COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)
APPRAISAL STAGE

Report No.: PIDISDSA19768

Date Prepared/Updated: 22-Nov-2016

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country:	Kenya	**Project ID:**	P154784
		Parent Project ID (if any):	
Project Name:	Kenya Climate Smart Agriculture Project (P154784)		
Region:	AFRICA		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	17-Oct-2016	**Estimated Board Date:**	31-Jan-2017
Practice Area (Lead):	Agriculture	**Lending Instrument:**	Investment Project Financing
Borrower(s):	The National Treasury		
Implementing Agency:	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries		

Financing (in USD Million)

Financing Source	Amount
BORROWER/RECIPIENT	29.70
International Development Association (IDA)	250.00
Total Project Cost	279.70

Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment
Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate
Other Decision:	
Is this a Repeater project?	No

B. Introduction and Context

Country Context

1. Kenya➢(s economy is larger and growing faster than previously estimated. Rebasing of

its Gross Domestic Product (GDP) reveals that Kenya➢(s economy is the eighth largest in Africa and fifth largest in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) - after Nigeria, South Africa, Angola, and Sudan. Kenya➢(s growth compares favorably with other countries. According to the World Bank classification, Kenya is a lower-middle-income country, with Gross National Income (GNI) per capita of US$1,340 in 2015.

2. Kenya is performing better than its regional peers or other lower-middle-income countries in economic growth performance. Average growth between 2010 and 2015 was 5.3 percent➢(higher than the 4.9 percent average for SSA. Kenya➢(s 2015 growth rate of 5.6 percent was above the 5.5 percent average growth rate for lower-middle income countries. In December 2015, Kenya➢(s GDP was estimated at US$63.4 billion (up from US$61.4 billion in 2014), with GDP per capita standing at US$1,377 (up from US$1,368 in 2014). The economy is expected to grow by 5.9 percent in 2016 on the backdrop of significant improvement in external and internal balances, such as falling oil prices; and public investment, mainly in infrastructure (energy and the standard gauge railway). The World Bank projects that Kenya➢(s GDP will grow at 6.0 percent in 2017, and 6.1 percent in 2018.

3. Although poverty rates in Kenya seem to have fallen, formidable challenges at reducing poverty and increasing shared prosperity remain, in particular in rural areas. Poverty reduction has been driven by solid growth across most sectors of the economy, together with some improvement in social safety nets targeting the poor. It has also been driven by continuing migration to urban areas ➢(especially metropolitan Nairobi ➢(that offer better job prospects (albeit largely in the informal sector), as well as easier access to health and education services. Kenya➢(s poverty rate has been falling from 47 percent in 2005/06 to about 39 percent based on best estimates in 2012/13. But improvements in income are not evenly shared amongst people and inequality appears to be rising among regions.

4. Poverty levels are highest in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs). In the remote, arid, sparsely populated north and northeastern parts of the country (Turkana, Mandera, and Wajir), poverty rates are above 80 percent. In ASALs, agro-climatic shocks impact vulnerable livelihoods that depend on livestock and low-productivity agricultural activities; and people➢(s assets, including their educational opportunities and attainments, are very limited. The populations in the western and coastal parts of the country benefit from better natural resource endowments, but the poor remain especially prone to contracting insect- and water-borne diseases, and agricultural potential is limited by the effects of flood-induced land degradation in certain rural areas.

5. The scale of consumption poverty in Kenya is staggering, and is concentrated in rural areas. Based on the last national household budget survey, close to half of the population (nearly 17 million Kenyans) was poor in 2005. The vast majority of the poor lived in rural areas and were more likely to depend on income and consumption from crops and livestock as their main source of livelihood. Poor agriculture performance has certainly been an obstacle to poverty reduction even though the economy has been growing. Agricultural sector growth is projected to slow down to about 3.5 percent in the medium term, which after netting out population growth of 2.7 percent, it is expected to result in only a relatively moderate reduction of the rural poverty rate over the same period. To successfully tackle poverty, the difficulties of low-income rural communities must be addressed, as well as the distinct problems of urban poverty.

6. In August 2010, Kenya adopted a new Constitution framed to provide a more equitable, prosperous, and inclusive future for its citizens. The Constitution is designed to address disparities and historical patterns of marginalization by creating a two-tiered system of national and county government. Under this system, the national government is devolving responsibility for multiple functions to 47 elected county governments, and it is providing a minimum of 15 percent of national revenues to counties to carry them out. The agricultural sector is now fully devolved. County governments now play the primary on-the-ground role in delivering agricultural services (crop and animal husbandry services, extension, agricultural marketing and other related services) previously managed by the national government, which retains a policy-making, regulatory and research role. So far, the results of devolution have been mixed: some counties deliver their mandated services, while others struggle.

Sectoral and institutional Context

7. Agriculture is a major driver of the Kenyan economy and the dominant source of employment for roughly half of the Kenyan people. In 2013, the sector contributed almost 27 percent to the national gross domestic product (GDP). The crops, livestock, and fisheries subsectors contribute approximately 78 percent, 20 percent, and 2 percent to agricultural GDP, respectively (GoK 2013). Agriculture generates most of Kenya➢(s food requirements, nearly two-thirds (65 percent) of merchandise exports, and roughly 60 percent of foreign exchange earnings. But with almost 91 percent of its agricultural exports in raw or semi-processed form, the country foregoes significant income by not adding value to its produce. The agricultural sector employs over four-fifths of Kenya➢(s rural work force and accounts for more than one-fifth of formal employment. It therefore plays a key role in poverty reduction.

8. In Kenya, about 83 percent of land area is in the ASALs, which are mainly pastoral areas; only 17 percent of the land (where 80 percent of the population lives) is classified as having medium to high agricultural potential. Kenya➢(s farms are small and for the most part are getting smaller, which is a major concern. Small farms face an uncertain and potentially untenable future, involving major dislocations, the steady migration of young people to urban areas, and increasingly frequent and severe poverty-related food crises. About 87 percent of farms operate less than 2 hectares; 67 percent operate less than 1 hectare. But the 20 percent of farmers with the smallest holdings generate 57 percent of their income from farming activities. Thus agricultural intensification and diversification are necessary for sustaining growth. Agriculture is also an increasingly female domain, as greater numbers of women are managing farms on their own; and the sector is needed to provide livelihoods for a burgeoning youth population.

9. Livestock production plays an important socioeconomic role in many areas across Kenya. In the ASALs, it accounts for as much as nine-tenths of employment and family income. But extensive livestock systems and pastoralist households in Kenya➢(s northern rangelands are particularly vulnerable to the effects of drought. Estimated losses to livestock populations from droughts that have occurred within the most recent decade amount to more than US$1.08 billion. Ancillary losses related to production assets and future income, and the costs of ex-post response measures are likely several times that figure. The increased incidence of droughts across the ASALs in recent years means that affected communities have less time to recover and rebuild their assets. This limited recovery has weakened households➢(traditional coping mechanisms and handicapped their resilience to future shocks.

10. Gender gap in the agricultural sector creates social exclusion, particularly among women

and youth. Kenyan women are the major force in agriculture and provide over 70 percent of the labor force ►(yet they hold less than 5 percent of agricultural land titles. Research suggests that weaker land rights reduce incentives to invest in land and may contribute to lower productivity. In terms of non-agricultural employment, only 29 percent of those earning a formal wage are women, and young females are twice as likely to be unemployed as adult females. Women are also disadvantaged in their access to agricultural inputs. The consequences of these gender disparities are increased vulnerability and lack of stable income.

11. More than 40 percent of Kenyans lack sufficient food on a daily basis. At the same time, more than 60 percent of households are net buyers of maize (the national staple). At any given time, at least 10 million Kenyans are estimated to suffer from chronic food insecurity and poor nutrition. When natural disaster such as drought strikes, the number of people in need of food aid almost doubles. Children in rural areas and from poorer households are more likely to be malnourished. Thirty-five percent of children under five will have permanent physical and mental limitations because of stunting.

12. Overall, the performance of Kenyan agriculture has been highly volatile, with growth rates dipping into negative territory in nine years between 1980 and 2012. The agricultural growth rate averaged 3.4 percent between 1995 and 2003 and decreased to an average of 2.1 percent during 2003-11. After decades of lackluster performance, agriculture began to revive in 2005. Annual growth rates for agriculture between 2005 and 2012 averaged 4.27 percent. The greatest production growth over this period was seen in fresh fruits and vegetables and, to a lesser extent, maize and dairy. Most other commodities, including tea, coffee, livestock, sugar, and oilseeds, experienced sluggish growth, yet they hold much potential. But recent years have witnessed increased volatility in agricultural growth rates, with debilitating impacts on rural ho usehold incomes and employment, urban and rural food security, poverty reduction, and the country►(s overall economic growth. Growth in real gross value-added in agriculture decelerated in 2013 to 2.9 percent from a revised growth of 4.2 percent in 2012. The lowest agricultural GDP growth rate and value-added agricultural GDP were noted in 2008, when Kenya experienced post-election violence following the country►(s 2007 general elections.

13. Extreme weather events, largely droughts and to a lesser extent floods, have been the principal source of volatility in the performance of agriculture in Kenya. The frequency and intensity of severe weather events has increased, and this trend will be further amplified in the future as temperatures rise due to climate change. Drought is a near-constant presence in Kenya, arriving with varying levels of severity. From 1981 to 2011, Kenya suffered from drought once every three years on average. Over the same period, widespread drought occurred in 13 of the 31 years, with three years (1983, 1984, and 2005) of extreme drought. Frequent drought resulted in precipitous crop losses, livestock deaths, spikes in food prices, and increased food insecurity and undernutrition for the poor; led to rural population displacement (temporary migration); and adversely affected rural incomes, employment, and livelihoods. Drought also impacted the government's fiscal balance (as resources were diverted for food relief and poverty reduction) and affected overall growth in agricultural and national GDP.

14. Climate change is increasing production risks, with serious implications for agriculture, the natural resource base, food security, livelihoods, and the stability of the wider economy. Kenya is highly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. The Center for Global Development ranks Kenya 13th out of 233 countries for ►(direct risks►(arising from ►(extreme

weather➢(and 71st of 233 for ➢(overall vulnerability➢(to climate change (after adjusting for coping ability). Climate projections for Kenya indicate that rising temperatures will significantly affect the availability of water and the quality of soils, worsening the effects of more frequent and severe drought. Changes in rainfall patterns and temperatures can alter the growing season and the spectrum of agricultural activities that can be sustained.

15. Kenya➢(s average annual temperatures increased by 1Â°C between 1960 and 2003, and by 1.5Â°C in the country➢(s drier regions. Climate change will exacerbate the vulnerability of Kenya➢(s agricultural sector as projections show increases in mean annual temperature of 1Â°C to 1.5Â°C by 2030. While precipitation is projected to increase between 0.2 and 0.4 percent per year in Kenya, the magnitude of change will vary considerably across regions, and warming-induced increases in evaporation rates are likely to offset the benefits of precipitation increases in some regions. Changes in rainfall distribution and more frequent extreme events such as prolonged drought and floods are predicted to result in more water shortages, especially in ASAL regions. Agriculture in Kenya is largely (98 percent) rain fed and thus extremely vulnerable to increasing temperatures and droughts. Climate change is projected to reduce agricultural yields and livestock productivity, worsening the effect of climate shocks on the food system. Estimates of crop yield and livestock losses vary greatly, but most global climate models project severe and adverse consequences, especially for the most food-insecure regions. In Kenya, studies show that by 2030, under a business as usual scenario, climate change will most likely reduce yields of staple crops (by 12 percent in maize, 23 percent in rice, and 13 percent in wheat). Crop land suitability is also expected to change, especially for wheat and maize production. Depending on the region and types of production systems, water scarcity will result in less productive pastures, lower dairy yields, and higher risk of the spread of crop and livestock diseases.

16. Meeting this challenge will require investments in building resilience to near-term shocks and in adapting to long-term climate change. In this context, climate smart agriculture (CSA) offers an appropriate strategic framework for responding to and reducing the adverse effects of climate change. FAO defines CSA ➢(as an approach that helps to guide actions needed to transform and reorient agricultural systems to effectively support development and ensure food security in a changing climate. CSA aims to achieve three outcomes (triple-wins): (i) sustainably increasing agricultural productivity and incomes; (ii) adapting and building resilience to climate change; and (iii) reducing and/or removing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, where possible.➢(

17. Agriculture is also the largest source of GHG emissions in Kenya, contributing about 58.6 percent to total emissions. Contributions of other sectors to national GHG emissions are: energy (25.3 percent), industry (3.2 percent) and waste management (1.2 percent). The agricultural sector is also a key driver of deforestation and land degradation. Agricultural emissions are likely to increase from 20 MtCO2e in 2010 to 27 MtCO2e in 2030, largely driven by livestock methane emissions, which account for 96.2 percent of agricultural emissions.

18. Agriculture, therefore, needs to reduce its GHG emissions and become part of the solution to tackle climate change. The sector plays an important role in sequestering carbon in soil and trees on farms. It has the biophysical potential to offset and sequester about 20 percent of total annual emissions through improved soil management techniques. Soils also have significant potential to absorb a larger amount of carbon from the atmosphere than they currently do. Restoring this carbon to the soil will not only sequester carbon from the atmosphere, but also

boost productivity of crops and pasture, increase water retention (leading to greater resilience when droughts occur), bring land back into production (thereby reducing pressure on biodiversity and forests), and boost incomes (thereby benefiting the rural poor). Kenya➢(s livestock GHG emission intensities (i.e., amount of GHGs emitted per unit of product) are amongst the highest in the world. This is mainly due to low livestock productivity. Rising demand for livestock products threaten to gravely amplify current GHG emissions level. Increasing livestock productivity (e.g., through improved forages and providing adequate year-round feed resources) would not only increase incomes and protect pastoralist➢(s asset base, but also reduce GHG emissions per unit of product.

19. Kenya has a wide spectrum of CSA policies, strategies and plans that would help achieve the triple-wins. The National Climate Change Response Strategy (NCCRS, 2010) provides a framework for integrating climate change into development priorities. The National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP, 2012) operationalizes the NCCRS, and emphasizes a low-carbon, climate-resilient development pathway for the economy that is critical for achieving SDG 13 of combating climate change and its impacts. The NCCAP sets out the Kenya Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) pathway for six sectors: energy, transport, industry, agriculture, forestry and waste management. Emissions from the forestry and agriculture sectors were analyzed under the NAMA process. Kenya is currently preparing a dairy NAMA with support from CCAFS and FAO. The NCCAP priority interventions include restoration of forest on degraded lands; REDD+ ; agroforestry; increase tree cover to 10 percent of total land area; conservation tillage; limiting use of fire in cropland; rangeland management; improved cook stoves; biogas; and management of agricultural wastes.

20. The Kenya Climate Change Act (2016) is now in place. Kenya also has a Climate-Smart Agriculture Program (CSAP, 2015➢(2030), that is jointly implemented by MoALF, the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MENR), and the Ministry of Water and Irrigation (MoWI). The CSAP➢(s envisions ➢(a climate resilient and low carbon growth sustainable agriculture that ensures food security and contributes to national development goals in line with Kenya Vision 2030.➢(In addition, Kenya has a National Policy on Climate Finance (2015) that seeks to position Kenya to better access climate finance through a variety of mechanisms. With support from the World Bank, the International Center for Tropical Agricultural (CIAT) developed a Kenya CSA Country Profile (2015). The Profile systematically assesses the state of CSA nationally, including agricultural practices that deliver higher productivity, improved resilience, and lower emissions; and assesses the required institutional, policy, and finance interventions. CIAT is now helping Kenya develop County-level CSA risk profiles by downscaling the country risk profile.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Development Objective(s)

To increase agricultural productivity and build resilience to climate change risks in the targeted small holder farming and pastoral communities in Kenya, and in the event of an Eligible Crisis or Emergency, to provide immediate and effective response.

Key Results

20. Achievement of the proposed PDO will be measured using the following outcome indicators: (i) Direct project beneficiaries (number), of which female (percent); (ii) Productivity Indicator -

Increase in productivity of selected crops, livestock, and aquaculture value chains (percent); and (iii) Resilience Indicator - Direct project beneficiaries adopting at least one of the technologies, innovations and management practices (TIMPs) promoted by the project (percent).

D. Project Description

A. Concept

22. Kenya has three main agricultural production systems. The smallholder mixed crop-livestock system found in areas that receive more than 1,000 mm of rainfall annually (high rainfall zones or non-ASAL areas), spreading from central Kenya, through the central Rift Valley to western Kenya and the coastal strip. This system focuses primarily on maize crop and dairy production with or without the integration of cash crops such as coffee, tea and horticulture. The crop-livestock-tree production (Agro-silvo-pastoral) system is most prevalent in areas that receive between 750 and 1,000 mm of rainfall annually (medium rainfall zones or semi-arid areas). This system focuses on integration of livestock and crops, soil and water conservation, and growing drought tolerant and early maturing crops. In some areas, irrigation schemes have also been set up to enhance crop production. The pastoral/extensive livestock production system is most common in areas receiving 200➢(750 mm of rainfall annually (low rainfall zones or arid areas), stretching from north and north-eastern Kenya to the southern parts bordering Tanzania. Livestock production, mainly beef animals and small ruminants, is the major enterprises under small-scale, but also some large scale ranches.

23. KCSAP will primarily focus on: (a) Promoting sustainable, community➢(driven rangeland management and improved access to quality livestock services in ASALs (i.e. in pastoral/extensive livestock production systems); (b) Improving water/soil management, especially within smallholder maize systems in the marginal rainfall zones (i.e. in smallholder mixed crop-livestock, crop-livestock-tree (Agro-silvo-pastoral systems), and crop-forest (agro-forestry) production systems; (c) Supporting the generation and dissemination of improved agricultural technologies, innovations, and management practices (TIMPs), and building sustainable seed systems; and (d) Enhancing access to quality climate/agro-weather, advisory and market information services among farmers/herders for improved decision-making.

24. KCSAP interventions will be concentrated in selected counties within the crop-livestock-tree production and pastoral/extensive livestock production systems (mainly in ASALs), with high potential for increasing production, but are prone to droughts.

Project Components

The proposed project will comprise five components briefly described below:

Component 1: Upscaling Climate-Smart Agricultural Practices (US$163.8 million, of which IDA US$150.0 million)

25. This component will finance interventions that promote and facilitate the adoption of TIMPs to achieve the CSA triple-wins: increased productivity, enhanced resilience (adaptation) and reduced GHG emissions (mitigation) per unit of output, as co-benefits. It will have three subcomponents: (i) building institutional capacity and strengthening service delivery; (ii)

supporting investments in smallholder agro-pastoral production systems; and (iii) supporting investments in pastoral extensive production systems.

Subcomponent 1.1: Building Institutional Capacity and Strengthening Service Delivery (US$24.5 million, of which IDA US$24.5 million)

26. This subcomponent will finance institutional capacity building activities at county, ward, and community levels to plan, implement, manage and monitor ward/county sub-projects and community micro-projects in all selected 24 counties. Specifically, this subcomponent will finance project interventions related to: (i) strengthening the capacity of county a nd ward to deliver agricultural services; (ii) supporting CSA planning and prioritization at county and ward levels; (iii) contracting private advisory service providers; and (iv) facilitating community institutions.

Subcomponent 1.2: Supporting Investments in Smallholder Agro-pastoral Production Systems (US$69.8 million, of which IDA US$63.0 million)

27. This subcomponent will finance climate-smart agriculture (CSA) investments in the form of community micro-projects, identified through the participatory processes, which help beneficiaries achieve the triple-wins (i.e. increased productivity; enhanced resilience; and reduced GHG emissions) in 17 counties located in semi-arid, and medium-to-high potential (non-ASALs) areas. Specifically, this subcomponent will support CSA investments aimed at: (i) improving water and soil management (active microclimate management); (ii) promoting livelihoods and crop diversification, including drought-tolerant crops (e.g., legumes - beans, cowpeas, pigeon pea, among others), stall-fed intensive dairy production and agro-forestry systems; and (iii) improving small-scale farmer-managed irrigation schemes for crop and pasture/fodder development/ production. Matching grants will be provided through three windows: (i) community-level investments to finance micro-projects; (ii) county-level investments to finance relatively larger sub-projects that benefit multiple wards or communities; and (iii) productive alliances investments on public-private partnerships with producers. Beneficiaries will be required to contribute at least 10 percent of the cost of their micro-projects. County-level investments will attract a contribution of at least 20 percent of the cost of their sub-projects. The recipient of the productive alliance grants will contribute at least 50 percent of the cost of their proposed investments.

Subcomponent 1.3: Supporting Investments in Pastoral Production Systems (US$69.5 million, of which IDA is US$63.5 million)

28. This subcomponent will support the operationalization of the North-Eastern Development Initiative (NEDI) and will cover seven out of the eight NEDI counties: Marsabit, Isiolo, Tana River, Garissa, Wajir, Mandera and Lamu. This subcomponent would help beneficiaries achieve the triple-wins by supporting interventions that are aimed at: (i) increasing productivity of livestock systems (e.g., range management, fodder and pasture production, animal fattening, heat tolerant breeds), animal health (disease surveillance, vaccination, quarantine), herd management and off-take rates; (ii) promoting integrated soil fertility and Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices based on crop-livestock integration (e.g., manure management, use of crop residues as feeds) and modern inputs; (iii) supporting market access (e.g., stock routes/migratory corridors, watering points, quarantine or holding grounds and animal markets); and (iv)

developing infrastructure for value addition (abattoirs, milk cooling and primary processing). Matching grants will be provided by the project under two windows: (i) Community level investments to common interest groups (CIGs), vulnerable and marginalized groups (VMGs) and producer organizations (POs) to finance community micro-projects; and (ii) County-level investments to finance relatively larger sub-projects covering several wards and/or cross-county. Beneficiary pastoralists will be required to contribute at least 10 percent of the cost of their micro-projects, while county governments will contribute at least 20 percent of the cost of sub-projects.

Component 2: Strengthening Climate-Smart Agricultural Research and Seed Systems (US$53.7 million, of which IDA US$50.0 million)

29. This component will support the development, validation, and adoption of context-specific CSA TIMPS to target beneficiaries under Components 1 and 3; and developing sustainable seed production and distribution systems in Kenya. It will also finance the strengthening of the technical and institutional capacity of KALRO to deliver on its mandate envisioned under the Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization Act (2013). It will have three subcomponents: (i) supporting CSA research and innovations; (ii) building competitive and sustainable seed systems; and (iii) strengthening technical and institutional capacity to coordinate and deliver research and seed system outputs.

Subcomponent 2.1: Supporting Climate-Smart Agricultural Research and Innovations (US$32.0 million, of which IDA US$30.0 million)

30. This subcomponent will finance through demand-driven, adaptive research approaches, the development, validation and dissemination of context-specific TIMPS that deliver CSA triple-wins. TIMPs developed and validated under this subcomponent will be availed for scale-up and dissemination under Components 1 and 3, respectively. Specifically, this subcomponent will finance collaborative research programs aimed at developing and promoting TIMPs related to five thematic areas: (i) climate-smart crops; (ii) climate-smart livestock and aquaculture; (iii) socio-economic research on CSA TIMPs; (iv) land, water and agroforestry; and (v) sustainable bio-energy, including charcoal VC. This will be achieved through: (i) the identification and prioritization of TIMPS at County level; (ii) the preparation of technical training materials and modules to facilitate dissemination and adoption of context-specific CSA TIMPs; (iii) technical trainings on CSA TIMPs to county technical departments and private service providers; (iv) on-farm trials and other adaptive research approaches to validate CSA TIMPS at county and community levels; and (v) the development of new CSA TIMPS based on gaps identified by target beneficiaries in the 24 target Counties.

Subcomponent 2.2: Building Competitive and Sustainable Seed Systems (US$16.7 million, of which IDA US$15.0 million)

31. The subcomponent will finance crop, livestock and aquaculture breeding programs and the involvement of private sector and communities in the production and distribution of commercial seed. KCSAP will work with the Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Services (KEPHIS), the Kenya Animal Genetic Resource (KAGRC), KALRO, CGIAR centers (e.g., CIMMYT, ILRI, ICRAF, CIAT, ICRISAT) Universities, and other NARS members), to develop and strengthen commercially driven seed multiplication and distribution systems. Specifically, this subcomponent will finance interventions across five thematic areas: (i) producing and

maintaining early generation seed and promoting improved seed, especially high value traditional crops; (ii) strengthening seed/breed/fingerlings production systems; (iii) developing and strengthening alternative delivery systems for high value traditional seeds and open pollinated varieties (OPVs); (vi) catalyzing growth of competitive seed retail networks; (v) developing and advocating conducive legal, regulatory and institutional framework for seeds/breeds/fingerlings; and (vi) supporting a national Public-Private Dialogue (PPD) platforms on seed/breeds/ fingerlings.

Subcomponent 2.3: Strengthening Technical and Institutional Capacity (US$5.0 million, of which IDA US$5.00 million)

32. This sub-component will finance the strengthening of the technical and institutional capacity of the national agricultural research system (NARS) to deliver CSA TIMPs; and the development of sustainable seed, breeding stock, and fingerling delivery systems in Kenya. Specifically this subcomponent will finance: (i) the development and implementation of a NARS coordination framework, including the strengthening of knowledge management systems; (ii) professional development training (11 PhD and 20 MSc) and short-term technical training and staff retooling; (iii) hiring interns in specialized areas to support the existing scientific staff at KARLO; (iv) CSA curriculum development for Agricultural Universities and Colleges; and (v) the refurbishment and/or upgrading of research and training facilities and infrastructure. The latter will include communications equipment, animal experimental structures, refurbishment of seed stores, procurement of small seed processing plants, fish fingerling production structures, laboratory equipment, value addition equipment, motor vehicles and farm machinery.

Component 3: Supporting Agro-weather, Market, Climate and Advisory Services (US$32.9 million, of which IDA US$30.0 million)

33. This component will finance the development of agro-weather forecasting and marketing information system and their dissemination tools. This component will have three subcomponents: (i) improving agro-meteorological forecasting and monitoring; (ii) developing climate-smart, agro-weather and market information system and advisories using ➢(big data➢(; and (iii) building institutional and technical capacity for agro-meteorological observation and forecasting, agricultural statistics collection and analyses, and market advisory services. By translating climate information into actionable knowledge, agro-weather tools will impr ove producers➢(long-term capacity for adopting CSA TIMPs, managing weather shocks and climate risks, and sustaining agricultural production under the changing climatic conditions.

Subcomponent 3.1: Improving Agro-meteorological Forecasting and Monitoring (US$16.5 million, of which IDA US$15.0 million)

34. This subcomponent will finance urgently needed investments to: (i) enhance agro-weather and climate information services; (ii) build core-capacity for agro-weather observation and forecasting; and (iii) develop the long-term ability to operate and maintain the agro-weather and climate information services. Specifically, this subcomponent will support four key interventions: (i) mapping of existing public and private operated AWS, agro-meteorological, hydrological and rain gauge stations to assess their functionalities for improvement; (ii) establishing agro-meteorological centers in participating counties to improve drought and flood forecasts; (iii) installing new automated agro-weather stations to complement existing

infrastructure; and (iv) developing the Early Warning System (EWS) at the Kenya Meteorological Department (KMD), and upgrading the existing EWS at the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA).

Subcomponent 3.2: Developing Integrated Weather and Market Information System (US$11.4 million, of which IDA US$10.0 million)

35. This subcomponent will finance activities related to: (i) developing ►(Big Data►(for CSA; (ii) strengthening the Market Information Systems; and (iii) delivering integrated weather and market advisory services using ICT and existing agricultural extension networks. Big data based on crop/pasture-weather analytics will help farmers in making decisions on what, when, where and how to plant their farms. Support to Big Data for CSA will involve financing activities related to: (i) segmenting and registering value chain stakeholders; (ii) establishing homogenous production zones to support location-specific information system and advisories; (iii) collecting agricultural statistics; (iv) appointing the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) agent; and (v) setting-up infrastructure for ►(big data►(analytics. Strengthening the Market Information System will involve financing the data capture on: (i) output (agriculture, livestock and fisheries); (ii) input; (iii) storage; (iv) transport; and (v) match making. Delivering the integrated weather and market advisory services the project will entail financing of three main activities: (i) extending the current agro-weather platform and tool at KALRO to include livestock, additional crops and VCs; (ii) improving the existing ICT infrastructure and systems at KALRO to effectively deliver data and information services; (iii) establishing governance and management structures for knowledge, which will ensure security, privacy and ownership of data and information.

Subcomponent 3.3: Building Technical and Institutional and Capacity (US$5.0 million, of which IDA US$5.0 million)

36. This subcomponent will finance the institutional and technical capacity building of the national and county governments to enable them to deliver on their Component 3 mandates. The main areas for capacity building would include sensitization of stakeholders on CSA concepts and climate change risks; capacity needs assessment; short-term and long-term training; and provision of IT equipment and operations and maintenance budgets. Competitive long-term training will be supported for about 5 PhD and 30 Masters Degrees in the areas of agricultural statistics, climate change science, CSA concepts, agro-weather, information systems, and crop and pasture modelling. The main beneficiary of the technical and institutional capacity building will be the semi-autonomous agencies such as: the KMD and KALRO; and the Agricultural Statistics Unit (ASU) and the Agriculture Insurance Unit (AIU) within the MoALF.

Component 4: Project Coordination and Management (US$29.3 million, of which IDA US$20.0 million)

37. This component will finance activities related to national and county-level project coordination and management, including annual work planning and budgeting (AWP&B); fiduciary aspects (financial management and procurement); human resource (HR) management; safeguards compliance monitoring; development and implementation of management information system (MIS) and information, communication technology (ICT)-based platforms; monitoring a nd evaluation (M&E) and impact evaluation (IE) studies; and communication strategy and citizen

engagement. All decision making bodies will include both men and women.

Subcomponent 4.1: Project Coordination (US$24.8 million, of which IDA US$15.5 million)

38. This subcomponent will finance the costs of the national and county-level project coordination units (National Project Coordination Unit and County Project Coordination Units), including salaries of the contract staff, and operations and maintenance (O&M) costs, such as office space rental charges, fuel and spare parts of vehicles, office equipment, furniture, and tools, among others. It will also finance the costs of project supervision and oversight provided by the National Project Steering Committee (NPSC), National Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC) and County Project Steering Committees (CPSCs), and any other project administration expenses.

Subcomponent 4.2: Monitoring & Evaluation and Impact Evaluation (US$4.5 million, of which IDA US$4.5 million)

39. This subcomponent will finance a web-based M&E system for collecting and processing information at the national, county and community levels, to verify the inputs, output, effects and eventually the impacts of project activities over time. In addition to the routine M&E functions (e. g., data collection, analysis and reporting), this subcomponent will finance the baseline, mid-point and end of project impact evaluations; on-demand thematic (quantitative, qualitative, and quality of implementation processes) studies; and the development and operation of the ICT-based Climate Smart Agriculture Information System (where beneficiaries can register to receive agro-weather, advisory and market information; and provide feedback). M&E approaches will be harmonized with continental and global efforts (e.g., Global Alliance for CSA and the Alliance for CSA in Africa) to build robust and harmonized evidence of the impacts of CSA TIMPs supported by the project to achieve CSA triple-wins.

Component 5: Contingency Emergency Response (IDA US$0 million)

40. This zero cost component will finance eligible expenditures under the Immediate Response Mechanism (IRM) in case of natural or man-made crises or disasters, severe economic shocks, or other crises and emergencies in Kenya. This contingency facility can be triggered through formal declaration of a national emergency by the government authority; and upon a formal request from GoK to the Bank through the National Treasury (NT). In such cases, funds from an unallocated category or other project components will be reallocated to finance emergency response expenditures to meet agricultural crises and emergency needs. The emergence response would include mitigation, recovery, and reconstruction following natural disasters, such as severe droughts, floods, disease outbreaks, and landslides, among others. Implementation of this subcomponent will follow the provisions of the Disaster Risk Management (DRM) Manual to be prepared within six months of project effectiveness.

Component Name

Component I: Upscaling Climate Smart Agricultural Practices

Comments (optional)

Component Name

Component 2: Strengthening Climate Smart Agriculture Research and Seed Systems

Comments (optional)

Component Name

Component 3: Supporting Agro-weather, Market, Climate and Advisory Services

Comments (optional)

Component Name

Component 4: Project coordination and Management

Comments (optional)

Component Name

Component 5: Contingency Emergency Response

Comments (optional)

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

41. The project will be implemented in 24 counties in Kenya. The activities will be implemented in the rural areas by smallholder farmers, agro-pastoralists and pastoralists, and will include projects in rural infrastructure, such as watering points, quarantine stations, holding grounds and animal markets, storage and marketing; sustainable resource use practices, including crop production, agro-forestry, soil erosion control, cisterns and water pans for storing rainfall and runoff water, controlled/rotational grazing, grazing banks, homestead enclosures, residue/forage conservation and other practices to access to feed and water resources during drought; and constructing and installing weather and hydro-metrological systems/stations.

F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Gibwa A. Kajubi (GSU07)

Svetlana Khvostova (GEN01)

II. Implementation

Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

Implementation of KCSAP will involve a three-tiered institutional arrangement (national, county, and community levels). At the first-tier, national level, the National Treasury (NT) will represent the Government of the Republic of Kenya (►(the Borrower►( ) and the MoALF will be the main implementing agency. Within the MoALF, the project will be anchored in the State Department of Agriculture (SDA). The second tier will be the county level, with the county governments as the executing agencies of the project. The third tier will be the community level, where beneficiaries will implement their community-led interventions. The three-tier institutional arrangement aims to: (a) lessen the clearance and approval layers for faster decision-making (enabling more efficient project implementation); and (b) utilize the constitutionally mandated governance structures at the national

and county levels, to the extent possible.

III. Safeguard Policies that might apply

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The initial scoping of the proposed project interventions suggests that due to the nature of proposed activities, the potential environmental and social impacts will be moderate, largely reversible, cost-effective and site-specific. The identification mission noted that the potential project investments in rural infrastructure and agriculture TIMPs and VCs will trigger the Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01). Given that specific micro-project designs and locations would not be known at the time of project preparation, the project will take the 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)/Integrated Pest Management Framework (IPMF); (b) Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF); and (c) Vulnerable and Marginalized Group Framework (VMGF). These frameworks will need to cover the types of activities envisioned; identify potential impacts of the likely to be implemented activities; propose screening mechanisms and processes of assessing their impacts; and designing mitigation measures. The scope of these frameworks, the exact implementation arrangements and costs have been identified and included in the reports. The preparation of ESMF, IPMF, RPF and the VMGF have included public consultations on September 20, 2016, and will be disclosed in country and at the Bank►(s InfoShop prior to project appraisal. During project implementation, based on the screening, an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA)/Integrated Pest Management Plans (IPMPs)/ Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs), Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) (where applicable) and Vulnerable and Marginalized Group Plans (VMGPs) will be developed for individual subprojects.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	This policy is not triggered because project will not fund any sub-projects deemed to adversely affect natural habitats. Using the screening checklist

		prepared for this project and annexed to the ESMF, the client will eliminate any subprojects that are believed to result in changes to sensitive ecological systems from the list of fungible subprojects.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	Not triggered because the project will not fund any subproject that would be deemed to bring about conversion of natural forests or changes in management and protection or utilization of natural forests or plantations. The ESMF prepared by the client is clear that any subproject likely to result in alterations of the management regimes of natural forests would not be funded under this project.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	The project envisions use of agrochemicals for some TIMPs for implementation of sub projects such as clean milk production, vegetables and fruit growing, fodder production, apiculture, local poultry and agro-forestry projects to mention a few. In view of this, the client has prepared an Integrated Pest Management Framework/Plan (IPMF/IPMP) which is annexed to the ESMF. During the implementation phase, in cases where agrochemicals and pesticides may be applied, the client will adopt and promote the adoption of an integrated pest management (IPM) approach, which stresses non-chemical pest management methods as much as possible, with use of agrochemicals only as a ►(last resort►(when other methods are not sufficiently effective. The IPMF/IPMP describes specific actions needed to be implemented and how and at what cost, timeframes, estimated costs, monitoring indicators, institutional and beneficiary roles and responsibilities, etc.).
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	Although project funds will not be used to fund physical cultural resources, there is the likelihood that implementation of sub-projects could result in chance finds. The sub-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	This VMGF for the Kenya Climate Smart Agriculture Project (KCSAP) has been prepared by the borrower (Government of Kenya) based on the requirements of OP 4.10 of the World Bank and the

		applicable National and County laws and regulations of the Government of Kenya. The OP 4.10 is triggered when it is likely that groups that meet criteria of WB OP 4.10 ➢(are present in, or have collective attachment to, the project area .➢(The VMGF will guide the preparation of the specific vulnerable and marginalized groups plans (VMGPs) of the KCSAP sub-projects that may affect VMGs in the proposed project counties. At the time of preparation of this VMGF the following issues were outstanding: (a) host sites for sub-projects had not yet been identified; and (b) those vulnerable and marginalised groups whose rights and livelihoods may be affected by the sub-projects had not yet been defined, as the location or alignment of the sub-projects were yet to be decided. The primary beneficiaries of the project will be rural smallholder and marginal farmers and pastoralists, VMGs and other stakeholders. The smallholder farmers and pastoralists will be organized in common interest groups (CIGs) and Producer Organizations (POs) along the value chains (VC). It is envisaged that KCSAP will be implemented in 24 selected counties with a total of 5 participating wards per each County. A key principle of the project is targeting and inclusion and therefore the Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Framework (VMGF) will focus on how to ensure that VMGs are aware of the project, involved in decision-making and fully participate through the free prior informed consultation (FPIC) principle leading to broad community support. Project counties, and communities will screen for the VMGs using a participatory methodology and the FPI Consultation principle; then undertake a Social Assessment and formulate VMGPs that are specific for the needs of the various VMGs. The VMGF was consulted upon on September 20, 2016. Minimal, if any, negative impacts are anticipated as a result of the project. Most of the impacts anticipated will be positive for all communities, including for VMGs. As a result, a key focus of the VMGF and the VMGPs will be to propose pro-active steps for such

		groups to benefit from the project.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/ BP 4.12	Yes	KCSAP does not envisage any physical displacement and no resettlement but OP 4.12 is triggered as a precautionary measure. No physical displacement is envisaged in the project as the majority of interventions will be small scale, on-farm and easy to site so as to avoid economic or physical displacement. However, some of the larger community investments (holding grounds, animal markets, storage and water pans etc.) may require land acquisition and/or may result in the loss of community resources. To guide the process of land acquisition and compensation, the project has prepared the RPF as a precautionary measure to guide the selection and implementation of sub projects. Investments are elated to sustainable land and water management, infrastructure development and land acquisition for public utilities (community and/or county investments under components 1, 2 and 3). Potential negative impacts on the livelihoods of the target beneficiaries include: land acquisition, restrictions on land use/utilization; restrictions to natural resources for individual and /or community livelihoods; and impacts on physical assets. The RPF will be publicly disclosed in Kenya and in the World Bank Info Shop prior to project appraisal.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The project investments do not include dams (higher than 15m) or irrigation structures that would require application of this policy. The project may support small dam construction (less than 4.5 meters) as part of small- and micro-scale irrigation schemes. The project will use the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations ►(Manual on Small Earth Dams, A Guide to Siting, Design and Construction►((FAO 2010) in support of implementing activities that involve the construction of small- and micro-scale irrigation schemes including small dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The project will not be involved in trans-boundary rivers, lakes, and body of waters or waters with two or more stakeholders that calls for establishments of agreements, arrangements or any Multilateral Frameworks for the waterway concerned.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/ BP 7.60	No	The sub project investments are designed not to be in a disputed area or involved in dispute including any

		component or sub components.

IV. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:

The project is proposed as Category B - Partial Assessment. No significant and/or irreversible adverse environmental issues are anticipated from the investments to be financed under the project. Civil works will 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. The impacts will be assessed through a screening process and appropriate mitigation measures will be proposed. Three environmental safeguards policies are triggered➢(Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01), Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11), and Pest Management (OP 4.09). In addition, two social safeguards are triggered ➢(Involuntary Resettlement (OP4.12), and Indigenous Peoples Policy (OP4.10). Table 5 summarizes the environmental and social safeguards policies triggered by KCSAP.

Given that the nature of the proposed interventions and the design and location of specific sub-projects are not known ex-ante, the project adopted a framework approach to managing safeguards. Consequently, the following framework documents were prepared: (i) an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) for Environmental Assessment (OP/ BP 4.01), Physical Cultural Resources (OP/BP 4.11), and Pest Management (OP 4.09); (ii) a Vulnerable and Marginalized Group Framework (VGMF) for Indigenous Peoples (OP/BP 4.10); and (iii) a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) for Involuntary Resettlement (OP/BP 4.12). These frameworks provide a mechanism for: (i) identifying and assessing potential adverse environmental and social impacts, based on the types of activities, investments, and TIMPs envisioned; and (ii) proposing screening methods and processes of assessing and designing appropriate mitigation measures for the identified investments. The screening will utilize the Environmental and Social Screening Form/checklist; and an Environmental and Social Project Report will outline simple environmental mitigation measures (a simplified Environmental and Social Management Plan/ESMP) for sub- projects not requiring a full ESIA (Environmental and Social Impact Assessment) report.

Whenever applicable, particularly for the relatively larger county-level infrastructure and landscape-wide investments, Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)/ESMPs, Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs), and Vulnerable and Marginalized Group Plans (VMGPs) will be developed for individual sub-projects during project implementation.

The preparation of the ESMF, VMGF, and RPF was informed by lessons learned from implementing WKCDD&FMP (focusing on alternative livelihoods) and KAPAP (VC development). During the preparation of those frameworks, a series of consultations were held in selected counties. The final stakeholders➢(consultation and public disclosure workshop was held on September 20, 2016.

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 and producer organizations.
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 concluded by March 2016 and Kenya Adaptation to Climate Change in ASALs and Kenya Agricultural Productivity and Sustainable Land Management Projects both expected to be completed by March 2017. 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 MoALF. 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 KCSAP is a national project targeting rural smallholder and marginal farmers, including women, youth and VMGs and other stakeholders, organized in common interest groups (CIGs).

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	30-Sep-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	14-Nov-2016
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Kenya	14-Nov-2016
Comments:	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	30-Sep-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	14-Nov-2016

"In country" Disclosure	
Comments:	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	30-Sep-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	14-Nov-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
Kenya	14-Nov-2016
Comments:	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Yes
Date of receipt by the Bank	30-Sep-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	14-Nov-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
Kenya	14-Nov-2016
Comments:	
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 [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
OP 4.09 - Pest Management	
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
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 [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources	

Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
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 [×] No [ ] NA [ ]
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 [ ]

V. Contact point

World Bank

Contact: Ladisy Komba Chengula
Title: Lead Agriculture Economist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name: The National Treasury
Contact: Dr. Thugge Kamau
Title: Principal Secretary
Email: ps@treasury.go.ke

Implementing Agencies

Name: Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries
Contact: Dr. Richard Lesiyampe
Title: Principal Secretary
Email: ps@agriculture.go.ke

VI. For more information contact:

The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 473-1000
Web: http://www.worldbank.org/projects

VII. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Ladisy Komba Chengula	
Approved By		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Nathalie S. Munzberg (SA)	Date: 13-Dec-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Dina Umali-Deininger (PMGR)	Date: 14-Dec-2016
Country Director:	Name: Thomas O'Brien (CD)	Date: 21-Dec-2016

Public Disclosure Copy