

Annex A - Distribution of Danida budget for APP Phases I-IV

Phase	Budget breakdown (DKK million)	
Pilot: 2003-2005	Total	12
I: 2005-2009	AU	72
	ECOWAS	66
	SADC	80
	IGAD	20
	Unallocated	5
	Reviews, programme coordination, monitoring etc.	5
	Total	248
II: 2010-2013	AU	90.5
	UNECA	8
	ECOWAS	60.1
	KAIPTC	25
	IGAD	42.5
	EASBRICOM	9.9
	Reviews, programme coordination, monitoring etc.	14
	Total	250
III: 2014-2017	AU (of which DKK 8 million are allocated to Technical Assistance and reviews, programme coordination, monitoring etc.)	125
	ECOWAS (excl. DKK 20 million carryover from Phase II)	20
	IGAD	30
	KAIPTC	25
	WANEP	10
	Total (excl. DKK 20 million carryover from Phase II)	210
IV: 2018-2021	AU	115
	ECOWAS	38
	IGAD	17
	Think Tanks (ISS and others to be identified)	20
	Unallocated	10
	Total	200
OVERALL TOTAL		928

Source: APP Programme Documents.

Note: At the outset, the evaluation appraised the extent to which the indicative budget of individual APP phases matched the ultimate expenditures. The intention was to gain a comprehensive overview of how the APP's expenditures had evolved over time. To support this task, Danida shared an expenditure overview of the APP I, which provided the financial amounts between the APP I's 'Commitment Frame' and 'Actually Disbursed,' but this was incomplete. The

document notes that due to missing information, the costs incurred under individual objectives and APP components do not sum up to the total amount Danida 'Actually Disbursed' under APP I.

It was not possible to reproduce a similar financial expenditure overview for APP II and APP III. While the evaluation intended to compare the indicative budget included within an APP programme documents with the financial donor reports of the individual APP components, this could not be completed due to two reasons: (1) Danish funding cannot be traced as the individual partner institutions (e.g. the AU) often prepare joint reports to donors and this therefore does not allow for sufficient hard data on activity level and outputs of individual donor contributions to be extracted, and (2) While each APP's indicative budget matches the objectives, outputs and activities set forth within the programme documents, the donor reports produced by partner institutions are based on their own cost structures and allocations, i.e. the objectives the AU sets out for itself to meet, and therefore do not directly correspond with the objectives the APP has set.

In view of the above, the evaluation has thus exclusively used the indicative budgets found within the APP Programme Documents, to preserve the ability to assess how APP expenditures have evolved under each APP phase.