for evidence based research and reporting on tenancy arrangements; provision of grants to NGOs to work on tenant rights and awareness campaigns, awarding and managing contracts, carrying out payments and recovering money due.

5.3.4.2 Indirect management with FAO in Colombia

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with FAO in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012. This implementation entails "to increase tenure security and governance in and around selected national protected areas of Colombia". Support to government on appropriate levels will be provided to define a land governance strategy through a multi-stakeholder platform, issue recognised land titles to informal tenants in selected protected areas and advice responsible authorities in procedures for restitution of land to communities overlapping with protected areas. This implementation is justified because FAO is already operating in the area and is well versed in carrying out budget-implementation tasks. The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-
implementation: provision of grants to WWF for facilitating negotiation processes, for capacity building activities, and procurement of services for monitoring actions, awarding and managing contracts, carrying out payments and recovering money due.

5.3.4.3 Indirect management with FAO in Guinea Bissau

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with FAO in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012. This implementation entails to "implement responsible land governance in Guinea Bissau based on the tenure law (1998) and its application provisions (2008/2014)". The action will: assist the national land commission to enhance its capacity, support the setting up of a land observatory and provide capacity building actions to different state and non-state actors involved in land governance. This implementation is justified because FAO is already operating in the area and is well versed in carrying out budget-implementation tasks. The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-implementation: procurement of services for monitoring and research activities and award of grant contracts for NGOs and national institutes managing contracts, carrying out payments and recovering money due.

5.3.4.4 Indirect management with FAO in Sudan

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with FAO in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012. This implementation entails to "strengthen non-state mechanisms for land tenure through traditional practices in Darfur". The action will: assist the Darfur Regional Authority to develop and operationalize a framework for land tenure in Darfur, assist in enacting community based land agreements, provide advice on the formulation of policies and assist in strengthening mechanism for community participation in policy processes and promote methodologies to solve land conflicts. This implementation is justified because FAO is already operating in the area and is well versed in carrying out budget-implementation tasks. The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-implementation: procurement of goods and services for land mapping, facilitating community consultations, providing grants to community based peace negotiation platforms; monitoring actions, awarding and managing contracts, carrying out payments and recovering money due.

5.3.4.5 Indirect management with FAO for transversal support

Part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with FAO in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012. This implementation entails to "implement the transversal support to in-country projects". The objective is to assist the 8 in-country projects on technical issues by providing guidelines and training documents, organising regular exchange of experiences made, developing commonly agreed progress indicators and progress reporting structures and facilitating the visibility of the programme on international levels. This implementation is justified because FAO is already providing this type of support for the land initiative launched in 2013. The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-implementation: procurement of goods and services for training events and large scale seminars, award of grant contracts for NGOs for selected monitoring actions, awarding and managing contracts, carrying out payments and recovering money due.

5.3.4.6 Indirect management with IFAD for the International Land Coalition

Part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with IFAD in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012. This implementation entails
to "support the implementation 2016-20 Strategic Framework of the International Land Coalition (ILC)". ILC aims to strengthen the capacities of civil society organisations defending the rights of poor female and male smallholders and holding government accountable on their commitments to improve land governance in respect of the VGGT. ILC will increasingly engage with government complementing the in-country projects subject to this action document. This implementation is justified because based on the renewed "housing agreement" 2015 – 2020; IFAD provides financial support to ILC to implement the new strategic framework 2016-2020 promoting people-centred land governance. The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-implementation: procurement of goods and services for training events, large scale seminars and selected monitoring actions, awarding and managing contracts, carrying out payments and recovering money due.

FAO is currently undergoing the ex-ante assessment in accordance with Article 61(1) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012. The Commission’s authorising officer responsible deems that, based on the compliance with the ex-ante assessment based on Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 1605/2002 and long-lasting problem-free cooperation, FAO can be entrusted with budget-implementation tasks under indirect management.

5.4 Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply.

The Commission’s authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility in accordance with Article 9(2) (b) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of products and services in the markets of the countries concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where the eligibility rules would make the realization of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult.

5.5 Indicative budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EU contribution (amount in EUR)</th>
<th>Indicative third party contribution( amount in EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1.1 Grants: Call for proposals with NGOs, (direct management) Cameroon</td>
<td>4 000 000</td>
<td>800 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1.2 Grants: Call for proposals with NGOs (direct management) Ghana</td>
<td>3 300 000</td>
<td>660 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2.1 Procurement of services (direct management) Brazil</td>
<td>3 000 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2.2 Procurement of supplies (direct management) Brazil</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3.1 Indirect management with Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH: Uganda</td>
<td>4 000 000</td>
<td>300 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3.2 Indirect management with Agence Francaise d'Expertise Technique Internationale</td>
<td>1 000 000</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.4.1 Indirect management with FAO: Pakistan</td>
<td>4 000 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.4.2 Indirect management with FAO: Colombia</td>
<td>3 200 000</td>
<td>800 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>EU contribution (amount in EUR)</td>
<td>Indicative third party contribution (amount in EUR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.4.3 Indirect management with FAO: Guinea Bissau</td>
<td>3 000 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.4.4 Indirect management with FAO: Sudan</td>
<td>3 000 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.4.5 Indirect management with FAO: Transversal component</td>
<td>2 500 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.4.6 Indirect management with IFAD for ILC</td>
<td>5 000 000</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and Audit</td>
<td>To be funded under another decision</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and visibility</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>37 000 000</td>
<td>2 560 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Organisational set-up and responsibilities

All projects covered under this action document will be managed by the EU Delegations with the exception of the transversal component and the project with IFAD supporting ILC. The latter two projects will be managed by Commission Services. For in-country projects, the organisational set-up will be defined according to the specificities of each project and in accordance with local requirements. Each EU Delegation responsible for in-country projects will participate in the decision making and strategic bodies (e.g. steering committees).

5.4 Performance monitoring and reporting

Performance monitoring of this programme pursues two objectives. Firstly, it provides information on progress made and gives indications for sound technical and financial management of the individual in-country projects. This programme is also aiming to provide practical experience on the use of the VGGT at country level and in different development settings. To ensure progressive learning and to draw lessons for the generalisation of the VGGT, continued and coordinated monitoring and reporting is required.

Contributing to these objectives is one of the activities of the transversal project managed by FAO. By taking into account the Commission results framework, FAO will identify a set of verifiable indicators which can be used by all in-country projects as well as establish a common reporting format. FAO will assist all in-country projects during their inception-phase to review their log frames ensuring that the agreed indicators are incorporated. It is the task of FAO to assess the reports of the in-country projects and prepare findings to be shared on international levels helping the EU to demonstrate that commitments are taken serious.

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of different in-country projects and the process of implementing partners' responsibilities will be a continuous process. The implementing partner shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports as defined in the general conditions of the contract. Every report shall provide an accurate account of the implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as

---

1 Will be funded by the different actions mentioned above directly
well as the degrees of achievement of results (outputs and direct outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators using as reference the log frame matrix. The report shall be laid out in such a way as to allow monitoring of the means envisaged and employed and of the budget details for the action. The final report, narrative and financial, will cover the entire period of the action implementation. IFAD will provide progress reports in accordance with the requirement of the general conditions of the contract concluded between the EU and IFAD in support of ILC. The French Ministry of Foreign Affairs will provide progress reports in accordance with the requirement of the general conditions of the contract concluded between the EU and the Ministry in support of the Land Matrix Initiative.

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

5.5 Evaluation

Considering the importance of the action, a mid-term and a final evaluation will be carried out for the entire action by independent consultants contracted by the Commission. In the case that an evaluation is not foreseen, the Commission may, during implementation, decide to undertake such an evaluation for duly justified reasons either by own choice or by following the partner's initiative.

The Commission shall inform the implementing partners at least 3 months in advance of the dates foreseen for the evaluation missions. The implementing partner shall collaborate efficiently and effectively with the evaluation experts, and inter alia provide them with all necessary information and documentation as well as with access to the project premises and activities.

The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner country and other key stakeholders. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations. Where appropriate, they should jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken in agreement with the partner country. This includes, in particular, any adjustments necessary, such as the reorientation of the actions and/or parts thereof, if indicated.

The financing of the evaluation shall be covered partly by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.6 Audit

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audits or expenditure verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

The financing of the audit shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.7 Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility of the EU is a legal obligation for all external actions funded by the EU.
This action shall contain communication and visibility measures, which shall be based on a specific Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action to be elaborated at the start of implementation and financed under the budget of each in-country project. A budget to fund some overarching visibility actions will be included in the transversal project.

In terms of legal obligations on communication and visibility, the measures shall be implemented by the Commission, the partner country, contractors, grant beneficiaries and/or entrusted entities. Appropriate contractual obligations shall be included in, respectively, the financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and delegation agreements.

In case of agreements with UN organisations, the Communication and Visibility Manual for European Union External Action or Joint Visibility Guidelines for EC-UN actions in the field shall be used to establish the Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action and the appropriate contractual obligations.
The activities, the expected outputs and all the indicators, targets and baselines included in the logframe matrix are indicative and may be updated during the implementation of the action without an amendment to the financing decision. The indicative logframe matrix will evolve during the lifetime of the action: new lines will be added for listing the activities as well as new columns for intermediary targets (milestones) when it is relevant and for reporting purpose on the achievement of results as measured by indicators.

Note: This logframe is indicative and summarises the actions of the 8 in-country projects, ILC and the Land Matrix as well as the transversal project. In line with basic principles of the VGGT, each in-country project is designed in response to challenges specific to the host country and do not necessary address all results defined for the programme logframe. For each of these projects specific logframes will be formulated. These logframes will be explored to gather information on progress made and results achieved on overall level, a task assumed by the transversal project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objective: Impact</th>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baselines (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Targets (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Sources and means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The programme will contribute to improved food security, improved livelihoods and poverty alleviation as well as sound management of natural resources, in particular for female and male smallholder farmers and other users of natural resources such as fisheries and forests.</td>
<td>Overall land and water productivity for major agriculture productions Decrease of number of food-insecure people Prevalence of poverty in rural areas</td>
<td>Ideally, to be drawn from the partner's strategy</td>
<td>Ideally, to be drawn from the partner's strategy</td>
<td>To be drawn from the partner's strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Mark indicators aligned with the relevant programming document mark with '*' and indicators aligned to the EU Results Framework with '**'.

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baselines (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Targets (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Sources and means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Specific objective: Outcome</td>
<td>Governance of land, fisheries and forests is improved in line with the VGGT and with a particular focus on female and male smallholder farmers and other disadvantaged populations</td>
<td>Number of female and male small-scale farmers with recognised evidence of tenure</td>
<td>Less than 30% of small-scale farmers have evidenced tenure rights in developing countries; for female farmers this is even worth</td>
<td>At least 25% of small-scale female and male farmers targeted by in-country projects will have evidenced tenure rights by the end of the project</td>
<td>Unified reporting of the in-country projects under the guidance of the transversal project on a yearly basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outputs 1</td>
<td>Legal, institutional and administrative framework for responsible land governance including environmental aspects is implemented by considering local requirements</td>
<td>Legal land tenure documents and regulations approved, duly consider local requirements (e.g. customary rights).</td>
<td>No baseline possible</td>
<td>At least in 5 countries considered by the programme, land governance regulations are operational benefiting small-scale farmers</td>
<td>Unified reporting of the in-country projects under the guidance of the transversal project on a yearly basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outputs 2</td>
<td>Systems recognising and administering formal and customary land rights are operational</td>
<td>Number of institutions managing/administering land titles on national and subnational levels operational. Number of land information mapping systems operational. Land titling systems do take into account customary land rights.</td>
<td>No baseline possible</td>
<td>At least in 4 countries considered by the programme institutions managing land titles are operational</td>
<td>Unified reporting of the in-country projects under the guidance of the transversal project on a yearly basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outputs 3</td>
<td>Local stakeholders, female and male smallholder farmers are capacitated and empowered to voice and defend their rights and interests</td>
<td>Meaningful participation of local stakeholders, female and male smallholder farmers, in decision making processes. Number of active multi-stakeholder platforms.</td>
<td>No baseline possible</td>
<td>At least in 5 countries considered by the programme stakeholder participate in land tenure consultations through formalised arrangements</td>
<td>Unified reporting of the in-country projects under the guidance of the transversal project on a yearly basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Intervention logic</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Baselines (incl. reference year)</td>
<td>Targets (incl. reference year)</td>
<td>Sources and means of verification</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs 4</td>
<td>Relevant stakeholders (public administration, technicians, local institutions and Civil Society Organisations) have the capacity to contribute to transparent and rights-based land governance</td>
<td>Number of female and male smallholders and of local institutions who received training in land governance. Public stakeholders’ knowledge on land governance increased thanks to training activities.</td>
<td>No baseline possible</td>
<td>In all countries considered by the programme at least one of the stakeholder groups received training</td>
<td>Unified reporting of the in-country projects under the guidance of the transversal project on a yearly basis.</td>
<td>The situation is sufficiently secure to allow operations on the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs 5</td>
<td>People in post-conflict countries benefit from more secure access to land</td>
<td>Number of people who received recognised formal or customary land rights. Number of land right cases successfully addressed</td>
<td>No baseline possible</td>
<td>In the 3 countries in post-conflict addressed by this programme 25% of the targeted population have received evidenced land rights</td>
<td>Unified reporting of the in-country projects under the guidance of the transversal project on a yearly basis.</td>
<td>The situation is sufficiently secure to allow operations on the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs 6</td>
<td>Information and data on land deals is accessible to all stakeholders for informed and transparent decision making to contribute to responsible land governance</td>
<td>In particular weaker stakeholders (e.g. smallholders women and minorities…) are using data and information produced by the Land Matrix Initiative in advocacy and policy dialogue</td>
<td>No baseline possible</td>
<td>Number of actions with confirmed use of Land Matrix Initiative data</td>
<td>Report from media and stakeholders, records of Land Matrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs 7</td>
<td>Lessons learned and experiences made are systematically explored and visualised</td>
<td>Number of events were work of programme was visualised. Number of experiences documented and made available through different channel</td>
<td>No baseline possible</td>
<td>At least 1 presentation on international levels of the programme per year</td>
<td>Reporting of the transversal project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 2

Component 2: Strengthening and promoting governance and capacity at the global, continental, regional and national level, for all relevant stakeholders

**INFORMATION FOR POTENTIAL GRANT APPLICANTS**

**WORK PROGRAMME FOR GRANTS**

This document constitutes the work programme for grants in the sense of Article 128(1) of the Financial Regulation (Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012) in the following sections concerning calls for proposals: 5.3.2 Value Chain Development and Food Fortification.

| 1. Title/basic act/CRIS number | Inclusive and Sustainable Value Chains and Food Fortification
|                               | CRIS number: DCI-FOOD/2015/038-326 financed under Development Cooperation Instrument |

| 2. Zone benefiting from the action/location | Multi-Country
|                                           | The Value Chains Development will mostly but not exclusively benefit countries having selected FNSSA as sector of concentration (60 countries so far) and Food Fortification will focus on countries out of the 60 presenting a high rate of under nutrition and that expressed an interest in developing this area: Bangladesh, Chad, Ethiopia, Gambia, Kenya, Laos, Malawi, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Zambia and Zimbabwe |


| 4. Sector of concentration/thematic area | Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture (FNSSA) |

| 5. Amounts concerned | Total estimated cost: EUR 124 000 000
|                      | Total amount of EU budget contribution EUR 105 000 000
|                      | The contribution is for an amount of EUR 55 000 000 from the general budget of the European Union for 2015 and for an amount of EUR 50 000 000 from the general budget of the European Union for 2016 subject to the availability of appropriations following the adoption of the relevant budget.
|                      | This action is co-financed by potential grant beneficiaries for an indicative amount of EUR 19 000 000 |

| 6. Aid modality(ies) and implementation modality(ies) | Project Modality
|                                                         | Direct management: procurement of services for the component 1 “Value Chain Analysis”
|                                                         | Direct management: grants – call for proposals for the component 2 “Value Chain Development”, and component 3 “Food Fortification”
|                                                         | Indirect management: via blending for the component 2 “Value Chain Development” |

| 7. DAC code(s) | 12240 Nutrition/31120 Agricultural development/52010 Food Security |
8. Markers (from CRIS DAC form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General policy objective</th>
<th>Not targeted</th>
<th>Significant objective</th>
<th>Main objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation development/good governance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to environment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality (including Women In Development)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive, Maternal, New born and child health</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIO Convention markers</th>
<th>Not targeted</th>
<th>Significant objective</th>
<th>Main objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological diversity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat desertification</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change mitigation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change adaptation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC) thematic flagships

N. A.

**SUMMARY**

This programme has two main goals: poverty reduction and improvement of nutritional status. It aims at developing: a) inclusive and sustainable agriculture based value chains on one side and b) food fortification on the other. Both areas rely on knowledge, evidence based experience and investments.

A) Agriculture has the potential to generate growth, employment in rural areas and along the value chains, and to manage environmental services. To fully exploit this potential public and private investments are needed. To foster inclusive, equitable and sustainable development and harness organisational and technological innovation, three priorities are set:

1. Produce knowledge and analyse experiences to help policy makers and investors to design strategies, policies and projects.
2. Facilitate the establishment of public-private stakeholders alliances and strengthen capacities of various operators along the value chain (farmers and their organisations, micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs), market organisations etc.) to improve governance, to access existing and new markets (domestic and international), and to remain competitive.
3. Increase investments in the agriculture value chain to start ‘rural transformations’ through blending mechanisms.

B) The programme will strengthen the production, diffusion and consumption of accessible technologically viable and culturally acceptable fortified food, compliant with national and international standards. It will involve working with government and intergovernmental regulatory bodies, the food processing private sector operators and civil society, and will reinforce the public/private partnerships in this area. It will also generate valuable knowledge about the cost-effectiveness of food fortification approaches in particular contexts that will be used to inform government policies. This component is supported by a technical assistance contract which will be active by end of 2015 and which will provide assistance to all projects generated though the call for proposals and will ensure coordination, exchange of experiences as well as a common framework for monitoring and evaluation.
This programme supports directly the achievement of the objectives of the Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture theme under the Global Public Goods and Challenges Programme (GPGC) Multi-Annual Plan (MIP). In particular under Component 2: Strengthening and promoting governance and capacity at the global, continental, regional and national level, for all relevant stakeholders, which under possible activities lists the following: ‘In order to increase the participation and strengthen the institutional capacities of relevant stakeholders in policy design and dialogue on food and nutrition security issues, the programme may support capacity development initiatives of stakeholders such as, CSOs, farmers’ organisations and other inter-professional groups along the value chain, the financing of events, studies, initiatives and actions that foster international, South-South and South-North policy dialogue, cooperation/coordination, advocacy, sharing of experiences, and harmonisation and alignment in the field of food and nutrition security. Within the context of innovative financing mechanisms, multi-stakeholder initiatives could be explored that promote inclusive business models that deliver high development impacts in terms of social inclusive and environmental sustainability. This will include facilitation, brokering, match making and establishing linkages between the parties involved. It also addresses the two other components as it strengthens knowledge generation and exchange and fosters innovation (component 1), and contributes to strengthening resilience through alleviating poverty (component 3).

1 CONTEXT

1.1 Sector and thematic context

Agriculture based value chains, both local and global, are an important part of the EU Agenda for Change, and play an important role in achieving sustainability and development: environmentally (natural resources management impacting on change in land use, carbon footprint, emissions and biodiversity among others), socially (risk management and resilience, land tenure rights, child labour, decent work, gender role among others) and economically (job creation, revenue distribution along the chain, overall benefits, multiplier effect of investment in agriculture and upstream and downstream private sector activities among others).

Together with governments, UN agencies and public and private partners, the EU is committed to sustainable sourcing and investment across the agricultural supply chains, and supports the novel guidance of voluntary principles for investment in agriculture such as the “Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security – VGGT” and “The Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems – RAI”. Private investment combined with public action can benefit smallholders, communities, business enterprises and governments and contribute to inclusive and sustainable development and poverty reduction.

Blended finance will address the serious barriers of the lack of investment and the risk associated with smallholders and micro, small and medium enterprises (MSME) financing. It will allow combining the grants under this programme with other public and private sector resources in different forms of risk sharing mechanisms in order to leverage financing and allow achieving results at scale.

It is estimated that about 11% of GDP is lost to under–nutrition every year, reducing a nation’s economic advancement by at least 8% due to direct productivity, poorer cognition
and reduced schooling related losses. About 840 million people worldwide are chronically undernourished and more than three million children die every year due to undernutrition. In 2012 The EU committed to support partner countries in reducing stunting in 7 million children by 2025. To reach this goal, at the 2013 G8 Nutrition for Growth high-level event the Commission pledged EUR 3.5 billion in 2014-2020. The EU will achieve its goal by supporting governments of high stunting burden countries to integrate nutrition in their national policies, by supporting high impact interventions and by increasing the knowledge base on the cost-effectiveness of nutrition interventions. The improvement of food systems is one of the areas that the Commission has more potential to attain impact in the reduction of stunting.

Deficiencies of essential vitamins and minerals are widespread and have substantial adverse effects on child survival and development. Deficiencies of vitamin A and zinc negatively affect child health and survival, and deficiencies of iodine and iron, together with stunting, contribute to children not reaching their developmental potential. Iron and calcium deficiencies contribute substantially to maternal deaths: anaemia is suspected to lead to 23% of total maternal deaths, while calcium deficiency increases the risk of preeclampsia, responsible for 19% of total maternal deaths.

Capacity to produce evidence based knowledge related to value chains and food fortification is needed, in order to draw lessons for action, innovation and accountability, and to ensure sustainable benefits for the poor and most vulnerable.

1.1.1 Public Policy Assessment and EU Policy Framework

The development of inclusive and sustainable value chains will be pursued in line with the EU policy commitments taken in 2011 on ‘Increasing the impact of EU Development Policy: an Agenda for Change’ (COM(2011)637), where agricultural development appears prominently. Value chains development is as well fully in line with the Communication released in 2014 on ‘A Stronger Role of the Private Sector in Achieving Inclusive and Sustainable Growth in Developing Countries’ (COM(2014) 263) and the voluntary principles mentioned above. The programme will contribute to implement 6 specific actions of the Communication, namely action 1 (business enabling environment); action 2 (market based schemes for MSMEs); action 4 (on innovative financing mechanisms); action 5 (on inclusive finance); action 7 (on engaging with the private sector) and action 9 (related to the promotion of eco-entrepreneurship).

To strengthen the coherence of EU instruments, the platform for blending in external cooperation is currently improving the quality, efficiency and harmonisation of EU external blending mechanisms with EU Member States, European financial institutions and European development financial institutions.

This programme is also consistent with AU Commission and CAADP public policy, notably the commitment from the recent second Malabo Declaration (2014) that underlines the need for “Enhancing Investment Finance in Agriculture”, in particular to “support systems for facilitation of private investment in agriculture, agri-business and agro-industries”.

The improvement of food fortification will be pursued in alignment with the Communication “Enhancing Maternal and Child Nutrition in External Assistance” (COM(2013) 141), which was adopted in March 2013 with Council Conclusions issued in May 2013. It is also indicated as one of the interventions that the Commission will support in its Nutrition Action Plan of July 2014 and the ensuing Council Conclusions.
1.1.2 Stakeholder analysis

Multi-stakeholder alliances are a central feature of value chains development. They include, but are not limited to, governments, the private sector/MSME agribusinesses, civil society, community and farmers organisations, regional and international organisations, development banks, fund managers, foundations, research institutions and academia.

This programme will specifically focus on smallholder farmers and MSME agribusinesses in developing countries as final beneficiaries by increasing income opportunities, creating jobs and business opportunities along the agricultural supply chains in an inclusive and sustainable manner, and particularly building up the participation of the small, vulnerable and poor members of society, therefore increasing their power of negotiation.

Final beneficiaries from food fortification will be poor and vulnerable households currently suffering from micronutrient deficiencies. In addition, for enhancing capacities for policy-making, legislating, regulating, enforcing and managing food fortification programmes, government will be a critical stakeholder.

Direct beneficiaries receiving the funds under the Call for Proposals are experienced organisations active at the interface between smallholders, MSMEs, and public and private institutions in marketing, provision of finance, information and other services, as well as the production, distribution, regulation, capacity building and monitoring of Food Fortification programmes.

1.1.3 Priority areas for support/problem analysis

Rising domestic and international demand for agricultural produce and improved climate for both domestic and foreign investment have increased agricultural prices and create market opportunities for big and small farmers to increase income, thereby reducing food insecurity and generating wealth. At the same time, many smallholder farmers are not or insufficiently connected to the local, regional or global markets, lack capacities (information, capital, skills and technologies) to be integrated into value chains or have low productivity or are not producing in a socially and environmentally sustainable manner.

Changing conditions for agricultural production due to climate change and natural resources increasing scarcity makes it imperative for stakeholders to find ways of adaptation, and to adopt production practices limiting the negative effects on climate (mitigation). This particularly leads to promoting climate smart agricultural production innovations and environmentally friendly technological processes and organisation along the value chains.

Increasing scarcity of natural resources (land, energy, water, etc.), growing attention for human rights (decent work, child labour, women rights, etc.) as well as the need for transparency and accountability, led both public and private sector to put more emphasis on sustainable agricultural development and responsible entrepreneurship. In particular more and more private companies are now embracing environmental, social and governance sustainability, in order to ensure a stable, strong and enduring supply chains.

All these production opportunities, development challenges and sustainability requirements are complex and need to be dealt with by various stakeholders. The programme will therefore be active in supporting the building of new multi-stakeholder governance at all levels.
These innovative approaches will be supported by systematic evidence-based knowledge generation on value chains in order to ensure appropriate accountability.

Deficiencies of essential vitamins and minerals are widespread and have substantial adverse effects on child survival and development. Deficiencies of vitamin A and zinc negatively affect child health and survival, and deficiencies of iodine and iron, together with stunting, contribute to children not reaching their developmental potential. Iron and calcium deficiencies contribute substantially to maternal deaths: anaemia is suspected to lead to 23% of total maternal deaths, while calcium deficiency increases the risk of preeclampsia, responsible for 19% of total maternal deaths. Food fortification has the potential to reduce significantly these deficiencies by strengthening the regulatory framework that exist in high stunting burden countries and by improving the capacity of the staple food suppliers (often locally based food processing small to medium size mills and industry).

To increase the efficiency of food fortification alliances and a robust governance system must be built between the public sector, the private staple food suppliers, civil society, local academia and the beneficiary communities. These must be adapted to reflect the particular regulatory context and nutritional situation of each country.

2 RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Risk level (H/M/L)</th>
<th>Mitigating measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some of the smallest farmers and MSMEs do not benefit from the intervention on the value chain they are or could be part of.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>All programme components focus on maximum levels of inclusion. Value Chain Analysis will allow monitoring effective inclusiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market risks like monopsony, low or volatile prices, product quality and non-delivery issues, lack of transparency, etc. are negatively affecting smallholders/MSMEs.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Value Chain Analysis (component 1) focusses on quantification of the benefits to stakeholders, and is used in the programme to reduce these risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputational risks of a general nature inherent to working with private sector entities (land grabbing for instance) could hamper the programme.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Proper value chain analysis and monitoring will reduce, mitigate or cope with the many risks associated with agriculture based value chains investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited capacity of local providers: to satisfy the demand in terms of quality and quantity. The choice to focus on the most vulnerable and destitute strata of the population encompasses the need to support small scale food producers and processors.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Apart from the private sector group of the SUN Movement, which interacts with medium large scale producers, the FFP will study the best options to reach lower strata of the population including the establishment of ad-hoc mechanisms and investing facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk level (H/M/L)</th>
<th>Mitigating measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited access to fortified food: The added cost of fortified foods and the attitudes of the target population could represent a risk to accessibility. The cost increase is linked to the cost of additional technology and added vitamin and mineral premix.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target beneficiaries develop negative attitudes towards fortified foods: if they regard it as adulterated. Such attitudes may reduce consumption of the foods and reduce impact.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions

1) There is a considerable proportion of small scale farmers and agribusinesses MSMEs with potential to move from semi-subsistence or low marketing levels to market supply oriented agriculture and agribusiness value chains.

2) Value Chain Analysis toolkit is responding efficiently to the need for an integrated and measurable approach of value chains development.

3) Strong ownership of food fortification programmes. Partner governments will set up appropriate legal frameworks and secure relevant accompanying measures. Government officers and technicians and implementing partners have the necessary capacity and skills or are willing and available to improve them to effectively engage with food fortification.

3 LESSONS LEARNT, COMPLEMENTARITY AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

3.1 Lessons learnt

Value chain development support in general suffers from a series of weaknesses. Many value chain studies have been done and several methodologies exist, but they usually provide only partial criteria on a domain (economics, social or environment) and/or do not propose measurable indicators, thus making comparisons and monitoring of results and impacts difficult, particularly in terms of value sharing and poverty reduction. The actual social and

\(^{1}\) Where this capacity is not adequate and it is requested to the EU, it will be strengthened and improved through the previously approved TA component.
environmental impacts have rarely been quantified. This programme therefore will be based on a robust analysis and monitoring framework.

Investments are generally perceived to be too risky when involving small stakeholders (smallholders, MSMEs), thus often only directed towards the bigger players. This is due to lack of skills, information flows, and lack of experience and trust between the value chain stakeholders. Multi-stakeholder alliances and grant supported activities will form the basis on which to mobilise additional funds; to this end, the experience from the establishment and enhancement of a project pipeline under the electrification financing initiative (ElectriFI) will be taken into consideration.

Food fortification has been practiced for over eighty years in industrialised countries, particularly to restore nutrients lost during food processing. This has played a crucial role in eradicating diseases associated with deficiency of some micronutrients particularly the B vitamins, vitamins A and D, folate, iron and iodine. Application of mass food fortification has been considered a quick, cost-effective and safe means of reaching large populations that are at risk of micronutrient deficiency, without needing to change the eating patterns of the populations, and most effective when integrated into effective food and nutrition policies and strategies. Targeted fortification has also been shown to improve nutritional status of population subgroups with special needs.

3.2 Complementarity, synergy and donor coordination

Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Security is an EU priority sector for the period 2014-2020; therefore a detailed analytical framework to identify investment opportunities and measure development impact is needed. This programme will use the analytical toolkit and provide value chain technical assistance services to all Commission and partner country services involved in value chain development. It will create a framework for increased investment in smallholder agriculture and agribusiness and will mobilise additional investment from public and private sources alongside EU grant provision through blended finance.

Specific projects under this programme will be set in motion through submissions to a call for proposals and through demands of the EU delegations and other Commission services in conjunction with the implementation of their NIPs, RIPs, and other programmes. Coherence with ongoing EU funded programmes, such as COLEACP PIP and EDES and the Intra ACP Commodity programmes will be sought. Closed coordination will also be sought with the future GPGC action on “global transformative and inclusive markets solutions” (inclusive business models and inclusive rural finance).

This action will have synergic effects with the efforts aiming at developing value chains in an inclusive and sustainable way, such as the Guidance for Responsible Agricultural Supply Chains developed by FAO and OECD.

The action will benefit as well from the enabling environment created by the existing national and international active nutrition governance and coordination mechanisms such as the Scaling up Nutrition (SUN) Movement. Only a comprehensive and coordinated approach between complementary activities will sustainably help reducing stunting, as highlighted in the EU Nutrition Action Plan. Several donors and international organisations are actively involved in funding and implementing Food Fortification actions, such as The International Council for Iodine Deficiency Disorders (ICCIDD), The MicroNutrient Initiative (MI), The Food Fortification Initiative (FFI), the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN),
Hellen Keller International (HKI), and Harvest Plus whom the EU are currently supporting in Bangladesh. In addition, some research organisations and investigation centres are active in food and bio fortification, such as CGIAR / IFPRI with EU support.

3.3 Cross-cutting issues

Compliance with social standards and creating decent jobs, in particular for youth will be a key element of the social analysis within the analytical framework and of the identification of actions to be undertaken.

Nutrition is a vital determinant of health, cognitive development, individual productivity and national development, and therefore fundamental to achieving basic human rights. Well-nourished individuals and communities have greater opportunities and productivity later in life.

Acknowledging that women contribute in many societies the bulk of the agricultural work force, the programme will pay particular attention to women, promoting gender equality, and actively seeking women’s recognition of their role and interests in agricultural production, marketing and overall value chains operations. Women are also suffering most from deficiency disorders such as anaemia. They will therefore constitute a key target for the benefits of food fortification.

Capacity development interventions will be considered to facilitate the inclusion of weak and disadvantaged groups.

Emphasising the importance of the environmental pillar of the analytical framework, and considering the systemic impact of agriculture, the programme will foster sustainable productive practices for climate change adaptation and mitigation.

4 DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

4.1 Objectives / Results

The overall objective of the programme is to improve food security for the poorest and most vulnerable, to help eradicate poverty and under-nutrition.

The specific objectives are:

1. To develop inclusive, sustainable and climate-smart agriculture based value chains.

2. To improve the nutritional status of populations suffering from micronutrient deficiencies by strengthening the access and consumption of fortified food

The expected results are:

Specific objective 1: To develop inclusive and sustainable agriculture based value chains

R1.1: Valuable knowledge for accountability, enhanced project management and policy decision making on value chains operations is available.

R1.2: Value chains governance is improved
R1.3: Value chains productive capacity and access to markets of small scale farmers and agribusinesses is enhanced through adoption of technological innovation.

R1.4: Responsible investment on agriculture based value chains is increased

Specific objective 2: To improve the nutritional status of populations suffering from micronutrient deficiencies by strengthening the access and consumption of fortified food

R2.1: The national regulatory framework for food fortification is strengthened with regards to policy, legislation/enforcement, certification, labelling, institutional capacity and knowledge

R2.2: The capacity of national producers of processed staple foods and condiments to produce fortified foods to reach the most vulnerable populations is improved

R2.3: The evidence on the cost-effectiveness of interventions for food fortification has been improved and informs government policies

The programme is organised into three distinct but inter-related components: 1) Value Chain Analysis, 2) Value Chain Development and 3) Food Fortification. Food Fortification operations are actually conceived as specific interventions aiming at improving the nutritional quality of staple food products along short value chains, targeting the most vulnerable.

4.2 Main activities

**Component 1: Value Chain Analysis**

R1.1: Valuable knowledge for accountability, enhanced project management and policy decision making on value chains operations is available.

Main activities will consist on mobilising a high level set of expertise to increase the analytical capacities on Value Chains. The analysis will aim at fostering organisational and technological innovation, identifying or assessing projects and investment opportunities and feeding the policy dialogue with partner governments in the field of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition security. This component will be a key element of the methodological approach for increasing the role of private sector in inclusive and sustainable agricultural growth in the future. Based on evidence it will also contribute to increase the global knowledge for potential scale up of interventions and ensure appropriate accountability.

Analytical capacities will consist of:

- national consultants and partners actively involved in the specific VC analyses;

- a pool of expertise coming from European science and knowledge institutions and acting as a service provider on demand of partners, EU Delegations and EU Services to analyse VC.

The analytical approach will be built upon the evidence-based quantitative analysis toolkit currently elaborated by the Commission “Methodological support for analysis and development of inclusive and sustainable value chains”. It consists of a robust diagnosis and monitoring system to describe what the initial state of affairs is for the three dimensions of sustainability (economic, environmental, social), to determine the bottlenecks and potential of the VC for stakeholders and the problems existing in the livelihood situation of smallholders.
and MSMEs, and to track results and impact of the actions and investments planned or implemented.

The analysis will aim at fostering organisational and technological innovation, identifying or assessing projects and investment opportunities and feeding the policy dialogue with partner governments in the field of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition security. This component will be a key element of the methodological approach for increasing the role of private sector in inclusive and sustainable agricultural growth in the future.

**Component 2: Value Chain Development**

**R1.2: Value chains governance including strengthened capacity of all stakeholders is improved**

Activities will consist of facilitating the establishment of public-private alliances, promoting responsible domestic and foreign direct investment in agricultural value chains for trading, processing or marketing of produce in local, regional and international markets. Activities will be coordinated with partners government policies.

Capacity development activities will aim at training of farmers, farmers organisations, producer groups, MSMEs in increasing competitiveness, in complying with market requirements, safety and quality standards, sustainability certification and improved market information.

**R1.3: Value chains productive capacity and access to markets of small scale farmers and agribusinesses is enhanced through adoption of technological innovation.**

This will include fostering adoption of appropriate innovative solutions and technologies, particularly climate smart innovations, by farmers and MSMEs along the value chains, training of farmers and farmers organisations, technical assistance services, business development and advisory services, training in entrepreneurial capacities, establishment of market links and trusted relations, finding sustainable productivity enhancing solutions.

Activities will foster adoption of appropriate technologies by farmers, tracing of supplies and commitment to sustainability by market leaders. Assessment of value-adding innovations will ascertain they have positive or no negative impact on the natural environment.

**R1.4: Responsible investment on agriculture based value chains is increased**

Blended finance and technical assistance will aim at promoting investment in the smallholder/MSME agribusiness sector where a high development impact is expected, but where high risks and/or low rates of return cannot attract public lenders or commercial financiers without grant support. The grant support will be provided only when there is high development impact, additionality, adherence to social, environmental and fiscal standards, or when innovative technologies are being used that can potentially be replicated.

**Component 3: Food Fortification**

**R2.1: The national regulatory framework for food fortification is strengthened with regards to policy, legislation/enforcement, certification, labelling, institutional capacity and knowledge**
Technical support will be provided to help strengthen the policy framework for food fortification, ensuring it adequately addresses public health realities, and builds on the capacity of food producers and importers. To this end the implementation of this component will build on, and seek support from, other EU funded initiatives addressing the strengthening of the national nutrition policy framework (e.g. Policy FIRST implemented by FAO or the National Information Platforms for Nutrition, when pertinent). Careful attention will be given to the capacity and experience of the implementing partners to actually achieve results in the improvement of the legal and regulatory food fortification framework. To ensure policy is translated into practice, assistance may be provided to ensure the monitoring components are adequate (e.g. laboratory services), and compliance is ensured so that all specified foodstuffs are fortified safely and effectively. Quality and safety of the foods will be assured through country-specific standards regulation by setting and/or improving governments’ standards, legislation, monitoring, enforcement for food fortification, including certification methodologies, composition and labelling rules, as identified by Delegations and partner countries, and based on WHO standards and guidelines. The technical assistance contract experts will ensure the quality control and adequate supervision in the implementation of this component.

R2.2: The capacity of national producers of processed staple foods and condiments to produce fortified foods to reach the most vulnerable populations has been improved

Learning from widespread experiences in other countries, support will be given to food producers and processors to ensure appropriate food vehicles are effectively fortified to help address identified micronutrient deficiencies in a sustainable, accessible and affordable manner. In particular, emphasis will be given to ensure appropriate market penetration to meet the micronutrient needs of vulnerable, poor and remote communities, and where epidemiological study shows deficiencies are most acute.

R2.3: The evidence on the cost-effectiveness of interventions for food fortification is improved and informs government and stakeholder decision making at national and regional level

Whereas there is a long and widespread experience with food fortification interventions and projects, the evidence base for which interventions effectively and sustainably improve physiological status and result in better health, is less robust. A key outcome of this support will be to use country level experiences to add to the global and national evidence-base of cost-effectiveness. This evidence is critical for a potential scale up of interventions.

4.3 Intervention logic

The strengthened value chain analytical capacities and monitoring tools will identify opportunities for smallholders and agribusiness MSMEs integration into the value chain in an inclusive and sustainable manner and will increase global and local knowledge for better policy making decisions. Capacity development of value chain stakeholders along with the established multi-stakeholder value chain alliances will reduce the risks and increase opportunity for increased financial investment by building trusted relations and productivity enhancing measures through innovation. It will thus increase the absorptive capacity for value chain financing.

The improved value chain governance, coupled with innovation and investment, will result into the development of inclusive and sustainable agriculture based value chains. Through
their integration into these value chains, the incomes of small holder farmers and agribusiness MSMEs will grow, thereby helping to eradicate poverty.

The development on inclusive and sustainable value chains is an initial step to prepare a comprehensive Agriculture Financing Initiative.

Under the Technical Assistance phase of the Food Fortification programme\(^2\), detailed assessments will be carried out on fortified food production in the targeted countries, to ascertain patterns of distribution, consumption, funding, management and delivery. The country projects will be implemented to respond to assessed needs and gaps identified and improve progress towards the 3 results areas.

Specific decisions related to the vehicle and fortificant will be taken at country level to address the micronutrient deficiencies of the target population, which may be different in each country, but likely to include iron, iodine, zinc, folate, calcium and vitamins A, D and B group. Special consideration will be given to the geographical and economic accessibility of fortified foods, in order to ensure access, consumption and measurable Micro Nutrient Deficiency (MND) reduction amongst the priority vulnerable groups.

5 IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Financing agreement

In order to implement this action, it is not foreseen to conclude a financing agreement with the partner country, referred to in Article 184(2)(b) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012.

5.2 Indicative implementation period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 4.1 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 120 months from the date of adoption by the Commission of this Action Document.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission’s authorising officer responsible by amending this decision and the relevant contracts and agreements; such amendments to this decision constitute technical amendments in the sense of point (i) of Article 2(3)(c) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014.

5.3 Implementation modalities

5.3.1 Procurement for component 1 “Value Chain Analysis” (direct management)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject in generic terms, if possible</th>
<th>Type (works, supplies, services)</th>
<th>Indicative number of contracts</th>
<th>Indicative trimester of launch of the procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Chain Analysis Capacity</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Q4 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) This technical assistance will be provided by Financing Decision 37-513 adopted in 2014.
The value chain analysis component will benefit countries outside those having selected Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture (FNSSA) as sector of concentration (60 countries so far), with a view to improving the quality of operations supported by EU funds in these countries, where deemed necessary.

5.3.2 Grants: call for proposals for component 2 “Value Chain Development” and component 3 “Food Fortification” (direct management)

The call for proposals will be organised in two distinct lots corresponding to the two components mentioned above. It will mostly but not exclusively target the 60 countries having so far selected FNSSA as sector of concentration, with a preference for countries having selected agriculture growth as a priority.

(a) Objectives of the grants, fields of intervention, priorities of the year and expected results

This programme aims at the development of:

1/ Inclusive and sustainable development of agricultural value chains. It will support public-private alliances, innovative investment and build capacity of smallholders and MSMEs to strengthen their participation in value chains. A robust diagnosis and monitoring system will be used to achieve and measure results.

2/ Food Fortification. The Call for Proposals will select country specific projects aiming at improving the health and micronutrient status of vulnerable women and children through fortified foods. Projects will gather evidence and information so that beneficiary countries, donors and international organisations can formulate effective policies and programmes related to food fortification. The following EU Delegations have stated their countries could benefit from food fortification programmes, as considerable micronutrient deficiencies exist, there is a promising context with supportive government awareness and policies: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Niger, Mozambique, Malawi, Kenya, Chad, Nigeria, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Laos & Gambia

(b) Eligibility conditions

The eligibility criteria for applicants are the ones defined in Article 9 of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 of 11 March 2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union’s instruments for financing external action.

The applicants should be:

For Lot 1 - Value Chains: Local or international NGOs, local authorities, public bodies, foundations, cooperatives, social ventures, inter-professional or intermediary organisations with an experience on Public-Private Partnerships promotion. Partnerships involving local stakeholders will be encouraged.

For Lot 2 - Food Fortification: International organisations, public bodies, foundations, local or international NGOs, cooperatives, local authorities’ social ventures, with experience in food fortification (including the strengthening of national food fortification regulatory frameworks).

Subject to information to be published in the call for proposals, the indicative amount of the EU contribution per country / grant is: Lot 1- Value Chains: at least EUR 3 000 000 and EUR
7 000 000 at the most, Lot 2- Food Fortification at least EUR 1 000 000 and EUR 4 000 000 at the most. The grants may be awarded to sole beneficiaries and to consortia of beneficiaries (coordinator and co-beneficiaries). The indicative duration of the grant (its implementation period) is 60 months.

(c) Essential selection and award criteria

The essential selection criteria are financial and operational capacity of the applicant. The essential award criteria are relevance of the proposed action to the objectives of the call; design, effectiveness, feasibility, sustainability and cost-effectiveness of the action.

(d) Maximum rate of co-financing

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for grants under this call is 70% for Lot 1- Value Chains and 80% for Lot 2- Food Fortification.

In accordance with Article 192 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012, if full funding is essential for the action to be carried out, the maximum possible rate of co-financing may be increased up to 100%. The essentiality of full funding will be justified by the Commission’s authorising officer responsible in the award decision, in respect of the principles of equal treatment and sound financial management.

(e) Indicative timing to launch the call

Last quarter 2015

5.3.3 Contribution to component 2: Value chain development (indirect management) via blending taking into account the discussions held at the level of the EUBEC Platform.

Under this component, will mostly but not exclusively be targeted the 60 countries having so far selected FNSSA as sector of concentration, with a preference for countries having selected agriculture growth as a priority.

In accordance with Article 4.1.(e) of the Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 this contribution shall be implemented under indirect management with the entities, called Lead Financial Institutions, in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012.

In accordance with Article 4 e) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 these contributions shall be implemented whenever possible under the lead of the EIB in line with its external mandate under Decision No 1080/2011/EU, a multilateral European financial institution, such as the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, or a bilateral European financial institution, e.g. bilateral development banks. The Lead Financial Institutions are not definitively known at the moment of adoption of this Action Document. Once they will be known, a complementary financing decision needs to be adopted in order to fulfil all the requirements of Article 84.3 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012.

The Lead Financial Institutions will be awarded a contract for an individual operation based on its operational and financial capacity. The Commission will only entrust budget implementation tasks to Lead Financial Institutions which have been assessed through the pillar assessment pursuant to article 60 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 and have transparent, non-discriminatory, efficient and effective review procedures in place.
Certain entrusted entities are currently undergoing the ex-ante assessment in accordance with Article 61(1) and 140.13 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012. The Commission’s authorising officer responsible deems that, based on the compliance with the ex-ante assessment based on Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 they can be entrusted with budget-implementation tasks under indirect management. In both cases and in anticipation of the results of such assessments, the responsible authorising officer deems that, based on a preliminary evaluation and on the longstanding and problem free cooperation with these entities, they can be trusted with budget implementation tasks under indirect management.

The entrusted budget-implementation tasks consist in the implementation of procurement, grants, financial instruments and payments. The entrusted Member State agency or international organisation shall also monitor and evaluate the project and report on it.

In addition, budget-implementation tasks may be sub-delegated by the entrusted entity to the partner country in accordance with 4(7) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014. The entrusted budget implementation tasks consist in the implementation of procurement and grants, following the rules assessed and approved by the Lead Financial Institution. Payments may be executed by the partner country under the control by the Lead Financial Institution or by the latter.

The EU contribution as described above will focus on projects targeting at promoting investment in the smallholder/MSME agribusiness sector where a high development impact is expected, but where high risks and/or low rates of return cannot attract public lenders or commercial financiers without grant support.

5.4 **Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants**

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures, and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents, shall apply.

The Commission’s authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility in accordance with Article 9(2)(b) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of products and services in the markets of the countries concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where the eligibility rules would make the realisation of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult.

5.5 **Indicative budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 1 Value Chain Analysis</th>
<th>EU contribution (amount in EUR)</th>
<th>Indicative third party contribution (amount in EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>8 000 000</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2: Value Chain Development</td>
<td>67 000 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants: Call for proposals</td>
<td>27 000 000</td>
<td>11 500 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to DCI Blending Framework</td>
<td>40 000 000</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Organisational set-up and responsibilities

The services contract under component 1: Value Chain Analysis will be managed by the Commission Headquarter in Brussels.

Projects under Component 2: Value Chain Development, targeting specific value chains in specific countries will be under the responsibility of corresponding EU Delegations both for direct management (projects selected through the Call for Proposals) and indirect management (projects financed via blending). For in-country projects the organisational set-up will be defined according to the specificities of each project and in accordance with local requirements. Each EU Delegation responsible for in-country projects will participate in the decision making and strategic bodies (e.g. Steering Committees).

The governing structure, rules and procedures of blending will be applicable for blending operations. The Boards are chaired by the Commission and include the European External Action Service (EEAS) and the EU Member States as voting members, and Financial Institutions as observers, and will formulate opinions on project proposals to be submitted by Financial Institutions and will provide guidance on appropriate future financing proposals. The set of criteria for assessing proposals are those applicable under blending whilst financial institutions need to demonstrate systematic consultation of the EU delegations and Commission services concerned an early stage of project preparation.

Projects under component 3, Food Fortification in specific countries will selected through a Call for Proposals managed by the Commission Headquarter. Selection will be done in conjunction with the respective EU Delegation who, subsequently, will be responsible for the signature and management of the grant agreements.

Ongoing global guidance and technical assistance will be managed by the European Commission in Brussels.

### Performance monitoring and reporting

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process and part of the implementing partner’s responsibilities. To this end, the implementing partner shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its results (outputs and direct outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the log frame matrix (for project modality) or the list of result indicators. The report shall be laid out in such a way as to allow monitoring of the means envisaged and employed.
and of the budget details for the action. The final report, narrative and financial, will cover the entire period of the action implementation.

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

Beyond this general framework of performance monitoring and reporting, value chains analysis implemented under the component 1 of this programme will improve significantly the quality of monitoring and impact measurements of the projects under the component 2, by providing, not only ex ante but as well during implementation and ex-post, quantitative data on economic, environmental and social dimensions effects of the investments realised on the governance and the performance of the value chains.

Given the pilot nature of the Food Fortification programme, the setting up of a results-oriented monitoring system will be of prime importance, considering a key objective is to provide evidence on what works in improving MND amongst vulnerable women and children, and to help inform partner governments, donors, the EU services and the general public. The day–to–day technical, financial and performance monitoring of the implementation of the Programme and its country project will be an under the responsibility of the previously approved global Technical Assistance Component3, and the implementing partners respectively. This Technical Assistance Component will assist country projects in refining their Logical Framework Matrix, selecting outputs, outcomes, indicators etc., to provide a sound basis for monitoring and evaluation.

The Commission may decide to carry out Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) missions as needed for the different component of the programme.

5.8 Evaluation

Having regard to the nature of the action, mid-term and final evaluations will be carried out by independent consultants contracted by the Commission.

The mid-term evaluation will be carried out for learning purposes, in particular with respect to possible fine tuning of the approach, for the three components of the action.

The final evaluation will be carried out for accountability and learning purposes at various levels (including policy revision), taking into account the fact that all components of the action are innovative.

The Commission shall inform the implementing partner at least 3 months in advance of the dates foreseen for the evaluation missions. The implementing partner shall collaborate efficiently and effectively with the evaluation experts, and inter alia provide them with all necessary information and documentation, as well as access to the project premises and activities.

---

3 This technical assistance will be provided by an action adopted in 2014 (COM(2014) 9510 of 16.12.2014 Annex 8.
The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner country and other key stakeholders. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.

The financing of the evaluation shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.9 Audit

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audits or expenditure verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

The financing of the audit shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.10 Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility of the EU is a legal obligation for all external actions funded by the EU.

This action shall contain communication and visibility measures which shall be based on a specific Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action, to be elaborated at the start of implementation and supported with the budget indicated in section 5.5 above.

In terms of legal obligations on communication and visibility, the measures shall be implemented by the Commission, the partner country, contractors, grant beneficiaries and/or entrusted entities. Appropriate contractual obligations shall be included in, respectively, the financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and delegation agreements.

The Communication and Visibility Manual for European Union External Action shall be used to establish the Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action and the appropriate contractual obligations.
APPENDIX - INDICATIVE LOGFRAME MATRIX (FOR PROJECT MODALITY) ⁴

The activities, the expected outputs and all the indicators, targets and baselines included in the logframe matrix are indicative and may be updated during the implementation of the action without an amendment to the financing decision. The indicative logframe matrix will evolve during the lifetime of the action: new lines will be added for listing the activities as well as new columns for intermediary targets (milestones) when it is relevant and for reporting purpose on the achievement of results as measured by indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baselines (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Targets (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Sources and means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall objective: Impact</td>
<td>To improve food and nutrition security for the poorest and most vulnerable, to help eradicate poverty and under-nutrition.</td>
<td>Ideally, to be drawn from the partner’s strategy</td>
<td>Ideally, to be drawn from the partner’s strategy</td>
<td>National and international indexes of production, income generation and distribution and poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural value added per hectare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence of stunting of children under 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence of MND among vulnerable women and children under 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealy, to be drawn from the partner’s strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.National and international indexes of production, income generation and distribution and poverty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence of MND among vulnerable women and children under 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence of MND among vulnerable women and children under 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ Mark indicators aligned with the relevant programming document mark with ‘*’ and indicators aligned to the EU Results Framework with ‘**’. 
### Specific Objective: Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baselines (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Targets (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Sources and means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO 1. To develop inclusive, sustainable and climate-smart agriculture based value chains</td>
<td>.Number of value chains where programme intervention has increased growth, inclusiveness, environmental and social sustainability</td>
<td>.To be determined under each project proposal</td>
<td>.30 VC analysed/monitored/evaluated over 5 years</td>
<td>Programme reports .VC monitoring reports</td>
<td>.There is a considerable proportion of small scale farmers and agribusinesses MSMEs with potential to move from semi-subsistence or low marketing levels to market supply oriented agriculture and agribusiness value chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO 2. To improve the nutritional status of populations suffering from micronutrient deficiencies by strengthening the access and consumption of fortified food</td>
<td>.Vit A deficiency for women RA &amp; children 6-59month .Anaemia of women RA &amp; children 6-59mo .NTD (Folate) .Calcium deficiency WRA .Vitamin deficiencies D, B, .Iodine deficiency .% intake of Estimated Average Requirement of XX in XX)</td>
<td>.To be determined under each project proposal</td>
<td>.15 VC developed over the first 2 years</td>
<td>National Health System data .Surveys, industry data or civil society .Analysis / research .Research publications, gov. policy and guidelines</td>
<td>.Increased consumption of fortified foods by target groups. Dietary deficiency is the cause of MND (i.e. not disease/parasites) Products remain affordable, accessible External negative factors do not interfere (flood, drought, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 These are suggested micro nutrients deficiencies (MND) areas only, country realities will need to determine which are most important and amenable to being addressed through this programme.

6 Estimated Average Requirement (EAR): to be defined under each project/country proposal in terms of the micronutrient/s (Vitamin A, Iron and Folic Acid, Zinc, etc.) that will be addressed and the vehicle chosen (the type of staple food to be fortified: flours, vegetable oil, etc.). The EAR is defined as the average daily intake that meets the needs of 50% of the healthy individuals within an age- and sex- specific population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs /results for Specific Objective 1</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baselines (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Targets (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Sources and means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1.1</strong>: Valuable knowledge for accountability, enhanced project management and policy decision making on value chains operations is available</td>
<td>.Number of VC analysed for project identification, formulation, monitoring or impact assessment and for policy decisions .Number of VCs for which the trade and business environment has improved</td>
<td>.30 VCs</td>
<td>.Programme reports .VC monitoring reports</td>
<td>Identified risk mitigating measures (see table 2) are effective</td>
<td><em>(Value Chain Analysis toolkit is responding efficiently to the need for an integrated and measurable approach of value chains development.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1.2</strong>: Value chains governance including strengthened capacity of all stakeholders is improved</td>
<td>.Number of formal alliances established between VC stakeholders .Number of smallholders, agribusiness MSMEs benefiting from integration into VCs</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>To be defined after each VC analysis</td>
<td><em>(Value Chain Analysis toolkit is responding efficiently to the need for an integrated and measurable approach of value chains development.)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1.3</strong>: Value chains productive capacity and access to markets of small scale farmers and agribusinesses is enhanced through adoption of technological innovation</td>
<td>.Agriculture based VCs where sustainable land management practices have been introduced (number of ha) .Number of people receiving rural advisory services .Number of MSMEs applying sustainable consumption and production practices .Number of quality certification for markets and trade issued</td>
<td>To be defined after each VC analysis</td>
<td><em>(Value Chain Analysis toolkit is responding efficiently to the need for an integrated and measurable approach of value chains development.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1.4</strong>: Responsible investment on agriculture based value chains is increased</td>
<td>.Total amount of funds mobilised .Number of MSMEs and firms with access to credit with EU support</td>
<td>.EUR 67 M + minimum EUR200 M of leveraged effect .To be defined after each VC analysis</td>
<td><em>(Value Chain Analysis toolkit is responding efficiently to the need for an integrated and measurable approach of value chains development.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.1: The national regulatory framework for food fortification is strengthened with regards to policy, legislation/enforcement, certification, labelling, institutional capacity and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs /results for Specific Objective 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Baselines (incl. reference year)</td>
<td>Targets (incl. reference year)</td>
<td>Sources and means of verification</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be defined under each project proposal</td>
<td>To be defined under each project proposal</td>
<td>Market / survey / project data</td>
<td>Counterparts have capacity to amend policy, laws, &amp; monitor. Commitment by counterparts remains high. Public opinion remains positive re. benefits of FF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased production, distribution and utilisation of fortified foodstuffs by vulnerable target populations. Use, recognition of FF certification logo. Uptake of fortified foodstuffs (salt, wheat, rice, maize, oil,)</td>
<td>Production of a national monitoring framework for tracking progress on FF and reduction of MND. Improved learning and evidence from FF programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2.2: The capacity of national producers of processed staple foods and condiments to produce fortified foods to reach the most vulnerable populations is improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2.3: The evidence on the cost-effectiveness of interventions for food fortification has been improved and informs government policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
ANNEX 3


Component 2: Strengthening and promoting governance and capacity at the global, continental, regional and national level, for all relevant stakeholders

| INFORMATION FOR POTENTIAL GRANT APPLICANTS |
| WORK PROGRAMME FOR GRANTS |

This document constitutes the work programme for grants in the sense of Article 128(1) of the Financial Regulation (Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012) in the following sections concerning grants awarded directly without a call for proposals:

5.3.1.1. Grant: direct award (direct management) (Bangladesh, Kenya, Laos, Niger)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Title/basic act/CRIS number</th>
<th>National Information Platforms for Nutrition (NIPN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRIS number: DCI-FOOD/2015/ 38-332</td>
<td>financed under the Development Cooperation Instrument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Zone benefiting from the action/location | Bangladesh, Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Laos, Niger |


| 4. Sector of concentration/thematic area | Food and nutrition security and sustainable agriculture (FNSSA), Component 1: Generating and exchanging knowledge and fostering innovation. |

| 5. Amounts concerned | -Total estimated cost: **EUR 20,575,000**  
-Total amount of EU budget contribution **EUR 20,000,000**  
The contribution is for an amount of EUR 20 000 000 from the general budget of the European Union for 2016 subject to the availability of appropriations following the adoption of the relevant budget.  
This action is co-financed by potential grant beneficiaries for an indicative amount of **EUR 575,000** |

| 6. Aid modality(ies) and implementation modality(ies) | Project Modality  
Direct management: grants – direct award, and procurement of services |

| 7. DAC code(s) | 12240 Basic Nutrition |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Markers (from CRIS DAC form)</th>
<th>General policy objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not targeted</td>
<td>Significant objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation development/good governance</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to environment</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality (including Women In Development)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Development</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reproductive, Maternal, New born and child health ☒

RIO Convention markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological diversity</th>
<th>Not targeted</th>
<th>Significant objective</th>
<th>Main objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combat desertification</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change mitigation</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change adaptation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC) thematic flagships

Component 1 “Generating and exchanging knowledge and fostering innovation” of the Multi-annual Indicative programme 2014-2020 GPCC-FSSA

SUMMARY

The EU is committed to support partner countries in reducing stunting by 7 Million children by 2025, in alignment with the internationally agreed World Health Assembly targets. The improvement of the knowledge base, information and accountability concerning nutrition commitments and interventions is at the core of the EU’s nutrition strategy. The primary objective of this Action is to support high stunting burden countries to strengthen their information and analysis about nutrition, in order to be able to better inform the priority decisions they are faced with and achieve their undernutrition reduction objectives. This will be achieved by harnessing existing data and analysing it purposefully in order to answer the key concerns of governments. Data about levels of undernutrition, levels of financial investment in programmes aimed at addressing undernutrition, and data on programme implementation will be systematically combined and organised into a single nutrition-focused system – a National Information Platform on Nutrition. These platforms will be hosted within a government body with a central mandate to compile information across all sectors. A unique aspect of the approach is that it can assess progress in undernutrition as linked to specific programmes. This would then enable government policies and investments to prioritise those interventions and approaches most likely to successfully reduce undernutrition in their specific setting.

The NIPN initiative is divided into two 2 closely interweaved components:

1) a Global Support Facility (GSF) that will provide technical assistance (TA) to support the NIPN at global level, to be operational in 2015, lasting for the whole duration of the intervention; and 2) the establishment of the NIPN themselves in six countries, based on expressions of interest from EU Delegations and supported by the Support Facility. The present action document covers the second component only, as the Support Facility is already covered by an Action Document approved in 2014.1

1 CRIS decision DCI-FOOD/2014/037-644
1 CONTEXT

1.1 Thematic context

1.1.1 Economic and social situation and poverty analysis

The World Health Organization considers that poor nutrition is the single most important threat to the world’s health. In many developing countries it is an underlying cause of about 45% of all child deaths and 20% of maternal mortality every year.

According to the Global Report on Nutrition, about 805 million people are estimated to be chronically undernourished in 2012–14. In 2013, 100 million children under the age of five underweight, 162 million children under five stunted, 52 million children wasted, and undernutrition was causing the deaths of an estimated 3.1 million children every year. In 2014, an estimated two billion people worldwide suffer from micronutrient deficiencies. It is estimated that up to 8% of GDP is lost to undernutrition in high stunting burden countries.

1.1.2 Elements on the nutrition global agenda

In its report on nutrition “Maternal, infant and young children nutrition: draft comprehensive implementation plan”, the World Health Organization established 6 global targets to be reached by all countries in 2025, notably on stunting, exclusive breastfeeding, maternal anaemia, low birth weight and wasting. These were endorsed by the European Council. The EU has pledged to contribute to the WHA stunting target by supporting partner countries to reduce stunting by 7 Million by 2025 and by allocating €3.5 Billion within 2014-2020.

The Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) movement, launched in 2010, has brought together government authorities from countries with high burden of malnutrition and a global coalition of partners. It calls for intensive efforts to scale up nutrition over the period 2013–2015 through such a strategy. With about 54 members, partners in the movement have committed themselves to work together to mobilize resources, provide technical support, perform high-level advocacy and develop innovative partnerships. The 2013 Nutrition for Growth Compact (organised during the UK’s presidency of the G7), the EU policy commitment and financing pledge for reducing stunting as well as the Zero Hunger campaign have also contributed to increase the attention and momentum for nutrition.

In November 2014, representatives of more than 170 nations gathered in Rome for the second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2), 22 years after the initial conference. ICN2 focused global attention on addressing malnutrition in all its forms. The two main outcome documents, the Rome Declaration on Nutrition and the Framework for Action, were endorsed by participating governments and institutions, including the EU, committing to establish and support national policies aimed at eradicating malnutrition.

During this conference DFID, with the support of the European Commission and other donors launched the first Global Nutrition Report\(^2\), with the aim to bring the crisis of malnutrition to the attention of people around the world.

1.1.3 National contexts

Five priority countries have been identified for the launch of the first National Information Nutrition Platforms:

Bangladesh: Nationally stunting rates among children under 5 are estimated to be high (41.3%, DHS in 2011) despite a fall by 9% compared to 2004. Stunting and wasting rates vary

\(^2\) [http://globalnutritionreport.org/the-report](http://globalnutritionreport.org/the-report)
markedly across the seven regions and recent analyses suggest that there is no simple explanation for these disparities in that undernutrition cuts across all wealth quintiles and has no clear, predictable relationship with food insecurity. About 33% of children under 5, and 26% of non-pregnant, non-lactating women of childbearing age, are anaemic.

Burundi: Classified as a fragile country, Burundi has the highest level of hunger with an indicator ratio of 38.8 (Global Hunger Index, 2013). This is however a visible progress in the area of nutrition, as Burundi stunting rate of 58% in 2010 (one of the highest in the world) decreased to 49% in 2014. Anaemia is also high at 44.5% prevalence in children under 5.

Ethiopia: Over the last fifteen years, rates of under-five stunting have declined on Ethiopia from 58% (in 2000) to 40% (in 2014) and wasting from 12% to 9%. The magnitude of these declines is impressive though the overall rates of wasting and stunting remain unacceptably high and the Government of Ethiopia has set a target of reducing stunting to 30% and wasting to 3% by the end of 2015.

Laos: The prevalence of stunting for children under 5 was classified as “very high” in 2012, with 44.2%. Some provinces such as Phongsaly reached 62.7%. Minority ethnic groups showed higher rates of stunting, as 60.9% of Chinese-Tibetans and 60.5% of Hmong-Mien were stunted compared to 33.4% of Lao-Tai, and prevalence of stunting among children from the poorest households were three times higher than that in the richest households (60.6% v. 19.7%).

Kenya: Despite its significant economic growth in recent years, and graduation to Middle Income Country (MIC) status, malnutrition remains a serious public health problem in Kenya. According to the most recent DHS in 2009, the prevalence of wasting is nearly 7% and the stunting prevalence is 35% in children under five years of age. The prevalence figures for stunting for 1987 onwards show a relatively small average annual rate of reduction with near stagnation in levels of stunting since 2003. The Government has more recently enshrined the right of ‘every child to basic nutrition, shelter and health care’ and defined a well-articulated multi-sectoral Food and Nutrition Security Policy, and a National Nutrition Action Plan.

Niger: Malnutrition is the leading cause of infant mortality and morbidity. The latest national figures (2013) indicate a prevalence of stunting and wasting of 44% and 18%, respectively (Institut National de la Statistique - INS). Although Niger is ranked last on the Human Development Index, the country has made significant strides in the fight against child mortality, which saw a drop of 31% between 1998 and 2009. In 2012, Niger presented the ambitious 3N initiative—Nigeriens Nourish Nigeriens.

1.1.4 Public Policy Assessment and EU Policy Framework

The EU policy framework for nutrition is described in the 2013 Communication3, “Enhancing Maternal and Child Nutrition in External Assistance: an EU Policy Framework” and its ensuing Council Conclusions. Following this Communication the European Commission has developed its Action Plan on Nutrition, adopted on July 20144 and for which Council Conclusions have been adopted in December 2014. It focuses particularly on one commitment - to reduce the number of stunted children under the age of five years by at least 7 million by the year 2025. The present Action is a fundamental pillar of the Strategic Priority 3 of the Nutrition Action Plan on "knowledge for nutrition", which focuses on strengthening information, and the nutrition knowledge-base to improve the cost-effectiveness of nutrition interventions and policies.

3 3241st Foreign Affairs Council meeting Brussels, 28 May 2013, CM 2757/13
4 SWD(2014) 234 final
This initiative falls under component 1 “Generating and exchanging knowledge and fostering innovation” of the Multi-annual Indicative programme 2014-2020 GPCC-FSSA. It will nonetheless also contribute to component 2 “Strengthening and promoting governance and capacity at the global, continental, regional and national level, for all relevant stakeholders” as it will create the enabling environment to ensure an evidence based country dialogue around national nutrition targets and will strengthen capacities in high stunting burden countries.

1.1.5 Stakeholder analysis

The successful implementation of the National Information Platforms for Nutrition implies that participating countries show a strong ownership over the Action, and political commitment of the respective countries is an identified necessary prerequisite for entering the NIPN programme.

As one of the requirements of a NIPN is to bring together relevant data from district, provincial and national sources, and from a range of stakeholders, it is expected that NIPNs will need to engage with a large number of contributing entities.

Indeed, the main stakeholders at country level will comprise the government and public institutions that will host the NIPN, operating and maintaining the central data system and leading the coordination of the Action, including capacity development activities in-country. It will liaise with central stakeholders such as sectoral line-ministries (e.g. Health, Agriculture, Social Welfare, Water and Education), coordinating ministries (e.g. Finance, Planning), government technical bodies (such as statistics offices, research institutes), plus other local and international bodies involved in surveillance, programme delivery, research and training. It will be necessary to perform a detailed mapping the stakeholders in each beneficiary country, as part of the preparation of the Action.

In recognition of the collaboration and joint thinking that has informed the design of the overall NIPN initiative, Stakeholder Group will be constituted at the international level, comprised of representatives of international organisations and networks (EU, WHO, DFID, UN agencies, SUN). This will provide strategic oversight to the Global Support Facility, which will provide Technical Assistance to all NIPN countries to ensure coordination.

1.1.6 Priority areas for support/problem analysis

Success in achieving the ambitious international and national goals to eradicate malnutrition will depend on the ability of stakeholders at the country level to analyse and understand how they can improve the effectiveness of their policies and interventions. A constant gap in this process is a mechanism to bring together available data across sectors, ensure their quality, and promote their use in answering questions about the needs of the undernourished.

To this purpose, the main identified challenges are the following:

- Defining clear country objectives for nutrition that are shared across government and other major nutrition stakeholders
- Agreeing a suitable architecture for each NIPN, and mechanisms for coordination
- Ensuring nutrition related information is 1) available, (e.g. data on nutrition-relevant programmes can be scarce); and 2) coherent (across the different sectors and different administrative levels).
- Optimizing the use of information and evidence to shape both policy and pro-nutrition narratives by strengthening nutrition-relevant capacity
2 **RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS**

Given its innovative nature, this initiative has a high reliance on political willingness at country level. General risks can potentially be reduced by the following mitigation measures, but in a context where country ownership is key, control and responsibility of partner Governments will potentially have a high impact on the quality of the implementation. Also, due to their nature and being mostly country related, a risk review is foreseen in each country during the first phase of the Action (RA1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Risk level (H/M/L)</th>
<th>Mitigating measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependency on Technical Assistance hinders ownership and potential sustainability.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Focus external support on the national agencies that will home the NIPN, tailored to their technical capacity and mandate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time taken to establish NIPNs is longer than planned. This impedes NIPN progress and perceptions of its added value, notably for cost effectiveness analyses or policy updates.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ensure government commitment to the national platform. Prepare realistic implementation plans, taking both national capacities and objectives into account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries do not maintain or update the system in the medium-to-long term.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Early identification of the potential benefits of the NIPN at country level. Advocacy for sound nutrition planning. Support capacity to raise funds (internally and at the international level).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor data quality seriously limits the value of analyses.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Establish clear quality control mechanisms and data standards and clearly communicate them to relevant partners and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments do not agree with data/analysis being shared with anybody outside the country, other than existing institutions (e.g.: WHO).</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cross-country learning through the exchange of information on good practices can be used as incentives to share information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting institution has low credibility and buy in from other sectors</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Dialogue and consultation to ensure hosting institute is accepted by partners and ministries as legitimate NIPN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions**

- Ability of Governments to adequately support (and eventually co-finance) identified NIPN projects (see concept NIPN notes prepared by each country).
- Support from key institutions in the partner countries, particularly with regard to sharing data and using country information.
- Readiness and capacity among national institutions to support NIPN preparation, and the operation and maintenance of the system.
- Governments are committed to support NIPN efforts towards updating nutrition related policies and dissemination of findings.
3 LESSONS LEARNT, COMPLEMENTARITY AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

3.1 Lessons learnt

The Lancet Journal documented that evaluation of large-scale programmes and initiatives aimed at improvement of health in countries of low and middle income needs a new approach. The latter should promote country ownership, transparency, and donor coordination while providing a rigorous comparison of the cost-effectiveness of different scale-up approaches.5

The EU has placed a strong emphasis in promoting improved information systems for nutrition, increasing the evidence base for the cost-effectiveness of nutrition sensitive interventions and strengthening the accountability framework for nutrition. All these elements are enshrined in the EU Communication “Enhancing Maternal and Child Nutrition in External Assistance: an EU Policy Framework”. As a result the EU engaged in through consultation with international partners around the NIPN initiative and organised key partner meetings in Geneva (5 March 2013) and Brussels (27 March 2014). Further to this preparation, the Technical Assistance component, with a total envelope of €3.5M, has been approved in 2014. Scoping missions have been organised in targeted countries from November 2014 to March 2015. These allowed to discuss the potential benefits of the NIPN approach with government stakeholders, to determine interest and readiness to introduce the NIPN approach to help improve government monitoring and learning for nutrition and to develop NIPN country concept notes describing the preliminary NIPN arrangements for each country.

National Information Platforms are recent innovations. However, the Institute for International Programs at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health (IIP) has formulated a series of early lessons learned:6

- **The new focus on evaluation is welcomed by specialists and political leaders.** Leaders of health and nutrition programs welcomed the capacity of bringing together existing data to go beyond routine monitoring and address questions about the effectiveness of implementation strategies. Furthermore, Government leaders are increasingly cautious of the national and global demand for accountability. They also see the platforms as a means of securing additional support for their programmes.

- **Country capacity in data quality assessment and analysis is limited.** In most cases even the most basic analyses of anthropometric data and child mortality are conducted by external institutions with results tables sent back to in-country stakeholders. The national institutions responsible for health, nutrition, and statistics identified expanded capacity in these areas as a top priority.

Finally, past interventions indicate that a high level support at country level is fundamental:

- **The transfer of methodologies does not necessarily lead to generalised use.** New approaches usually need the impulsion of decision makers at the central level so as they can be implemented in practice at intermediate and local levels.

- **Availability of information does not imply that it will necessarily be used for decision-making purposes.** This is why clear objectives should be defined at country level, to ensure the relevance of the NIPN to identified information requirements and delivery to decision makers, and therefore their future use at both technical and political levels.

---


3.2 Complementarity, synergy and donor coordination

The EU has a long-standing commitment on food security and nutrition. The EU pledged to spend an unprecedented €3.5 billion between 2014-2020 on reducing undernutrition in some of the world's poorest countries.

The EU is also a major actor in responding to extreme regional food crises, such as those in the Horn of Africa and in the Sahel, through the SHARE (Support Horn of Africa Resilience) and AGIR (the Global Alliance for Resilience Initiative) programmes respectively.

The Institute for International Programs at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health (IIP/JHU) is developing, with financial support from the Government of Canada, National Evaluation Platforms in four African countries: Malawi, Niger, Tanzania and Mozambique (2014-2016). These will focus on evaluating the impact of maternal and child health programmes. The preparation of the present Action benefitted from insights on this work from IIP/JHU.

The EU is also the most important donor of the SUN Movement Secretariat, which is a critical pivot in both national and international efforts to reduce undernutrition. The SUN Movement, through its support to governments, has seen that whilst nutrition-specific interventions (mainly through the health sector) may be relatively easy to coordinate between donors, nutrition-sensitive approaches that are cross-sectoral present greater challenges to monitor. In part response to this, the SUN Donor Network has developed a common approach for the tracking of resources aimed at nutrition, in order to build consistency across donors and strengthen their accountability. The SUN Movement secretariat has been closely involved in the preparation of this proposal and will play a key role in providing guidance to the NIPN.

As such, the NIPN initiative has become a major EU programme in the area of nutrition with EUR 23.5 million earmarked by the EU. DFID and Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) have indicated their willingness to further support the programme respectively with GBP 6.4 million and USD 500,000 through transfer agreements with the EU.

The EU Delegations in Ethiopia, Bangladesh, Niger and Laos will also ensure the complementary with other innovative EU interventions to scale up nutrition investments and increase the knowledge base for cost effectiveness.

The country NIPNs are expected to be an important source of information to feed the global knowledge base and generate evidence that is key to inform partner's policies. Countries, donors, private sector and civil society will benefit from the wealth of information generated through the NIPN, contributing to improve the effectiveness of the nutrition interventions. The information generate by the NIPN can be fundamental to feed the emerging annual Global Reports on Nutrition, which are key in building momentum for action on nutrition and empowering nutrition advocates at all levels to make the argument for a scale up in resources, and an effective allocation of those resources.

The present action will also be directly contributing to the implementation of the recommendations of the ICN2 notably on creating an enabling environment for effective action, sustainable food systems, international trade and investment, nutrition education and information, or improving health systems.

Lastly, the NIPN will contribute to strengthen the monitoring of all major nutrition projects at country level including the EU funded initiative to support food fortification in high burden countries.

In providing a single robust platform for monitoring and reporting on nutrition resources and results, savings can be made on M&E costs of projects, generating value for money from
aligning behind a single country-owned approach. This will permit better reporting on the €3.5bn committed by the EU for nutrition, as well as the €17.5bn committed by for nutrition sensitive programmes at the Nutrition for Growth event in 2013.

3.3 Cross-cutting issues

Nutrition is by definition cross-cutting and has furthermore direct linkages on major cross-cutting issues that affect developmental processes. Gender equality, for instance, has key implications in nutrition outcomes. Moreover, there is a close link between gender, nutrition and the adaptive capacity of households to climate change. Women are most prone to undernutrition (especially as mothers) yet they are the principal drivers and decision-makers of coping mechanisms at household level. Ensuring women are healthy with access to a sufficient, nutritious diet strengthens the adaptive capacity of households to cope with climate change. As such, improved nutrition is a key factor contributing to climate change adaptation.

Furthermore, the nature of this Action is also to adopt a multidisciplinary approach, analysing high-quality data from diverse sectorial sources so as to evaluate the effectiveness and impact of health and nutrition programs.

4 DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

4.1 Objectives/results

The Overall Objective will be to contribute to the global reduction of stunting (chronic undernutrition) in alignment with the World Health Assembly 2025 targets.

The Specific Objective will be to strengthen capacities in 6 high-burden countries to monitor progress towards undernutrition reduction, and implement more cost-effective and evidence based policies.

The Action will be structured across three Result Areas:

Result Area 1: National host entities have the capacity to operate and maintain the NIPN

Entities hosting the NIPN will be strengthened so as they can fulfil their role coordinating the central information system, performing internal quality checks on the data and on collaborating surveillance systems, maintain and update information of the central database on a continuous basis as and when new data becomes available.

Result Area 2: Countries track nutrition progresses in meeting its national objectives on undernutrition reduction and in monitoring nutrition investments

The NIPN will be strengthened so as they can be effectively used to improve the tracking of resources and actions with nutrition impact, and to monitor and report on outcomes and impact, so progress towards targets and strategies can be better assessed. This will be critical to ensuring progress and advocating for resources and effective policies.

Result Area 3: Countries are able to translate NIPN findings into nutrition related policies

The stimulation of multisectoral and multi-institution collaboration in-country will lead to data analysis. The NIPN will ultimately enable evidence-based decisions on future allocations of funding, national priorities and will help to better inform policies at national, regional and global levels.

4.2 Main activities

It is important to note that it is unlikely that one common approach will be appropriate for all countries. The activities will be implemented by the host entities of the NIPN, directly via a
Grant Contract, or through the support of a Technical Assistance that will be embedded within the host entity in the form of a Country Support Team.

**Result Area 1: National host entities have the capacity to operate and maintain the NIPN**

1. Comprehensive review of the institutional and technical context related to nutrition and its monitoring and evaluation. Perform country assessments of nutrition surveillance capacities, that may include:
2. Support to the definition of NIPN country objectives and its planned uses,
3. Finalise the organisational arrangements of the NIPN including governance arrangements coordination of sectors and stakeholders, for data analysis, interpretation and decision making. This will include the definition of appropriate participatory mechanisms and exchanges of information at country level, including a responsible involvement of Civil Society and Private Sector entities, while avoiding conflicts of interest.
4. Update the central information system as additional data from national surveys, routine reporting systems, and programme monitoring becomes available,
5. Building monitoring and maintenance capacity among stakeholders, at both central and decentralised (District) levels,

**Result Area 2: Countries track nutrition progresses in meeting its national objectives on undernutrition reduction and in monitoring nutrition investments**

6. Applying data quality assessment procedures that will maintain or improve the quality of the primary information. These quality assessment procedures will also be applied in any new data streams that are needed.
7. Update the information management process according to the identified weaknesses, or to changing needs due to an evolving context
8. Perform additional periodic surveys when deemed needed, for instance to: complete existing data; make quality checks on existing data sets; have detailed data focusing on specific groups at risk.
9. Routine processing of information to feed the NIPN database.

**Result Area 3: Countries track nutrition progresses and translate NIPN findings into nutrition related policies**

10. Support national capacities to analyse, interpret, and report (at central and district level) on NIPN data for assessment, planning and decision making purposes,
11. Organize regular country reviews focusing on the status of nutrition, including levels and uses of financial resources,
12. Develop national expertise towards the formulation of national nutrition strategies/policies, improved coherence across different ministerial policies relevant to nutrition, joined-up results frameworks, and costed action plans,
13. Facilitating multi-donor contributions to national coordination mechanisms,
14. Facilitating information sharing and dissemination of findings at international level
15. Supporting the development of, and partnering with, regional centres of excellence for countries willing to share training resources and expertise.
4.3 Intervention logic

The NIPN approach has raised expectations in the international community, due to its high potential impacts, allowing countries to:

- Maximize the analysis and interpretation of existing national and sub-national nutrition-relevant data;
- Identify critical nutrition information gaps and promote that these gaps are addressed;
- Monitor national and sub-national progress in reducing undernutrition;
- Examine the association between changes in undernutrition and investments in nutrition;
- Build plausibility arguments on the (cost) effectiveness of interventions/programmes in reducing undernutrition;
- Strengthen the accountability of government and donor stakeholders in meeting their commitments.

Being innovative by nature, and associated to the challenges described above, it was decided to take a realistic approach, in 3 consecutive phases (design, operations and maintenance, analysis and dissemination) so as to effectively contribute to the achievement of the specific objective.

The NIPN are an innovative approach to monitoring nutrition information and commitments and have raised a significant expectation among the key donors and institutions. Through the Global Support Facility (TA) component funded under the Decision 2014/37-644, the NIPN will benefit from a continuous support from a team of dedicated experts and research institutions working in this area. The key players (DFID, BMGF, UN, SUN, Civil Society, Countries) will form part of an international NIPN stakeholder group that will regularly discuss progress reports produced by the GSF and provide guidance. It is expected that the present Action will foster new working ways and partnerships among technicians, decision makers, and funding agencies, shedding new light on how to get to results, and have broader positive global impacts, not restricted to the countries directly benefitting from this EU support. Close collaboration will be also sought with the EU Joint Research Centre (JRC) which has a longstanding experience in the development, maintenance and dissemination of data systems.

The NIPN are conceived as a means to strengthen the capacity of government bodies, such as national statistics or planning institutes or departments. It is envisaged that the need of support will be significant in the early stages of the NIPN but that it would gradually diminish as the national staff capacities grow and the collection analysis of the nutrition related data becomes part of the routine work of these institutions. Consequently the exit strategy of this project will be to gradually pull out from providing support as a result to increased national skills.

5 Implementation

5.1 Financing agreement

In order to implement this action, it is foreseen to conclude a financing agreement with some partner countries (Burundi, Bangladesh, Niger), referred to in Article 184(2)(b) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012.

5.2 Indicative implementation period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 4.1 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements
implemented, is 72 months from the date of entry into force of the financing agreement and where no financing agreement is concluded from the date of adoption by the Commission of this Action Document.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission’s authorising officer responsible by amending this decision and the relevant contracts and agreements; such amendments to this decision constitute technical amendments in the sense of point (i) of Article 2(3)(c) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014.

5.3 Implementation modalities

5.3.1.1 Grant: direct award (direct management) (Bangladesh, Niger, Kenya, Laos)

a) Objective of the grant

The objective of the grant will be to set up a central institutional database and reinforce the institutional analytical capacity to produce information linking actions to nutrition outcomes for decision making and planning. The beneficiary of the grant will be the Institut National des Statistiques in Niger, the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics and the National Economic Research Institute in Laos.

In Bangladesh, a grant contract will be concluded with Helen Keller International consortium which has a specific expertise in nutrition data processing, analysis and reporting to provide in-country technical and quality support to the three institutions (GED, BBS, and Ministry of Finance).

(b) Justification of the direct grant

A direct grant is justified because all these entities have in their respective countries *a de facto* monopoly in managing nutrition data. Moreover, a grant to these entities will reinforce their internal capacities and strengthen the sustainability of the Action.

(c) Rate of co-financing

The maximum rate of co-financing for grants in Niger, Kenya and Laos is 100% of the eligible costs of the action. The limited own financial resources of national entities requires this increased ratio of co-financing to ensure the implementation of the action.

Regarding the grant contract in Bangladesh, the maximum rate of co-financing is 80% of the eligible costs of the action.

(d) Indicative trimester to conclude the grant agreement: 1st trimester 2016.

5.3.1.2 Procurement (direct management) (Bangladesh, Burundi, Ethiopia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject in generic terms, if possible</th>
<th>Type (works, supplies, services)</th>
<th>Indicative number of contracts</th>
<th>Indicative trimester of launch of the procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA to the Planning Commission to support capacity building and set up</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1st, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nutrition database, Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td>(EUR 1,200,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA to the Institute of Statistic and Economic studies of Burundi to support capacity building and set up nutrition database, Burundi</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1st, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(EUR 3,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply, subject to the following provisions.

The Commission’s authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility in accordance with Budget Article 9(2)(b) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of products and services in the markets of the countries concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where the eligibility rules would make the realisation of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult.

5.5 Indicative budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>EU contribution (amount in EUR)</th>
<th>Indicative third party contribution, (amount in EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct grant (direct management) Kenya</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct grant (direct management) Laos</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct grant (direct management) Niger</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct grant (direct management) Bangladesh</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td>EUR 575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (direct management) Bangladesh</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (direct management) Burundi</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (direct management) Ethiopia</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>575,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Performance monitoring and reporting

At the beginning of each project a comprehensive internal monitoring system will be established in line with the overall monitoring and evaluation systems used for development cooperation actions will be established. The system will rely on a set of smart indicators, supported by a clear baseline, annual milestone and end of the programme targets which will be assessed annually (annual review).

Whenever possible, linkages with the EU results framework indicators related to systemic resilience to food crisis, food and nutrition security and sustainable agriculture will be sought.

5.7 Evaluation

Having regard to the nature of the action, a mid-term evaluation will be carried out for this action or its components via independent consultants contracted by the Commission.
It will be carried out for potential problem solving, learning purposes, in particular with respect to the potential replication of this Action in other countries, or the intention to launch a second phase of the Action in the first list of beneficiary countries.

The Commission shall inform the implementing partners at least one month in advance of the dates foreseen for the evaluation missions. The implementing partners shall collaborate efficiently and effectively with the evaluation experts, and inter alia provide them with all necessary information and documentation, as well as access to the project premises and activities.

The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner countries and other key stakeholders. The implementing partners and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner countries, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.

The financing of the evaluation shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

The Commission may carry out Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) assessment missions if deemed necessary.

5.8 Audit

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audits or expenditure verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

The financing of the audit shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.9 Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility of the EU is a legal obligation for all external actions funded by the EU.

This action shall contain communication and visibility measures which shall be based on a specific Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action, to be elaborated at the start of implementation and supported with the budget indicated in the Action Document for the Global Support Facility of the NIPN.

In terms of legal obligations on communication and visibility, the measures shall be implemented by the Commission, the partner country, contractors, grant beneficiaries and/or entrusted entities. Appropriate contractual obligations shall be included in, respectively, the financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and delegation agreements.

The Communication and Visibility Manual for European Union External Action shall be used to establish the Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action and the appropriate contractual obligations.
APPENDIX - INDICATIVE LOGFRAME MATRIX (FOR PROJECT MODALITY)  

The activities, the expected outputs and all the indicators, targets and baselines included in the logframe matrix are indicative and may be updated during the implementation of the action without an amendment to the financing decision. The indicative logframe matrix will evolve during the lifetime of the action: new lines will be added for listing the activities as well as new columns for intermediary targets (milestones) when it is relevant and for reporting purpose on the achievement of results as measured by indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baselines (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Targets (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Sources and means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall objective: Impact</td>
<td>Stunting prevalence reduced in countries benefiting from NIPNs (disaggregated by age categories and sex)</td>
<td>No. children stunted in 2010 - 171 million</td>
<td>Number of stunted children reduced by 40% (68.4m) by 2025 (102.6m)</td>
<td>WHO/Unicef/WB joint Database Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) Other robust &amp; anthropometric National Nutrition Surveys Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific objective(s): Outcome(s)</td>
<td>Increased Average Annual Reduction Rate (AARR) of stunting as a result of improved planning and efficacy of nutrition policies and interventions.</td>
<td>AARR by country in 2014</td>
<td>AARR by country by end of project</td>
<td>WHO stunting tracking reports MoUs/FA for establishing NIPN GSF reports NIPN Stakeholder Group meetings. SUN stage of preparedness reports</td>
<td>Effective utilisation of NIPN findings results in better use of resources and management of programmes. Ability of Governments to adequately support (and eventually co-finance) identified NIPN projects. Support from key institutions in the partner countries, particularly with regard to sharing data and using country information. No major shocks or changes undermine efforts to improve nutrition outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 Mark indicators aligned with the relevant programming document mark with '*' and indicators aligned to the EU Results Framework with '**'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baselines (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Targets (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Sources and means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1</strong>: National host entities have the capacity to operate and maintain the NIPN</td>
<td>Degree of achievement of the implementation plans agreed with the NIPN Steering Committee, according to the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and their annual targets.</td>
<td>No central Nutrition data repository currently exists</td>
<td>(information is not available yet: should be defined at inception level) Implementation plans defined by end 2016</td>
<td>Human resource management reports/assessments/evaluations from ministries and/or other public organisations Experts’ and TA reports NIPN Stakeholder / steering Group meeting reports GSF country reports NIPN country coordinator reports GNR country reports</td>
<td>Readiness and capacity among national institutions to support NIPN preparation, and O&amp;M. There is a good cooperation and data sharing between NIPN stakeholders at country level, across sectors, including between the national and sub-national level. Additional financial resources are identified for the establishment of large NIPN. Governments are committed to support NIPN efforts towards updating nutrition related policies and dissemination of findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R2</strong>: Countries track nutrition progress in meeting its national objectives on undernutrition reduction and in monitoring nutrition investments</td>
<td>Quality and frequency of nutrition specific &amp; sensitive data being captured by NIPN % of coverage of sub-district nutrition information system in each beneficiary country. Policies that are informed or updated and reflect the needs in nutrition, notably for vulnerable groups, women, and children under 5, by project end. Individuals receiving a targeted nutrition programme (Number, by sex and age). Evolution in the cost-effectiveness of nutrition related programmes. Changes in nutrition related data from specific and sensitive programmes and sectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R3</strong>: Countries are able to translate NIPN findings into nutrition related policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 4


Component 3: Supporting the poor and food and nutrition insecure to react to crises and strengthen resilience

| INFORMATION FOR POTENTIAL GRANT APPLICANTS |
| WORK PROGRAMME FOR GRANTS |

This document constitutes the work programme for grants in the sense of Article 128(1) of the Financial Regulation (Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012) in the following sections concerning calls for proposals: 5.3.2. (DPR Korea); and in the following sections concerning grants awarded directly without a call for proposals: 5.3.3 (Sudan, Nigeria, regional West and Central Africa, Syria, Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone).

<p>| 1. Title/basic act/CRIS number | Pro-Resilience Action - PRO-ACT 2015- CRIS number: DCI-FOOD/2015/37980 DCI-FOOD/2015/38410 (Cape Verde) financed under the Development Cooperation Instrument |
| 2. Zone benefiting from the action/location | Multi-Country: Burundi, Cape Verde, DPR Korea, Gambia, Guinea, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria and West and Central African Region. |
| 4. Sector of concentration/thematic area | Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture |
| 5. Amounts concerned | Total estimated cost: EUR 71 270 000 Total amount of EU budget contribution EUR 65 250 000 of which EUR 1.25 million for budget support. This action is co-financed by potential grant beneficiaries for an indicative amount of EUR 6 020 000. |
| 6. Aid modality(ies) and implementation modality(ies) | Project Modality and Budget Support Direct management: budget support; in Cape Verde; Grants –call for proposals in Sierra Leone and DPR Korea; direct award in Guinea, Liberia, Nigeria, Sudan, Syria to FAO, and in the West and Central African region to the OIE. Indirect management, with FAO in Burundi, with UNOPS in Sudan and with UNICEF in The Gambia. |
| 7. DAC code(s) | 52010 |
| 8. Markers (from CRIS DAC form) | General policy objective | Not targeted | Significant objective | Main objective |
| Participation development/good governance | □ | V | □ |
| Aid to environment | V | □ | □ |
| Gender equality (including Women In Development) | □ | V | □ |
| Trade Development | V | □ | □ |
| Reproductive, Maternal, New born and child health | □ | V | □ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIO Convention markers</th>
<th>Not targeted</th>
<th>Significant objective</th>
<th>Main objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological diversity</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combat desertification</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change mitigation</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change adaptation</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9. Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC) thematic flagships**

*Supporting the poor and food insecure to react to crises and strengthen resilience*

**SUMMARY:** Following the application of the PRO-ACT methodology in December 2014 a total of 41.5 million people would be in phase 3 or 4 (crises or emergency) of the Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) in relation to their food and nutrition situation. These people are the main target of PRO-ACT in 2015. Since the needs are wider than the available resources, PRO-ACT criteria for prioritisation have been applied and the situations considered as requiring urgent interventions are: the negative impact of the Ebola outbreak on the food security situation in West Africa, in particular Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone and the possible chronicity of future outbreaks, the political/military crises in Syria (considering also the affected population in Iraq), the protracted crises in Burundi and Sudan, the multifactor crises cumulating chronic food insecurity with one shot events in DPR Korea (food spikes, food production decrease), The Gambia (Ebola indirect effects, crop failures due to weather extremes) and Nigeria (terrorism, political instability, localized crop failure), the climatic crisis in Cape Verde.

1 **CONTEXT**

1.1 **Sector/Country/Regional context/Thematic area**

In 2012, the EU took the policy commitment to contribute to building resilience of vulnerable communities by addressing the root causes of food insecurity. Both the geographical and thematic instruments of the Multi-annual Financial Framework are requested to contribute to the above mentioned policy commitment. The Food Security and Sustainable Agriculture (FSSA) thematic instrument under the Global Public Goods and Challenges Programme (GPGC) contributes to the policy commitment through the component “Supporting the poor and food insecure to react to crises and strengthen resilience”. The indicative allocation in FSSA for the period 2014–2020 is EUR 525 million with an annual indicative allocation of EUR 75 million.

Given the overwhelming needs of populations and the limited financial resources, a methodology to guide the selection of countries which could receive support through the thematic programme GPGC-FSSA, was adopted in 2013 and named “PRO-ACT”. One of the main aims is to maximise complementarity between various financial instruments to ensure high-impact of EU aid. Selection criteria are the following:

1. Number of food insecure people, based on evidenced based needs assessment;
2. Nature of food and nutrition crisis;
3. Assessment of response capacity and complementarity between instruments;

---

4. Others factors of vulnerability, including political considerations;

The methodology includes a joint analysis by the Commission services (DG-DEVCO, the Joint Research Centre, DG-ECHO) and EU partners such as the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO).

1.1.1 Public Policy Assessment and EU Policy Framework


1.1.2 Stakeholder analysis

At the global level the main stakeholders are regional organisations, the African Union, SUN secretariat, UN Agencies and civil society and of course partner countries with whom the EU will continue to ensure coordination and advocacy around the resilience agenda.

Specific stakeholders’ analysis is done at country level. The programme will focus on the most vulnerable populations, facing recurrent crisis and under food stress as the main beneficiaries. All humanitarian and development partners are involved in this approach. Two extreme examples of stakeholders’ analysis come from

i) **Cape Verde** is the example of long term alignment on EU support and Government policy, with budget support absorption and effective implementation capacities are very high. For those reasons, the budget support implementation modality has been chosen for the present PRO-ACT crisis response.

ii) On the opposite extreme there is the situation in **DPR Korea**, where interaction with the government is very limited and food insecurity is not addressed by the authorities in an integrative way: though the Government is aware of the situation and has initiated some minor agricultural reforms, no clear strategy has been elaborated to improve the situation.

1.1.3 Priority areas for support/problem analysis

The PROACT methodology relies on evidenced based needs assessments (for instance the Integrated Phase Classification-IPC\(^2\)) to identify the needs of a country and the severity of the crisis in terms of number of people affected by food insecurity. The assessment carried out in December 2014 indicates that 41.5 million people are in phase 3 or 4 (crisis or emergency), while 60 million are in phase 2 (stress). These people, in particular those in phase 3+, are the main target of the PRO-ACT action in 2015.

The situations to be addressed in priority are: the negative impact of the Ebola outbreak on the food security situation in **West Africa** (Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone in particular), the political/military crises in **Syria**, the protracted crises in **Burundi** and **Sudan**, the multifactor crises cumulating chronic food insecurity with one shot events in **DPR Korea** (food spikes, food production decrease), **The Gambia** (Ebola indirect effects, crop failures due to weather

---

\(^2\) The IPC is a methodology of food security analysis allowing convergence between different actors (Governments, donors, NGOs, UN Agencies, etc.) and producing a shared picture of the present and projected situation in a defined area (national or sub-national level).
extremes) and Nigeria (terrorism, political instability, localized crop failure), the climatic crisis in Cape Verde.

Regional and country analysis

- **The Ebola outbreak has two levels of consequences, relevant for food security:** i) a long-term risk, of future outbreaks and ii) an impact at country level, involving vulnerable population directly or indirectly affected by the virus.
  - Regional West Africa: Ebola virus reservoirs in wild animal were not object of systemic research in the past and, for this reason, they are not very well known. Epidemic-surveillance and early warning system on zoonosis demonstrated to be ineffective and insufficient.
  - Liberia, Sierra Leone, Guinea: have been particularly exposed to the effect of the present Ebola crisis which, apart from the direct effects of losing lives and disruption of the national health system, created additional burdens to free movements of people, with an effect on local market functionality, on the viability of small (formal and informal) business and, in some areas, the access to agricultural inputs and the fields affecting food production. In the long term, localized food price spikes have contributed to unsustainable coping mechanisms affecting assets and capitals and, thus, reducing resilience of the most vulnerable.

- **Syria**: since 2011, the Syrian civil war has affected the population creating massive population movements, internal and external displaced people. Economic repercussions and the unstable security situation generated by the conflict are severely and negatively impacting the food production and food access capacities in the most affected geographical areas (Iraq as well). Soaring of food prices reduced access to source of income, drop in food production are depleting purchasing power and severely affecting the access of vulnerable people to a sufficient diet.

- **Burundi**: is classified as a fragile country cumulating the effect of i) chronic food insecurity, partly due to the high demography and the limited access to productive land, exacerbated by the vague or returnees from Tanzania ii) the acute effect of the rain irregular patterns in key crop vegetation phases producing both floods (February) and early halt or rain which consequent droughts (April) and iii) a series of crop diseases (bacteria and virus) which affected productivity iv) a very high rate of chronic undernutrition rate.

- **Sudan**: is facing several crises at the same time, namely: conflicts, food price spikes, internal and external refugee movements, high food dependency ratio during the lean season. Moreover, structural food production deficit creates a chronic situation of food insecurity which is locally exacerbated by the different contingency.

- **DPR Korea**: food security situation is tense because of the drop in food production due to the recent drought. Besides, long term phenomena exist of soil degradation and fertility loses due non sustainable agricultural practices leading to a trend of decreased food production capacity. Furthermore, the country food system remains extremely fragile as a consequence of the protracted food crises lasting from the mid-1990s. From the operational point of view, food security programs in the country are going to expire during 2016. The gap in funding would imply the withdrawal of the EU presence in the country.
and, thus the loss of the financial and human investments done to ensure a permanent presence of a Food Security Office together with field programs.

• The Gambia: is facing chronic food insecurity and rising stunting rates, linked to rising malnutrition and a deteriorating ability of rural communities to cope due to recurrent drought crises in 2011/2012 and 2013/2014 (production -50% on average for rice, maize, sorghum and groundnuts, according to some recent estimates). This situation is compounded by, among others, a limited system of social protection/support, inappropriate agricultural practices, poor infrastructures, limited access to markets. Furthermore, the country has been hugely affected by the Ebola crisis as this has led to a steep decline in tourism (a major employer in the coastal urban area and source of internal remittances) as well as a reduction in commercial exchanges with neighbourhood countries, producing price spikes in some food items (oil, cassava, etc.). Moreover, a deterioration of the political framework is limiting the capacity of the EU to dialogue with Government.

• Nigeria: the northern states of Nigeria, in particular Kebbi, Sokoto and Adamawa, show very high stunting rates, linked to a chronic situation of undernutrition and very low resilience to food shocks due to the limited access to basic services and no DRR sensitivity of agricultural techniques commonly applied. The very high population density in the area imply that a large share of food insecure people of the entire West Africa live in the region. An intervention in the North Nigeria offers the opportunity to tackle large numbers of vulnerable population with high impact. Besides, the recent escalation of violence linked to Boko Haram terrorism finds fertile substratum in the population vulnerable to food shocks. The effects of this political crisis make itself felt far beyond the state and national borders affecting the entire region with a crescendo of instability, which is, by itself, a structural cause of food insecurity and a limit for resilience building.

• Cape Verde: the country has been exposed to exceptional weather conditions, in particular drought, which caused a significant drop (more than 80% less than the average of the last years) in agricultural production, in particular staple food (grains, beans). This is causing a food crisis that cannot be addressed by the already established national-based response mechanisms and an ad hoc intervention is required to avoid unsustainable coping mechanisms among the most vulnerable.

2 RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Risk level</th>
<th>Mitigating measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• For Ebola countries (Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia): a risk exists that the trends of the Ebola outbreak could pick up again in the coming months. This would considerably reduce the operational capacity at country level.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Measures on this risk are taken by the countries and the international community in order to limit the contagion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For conflict prone countries (Sudan, Nigeria, Burundi, Syria), a risk exist that a deterioration of the security situation could limit the</td>
<td>Medium to High</td>
<td>When applicable because of the emergency situation, direct award procedures are applied. The application of those procedures: i) reduces the contracting process period, ii) allows the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
operational capacity restricting the movements of the implementing partners.

selection of implementing partners able to adapt to the volatile situation, iii) enhance flexibility on the implementation and iv) increase capability to react to specific field situations.

Assumptions
The human resources in EU Delegations are adequate in terms of number and technical background to guarantee the follow up and steering of the programmes at country level. This element has been assessed and it was one of the criteria for the selection of the countries for intervention.

3 LESSONS LEARNT, COMPLEMENTARITY AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

3.1 Lessons learnt

The Commission has demonstrated its ability to respond to food crisis using a mix of available instruments (e.g. envelope B under EDF, thematic instruments the Food Facility). However, focusing on causes turns more efficient than responding to them after their occurrence. For this reason, the resilience approach, established by the Commission in 2012, aims at addressing the root causes of vulnerability, among the most important of which are chronic food and nutrition insecurity. During the period 2014-2020 period, the Food and nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture (FSSA) resilience building mechanism will address post-crisis situations with the objectives to: i) mitigate reallocation of funds from the National Indicative Programme (NIP), ii) address acute crisis to prevent their deterioration into protracted crises, iii) contribute to build up resilience of affected communities by helping them in bouncing back after the shock, iv) contribute to the capacity building process, which has been instrumental in resilience initiatives like the Global Alliance for Resilience (AGIR) and Supporting Horn of African Resilience (SHARE).

The second lesson learned is that building resilience can be achieved by: i) better coordinating stakeholders around a common objective, ii) recognizing local and national authorities as the main actors of the development process, iii) integrating multi-sector and multi-partner interventions and iv) committing for long term. For those reasons, the resilience agenda has been translated at regional and national level by supporting key institutions. These initiatives need replication and in some cases scaling up to feed in the geographic instruments to successfully build more resilient food systems.

Moreover, advocacy, information management and sharing are also global goals and their achievement could imply interventions that are out of the scope of geographical financial mechanisms and, thus, relevant for the Global Public Goods and Challenges scope.

3.2 Complementarity, synergy and donor coordination

One of the key criteria of the PRO-ACT methodology is the research of complementarity between different financial instruments of the EU including its Member States, as well as other national and international partners. Funds are allocated taking into consideration the necessity to build upon previous or parallel initiatives. Coordination is done by EU Delegations at country level and synergies are constantly sought, namely with the NIPs and/or the humanitarian funds managed by ECHO and defined by the Humanitarian Implementation Plans (HIP) and, as far as coordination is feasible, with other partners.
The integration of NIPs, HIPs and thematic instruments allow building the foundation of the Linking Relief Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD) approach and provides a clear ground of discussion with other partners, including EU Member States.

On the other hand, ECHO’s agenda, when feasible, has also included a resilience building component (e.g. livelihood building through social transfers) complementary to its life saving mandate.

For the regional program in West and Central Africa, particular attention will be paid to the coordination of this action with the projects “Anticipating the Global Onset of Novel Epidemics (ANTIGONE)" and "Preparedness, Prediction and Prevention of Emerging Zoonotic Viruses with Pandemic Potential using Multidisciplinary Approaches (PREDEMICS)" funded by the European Commission under the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development and with the project "Ebola Virus Disease - correlates of protection, determinants of outcome, and clinical management" (EVIDENT) funded under Horizon 2020. Moreover, a technical and strategic steering mechanism will ensure proper coordination and synergies with related actions funded by the European Commission. To this end, the steering mechanism will involve DG-RTD.

To ensure technical soundness and creating synergies between different interventions funded by the European Commission, a specific program steering mechanism involving different commission services, including DG-RTD and DG-SANTE will be set-up.

### 3.3 Cross-cutting issues

Specific analysis of cross-cutting issues is performed at country level. However, across countries and as a common approach, the role of women and gender is recognized as being central for the building up of resilience against food crises, as well for contributing to reduce children undernutrition.

Orientation toward the most vulnerable is also paramount to this program. Building resilience to food crises can only be achieved by focusing on those who are most vulnerable, food insecure and undernourished.

Climate change adaptation is mainstreamed in intervention at country level. This applies in particular for Nigeria and Sudan, where fertility and soil conservation, protection against degradation and rehabilitation of degraded land will be specifically targeted.

More globally, environment degradation is considered as one of the main reasons for the lack of sustainability of food systems and, thus it is one of the cross-cutting elements to be taken into consideration to ensure long term resilience building. Moreover, environmental disasters, in particular extreme weather events, are part of the risks to be taken into close consideration for planning interventions aiming at strengthening resilience to food crises in particular in rural areas where agriculture is one of the main sources of revenues and where local food markets are those who provide access to basic food.

---

3 [http://antigonefp7.eu](http://antigonefp7.eu)
4 DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

4.1 Objectives/results

The global objective is to enhance resilience to food shocks of chronic and acute food insecure people in post-food crisis by improving adaptation to climate change, combatting desertification, promoting nutrition sensitive activities and policies and encouraging sustainable and resilient small scale agricultural practices.

Specific objectives are:

**Objective 1**: Respond to major post-food crises scenarios promoting structural and resilient actions aiming at improving the capacity to prepare for, to withstand and to bounce back after shocks or stressors.

**Objective 2**: Build Capacity of public institutions and private organisations to respond to food crises and capitalise on food crises prevention experiences by investing in resilience building good practices, such as the AGIR and SHARE initiatives.

4.2 Expected results and main activities

Result 1.1, Resilience against food crises for the targeted population is build up by preventing negative coping mechanisms.

Activities:
- Introduction and/or expansion of adapted agricultural production methods, including soil protection, fertility restoration, restoration and rehabilitation of degraded land, combat desertification, reclamation of desertified land, etc.
- Small scale agriculture including input provision (seeds and fertiliser) to rebuild livelihoods,
- Strengthening of producer groups,
- Small scale water systems like rainwater harvesting, local water pump,
- Access to basic natural resources such as water and land,
- Local storage facilities, food processing and other coping mechanisms in the lean season
- Early warning or early response mechanisms

Result 1.2, Access to sufficient and nutrition food is enhanced by addressing temporary-permanent market failures and improved access to income opportunities

Activities:
- Livelihood diversification and non-agricultural income generating opportunities
- Social transfers and promotion of the reestablishment of livelihoods

Result 1.3, Access to a dietary balanced intake is promoted in post crises situations

Activities:
- Activities aiming at increasing access and availability of high-nutrient content food, (e.g. fortified and complementary food)
- Nutrition sensitive programs and improving nutrition knowledge to enhance dietary diversity

Result 2.1, Capacity at regional, national and possibly local level on effective resilience building initiatives and mechanisms are improved.
Activities:
- Capacity building of partner owned resilience initiatives addressing public institutions and civil society organisations.

Result 2.2. Know-how and lessons learned are shared

Activities:
- Capitalization of initiatives, good practices and sharing of lessons learned: (e.g. good agricultural practices, food reserves, risk management tools, including storage, insurance, contingency planning, Private-Public-Partnerships for resilience building, etc.)

Result 2.3. Epidemic-surveillance mechanisms designed and capacity to prevent future Ebola outbreaks improved

Activities:
- Analysis of Ebola reservoirs in wild animals
- Design of an epidemic-surveillance mechanism at trans-regional level, able to rapidly inform animal and human health authorities in case of future Ebola outbreaks.

5 IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Financing agreement

In order to implement this action, it is foreseen to conclude a financing agreement referred to in Article 184(2)(b) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012, only with Cape Verde. It is not foreseen to conclude a financing agreement with the other partner countries (Burundi, Gambia, Guinea, DRP Korea, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria, West and Central African Region).

5.2 Indicative implementation period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 4.1 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is up to 126 months from the date of entry into force of the financing agreement or the adoption by the Commission of this Action Document.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission’s authorising officer responsible by amending this decision and the relevant contracts and agreements; such amendments to this decision constitute technical amendments in the sense of point (i) of Article 2(3)(c) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014.

5.3 Implementation components and modules

5.3.1 Implementation of the budget support component for Cape Verde

5.3.1.1 Rationale for the amounts allocated to budget support

The amount allocated for budget support component is EUR 1 250 000. This amount is based on an indicative amount of 150 EUR per household and, at least 8 300 households in need of assistance.
5.3.1.2 Criteria for disbursement of budget support

a) The general conditions for disbursement are the following:
- Satisfactory progress in the implementation of the Good Governance Policy and continued credibility and relevance thereof;
- Implementation of a credible stability-oriented macroeconomic policy;
- Satisfactory progress in the implementation of CV-EU Special Partnership – Agreement nº CV/FED/23-892;
- Satisfactory progress with regard to the public availability of timely, comprehensive and sound budgetary information.

b) The specific conditions for disbursement that may be used are:

**Result:** Immediate relief and assistance to population in Phase 3 and those at risk of falling into it.

**Indicators:**
1) Prevention of casualties and loss of life and cattle;
2) Prevention of further persons falling into Phase 3; and
3) Reduction of population in phases 3 & 2 (IPC classification).

In case of a significant deterioration of fundamental values, budget support disbursements may be formally suspended, temporarily suspended, reduced or cancelled, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the financing agreement.

5.3.1.3 Budget support details

Budget support is provided as direct untargeted budget support to the national Treasury. The crediting of the euro transfers disbursed into Escudos CVE will be undertaken at the appropriate exchange rates in line with the relevant provisions of the financing agreement.

5.3.2 Grants: call for proposals - (direct management)

(a) Objectives of the grants, fields of intervention, priorities of the year and expected results

The global objective for all implementation components and modules is to improve the food and nutrition security situation of vulnerable population groups. The specific objective is to enhance the capacities of vulnerable groups to improve their food crises resilience and sustainably produce and access food. The implementation of the programme will be carried out through local authorities, public bodies, international organisations or NGOs.

**Countries:**

**DPR Korea:** call for proposals to award grants to NGOs for capacity-building for: i) cooperative farms as well as benefiting organizations in the fields of nutrition, reduction of post-harvest losses and disaster prevention mitigation, ii) representatives of line ministries in the field of relevant technics and sensitization to food security and nutrition related issues.

**Sierra Leone:** grants with NGOs (call for proposals) for the reactivation of the economic environment, via the promotion of small businesses, the distribution of cash through social transfers, the strengthening of local organisations, including farmers’ associations and mutual groups.
(b) Eligibility conditions

The applicants should be local authorities, public bodies, international organisations or NGOs.

Subject to information to be published in the call for proposals, the indicative amount of the EU contribution per grant is between EUR 500,000 and EUR 5,000,000 and the grants may be awarded to sole beneficiaries and to consortia of beneficiaries (co-decision and co-beneficiaries). The indicative duration of the grant (its implementation period) is 60 months.

For DPR Korea, making reference to Article 9, point 2 a) and b) of the Regulation (EU) no 236/2014 of the European Parliament and the European Council, China and India are eligible as goods providers to the DPR Korea.

(c) Essential selection and award criteria

The essential selection criteria are financial and operational capacity of the applicant.

The essential award criteria are relevance of the proposed action to the objectives of the call; design, effectiveness, feasibility, sustainability and cost-effectiveness of the action.

(d) Maximum rate of co-financing

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for grants is 90%.

In accordance with Articles 192 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012, if full funding is essential for the action to be carried out, the maximum possible rate of co-financing may be increased up to 100%. The essentiality of full funding will be justified by the Commission’s authorising officer responsible in the award decision, in respect of the principles of equal treatment and sound financial management.

(e) Indicative timing to launch the call

Third trimester of 2015.

5.3.3 Grant: direct award (direct management)

(a) Objectives of the grant, fields of intervention, priorities of the year and expected results

The global objective for all implementation components and modules is to improve the food and nutrition security situation of vulnerable population groups. The specific objective is to enhance the capacities of vulnerable groups to improve their food crises resilience and sustainably produce and access food. The implementation of the programme will be carried out through national and international NGOs.

Countries:

Sudan: direct award to NGOs for: i) the introduction of better adapted agricultural production methods including soil conservation techniques as well as restoration and protection of soil fertility; ii) strengthening of small holder farmers groups; iii) support to post harvest activities (storages) small scale water systems (rainwater harvesting); iv) livelihood diversification and non-agricultural income generating opportunities; v) increasing access and availability of high nutrient food and improving nutrition knowledge.
Nigeria: direct award to a NGO for: i) Built technical and organisational capacity of small-scale farmers to support increased production levels of drought resistant crops, ii) – Improved Government capacity and prioritisation of support towards the development of food secured and resilient communities which offer increased income opportunities and adequate food supplies through a revitalised small scale farming sector, iii) Establish linkages to appropriate stakeholders and networks to enable a vibrant and active small scale farming sector in Northern Nigeria, iv) Improvement of livelihood options and assets of the selected communities, including reduction of land degradation, rehabilitation of degraded land, reclamation of desertified land.

Regional West and Central Africa: direct award to the OIE to work on the analysis of natural (wild) reservoirs of the Ebola virus and the establishment of a surveillance mechanism.

Guinea/Liberia/Sierra Leone: direct award to NGOs, IO, Member States Development Agencies or Public Institutions for the reactivation of the economic environment, via the promotion of small businesses, the distribution of cash through social transfers, the strengthening of local organisations, including farmers’ associations and mutual groups.

Syria: direct award to the FAO for the implementation of a resilience building program encompassing emergency and development interventions.

(b) Justification of a direct grant

Under the responsibility of the Commission’s authorising officer responsible, the grant may be awarded without a call for proposals to NGOs (for Nigeria and Sudan). The recourse to an award of a grant without a call for proposals is justified because of the crisis situation referred to in Article 190(20 RAP in Sudan\(^5\), Northern Nigeria\(^6\), Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone\(^7\) allowing the application of flexible procedures. Should the crisis situation not be recognised any more at the time of the contractual procedure, calls for proposals might be launched.

Under the responsibility of the Commission’s authorising officer, the grant may be awarded without a call for proposals to OIE (for West and Central Africa). The recourse to an award of a grant without a call for proposals is justified because of the de facto monopoly of the organisation related to the capacity to analyse the implication of the zoonosis on human health. In fact, the Organisation in coordination with the World Health Organisation has the international mandate to norm and control animal health including its implication on human health. Certain activities such as the field study, the capacity building at country level and the laboratory analysis will be subcontracted.

OIE is currently undergoing an ex-ante assessment of its procedures in accordance with Article 61(1) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012. Should the ex-ante assessment provide positive results this component may alternatively be implemented in indirect management with the OIE.

Under the responsibility of the Commission’s authorising officer responsible, the grant may be awarded to FAO (for Syria) without a call for proposals. The recourse to a direct award without a call for proposals is justified first because of the declared crisis situation of Syria

\(^5\) DG letter - Ares(2014)2321673  
\(^6\) DG letter - Ares(2014)2281569  
\(^7\) DG letter – Ares(2014)3519887
pleading for a swift implementation and second because of the absolute necessity to ensure a close coordination and cooperation with the other ongoing programmes. The EU already fund through UN agencies namely UNICEF, WFP and UNDP in order to have geographically coherent and complementary interventions to efficiently support de-escalation of violence in the country. FAO is the only organisation presently capable of coping with these two requirements thus creating a de facto situation of monopoly. In addition FAO has the direct mandate of defeating hunger and achieving food security for all.

(c) Eligibility conditions

The potential beneficiaries of funding should be local authorities, public bodies, international organisations or NGOs

(d) Essential selection and award criteria

The essential selection criteria are the financial and operational capacity of the applicant.

The essential award criteria are relevance of the proposed action to the objectives of the action; design, effectiveness, feasibility, sustainability and cost-effectiveness of the action.

(e) Maximum rate of co-financing

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for this grant is 90%.

In accordance with Articles 192 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012, if full funding is essential for the action to be carried out, the maximum possible rate of co-financing may be increased up to 100%. The essentiality of full funding will be justified by the Commission’s authorising officer responsible in the award decision, in respect of the principles of equal treatment and sound financial management.

(f) Indicative trimester to conclude the grant agreement

Second trimester of 2015

(g) Exception to the non-retroactivity of costs

Not applicable.

5.3.4 Indirect management with an international organisation.

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012. This implementation entails responding to major post-crisis scenarios promoting structural and resilient actions aiming at improving the capacity to prepare for, to withstand and to bounce back after shocks or stressors. This implementation is justified because the international organisations have long term experience both working with the country and with civil society.

The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-implementation tasks procurement of goods and services, contracting of partners for the implementation of the activities in the mentioned countries. This includes launching calls for tenders; definition of eligibility,
selection and award criteria; evaluation of tenders and; award of contracts; concluding and managing contracts, carrying out payments, recovering moneys due etc.

FAO, UNICEF and UNOPS will operate in crisis and post-crisis situations with an imbedded degree of uncertainty; both entities, equipped with their management, steering and technical expertise, will ensure the identification of the most appropriate partner for the implementation of activities, ensure achievement of the stated objectives and efficient use of resources.

The entrusted entities would, in:

- **Burundi**: FAO will work on the distribution of agricultural inputs, soil protection, agroforestry, community based food stock management, food processing, nutrition education, early warning systems. All those activities will be implemented in close collaboration and coordination with IFAD, WFP and UNICEF.

- **The Gambia**: UNICEF for nutrition sensitive initiative focusing on pregnant women, children under the age of 2 and their mothers, and seasonal cash transfers linked to nutrition interventions to support livelihoods through the lean season.

- **Sudan**: UNOPS will work on the intensification and diversification of existing food production patterns, protection of productive resources, including land, support better access to income and social protection safety nets.

FAO is currently undergoing the ex-ante assessment in accordance with Article 61(1) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012. The Commission’s authorising officer responsible deems that, based on the compliance with the ex-ante assessment based on Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 1605/2002 and long-lasting problem-free cooperation, the international organisation can be entrusted with budget-implementation tasks under indirect management.

### 5.4 Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply.

The Commission’s authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility in accordance with Budget Article 9(2)(b) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of products and services in the markets of the countries concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where the eligibility rules would make the realisation of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult.
5.5 Indicative budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>EU contribution (amount in EUR)</th>
<th>Indicative third party contribution, in currency identified (amount in EUR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1 - Budget support: Good Governance and Development Contract - Cape Verde</td>
<td>1 250 000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2 – Grant: Call for proposals (direct management) - DPR Korea</td>
<td>7 000 000</td>
<td>770 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2– Grant: Call for proposals (direct management) - Sierra Leone</td>
<td>6 000 000</td>
<td>660 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3- Grants: Direct Award with OIE (direct management) - Regional West and Central Africa</td>
<td>8 000 000</td>
<td>880 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3 – Grants: Direct Award to NGOs (direct management) - Sudan</td>
<td>6 000 000</td>
<td>660 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3 – Grants: Direct Award to NGOs (direct management) - Nigeria</td>
<td>10 000 000</td>
<td>1 100 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3 – Grants: Direct Award to FAO (direct management) - Syria</td>
<td>6 000 000</td>
<td>660 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3 -Grant: Direct Award to NGOs (direct management) Guinea</td>
<td>3 000 000</td>
<td>330 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3 -Grant: Direct Award to NGOs (direct management) Liberia</td>
<td>3 000 000</td>
<td>330 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3 -Grant: Direct Award to NGOs (direct management) Sierra Leone</td>
<td>3 000 000</td>
<td>330 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.4 – Indirect management with FAO - Burundi</td>
<td>5 000 000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.4 –Indirect management with UNICEF – The Gambia</td>
<td>3 000 000</td>
<td>300 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.4 –Indirect management with UNOPS - Sudan</td>
<td>4 000 000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 – Evaluation, 5.10 - Audit</td>
<td>Covered by another decision</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10 – Communication and visibility</td>
<td>Financed by individual grant and delegation agreement</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>65 250 000</td>
<td>6 020 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Organisational set-up and responsibilities

The organisational set-up will be defined according to the specificities of each country and implementing modality. More specifically, the regional West and Central Africa intervention on Ebola reservoirs and surveillance contracted with the OIE and the Call for Proposal for DPR Korea will be centrally managed by the Commission headquarters.

The EU Delegation in Burkina Faso will manage and follow up the grant directly awarded in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone. This set-up has been established to overcome the lack of human resources at the disposal of the EU Delegations in the three countries.
While the budget support in Cape Verde, the Call for Proposal for Sierra Leone, grants directly awarded in Sudan, Nigeria and Syria, and the delegation agreements in Burundi, Gambia and Sudan, will be managed by the EU Delegations in the respective countries.

5.7 Performance monitoring and reporting

At the beginning of each project a comprehensive internal monitoring system in line with the overall monitoring and evaluation systems used for development cooperation actions will be established. The system will rely on a set of smart indicators, supported by a clear baseline, annual milestone and end of the programme targets which will be assessed annually (annual review).

Whenever possible, linkages with the EU results framework indicators related to systemic resilience to food crisis, food and nutrition security and sustainable agriculture will be sought.

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of the action will be a continuous process and part of the implementing partner’s responsibilities. To this aim, the implementing partner shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its results (outputs and direct outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the logframe matrix (for project modality) or the list of result indicators (for budget support). The report shall be laid out in such a way as to allow monitoring of the means envisaged and employed and of the budget details for the action. The final report, narrative and financial, will cover the entire period of the action implementation.

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

5.8 Evaluation

Having regard to the nature of the action, a final evaluation(s) will be carried out for this action or its components via independent consultants contracted by the Commission. In case an evaluation is not foreseen, the Commission may, during implementation, decide to undertake such an evaluation for duly justified reasons either on its own decision or on the initiative of the partner.

The Commission shall inform the implementing partner at least 60 days in advance of the dates foreseen for the evaluation missions. The implementing partner shall collaborate efficiently and effectively with the evaluation experts, and inter alia provide them with all necessary information and documentation, as well as access to the project premises and activities.

The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner country and other key stakeholders. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.
The financing of the evaluation shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.9 Audit

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audits or expenditure verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

The financing of the audit shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.10 Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility of the EU is a legal obligation for all external actions funded by the EU.

This action shall contain communication and visibility measures which shall be based on a specific Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action, to be elaborated at the start of implementation and supported with the budget indicated in section 5.5 above.

In terms of legal obligations on communication and visibility, the measures shall be implemented by the Commission, the partner country, contractors, grant beneficiaries and/or entrusted entities. Appropriate contractual obligations shall be included in, respectively, the financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and delegation agreements.

The Communication and Visibility Manual for European Union External Action shall be used to establish the Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action and the appropriate contractual obligations.

For UN organisations, Joint Visibility Guidelines for EC-UN actions in the field will be adopted.
**APPENDIX 1 INDICATIVE LOGFRAME MATRIX (FOR PROJECT MODALITY)**

The activities, the expected outputs and all the indicators, targets and baselines included in the logframe matrix are indicative and may be updated during the implementation of the action without an amendment to the financing decision. The indicative logframe matrix will evolve during the lifetime of the action: new lines will be added for listing the activities as well as new columns for intermediary targets (milestones) when it is relevant and for reporting purpose on the achievement of results as measured by indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baselines (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Targets (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Sources and means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall objective: Impact</strong></td>
<td>Enhance resilience to food shocks of chronic and acute food insecure people in post-food crisis by improving adaptation to climate change, combatting desertification, promoting nutrition sensitive activities and policies and encouraging sustainable and resilient small scale agricultural practices.</td>
<td>long-term trend of food insecurity linked to food crises situation at global level and in the countries serve by the PRO-ACT program have decreased</td>
<td>Around 40 million people globally and 21 million people in the 9 countries addressed 13.9% of the population of the 9 countries in average</td>
<td>Ideally, to be drawn from the partner's strategy</td>
<td>Food security situation is not affected by major non-food crises producing direct relevant impact on food security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific objective: Objective 1: Respond to major post-food crises scenarios promoting structural and resilient actions aiming at improving the capacity to prepare for, to withstand and to bounce back after shocks or stressors.</strong></td>
<td>Number of people vulnerable to food crises and average level of vulnerability</td>
<td>By country when available</td>
<td>5% index increase in 5 years horizon</td>
<td>Resilience analysis when available (e.g. RIMA/RAU, UNDP/Tango, others)</td>
<td>No major additional (natural and man-made) crises happen during the reference period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number and % of children under the age of 5 which are stunted</td>
<td>Decrease of the number by xxx and the % by 5% of stunted children</td>
<td>DHS or other nutrition sensitive health surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 2: Build Capacity of public institutions and private organisations to respond to food crises and capitalise on food crises prevention experiences by investing in resilience building good practices, such as the AGIR and SHARE initiatives.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Objective 2: Build Capacity of public institutions and private organisations to respond to food crises and capitalise on food crises prevention experiences by investing in resilience building good practices, such as the AGIR and SHARE initiatives.</th>
<th>Availability of a food crisis resilience strategy at country sub-country level</th>
<th>A national strategy linked to financial allocation available</th>
<th>National policy documents, State budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1, Resilience against food crises for the targeted population is build up by preventing negative coping mechanisms. (all countries and regions)</td>
<td>Number of people (man and women) affected by food crises receiving support from the program intervention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td># of beneficiaries</td>
<td>Program project reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2, Access to sufficient and nutrition food is enhanced by addressing temporary-permanent market failures and improved access to income opportunities. (all countries)</td>
<td>Number of people receiving a form of social transfer as a direct or indirect effect of the PRO-ACT program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td># of beneficiaries</td>
<td>Program and project reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3, Access to a dietary balanced intake is promoted in post crises situations. (all countries)</td>
<td>Dietary Diversity Score DDS (for men and women)</td>
<td>Xx</td>
<td>5% increase of the DDS</td>
<td>Households surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Insecurity will not affect the operationalization of the program in the field by limiting movements of implementing partners.
2.1. Capacity at regional, national and possibly local level on effective resilience building initiatives and mechanisms are improved. (all countries, excluding DPR Korea and Sudan for national interventions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Community Based Organisations (CBOs) established/reinforced for the management of: i) food crises, ii) public goods such as natural resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program project reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Know-how and lessons learned on building resilience to food crises are shared. (all countries and regions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of good practices adopted in a country issued of a knowledge sharing mechanism (seminar, information material, other)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program and project reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result 2.3. Epidemic surveillance mechanisms designed and capacity to prevent future Ebola outbreaks improved (West and Central Africa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epidemic surveillance system against Ebola designed at trans-regional level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program and project reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditions for the knowledge sharing are met, namely the natural, social and institutional environment are ready to accept innovations.

Political support is given to the process of improvement of the zoonosis surveillance to prevent future outbreaks.
ANNEX 5


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Title/basic act/CRIS number</th>
<th>Support Measures 2015 CRIS number: DCI-FOOD/2015/038-381 financed under Development Cooperation Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Zone benefiting from the action/location</td>
<td>The action shall be carried out in all countries eligible for support under the thematic programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sector of concentration/thematic area</td>
<td>Food and nutrition security and sustainable agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. Amounts concerned | Total estimated cost: EUR 1,000,000
Total amount of EU budget contribution **EUR 1,000,000**
The contribution is for an amount of **EUR 543,552** from the general budget of the European Union for 2015 and for an amount of **EUR 456,448** from the general budget of the European Union for 2016 subject to the availability of appropriations following the adoption of the relevant budget |
| 6. Aid modality(ies) and implementation modality(ies) | Project Modality
Direct management - procurement of services |
| 7. DAC code(s) | 99810 |
| 8. Markers (from CRIS DAC form) | **General policy objective** | **Not targeted** | **Significant objective** | **Main objective** |
| | Participation development/good governance | x | □ | □ |
| | Aid to environment | x | □ | □ |
| | Gender equality (including Women In Development) | x | □ | □ |
| | Trade Development | x | □ | □ |
| | Reproductive, Maternal, New born and child health | x | □ | □ |
| | **RIO Convention markers** | **Not targeted** | **Significant objective** | **Main objective** |
| | Biological diversity | x | □ | □ |
| | Combat desertification | x | □ | □ |
| | Climate change mitigation | x | □ | □ |
| | Climate change adaptation | x | □ | □ |
| 9. Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC) thematic flagships | NA |
SUMMARY

This action document covers the expenditures of activities related to the preparation, follow up, monitoring, evaluation and audit activities related to the implementation of the Food Security & Sustainable Agriculture (FSSA) strategic area of the Global Goods and Challenges thematic programme and to the achievement of its objectives. The overall objective is to contribute to the achievement of FSSA’s objective and specific results by providing support to EU delegations and Headquarter (HQ) services as well as beneficiary countries to design and deliver evidenced based, high quality, value for money programmes and to engage in effective policy and political dialogue.

In accordance with Article 3 of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union’s instruments for financing external action, the Support Measures will be used to finance, among others, activities such as i) risk-based audits and evaluations, ii) technical support for the identification and formulation of new actions, iii) studies and advisory services, trainings, seminars, conferences, workshops, meetings and production of related publications, and iv) technical support for the overall monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment of the programme.

1 CONTEXT

The Support Measures are designed to cover expenditures associated with the preparation, follow up, monitoring, evaluation and audit activities related to the implementation of the FSSA-GPGC thematic programme and to the achievement of its objectives. Such measures (audits, evaluations, identifications, studies, meetings, information sessions, special events for awareness-raising, publications, training activities and any other administrative or technical assistance expenditure, including interests for late payments, etc.) contribute to the sound management of the programme, to the achievement of its expected results and objectives and to the measurement, analysis and reporting on the impact.

2 RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

Given the specificity of this action there are no major risks and assumptions.

3 LESSONS LEARNT, COMPLEMENTARITY AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

3.1 Lessons learnt

Annual Action Programmes under the Food Security Thematic Programme in the previous programming period (2007-2013) had a provision for support measures which resulted in more than 150 contracts. These contracts allowed HQ and Delegations to perform studies to facilitate the design and alignment of programmes, audits, evaluations and to improve technical competences in the four pillars of food security (availability, access, nutrition and stability) necessary to design and deliver evidenced based, high quality, value for money programmes and to engage in policy and political dialogue.
3.2 Complementarity, synergy and donor coordination

Technical and study facilities set up at geographical levels, existing arrangements covering monitoring and evaluation (ROM contracts, sectoral evaluation studies, Court of Auditors reports, etc.) and training provision (aid delivery methods contract) will be complementary to the support measures provided under this action.

The Support Measures are not directly subject - by their support nature - to donor coordination, at the same time many of the outputs of support measures (evaluations, studies, conferences) can be used to nourish the dialogue with other donors and to enhance alignment to country approaches.

3.3 Cross-cutting issues

Cross cutting issues (gender, environment and climate change and governance) are at the hearth of the FSSA. All measures made available through this action will help analyse, deal with or address cross cutting issues.

4 DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

4.1 Objectives/results

The overall objective is to contribute to the achievement of FSSA’s objective (to improve food security for the poorest and most vulnerable, to help eradicate poverty and hunger for current and future generations, and to better address under-nutrition thereby reducing child mortality.) and specific results by providing support to EU Delegations and Headquarters as specified in Article 3 of the Common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for external action.

4.2 Main activities

The Support Measures will be used as a framework to finance activities in the following fields:

1. Risk based audits and evaluations. The objective is to reinforce auditing and evaluation activities in order to ensure the proper and sound management of EU funds as well as the assessment of the impact of actions financed by the Thematic programme.

2. Technical support for the identification and formulation of new actions. The objective is to provide support to EU Delegations and Headquarters in the design of projects and programmes which requires a more in-depth analysis.

3. Studies and trainings, seminars, meetings and production of related publications. The main objective of this type of activities is to support food security practitioners involved in the implementation of the FSTP and in the achievements of its objectives through for example, seminars, workshops, conferences, training courses, and on the ground support to foster their understanding of causes of food insecurity as well as of possible response strategies and good practices so to ensure delivery of high quality results while increasing efficiency and effectiveness.
5 IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Financing agreement

In order to implement this action, it is not foreseen to conclude a financing agreement with the partner country, referred to in Article 184(2)(b) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012.

5.2 Indicative implementation period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 4.1 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 60 months from the date of adoption by the Commission of this Action Document.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission’s authorising officer responsible by amending this decision and the relevant contracts and agreements; such amendments to this decision constitute technical amendments in the sense of point (i) of Article 2(3)(c) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014.

5.3 Implementation modalities

5.3.1.1 Procurement (direct management)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject in generic terms, if possible</th>
<th>Type (works, supplies, services)</th>
<th>Indicative number of contracts</th>
<th>Indicative trimester of launch of the procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk based audits and evaluations.</td>
<td>service</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Starting from 3rd trim 2015 up to 4th trim 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification and formulation of new actions</td>
<td>services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Starting from 3rd trim 2015 up to 4th trim 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies and trainings, seminars, meetings and production of related publications.</td>
<td>services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Starting from 3rd trim 2015 up to 4th trim 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply.

The Commission’s authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility in accordance with Article 9(2)(b) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of products and services in the markets of the countries concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where the eligibility rules would make the realisation of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult.
5.5 **Indicative budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct management – Procurement of services</th>
<th>EU contribution (amount in EUR)</th>
<th>Indicative third party contribution, in currency identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 **Organisational set-up and responsibilities**

Support measures are available for use to all EU delegations implementing actions funded by the thematic programme. At the beginning of each year, a letter is sent from headquarters to Delegations and geographic directorates in headquarters, announcing the availability of support measures. Delegations ask the authorisation to use the funds to the service in HQs in charge of the decision and then manage the procurement – mostly through existing framework contracts- and contracting of services autonomously.

5.7 **Performance monitoring and reporting**

The technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of the service contracts resulting from the procurement procedure is a continuous process and part of the responsibilities of the Delegation or HQs service in charge of the contract. Delegations are asked to keep HQs informed of progress in implementation of the various services and where feasible and relevant to share the products (such as studies and evaluations) for lessons learning and dissemination of good practices.

5.8 **Evaluation**

Having regard to the nature of the action (i.e. support measures), evaluations will not be carried out for this action.

5.9 **Audit**

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audits or expenditure verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

5.10 **Communication and visibility**

Communication and visibility of the EU is a legal obligation for all external actions funded by the EU.

Communication and information activities are an integral part of the action, aiming at enhanced visibility and better understanding of EU-funded activities aiming at combating hunger and malnutrition and at increasing food security of vulnerable and fragile groups.