

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA16220

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 11-Feb-2016

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 21-Mar-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Kenya	Project ID:	P153349
Project Name:	National Agricultural and Rural Inclusive Growth Project (P153349)		
Task Team Leader(s):	Ladisy Komba Chengula, Christopher Finch		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	15-Feb-2016	Estimated Board Date:	28-Apr-2016
Managing Unit:	GFA07	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (60%), Sub-national government administration (20%), Agro-industry, marketing, and trade (10%), Public administration- Other social services (10%)		
Theme(s):	Rural services and infrastructure (40%), Social Inclusion (30%), Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise support (30%)		
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?			No
Financing (In USD Million)			
Total Project Cost:	219.00	Total Bank Financing:	200.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
BORROWER/RECIPIENT			19.00
International Development Association (IDA)			200.00
Total			219.00
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	No		

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The proposed development objective is to increase agricultural productivity and profitability of targeted rural communities in selected counties.

3. Project Description

Introduction

1. A key premise of NARIGP is the importance of linking rural smallholder farmers' CIGs and VMGs organized along selected priority VCs to markets. Thus the technical Components 1-3 of NARIGP are interlinked. Component 1 entails: (i) mobilizing smallholder farmers into CIGs and VMGs; (ii) building their capacities to plan, implement, manage, and monitor community-level micro-projects along their priority VCs; and (iii) providing primary production TIMPs (e.g., inputs, animal husbandry, and agronomic practices) and advisory services to improve productivity. Component 2 focuses on: (i) federating CIGs and VMGs capacitated under Component 1 to join existing POs (or form new ones in cases where none exist) along priority VCs; (ii) providing technical (value addition), business (planning and management), financial (access to credit/finance), and organizational (leadership and governance) advisory services; and (iii) linking them to markets and value addition opportunities. Component 3 provides: (i) technical advisory services (e.g., public extension services) facilitated by counties; (ii) an enabling environment for the private sector and public-private partnerships (PPPs) to operate; and (iii) multi-community (e.g., catchment or landscape-wide and larger rural infrastructure) investments based on priorities identified under Components 1 and 2. Component 4 supports national and county-level project coordination and management activities, including establishment of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and management information (MIS) systems, an ICT-based Agricultural Information Platform, and fiduciary (financial management and procurement), human resources, communication and citizen engagement, and environmental and social safeguards compliance. In addition, a contingency emergency response facility was built under this component to respond to a natural disaster affecting the sector.

Project Beneficiaries

2. The primary beneficiaries of the project will be targeted rural smallholder farmers, including VMGs and other stakeholders, organized in CIGs, of which 70 percent are expected to federate into POs along VCs, and selected county governments. It is envisaged that NARIGP will be implemented in 21 selected counties with a total of 140 sub-counties. Each sub-county will have at least three (maximum of five) participating wards. Within these sub-counties, the project will cover about 420 out of the existing 696 wards, which is equivalent to 60 percent coverage. It is estimated that each CIG/VMG will have up to 30 registered farmers who pay membership and annual fees, as detailed in the Project Implementation Manual (PIM).

3. Under Component 1, the project will support CIGs/VMGs through four investment windows: micro-projects on sustainable land management (SLMW) and VCs (60 percent); VMGs (10 percent); livelihood (25 percent); and nutrition (5 percent). The CIGs/VMGs on SLM/VC and VMG are expected to federate into POs, which will receive further support from the project under Component 2. Each PO will have up to 100 registered CIGs/VMGs, which pay membership and annual fees (as detailed in the PIM), trained on SLM/VC and covering at least two wards. Thus on average, there will be four POs (400 CIGs/VMGs) per county. Adding the CIGs/VMGs on livelihood and nutrition (a total of 30 percent) translates to an average of 571 CIGs/VMGs with 17,143 direct beneficiaries per county or a total of 360,000 in the targeted project area.

Project Components

Component 1: Supporting Community-Driven Development (US\$80 million of which IDA US\$75

million)

4. The overall objective of this component is to strengthen: (i) community-level institutions' ability to identify and implement investments that improve their agricultural productivity, food security, and nutritional status; and (ii) linkages to selected VCs and POs.

Subcomponent 1.1: Strengthening Community-Level Institutions (IDA US\$12 million)

5. The project will finance activities aimed at building the capacity of community-level institutions, such as Community-Driven Development Committees (CDDCs), CIGs, and VMGs, to plan, implement, manage, and monitor agricultural and rural livelihood development interventions. Specifically, the project will finance costs related to: (i) facilitation of community institutions, including community mobilization and awareness creation of the PICD process, through which priority interventions will be identified; (ii) development of and training on standardized training modules for PICD, VC development, fiduciary management (i.e., community financial and procurement management, and social audits), and environmental and social safeguards monitoring (i.e., use of checklists in micro-project identification and implementation); (iii) payments to competitively selected advisory service provider (SP) consortia (i.e., to provide technical and extension advisory services, micro-project planning and implementation support, and local value addition, and to link CIGs/VMGs to POs; and (iv) facilitation of County Technical Departments (CTDs) to provide oversight and quality assurance at the sectoral level.

Subcomponent 1.2: Supporting Community Investments (US\$68 million of which IDA US\$63 million)

6. This subcomponent will finance physical investments in the form of community micro-projects identified in the PICD process that increase agricultural productivity, include a strong nutrition focus, improve livelihoods, and reduce vulnerability. Micro-project investments will fall under four windows: (i) SLM interventions and VCs' development; (ii) market-oriented alternative livelihood interventions; (iii) targeted support to VMGs; and (iv) nutrition mainstreaming through three pathways: consumption (e.g., nutrient-dense crops and livestock products), income (e.g., home-based value addition, storage, and preservation), and women's empowerment (e.g., on- and off-farm activities, labor-saving technologies, and savings and credit schemes). Priority will be placed on micro-projects that have: (a) the potential to increase agricultural productivity and incomes, value addition, and links to markets via POs, and for livelihoods to SACCOs; and (b) sustain natural resources base and returns to targeted communities, rather than simply providing inputs.

Component 2: Strengthening Producer Organizations and Value Chain Development (US\$50 million of which IDA US\$45 million)

7. The objective of this component is to build POs' capacity to support member CIGs and VMGs to develop selected priority VCs in targeted rural communities. Under Component 2, CIGs and VMGs formed under Component 1 and facilitated to federate into POs will be strengthened to become viable and profitable, and attractive not only to existing and additional members, but also to business partners in input, output, and service markets. POs will integrate member CIGs and VMGs into input and service markets to: (i) further improve production; and (ii) take advantage of market opportunities available along the selected VCs determined to be of high priority in the development of the respective counties. Targeted investments will also be made towards value addition and improved harvest and post-harvest management of produce to reduce the high post-production losses,

which range from 30-50 percent depending on the VC. Targeted POs will comprise inter-community cooperatives, farmers' associations, or other forms of market-oriented farmers' organizations (including companies), primarily formed by federated CIGs and VMGs supported under Component 1. Each CIG and VMG joining a PO will pay members hip and annual fees, as detailed in PIM.

Subcomponent 2.1: Capacity Building of Producer Organizations (IDA US\$7 million)

8. The objective of this subcomponent is to build the capacity of business-oriented POs formed by federated CIGs and VMGs organized under Component 1 so that they become profitable. Through their POs, CIG and VMG members can: have a stronger say in the VCs in which they participate; access improved farm inputs, technologies, and agricultural services (including rural finance and extension); and negotiate prices in input and output markets. Project support to POs will be structured around two pillars: (a) organization and capacity building; and (b) financing for enterprise development tailored to the needs of POs and their subscribing member CIGs and VMGs. At the start of the project, each selected PO will be supported to prepare a five-year Enterprise Development Plan (EDP) that will be the main instrument for guiding project investments at the PO level.

Subcomponent 2.2: Value Chain Development (US\$43 million of which IDA US\$38 million)

9. The objective of this subcomponent is to upgrade competitive VCs for integration and economic empowerment of targeted smallholder farmers (organized into CIGs and VMGs) through their respective POs. Project support will be used to finance activities related to: (i) selection, mapping, and organization of competitive nutrition-sensitive VCs for smallholder development; and (ii) VC upgrading through a matching grants mechanism targeted at addressing key investment gaps, including: strengthening of input supply systems (e.g., foundation seed by research institutions, commercial seed production by the private sector, and community-based seed multiplication); development of farm mechanization technologies for CSA practices; value addition and processing; and post-harvest management technologies and facilities (e.g., drying, storage, and warehousing receipt system).

Component 3: Supporting County Community-Led Development (US\$72 million of which IDA US \$65 million)

10. The objective of this component is to strengthen the capacity of county governments to support community-led development initiatives identified under Components 1 and 2. This includes: provision of technical advisory services (e.g., public extension services); supervision of SPs; creation of an enabling environment for the private sector and PPPs to operate; and financing of inter-community (e.g., catchment or landscape-wide and larger rural infrastructure) investments based on priorities, as well as employment programs related to O&M of these investments. This component will also enable county governments to establish mechanisms for effective citizen engagement through consultations, sensitizations, capacity building, and partnerships.

Subcomponent 3.1: Capacity Building of Counties (IDA US\$10 million)

11. This subcomponent will finance the capacity building of participating counties in the area of community-led development of agricultural and alternative livelihoods. The objective is to enable them to support activities under Components 1 and 2. The project will ensure that activities under this subcomponent are coordinated and harmonized with those financed by the National Capacity

Building Framework (NCBF). In particular, this subcomponent will finance activities related to: (a) stakeholder engagement through sensitization and awareness creation to become familiar with project objectives and “philosophy”; (b) county-level Capacity Needs Assessments (CNAs) and Capacity-Building Plans (CBPs); (c) training and capacity building, including the development of relevant standard training manuals and Information, Education and Communication (IEC) materials; technical assistance (TA); and logistical support and facilitation of County Technical Departments (CTDs) staff.

Subcomponent 3.2: County Investment and Employment Programs (US\$60 million of which IDA US\$55 million)

12. This subcomponent will finance investments in key agricultural and rural development infrastructure that span across multiple targeted communities, as well as landscape-wide environmental and natural resource management (NRM) investments. It will also finance short-term employment during off-season, particularly for VMGs and unemployed/out-of-school youth. Employment opportunities will largely be created under public works using a cash-for-work approach managed by county governments. Typical investments would include: construction of rural roads, small multipurpose dams, earth pans, small-scale community-managed irrigation systems, and market and storage facilities (under PPP arrangements); restoration of degraded catchments and water courses; and rehabilitation of similar existing infrastructure. Co-financing and the presence of a satisfactory O&M plan, including arrangements for cost recovery or sharing (e.g., through collection of user fees/charges and membership dues), will be prerequisites for counties to access project funds. Component 4: Project Coordination and Management (US\$17 million of which IDA US\$15 million)

13. This component will finance activities related to national and county-level project coordination, including planning, fiduciary (financial management and procurement) and human resources (HR) management, safeguards compliance and monitoring, development of the MIS and ICT, regular M&E, impact evaluation, and communication and citizen engagement. In addition, in the event of a national disaster affecting the agriculture sector, the project through this component would respond via a built-in contingency emergency response facility.

Subcomponent 4.1: Project Coordination (US\$12 million of which IDA US\$10 million)

14. This subcomponent will finance the costs of national and county-level project coordination units (NPCU and CPCUs), including salaries of the contract staff, and O&M costs, such as office space rental, fuel and spare parts of vehicles, office equipment, audits, furniture, and tools, among others. It will also finance the costs of project supervision and oversight provided by the National Project Steering Committee (NPSC) and CPSCs, and any other project administration costs.

Subcomponent 4.2: Monitoring & Evaluation and ICT (IDA US\$5 million)

15. This subcomponent will finance activities related to routine M&E functions (e.g., data collection, analysis, and reporting) and development of an ICT-based Agricultural Information Platform for sharing information (e.g., technical or extension and business advisory services, market data, agro-weather, and others); it will also facilitate networking across all components. It will finance baseline, mid-point, and end-of-project impact evaluations. The Platform is intended to provide the project and other stakeholders with the ability to: (i) capture real-time geo-referenced data from ongoing project activities using mobile phones connected to network servers; and (ii) geospatially aggregate uploaded data and information received from community, county, and

national levels, including agricultural statistics.

Subcomponent 4.3: Contingency Emergency Response (IDA US\$0 million)

16. This zero budget subcomponent will finance natural disasters risk management (DRM) activities in the agriculture sector. The contingency emergency response financing would be triggered: (a) through a formal declaration of a national emergency by the authorized agency of GoK; and (b) upon a formal request from the National Treasury (NT) on behalf of GoK. In such cases, funds from the unallocated expenditure category or from project components would be reallocated to finance emergency response expenditures to meet agricultural crises and emergency needs.

4. Project location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

The project will cover areas with high agriculture potential. The specific project area would be determined during the project implementation. The initial scoping of the proposed project interventions suggests that the potential environmental and social impacts will be minimal to moderate, largely reversible and site-specific due to the nature of proposed activities. Minimal adverse social risks are anticipated under this project and no resettlement is expected under any component of this project.

Based on the initial screening of the proposed project investments in rural infrastructure (e.g. irrigation, local markets, water conservation structures, etc.) and agriculture value chains (e.g. storage facilities, local level value addition, limited use of agro-chemicals, etc.) the project is likely to trigger four Bank's environmental and social safeguard policies: (i) Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01); (ii) Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04); (iii) Pest Management (OP 4.09); (iv) Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10); and (v) Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12). The triggering of policies on Natural Habitats (OP/BP 4.04) and Forests (OP/BP 4.36) will be confirmed after the preparation of the environmental and social safeguard instruments is complete.

Given the nature of the proposed interventions with specific micro-project designs and locations not known at the time of project preparation, the project will take a framework approach to managing safeguards. There are three framework reports that will need to be developed by GoK:

- a) Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF);
- b) Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF); and
- c) Vulnerable and Marginalized Group Framework (VGMF).

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Gibwa A. Kajubi (GSU07)

Svetlana Khvostova (GEN01)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	Proposed project investments in rural infrastructure (e.g. local markets, water conservation structures, etc.) and agriculture value chains (e.g. storage facilities, local level value addition, limited use of agro-chemicals, etc.), are likely to have negative environmental and social impacts, which however are expected to be small-scale, site-

		<p>specific and largely reversible. The area of project investments and the design of micro-projects will not be known during project preparation, since the project has adopted a Community Driven Development approach. The GoK has prepared an ESMF which takes into account the natural environment (air, water, and land); human health and safety, and social aspects (involuntary resettlement, vulnerable and marginalized groups, and physical cultural resources). The ESMF describes the process of environmental and social assessment, which will help the implementing agencies at the national, county and local levels to identify, assess and avoid or mitigate the potential negative impacts of the proposed interventions. The ESMF defines uniform screening mechanisms and monitoring procedures for identification and management of potential adverse environmental and social impacts. The ESMF also includes a capacity building and training program to assist the project in mainstreaming the safeguards implementation, based on the lessons learned from Western Kenya Community Driven Development and Flood Mitigation Project (WKCDD/FMP) and Kenya Agriculture Productivity Project (KAPAP) implementation. The ESMF report also provide a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) with guidance on the reception, recording, handling, and reporting of complaints that may be encountered during project implementation. During project implementation and based on the environmental and social screening process provided in the ESMF, Environmental and Social Impact Assessments/Environmental Social Management Plans (ESIAs/ESMPs) shall be developed and relevant environmental assessments undertaken where necessary. Monitoring and reporting formats have been provided in the ESMF and shall be customized to the respective micro-projects. The ESMF has gone through public consultations during their preparation and will be disclosed locally and in the Bank Info Shop prior to project appraisal.</p>
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	<p>A specific focus of the project will be rehabilitation of degraded areas to improve rural livelihoods. Some project activities for improving catchment management may directly or indirectly result in the conversion or degradation of natural habitats, such as wetlands and streams. The ESMF provides for screening and measures to mitigate adverse impact of any activities in the project intervention areas.</p>
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	<p>Although there may be a need for replacement of trees</p>

		that may be removed along existing Rights of Way, micro-projects will be screened to ensure that they do not traverse natural forests. Some project activities, such as small irrigation infrastructure, may indirectly affect forested areas. The ESMF provides for screening and management measures to mitigate adverse impact of any activities in the project intervention areas.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	The project activities may indirectly incentivize the pesticide and other agro-chemicals use. Overall, the project is neither expected to have significant pest management issues, nor finance substantial quantities of pesticides. However, to guide the project in procurement, management and disposal of these chemicals, the ESMF includes a chapter on the chemical management and use, guide their safe handling, storage and disposal, and include training and capacity building activities for farmers.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The micro-projects are not expected to traverse areas of cultural or historical importance. In addition, due to the community-driven nature of the project activities, the civil works are expected to be small scale and localized. However, ESMF includes a procedure for handling “chance finds”. Chance find procedures will be included in contracts and ESMPs.
Indigenous Peoples OP/ BP 4.10	Yes	The OP. 4.10 is being triggered for Components 1, 2 and 3. Some of the identified counties (Transnzoia, Kwale, Kilifi, Baringo, and Nakuru, among others) have known populations of groups that meet the criteria of OP 4.10. Since the location of the micro-projects is as yet unknown, a Vulnerable and Marginalized Framework (VMGF) is being prepared to guide the preparation of plans to mitigate any negative effects and to enhance benefits of the NARIGP micro-projects. The VMGF, which will be disclosed before project appraisal outlines the processes and principles of: (a) screening to determine if a proposed sub-project investment will be undertaken in the vicinity of vulnerable and marginalized communities; and (b) the preparation of a VMGP, including the social assessment process, consultation and stakeholder engagement, disclosure procedures, communication and grievances redress mechanism. A detailed VMGP will be prepared for each micro-project once the location is identified and screening conducted has determined that VMGs are present in the area.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	Although no physical resettlement is envisaged, OP4.12 is triggered given that some proposed project interventions

		<p>are likely to require limited land acquisition especially with regard to the county levels value addition interventions, which will have to be compensated. The micro-project sites for Components 1, 2 and 3 cannot be identified in advance, therefore a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) has been prepared to cover aspects of potential land loss, loss of livelihood, and displacement of land use. The RPF provides guidance during implementation (and prior to any civil works) for determining the necessity of Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) for micro-projects and the procedures for their preparation, including consultations with potentially affected individuals and households in the project areas. Based on the RPF guidance, each micro-project will be screened, and if RAPs are found to be necessary, they will be prepared, cleared, disclosed and implemented prior to the commencement of any civil works, in accordance with World Bank OP 4.12. The MoDP has experience in the preparation and implementation of the social safeguards, including under the WKCD/FMP. However, since the projects will be implemented at County and Community levels provision has been made for training and capacity building of the NEMA and County officers designated with the implementation of the environmental and social policies and instruments.</p> <p>The RPF will undergo a set of public consultations and will be disclosed in Kenya and in the InfoShop before the project appraisal.</p>
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project investments do not include dams or irrigation structures that would require application of the policy.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</p>
<p>The NARIGP is assigned EA category B, based on the screening during project preparation. There are no significant and/or irreversible adverse environmental and social issues anticipated from the investments to be financed under the Project. Civil works (small scale irrigation infrastructure, community level value addition processing plants) may lead to relatively minor air and water pollution during the construction phases and, once the works are completed, limited loss of non-critical animal and plant habitats.</p>

The envisaged environmental risks at project implementation include: (i) new production technologies, which may involve intensified use of fertilizers and pesticide may increase social acidity and water pollution; (ii) skills on safe use of agro-chemicals and fertilizers is also limited among smallholder farmers; and (iii) technical capacity to handle implementation and monitoring of the projects' safeguards instruments is limited and especially at County level.

The project impacts were assessed through a screening process and appropriate mitigation measures were proposed in the ESMF prepared by MoDP. The ESMF also contains an environmental and social screening process, including impacts related to natural habitats, pest management and physical cultural resources, as well as mitigation guidelines at the micro-project level.

Social risks envisioned in the implementation process include: (i) possibility of elite capture at the community and county levels, thus excluding target groups; (ii) political capture as the project is being launched in the lead up to the national elections in 2017; (iii) leakages of inputs and resources as funds are to be channeled to community groups. These risks will be mitigated through the following: (a) sequencing of project so that in first year focuses on building capacity of farmer organizations at community levels; (b) lobbying and advocacy skills to understand and influence the country integrated development plans use of PICD approach; and (c) applying social accountability tools at community and county levels for transparency.

A key principle of the project is inclusion and therefore the VMGF will focus on how to ensure that VMG are aware of the project and can participate. The project is therefore triggering the OP 4.10 Indigenous Peoples, which will require the preparation of a VMGF. The VMGF will include: (i) screening to determine presence of VMGs (Indigenous Peoples per OP 4.10 criteria) in the project areas and, if present, (ii) measures to ensure they benefit from the project activities through the preparation of a VMGP.

Other risks at the county level include weak capacity to implement and monitor safeguards at the county level as this is a recently devolved function. A training component is included into the project design targeting counties to address this, as well as training for communities and provision for the ESMF, RPF and VMGF to guide development of plans and legal requirements for national gender policy. Socio-cultural issues in some target communities hinder resource allocation/sharing, resource access and use, and equity issues in project implementation, particularly the inclusion of women and youth in the decision-making structures and access to project benefits. For example in some communities a woman can not own a cow. The project will require gender analysis as part of the PICD process and development of the action plan. The functions of managing land acquisition have been devolved to the County land boards, resulting in relays in some counties related to land transactions. In addition, compensation for community land and/or donations of community land for investments may also be challenging. The project has prepared an RPF, which lays out the principles for compensation. As noted, the bulk of the investments are CDD-type, small in size and their impacts are not likely to result in physical resettlement or land acquisition. The investments for value addition will also be sited in a way as to avoid resettlement.

2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:

Farmer organizations, communities and County governments will have strengthened their ability to manage their resources in a sustainable manner; will be able to lobby and influence their

development priorities in the CIDPs and in their own CIGs.
3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.
N/A
4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.
The project builds on lessons-learned and strengths of various existing and on-going operations of the GoK and development partners, including the Bank, especially, the WKCDD/FMP and KAPAP that are both expected to be completed by March 2016. Good practices will also be drawn from the Accelerating Rural Women's Access to Agricultural Markets (GROOTS-Kenya) project being implemented in Nakuru and Kitui Counties. Overall, project coordination and monitoring would be conducted at the national level at the MoDP and Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries. However, micro-project level implementation is envisioned to be handled at the County and community level given the CDD focus of the project. While at the national level there is sufficient experience and expertise of handling safeguards related aspects, local level entities are not likely to have such capacity. The county level implementation agencies will be strengthened to provide quality services to the community institutions. As the counties were formed relatively recently, there is still a considerable variation in capacity and resources among the counties (including capacity to manage safeguards), which will take a concerted effort to address. The project has made provision for capacity building and training in the safeguards for County and project staff. The project will work closely with the Devolution Trust Fund and proposed devolution Program-for-Results to ensure capacity building at national and County level agencies and staff tasked with monitoring of environment and social safeguards.
5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.
The NAGRIP is a national project targeting rural small and marginal farmers, including women and VMGs and others stakeholders, organized in common interest groups (CIGs).

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	18-Dec-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	11-Feb-2016
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	11-Dec-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	11-Feb-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	

Date of receipt by the Bank	18-Dec-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	11-Feb-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
Kenya	11-Feb-2016
<i>Comments:</i>	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	NA
Date of receipt by the Bank	18-Dec-2015
Date of submission to InfoShop	11-Feb-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/ Audit/or EMP.	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment	
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP 4.09 - Pest Management	
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples	
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [] No [] NA []
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	Yes [] No [] NA []
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement	
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes [×] No [] NA []
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [×] No [] NA []
Is physical displacement/relocation expected? Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [] No [×] TBD []
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods) Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [] No [×] TBD []
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [] No [×] NA []
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes [] No [×] NA []
All Safeguard Policies	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [×] No [] NA []
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [×] No [] NA []
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [×] No [] NA []
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [×] No [] NA []

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Ladisy Komba Chengula, Christopher Finch	
Approved By		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Johanna van Tilburg (SA)	Date: 21-Mar-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Dina Umali-Deiningner (PMGR)	Date: 21-Mar-2016