**UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2021**

Reporting from 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

# INSTRUCTIONS TO COMPLETE THIS PIR

# 1. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

# 1.1. Project details

This entire table is to be prepared by Task Managers

1. IDENTIFICATION

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Identification Table | GEF ID.: 5272  | Umoja no.: 0926 |
| Project Title | Scaling Up Sustainable Land Management and Agro-Biodiversity Conservation to Reduce Environmental Degradation in Small-Scale Agriculture in Western Kenya |
| Duration months | Planned | 60 months / Actual Start Date from June 2017 to June 2022 |
| Extension(s) | N/A | N/A |
| Division(s) Implementing the project | UN Environment Programme, Ecosystems Division, GEF Biodiversity and Land Degradation Unit Biodiversity and Land Branch |
| Name of co-implementing Agency  | N/A |
| Executing Agency(ies) | Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) and Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization (KALRO). |
| Names of Other Project Partners | * County Governments of Kakamega, Nandi and Vihiga
* Agricultural Sector Development Support Program (ASDSP)
* Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI)
* Kenya Forest Services (KFS)
* Kenya Wildlife Services (KWS)
* Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology (MMUST)
* Anglican Development Services Western (ADS –Western Kenya)
* Rural Outreach Program (ROP)
* Nature Kenya
* Community Groups (CBOs, CFAs FFS, WRUAs, Farmer, Women and Youth groups)
* Private Sector (Input suppliers, market linkages, etc.) (innovation Platforms)
 |
| Project Type | Full-Sized Project |
| Project Scope | National |
| Region  | Africa |
| Countries | Kenya |
| Programme of Work | Ecosystem ManagementSP3: EAa (i,iii) and EAb (i,ii)2018-2019 PoW and the 2018-2021 MTS |
| GEF Focal Area(s) | Multi Focal Area |
| UNSDCF / UNDAF linkages  | Cuts across the three strategic objectives of UNDAF Kenya 2018 – 2022 |
| Link to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s) | SDG 1: 1.1; SDG 2:2.4; SDG 11:11.4; SDG 14:14.2, 14c; SDG 15:15.1, 15.5, 15.6, 15.7; SDG 16: 16b; SDG 17:17.6, 17,7, 17.11 and 17.14 |
| GEF financing amount | $ 3,583,800 |
| Co-financing amount | $ 9,904,405 |
| Date of CEO Endorsement | 12th July 2016 |
| Start of Implementation | 27th December 2016 |
| Date of first disbursement | 27th December 2016 |
| Total disbursement as of 30 June 2022 |  USD. 3,328,609.86 |
| Total expenditure as of 30 June 2022 |  USD. 3,428,895.42 |
| Expected Mid-Term Review Date | October 2020 |
| Completion Date | Planned | 31st July 2022 |
| Revised | 31st January 2023 |
| Expected Terminal Evaluation Date | September 2022 |
| Expected Financial Closure Date | 30th Sept 2022 |

# 1.2. Project description

|  |
| --- |
| Present a brief project description, stating objective, components, executing agency and main government/other partners involved. Summarize each component in one short paragraph:The Global Environment Facility (GEF) on 12th July 2016 approved the GEF grant of US $3,583,800 to the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) to scale up sustainable land management and agro-biodiversity conservation to reduce environmental degradation in small-scale agriculture in western Kenya (GEF 5). The project is co-financed by the project partners to the tune of USD 9,904,405. The Project commenced on 27th December 2016 and technically came to an end on 31st July 2022 but with revised dates to close by 31st January 2023. The Project Executing Agency is Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) working collaboratively with the Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization (KALRO). The project targets three counties in western Kenya namely Kakamega, Vihiga and Nandi and thus these three County Governments are partners in the project. Other partners include Agricultural Sector Development Support Program (ASDSP); Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI); Kenya Forest Services (KFS); Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS); Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology (MMUST); Anglican Development Services Western (ADS –Western Kenya); Rural Outreach Program (ROP); Nature Kenya; Community Groups (CBOs, CFAs FFS, WRUAs, Farmer, Women and Youth groups) and the Private Sector players (Input suppliers, market linkages, etc.). The project targeted to put 3,913 hectares (ha) of land under Sustainable Land Management thereby benefiting 100,000 smallholder farmers growing maize, beans and indigenous vegetables.The goal of the project is to contribute to food security and incomes of smallholder farmers and secure sustainable land and forest ecosystems in western Kenya. The development objective is to promote the adoption and adaption of sustainable land and forest ecosystem management (SLM/SFM) practices across the productive landscape of Kakamega-Nandi ecosystem. The global environment objective of the project is to reduce land and ecosystem degradation, mainstream biodiversity (including agro-biodiversity) conservation across the landscape and contribute to climate change adaptation and mitigation. The project is being implemented through 3 components as follows:**Component 1**: Capacity building of stakeholders on SLM /SFM and biodiversity conservation within Kakamega forest ecosystem. Under this component, the project partners were supposed to train smallholder farmers on sustainable land management options in order to increase the productivity of their crops especially maize, beans and indigenous vegetables. The farmers were trained by 100 Trainer of trainers (100) using 50 learning sites spread across 10 micro-catchments. In addition, six Community Forest Associations were to be trained to help in rehabilitation of degraded hotspots.**Component 2:** Mainstreaming Value Chain Approach to Smallholder Producers. Under this component, the project partners were to link farmer groups to inputs and output markets in order to earn income by selling their farm produce at remunerative prices. They were also to provide support to strengthening of Community Based Seed producers especially of indigenous vegetables. The project partners were also supposed to help farmers minimize post-harvest loses at household level. The farmers were supposed to be trained on postharvest technologies such as safe use of chemicals, hermetic storage bags, labor-saving post-harvest equipment such as, vegetables drying and Sheller. The partners were also supposed to Support 20 women and youth groups in small scale agricultural enterprises (SMEAs). This was to be done through trainings on business plans and enterprise development. The SMEs were supposed to be linked to bank institution to receive credit financing. **Component 3**: Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework. Under this component, the project was to support development of county-level SLM/SFM and biodiversity frameworks and strategies as well as provide support to ecosystem valuation and assessment. The rationale was to sustain the benefits of the SLM project by helping the County Governments gather sufficient data and develop appropriate policies for domestication of SLM practices at each county and institutionalize the same in the County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs). |

# 1.3. History of project revisions

To be completed by Task Managers

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Date** | **Main changes introduced in this revision** |
| Rev0 (CEO ED) |  |  |
| : |  |  |
| : |  |  |
| RevN (latest version at the time of this PIF) |  |  |

# 2. OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

To be completed by UNEP Task Manager

* 1. 2.1. UNEP Subprogramme(s)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Insert the Sub-programme(s) and biennia of the PoW to which the project contributesEcosystem ManagementSP3: EAa (i,iii) and EAb (i,ii)2018-2019 PoW and the 2018-2021 MTS**Subprogramme 3: Healthy and productive ecosystems**Biennia for the PoW under result **“***The health and productivity of marine, freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems are institutionalized in education, monitoring and cross-sectoral and transboundary collaboration frameworks at the national and international levels*” **:**1. Technical assistance and partnerships to establish indicators for biodiversity and ecosystem functioning and monitoring of key issues that have an impact on ecosystem functioning and ecosystem productivity 2. Technical assistance and partnerships on effective conservation measures and monitoring thereof (ecosystem management, ecological representativeness and connectivity) Biennia for the PoW under result **“***Policymakers in the public and private sectors test and consider the inclusion of the health and productivity of ecosystems in economic decision-making*”: 1. Development and dissemination of tools and methodologies to incorporate ecosystem health and resource availability in economic decision-making  | **Specify the relevant Expected Accomplishment(s) & Indicator(s)**Insert the Sub-programme’s Expected Accomplishment(s) and Indicator(s) to which the project contributesExpected accomplishments under sub-programme 3 “Healthy and productive ecosystems”:(a) The health and productivity of marine, freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems are institutionalized in education, monitoring and cross-sectoral and transboundary collaboration frameworks at the national and international levels(b) Policymakers in the public and private sectors test and consider the inclusion of the health and productivity of ecosystems in economic decision-making*Indicators:*1. The number of countries and transboundary collaboration frameworks that have made progress in monitoring and maintaining the health and productivity of marine and terrestrial ecosystems with the assistance of UNEP
2. The number of public-sector institutions that test and consider the inclusion of the health and productivity of marine and terrestrial ecosystems in economic decision-making with the assistance of UNEP
 |
| Describe any progress made towards delivering the stated PoW Expected Accomplishments and Indicators. State key changes since previous reporting period.***In this current year July 2021 to June 2022, the following achievements were made:***Degraded lands were put under sustainable land management practices through planting the targeted crops namely maize, beans, indigenous vegetables in the 50 learning sites during long rains and short rains between July and December 2021. The SLM/FM Practices exhibited at the leaning sites were those that were highly ranked (prioritized) and integrated into the 10 micro-catchment land use management plans that had been developed. They were also informed by the land degradation assessment and soil testing results. These technologies at the learning sites included conservation agriculture (CA), terraces, grass strips, agroforestry, fertilization, liming, organic manuring, improved varieties, intercropping and crop rotation. Maintenance and Harvesting of the 50 learning sites continued through support of the 100 TOTs and the 248 innovation platforms members. The yields of maize obtained from the learning sites averaged 4.6t/ha while the beans were at 1.6 t/ha and 4.2 t/ha indigenous vegetables. A total of 32,541 males and 29,059 females out of the targeted farmers adopted SLM/FM technologies exhibiting 77% of early adopters out of the targeted 80%. Averagely 2769 ha of maize, 1470 ha of beans and 211 ha of indigenous vegetables were integrated with at least one SLM strategy namely agroforestry, Soil and water conservation, conservation agriculture and integrated soil fertility management.The increase in yield of maize and beans over the period was attributed to adoption of SLM technologies, mainly Conservation Agriculture (CA) by 94%, Agroforestry by 83%, soil and water conservation by 67%, inorganic balanced blended fertilizers by 37% and improved seed varieties use by 67% of the smallholders. Ultimately increased yields led to improve food security and surplus was sold leading to improved household incomes from USD 105 to USD 157.5/= resulting to 50% increased incomes against the targeted 20%. Averagely 22,446 household managed to sell 0.472MT of target crops (0.243mt Maize, 0.043mt Beans and 0.186mt indigenous vegetables) in short rains season (September –December 2021) culminating to 10,594 MT sold through different market channels such as the aggregation centres, schools, and local markets. Higher quantity of local vegetables was marketed during the dry season between November and December 2021. In the long rains season between July and august 2021 averagely 0.66 MT was sold by 20,659 farmers culminating to 13,635 MT sold.About 7628 ha (4088 ha in Nandi county, 3022 Kakamega county and 518 in Vihiga counties) have been put under Sustainable forest management to reduce pressure on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services within Nandi and Kakamega forest ecosystem. These areas were conserved through several programs such as Plantation Establishment and Livelihood Improvement Scheme (PELIS) and the sustainable utilization and rehabilitation through planting of over 363,800 seedlings of assorted species. The main species were indigenous trees and they were planted within the project implementation sites and the degraded hotspots. Non wood forest products were produced and sold by the forest users for improved household incomes and reduced pressure on forest resource. The forest users raised additional 28,000 tree seedlings in July 2021 from their nursery which were sold at KES 28/= per seedling totalling to USD 5,600/=. This benefited 15 active forest users’ members. The Muleshi Community Forest Association in Kakamega county was linked to Safaricom Foundation who bought 50,000 assorted indigenous tree seedlings valued at USD14,000/= to support rehabilitation at Shinyalu forest area. Other products sold included 1115 litres of honey by 9 forest producers at USD 6690 /=. 423 kg Medicinal plants were sold at the total value of UDS 2,185/= by 9 forest users and lastly 11 800 kg of mushrooms were sold at USD 1.5/= per kg by 6 producers at the total value of USD 17,700/=. It was observed that the NWFP were highly marketable hence required more strategic private sectors linkages for improved input, value addition and structured markets for enhanced commercialization. The developed PFMP Plans together with the concession agreement would yield an incentive mechanism for forest conservation. However, the NWFP were sold to local hotels, Nairobi market and local marketsFive community-based seed producer (CBSP) groups continued in the bulking of indigenous vegetable seeds on one acre piece of land and produced 200kg of basic seed for further multiplication by other farmers. This was an initiative geared towards enhanced access to indigenous vegetable seeds which had been a major bottleneck towards increased production in the past. Validation of five (5) participatory forest management plans were done giving rise to completed five PFMPs which have been forwarded to the national Chief Conservator for Forests for approval and signing and binding. These documents will be used for sustainable forest management in the next five years as well as implementation of the concession agreements. Three public participation forums held for SL/FM policy in the three Counties of Nandi, Vihiga and Kakamega with the aim of creating awareness to stakeholders and enriching on the three SLM policies for guiding the sustainable development of land and forest resources in Vihiga County. The policies provided a framework for addressing issues that the Counties fronts or which may surface in future due to effects of environmental degradation. Among areas incorporated were those delving on environment, agriculture, health and recreational activities, sustainable eucalyptus management. The policies hold a living status and shall be reviewed and updated regularly to deal with overarching and emerging concepts and issues of the ever-evolving science of land and forest management.Documentation of the project knowledge products by the consortium partner’s technical team was conducted and shared during the close of project workshop. These knowledge products were anticipated to be published in scientific journals after agreement procedures between AGRA, UNEP and KALRO. The project also carried its impact survey in December 2021 to assess the impacts of SL/FM on food security, incomes, livelihoods and sustainability. A Sample size of 180 participants was used for data collection and extrapolation of the results. Data collection methods used included KII, FGDs and household survey administered through use of KOBO collect tool for enhanced effectiveness, validity of responses and efficiency. The findings indicated improved food security among 59% farmers out of the 77% farmers adopting the SLM practises. Those who were slightly food insecure or very food insecure coped through consuming seed stocks that were to be saved for the next planting season, bought food on credit, harvested immature crops (for example, green maize), sold livestock (chicken, goats), spend their savings while majority borrowed from their savings group. It was found that 52% of SLM farmers indicated that 75% of household incomes came from SLM. Smallholder farmers revealed improved quality of life since they have money in their pockets therefore spend less money to buy food while leaving some for savings and school fees. Women have confidence during their social time since they can refresh themselves. There was also less pressure in the forest because youth /women are busy in the farms. They confirmed that their incomes and food security throughout the whole year improved because of crop diversification and sale of cover crops such as Desmodium and Mucuna, for instance they sold Desmodium seed at Kes 3000/= and vetiver grass 200 per bunch. The close of project workshop was held on 4-7th July 2022 and was attended by 75 stakeholders including three county executives representing Governors of Vihiga, Nandi and Kakamega Counties, KALRO, UNEP, AGRA, Private sectors, other donor partners (GIZ), beneficiaries and consortium partners. Key note speeches were delivered with an overview on land degradation issues and its impacts across Africa; previous attempts, bottlenecks that then necessitated the SLM project as a pilot; resilience and regenerative agriculture; general overview of the SLM project, Goals, Objectives, Implementation process, achievements, lessons learnt, opportunities and challenges together with presentation of four to five cross cutting papers originating from the write shop sessions, e.g. land degradation and SLM approach to mitigation, Evaluation of SLM interventions on productivity and economic returns, agro biodiversity perspectives, Forests and Ecosystem services evaluations and policy briefs.  |
| **Expected Accomplishment** | **Indicator** | **Progress** |
| Expected accomplishments under sub-programme 3 “Healthy and productive ecosystems”:(a) The health and productivity of marine, freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems are institutionalized in education, monitoring and cross-sectoral and transboundary collaboration frameworks at the national and international levels (b) Policymakers in the public and private sectors test and consider the inclusion of the health and productivity of ecosystems in economic decision-making  | Indicators:(i)The number of countries and transboundary collaboration frameworks that have made progress in monitoring and maintaining the health and productivity of marine and terrestrial ecosystems with the assistance of UNEP (ii) The number of public-sector institutions that test and consider the inclusion of the health and productivity of marine and terrestrial ecosystems in economic decision-making with the assistance of UNEP | 52% (USD 157.5). Increased incomes amongst farmer households attributed to improved yields for consumption from the 3 targeted crops and for sale through structured markets.4,461 ha under SLM. That is: maize (2769 ha) Beans1470 ha) and indigenous vegetables (222 ha)7628 hectares has been put under Sustainable forest management to reduce pressures on forest resources and Generate Sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services. That is; 4087.2ha in Nandi, 3022ha in Kakamega and 518.8 ha in Vihiga counties.77% of 92,296 (46934m,45362f) smallholders have applied at least one SLM technologies on their farms5hotspots conserved (2 in Nandi and 2 Kakamega and 1 in Vihiga county) to reduce area under degradation. A total of 363,800 tree seedlings have been planted both in the hotspots and on farms. |
| **b):** Institutional capacities and policy and/or legal frameworks are enhanced to achieve internationally agreed environmental goals, including the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs  | Indirectly relevant indicators:(i) The number of countries that have enhanced institutional capacity and legal frameworks to fully implement the multilateral environmental agreements and to achieve internationally agreed environmental goals, including the SDGs as a result of UNEP support | 3 SLM related frameworks at county and landscape level in place. Validation of the county SLM policies done. Policy briefs documented and shared with the counties.10 Land use plans developed for ten micro-catchments were implemented within the 50 learning sites established in ten micro catchments. The county government to continue with the sustainability of the learning sites through innovation platforms and for continued capacity building of farmers.20,819 (10,534M, 10534 F) farmers reached in the 21 Field days held at the established learning sites.5 PFM plans development and plans develop, validated and handed over to Kenya forest Service for future implementation and sustainable forest conservation.26 forest user groups and CBO trained on Forest governance act, participatory forest management and advocacy, governance, catchment rehabilitation, agroforestry systems, ecosystem management and biodiversity monitoring. They have been engaged in commercialization of 4 non wood forest products namely, tree seedlings, medicinal plans, honey and mushrooms. |

* 1. 2.2. GEF Core Indicators (for all GEF 6 and later projects) (Not applicable since this is a GEF 5 project)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| GEF Core Indicators | **Indicative expected Results** |
| Discuss GEF core indicators targeted by the project, as well as expected results. (maximum one paragraph)* 1. N/A – GEF-5
 |

* 1. 2.3. Implementation status and risk

*[complete the fiscal year and select: 1st PIR; 2nd PIR; …. Final PIR; select HS; S; MS; MU; U; HU; unknown; not rated to rate the progress towards outcomes and outputs in third and fourth lines; select H; S; M; L; to rate risks for the fiscal year you are reporting in the fifth line. Add more columns if needed]*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | FY 2018\_\_ | FY 2019\_\_ | FY 2020\_\_ | FY 2021\_\_ | FY 2022\_\_ |
| PIR # | 1st  | 2nd  | 3rd  | 4th  | Final |
| Rating towards **outcomes** (section 3.1) | S | HS | HS | HS | HS |
| Rating towards **outputs** (section 3.2) | S | HS | HS | HS | HS |
| **Risk** rating (section 3.3) | S | HS | HS | HS | HS |

|  |
| --- |
| Rating towards outcomes: The rating of outcomes is HS because it has achieved or exceeded the set targets as reported below:Ecosystem valuation and assessment was undertaken in close collaboration with 700 stakeholders drawn from farmers, forest users, CFA, County Governments, Sub county agriculture officers, Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI), Kenya Forest Service and National Environment Management Authority (NEMA). The ecosystem valuation report of the entire Kakamega-Nandi forest complex has been documented and consisted of; inventory of existing forest resources, ecosystem services in terms of level of importance; population concerns; magnitude and scale of benefits; economic values; social and cultural values; and activities that threaten the Kakamega-Nandi ecosystem. The report was shared to stakeholder who learnt the patterns and changes in interaction with the forest and explored the alternatives for conservation of the forest through SLM strategies such as agro-forestry and Non-wood forest products. The stakeholders understood the monetary value to the forest products, willingness to pay for the ecosystem products and services, alternative sources of the forest products and the role of ecosystem service valuation in influencing policy and resource allocation for forest and environmental conservation. The Ecosystem valuation report will be useful in creating the awareness on the forest value and increased investment by the County Governments during the Intercounty forums to be establish through signed Intercounty on Memorandum of understandings (MoU). This will lead to collective and co ownership of the forest resources for enhanced economic benefits for the 3 Counties.About 7,628 hectares (4087.2ha in Nandi, 3022ha in Kakamega and 518.8 ha in Vihiga counties) have been put under Sustainable forest management to reduce pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services within Nandi and Kakamega forest complex. These areas were conserved through PELIS, sustainable utilization and rehabilitation through planting of over 363,800 seedlings of assorted species mainly indigenous have been planted within the project implementation sites and the degraded hotspots. The support from KFS and KWS in the project consortium contributed to increased area under Participatory Forest Management (PFM). Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) worked in Kisere, Buyangu and Shamiloli forest blocks, while Kenya Forest Service (KFS) concentrated in 6 forest areas under Community Forest Associations (CFAs). Participation of CFAs through trainings improved their knowledge on SFM as well as rehabilitation measures. This was also supported through rehabilitation of 5 hotspots.Coupled with community sensitization meetings, structured and unstructured trainings, the project has reached out to 92,296 *(*46934m, 45362f) smallholder farmers out of which 77% are already implementing at least one SLM technology on their farms. The smallholders applying at least one SLM technologies on their farms are already reaping the benefits through the increased yields of maize grain from the initial 0.8 t ha-1 to the current 3.2 t ha-1; an increase of 256% among the 52,000 farmers who cultivate maize using SLM practices Bean grain has increased from the initial 0.2 t ha-1 to the current 0.44 t ha-1; an increase of 147% amongst the 20,000 practicing farmers. The 4,000 smallholders growing indigenous vegetables have increased the yields by more than 10-fold from the initial 0.22 t ha-1 to the current 2.5 t ha-1. The increase in yields was attributed to adoption of SLM technologies, mainly Conservation Agriculture (CA) by 94%, Agroforestry by 83%, soil and water conservation by 67%, inorganic balanced blended fertilizers by 37% and improved seed varieties use by 67% of the smallholders. Others included the use of good agronomic practices such as timely planting and integration of organic and inorganic fertilizers into maize-legume rotations/intercrop application of organic manure, timely weeding and the use of improved seed varieties Cost-benefit analysis conducted by the project showed that for each dollar invested in maize, beans and indigenous vegetables coupled with Sustainable Land Management practices, 2 more dollars were gained as actual benefits to the farmers which showed the viability of technologies.Rating towards outputs: The rating outputs is HS because it has achieved or exceeded the set targets as reported below:**Output 1.1: Baselines for SLM, SFM and Biodiversity established at landscape level**Initial status of socioeconomic and agro biodiversity was recorded at the beginning of the project in ten (10) landscapes. SLM interventions instituted at target sites prompted changes that needed to be tracked and recorded through biophysical assessment of crop agro biodiversity, tree diversity and soil invertebrates. This was through participatory selection of ten landscapes; spatial mapping of the selected landscape sites, 10 Community sensitization on SLM/SFM in the 10 Landscapes resulting to development of 10Participatory action plans to guide implementation of SL/FM strategies.1 baseline survey in 10 landscapes documented socio economic, below and above ground agro biodiversity. Rapid surveys to evaluate changes in agro biodiversity over the baseline for pollinators, above and below ground agro biodiversity will be finalized by December 2021.**Output 1.3: Development of Integrated Land Use Plans for SLM, SFM and Biodiversity conservation at Landscape Level.**As reported earlier, 10 Land use plans were developed for the ten micro-catchments. This was through; Stakeholder engagement (community mobilization and engagement), Scenario development and analysis (carbon benefits modeling), transect walks and Production of land use plans. As part of rehabilitation strategy 50 learning sites within the 10 selected landscapes (micro catchments) are showcasing land use plans model through application of appropriate sustainable land management with integration of agroforestry systems. Application of the Carbon Benefit Projects (CBP) introduced to the project through the collaboration with Colorado State University (USA) assisted in identifying SLM practices to be incorporated in the land use plans which were socially and environmentally superior in terms of the amount of carbon sequestered and the higher value cost ratio and positive cost benefit analysis for the smallholder farmers. Nandi and Kakamega counties have integrated these land use plans into existing spatial land use strategies which are being used to rehabilitate wetlands, water sources and riparian areas. Sustainable land Management technologies data collection tool uploaded into WOCAT database. The project documented a paper on Integrated landscape approach to scaling out sustainable land management technologies in western Kenya with the aim of addressing and degradation and sustainable land management interventions in western Kenya.**Output 1.4: Support to conservation of biodiversity hotspots** 5hotspots conserved (2 in Nandi and 2 Kakamega county, 1 Vihiga County) to reduce area under degradation. A total of 363,800 tree seedlings have been planted both in the hotspots and on farms. A total of 7628 hectares has been put under Sustainable forest management. Support from Nature Kenya, KFS and CFA planted was geared through catchment protection and gapping at degraded areas (enrichment planting) Kimondi Forest within the project area. A Total of 30,000 indigenous trees were planted between august 2022 and April 2022 to additional 30 hectares of land under rehabilitation. Key activities that led to rehabilitation of degraded sites included identification of 5 hotspots; 3 stakeholder meetings for 150 stakeholders in 8 sub counties and assessment of their capacity toward rehabilitation. This was followed by development and adoption of catchment rehabilitation action plans that constituted strategies for rehabilitation such as; rehabilitating stream banks, degraded watersheds through replacement planting, replacing Eucalyptus trees planted on streambeds with suitable indigenous tree species, addressing land degradation by having erosion control structures in e.g. terraces and grass strips; Addressing soil degradation due to poor land management practices and rehabilitating degraded forests by suitable forest restoration techniques. 42 (28m, 12f) stakeholders also trained on rehabilitation procedures including farm forestry development resulting to 9 farm forest producers establishing 9 commercial tree nurseries with approximate capacity of 400,000 tree seedlings. They received market linkages for 80,000 tree seedlings valued at KES 8000= by December 2020 while in 2021 additional 78,000 trees seedlings sold were value at USD 19600 due to increased price of the tree seedlings. 5435 (2505f, 2930m) Community members were engaged in rehabilitation of hotspots during the 16 tree planting field days. 4 rehabilitated hotspots sites are being maintained by CFAs and adjacent Landowners have a regeneration rate of 65%.**Output 1.5: Conduct training of trainers (ToT) for Farmer Field Schools (FFS)**100 Trainers (ToTs) trained on aspects of Good Crop husbandry Practices, Land use management, catchment rehabilitation, agroforestry development and suitable agroforestry species and Postharvest handling and value addition. The 100 TOTs continued to reach out to 2040 (1006 females and 1037males) who are members of the 50 famers groups and additional 20,546 smallholder farmers between January 2021 and March 2022. This brought the total cumulative number of farmers reached with SLM to 90,110 (45,569m, 44,541f). The TOTs will continue to follow up and monitor the uptake of SLM technology at farm level. They will also be engaged in development of strategic plans as The TOTs followed up and monitored the uptake of SLM technology at farm level. A total of **22,586** smallholder farmers were reached by TOTs through trainings and backstopping thus contributing to the total 92,296 (46,934m, 45362 female) smallholder farmers reached. **Output 1.6: Conduct training of trainers (ToT) for Farmer Field Schools (FFS)**50 Producer groups trained during learning sites establishment, structured trainings on good crop husbandry practices such as soil and water conservation structures, postharvest handling & value addition, catchment rehabilitation, financial literacy and record keeping. More structured trainings have been delivered by the trained ToTs to producers resulting to 2186 new farmers reached in 32 new groups) leading to 158 groups reached. The farmer groups have adopted learned practices in their own farms as well as endorsed their own record keeping assessing gross margins per production unit. The farmer groups in reaching out farmers for trainings on GAP, this made it easier for reach more farmers and make follow up. Farmer to farmer learning was enhanced and additional 300 new beneficiaries from the catchment and outside catchment were reached. The farmer groups continued to receive on farm trainings through TOTS.Harvesting of maize beans crop and indigenous vegetables continued amongst the 77% of farmers who had adopted SL/FM. In the long rains (March-August 2021) averagely 3.5t/ha of maize was harvested (3.6 t/ha Nandi, 3.8t/ha Kakamega and 3t/ha Vihiga). For beans, averagely 0.62t/ha of beans was harvested (0.7Nandi, 0.5 Kakamega and 0.66 Vihiga).Finally 3.5t/ha of indigenous vegetables were harvested and this included 3.7 t/ha Nandi, 3.3t/ha in Kakamega, 3.6t/ha Vihiga county. In terms of the indigenous vegetables’ variety 3.6t/ha black night shade, 3.3t/ha Cowpeas and 3.6t/ha of Ethiopian Kales were harvested. Harvest of the short rains seasons between September and December 2021 indicated averagely 3.2 t/ha of maize (3.4t/ha Nandi, 4t/ha Kakamega and 2.It/ha Vihiga Counties) 52,000 maize farmers during. Averagely 0.44 t/ha of beans (Nandi 0.51t/ha, 0.3t/ha Kakamega, and 0.52t/ha in Vihiga for 20,000 farmers while Indigenous vegetables Averagely 2.5t/ha of indigenous vegetables were harvested (2.4 t/ha, Nandi, 2.0t/ha in Kakamega, 3.2t/ha Vihiga county) amongst 4000 farmers. During the reporting period erratic weather was experienced, rain was not received from May 2021, this resulted to wilting of crops in the neighboring Micro catchment. In areas where SLM was practiced, farmer’s crops were not affected due to improved integration of soil fertility management practices, conservation agriculture and agroforestry which perhaps might have improved crop resilience to drought.**Output 1.7: Establishment of SLM/SFM biodiversity learning sites**50 learning sites continued to be maintained in in ten micro catchments amid January –December 2021 and showcased appropriate SLM/FM practices such as Soil and water conservation structures, ISFM, agroforestry, and conservation agriculture. The sites addressed the agronomic challenges the farmers faced. Backstopping visits to all the 50 learning sites was undertaken by the innovation platforms. Harvesting of the learning sites for Maize, beans and vegetables done. The results indicated at 4.6t/ha for maize, beans was at 1.6t/ha and 4.2 t/ha indigenous vegetables. The increase in yields could also be attributed the fact that the demo sites received intensive care management from the research and project team as learning sites.Averagely, maize under CA in the 3 counties produced more yields by recorded at averagely 7.1t/ha followed by inorganic fertilizer by 5.3t/ha. Generally, these yield increases are largely attributed to sustainable land management strategies such as CA, organic into maize-legume rotations/intercrop application of organic manure, liming, timely weeding and the use of improved seed varieties which were in use by 67% of the smallholders up from the initial 30%. **Output 1.8: Facilitation of farmer open and field-days**20,819 (10,534M, 10534 F) farmers reached in the 21 Field days held at the established learning sites. The field days created wider awareness on SLM/SFM practices outside the focal project sites. Due to Covid19 pandemic which led to stoppage of large gatherings by people no field days were held. **Output 1.9: Support to implementation Participatory Forest Management (PFM) Plans**5 PFM plans have been development, peer-reviewed and validated in a stakeholder workshop and at community level. The draft copies have been sent to KFS at national level for signing, binding and dissemination to forest stations. The development of the Participatory Forest Management Plans (PFMP) involved the following conclusive steps such as; identification of the Community and Verification of Resource Base; formation of Forest Association(s), assessing the Forest Area and Communities, preparation of a Forest Management Plan, negotiating and signing Forest Management Agreements, implementation of the Plan, review and revision of the Plan, and Monitoring and Evaluation. Implementation of PFMPs is ongoing through rehabilitation of the hotspots inside the forest, PELIS, sustainable utilization and total protection. Additional 20.5 hectares of forest land at Malava area was put under PELIS (Plantation Establishment and Livelihood Scheme). Restoration techniques used included planting of extinct indigenous trees seedlings and some agroforestry tree seedling all incorporated with maize crop. On Sept- December 2020, a total of 10,000 tree seedlings were planted by community forest association members who are currently in charge of maintenance for improved regeneration. In august 2021 a total of 30000 trees seedlings were also planted in hotspot areas This culminated to a total of 7628 hectares area under participatory forest management with a total of 363,800 tree seedlings planted since project inception.**Output 1.10: Capacity building of Community Forest Associations (CFAs) and other forest stakeholders**26 forest user groups and CBO trained on Forest governance act, participatory forest management and advocacy, governance, catchment rehabilitation, agroforestry systems, ecosystem management and biodiversity monitoring. More trainings for CFAs were conducted on advocacy and negotiation with county governments over the management of forest resources. The 26 Forest user groups were trained on advocacy as a tool to initiate negotiations for forest management agreements.**Output 2.2** **Farmer groups linkage to inputs and output markets**By October 2021, over 67% (31,671) of 48,000 maize farmers had access to input markets. These included (6504 Nandi county, 15,545Kakamega county, 9622 in Vihiga county. The innovation platforms brought together the Value chain actors mapped such as Agrovets and seed companies (western seed) who availed the inputs near farmers’ locations hence reduced distance and transport costs for input acquisition. The organized Input linkages meetings with community and Trade fares facilitated farmers linkages to inputs coupled with advisory messages from the input suppliers. Stocking of high yielding varieties at the local Agrovets facilitated purchasing power. County input subsidy program in Nandi, Kakamega and Vihiga spurred increased linkages. There was also strengthened provision of inputs by Western seed Company. County input subsidy program in Nandi, Kakamega and Vihiga spurred increased linkages. For instance, 1800mt of blended fertilizers and seed was subsidized to 17,000 farmers.By March 2022, 32% of the 77% farmers adopting spread across the 50 learning sites were marketing their produce through structured markets. 50% increased volumes sold by household between November and December 2021 from 5295mt to 10590mt. In the long rains season between July and august 2021 averagely 0.66 MT was sold by 20,659 farmers culminating to 13,635 MT sold. This included an average of 0.81mt of maize, 0.09 mt beans and 1.08 mt indigenous vegetables. In the short rains September –December, averagely 0.472 mt (0 .243mt Maize, 0.043mt Beans and 0.186mt indigenous vegetables) was sold by 19,712 through different market channels such as the aggregation centres, schools, and local markets. Higher quantity of local vegetables was marketed during the dry season between November and December 2021. A total of 62,745 metric tons have been sold since 2018 to March 2022.This was strengthened through innovation platforms where producers were trained on market linkages and market information, and Good crop husbandry. They also signed trade agreements which spurred commitment to improve quantities to be sold by producers.**Output 2.3:** **Support to strengthening of Community Based Seed producers**At the end of year five, 5 community-based seed producer (CBSP) groups continue with the bulking of indigenous vegetable seeds on an acre piece of land each and produced 0.3tons of basic seed for further multiplication by other farmers. The capacity of 3 community based indigenous seed producers was built on better seed selection and crop husbandry: treatment, viability and post-harvest handling. Storage of seed from their own farmers. 30kgs of starter improved basic seeds for cowpea, Ethiopian kales and black night shade were provided for the 3 CBSP producers. KEPHIS and KALRO seed breeding unit were part and parcel in the inspection of the IV breeding, genetics and plant health. Linkages are ongoing through the innovation platform. The 5 community-based seed producers influenced 420 Indigenous vegetable farmers in Nandi (120), Kakamega (180) and Vihiga (100) Counties have cumulatively harvested 9.5tons of their indigenous vegetables valued at USD, 9500.**Output 2.4:** **Support to post-harvest management at household level**Between July 2021 to June 2022, 16,013 farmers (7,963m, 7,750f) who had been trained by June 2021 in post-harvest handling measures continued to use postharvest technologies such as safe use of chemicals, hermetic storage bags, labor-saving post-harvest equipment such as, vegetables drying and Sheller. Adoption of these technologies was aided by demonstration of appropriate post-harvest technologies tailored for smallholders in field days, trade fares and at the learning sites.9000 farmers adopted 20,000 hermetic storage bags valued at USD 100,000, for enhance postharvest handling and enhanced safe food.**Output 2.5.** **Support to women and youth groups in small scale agricultural enterprises (SMEAs)**20 SMAEs (10 youth), and (10 women) were supported through trainings on business plans and enterprise development. The SMEs were linked to bank institution and received finance credit worth USD 3540 during the reporting period culminating for USD 8,285 to date. In addition, 200 youth and women were supported in processing and in business plan development and linked to innovation platforms as managers of the aggregation Centres responsible for marketing the produce from the producers. 10 linkage agreements between IPs, financial creditors (VSLA) and SMEs (mainly youth and women) were signed to operationalize credit facilitation to the SMEs under the supervision of the IPs. Already 10 SMAES members (6 CFA Members in Kakamega, 1 Vihiga and 1 in Nandi county) are also processing and packaging their honey for sale. In addition, 3 producers’ members (1kakamega, 1 Nandi and 1 Vihiga are currently offering processing services to other producers.**Output 3.2** **Support development of county level SLM/SFM and biodiversity frameworks** 36 County Technical Committees (CTC) were trained on the development of policy frameworks and strategies. 3 draft documents have been developed and submitted to respective County Governments for further deliberation with the Agriculture committees, MCAs and attorneys. The needed steps to bridge the identified gaps will be unlocked during the dialogue meetings at community level during public participation, at executive level, at sector committee, and validation at stakeholder upon which the strategy will be presented to the county assembly. A total of 96 county level executives involved in 9 dialogue meetings from Jan to June 2021. In addition, 3 county SLM/SFM drafts were reviewed by the committees and 2 sensitization meetings to county executives in Nandi and Kakamega were done to refine the policy drafts. County sensitization and Validation meetings for the 3 SLM policies continued in July 2021 to May 2022 in the three counties A total of 320 stakeholders participated in the validation (198m, 121f). So far, the three county policies have been validated, policy briefs have also been documented awaiting handover to the county government executives through the county CECM agriculture.**Output 3.3** **Support to Ecosystem valuation and assessment**One report on ecosystem services valuation and assessment validated with county stakeholders in close collaboration with farmers, forest users, CFA, KEFRI. The report was used during the three Intercounty ecosystems forums to creating the awareness on the forest value and increase investment by the county government. So far, the project has an Intercounty MOU bringing the three counties in place to preserve the Kakamega forest. The Intercounty task force also promise to frontier their plans within the county integrated plans.**Output 1.11 Documentation of SLM/SFM knowledge and technologies**50 learning sites established in ten micro catchments between July –December 2021 continued to showcase appropriate SLM/FM practices such as Soil and water conservation structures, ISFM, agroforestry, and conservation agriculture. The sites addressed the agronomic challenges the farmers faced. Additional 2,186farmers were reached during the reporting period leading to a total of 92,296 (46,934m 45,362f) reached by June 2022.Overall risk rating:  **L.** The consolidated project risk is given on Table A in section 3.3.[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal] |

* 1. 2.4. Co-financing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Planned Co-finance****Total:**  (USD 9,904,405)**Actual to date:** Complete (in $ and %. State the date for which this value is valid) | Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges. Planned Co-finance Total: $9,904,405Actual to realized date: $ 9909705.94 (100.1%) as of 30th June 2022The partners have made good progress towards meeting the targeted co-finance ceiling having attained $9,909,705.94 as of 30th June 2022.  |

* 1. 2.5. Stakeholder engagement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder engagement** | Describe progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO endorsement). For older projects that did not have a Stakeholder Engagement Plan in the CEO Endorsement Document, simply mention any kind of stakeholder engagement activities undertaken during the reporting period.Project steering committee meetings:TheProject Steering Committee (PSC) meetings was held on 24-28 January 2022. The meeting was attended by 24 members while 2 members sent apology and another one member was absent without apology. The aim of the meeting was to review the project progress report vis-a-vis the evidence on the ground, financial status, 2022 Program of Work and Budget (PoWB) and pending activities amid closure of project. The steering committee noted the significant increase in crop yields, increase in incomes and number of trees planted to restore the Kakamega Forest ecosystem. Close of project workshop:Close of project workshop was held on 4-7th July 2022 where 75 stakeholders attended. The meeting was graced by the three county executives representing the CEC’s, KALRO, UNEP, AGRA, Private sectors, other donor partners (GIZ), Beneficiaries and consortium partners. Keynote speeches were delivered with an overview on land degradation issues and its impacts across Africa; previous attempts, bottlenecks that then necessitated the SLM project as a pilot ;resilience and regenerative agriculture; general overview of the SLM project, Goals, Objectives, Implementation process, achievements, lessons learnt, opportunities and challenges together with presentation of four to five cross cutting papers originating from the write shop sessions.Main challenges encountered over the reporting period were: Maize not allowed under PELIS hence hindering management and survival of trees seedlings. This was mitigated by advising farmers to plant trees and crops on the correct niches. Another challenge was rise in fuel prices that also affected the cost of inputs and selling price of produce (linked to COVID19 and Russia-Ukraine War). Farmers were advised to use farmyard and compost manures to improve soil fertility. Another challenge was insecurity of the NWFP established inside the forest. Theft cases realised for honey inside the forest. This was mitigated through community awareness and the benefit of living as good neighbors. Another challenge was the CFA lacking resources to maintain the community scouts who support in joint patrols assisted by the forest rangers and informers for biodiversity monitoring to avert illegal activities in the forest. The County Government helped to mitigate this challenge.[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal] |

* 1. 2.6. Gender

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Gender mainstreaming** | Describe progress, challenges and outcomes related to the gender-responsive measures documented at CEO Endorsement/ Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent. Older projects that were designed before gender mainstreaming should proactively report any possible gender benefits, as appropriate.Gender mainstreaming was reinforced in all project activities through consideration of factors such as time poverty; knowledge (technical assistance), access and control of assets, income, decision making, leadership positions and monitoring and evaluation. Structured trainings and ToT follow up and field days and linkages to private sector through the innovation platforms resulted in reaching out to 92,296 farmers among 49.1 percent (45,362) and 50.9 percent (46,934) were female and male respectively. This was attributed to gender sensitive provision of information and communication; gender awareness raising in community sensitization and mobilization; provision of functional adult literacy classes; working with women role models; training women in business, leadership, negotiation skills; and strengthening of women's groups, associations and networks, and promotion of savings groups. 50% females and youth are TOTs in offering extension services.The main challenges were: Men own land and therefore exercising obvious authority on utilization and technology in use. In addition, social cultural barriers that limited the delivery of extension services by female TOTS required seeking of consent from their spouses. Higher incomes for women were realized in the beans and indigenous vegetables value chains, however men still controlled family incomes, expenditure and access to financial services therefore limiting benefits that accrued to women. Therefore, the main lessons learnt were Knowledge access and linkages between actors of the Innovation Platform enabled men, women and youth easily access the benefits and provide solutions to the common problem. [section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal] |

* 1. 2.7. Environmental and social safeguards management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Environmental and social safeguards management** | Describe progress, challenges and outcomes related to the environmental and social safeguard-responsive measures documented at CEO Endorsement/ Approval in social safeguard action plan or equivalent. Older projects that were designed before environmental and social safeguard mainstreaming should proactively report any possible social safeguard benefits, as appropriate.1. A training manual with relevant modules on Environmental and social safeguards was developed in the early stages of project implementation with the aim of building the capacity of target stakeholders especially the youth on the potential direct, indirect and cumulative environmental and social impacts of SLM &SFM technologies and practices on ecosystem services such as soil fertility, water, biodiversity, and climate; and also suggest mitigation measures. It was also aimed at equipping the trainers (youth) with the knowledge and skills for identifying, evaluating the positive and negative impacts of project activities, identifying corrective and mitigation measures and training others on the environmental, social and legal safeguard policies in their communities. Identified positive impacts of the project interventions included Improved crop resilience to climate change leading to increased agricultural production, Improved Food Security and Nutritional Status of the beneficiaries due to diversity in production and forest related products, Improved Land Conditions due to implementation of land use plans for improved upward and downward linkage, Enhanced Livestock Feed Supplies, Improved Soil and Water Conditions, Increased Employment Opportunities for women and youth participating in indigenous vegetables and tree seedlings, non-wood forest products, enhanced knowledge base of the local communities, improved market access, Improved quality of agricultural produce, Increased storage for agricultural produce and reduced post-harvest losses amongst others.
2. Challenges encountered were vegetation loss as a result of bush clearing for setting project demo farms, Loss of biodiversity and destruction of the natural habitat due to setting up of project demo sites, Soil Compaction and erosion during land preparation, Pollution of Rivers and Wetlands which included Eutrophication. Key project mitigation on these challenges were the County Governments banned the growing of eucalyptus trees on the riverbanks. Older trees were uprooted and replaced with indigenous tree species.
3. [section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]
 |

* 1. 2.8. Knowledge management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Knowledge activities and products** | Provide a narrative of knowledge activities/ products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement/ Approval Documentation of the project knowledge products by the consortium partner’s technical team was conducted between April 26 to June 16, 2022. These products were shared during the close of project workshop. These knowledge products were expected to be presented as possible journals to UNEP with an intent to publish at the end for their guidance and permission. The 19 knowledge products grouped into 6 clusters were condensed in a central point to present their proposed papers titles, proposed journal for publication in line with their main theme and a list of contributors.  A list of all the proposed titles of papers and policy brief documented in the write shops included those on Integrated landscape approach to scaling out sustainable land management technologies in western Kenya. Land degradation and sustainable land management interventions in western Kenya; Innovation platform for enhanced quality service delivery in Kakamega-Nandi forest ecosystem. Bee population distribution with proximity to Kakamega, Vihiga and Nandi tropical forest ecosystem; Floral resource richness and their utilization by honeybees in the Kakamega forest ecosystem and distance effects on abundance and diversity of plant crop pollinators in agricultural landscape of Kakamega, Nandi and Vihiga forest ecosystems. It was suggested that these knowledge products be handed over to the county government for use. AGRA/UNEP to follow up on publication of papers. |

* 1. 2.9. Stories to be shared

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stories to be shared** | Optional for mature projects: Provide a brief summary of any especially interesting and impactful project results that are worth sharing with a larger audience, and/or investing communications time in, if any.Iloro Hotspot in Kakamega county, rehabilitated by the SL/FM project through removal of evasive species and planting indigenous tress has been put under 40years agreement for Carbon credit. The community need to understand the carbon credit component. Linkages have been initiated by partner KWENCH who have shown willingness to upscale SLM activities such as supporting non wood forest products to ease pressure from forest products and rehabilitation of ILORO. One of the Innovation Platform known as Indangalasia Innovation platform wrote a proposal and received a grant valued at KES 997,000/= from Kenya Climate Smart Adaptation Project. They have been able to buy vegetable seeds, maize, and fertiliser to be used for long rains season. They have also invested in other inputs such as dairy goats, water tank for water harvesting, wheelbarrow, Clean cooking energy (Jiko koa) and watering cans. They also received County government fertilized for 50 kgs each Mavuno and CAN 50 kgs for the 30 members. The innovation platform is being used by the county government to train farmers on issues of mushroom production and Good agriculture Practices.  [section to be shared with communication division/ GEF communication] |
|  |

# 3. PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK

*Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the* ***UNEP Task Manager****[[1]](#footnote-2) will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:*

1. *Progress towards achieving the project Results(s)- see section 3.1*
2. *Implementation progress – see section 3.2*

*Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.*

* 1. 3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes

[copy and paste the CEO Endorsement (or latest formal Revision) approved Results Framework, adding/deleting outcome rows, as appropriate]

**(Ensure that each entered indicator has a baseline, end of project and current period value)**

| **Project objective and Outcomes** | **Indicator****(One indicator per row)** | **Baseline level** | **Mid-term target** | **End-of-project target** | **Progress as of current period****(numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)** | **Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2022** | **Progress rating[[2]](#footnote-3)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective:****To increase smallholders’ productivity through up-scaling of sustainable land management** | 1. The average yield (production per ha) of targeted crops (maize, legumes, indigenous vegetables) | Maize: 1 t/haBeans: 0.2 t/haIndigenous Vegetables: 1 t/ha | 1.0 MT/ha | Maize:2 t/haBeans:0.4 t/ha Indigenous Vegetables:1.5 t/ha | Averagely 3.2 t/ha of maize (3.4t/ha Nandi, 4t/ha Kakamega and 2.It/ha Vihiga Counties was reported during short rains (June 2022).Averagely 0.44 t/ha of beans reported for short rains seasons. This included (Nandi 0.51t/ha, 0.3t/ha Kakamega, and 0.52t/ha in Vihiga)Averagely 2.5t/ha of indigenous vegetables were harvested in the short rains season. This included 2.4 t/ha, Nandi, 2.0t/ha in Kakamega, 3.2t/ha Vihiga county during short rains season | *End of project targets have been achieved and exceeded* | *HS* |
|  | 2.Proportion increase of income from the sale of 3 target crops | Averagely, USD 105 | 3rd Yr: 20% increase in income | 20% | 50% (USD 157.5). Increased incomes amongst farmer households attributed to improved yields for consumption from the 3 targeted crops and surplus for sale through structured markets. | *End of project targets have been achieved and exceeded* | *HS* |
|  | 3. Area(ha) of forest land under Participatory Forest Management (SFM) | 1977 ha | 3rd Yr: 2500 ha | 3913 ha(1963 maize, 1657 beans, indigenous vegetables 145) | 4,461 ha under SLM. That is: maize (2769 ha) Beans1460 ha) and indigenous vegetables (222 ha) | *End of project targets have been achieved and exceeded* | *HS* |
|  | Area (ha) of land put under SLM  | 1,000 ha (213.5 Nandi,443Kakamega,343.5 Vihiga) | 3rd Yr: 5,000 ha  | 7,772 ha of forest land under Sustainable Forest Management (SFM). That is 4,990 ha in Nandi,2,689 ha in Kakamega and 563 ha in Vihiga | 7,628 hectares has been put under Sustainable forest management to reduce pressures on forest resources and Generate Sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services. That is; 3734 ha in Nandi, 2864 ha in Kakamega and 450 ha in Vihiga counties. | *98% achievement of project target* | *S* |
| **Outcome 1.1:** Enhanced capacity of smallholder farmers to implement and upscale sustainable land and agro-biodiversity management practices. | Proportion of target farmers using appropriate SLM practices | 30% | 3rd Yr: 60% | 80% | 77 % ( 61600/80000) representing  32,541m, and 29,059f smallholders have applied at least one SLM technologies on their farms and are already reaping the benefits through the increased yields as at June 2021 | *96% achievement of project target* | *HS* |
| **Outcome 2:** Increased farmers’ access to profitable input and output markets of targeted crops and forest products | Proportion of target farmers with access to inputs and output markets (with gender disaggregated data) | 30% farmers with access with input/output markets | 3nd Yr - 60% | End of project - 80% | 67% of 48,000 had access to inputs by March 2021.31,671 out of 48,000 Small holder farmers were linked Inputs. These include (5513 Nandi County, 15,545 Kakamega County and 9622 in Vihiga County | *112% achievement of project target* | *S* |
| **Outcome 3:** Enabling policy and institutional framework for up scaling sustainable land and forests management at county levelComponent 3: Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework | No. of SLM related frameworks at county and landscape level | 0 | 3rd Yr: 1 | End of project - 3 institutional frameworks established by end of project. | 3 SLM related frameworks at county and landscape level in place | *100% achievement of project target* | *HS* |

* 1. 3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs

| **Outputs/Activities[[3]](#footnote-4)** | **Start Date****(dd/mm/yyyy)** | **Expected completion date[[4]](#footnote-5)****(dd/mm/yyyy)** | **Implementation status as of 30 June 2020 (%)** | **Implementation status as of 30 June 2021 (%)** | **Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%)** | **Progress rating justification[[5]](#footnote-6), description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay** | **Progress rating[[6]](#footnote-7)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **COMPONENT 1: CAPACITY BUILDING OF STAKEHOLDERS ON SLM AND SFM** |
| **Output 1.1:**  Baselines for SLM, SFM and Biodiversity established at landscape level | Sept 2017 | June 2021 | 100% | 100% | 100% | Fully achieved. Baseline characterisation for the 10 selected landscapes for project implementation was finalized and reported. The baseline line data collected was used in the revision of the result-based M&E Framework | HS |
| **Output 1.2:** Capacity needs assessment for key stakeholders conducted | Sept 2017 | June 2021 | 100% | 100% | 100% | Fully achieved. Capacity Needs Assessment Report documented and has been used to develop training plans and 19 training modules to facilitate structured training for the different cadres of stakeholders. | HS |
| **Output 1.3:** Development of Integrated Land Use Plans for SLM, SFM and Biodiversity conservation at Landscape Level | July 2018 | June 2021 | 100% | 100% | 100% | Fully achieved. Ten Land use plans have been developed for each of the project implementation landscapes and have been integrated into the implementation policy framework for the three target Counties (Nandi, Vihiga and Kakamega). | HS |
| **Output 1.4:** Support to conservation of biodiversity hot spots | July 2018 | June 2021 | 100% | 100% | 100% |  Five Hotspots rehabilitated and continued to be maintained through beating up with a regeneration level of 75% achievement. Forest users continue to reap improved incomes through increased supply of assorted healthy indigenous tree seedlings for continued rehabilitation of degraded lands. | HS |
| **Output 1.5:** Conduct training of trainers (ToT) for Farmer Field Schools (FFS) | October 2017 | June 2021 | 100% | 100% | 100% | The target of 100 TOTs were trained on various aspects of sustainable land management practices and the ToTs are currently enhancing the capacities producer groups on Good Agronomic Practices. | HS |
| **Output 1.6:** Conduct training of trainers (ToT) for Farmer Field Schools (FFS | January 2018 | Dec 2021 | 100% | 100% | 100% | FFS groups have been established through the Innovation Platforms and have been trained on 8 relevant modules as per training plan. These include trainings on good crop husbandry, soil and water conservation, postharvest handling & value addition, catchment rehabilitation, financial literacy, tree nursery establishment, record keeping and market linkages. More trainings underway. | HS |
| **Output 1.7:** Establishment of SLM/SFM biodiversity learning sites | January 2018 | January 2021 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 50 learning sites have been established under the management of the Innovation Platforms and these sites are being used to address the agronomic challenges the farmers face. | HS |
| **Output 1.8:** Facilitation of farmer open and field-days | January 2018 | December 2021 | 92% | 92% | *92%* | In progress to end of project. 20,819 (10,534M, 10534 F) farmers reached in the 21 Field days held at the established learning sites. The field days created wider awareness on SLM/SFM practices outside the focal project sites.Due to Covid19 pandemic which led to stoppage of large gatherings by people no planning field days were held. | S |
| **Output 1.9** Support to implementation Participatory Forest Mangement (PFM) Plans | July 2018 | December 2021 | 90% | 100% | 100% | 5 PFM plans are still at the advanced stages of development | HS |
| **Output 1.10:** Capacity building of Community Forest Associations (CFAs) and other forest stakeholders | December 2018 | June 2021 | 90% | 100% | 100% | All the targeted forest user groups and CBO have been trained on Forest governance act, participatory forest management and advocacy, governance, catchment rehabilitation, agroforestry systems, ecosystem management and biodiversity monitoring | HS |
| **Output 1.11** Documentation of SLM/SFM knowledge and technologies | May 2018 | December 2021 | 90% | 95% | 95% | Almost fully achieved and partly hindered by COVID 19 which limited groups meetings, large crowds.  | HS |
|  | **COMPONENT 2: MAINSTREAMING VALUE CHAIN APPROACH TO SMALLHOLDER PRODUCERS** |
| **Output 2.1:** Value chain analysis of target crops undertaken | July 2020 | June 2021 | 100% | 100% | 100% | Fully achieved. Value Chain analysis for the three target crops were finalized and reported and actor linkage maps established and strengthened through signed commitment agreements between the various actors under the auspices of the Innovation Platforms. | HS |
| **Output 2.2** Farmer groups linkage to inputs and output markets | May 2018 | June 2021 | 80% | 97% | 97% | Most farmers have been linked with markets and have realized over 53% increase in volumes sold by household between April and March 2021 | HS |
| **Output 2.3:** Support to strengthening of Community Based Seed producers | May 2018 | June 2021 | 90% | 100% | 100% | Fully achieved. 5 community-based seed producer (CBSP) groups have engaged in the bulking of indigenous vegetable seeds on one acre piece of land and produced 200kg basic seed for further multiplication by other farmers. | HS |
| **Output 2.4:** Support to post-harvest management at household level | September 2018 | June 2021 | 80% | 100% | 100% | Fully achieved. Farmers trained on post-harvest handling measures such as safe use of chemicals, hermetic storage bags, and labour-saving post-harvest equipment. | HS |
| **Output 2.5:** Support to women and youth groups in small scale agricultural enterprises | May 2019 | June 2021 | 80% | 100% | 100% | Already 10 SMAES members (6 CFA Members in Kakamega, 1 Vihiga and 1 in Nandi County) are also processing and packaging their honey for sale. And 3 producers’ members (1kakamega, 1 Nandi and 1 Vihiga are currently offering processing services to other producers) | HS |
| **Output 2.6:** Support to development and commercialization of Non-wood forest | May 2019 | June 2021 | 80%. | 100% | 100% | 3 NWFP developed. This includes honey production groups in Vihiga and Kakamega and Mushroom products in Kakamega and tree seedlings. | HS |
|  | **COMPONENT 3: ENABLING POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK** |
| **Output 3.1:** Assessment of SLM/SFM and biodiversity conservation related policies and strategies at county level | Sept 2018 | June 2021 | 100% | 100% | 100% | National level policies and county level policy were reviewed in relation to SL/FM. Gaps were identified and recommendations to fill the GAPs have been made and are now being reframed into policy statements | HS |
| **Output 3.2:**Support to development of county level SLM/SFM and biodiversity frameworks  | Sept 2018 | June 2021 | 95% | 100% | 100% | Fully achieved. 3 draft documents have been developed and submitted to respective County Governments for further deliberation with the agriculture committees, MCAs and attorneys. | HS |
| **Output 3.3****:**Support to Ecosystem valuation and assessment | Sept 2018 | June 2021 | 75% | 100% | 100% | The economic evaluation of the ecosystem services for the Kakamega – Nandi Forest ecosystem was finalized and reported. This will form a strong basis for the drawing of a memorandum of understanding between the three counties for the joint and co-owned management of the forest resources | HS |
| **Output: 3.4:** Support to inter-county ecosystem forum | June 2021 | December 2021 | 75% | 75% | 100% | Three counties formed Intercounty committee and drafted documents which were amended by the counties Attorney and later on signed by the CEC. | HS |

* 1. 3.3. Risk Rating

**Table A.** Risk-log

Insert ALL the risks identified either at CEO endorsement (inc. safeguards screening), previous/current PIRs, and MTRs. Use the last line to propose a suggested consolidated rating.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Risk affecting:** |  | **Variation respect to last rating** |
| Outcome / outputs | **CEO ED** | **PIR 1** | **PIR 2** | **PIR 3** |  **MTR** | **PIR 4**  | **PIR 5** | **Δ** | **Justification** |
| Policy and institutional conflicts among key implementing partners | All outcomes & outputs | M | M | M | M | L | L | L | = | Continued dialogue and sensitization of key stakeholders to interpret the evidence produced by the project as a basis of policy formulation suited to the local conditions.Harmonised activities implemented across partners.Continued dialogue with county governments to incorporate and fund the actions drafted in the SL/FM legislations. The lead implementing institution KALRO has a pool of specialized and experienced scientists who are called upon to backstop any gaps created in case of consortium partners pull out. |
| Significant increases in externally driven pressure on forest protected areas leading to increased forest loss and fragmentation | All outcomes & outputs | L | M | m | M | L | L | L | = | Continued sensitization on alternative livelihoods options such as non-wood forest products, use of SLM technologies to improve on farm crop yields and incomes which ultimately minimise forest encroachment.Dialogue with the Community Forest association, County governments and KFS. Developed 5 PFMP provided a framework towards forest conservation and incentive mechanisms for CFA |
| Price volatility of inputs and outputs | All outcomes & outputs | M | M | M | M | L | L | M | = | Strengthen the seed multipliers on production of basic seed especially for Indigenous vegetable and beans.KALRO collaboration with KEPHIS for Quality seed inspection.Continued empowerment of aggregation centres through innovation platforms to enable producer groups acquire seed in bulk.Continued use of organic manure, composting and CA for enhanced soil fertility |
| Land tenure and related resource use conflicts | All outcomes & outputs | M | M | M | M | L | L | L | = | Popularise county level land use planning. Recognition of traditional land rights and land dispute arbitration through county of by-laws*.*Sensitization on land lease guidelines to support management and continuity of SLM/SFM.Continuous capacity on gender mainstreaming for improved intra household resource ownership and control.Women empowerment in involvement of other activities income generating activities such as savings and loans, SME to empower them acquire productive assets  |
| Climate change risk: shifting weather patterns may adversely affect the cultivation activities. | All outcomes & outputs | H | H | H | M | M | M | M | = | Encouraged farmers to plant early maturing seed varieties for maize and beans.Strengthened growing of crop varieties suitable within the agro ecological zones*.*Sensitization on weather forecast and climate information to TOTS to disseminate to the producers. This cushioned them from climate shocks. |
| Political conflict/war (Russia/Ukraine | All outcomes | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | = | Depended on other countries goodwill to supply inputs on reduced cost and reduced fuel crisisUse of SLM strategies such as composting, community-based seed producers |
| Consolidated project risk |  | L | L | L | L | L | L | L | = | No change |

**Table B.** Outstanding medium & high risks

List here **only risks from Table A above that have a risk rating of M or worse** in the **current** PIR

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk**   | **Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)** | **Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period** | **Additional mitigation measures for the next periods** |
| What | When | By whom |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Climate change risk: shifting weather patterns may adversely affect the cultivation activities. | Linkages to other seed companies for provision of Climate resilient seed varieties such as early maturing and water efficient varieties | Encouraged farmers to plant early maturing seed varieties for maize and beans.Strengthened growing of crop varieties suitable within the agro ecological zones.Sensitization on weather forecast and Climate information to TOTS to disseminate to the producers. This cushioned them from climate shocks. | Linkages with Metrological Department for sending weather updates to farmers. | Immediately | PMU /stakeholders |
| Price Volatility | Linkages to seed and fertiliser companies to provide subsidised seedOrganisation of farmers into bulk purchasing groups for reduced prices | Strengthen the seed multipliers on production of basic seed especially for Indigenous vegetable and beans.KALRO collaboration with KEPHIS for Quality seed inspection.Continued empowerment of aggregation centres through innovation platforms to enable producer groups acquire seed in bulk.Continued use of organic manure, composting and CA for enhanced soil fertility. | Linkages with private sector and county governments | immediately | County/private sector/stakeholders |

**High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
**Significant Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
**Medium Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.
**Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

**Project Minor Amendments**

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines.

Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Results framework |
|  |  |
|  | Components and cost |
|  |  |
|  | Institutional and implementation arrangements |
|  |  |
|  | Financial management |
|  |  |
|  | Implementation schedule |
|  |  |
|  | Executing Entity |
|  |  |
|  | Executing Entity Category |
|  |  |
|  | Minor project objective change |
|  |  |
|  | Safeguards |
|  |  |
|  | Risk analysis |
|  |  |
|  | Increase of GEF project financing up to 5% |
|  |  |
|  | Co-financing |
|  |  |
|  | Location of project activity |
|  |  |
|  | Other |

*[Annex document linked to reported minor amendment]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Minor amendments**Implementation schedule | [Provide a description of the change that occurred in the fiscal year of reporting]The project was scheduled to end on 31st July 2022. However, the Executing Agency, AGRA, requested UNEP to extend the project for six months up to 31st January 2023. This will allow AGRA to submit the final Audit, financial and technical reports to UNEP for official closure of the project. The extension will also allow the project partners to finalize and publish the knowledge products developed this year. |

**GEO Location Information:**

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=4/21.84/82.79) or [GeoNames](http://www.geonames.org/) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as:[https://coordinates-converter.com](http://www.geonames.org/) Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Location NameRequired field | LatitudeRequired field | LongitudeRequired field | Geo Name IDRequired field if the location is not an exact site | Location Description Optional text field | Activity Description Optional text field |
| Nambirima | 0.491 | 34.812 |   | Micro catchment for project implementation |  Innovation Platform, learning sites, field days |
| Indangalasia | 0.328 | 34.766 |   |  As above |   As above |
| Mahiakalo | 0.308 | 34.788 |  |  As above |  As above |
| Chepturer | 0.041 | 34.951 |  |  As above |  As above |
| Makuchi | 0.146 | 34.848 |   |   As above |   As above |
| Shiru  | 0.146 | 34.898 |  |  As above |  As above |
| Cheboite | 0.124 | 34.934 |  |  As above |  As above |
| Kurgung | 0.415 | 34.996 |  |  As above |  As above |
| Shiamiloli | 0.263 | 34.812 |  |  As above |  As above |
| Chepsui | 0.815 | 35.024 |   |   As above |   As above |

**Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate. \***

*[Annex any linked geospatial file]*

|  |
| --- |
| [Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate]The project is taking place in 10 micro catchments each being managed by innovation platform members and hosting learning sites for showcasing appropriate SLM technologies in western Kenya in Kakamega, Vihiga and Nandi counties as shown in the map below.  |

1. For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Outputs and activities (or deliverables) as described in the project log frame (and workplan) or in any updated project revision. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. The completion dates should be as per latest workplan (latest project revision). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. As much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, e.g., access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-7)