

June 2012

E



منظمة الأغذية  
والزراعة للأمم  
المتحدة

联合国  
粮食及  
农业组织

Food and  
Agriculture  
Organization  
of the  
United Nations

Organisation des  
Nations Unies  
pour  
l'alimentation  
et l'agriculture

Продовольственная и  
сельскохозяйственная  
организация  
Объединенных  
Наций

Organización  
de las  
Naciones Unidas  
para la  
Alimentación y la  
Agricultura

# DESERT LOCUST CONTROL COMMITTEE

<b>Fortieth Session</b>
<b>Rome, 19-22 June 2012</b>
<b>Future directions and improvements for sustainability (Financial governance/Description of financial instruments)</b>
<b>(Agenda item 9)</b>

*This document is printed in limited numbers to minimize the environmental impact of FAO's processes and contribute to climate neutrality. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and to avoid asking for additional copies. Most FAO meeting documents are available on the Internet at [www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org)*

**Card 1: State budget****RECESSION – OUTBREAK – UPSURGE - PLAGUE**

1. **Objectives.** The state budget is the primary instrument for the financing of well equipped and organized national locust control units (NLCUs), which constitute the cornerstone of desert locust control. In frontline countries, NLCUs must be capable of carrying out monitoring and control operations in reproduction areas, so as to prevent gregarization and avoid development into an outbreak situation or worse. This objective has an economic justification: on the one hand, the costs of prevention are far lower than those of a curative campaign in periods of strong outbreak, upsurge or plague; on the other hand, preventive control prevents damage to the agricultural sector and rural households, which could have considerable costs. In plague countries, NLCUs can play a preventive role in the gregarization areas they may contain and, even in countries that do not contain such areas, they must be fully operational so that they can respond quickly and effectively to locust infestations coming from other countries.
2. **Eligibility.** In each country, the NLCU is eligible for financing from the state budget. It is recommended that, at least in countries contributing to preventive control, NLCUs should have administrative and financial autonomy, which is more conducive to secure financial resources.
3. **Activation.** Resources must be available and deployed every year, irrespective of the development stage of desert locust populations. Although NLCUs are not in charge of resource allocation, they are responsible, possibly with the assistance of their regional commission, for raising the awareness of national decision-makers, particularly their supervising minister, on the importance of financing a solid national prevention system.
4. **Amount.** The exact nature and amount of costs in recession and low outbreak periods must be specified in national locust contingency plans. These costs vary according to the total area of the zones to be monitored and the length of the period during which these operations are necessary.
5. **Financing modalities.** Every year, the NLCUs must submit a budget proposal to their supervising ministry. It is proposed that each NLCU should prepare a double budget, i.e. an annual reference budget, covering all the recurrent costs and the investments required for the good functioning of the NLCU, and a constrained annual budget, or real budget, which would be based on the reference budget. The allocation of resources by the ministry of finance then follows the regular budgeting procedure of each country.
6. **Management.** The management of funds allocated by the state budget follows regular national procedures.
7. **Monitoring and auditing.** The applicable monitoring and auditing modalities are those found in the national procedures in force for public administrations.

**Card 2: Budget of the regional commissions****RECESSION – LOW OUTBREAK**

1. **Objectives.** The budgets of regional commissions have the aim, on the one hand, of financing the commissions' regular activities, and, on the other, of providing additional resources for national locust control units (NLCUs) when these do not have access to sufficient national resources to cover their needs in periods of recession or low outbreak. Such a mechanism brings regional solidarity into play, inasmuch as preventive control benefits not only the countries that contain reproduction areas, but indeed the whole region, so that responsibility for its financing should be shared at the regional level. Such an approach is all the more justified in that many frontline countries have limited resources, as is the case of all the frontline countries in the western region and a good half of those in the central region. The regional commissions, which receive contributions from all their member states, can thereby become instruments of equitable sharing of the costs of preventive control among all the countries that benefit from these measures.
2. **Eligibility.** The types of activity that are eligible for financing from the regional commission's budget should be identified in the regional locust contingency plan and would cover: (i) activities of a regional nature that can benefit all the member states according to programmes of activities that are approved at biennial meetings; and (ii) activities of a national nature, for which financing would be subject to eligibility criteria in the case both of NLCUs (units whose reference budget exceeds the real budget and that have made proven efforts to achieve an increase in their real budget) and of expenditure during recession periods (only expenditure considered to be investment, i.e. for equipment or training) and outbreak periods (any expenditure aimed at boosting NLCU capacity to respond to a worsening situation on the ground, including costs of increasing survey and control teams, equipment and pesticide).
3. **Activation.** Activities of a regional nature are planned and implemented by the executive secretary of the regional commission, in accordance with the biennial work plan and budget approved by member states at their biennial meetings. Activities of a national nature are accessible to NLCUs submitting a request to the regional commission in the prescribed format and observing the established conditions.
4. **Amount.** The nature and cost of activities will be defined in the regional commission's biennial work plan and budget and in regional locust contingency plans.
5. **Financing modalities.** Member states' contributions constitute the primary source of finance for the regional commissions' budget. They are established according to a scale adopted by a two-thirds majority of commission members. Each regional commission is responsible, together with the corresponding NLCUs, for raising the awareness of member states so that they pay their annual contribution and any arrears. Every two years, each regional commission prepares a biennial budget to be approved by member states. The financing of the national level by the regional level could be implemented in one of three ways: (i) through an *ad hoc* decision taken by the commission's secretary on a case-by-case basis, which allows flexibility to the commission and discourages countries from refraining to increase their national budgets, but has the disadvantage of a lack of resource predictability and thus does not facilitate national-level planning; (ii) allocation based on a call for

proposals addressed to NLCUs, which gives a certain flexibility, although resource predictability remains limited; and (iii) allocation conditional on performance, with finance provided on condition of disbursement of a percentage (to be determined) of the budget financed by national resources, the supply of regular, good-quality ten-day and monthly bulletins to the regional commission and the Desert Locust Information Service (DLIS) for the current year, and the financial and administrative autonomy of the beneficiary NLCU. The advantages of this third scenario are that it facilitates resource predictability, while also encouraging good performance.

6. **Management.** In accordance with the agreements establishing the regional commissions, the trust funds receiving contributions from member states are managed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), according to the Organization's financial rules. Expenditure other than local petty expenses is settled by two budget holders in FAO's Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP). The delegation of authority to the executive secretary of a regional commission may be envisaged for certain types of expenditure or for certain amounts, which would shorten the procedure, but would have significant consequences with regard to financing and management (the need to recruit staff to handle financial management). These aspects are reviewed into greater detail in juridical terms in the legal study carried out parallel to this study.

7. **Monitoring and auditing.** The executive secretary of the regional commission draws up a technical and financial report on the commission's activities and budget execution. Auditing procedures are those applicable to the activities of FAO.

**Card 3: Multi-donor Fund for Preventive Control****RECESSION – LOW OUTBREAK**

1. **Objectives.** The Multi-donor Fund for Preventive Control is intended to complement financing allowed by the national budget and the regional commission's budget in countries lacking sufficient resources to finance the whole range of elements necessary for effective preventive control. In such cases, the multi-donor fund would provide the additional finance needed to allow a national locust control unit (NLCU) to carry out all the activities required for preventive control without any break in operations.
2. **Eligibility.** NLCUs eligible for a contribution from the multi-donor fund are those of frontline countries in the western and central regions with reference budgets exceeding their real budgets, which have made proven efforts to achieve an increase in their real budget and have received a contribution from the regional commission. In recession periods, only expenditure considered an investment, i.e. for equipment and training, is eligible, so as to prevent governments from making the financing of NLCUs' regular activities (recurrent costs) dependent on the availability of external funding. In low outbreak periods, all expenditure aimed at increasing NLCU capacity to respond to a worsening situation on the ground is eligible, including the costs of increasing survey and control teams, equipment and pesticide.
3. **Activation.** To receive financial support as per the above eligibility criteria, an NLCU must make formal application to the fund manager, observing a prescribed format. The proposed eligibility criteria and procedure should be validated (and possibly supplemented) by the states and institutions financing the multi-donor fund, and also by the countries eligible to benefit from it.
4. **Amount.** The size of the multi-donor fund in each region should be based on an annual estimate of the financing shortfall between, on the one hand, the total resources needed by the NLCUs of frontline countries to carry out preventive control (the sum of reference budgets) and, on the other, the resources actually available to them (the sum of real budgets and the total contribution of the regional commission to the budgets of these NLCUs, plus any *ad hoc* projects). For example, it is estimated that the annual contribution of the fund in the western region would be approximately US\$300 000 (assuming that it would cover the whole financing shortfall for the four frontline countries).
5. **Financing modalities.** The fund would be financed by the contributions of international donors, and such contributions could be global, which would be preferable, or could target specific countries or types of activity, depending on the donor's priorities. Two scenarios can be envisaged for resource allocation to NLCUs: (i) through an *ad hoc* decision taken by the fund manager on a case-by-case basis, which allows flexibility and discourages countries from refraining to increase their national budgets, but has the disadvantage of a lack of resource predictability and thus does not facilitate national-level planning; and (ii) allocation conditional on NLCU performance, with finance provided on condition of disbursement of a percentage (to be determined) of the budget financed by national resources, the supply of regular, good-quality ten-day and monthly bulletins to the regional commission and the Desert Locust Information Service (DLIS) for the current year, and the financial

and administrative autonomy of the beneficiary NLCU. The advantages of this second scenario are that it facilitates resource predictability, while also encouraging good performance.

6. **Management.** The fund's governance system would bring together donor countries and institutions, the regional commissions and the Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP) of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), which would form a steering committee. Two scenarios can be envisaged for implementation of the Multi-donor Fund for Preventive Control: (i) a regional-level trust fund in the form of a subaccount in the trust fund that already exists for every regional commission; this scenario would secure resources at the regional level, facilitate targeting according to donors' geographical priorities and boost the legitimacy and credibility of the regional commissions by attributing to them an important new role; and (ii) an international-level trust fund in the form of a subaccount in the Desert Locust Control Committee (DLCC) trust fund; this scenario would make a broader mobilization of donors at the international level possible and also offer the possibility of ensuring the global management of the funds allocated by donors in support of preventive control; however, it would also complicate the procedure for approving funding requests by creating an additional decision-making level, run counter to the decentralization trend supported by both FAO and donors, and dilute the dialogue between donors and NLCUs.

7. **Monitoring and auditing.** The fund manager draws up a technical and financial report on the allocation of the fund's resources and their use by beneficiary NLCUs. Audit procedures are those applicable to the activities of FAO.

**Card 4: National emergency fund****STRONG OUTBREAK – UPSURGE - PLAGUE**

1. **Objectives.** National emergency funds must enable a rapid response to the worsening of a desert locust outbreak by making available the financial resources needed to increase field teams, equipment and control materials when the regular resources of the national locust control units (NLCUs) are not sufficient. They must play a key role in the transition between (i) the time when the resources of the regular NLCU budget (possibly topped up by contributions from the regional commission and the Multi-donor Fund for Preventive Control) are no longer sufficient to cope with the situation on the ground and (ii) the time when other instruments (the regional emergency fund and the Central Emergency Response Fund [CERF]) disburse additional resources.
2. **Eligibility.** Eligibility criteria for access to finance from the national emergency fund should be established in the national locust contingency plan and, in the case of a general emergency fund (see below), in the agreement made between the NLCU or its supervising authority and the fund's management structure. The main criterion will be the inadequacy of available resources to cope with the deterioration in the situation. Other criteria can be based on risk development forecasts, the total area of infested zones and the development stage of the locust population.  
**Eligible expenditure** would include all expenditure aimed at increasing an NLCU's response capacity in the case of a worsening situation on the ground, whether these be operating or investment expenses. It can thus cover costs related to increasing survey and control teams, equipment, aerial operations or pesticide.
3. **Activation.** Resources from this emergency fund become available as soon as the locust emergency mechanism is activated: launching of the national locust emergency plan and activation of the national locust contingency structure. This mechanism must be activated early enough to take into account the time needed to make the resources available and procure the additional equipment and materials.
4. **Amount.** Resources from the national emergency fund are needed to finance increased control resources throughout a locust emergency. However, in many frontline countries, national budgets are insufficient to cover all the costs of locust control for the whole length of an emergency, especially if it persists for a protracted time and covers several stages in locust development. The national locust contingency plan, approved by the cabinet, should indicate the minimum amount that should be immediately accessible through the national emergency fund, based on forecasts and scenarios.
5. **Financing modalities.** There are two possible scenarios: (i) a specialized locust emergency fund, which would be set up specifically to finance locust control in times of emergency, with a minimum amount deposited in a blocked account; and (ii) a general emergency fund, with more general objectives of responding to food crises or agricultural calamities, which may be more appropriate in countries with only limited budget resources. The establishment of specialized locust emergency funds could be facilitated, even in the most resource-poor countries, through an agreement between the NLCU's supervising authority (usually the ministry responsible for agriculture) and one

or more donors, under which the unspent balance from rural development projects would be allocated to the emergency fund. An automatic contribution (for example 1 percent) from any new project approved in the rural development sector could even be envisaged. Such an agreement would be justified by the fact that locust control activities in outbreak periods would have a direct impact on preservation of productive capacities and income in rural areas.

6. **Management.** The management of resources allocated by the state budget follows the procedures laid down at the national level and in the legal documents establishing the funds, especially those cofinanced by international donors. It should also be based on support measures to facilitate rapid deployment of the allocated resources, which include the following, apart from the national locust emergency plan:

- a decision-making authority located at a very high political level;
- an interministerial structure that can rapidly mobilize institutions and resources, and also facilitate decision-making and the coordination of interventions;
- a well-organized and prepared intervention mechanism that can be rapidly mobilized;
- exemptions from regular administrative procedures (control *a posteriori*) to reduce the bureaucratic delays these normally entail.

7. **Monitoring and auditing.** The applicable monitoring and auditing modalities are those laid down in the national procedures in force for public administrations, together with the procedures anticipated in the fund's constitution.



**Card 5: Regional emergency fund****STRONG OUTBREAK - UPSURGE**

1. **Objectives.** The regional emergency fund has the aim of making additional resources available to national locust control units (NLCUs) faced with a strong locust outbreak or upsurge, so that they can finance additional survey and control teams and corresponding equipment and pesticide. It plays a transitional role between the time when national resources (regular or emergency) are no longer sufficient and the time when international resources become available. It is proposed that one regional emergency fund be set up for the western region and one for the central region.
2. **Eligibility.** NLCUs are eligible for financing from the regional emergency fund if they have activated the national emergency mechanism, on condition that the alert has been confirmed by the Desert Locust Information Service (DLIS) and the relevant regional commission has expressed its favourable opinion. Eligible expenditure includes all expenditure aimed at increasing an NLCU's capacity to respond to a worsening situation on the ground, be they operating or investment costs. It can thus cover costs connected with an increase in survey and control teams, equipment, aircraft operations or pesticide.
3. **Activation.** The NLCU must address a request for finance to the executive secretary of the relevant regional commission, which will be transmitted as soon as the situation on the ground and development forecasts drawn up by the NLCU and confirmed by the relevant regional commission and the DLIS indicate a likely development from a low outbreak situation to a strong outbreak situation, with a lack of sufficient national resources to cope with it. The executive secretary then organizes a meeting of experts from the member states to assess the locust situation on the ground and prepare a regional plan of action to respond to the emergency, in collaboration with the NLCU of the affected country. The proposed eligibility criteria and procedure should be validated (and possibly supplemented) by the states and institutions financing the regional fund, together with the states that would benefit from it.
4. **Amount.** It is estimated that the regional emergency fund should be able to finance interventions for a period corresponding to two generations of desert locusts, i.e. four months, and cover simultaneous needs in three countries, on the basis of the average areas treated during past outbreaks. A first estimate would set the amount at approximately US\$5 million for the Commission for Controlling the Desert Locust in the Western Region (CLCPRO).
5. **Financing modalities.** The fund would be financed from three sources: (i) the budget of the regional commissions, which should include a provision for the financing of emergency operations; these resources should be blocked in a subaccount in the regional commission's trust fund until the total amount of the fund, including international resources, is reached; the resources currently set aside to cope with emergency situations by both the CLCPRO and the Commission for Controlling the Desert Locust in the Central Region (CRC) (US\$1.34 million and US\$2.19 million respectively) would allow a first disbursement of funds to be made immediately; (ii) bilateral contributions from member states of the regional commission concerned; and (iii) contributions from international donors.

Two scenarios – which may be combined – can be envisaged for making the resources financed by these donors available: (i) blocked resources, which would guarantee the availability of resources and facilitate rapid mobilization; and (ii) the establishment of financing agreements between the donors concerned and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) represented by its Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP) and/or the regional commission, whereby donors would pay out their contributions when activation indicators are fulfilled (based on the established eligibility criteria) and a call for funds is presented in a prescribed format (along the lines of a project proposal); such agreements could be signed and approved in advance, so that in case of an emergency, the funds could be deployed within a few days; the amount and destination of the resources would be defined in the finance agreement; contributions could be made in the form of a global contribution to the fund, which would be preferable, or a contribution earmarked for specific countries or specific types of activity, depending on the donor's priorities.

In the current situation, the agreements establishing the regional commissions do not allow them to make direct agreements with other institutions, a responsibility that rests with FAO. Some people argue that the regional commissions should have this capacity, which would be a way of shortening bureaucratic processes. The legal implications of this issue are examined in the juridical study carried out parallel to the present study. It should be stressed here that such a transfer of responsibilities from FAO to the regional commissions would have significant consequences with regard to management (the need to recruit staff to handle financial management).

The fund could be replenished on the occasion of emergencies, by including the necessary replenishment amounts in the call for funds launched by FAO.

6. **Management.** The regional emergency fund's governance system would bring together donor states and institutions, the regional commissions and FAO (AGP), which would form a steering committee. Two scenarios can be envisaged for the fund's implementation: (i) a regional-level trust fund in the form of a subaccount in the trust fund that already exists for every regional commission; this scenario would secure resources at the regional level, facilitate targeting according to donors' geographical priorities and boost the legitimacy and credibility of the regional commissions by attributing to them an important new role; and (ii) an international-level trust fund in the form of a subaccount in the Desert Locust Control Committee (DLCC) trust fund; this scenario would make a broader mobilization of donors at the international level possible and also the possibility of ensuring the global management of funds allocated by donors in support of preventive control; however, it would also complicate the procedure for approving funding requests by creating an additional decision-making level, run counter to the decentralization trend supported by both FAO and donors, and dilute the dialogue between donors and NLCUs.

7. **Monitoring and auditing.** The fund manager draws up a technical and financial report on the allocation of the fund's resources and their use by the beneficiary NLCUs. Audit procedures are those applicable to the activities of FAO.

**Card 6: Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)****STRONG UPSURGE - PLAGUE**

1. **Objectives.** The Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) was created in 2005 by a decision of the United Nations General Assembly, with the objective of improving the coordination of humanitarian aid, especially in emergency situations. It opens very fast access to international funds, which, in the case of a desert locust upsurge or the beginning of a plague, should provide a bridge between (i) the time when national or regional resources become or threaten to become insufficient to finance a response and (ii) the time when the first contributions from donors in response to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)'s call for funds become available. It is thus a transition fund financed by the international community and managed by the United Nations.
2. **Eligibility.** The admissible interventions listed in the guidelines provided by the CERF specifically include "initial inputs for transboundary or country-contained crop pest plague control (for example against locusts)", which encompasses "time-critical interventions to avert disaster and restore livelihoods". Funds are attributed to United Nations agencies and programmes (thus, to FAO for locust emergencies), in consultation with the states and humanitarian coordinators concerned. Regional commissions should be consulted in this process.
3. **Activation.** The financing request is prepared by FAO headquarters in consultation with the country or countries concerned, the relevant regional commission or commissions, the FAO local (and, where appropriate, regional) representation or representations and the United Nations humanitarian coordinators of the countries concerned. Mobilization of the CERF must be prepared by the end of the outbreak period, based on reliable forecasts of development towards an upsurge situation.
4. **Amount.** CERF financing can reach a maximum of US\$30 million. Identification of the costs to be covered through these resources should be based on national and regional locust contingency plans. Funds are made available very rapidly, with a maximum time lapse of 15 days. CERF allocations must be spent within six months of their disbursement.
5. **Management.** Funds are attributed to and managed by FAO. This means that FAO must have rapid procedures for procurement and contracts, inasmuch as the whole allocation must be spent in a maximum of six months. FAO's Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division (TCE), in collaboration with its Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP) and its Contract and Procurement Service, is now able to carry out procurement very rapidly by preparing technical specifications and tender documents well in advance.
6. **Monitoring and auditing.** FAO's local representation must provide the local United Nations humanitarian coordinator with a report describing and analysing the activities carried out and the results obtained as against the objectives set, together with financial information on expenditure.

**Card 7: Special Fund for Emergency and Rehabilitation Activities (SFERA)****STRONG UPSURGE - PLAGUE**

1. **Objectives.** The Special Fund for Emergency and Rehabilitation Activities (SFERA) is a mechanism within the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) created in 2004. It has three components: (i) a revolving fund that can advance funds for which a financing agreement has been reached with a donor, until the finance is actually released by the donor; (ii) a revolving fund that finances FAO's participation in emergency needs assessments; and (iii) a component to finance large-scale emergency response programmes, including in the case of transboundary emergencies, through the establishment of multi-donor funds. The first two components are considered here; the second can be used to finance consultants to boost field assessments and define needs.
2. **Eligibility.** A financing pre-agreement must be provided by the donor before the SFERA can release any funds.
3. **Activation.** Authorization to commit funds is given by the Director of FAO's Finance Division.
4. **Amount.** The average amount of advances on funding is approximately US\$500 000.
5. **Financing modalities.** The SFERA provides advances on funding. As soon as the donor makes its contribution available, the SFERA is automatically reimbursed for the amount advanced.
6. **Management.** Funds are attributed to and managed by FAO. Rapid procedures are required for procurement and contracts. FAO's Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division (TCE), in collaboration with its Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP) and its Contract and Procurement Service, is now able to carry out procurement very rapidly by preparing technical specifications and tender documents well in advance.
7. **Monitoring and auditing.** The local FAO representations concerned must provide a report to headquarters, describing and analysing the activities carried out and the results obtained as against the objectives set, together with financial information on expenditure.

**Card 8: FAO call for funds****STRONG UPSURGE - PLAGUE**

1. **Objectives.** The call for funds has the aim of providing countries engaged in desert locust control in periods of upsurge or plague with the resources they need to finance operations, equipment and materials on a large scale. At this stage, the resources required become too great to be covered solely by the other sources of finance so far used and the intervention of the international community becomes necessary.
2. **Eligibility.** There are no specific eligibility conditions, apart from the fact that all other sources of finance must have already been activated and be nearing exhaustion. The situation is assessed jointly by the national locust control units (NLCUs) and regional commissions concerned, together with the Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP) and Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division (TCE) of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Any expenditure aimed at increasing an NLCU's capacity to respond to the worsening of the situation on the ground is eligible, be it related to operating costs or investment. It may thus cover the costs of increasing survey and control teams, equipment, aircraft operations and pesticide.
3. **Activation.** The call for funds is launched by TCE, based on consultation with the executive secretaries of the regional commissions concerned and AGP. The call should be launched as soon as an expansion of the emergency can be anticipated, combined with the approaching insufficiency of available resources. Mobilization must thus be prepared for by the end of the outbreak period, based on reliable forecasts of the development of the outbreak situation towards an upsurge situation, the scenarios contained in the locust contingency plans and careful monitoring of the development of the locust situation and environmental conditions on the ground.
4. **Amount.** To be determined on the basis of needs.
5. **Financing modalities.** Funds granted by donors that respond to the call for funds are channelled to FAO headquarters and managed by FAO through its specialized departments or local representations.
6. **Management.** Funds are attributed to and managed by FAO. Rapid procedures are required for procurement and contracts. TCE, in collaboration with AGP and the Contract and Procurement Service, is now able to carry out procurement very rapidly by preparing technical specifications and tender documents well in advance.
7. **Monitoring and auditing.** The local FAO representations concerned must provide a report to headquarters, describing and analysing the activities carried out and the results achieved as against the objectives set, together with financial information on expenditure.