



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Scaling up sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation to reduce environmental degradation in small scale agriculture in Western Kenya.			
Country(ies):	Kenya	GEF Project ID: ¹	5272
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	0926
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock & Fisheries with Alliance for Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA)	Resubmission Date:	June 15, 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multifocal Area	Project Duration(Months)	60 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	340,461
➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/>			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
(select) LD-3	3.1: Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management	3.1 Integrated land management plans developed and implemented	GEF TF	2,052,400	5,750,000
(select) BD-2	2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation	2.1.1 Policies and regulatory frameworks (number) for production sectors	GEF TF	1,031,400	2,600,000
(select) SFM/REDD+ - 1	1.2 Good mangement practices applied in existing forests	1.2.1 Forest area (hectares) under sustainable management, separated by forest type.	(select)	500,000	1,554,405
Total project costs				3,583,800	9,904,405

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

Project Objective: The development objective is to promote the adoption and adaption of sustainable land and forest ecosystem management (SLEM) practices across the productive landscape of Kakamega-Nandi ecosystem						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
Component 1 Capacity building of stakeholders on SLM /SFM and biodiversity conservation within Kakamega forest ecosystem	TA	1.0 Enhanced capacity of smallholder farmers to implement and upscale sustainable land, Forest and biodiversity management practices at landscape level	1.1 Baselines established for Sustainable Land & Forest Management and Biodiversity Conservation at landscape level 1.2 Capacity needs assessment for key stakeholders conducted 1.3 Development of Integrated Land Use Plans for Sustainable Land & Forest Management and Biodiversity Conservation at Landscape Level 1.4 Support to conservation of biodiversity hot spots 1.5 Conduct training of trainers (ToT) for FFS 1.6 Facilitation of FFS 1.7 Establishment of SLM/SFM and biodiversity learning sites for farmer groups 1.8 Facilitation of farmer open and field-days 1.9 Support to implementation Participatory Forest Mangement (PFM) Plans 1.10 Capcity building of Community Forest Associations (CFAs) for	GEF TF	1,572,200	4,199,185

			biodiversity conservation 1.11 Documentation of SLM, SFM and biodiversity conservation best practices			
Component 2 Mainstreaming Value Chain Approach to Smallholder Producers	TA	2.0: Increased farmers' access to profitable input and output markets of targeted crops and forest products	2.1 Value chain analysis of target crops undertaken 2.2 Farmer groups linkage to affordable finance markets 2.3 Support to establishment and strengthening of Community Based Seed producers 2.4 Support to post-harvest management at household level 2.5 Support to women and youth groups in small scale agricultural enterprises (SMAEs) 2.6 Support to development and commercialization of Non-wood forest products and services (NWFPs)	GEF TF	1,080,200	3,692,305
Component 3 Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework	TA	3.0: Enabling policy and institutional framework for up scaling sustainable land and forests management at county level	3.1 Assessment of SLM/SFM and biodiversity related policies and strategies at county level 3.2 Support to development of county level SLM/SFM and	GEF TF	620,200	1,662,915

			biodiversity Management frameworks			
			3.3 Support to Ecosystem valuation and assessment			
			3.4 Support to inter-county ecosystem forum			
Subtotal					3,272,600	9,554,405
Project management Cost (PMC) ³				GEF TF	311,200	350,000
Total project costs					3,583,800	9,904,405

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (ASDSP)	In-kind	568,000
Local Government	County Government of Kakamega	Cash	2,000,000
Local Government	County Government of Nandi	In-kind	2,210,000
Local Government	County Government of Vihiga	In-kind	1,700,000
GEF Agency	UNEP	Cash	200,000
Foundation	Alliance for Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA)	Cash	2,094,097
Others	Anglican Church of Kenya (ACK)	In-kind	382,308
Others	Kenya Agricultural Livestock Research Organization (KALRO)	In-kind	750,000
Total Co-financing			9,904,405

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNEP	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Kenya	2,052,400	194,978	2,247,378
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Kenya	1,031,400	97,983	1,129,383
UNEP	GEF TF	Multi-focal Areas	Kenya	500,000	47,500	547,500
Total Grant Resources				3,583,800	340,461	3,924,261

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	295,000	234,000	529,000
National/Local Consultants	600,000	925,000	1,525,000

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴****A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.**

When the PIF was being developed the devolution process under the new Kenyan Consitution (2010) had not been implemented. The new consitution came into force from 2013 after the general election. Under the new constitutional dispensation, county governments were created with devolved functions which included mandate on agriculture, land and natural resources. The county governments came into in 2013 after the General Elections and are at the formative stages with limited technical and operational capacity to implement their consitutional mandate in the agricultural sector. During the development of the full project, the county governments within the project area expressed interest of partnership as the key stakeholders of the project. The areas that the county governments identified as critical for support include enabling policy framework for agriculture and SLM at county level. In this regard, the project added a new component on policy which was not there in the initail PIF. The new component will address the policy gaps for SLM at county level. The county governments already have some resources to invest in agriculture and SLM but are limited in terms of policy frameworks and tecnical knowledge to guide their investments.

A major strength of the current project is the County Governments are investing for the first time in the management of their natural resources in partnership with the local communities and development partners.

The new national strategies and plans that have developed during the PPG phase and which has a direct impact on the project include; Agricultural Sector Development Program (ASDSP) that seeks to increase agricultural productivity in small scale agriculture; Draft Forest and Act (2014), the new Policy and Act envisage to empower stakeholders in participatory management of forests; Access and Benefit Sharing Bill which will outline the benefit sharing of ecosystems goods and services to the target communities. During this time, the UNDAF programme for 2014-2018 was also formulated with a strong component on environment and natural resources management. The current policy environment is thus even more favorable than when the PIF was submitted.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

The proposed project is consistent and responsive to the GEF-5 Focal area (FA) strategies on Land Degradation (LD), Biodiversity (BD) and also on Sustainable Forest Management (SFM/REDD+).

In particular, the project will contribute to achievement of LD Outcome 3.2 Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities. The proposed project will also contribute to achievement of BD Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes that integrate biodiversity conservation. In addition, the project is in alignment with SFM/REDD+ Outcome 1.2. Good management practices applied in existing forests.

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

In particular, the proposed project promotes sustainable land management through farmer fields' schools to address challenges in land degradation. For mainstreaming biodiversity conservation, the project will support the development and implementation of land use plans that support the conservation of biodiversity (including agro-biodiversity) at landscape level. . In addition, the project will support conservation of biodiversity hot spots within Kakamega Forest. The forest harbours many species that are related to the Central and West African flora. More than 120 species of trees have been recorded in the forest (GoK 2012). The forest is also home to threatened tree species including the Elgon teak and *Prunus africana* which are species of special conservation concern (locally threatened and rare). These species are prone to over exploitation due to their high quality timber and medicinal value. The forest also has high diversity of primates, with monkeys being the most conspicuous group of mammals in the forest, amongst which the Blue Monkey (*Cercopithecus mitis stuhlmanni*), the Redtail Monkey (*Cercopithecus ascanius schmidtii*), and the Black-and-white Colobus Monkey (*Colobus guereza*) are the most common (GoK 2012). It is an important bird area (IBA) with almost over 500 different species recorded including globally threatened Turner's Eremomela (*Eremomela turneri*) and Chapin's Flycatcher (*Muscicapa lendu*); a further 15 species regionally threatened, and 46 endemic species. Most of these species are found in plantations of mixed indigenous tree species. Many bird species are crucial for the forest ecosystem, because most tree species depend on birds for seed dispersal (GoK 2012).

The project has relevance to realization of Aichi Nagoya Targets; especially Target 7: By 2020, areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity and Target 15: By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.

Additionally, the CBD recognizes the need for integrating agro-biodiversity in NBSAPs and stipulates the provisions to support the implementation of activities on conservation and sustainable utilization of plant and animal genetic resources for food and sustainable agriculture. The SBSTTA (UNEP/CBD/COP/10/3) report further recommends among other things, potential actions to promote agro-biodiversity conservation that contribute to biodiversity as well as ecosystem based carbon sequestration of soils and to conserve and restore organic carbon in soil and biomass

The project proposes to use the LADA tool in developing the participatory M&E framework for SLM/SFM. LADA has been recognized by GEF and UNCCD as an important flagship in the land degradation focal area. LADA has played an important role in advancing the focal area agenda globally by generating knowledge and tools to support activities of parties to the UNCCD. LADA also exemplifies several key principles of the GEF, such as partnership between scientific institutions, civil society organizations and support to implementation of the UNCCD. The project will promote institutionalization of LADA as part of its global agenda for knowledge to improve management of production landscapes in the context of agricultural development and food security as recommended by FAO and UNEP.

A.3. The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

UNEP's mission is to provide leadership and encourage partnership in caring for the environment by inspiring, informing, and enabling nations and peoples to improve their quality of life without compromising that of future generations. UNEP is the only United Nations organization with a mandate derived from the General Assembly to co-ordinate the work of the United Nations in the area of environment. As such it is the only GEF Agency whose core business is the environment.

UNEP's comparative advantage lies in its particular mandate to advance environmental management, its experience in working with scientific and technical communities, including its support to the GEF's Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP), its work in assessment and monitoring, its links to environment ministries and other bodies in the regions, and its role in serving as the Secretariat to three of the MEAs, for which GEF is the financial mechanism.

UNEP has an advantage in its extensive experience in piloting approaches and innovations to address emerging environmental issues. UNEP assists countries in identifying, testing and demonstrating the use of tools and methods for improving environmental management, related to UNEP's involvement with the Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs).

The emphasis on science as a basis for policy in the work of UNEP has led to a recognized leadership role in global scale environmental assessments, such as the work of UNEP's 'GRID' network and the Global Environmental Outlook. UNEP has developed expertise in global environmental monitoring and assessment, and early warning on emerging issues and can help governments and agencies base their decisions and investments on the best information available.

On Biodiversity, UNEP's work on ecosystem services through the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment is an important building block for its work in the GEF. UNEP utilizes a unique combination of skills from its divisions of Environmental Policy Implementation, Trade, Industry and Economics and Environmental Assessment and its collaborating centre - WCMC producing a body of expertise on the subject of Ecosystem Services.

On Land Degradation, UNEP has focused its work in sustainable land management putting in place integrated approaches to land use management at regional and landscape levels. The result is a portfolio of interventions in bi-national and regional water basins, transboundary ecosystems and production systems across national borders, like pastures and rangelands.

UNEP's comparative advantages in the GEF are also aligned with its mandate, functions and Medium Term Strategy and its biennial Programme of Work (2015- 2016). The proposed project is consistent with the Ecosystem management thematic priorities. Specifically, it will contribute to the achievement of Expected Accomplishment EA (a): Use of the ecosystem approach in countries to maintain ecosystem services and sustainable productivity of terrestrial and aquatic systems is increased by (2): Tools, technical support and partnerships to improve food security and sustainable productivity in agricultural landscapes through the integration of the ecosystem approach.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

N/A

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The baseline scenario with no GEF intervention, would see SLM initiatives been undertaken by different actors using different approaches at project level with minimal coordination and information sharing. Despite several sustainable land management project implementations, lack of financial support inhibits further up scaling of some of the successful projects and utilization of experiences and lessons learned. The project alternative with GEF support would first consolidate the lessons learned and develop a more holistic and programmatic approach to SLM. In particular the proposed project would facilitate participatory land use plans at landscape level and build the capacity of community groups and other key stakeholders especially the county government which under the new constitution has the oversight mandate on environment and land resources.

The project aims to mainstream sustainable land management (SLM) practices across the productive landscapes around the Kakamega Forest ecosystem. The expected outcome of the project will be decreased land degradation and improved soil fertility that will lead to increased farm productivity and incomes. These results in turn will ease pressure on the forest, conserving the ecosystem and assuring the services it provides.

Currently AGRA projects in Western Kenya are in 6 districts (Busia, Kakamega, Mumias, Siaya, Teso and Vihiga) and target approximately 100,000 farmers. Half of these farmers are in projects promoting Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM) while the other half focuses on promoting agricultural lime (to address the area's acidic soils).

Besides the above projects other successful approaches to SLM include the National Agricultural and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP) that has promoted soil and water conservation technologies among over 100,000 small scale farmers, and ICRAFs integrated soil nutrient management program, which has assisted over 8,000 small holders' farmers in adopting the use of local materials (Dithonia green manure) to improve soil fertility. In addition, some 2,500 Farmer Field Schools (FFS) have been conducted in about 25 districts, which mean that there is an ample supply of field-level trainers and master trainers on FFS.

The proposed additional GEF funding could reach 100,000 more farmers with SLM practices among surrounding communities bordering Kakamega Forest. This additional GEF funding will enable scaling up of AGRA's current SLM interventions in areas around the forest to secure the global environmental benefits of conserving:

- (1) a greenhouse gas-absorbing woodland;
- (2) an internationally critical freshwater source for millions of people; and
- (3) a significant tropical ecosystem with a wide range of biodiversity.

In addition, the project will also make significant contribution to sequestering carbon through improved management of existing forests. Total potential carbon benefit as a result of forest carbon stock enhancement and conservation and successful restoration is estimated at 1,003,801 tCO₂e over the duration of the project (see Appendix 14 & 15).

<i>Business as usual scenario</i>	<i>GEF Alternative (Additional Interventions)</i>	<i>Global Environmental Benefits</i>
Project based approach on SLM with limited coordination of efforts	Capacity development of stakeholders on SLM and SFM Development of county level programmatic approach to strengthen institutional coordination and enabling environment for SLM upscaling	Synergies created for improved land management leading to increase of land under SLM/SFM, biodiversity conservation and increased carbon sinks
Lack of comprehensive land use plans for SLM/SFM and biodiversity conservation at county and landscape level	Support to county level legislation on land tenure and land use Participatory development of SLM/SFM and Biodiversity management plans at landscape / sub-catchment level	Increased productivity of ecosystem goods and services at landscape level
Limited knowledge on land degradation status and reversal opportunities while existing knowledge remains unapplied	Creation of agricultural information products sharing platforms Participatory development of a Monitoring and Evaluation system for SLM / SFM	Knowledge generated will create awareness leading to adoption of SLM/practices for socio-economic and environmental benefits both at local and global scale.
Limited incentive for participatory and sustainable forest management	Mainstreaming of value chain approach for better markets Linkage of producer groups to better input and output markets	Increased land under SLM/SFM for conservation of endangered ecosystem and species

	Framework for Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS)	
--	--	--

A.6 : Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

The potential risk factors include:

Policy and institutional conflicts – There are a number of policy and institutional overlaps regarding the management of natural resources in Kenya. The regulatory authorities especially KFS, KWS, WRMA and NEMA all have mandates that tend to overlap in regard to the management of natural resources and yet there is no structured framework for harmonization of programmes. The devolution under the new constitutional dispensation has completed matters since the new county governments are also interested in the management of natural resources. These policy and institutional overlaps are potential source of conflicts among the key project implementing partners and may slow down the project implementation. The project proposes to mitigate this risk factor through consultative process and defining roles and responsibilities of each implementing partner equitably.

Externally driven demand of land and forest resources – The demand of land and forest resources from an expanding population still remains a major threat to the attainment of the project goal. The political and social instability within or outside the target counties may create movement of people who may encroach on the forest and wetlands. The market demand of some forest products from Kakamega –Nandi forest ecosystem may also led to overexploitation. Capacity building of county and local institutions especially CFAs and also facilitating access and benefit sharing of forest resources could mitigate this risk.

Price volatility – Price instability of essential agricultural inputs and outputs could adversely affect the projected productivity from SLM investments. The high cost of agricultural inputs has led to adulteration and counterfeits of agricultural inputs especially seeds, fertilizers and agrochemicals by unscrupulous traders. The spread of these illegal products has led to huge losses to farmers. The project will work very closely with regulatory authorities and agro-dealers to manage this problem. The will also build the capacity of farmer groups to source their inputs at subsidized rates from the source. On the other hand, the project will support small scale farmers on post-harvest management and bulking of agricultural produce to attract better prices at the right time.

Climate change – The agriculture sector is the most sensitive to climate change, meaning that agricultural systems will need to adapt to the changing environment. At the same time, the sector is a large and growing GHG emitter. The project will support climate smart technologies for mitigation and adaption including conservation agriculture and use, drip irrigation systems and appropriate crop varieties.

<i>Risk</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Mitigation measures</i>
Weak governance structure at county level	High	Support in institutional capacity development. Promotion of public participation and advocacy for transparency and accountability

Policy and institutional conflicts among key implementing partners	Medium	Clearly defined, roles, responsibilities of each entity Open communication channel and feedback Synergy built for county and national institutions Recognizing community structures and leadership
Significant increases in externally driven pressure on forest protected areas leading to increased forest loss and fragmentation	Low	Creation of more incentives that could offer more direct benefits to farmers CFAs facilitated for to apply for concessions of forest blocks
Price volatility of inputs and outputs	Medium	Post-harvest management and bulking of produce Strengthening of value chains Collaboration with regulatory authorities
Land tenure and related resource use conflicts	Medium	Support to county level land use planning Recognition of traditional land rights and land dispute arbitration through county of by-laws.
Climate change risk: shifting weather patterns may adversely affect the cultivation activities.	High	Adoption of Climate Smart Agriculture to build resilience capacity of smallholder farmers.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

UNEP/FAO/GEF - Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use for Improved Human Nutrition and Well-being: The Development Goal of the Project is to contribute to the improvement of global knowledge of biodiversity for food and nutrition and thereby enhance the well-being, livelihoods and food security of target beneficiaries in Brazil, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Turkey through the conservation and sustainable use of this biodiversity and the identification of best practices for up-scaling. The Project Objective is to strengthen the conservation and sustainable management of agricultural biodiversity through mainstreaming into national and global nutrition, food and livelihood security strategies and programmes. The Project will seek to achieve these goals and objectives through implementation of three components which designed to improve: the knowledge base (Component 1); the policy and regulatory framework (Component 2); and awareness and out scaling (Component 3). Global knowledge will encompass globally relevant tools, lessons and best practices.

The Kenyan component of the project is being piloted in Busia County adjacent to Kakamega County, KALRO is the local implementing partner same as the proposed project and thus it will be easy to share information and create synergies especially in agro-biodiversity conservation.

UNDP/GEF - Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya: The project goal is to ensure that the montane forest biodiversity and ecosystem values are conserved and provide sustainable benefit flows at local, national and global levels. The project envisage to bring 65,000 ha of forests in the three target landscapes of Kakamega, Nandi and Cherangani gazetted or reclassified to higher status and with improved

governance systems and financial scoring allowing for effective management. The project focus is on protected areas while the proposed project is focusing on the wider landscape in and out of the protected areas. There exist good prospects for creating synergies of the two projects through an integrated ecosystem approach.

WB/GEF - Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project (LVEMP II): – The LVEMP II project is a comprehensive programme aimed at rehabilitation of the lake ecosystem for the benefit of the people who live in the catchment, the national economies of which they are a part, and the global community. The project will contribute towards the achievement of the EAC's Lake Victoria Basin Development Vision and Strategy "*a prosperous population living in a healthy and sustainably managed environment providing equitable opportunities and benefits*". The Project development/global environmental objectives are to: (i) improve collaborative management of the trans-boundary natural resources of LVB for the shared benefits of the EAC Partner States; and (ii) reduce environmental stress in targeted pollution hotspots and selected degraded sub-catchments to improve the livelihoods of communities dependent on the natural resources of the Lake Victoria Basin. This will be achieved by supporting: (i) Institutional capacity development and harmonization of policy, legislation and regulatory frameworks; (ii) Point source pollution control and prevention; and (iii) Participatory watershed management. The proposed project will collaborate with this project especially in watershed conservation in Kakamega and Nandi forests.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

The success of the project will so much depend on the inclusive involvement of the stakeholders from a broad range of sectors, from grassroots to county and national level, from institutional to individual. Clear mechanisms for participation, partnership building and effective communication will be essential and will be considered at the outset of Project implementation to ensure full inclusion of all relevant stakeholders. It is essential that the project management arrangements provide space to enable partners to work together effectively and that all stakeholders are kept fully informed of project progress.

The main beneficiaries of this project will be the County governments, community groups and households, in pilot sites. Women and youth groups will be the priority target of interventions. The project will work closely with individuals, farmers, households and groups at the community level in selected locations to achieve specific key results across in all the 4 project components. Farmers will benefit from improved linkages to markets and the project will make to their livelihoods. Communities in general will benefit from the opportunities created by of up scaled SLM/SFM practices across the landscape. The capacity of the county governments to support the agricultural sector and sustainable management of the natural resource will be enhanced.

The project implementation will adopt a participatory approach, engaging various stakeholders whose participation is central to the successful delivery of the project. The level of stakeholder involvement will depend on group stake in the project, the statutory mandate, technical and operational capacity. In this regard, the project will have three levels of stakeholder involvement. Level 1 is the core group that will execute and implement the project, this group will include the KALRO, County governments and community groups. Level 2 group that will be involved in the management or service provision of the project, this group include ICRAF, KFS, KEFRI and other stakeholders while 3 group are other stakeholders that will be informed of the project progress and consulted for their input where applicable.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The project will also generate socio-economic benefits to the local communities in a way that will lead to behavioral change and more support for sustainable land and ecosystem management. Some of the socio-economic benefits include:

- a) Improved farm production for household food security and higher incomes as SLM practices yield benefits for soil fertility and crop productivity. Kenya's current staple food production is not able to meet the demand in growing urban markets and additional production from farmers in Western Kenya should find ready outlets, thereby boosting farm incomes
- b) Improved nutrition and incomes through and expanded legume and cereals inter-cropping. In addition, legumes are a source of high quality protein while cereals are sources of carbohydrates and fats and will contribute significantly to household nutrition;
- c) The promotion of indigenous crops will enhance conservation of agrobiodiversity and the plant genetic resources that have been neglected and yet could offer the solution to food security and adaptation to climate change.
- d) Women farmers and youths who are the majority in the target area will benefit from increased awareness, knowledge and skills as well as enhanced access to farm inputs that will improve their production. The legumes promoted as part of ISFM and CA are often considered a woman's crop and, with improved productivity, are expected to be an important income source for women.
- e) Putting more land under sustainable land and ecosystem management will increase productivity of ecosystem goods and services to cope with the increasing demand from an expanding population. In addition, the operationalisation of PES schemes would generate further incomes to the local communities.
- f) The project will facilitate Private-Public-Partnerships (PPPs) through capacity building of producer groups in agribusiness and bio-enterprise development in order to ensure that SLEM practices are market driven and sustainable.

The socio-economic benefits are expected to create incentives for adoption of Sustainable land and forest management practices across the landscapes. The upscaling of SLM practices will generate global environmental benefits, specifically putting over 100,000 ha of vulnerable productive landscapes under sustainable land and ecosystem management. This will result to increased productivity of ecosystem goods and services that are so vital to sustain the high population in the region. The project will also secure threatened biodiversity including indigenous crop varieties and pollinators. In addition, better farming practices and reforestation help to reduce soil loss and sediment loads on rivers with substantial benefits on water quality, international waterways, riverine and marine ecosystems.

The project will also make significant contribution to sequestering carbon through improved management of existing forests. Total potential carbon benefit as a result of successful restoration, forest carbon stock enhancement and conservation is estimated at 339,240 of CO₂/yr (based on PPG estimation).

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The project will adopt cost saving strategies in the execution of the project implementation. The aim is to reduce operational costs so as to release more funds to the actual implementation of activities that would directly benefit the target groups. The strategies to be employed include:

Use of existing institutions and structures – The project will not create new structures nor employ new extension staff but as much as possible use the existing structures in the county. The Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) in Kakamega has been identified as the lead implementing agency on the ground with well-established operational and technical capacity. The agricultural sector has been fully devolved at county level with appointment of County Director of Agriculture. The project will work closely with the County Department of Agriculture and will use their extension staff in training and dissemination of

project activities. At the community level, the project will work with existing community institutions already established and will not directly support establishment of new CBOs for the sake of the project. This approach will reduce administrative costs.

Targeted support – The project will build the capacity of stakeholders based on capacity needs assessment. The project resources will thus be based on targeted support and will avoid duplication with on-going support from other development partners but rather complimenting and building synergies.

Community Based Approach – The communities are the key target for the project and the project will use the existing community groups as entry points for the project. This approach will reduce costs on community mobilisation and thus more funds will be used for training and capacity building. The strengthening of community groups will also ensure sustainability of the project activities at the end of the project.

Strategic partnership with on-going SLM/SFM related programmes – There are a number of on-going SLM/SFM related programmes in the focal counties which the project could benefit through linkages and synergies. These include Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDSP), Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya, Vi Agroforestry Agricultural Carbon Project and AGRA's Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM) programme. These programmes are well established on the focal counties and the proposed project could use them as platforms for up scaling the SLM/SFM practices.

Up scaling of evidence based SLM/SFM practices – The project will invest more in up scaling tested and proven best SLM/SFM practices in the region than developing new technologies. There are ready-made technologies that have developed through research and demonstrations and the project focus will be to scale out the proven practices across the landscape. Co-financing – The GEF investment is catalytic and it's envisaged to raise 4 times the principal amount through co-financing arrangements. The co-finance will both be in cash and in-kind and will support the project operations on a wider scale. The co-finance will come from partners and county governments including community groups.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

UNEP will be responsible for managing the mid-term review/evaluation and the terminal evaluation. The Project Manager and partners will participate actively in the process. The project will be re-viewed or evaluated at mid-term (tentatively in mm/yy as indicated in the project milestones). The purpose of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) or Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to provide an independent assessment of project performance at mid-term, to analyze whether the project is on track, what problems and challenges the project is encountering, and which corrective actions are required so that the project can achieve its intended outcomes by project completion in the most efficient and sustainable way. In addition, it will verify information gathered through the GEF tracking tools. [Note: For a short duration project, PIR will serve as the project Mid-Term Review (MTR).

The project Steering Committee will participate in the MTR or MTE and develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations along with an implementation plan. It is the responsibility of the UNEP Task Manager to monitor whether the agreed recommendations are being implemented. An MTR is managed by the UNEP Task Manager. An MTE is managed by the Evaluation Office (EO) of UNEP. The EO will determine whether an MTE is required or an MTR is sufficient.

An independent terminal evaluation (TE) will take place at the end of project implementation. The EO will be responsible for the TE and liaise with the UNEP Task Manager throughout the process. The TE will provide an independent assessment of project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine the likelihood of impact and sustainability. It will have two primary purposes:

- (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and
- (ii) to promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP and executing partners.

While a TE should review use of project funds against budget, it would be the role of a financial audit to assess probity (i.e. correctness, integrity etc.) of expenditure and transactions.

The TE report will be sent to project stakeholders for comments. Formal comments on the report will be shared by the EO in an open and transparent manner. The project performance will be assessed against standard evaluation criteria using a six point rating scheme. The final determination of project ratings will be made by the EO when the report is finalized. The evaluation report will be publically disclosed and will be followed by a recommendation compliance process.

The direct costs of reviews and evaluations will be charged against the project evaluation budget.

The GEF tracking tools are attached as Appendix 13. These will be updated at mid-term and at the end of the project and will be made available to the GEF Secretariat along with the project PIR report. As mentioned above the mid-term and terminal evaluation will verify the information of the tracking tool. The budgeted M&E plan is summarized in Appendix 7 (in the prodoc).


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Ali D. Mohamed, CBS	Permanent Secretary & GEF OFP	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT & MINERAL RESOURCES	08/29/2012

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Brennan Van Dyke, Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP, Nairobi		June 15, 2016	Mohamed Sessay SPO, GEF Unit	+254 20 762 4294	Mohamed.sessay@ unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Project Goal: To contribute to improved food security and incomes of smallholder farmers through sustainable land and agro-biodiversity management in Western Kenya						
Project Objective	Objective level Indicators	Baseline	Targets and Monitoring Milestones	Means of Verification	Assumptions & Risks	UNEP MTS reference* & Expected Accomplishment (EA)
To increase smallholders' productivity through up-scaling of sustainable land management	The average yield (production per ha) of targeted crops (maize, legumes, indigenous vegetables)	Maize: 1 t/ha Beans: 0.2 t/ha	Maize: 3 rd Yr: 1.5 t/ha End of Project: 2 t/ha Beans: 3 rd Yr: 0.3 t/ha End of Project: 0.4 t/ha	Project reports County reports M&E reports	Stability of input and output markets No major crop pests or diseases Favorable weather conditions	ECOSYSTEM Management EA (a): Use of the ecosystem approach in countries to maintain ecosystem services and sustainable productivity of terrestrial and aquatic systems is increased by (2): Tools, technical support and partnerships to improve food security and sustainable productivity in agricultural landscapes through the integration of the ecosystem approach.
	Proportion increase of income from crop productivity	0	3 rd Yr: 20% increase in income End of Project: 50%	Project reports County reports M&E reports	Enabling political and socio-economic environment Favorable markets	

	Area(ha) of forest land under Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) with biodiversity conservation	0	3 rd Yr: 25,000 ha End of Project:50,000ha	Project reports M&E reports	Weather conditions are favourable Good incentives for CFAs	
	Area (ha) of land put under SLM	0	3 rd Yr: 10,000 ha End of Project:20,000ha	Project reports M&E reports	Factors of production are favourable Good incentives for FFS	
Component 1	Capacity Building of Stakeholders on SLM and SFM					
Project Outcome	Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Targets and Monitoring Milestones	Means of Verification	Assumptions & Risks	MTS Expected Accomplishment
Outcome 1: Enhanced capacity of smallholder farmers to implement and upscale sustainable land, forest and biodiversity (including agro-biodiversity) management practices	Proportion of target farmers using appropriate SLM practices	30%	3 rd Yr: 60% End of Project: 80%	Project reports County reports M&E reports	Enabling political and institutional framework to support SLM/SFM initiative Favorable weather conditions Local policies provide incentives for farmers to adopt the practices	
Output 1.1: Baselines for SLM, SFM and Biodiversity established at landscape level	Baseline scenario of initial project values established	TBD	3 rd Yr – Baseline reports and maps of projects sites in place	Baseline reports and maps Project progress reports	Availability of secondary data	

Output 1.2: Capacity needs assessment for key stakeholders conducted	Capacity needs of key project partners established	TBD	1 st Yr : Capacity needs assessment report ready	Capacity Needs Assessment Report Project Report	Accurate information provided by stakeholders	
Output 1.3: Development of Integrated Land Use Plans for SLM, SFM and Biodiversity conservation at Landscape Level	No. of landscape land use plans developed	10 land use plans developed	2 nd yr – 10 Land use plans developed	Land use plans reports Project progress reports	No land use conflicts	
Output 1.4: Support to conservation of biodiversity hot spots	No of hot spots conserved	0	3 rd yr – 3 Biodiversity hotspots conserved End of project – 5 hot spots conserved	Biodiversity reports Project progress reports	Mitigation of human and wildlife conflicts	
Output 1.5: Conduct training of trainers (ToT) for Farmer Field Schools (FFS)	No. of training of trainers (ToTs) trained by gender	40 trained by AGRA SHP	3 rd Yr:100 ToTs trained	Project progress reports	There will be no transfers of ToTs during the project duration	
Output 1.6: Facilitation of FFS groups	No. of farmer groups trained by gender	30 trained by AGRA	3 rd Yr – 30 End of project – 50 farmers trained	Project progress reports Training reports	The groups will take adopt learned practices in their own plots	
Output 1.7: Establishment of SLM/SFM and	No. of learning sites established	0 learning sites on best SLM practices	3 rd Yr – 30 End of project – 50	Project progress reports	The sites will address the agronomic challenges the farmers face	

biodiversity learning sites				Learning sites reports		
Output 1.8: Facilitation of farmer open and field-days	No. of farmers attending field days by gender	30,000 farmers	3 rd Yr – 40,000 End of project – 100,000	Project progress reports Field day reports	The field days will create wider awareness of SLM/SFM practices outside the focal project sites	
Output 1.9 Support to implementation Participatory Forest & Biodiversity Management (PFM) Plans	No. of Participatory Forest Management Plans developed and implemented	3 PFM developed	3 rd Yr – 3 End of project – 6	Project progress reports PFMP reports	The proposed amendment of the Forest Act is enacted and operationalized	
Output 1.10: Capacity building of Community Forest Associations (CFAs) and other forest stakeholders	No. of forest user groups trained (with gender disaggregated data) Number of concessional agreements with KFS signed	10 user groups supported 3 Forest Management Agreements (FMA) signed	3 rd Yr – 5 End of project – 20 3 rd yr – 1FMA End of Project – 3FMAs	Project progress reports CFA training reports	The governance of CFAs is democratic, transparent and accountable to the members	
Output 1.11 Documentation of SLM/SFM Biodiversity knowledge and	No. of people with access to SLM information	TBD	End of project - SLM and agro-biodiversity best practices documented	Project progress reports	Knowledge on SLM and agro-biodiversity will trigger interest for conservation	

technologies				SLM and agro-biodiversity reports		
Component 2	Mainstreaming Value Chain Approach to Smallholder Producers					
Outcome 2.0: 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	3 rd Yr - 60% End of project - 80%	Household farmer survey (mid-way and end of project)	Farmers willing to adopt improved seed	
	Increase in volume of produce (target crops) sold by households through structured markets	0	3 rd Yr - 30% End of project - 50%	Household farmer survey (mid-way and end of project)	Local policies provide incentives for farmers to adopt the practices Market prices are favourable to farmers	
Output 2.1: Value chain analysis of target crops undertaken	Value-chain analysis of target crops undertaken	0	1 st Yr: 3 value chain analysis undertaken	Value-chain analysis report Project Reports	business disclosure of value chain actors	
Output 2.2 Farmer groups linkage to inputs and output markets	Proportion of farmers marketing their produce through structured markets Proportion of farmers accessing loans from micro-financing institutions	10% of t small scale farmers accessing loans and better markets	3 rd Yr; 20% End of project - 30%	Project progress reports County economic survey	stability in commodity prices Government support for subsidised credits	
Output 2.3: Support to strengthening of Community Based	No. of Community based seed producers supported	TBD	3 rd Yr - 1 groups supported End of project - 3 groups	Project progress reports	Availability of quality indigenous seeds	

Seed producers		TBD	supported	Community based seeds reports	Approvals from seed regulatory authority	
Output 2.4: Support to post-harvest management at household level	No. of farmers trained in post-harvest handling by gender	1,200 farmers trained	3 rd Yr: 4,000 End of project 10,000 farmers reached	Household farmer survey (mid-way and end of project)	The post -harvest technologies are affordable to smallholder farmers	
Output 2.5: Support to women and youth groups in small scale agricultural enterprises	No. of Women and youth groups supported	0	3 rd Yr – 10 groups End of project - 30 groups	Project progress reports	Youths linked to affordable finance institutions	
Output 2.6: Support to development and commercialization of Non-wood forest products and services (NWFPS)	No. of NWFPS developed and marketed	2	3 rd Yr: 2 4 NWFPS developed by End of project	Project progress reports NWFPS reports	CFAs are functional Less conflicts over forest resources	
Component 3	Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework					

Outcome 3: Enabling policy and institutional framework for up scaling sustainable land and forests management at county level	No. of SLM related frameworks at county and landscape level	0	3 rd Yr: 1 End of project - 3 institutional frameworks established by end of project	County assembly reports and bills Project Progress reports M&E report	Political will from county governments	
Output 3.1 Assessment of SLM/SFM and biodiversity conservation related policies and strategies at county level	Policy analysis report	0	3 rd Yr - Policy analysis report with recommendations	Policy reports Project Progress reports	Political will from county governments	
Output 3.2 Support to development of county level SLM/SFM and biodiversity management frameworks	No. of county level SLM related strategies	0	3 rd Yr – 3 policy dialogues undertaken End of project – 2 SLM related strategies developed	Policy reports Project Progress reports	Political will from county governments	
Output 3.3 Support to Ecosystem valuation and assessment	Valuation of Kakamega-Nandi forest complex established	0	Ecosystem valuation established by end of project	Ecosystem Valuation Report Project progress reports	The Ecosystem valuation report would increase awareness of the forest value and increase investment by the county government.	

Output: 3.4: Support to inter-county ecosystem forum	Inter-county MoU	0	3 rd Yr – 3 inter-county dialogues undertaken End of project - Inter-county MoU in place	Project Progress reports Inter-county MoU	Political will from county governments	
---	------------------	---	--	--	--	--

Appendix 7: Costed M&E plan

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget (USD)			Time frame
		GEF TF	Co-finance	Total	
Inception workshop and reporting	NPC PMU AGRA UNEP	3,000	5,000	8,000	Within 2 months of project inception.
Baseline data collection -Field surveys (to fill gaps in baseline information, refinement of indicator, etc.)	NPC PMU AGRA	92,800	215,000	307,800	Within 6 months of project inception for project pilot sites
Establishment of baseline values for GEF tracking tools	NPC PMU	20,000	65,000	85,000	GEF tracking tools indicators: start, mid and end of project
Development of participatory Monitoring and evaluation tool for community groups	NPC PMU AGRA	20,000	54,000	74,000	Within 6 months of project start up
Project Progress reports/ Annual Technical reports to UNEP	NPC PMU AGRA	32,000	72,000	104,000	Progress reporting: quarterly Overall performance: annual
PMU /Landscape Management Committee/ Project Advisory Committee / meetings	NPC PMU AGRA UNEP	60,000	145,000	205,000	PMU – monthly LEC – quarterly PAC – twice /year
Project Implementation Review (PIR)	NPC PMU	0	50,000	50,000	PIR – annual (overall performance)

	AGRA				
Field monitoring visits to project sites	NPC PMU AGRA	75,000	240,000	315,000	Quarterly (basis for quarterly reporting)
Mid Term Review/Evaluation	PMU AGRA UNEP	30,000	86,000	136,000	At mid-point of project implementation
Publication of Lessons Learnt and other project documents	PMU AGRA UNEP	25,000	64,000	89,000	Annually / part of Project Final Report
Financial audit	PMU AGRA National Executing Agencies External auditor(s)	30,000	0	30,000	Annually /Terminal
Terminal Evaluation	PMU AGRA UNEP National Executing Agencies External consultant(s) GEF	50,000	96,000	156,000	Within 6 months of end of project implementation
Total M&E Plan cost		457,800	1,092,000	1,549,800	

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

1. STAP believes the proposal could be strengthened further by addressing the points below during the proposal development	Response
<p>1. In the project framework, STAP suggests ensuring the indicators that are measurable. For example, the outcome indicators proposed for component 1 include agro-biodiversity and green water. Further details would be useful on how will these be quantified.</p>	<p>Done, all indicators specified in Results Framework are measurable as well as SMART (See Appendix 4)</p>
<p>2. During the PPG phase , STAP recommends defining further the proposed components. Currently, these appear to be only briefly described on page 8 and 9. Furthermore, STAP recommends strengthening the document by improving its clarity and accuracy of expression. This includes addressing the following details (1) Structure sequentially the description of land degradation followed by deforestation “ or vice versa. Currently, the text goes back and forth between these two issues, and clarity is lost. 2) On page 5, specify that "...per capita income of \$480 is "per annum"..." 3) On page 5, specify "...3 million farming families own less than 2 hectares of land "each"." 4) On page 5 (paragraph 3), please note that loss of agrobiodiversity is not a land degradation process. STAP suggests correcting this phrase. 5) Similarly, on page 5 (paragraph 3), please note that "mitigation of" climate change is an ecosystem service. Thus, please correct this sentence. 6) Paragraph 16 does not appear to link with the rest of the text in this section, or correspond with the section heading. Please strengthen the coherence between the different paragraphs in this section. 7) Please clarify whether the issues listed on page 12 are priority issues of the KAPSLAMP, or of this proposal. Please describe further their relevance to coordination.</p>	<p>The Components have been further defined and detailed descriptions can be found in section 3.3, pages 44-53 of the Project document. The project document has been strengthened and issues clarified with reference to the comments of STAP.</p>
<p>3. For component 1, STAP recommends adding a gender component to it. This may strengthen the ability to disaggregate by gender the capacity building, or learning, needs of men and women in the farmer-field schools. In this regard, the project developers may wish to consider disaggregating data by gender in</p>	<p>Gender dimensions have been added to Component 1 and appropriate indicators disaggregating gender deployed in the Results Framework to capture this element.</p>

<p>this component “ for example, what are the learning outcomes of men and women and how did their learning, capacity building, contribute to improved agricultural productivity/agro-biodiversity conservation. Doing so will strengthen the project's ability to target one of the defined primary beneficiaries “ female smallholder farmers. The project developers may wish to consider the following paper as they develop further component 1, including the gender aspects “ 1) Najjar, D. et al., "Learning about sustainability and gender through farmer field schools in the Taita Hills, Kenya". International Journal of Educational Development. 2012 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2012.064 2) Friis-Hansen, E. and Duveskog, D. "The empowerment route to well-being: an analysis of farmer field schools in East Africa". World Development. Vol.40, No.2 (2012): pp.414-427.</p>	
<p>4. Additionally in component 1, STAP recommends describing further the LADA tool to be applied for the participatory monitoring and evaluation system for sustainable land management, and sustainable forest management interventions. STAP believes monitoring and evaluating are important components, especially in estimating and tracking the intended global environmental objectives. As such, STAP would like to see greater detail describing the LADA tool and how it will assist in estimating and monitoring the global environmental benefits associated with component 1.</p>	<p>LADA tools and their use for participatory M&E have been described in detail in the project document (see Pg. 54 and Appendix 14 of the UNEP Prodoc). Additionally, guidelines in the use of the LADA tools will be developed during first year and used during implementation of project.</p> <p>In addition as carbon sequestration is also an important global benefit to be delivered by this project, it will be monitored using FAO EX-ANTE Carbon Benefit toll (see Appendix 14 of the Prodoc)</p>
<p>5. For component 2, STAP feels that the PES component is poorly described, and lacks understanding of the requirements for a successful PES scheme, and the hurdles that need to be overcome. It is unclear what incentive commercial water users would have for buying ES? STAP recommends consideration of its advisory document on "Payment for Ecosystem Services and the Global Environment Facility", 2011. The document identifies potential threats to PES effectiveness, which could be minimized by describing the design choices and specifying indicators. The document can be accessed at “ http://stapgef.org/biodiveristy-and-biosafety</p>	<p>PES component deleted completely.</p>
<p>6. The table in the incremental reasoning section is</p>	<p>Table has been strengthened and methodology and indicators for estimating and monitoring global</p>

<p>helpful in readily identifying the additional activities funded by the GEF, along with describing the global environmental benefits. STAP believes this section (and possibly the table) could be strengthened further by defining the methodologies and indicators that will be used to estimate and monitor the global environmental benefits. For example, STAP believes it would be valuable to detail how carbon, agro-biodiversity conservation and soil fertility will be estimated and their changes monitored (will the LADA tool be used for the latter?). Currently, this information appears to be missing in the proposal. For the table, STAP suggests defining specifically the global environmental benefits (e.g. carbon sequestration, improved land cover, agro-biodiversity conservation) along with their proposed impact indicators.</p>	<p>environment benefits described in details in relevant sections of the project document.</p>
<p>7. STAP would value further details on the World Bank's baseline project "Vi Agroforestry Agricultural Carbon Project". For instance, STAP would appreciate knowing further details about the carbon accounting, including how the small-farmer groups will measure carbon stocks and more generally “ how the process will be implemented. For estimating and monitoring carbon stocks, the project developers may wish to suggest using the Carbon Benefits Project methodology (UNEP/GEF).</p>	<p>Additional information is provided in section 2.7 para 116 on page 32</p>
<p>8. Additionally, STAP recommends for UNEP to contact FAO about its recently submitted proposal on "Development of SFM and support to REDD for dryland forests" (GEF ID 5083). The FAO's project will focus (in part) on assisting Kenya develop its national REDD+ strategy, including development of a national forest carbon accounting system, and participatory forest monitoring system to monitor forest carbon. Therefore, it would be desirable if the activities under the project #5272 (GEF ID) could be used to calibrate the methods being developed under #5083.</p>	<p>FAO was contacted during development of this project and the two projects will work closely together as recommended by STAP.</p>
<p>9. In the stakeholder section, STAP recommends detailing the actors' roles in relation to the components, and specifying their comparative advantage if applicable.</p>	<p>The role of the actors in the implementation of the different components based on their comparative advantage(s) has been specified. See Tables 5 and 11 on page 28 and 68 of project document</p>

2. GEF SEC Review at PIF Stage	
24. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	
<p>Please provide a full risk analysis.</p> <p>- Please, confirm the cofinancing.</p> <p>- Please try to improve the cofinancing from UNEP, as well as the involvement of technical staff.</p> <p>- Please provide metrics for hectares of agricultural lands under SLM, hectares of protected forests or under SFM.</p> <p>- Develop the monitoring and evaluation system, notably the evaluation of global environment benefits.</p> <p>- Include the Aichi targets and the indicators in the final project document.</p> <p>- Develop information related to the PES that is proposed in the result framework.</p> <p>- Develop the socio-economic benefits and include gender dimensions.</p> <p>- Provide the tracking tools.</p> <p>- Develop a rationale about the innovative aspects of the project.</p>	<p>Done, see table 9 on page 56 of Prodoc.</p> <p>Done (more co-finance raised than stated at PIF stage)</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done all throughout project document</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done, see Table 8 on page 44 of Prodoc</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Tracking tools provided (see Appendix 13a, 13b and 13c)</p> <p>Done</p>
<p>3. German Council Member Comments</p> <p>(i) Focus mainly on innovative aspects of Component 2 and reduce the focus of study on Component 1.</p> <p>(ii) Suggest exploring how PES scheme pilot should be designed.</p> <p>4. US Council Member Comments.</p>	<p>This is a very welcome suggestion that has been taken on board fully with seven outputs dedicated to this component linking small scale producers to markets.</p> <p>Given that there is limited knowledge on use of incentive-based mechanism especially that of PES, and the fact that focusing on component 2 would require quite a lot of effort than originally envisaged we have had to drop this aspect of the project. Keeping it would mean the project promising more than it could deliver. This also based on the sound advice of the reviewer which we fully agree with.</p>

<p>(i) More information and explanation on capacity of Farmer Field Schools to take on new training programmes and extension under this project (e.g. do they have a flexible curriculum and ability to propose new topics from the community level)?</p> <p>(ii) More information on development of ABS Framework for PES scheme and how framework is envisioned to contribute to a PES scheme.</p>	<p>There are already well established and functional FFS set up by FAO which this project will be using. They have flexible SLM programmes and can develop new topics if required and additional funding is provided</p> <p>With the project no longer focusing on PES work no additional information could be provided at this stage.</p>
--	--

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$80,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent Todate</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Environmental and socio-economic baseline studies	20,000	20,000	20,000
Stakeholder analysis	10,000	10,000	10,000
Piloting of SLM /Agro-biodiversity conservation	20,000	20,000	20,000
Assessment of governance and institutional arrangements for SLM	10,000	10,000	10,000
Development of Ful size project proposal	20,000	20,000	20,000
Total	80,000	80,000	80,000

⁵ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.