This action is funded by the European Union

**ANNEX 1**

of the Commission Decision on the Annual Action Programme 2015 in favour of Kenya

**Action Document for Support to the agriculture sector transformation process and to decentralised land governance**

| 1. Title/basic act/CRIS number | "Support to the agriculture sector transformation process and to decentralised land governance"  
CRIS number: KE/FED/037-776  
financed under the 11th European Development Fund |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2. Zone benefiting from the action/location | Kenya  
The action shall be carried out at the following locations:  
Component 1: National  
Component 2: Turkana, West Pokot, Baringo, Samburu, Laikipia, Marsabit, Tana River and Nandi Counties |
| 4. Sector of concentration/thematic area | Focal Sector 1: Food security and resilience to climatic shocks with focus on ASAL |
| 5. Amounts concerned | Total estimated cost: EUR 22 441 000  
Total amount of EDF contribution: EUR 16 000 000  
This action is co-financed in parallel co-financing by:  
- German Development Cooperation for an amount of EUR 2 000 000  
- Swedish Bilateral Aid for an amount of EUR 4 000 000  
- Food and Agriculture Organisation of EUR 441 000 |
| 6. Aid modality and implementation modality | • Project Modality  
• Indirect management with the German Cooperation, with the Swedish Cooperation and with the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) |
| 7. DAC code(s) | Main DAC code: 311 "AGRICULTURE"  
• Sub-code 1: 31110 "Policy development, Institutional Capacity Building"  
• Sub-code 2: 31130 "Agriculture Land Resources"  
• Sub-code 3: 41010 "Land use planning - Environment protection"  
• Sub-code 4: 43040 "Land use planning – Rural development" |
| 8. Markers (from CRIS DAC form) | **General policy objective** | **Not targeted** | **Significant objective** | **Main objective** |
| | Participation development/good governance | ☐ | ☒ | ☒ |
| | Aid to environment | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| | Gender equality (including Women In Development) | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| | Trade Development | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
| | Reproductive, Maternal, New born and child health | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |
### SUMMARY

This programme has two components: a) the implementation of the Agriculture Sector Development Strategy, the National Food & Nutrition Security Policy and Strategy of 2008 and b) the implementation of the land policy in the context of devolution of implementation responsibilities from National to County government as prescribed by the 2010 constitution.

The two components of the programme are built on two existing European Union (EU) programmes: a) the joint EU initiative aligning support provided by EU, German Development Cooperation and Swedish Bilateral Aid to sector policy and coordination into a single EUR 9 000 000 framework and b) the current EU funded support for land governance and the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGT) pilot project in Tana and Turkana Counties; both ending in 2016.

By promoting coherence in the implementation of the sector and access to land tenure, the two components will provide the foundation for our AAP 2016 EUR 50 000 000 programme to support productive agriculture in order to achieve food security and nutrition, and will build synergy with the support to Drought Contingency Fund and to the support to county Climate Proofed infrastructure.

The principle of a 50% maximum EU contribution to programme frameworks will leverage contribution from other EU Member states for the first component and the resources from the county governments and other development partners for the second. As experienced before, this cost sharing principle has been enhancing our cost-effectiveness and visibility, and has created opportunities for an in-depth EU political dialogue.

The geographical scope of the intervention is national for the institutional restructuring component. For the component land governance, the coverage is the north western Arid and Semi-Arid (ASAL) cluster of six counties comprising of: Turkana, West Pokot, Baringo, Samburu, Laikipia, Marsabit, as well as the counties of Tana River and Nandi to inform the second phase of the programme.

### 1 CONTEXT

#### 1.1 Sector/Country/Regional context/Thematic area

##### 1.1.1 Public Policy Assessment and EU Policy Framework

The 2010 Constitution of Kenya establishes two levels of Government, National and County. Each level has distinct functions and roles, all geared towards enhancing service delivery in order to achieve the aspirations of Kenya’s Vision 2030.

Pursuant to the fourth Schedule of the Constitution of Kenya 2010 and the Transition to Devolved Governments Act 2012 - Notice No. 139, some of the agricultural and land
management\textsuperscript{1} functions were transferred to the Counties, and subsequently part of the functions of Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MoALF), the Ministry of Lands and Housing (MoL), the Ministry of Environment, Water & Natural Resources (MEWNR) were substantially devolved.

The rationale to support the agriculture sector transformation is nested in the resolution of the agriculture sector Inter-Governmental Consultative Forum held in June 2014 where the 47 Counties and MoALF agreed to “Deliver as One” in order to operationalize the Agriculture Sector Development Strategy. Among the key resolutions it was agreed to: a) address the coordination and implementation of national programmes and projects being implemented at County level, b) involve County Government, National Government and Development Partners in project prioritization, formulation and implementation and to set a structure/platform for coordination, c) National Government should ensure that policy and legislation formulation and review processes involve County participation, and d) to develop a National Agriculture Data Base linked with Counties. The continuation of the joint EU support to the agriculture sector transformation, which is currently going on in partnership with Germany and Swedish Bilateral Aid until 2016, is justified by the time needed to mainstream the devolution of service delivery functions in the agriculture sector to county governments while maintaining coherence in the overall agriculture sector development, including the attainment of the food and nutrition security objectives.

The rationale of supporting decentralized land governance\textsuperscript{2} is nested in the operationalization of the National Land policy in the devolution context, particularly in capacitating the different functions of the County Land Management Boards (CLMBs). The CLMBs are now in charge of land planning, including allocating land and natural resources to agriculture, they are also the interface with the public to administer all categories of land and finally, they have also the mandate to manage community access in coordination with the Community Land Boards and to resolve dispute between communities with the Community Land Management Committees. Capacitating CLMBs and the two community institutions to exercise this last function is particularly important in a context where about 60% of the land allocated to smallholder farmers and to pastoralists is under customary tenure, and where the protection of women's interests is widely ignored under earlier Trust Law provision. Women, who are already socially and economically marginalised, are particularly vulnerable when tenure governance is weak. There is growing evidence that women’s empowerment (including women’s control of economic sources) contributes significantly to better food and nutrition security within the household.

Targeting the Arid and Semi-Arid Land areas of Kenya (ASAL), the proposed component is also aligned with the Ending Drought Emergency Common Programming Framework (EDE-CPF), which has earmarked a support to improved governance of land tenure\textsuperscript{3} by CLMBs and community leaders under its pillar livelihood. Finally, the EU recognises land governance as fundamental to foster food security and agricultural development as stated in the 2004 EU Land Policy Guidelines and in the EU policy framework for food security (2010).

\textsuperscript{1} Land management can refer to management of the tenure (transfers, purchases, new allocations, etc) or to the actual use of the land. Resolution of conflicts fall in here but established processes will then be captured under an administration system (formal or informal).

\textsuperscript{2} Land governance is the way how land tenure, administration and management are addressed. It is about processes and the importance of these in order to do it in a socially legitimate manner that is participatory, accountable and inclusive.

\textsuperscript{3} Land tenure is the relationship, whether legally or customarily defined, among people, as individuals or groups, with respect to land. It can be considered an institution that define the rules of how to access, use and control land.
### 1.1.2 Stakeholder analysis

The Ministry of Devolution, overseeing the devolution process, is an important stakeholder for the two components of this project.

On institutional support to the agriculture sector, the main stakeholder is the Ministry of Agriculture Livestock and Fisheries (MoALF). Other the primary stakeholders will be different administrative structures involved in coordination.

At the County level, they are: a) the County Assembly Agricultural Sector Committees whose function is to plan, budget and oversee the implementation of the agriculture strategy at county level, b) the County Executive Committees which constitute the executive arm of the County government and oversee local service delivery and inter-departmental coordination, and c) the coordination mechanisms between County government sector institutions and non-state sector actors which in most counties is organized on an ad-hoc basis. The setting of the Food and Nutrition Security Coordination in each County is a priority in order to plan and streamline parallel humanitarian and development aid inflow.

At the National level, the stakeholders are: a) the Transformation Secretariat which is in charge of the transformation process within MoALF with an objective to develop targeted and result-oriented policies, to oversee the restructuring and change management process, strengthen the coordination of programmes, b) the Inter-governmental Secretariat (IGS) which is mandated to establish and initiate structures and instruments for the Inter-governmental coordination between MoALF and counties, the inter-ministerial coordination between MoALF and other sector Ministries and the Coordination with the private sector and development partners, c) finally, the Agriculture Rural Development Donor Group includes the main development partners and donors working in Agriculture.

On land the stakeholders are:

At community level: a) the Council of Elders is an informal customary institution found in every community recognized by County governments as the entry point to any engagement with the community, varying from issues on land tenure to health and education, and b) local level user’s rights associations (forest users groups, water resource associations, etc.), the CLMB and generally the county officials and staff having a say on land governance.

At County level the key stakeholders are a) the County Assembly committees on land and/or natural resources whose role is to debate and inform the Executive on land and Natural Resources issues, b) the Land & Environment Court in charge of resolving land conflicts that cannot be resolved through the traditional customary structures, c) the CLMB whose role is to process all applications for allocation of land, change and extension of user, subdivision of public land and renewal of leases, and finally d) in some counties, Natural Resource Management Forum are now sprouting to coordinate the work that NGOs and CSOs are conducting in the areas of energy, mining, water, irrigation, rangeland, fisheries and research policy.

At national level the key actors are a) the National Land Commission, with responsibility to manage public land on behalf of the national and county governments, to recommend a national land policy to the national government, and to advise the national government on a comprehensive programme for the registration of land titles throughout Kenya. Also, it assesses tax on land transfers and has oversight responsibility on land use planning in the Country; b) the Ministry of Lands (MoL), formed in 2014, and c) Land Titling Centre for the issuing of land titles whose connectivity with counties is still poorly used. Finally d) the Development Partner Group on Land (DPGL), composed of donors and implementing agencies, has played a big role on influencing the implementation of the national land policy.
and introducing other international guiding principles such as the Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Tenure.

For both components, the ultimate beneficiaries are the smallholder farmers and pastoralists who will see their food security and nutrition status improved thanks to a) more secure access to land and natural resources, and b) better consideration of their interest in the design and implementation of the agriculture sector strategy across the different levels of government.

1.1.3 Priority areas for support/problem analysis

Overall, the attainment of food security and nutrition objectives are structurally constrained by the non-effective implementation of the agriculture and food security policies between the two levels of government and by the difficult and unsecured access to land and natural resources of the marginalized group.

At the level of the agriculture sector, the core problem brought by the sudden devolution is the weak operational coordination between the new entities at all levels, preventing a coherent implementation of the agriculture sector strategy, including the attainment of the food and nutrition security objectives, and the weak capacity of the counties to operationalise the roll-out of the devolved service provision and programming.

At national level, the consolidation of the former ten sector ministries into four larger ministries has meant that some support functions within individual ministries were duplicated and need rationalisation. In addition, sector performance needs to be accounted for not only by MoALF, but also by other ministries responsible for land, provision of water, natural resources and enterprises development. In this context and because of the collapse of the former Agriculture Sector Coordination Unit, there is a need to capacitate the intergovernmental coordination according to the Inter-Governmental Relations Act in developing effective linkages between MoALF and other sector ministries. Finally, the MoALF is required by the Constitution to build the Counties' capacity on sector issues, but is not yet structured to do so, and has not yet put in place the coordination mechanisms to perform this role effectively.

At county level sector, despite political good will, and the fact that the constitutional transition process was originally planned in an incremental fashion, the recent devolution of agricultural services to county governments happened so suddenly that the new county structures do not have yet enough capacity to coordinate and delivery services; moreover, a further major constraint to the devolution process is that in many cases county governments do not fully understand the role they should play in the support to the agricultural sector. A few counties are in the process of enacting local legislations to facilitate establishment of sector coordination boards/committees, but are slowed down by lack of legislative skills. In addition, several counties have formed informal regional networks based mainly on value chains of common interest, that provide possible entry points for capacity support to counties, but they are difficult to engage with because of their informality.

On land issues, the core problem brought by the sudden devolution is the weak capacity of the newly created CLMBs and the overwhelming public demand for transparency and efficiency in the application of land rights and land management. The 2009 National Land Policy (NLP) was a breakthrough as far as civil society and national expert participation and consultation was concerned. It was a forerunner to the 2010 Constitution which unleashed the land reform processes that followed shortly after. Several bills were then enacted, amongst the most important being the Land Act (2011), the National Land Commission Act (2012), and the Land Registry Act (2012). After initial high interest and massive support, the current government infighting between the scope of the mandates of the Ministry of Land (MoL) and of the National Land Commission (NLC) has paralyzed the implementation of the Land Act,
particularly the application of the Community Land Bill (2012) which formalizes community land rights and the Draft Evictions and Resettlement Procedures Bill (2012) which provide for compensation procedures. The devolution process has added an element of complexity with the creation of CLMBs whose mandate is to manage all public land, to keep copy of the registry and to conduct research on historical land injustices that need to be addressed including exercising the right of women's access to land in a context of traditional society as given in the 2010 Constitution of Kenya. So far information on land (registry, cadastres) for the management of land at county level is seldom available, and the CLMBs are far from being fully functional. Capacity of land officers is limited particularly in terms of land planning for agriculture and land administration, including land access and land rights for communities, as well as land conflicts resolution between communal and individuals. Counties are at different stages in recognizing certain rights (tenure) and have different levels of human capacity and hardware/software for land administration systems. The programme will address all these areas in a county-specific ways. Each county will have its own workplan but with a set of standards and guidelines to provide a functional land system.

2 Risks and Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Risk level (H/M/L)</th>
<th>Mitigating measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited number of staff assigned to land issues as per the total county populations and high demand to respond to land conflicts and general administration.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>County Governments are aware of the need to hire more staff and allocate funds that invest in their HR needs. They will put in place incentives and entry level contracts to mitigate this risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall programme covering the 47 counties will not be fully financed.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>The land governance programme is designed as a framework programme to be implemented in phases and to be financed also by the national and the county governments as well as from other development partners. The EU funding, being the first committed, will focus on defining the standard solutions applicable to all counties and test their roll out in 8 counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the transformation agenda within MoALF, while the Cabinet Secretary and his senior management team are committed to the transformation process, entrenched institutional resistance towards the required down-scaling and restructuring of the Ministry constitutes a risk.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Our support and the ongoing political dialogue with the Cabinet Secretary and his senior management team are expected to mitigate this risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Land administration refers to the tools (cadasters, land records, reports, etc.) used to capture rights to land (for access, use and management) that the tenure system previously defined. Land administration is also a process involving key stakeholders in order to be socially accepted and sustainable.

5 Standard solutions are to be understood as defined models and benchmarks/targets for the capacity building component, which can be rolled out for implementation in counties eventually left out should the budget not be fully covered by GoK and other DP.
Non-cooperation between national and county government. | M | To mitigate this risk, the proposed support will focus on supporting the transformation process and capacitating essential inter-governmental coordination platforms and systems, including the much-needed strengthening of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems.

Inadequate financing of the institutional support component. | L | Given the level of commitment by the EU partners, the risk of insufficient co-financing is estimated as low and eventual shortfalls will be covered by the MoALF.

As experienced with the former Agriculture Sector Coordination Unit, fiduciary risk is a reality. | M | Implementation modality (Delegated Cooperation with Swedish and German Development Cooperation) is the main risk mitigation strategy. Furthermore, our disbursement mechanism to Counties and MoALF institutions (i.e., Transformation Secretariat and IGS) will be task/event focused and based on agreed yearly work programmes, rather than supporting the budget of institutions.

**Assumptions**

1. The prime assumption is that political infighting over the overall devolution process along party lines will be contained. So far, the commitment of the elected County Governors to deliver to their respective constituency has the potential to re-enforce implementation and stimulate the Counties to improve their coordination.
2. Possible restructuring of the level of devolution (fewer counties) does not compromise the philosophy of bringing public services and government close to the people.
3. Counties continue to have sufficient budget allocation from central government to operate and fully spend development budget as per treasury guidelines.

**3 LESSONS LEARNT, COMPLEMENTARITY AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES**

**3.1 Lessons learnt**

On agriculture sector coordination, a) Evaluation and joint analysis by development partners have highlighted the danger of providing parallel and uncoordinated development partners' (DPs) support towards sector coordination, and of targeting such support towards a stand-alone coordination unit having no clear reporting and accountability mechanism with its parent ministries, such as the Agriculture Sector Coordination Unit (ASCU); b) the MoALF initiative has initiated a transformation process supported by EU, German Development Cooperation and Swedish Bilateral Aid.

An identification study, funded by Swedish Bilateral Aid, has shown the need for a continuation of the Joint EU/MoALF Transformation Initiative to support the Agriculture sector transformation process while enabling high-level political dialogue.

On land governance, the current EU funded pilot supporting land governance and the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines (VG) on the Responsible Governance in Tana and Turkana has so far demonstrated that funding fully-fledged projects on land governance
(tenure, administration and management) is viable using County administration as a stepping stone. Particularly, the engagement with community members, County and central government officials by the FAO land governance project has reassured the need to address the land question at all three levels with a standardized approach and has opened up dialogue. Other donors that have traditionally supported MoL and NLC funded land issues in Kenya, such as USAID, SIDA and IFAD, have currently halted financial support due to poor delivery and political instability, limiting it to interventions by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in the area or community resource mapping or sensitizations.

3.2 Complementarity, synergy and donor coordination

The support to the agriculture sector transformation process builds on the institutional support to the Ministry of Agriculture provided by the 10th EDF Kenya Rural Development Programme (KRDP) which has been turned, at the request of MoALF, into a joint EU initiative aligning the support of EC, German Development Cooperation and Swedish Bilateral Aid into a single EUR 9 000 000 framework until end 2016.

In terms of support to smallholder farmers, complementarity will also be established with the existing national programmes being implemented at County level such as the 10th EDF Kenya Cereal Enhancement Programme, the Conservation Agriculture project and the Livestock support projects, as well as the Agriculture Sector Development Support Project funded by Swedish Bilateral Aid, the Kenya Agriculture Productivity and Agri-business Project of the World Bank. Finally, synergy will also be established with the EU funded FIRST initiative implemented by FAO in Kenya which will provide a support to the intergovernmental coordination on food security and nutrition.

On land governance, Swedish Bilateral Aid is preparing a new land facility for the next 5 years following their headquarters decision to continue addressing the development of the Land Management Information System that should link up with this project. Besides this direct support to land, a number of initiatives could also be taken on board in this programme: a) the Ford Foundation has been supporting the National Land Commission (NLC) in its operative functions and in the Commission’s strategic planning launched in June 2014; b) IFAD and UN-Habitat have been collaborating with County governments through its Global Land Tool Network for urban planning and initial cadastre; c) DFID and USAID also have natural resources (including land) as part of the strategic framework and will be interested in contributing to the umbrella programme; d) a number of national and international NGOs are supporting training jurists and field officers on land issues, as well as supporting advocacy in support of the enactment of the community land bill, sensitization on land rights and community natural resource mapping, finally; e) Land Governance in ASAL is one of the key activities earmarked in the Pillars "Livelihood" and "Peace and Security" of the Ending Drought Emergencies Common Programme Framework (EDE-CPF).

Within the EU cooperation in Kenya, the support to land planning, land administration and resolution of conflicts will synergise with or have an impact on a) the Merile-Marsabit road construction, along which unplanned land settlements are taking place, b) the Local Economic Development support provided by "Instruments for Devolution Advice and Support", c) the support to Water Towers, d) the future support to Drought Risk Management, and e) the support to Productive Agriculture for sustainable food security.

The coherence with the other three 11th EDF interventions in the sector of concentration is nested in two sets of governmental policies and planning frameworks:

a) The Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and the sector Medium Term Plan (MTP) that have for objective sustainable food security among others. The EU specific interventions under this set of government policy are included in this programme (support to agriculture sector coordination and the support to land governance) and the support to productive agriculture programme (under preparation).
b) The ASAL Policy, the Ending Drought Emergencies (EDE) MTP and the Common Programming Framework to implement the EDE that have for objective to improve resilience to drought in Arid and semi-arid land of Kenya. The EU specific interventions under this set of government policies will be captured in a programme including the support to the drought contingency fund and to the EDE coordination (Pillars 5 and 6 of the EDE) and a programme supporting to climate proofed infrastructure at county level (Pillar 2 of the EDF).

The overall coherence to achieve food security is ensured because the four proposed 11th EDF interventions have a direct impact on achieving sustainable food security. This proposed programme is addressing the multi-sector approach of food security and nutrition, as well as coordination at different government levels, including the operational coordination at county level, and for the land governance component will contribute to the access of land and natural resources by communities, for agriculture and livestock activities; the Ending Drought Emergencies and Support to Drought Risk Management and Coordination addresses community needs in case of drought and impacts directly their livelihood by preserving their assets; the support to climate proofed infrastructure will ensure access to permanent water points in case of drought, that will preserve productive assets; finally, the support to productive agriculture gears to address the food production deficit at national level.

The multi-sector and diversified approach is required because of the diversity of agro-ecology and socio-economic potential in different areas of the Country, which impose different programmes to enhance the effectiveness of the EU interventions that address 1) Food insecurity and lack resilience to drought and climate change in the ASAL 2) Insufficient production and access to markets in the high productive areas and 3) Need to build a more conducive policy environment and service provision. Therefore, the four Action Documents respond to the three main areas above and should contribute significantly to achieve food security and resilience in the whole Country.

Political dialogue with Government will be using the two planning and coordination platforms (Transformation Initiative and the EDE coordination) already supported by 10th EDF projects. The link between the two coordination bodies is ensured by the fact that Ministry of Agriculture Livestock and Fisheries chairs at the same time, the Joint Technical Working Group and the EDE subcommittee dealing with the EDE pillar on sustainable livelihood. The above involvement by the MoALF in both initiatives ensures the coordination between the TI and the EDE. Also, the Common Programming Framework (CPF) which the Transformation Secretariat is in the process of elaborating, should improve awareness and coordination between the two coordination structures. As experienced today, because of 11th EDF strategic positioning on the food security and resilience objectives, and thanks to the principle of leveraging other donors’ funds with EU funded programmes, the political dialogue on programme implementation, as well on future government orientations, should continue to be effective.

3.3 Cross-cutting issues
Women’s access to land in the context of traditional society is one of the critical issues that will be addressed by the project. One of the entry points will be the 2010 Constitution of Kenya providing equal access to land and the 2009 National Land Policy (NLP) enacting those rights. The other entry point will be the dialogue at community level and with County authorities.

Environmental aspects are fully addressed under the land component in result "support to land planning", where mapping and rational use of natural resources and water will be supported at the level of local Government. With this result, local government is expected to be able to exercise directly or via the communities a better management of natural resources as well as to enforce control on deviant practices such a forest encroachment, degradation of the natural
pasture, unregulated and unfair tapping of water systems and others. It is also expected that inter-community planning will be systematically pursued for the use of common natural resources and conflict management. Overall, this result will contribute to the full implementation of the National Climate Change Response Strategy and of the EDE-CNF.

Both the agriculture sector transformation process and the introduction of responsible land tenure present real opportunities to improve nutrition security in the operational area. Improved diet of women and children by increasing household consumption of diverse, high-nutrient content foods and the empowerment of women as income-earners, decision-makers and primary childcare providers are the principal pathways in addressing under nutrition through agriculture.

4 DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

4.1 Objectives/results

The overall objective is food security of smallholder farmers and pastoralists' communities strengthened with improved access to agriculture services and to land.

Specific objective of component 1 - institutional support to the agriculture sector: Agriculture sector transformation process is supported and coordination mechanisms established and functional in the new devolved context.

The results for the first component are:
- Result 1: County capacity to pursue county and cross-county coordination and service delivery for the sector is strengthened.
- Result 2: Intergovernmental coordination framework is in place and effective.
- Result 3: Transformation process within MoALF completed.
- Result 4: The transformation process is evidence-based supported.

Specific objective of component 2 – land governance: Equitable access and management of land for better livelihoods and socio-economic development is improved as per the Voluntary Guidelines for responsible land tenure governance (VGGT).

The results for the second component are:
- Result 1: Land use planning initiated and planning methodology established in selected counties.
- Result 2: Land management & administration established in selected counties.
- Result 3: Land Policy and legal framework for land at county established and rolled out.
- Result 4: Capacity of research and academic institutions on national land issues strengthened.

4.2 Main activities

*The main activities for the first component are:*

*To attain result 1:* a) the definition of the coordination formats and the provision of standard support to the coordination process, b) the provision or reinforcement of standard M&E, reporting and information systems at the County level, c) provision of capacity building support, including HR strengthening, at the County and inter-County level, depending on assessed needs, d) thematic information seminars on key issues such as food security and nutrition, private sector integration, infrastructure development and maintenance, gender inclusion, environment and rangeland management, public finance efficiency, etc. County
staff and non-state value chain actors contributing to coordination at County level will be eligible for those seminars.

To attain result 2: a) definition of the coordination formats and the provision of standard support to the coordination process, and b) standardized provision of capacity building support, including HR strengthening. The formal inter-governmental consultation bodies of relevance for the sector, as defined in the Inter-governmental Relations Act, as well as informal inter-governmental consultation structures will be targeted for this support.

To attain result 3: a) establishment of a single sector-wide M&E and information management system covering all national and County programmes, b) streamlining of steering mechanisms for existing programmes (EU programmes as a first step), c) development of and support to the implementation of a strategy of Communication for Development for the sector, d) support to the development and operationalization of the Common Programme Framework (CPF) for future programmes, e) support to policy updating and integrated planning, f) definition of technical back-stopping to counties, g) Coordination with the private sector, other sector ministries and development partners

To attain result 4: Provision of analysis and expertise for the above.

The main activities for the second component are:

To attain result 1: 1.1. Consultations and agreements on county land use planning objectives and processes; 1.2. Collect and systematize land information for land use planning and registry purposes; 1.3. Consult with women and youth groups to prioritise their need in land planning; 1.4. Spatially identify land tenure regimes to allow the identification of the areas that can be planned for, i.e. land banking; 1.5. Set in place inter-county consultations on land use planning objectives; 1.6. Develop inter-county agreements on shared resources and planning; 1.7. Assess and map current land uses with agro-ecological zoning for income generation, drought resilience and other planning options; 1.8. Develop standard guidelines for land use planning including printing and dissemination; 1.9. Develop a database on land and natural resources use at county level; and finally 1.10. Support to national & county land use plan policy.

To attain result 2: 2.1. Assess the needs and provide infrastructural support to county land offices including support to county Land Information Management System to interface with the national land registry and the digitalization of the registry; 2.2. Develop specific awareness materials for general public on land governance; 2.3. Adapt Land Governance Assessment Framework (LGAF) for counties; 2.4. Inform the human capacity development strategy of counties’ land institutions; 2.5. Train planners and surveyors on Geographic Information Systems; 2.6. Train planners and surveyors on participatory land delimitation methodology; 2.7. Conduct with county government land rights sensitization campaigns targeting rural communities; 2.8. Train county land officials, Community Based Organisations, youth, women and vulnerable groups in land governance; 2.9. Identify land conflict spots in counties and support resolution mechanism; 2.10. Establish a gender sensitive county based platform of dialogue for land and natural resources conflict resolution; 2.11. Mainstream the use of United Nations Habitat voluntary guidelines on land tenure for urban areas.

To attain result 3: 3.1. Review land and natural resource related policies, acts and action plans at county level; 3.2. Support land policy harmonisation across sectors (agriculture, livestock, fisheries, mining, transport, water, tourism, etc.) at county level; 3.3. Train county land staff in the formulation and drafting of land legislation for community land adjudication and titling procedures; 3.4. Train on social and environmental safeguards through by-laws to protect community land; 3.5. Train land county staff and members of the Community land committees on policy advocacy.
To attain result 4: 4.1. Survey land issues covered by academic institutions for curriculum gaps identification and academic plan recommendations; 4.2. Develop curriculum proposal on land governance, planning and administration with academic institutions; 4.3. Assess academic support need of governmental institutions on land; 4.4. Develop and support the beginning of a scheme for training and re-training county government staff. 4.5. Integrate climate risk assessment, gender and youth tenure in the development of land curriculum.

4.3 Intervention logic

The support to sector coordination under KRDP has been reshaped and is now delivered under the Joint EU/MoALF Transformation Initiative, which aligns the sector coordination efforts of EU, German Development Cooperation and Swedish Bilateral Aid. The use of Indirect Management with EU Member States rather than stand-alone Programme Estimates has been critical to foster this Joint EU initiative, in which the Delegation has played a key strategic role. The joint EU initiative also enabled to engage political dialogue on future priorities for the sector along themes such as "accelerating policy implementation", and to improve efficiency with the development of "common programming framework". As a result EU visibility has been greatly enhanced.

In a politically difficult and challenging context on land and natural resource governance in Kenya, the FAO is currently the only development agency who has been able to provide guidance and technical capacity to the counties and national government using the VGGT. Hence, the FAO is acting as a neutral and honest broker in strengthening land management in a politically tense context between local and national government. The strategy for scaling up the programme throughout the country is based on increasing capacity as the programme is rolled out. The initial five-year phase will therefore target 8 counties. Officers of other counties (to be targeted in the second phase) will however be included in training and capacity building exercises, and national level capacity will also be built. This will enable an additional 16 counties to be scaled up and covered in the second four-year phase and 27 counties in the final four-year phase. Whilst issuing secure titles for the additional 16 counties of phase 2 is outside of the programme’s control within this timeframe, the programme will ensure that all counties in the country have the capacity to protect community land rights and that communities have the necessary information to take full responsibility in ensuring that this happens.

The support to access to land should foster an inclusive growth with more emphasis on youth, women and marginalized groups' access. This support should contribute to preventing the radicalization of land issues along ethnical, religious and political divides, hence contributing to security in the nation and in particular in arid areas which have permeable borders with Uganda, South Sudan, Ethiopia and Somalia. Improved land governance and enhancement of institutional and technical tools and capacity to apply the rule of law in defining and enforcing property rights will contribute to prevent and reduce land related conflicts which have been a major cause of insecurity especially in the last 2 years. The Counties targeted for the first phase (in particular Turkana, West Pokot and Baringo) have witnessed strong insecurity in the recent past due to ethnic based land related conflict. Proper land use planning, moreover, has the potential to reduce conflicts on the use of natural resources which have been growing exponentially due to the impact of drought and climate change.

The strengthening of academic institutions will contribute to reduce the chance of professional gaps in the future and support institutional sustainability (and the exit strategy). Current land officers in the counties with whom the programme will work and capacitate may move on or change jobs. The new generation of land officers graduating from the main universities will arrive with the same capacity gaps which this programme addresses. Therefore, the rationale of result 4 of component 2 is to begin to provide a more complete curriculum for these higher education institutions. The research component will address the
issue of capacity and information gaps around land issues. The national land commission has a research and advocacy directorate that needs support to produce quantitative information that can provide better policy advice for the Ministry of Land. The Programme, therefore, will contribute to establish the conditions (methodological and administrative processes) for titles of community land to be issued. Proper land use planning of livestock and agriculture production areas along the Lamu Port Southern Sudan-Ethiopia Transport (LAPSET) corridors will also contribute to increase trade. The Counties targeted for the first phase are not strongly export oriented; however, the signature of the Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) opens the possibility to new export opportunities towards the EU: the enhanced security of land tenure targeted by this project is a pre-condition for enhanced investments for agri-businesses in the area.

5 IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Financing agreement

In order to implement this action, it is not foreseen to conclude a financing agreement with the partner country, referred to in Article 17 of Annex IV to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement.

5.2 Indicative implementation period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 4.2 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 72 months from the date of adoption by the Commission of this Action Document.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission’s authorising officer responsible by amending this decision and the relevant contracts and agreements; such amendments to this decision constitute non-substantial amendment in the sense of Article 9(4) of Regulation (EU) 2015/322.

5.3 Implementation modalities

5.3.1 Indirect management with a Member State agency

For the component institutional support to the agriculture sector; a part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with Swedish Bilateral Aid in accordance with Article 58(1) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012, applicable by virtue of Article 17 of Regulation (EU) 2015/323. This implementation entails support to the Inter-Governmental Secretariat and related activities, including the support to the development M&E system at County level. This implementation is justified because of the current support provided by Swedish Bilateral Aid to the Agriculture County Coordination Units in the 47 counties of Kenya and by the division of labour between the partners of the joint EU initiative (See also paragraph 5.6 below). The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-implementation tasks: managing and enforcing the contracts concluded (making payments, accepting or rejecting deliverables, enforcing the contract, carrying out checks and controls, recovering funds unduly paid), and also running the procurement and grant procedures preceding the conclusion of such contracts, including the award and rejection decisions related to the Inter-Governmental Secretariat. This will involve the support to the Inter-governmental coordination including studies and technical assistance, procurement of equipment and facilitation of trainings and coordination/planning/policy workshops.

If negotiations with the above-mentioned entrusted entity fail, that part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with German Development Cooperation. The implementation by this alternative entrusted entity would be justified because German
Development Cooperation is one of the three partners of the joint EU initiative. The alternative entrusted entity would in that case implement the facilitation and operational costs of the Inter-governmental coordination including studies and technical assistance. The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-implementation tasks: managing and enforcing the contracts concluded (making payments, accepting or rejecting deliverables, enforcing the contract, carrying out checks and controls, recovering funds unduly paid), and also running the procurement and grant procedures preceding the conclusion of such contracts, including the award and rejection decisions.

5.3.2 Indirect management with a Member State agency

For the component institutional support to the agriculture sector: a part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with German Development Cooperation, in accordance with Article 58(1) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012, applicable by virtue of Article 17 of Regulation (EU) 2015/323. This implementation entails support to the Institutional Restructuring of MoALF and related activities. This implementation is justified because of the current support provided by German Development Cooperation to the Institutional Restructuring of MoALF and to the Transformation Secretariat and by the division of labour between the partners of the joint EU initiative (See also paragraph 5.6 below). The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-implementation tasks: managing and enforcing the contracts concluded (making payments, accepting or rejecting deliverables, enforcing the contract, carrying out checks and controls, recovering funds unduly paid), and also running the procurement and grant procedures preceding the conclusion of such contracts, including the award and rejection decisions related to the Institutional Restructuring of MoALF and to the Transformation Secretariat. This will involve the support to institutional restructuring including procurement of equipment for the Transformation Secretariat, studies, facilitation of capacity building and coordination workshops and technical assistance.

If negotiations with the above-mentioned entrusted entity fail, that part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with Swedish Bilateral Aid. The implementation by this alternative entrusted entity would be justified because Swedish Bilateral Aid is one of the three partners of the joint EU initiative. The alternative entrusted entity would in that case implement the facilitation and operational costs of the Institutional Restructuring of MoALF and to the Transformation Secretariat including studies and technical assistance. The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-implementation tasks: managing and enforcing the contracts concluded (making payments, accepting or rejecting deliverables, enforcing the contract, carrying out checks and controls, recovering funds unduly paid), and also running the procurement and grant procedures preceding the conclusion of such contracts, including the award and rejection decisions.

5.3.3 Indirect management with an international organisation

For the component support to land governance a part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with the FAO in accordance with Article 58(1) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012, applicable by virtue of Article 17 of Regulation (EU) 2015/323. This implementation entails support to land governance in local Government and related activities. In a politically difficult and challenging context on land and natural resource governance in Kenya, the FAO is currently the only development agency which has been able to provide guidance and technical capacity to the counties and national government using the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGT). Moreover, currently most counties do not yet have the full capacity to make the land management institutions fully functional without external capacity building. Hence, the FAO is acting as a neutral and honest broker in strengthening land management in a politically tense context between local and national government.
Given the outreach to over 8 counties in this first phase at a time when most counties do not have full human resource capacity and when technical specifications for the procurement of services or assets is lacking, the FAO is also best placed to deal with procurement and the overall financial management of the programme.

The FAO has a clear strategy for scaling up the programme throughout the country as described in paragraph 4.3 of the Action document.

The entrusted entity would carry out the following budget-implementation tasks: managing and enforcing the contracts concluded (making payments, accepting or rejecting deliverables, enforcing the contract, carrying out checks and controls, recovering funds unduly paid), and also running the procurement and grant procedures preceding the conclusion of such contracts, including the award and rejection decisions related to the implementation of the land governance programme. This will involve the facilitation of the county land governance including procurement of equipment, studies and short terms expertise. The FAO will also sub-grant some of the activities related to community awareness and empowerment on land rights to civil society organisations.

5.4 Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply.

The Commission’s authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility in accordance with Article 22(1)(b) of Annex IV to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of products and services in the markets of the countries concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where the eligibility rules would make the realization of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult.

5.5 Indicative budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EU contribution (EUR)</th>
<th>Indicative third party contribution (EUR) (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Specific objective of component 1 - institutional support to the agriculture sector:</strong> Agriculture sector transformation process is supported and coordination mechanisms established and functional in the new devolved context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2. Indirect management with German Development Cooperation (support to Transformation Secretariat)</td>
<td>2 450 000</td>
<td>(** 2 000 000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1. Indirect management with Swedish Bilateral Aid (support to the Inter-governmental coordination)</td>
<td>3 450 000</td>
<td>(** 4 000 000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Specific objective of component 2 – land governance:</strong> Equitable access and management of land for better livelihoods and socio-economic development is improved as per the voluntary guidelines for responsible land tenure governance (VGGT) (*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3. Indirect management with FAO Programme Activities: land use planning, land management and administration, land policy and legal framework, support to research and academic institutions</td>
<td>7 905 610</td>
<td>441 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Operational Costs</td>
<td>1 300 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support costs 7%</td>
<td>644 390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation – Audit | 250 000 | N.A.  
Communication and visibility | N.A. | N.A.  
**Totals** | 16 000 000 | 6 441 000  
(*) Counterpart contribution from counties are so far estimated at 50% of the donors contribution to land planning and land management in term of the hardware cost in terms of land, office space, staffing and equipment such as surveying and security filing of documents. Complementarities with the Swedish programme supporting the digitalisation of land records at the national Land Commission have been confirmed.  
(**) Member states' contribution will be confirmed upon completion of their respective programming cycles that will start in June 2015.  

5.6 Organisational set-up and responsibilities

For the component institutional support to the agriculture sector the project will be managed through two PAGODAs, respectively with German Development Cooperation and Swedish Bilateral Aid along the division of labour that was agreed between the three partners of the EU initiative as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVISION OF LABOUR</th>
<th>GERMANY/EU</th>
<th>SWEDISH BILATERAL AID/EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transformation secretariat and restructuring activities at MoALF level</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inter-governmental secretariat and related activities</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Development of common framework for the sector priority programmes</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Development of sector M&amp;E framework</td>
<td>National system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The programme will be implemented through the transformation structure that has been put in place during the first phase of the support. The governance of the Joint EU initiative is assumed by the Joint Transformation Working Group which has been so far chaired by the Cabinet Secretary of MoALF and attended by all heads of the state departments, Representative of the Counties chair of the agriculture sector, representative of EU joint initiative and the chair of donor working group.

For the component land, the programme will be managed through a Pillar Assessed Grant or Delegation Agreement (PAGODA) with FAO. This Programme component will be implemented directly by FAO, in close partnership with the county governments. Memoranda of understanding (or equivalent agreements) will be signed with each target county, detailing the respective roles, responsibilities and contributions of the FAO and of the County Government. Following on from this, where funds are needed by the county government, these will be provided on the basis of individual work plans. A similar approach will be used with the NLC and any other relevant ministry.

A steering committee will be established to oversee the implementation of the land component of the programme. Members of the steering committee will include: a) the Chairman of the NLC (or his representative), b) a representative of the Ministry of Land, c) the governors of the targeted counties (or their representatives), c) a representative from the council of governors on land or Natural Resources, d) a representative from the County Land Management Boards of each target county, e) FAO, and f) the chair of the donor working group on lands. The EU will be included in the steering committee as an observer. The Steering committee will meet at least once a year; there will however be a provision for ad
hoc meetings should any significant change need to be made in the programme modus operandi.

5.7 Performance monitoring and reporting

For the component institutional support to the agriculture sector, the performance monitoring will be nested in MoALF’s M&E currently under construction. As part of the renewed commitment towards Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) Compact coordination, the Ministry is now actively finalizing the design of the sector M&E system, which was previously spearheaded by ASCU. Strengthening of the Ministry’s operational M&E capacity is a stated priority of Joint EU initiative support. The Joint Transformation Working Group has also a work-plan and budget, which is the basis of the division of labour mentioned in paragraph 5.6 above, and of the monitoring of the Joint EU initiative support effectiveness.

For the component Land Governance, a detailed general work-plan will be developed in the inception phase with government institutions that will build upon specific county work-plans and work-plan with NLC and where a number of quantifiable targets at key stages throughout the programme will be identified. The impact of the programme will be measured against a comprehensive baseline survey along indicators such as the one reflected in the logframe in appendix.

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process and part of the implementing partner’s responsibilities. To this aim, the implementing partner shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its results (outputs and direct outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the logframe matrix. The report shall be laid out in such a way as to allow monitoring of the means envisaged and employed and of the budget details for the action. The final report, narrative and financial, will cover the entire period of the action implementation.

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

5.8 Evaluation

Having regard to the importance of the action, a mid-term and a final evaluation will be carried out for this action or its components via independent consultants contracted by the Commission.

The mid-term will be carried out for learning purposes, in particular with respect to launching a second phase of the action or its components.

The final evaluation will be carried out for accountability and learning purposes at various levels (including for policy revision), taking into account in particular the fact that both the joint EU support to an institution transformation process and a comprehensive support to land governance are innovative actions.
The Commission shall inform the implementing partner at least three months in advance of the dates foreseen for the evaluation missions. The implementing partner shall collaborate efficiently and effectively with the evaluation experts, and inter alia provide them with all necessary information and documentation, as well as access to the project premises and activities.

The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner country and other key stakeholders. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.

The financing of the evaluation shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.9 Audit
Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audits or expenditure verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

The financing of the audit shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.10 Communication and visibility
Communication and visibility of the EU is a legal obligation for all external actions funded by the EU.

This action shall contain communication and visibility measures which shall be based on a specific Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action, to be elaborated at the start of the implementation of the direct PAGODAs with Swedish Bilateral Aid, German Development Cooperation and FAO and supported with their budget. In addition, visibility activities are planned to be implemented centrally out the visibility funds that have been pooled from the last 10th EDF global commitments and from the 11th EDF funds that will be earmarked in the three projects foreseen in the AAP 2016 Kenya. Visibility actions supported may cover all EU cooperation activities in Kenya in order to increase coherence in the EU's communication strategy. Care will be taken that substantial visibility will be given to the programme as described in this Action Document. Standards for visibility will be derived from the "EU visibility guidelines for external actions" published by the European Commission.

In terms of legal obligations on communication and visibility, the measures shall be implemented by the Commission, the partner country, contractors, grant beneficiaries and/or entrusted entities. Appropriate contractual obligations shall be included in, respectively, the financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and delegation agreements.

The Communication and Visibility Manual for European Union External Action shall be used to establish the Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action and the appropriate contractual obligations.

Appendix: Indicative logframe matrix
APPENDIX - INDICATIVE LOGFRAME MATRIX

The activities, the expected outputs and all the indicators, targets and baselines included in the logframe matrix are indicative and may be updated during the implementation of the action without an amendment to the financing decision. The indicative logframe matrix will evolve during the lifetime of the action: new lines will be added for listing the activities as well as new columns for intermediary targets (milestones) when it is relevant and for reporting purpose on the achievement of results as measured by indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention logic</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Baselines (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Targets (incl. reference year)</th>
<th>Sources and means of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall objective:</strong> Impact</td>
<td><strong>Intervention logic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baselines</strong></td>
<td><strong>Targets</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sources and means of verification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food security of smallholder farmers and pastoralists' communities strengthened with improved access to agriculture services and to land</td>
<td>Increase in food and nutrition security level for both adult male and adult female headed household</td>
<td>June 2014 Agriculture Sector Development Strategy programme (ASDSP) Household baseline survey. Current baseline data for selected counties.</td>
<td>10% increase food security level for both adult male and adult female headed household to be achieved by end of 2018</td>
<td>Repeat of the Household baseline survey by ASDSP in association with the County governments and MoALF</td>
<td>1. Occurrence of droughts remains within acceptable level for its effects to be contained by resilience programmes. 2. All agriculture development and nutrition programmes are synergised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific objectives:</strong> Outcome</td>
<td>Component 1 - institutional support to the agriculture sector: Agriculture sector transformation process is supported and coordination mechanisms established and functional in the new devolved context</td>
<td>Food and nutrition security specific policies in place and coordination functional in all counties</td>
<td>December 2014 - Currently none of the counties have adopted specific policies on food and nutrition security and specific coordination are only crisis led in few counties.</td>
<td>At least the 23 ASAL counties have specific policies in place and functional coordination by end of 2018</td>
<td>Published county policies and County Integrated Development Plans (CIDP) approved by the County Assemblies Transformation Initiative (TI) monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2 - land: Equitable access and management of land for better livelihoods and socio-economic development is improved as per the voluntary guidelines for responsible land tenure governance (VGGT).</td>
<td>Rate of increase in women having secure tenure of land, either individually or as part of a community, due to EU support</td>
<td>June 2014 (ASDSP) Household baseline survey. Current baseline data for selected counties.</td>
<td>20% increase due to EU funding in 8 counties</td>
<td>Repeat of the Household baseline survey by ASDSP in association with the County governments</td>
<td>Repeat of the Household baseline survey by ASDSP in association with the County governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Component 1: Agriculture sector transformation</td>
<td>Component 2: Land governance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1-Result 1: County capacity to pursue county and cross-county coordination and service delivery for the sector is strengthened</td>
<td>C2-Result 1: Land use planning initiated and planning methodology established in selected counties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1-Result 2: Intergovernmental coordination framework is in place and effective</td>
<td>C2-Result 2: Land management and administration established in selected counties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 – Result 3.: Transformation process within MoALF completed</td>
<td>C2-Result 3: Land Policy and legal framework for land at county established and rolled out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1-Result 4: The transformation process is evidence-based supported</td>
<td>C2-Result 4: Capacity of research and academic institutions on national land issues strengthened.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>I.1.1 Review of the sector policies jointly assessed and completed by national and by county government</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.1.2 Common programme framework (CPF) to implement sector policies adopted and contributed to by county and national budgets</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.2.1 December 2014 - Currently county planning is just starting with a focus on municipalities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I.2.2 and I.2.3 Same base line as above – counties are at the very initial steps in terms of land management and in the formulation of county policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I.2.4 Currently there are no schemes to train and re-train land officers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.2.1 % of county land planning completed in selected county 30% of the county by 2018, by 80% by 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.2.1 By end of 2018 40% of the planning requirement should be completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.2.2 Number of land title issues to individual and communities after land right verification</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.2.2, I.2.3 and I.2.4 Exact targeting is not possible at this stage until base line and need assessment of curriculum is established at the initial stage of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.2.3 Substantial reduction of land grabbing incidence on lands over which counties have a jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.2.4 Number of land officers trained and retrained each year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3 and 1.2.4 County land offices record and project M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 2014 - Currently the process of inter government consultation has been initiated for the achievement of the two indicators – currently we are at 15 % in the process with the political binding and transformation structure in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By end of 2017 the CPF should be launched and by end of 2018 CPF should inform the formulation of the new Medium Terms Plan for the sector and all CIDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Published sector policies, MTP and CIDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TI and ministry monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E) system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political commitment to the ongoing institutional restructuring for the sector remains.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>