

F – Monitoring and evaluation

9. MONITORING, EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION	2
9.1 Monitoring and Reporting	2
9.2 Independent Tripartite Evaluation.....	3
9.3 Table: Kagera TAMP Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget	3
Annexe 7 MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN	6

9. MONITORING, EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION

9.1 Monitoring and Reporting

The objective of monitoring and evaluation is to assist all project participants in assessing project performance and impacts, with a view to maximizing both. Monitoring will consist of continuous or periodic review and surveillance of activities with respect to management and the implementation of the work plan and budget. This will help to ensuring that all required actions are proceeding as planned. Monitoring and Evaluation will take place at three levels: *project execution*, *project performance*, and *impact evaluation*.

Project Execution. Monitoring will concentrate on the management and supervision of project activities, seeking to improve the efficiencies when needed so as to improve the overall effectiveness of project implementation. It is a continuous process, which will collect information about on actual implementation of project activities compared to those scheduled in the annual work plans, including the delivery of quality outputs in a timely manner, identify problems and constraints (technical, human resource, and financial), make clear recommendations for corrective actions, identify lessons learned and best practices, etc.

Project Performance. Performance evaluation will assess the project's success in achieving its objectives (above). The project will be monitored closely by FAO (LTU and FAO-GEF Units), and by the Project Steering Committee through semi-annual reports, quarterly implementation reviews, technical reports, and regular technical supervision missions will be provided as required to enhance success. Project achievements will be evaluated after two years of project execution (mid-term) and at the end of the project (final) through an independent evaluation.

Project impact. Evaluation of the project's success in achieving its outcomes will be monitored continuously throughout the project. The key indicators can be found in the logical framework in Annex 2. The indicators will be further refined at the Inception Workshop, and tools and methods and indicators for measuring impact will be determined and agreed to ensure that a standardized framework is shared by the four participating countries.

Specific technical reports that will be developed to guide and monitor project implementation include:

- Sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management guides/manuals for farmer field schools, selected micro-catchments and landscapes;
- Community planning guide for SLAM - development, implementation and monitoring of community action plans including land tenure and access to resources;
- Incentives and policy for SLAM - including agricultural, environmental and land tenure issues;
- SLM baseline studies, indicators and methods for monitoring by FFS, communities and districts.

The monitoring and evaluation plan for the Kagera TAMP will serve two functions: first, periodic assessment of project implementation and performance of activities and, second, evaluation of their results in terms of relevance, effectiveness and impact in promoting the adoption of sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management (SLAM). Both will contribute to improved decision making and management, by keeping the project on track towards achieving the human development and global environmental goals/objectives and by feeding knowledge from experiences and lessons learnt into planned activities.

The Project Logical Framework in Annex 2 provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with the corresponding means of verification. Project progress, technical and financial reports and other sources identified in the logical framework will serve as the means of verification. Once operational, the basin-wide information centre that will be established to monitor change in the status of natural resources, agro-ecosystems and impact on livelihoods will contribute to the preparation of these reports. This monitoring system would be developed in close consultation

with the various levels of stakeholders to enable them to provide feedback and observations. The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan is described in detail in Annex 7.

Indicators of project impact will be applied at the project, community, district and national levels. Key indicators will reflect, *inter alia*:

- status of land, natural resources and ecosystems, their conservation and capacity for production of goods and services;
- evidence of positive changes in the management and use of biodiversity and natural resources,
- improvements in productivity, livelihoods and reduction of poverty;
- strengthening of capacities at different levels.

The indicators will be further elaborated at the Project Inception Workshop with the participating countries, stakeholders and FAO. The GEF Global Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA) project (FAO/UNEP) and as appropriate the Medium-size Project on Dryland Biodiversity Indicators (UNEP/GEF) will provide valuable inputs and guidance in this respect.

Day-to-day monitoring of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the Regional Project Coordinator and the National Project Managers, based on the project’s annual Work Plan and its indicators. The RPC will advise the FAO Lead Technical Unit and Technical Cooperation Department, who will duly inform the GEF Secretariat, of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and appropriate manner.

9.2 Independent Tripartite Evaluation

Evaluation is a process for determining systematically and objectively the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, progress and impacts of the activities in light of their objectives and inputs, both during the project lifetime and beyond.

Independent Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluations of the project will be organized, in close consultation with the participating countries and FAOs evaluation unit (PBEE). The independent Mid-Term Evaluations will be undertaken at the beginning of the third year of project implementation. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made towards achievement of outcomes and will identify corrective actions if necessary. It will, *inter alia*:

- review the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation;
- analyze effectiveness of implementation and partnership arrangements;
- identify issues requiring decisions and remedial actions;
- identify lessons learned about project design, implementation and management;
- highlight technical achievements and lessons learned;
- analyze whether the project is on track with respect to achieving the expected results; and
- propose any mid-course corrections and/or adjustments to the Work Plan as necessary.

An independent tripartite Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to completion of the project and will focus on the same issues as the Mid-Term Evaluation. In addition, the final evaluation will review project impact, analyze sustainability of results and whether the project has achieved the outcomes and the development and environmental objectives. It will also provide recommendations for follow-up actions. Table 1 below provides a summary of the main M&E reports, responsible parties, timeframe and estimated budget.

9.3 Table: Kagera TAMP Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Budget US\$ * ¹
Regional Inception Workshop	Regional Project Coordinator - RPC	Within two months of project start up	35,000

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Budget US\$ * ¹
	National Project Managers -NPMs FAO (NRL, FAO country offices)		
Project Inception Report	RPC with NPMs + FAO	Immediately after workshop	RPC/NPMs no extra cost FAO staff time in kind
Establish/refine outcome- and site- specific indicators (environmental + socioeconomic)	RPC + NPMs International M&E consultant with guidance of FAO	During year 1	10,000 (2,000/country+2,000 river basin level)
Field based impact monitoring	Oversight by RPC and NPMs Monitoring by district facilitators, local implementing agencies FAO guidance	Continually, but annual analysis prior to progress report, PIR and annual work plan preparation	50,000 (2,500/country/year)
Annual impact monitoring and Adaptive management of SLAM practices and Lessons learnt	RPC with NRL/SAF to oversee SLM activities and monitoring in the basin, in coordination with NPMs (responsible for country level activities and monitoring by national teams/contracts)	Annual Review	40,000 (10,000/country-indicative)
Project Implementation Review – FAO internal monitoring tool	Project Team + FAO	Annual	Project team no extra cost FAO in kind
Regional and National Project Steering Committee Meetings	RPC + NPM Participating countries FAO + Main partners/donors	Immediately after inception workshop and at least once a year	50,000 (travel and DSA costs) FAO staff in kind
Quarterly Project Implementation Reports - QPIR compare delivery with approved work plans; take remedial action	FAO Budget Holder TCOM, TCI/GEF	Quarterly	FAO in kind
6 monthly Project Progress Reports	Project team FAO (NRL, SAF, TCI/GEF, TCOM)	June and December	Project team no extra cost FAO in kind
Technical reports- see below*	Project team FAO (NRL, SAF, Project Task Force) Consultants as required	Indicative list of outputs of contracts/consultancies below	21,000 (review, printing, dissemination of technical outputs)
Supervisory visits to project and field sites	FAO technical missions ¹ Government PSC representatives	Yearly or as required	FAO (covered by fee) and GO staff time in kind
Independent Mid-term Review	PBEE –FAO independent evaluation unit) Project team Participating countries FAO-NRL, SAF, TCI/GEF, TCOM	At mid-point of project implementation	39,600
Independent Tripartite Final Evaluation	External Consultant Project team Participating countries FAO (NRL, SAF, PBEE, TCI/GEF, TCOM)	At the end of project implementation	65,000
Lessons learnt	Project team FAO (LTU+ project task force) FAO GEF Unit +TerrAfrica Partners	Yearly	75,000 (av. 3,000 per year for outreach; national and regional experience sharing workshops)
Terminal Report	RPC with support of NPMs FAO	At least one month before end of project	6,000
TOTAL Indicative Cost to GEF project (excludes project team and part of FAO staff time covered by IA fee)			US\$391,600

* Specific technical reports will be developed to guide and monitor project implementation including:

- Sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management guides/manuals for farmer field schools, selected micro-catchments and landscapes

¹ Part of FAO staff time and travel covered by the fee

- Community planning guide for SLaM - development, implementation and monitoring of community action plans including land tenure and access to resources
- Incentives and policy for SLaM - including agricultural, environmental and land tenure issues
- SLM baseline studies, indicators & methods for monitoring by FFS, communities & districts

Annexe 7 MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

INTRODUCTION

The objective of monitoring and evaluation is to assist all project participants in assessing project performance and impact, with a view to maximizing both. Monitoring is the continuous or periodic review and surveillance by management of the implementation of an activity to ensure that all required actions are proceeding according to plan. Evaluation is a process for determining systematically and objectively the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the activities in light of their objectives. Ongoing evaluation is the analysis, during the implementation phase, of continuing relevance, efficiency and effectiveness and the present and likely future outputs, effects and impact.

The project will be evaluated on the basis of execution performance, monitoring of milestones, output delivery, and project impact. The general and specific objectives of the project, its outcomes and outputs and key indicators, as expressed in the Project Logical Framework (Annex 2) and annual Work Plans, form the basis of this M&E plan.

The project's M&E programme will be guided by indicators that represent a summary description of the expected results and impacts. The indicators, as presented in the Project Logframe, should be understood as being adaptable in the sense that they could be subject to revision during the course of project implementation. Reasons for revision could include changing circumstances, a demonstrated inability (either physical or practical) to collect reliable baseline data on an indicator such that change cannot be reliably measured, interim monitoring that indicates that targets are either too high or too low, or more appropriate indicators have been identified.

The project will be monitored and evaluated on the basis of:

- **Project execution.** Monitoring will assess whether the management and supervision of project activities is efficient and seek to improve the efficiencies, when needed, so as to improve the overall effectiveness of project implementation. It is a continuous process, during which information about the execution of activities programmed in the annual work plans will be collected, including the delivery of quality outputs in a timely manner. Such information will facilitate the comparison of accomplished against programmed tasks (according to the annual work plan), with a view to identifying any corrective measures that may be necessary to improve performance. This activity will be the direct responsibility of the Regional Project Coordinator, with advice from the Project Steering Committee and FAO. See *Table 1* for the execution performance indicators.
- **Project performance, milestones and delivered outputs.** The project will be monitored closely by the Project Steering Committee and FAO-LTU and FAO-GEF units through semi-annual reports and quarterly implementation reviews. How successful the project is will be evaluated at mid-term (after two years of project execution) and final (at the end of project execution) by external consultants contracted by FAO. See *Table 3* for a summary of the project performance indicators.
- **Project impact.** Evaluation of the project's success in achieving its outcomes will be monitored continuously throughout the project through semi-annual project progress reports, annual summary progress reports, and a midterm and final evaluation. The key performance indicators identified in the project logframe will guide the evaluation of project impact. *Table 2* presents the key performance indicators. Methods of data collection must strive to ensure that reliable baseline data has been collected/is collected and that impact data are collected regularly throughout project implementation. The performance indicators will be tested and refined, if necessary, and interim indicators and numerical targets with timeframes will be agreed during the inception workshop.

MONITORING OF PROJECT EXECUTION AND PERFORMANCE

Day-to-day monitoring of progress and performance and reporting will be the responsibility of the Regional Project Coordinator (RPC) in close consultation with national project managers (NPMs) and the regional GIS remote sensing centre. The RPC and NPMs will report regularly to members of Regional and National Project Steering Committees, highlighting important issues and constraints for advice and guidance. The RPC will advise the lead technical unit and budget holder [Land and Water Division -NRL] and Technical Cooperation Department, and in turn GEF Secretariat, of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that timely support/corrective measures can be provided. FAO, will organize an independent mid-term review and final project evaluation with a team of external consultants to assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, progress and impacts of the project in light of TAMP objectives, inputs and expected outputs. Table 1 below contains a description of the indicators that will be used to measure project performance.

Table 1: Indicators for Evaluating if Project Management Units are Effectively Operational

Indicator	Means of Verification ²
Regional coordination mechanisms and national project management structures established and functioning	Project Inception Report and Semi-annual Project Progress Reports
Semi-annual and annual activity and progress reports are prepared in a timely and satisfactory manner	Arrival of reports to TCI
Semi-annual expenditure reports are prepared in a timely and satisfactory manner	Arrival of reports to TCI
Performance targets, outputs, and outcomes are achieved as specified in the annual work plans.	Semi-annual and Annual progress reports
Deviations from the annual work plans are corrected promptly and appropriately. Requests for deviations from approved budgets (budget revisions) are submitted to and approved by FAO in a timely fashion.	Work plans, timely submission to, and approval by FAO of revised budget
Disbursements are made on a timely basis, and procurement is achieved according to the procurement plan.	Transactions statements and financial reports of FAO
Report on the procurement of non-expendable equipment against the project budget filed in a timely manner	Inventory of Non-Expendable Equipment reports
Project Steering Committee (PSC) is providing guidance on project implementation, monitoring project progress and project impact, and fulfilling its Terms of Reference (TORs)	Minutes of PSC meetings
PSC is providing policy guidance, especially on achievement of project impact.	Minutes of PSC meetings

PROJECT IMPACT

Evaluation of the project's success in achieving its outcomes and desired impact will be monitored continuously throughout the project by the Regional Project Coordinator, LTU and GEF unit /TCI. An independent mid-term review will be carried out at the beginning of Project Year 3 and an independent final evaluation will be carried out just prior to project completion. The key performance indicators identified in the project logframe will guide the evaluation of project impact. **Table 2** presents the key

² The GEF project task manager will track this in consultation with the global PMU.

performance indicators. Methods of data collection must strive to ensure that reliable baseline data has been /is collected and that impact data are collected regularly throughout project implementation. The performance indicators will be tested and refined, as necessary, and interim indicators and numerical targets with timeframes will be agreed during the inception workshop. FAO will work closely together with the Regional Project Coordinator to complete this task.

Kagera TAMP objectives and impact: The objectives of the 4.5 year project and the project outcomes (components) and planned outputs (expected results) provide the basis for this M&E plan. The environmental objective is to address the causes of land degradation and restore ecosystem health and functions in the Kagera basin through the introduction of adapted agro-ecosystem management approaches. The development objective is to improve the livelihood opportunities, resilience and food security of rural communities (men, women and children) in the Kagera Basin through adoption of more productive and sustainable resource management practices that are technically feasible and socio-economically viable. Major areas identified for impact assessment include: (a) status of land resources and agro-ecosystems; (b) evidence of change in land and agro-ecosystems management practices; (c) improvement in achievement of environmental and livelihood goals – reversing land degradation, biodiversity conservation, carbon sequestration and enhancing crop and livestock productivity, reducing poverty, reducing food insecurity and vulnerability; and (d) strengthened capacities for integrated sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management (SLaM) at different levels and across the river basin.

A minimum data collection is required to enable TAMP project management and stakeholders (field staff/communities/land users/partner institutions) to track at regular time intervals a) the extent to which the SLaM objectives are being achieved (compare planned/versus achieved inputs and outputs) and assess effects of both external factors and internal project operations and b) to assess results and lessons learnt, solutions to keep project on track for decision making process by the management. The databases and monitoring systems established and maintained by the regional and national project management units, as well as the information centres at community level, should help the project decision makers, as and when needed, and the mid term and end of project evaluations, to establish the relationship between objective, outputs and effects (impacts) in regard to the SLM objectives/goal.

During the PDF-B the baseline problem/situational analysis, characterization and evaluation of land management practices and their implications (biophysical and socioeconomic status, spatial and temporal trends) with stakeholders led to the diagnosis and formulation of required interventions. The indicators identified to monitor progress/change are elaborated in the Logical Framework in Annex 2.

Baseline information has been collected by Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda from the several transects and PRA processes conducted in a range of agro-ecological zones and contexts by an interdisciplinary team of experts with community representatives This is supplemented by information collected through consultations with government, NGOs, projects and other stakeholders. (Burundi has yet to compile such information as it was not one of the participating countries in the PDF-B, although representatives from Burundi participated in some of the regional workshops). In addition, the three PDF countries, through a contracted remote sensing/GIS centre, each set up a preliminary geographic information system (GIS) for its part of the basin with biophysical and socioeconomic data built up from various sources and scales of information. The three digitised datasets and reports (available) and a dataset for Burundi (to be developed during initial months of the project) will be combined and harmonised by the University of Butare which has been selected, following the PDFB, as the most qualified service provider in the Kagera Basin to develop and monitor the basin wide GIS/RS system.

The indicators and baseline will be reviewed, responsibilities actors tentatively identified, and the method of collection and responsible actors agreed at the Inception meeting and first Regional Project Steering Committee meeting.

Table 2. Key performance indicators

Objectives and outcomes	Key Performance Indicators	Baseline	Method of Data Collection (including frequency)
<p>ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES</p> <p>The <u>environmental objective</u> is to address the causes of land degradation and restore ecosystem health and functions in the Kagera basin through the introduction of adapted agro-ecosystem management approaches.</p> <p>The <u>development objective</u> is to improve the livelihood opportunities, resilience and food security of rural communities (men, women and children) in the Kagera Basin through adoption of more productive and sustainable resource management practices that are technically feasible and socio-economically viable.</p>	<p>Improved land use systems/ management practices for the range of agro-ecological zones in the basin being tested and adapted (by end PY3) for arable and pastoral systems including measures for reducing pressures on wetlands, riverbanks, forest and protected areas.</p> <p>Transformation of 43,700 ha of land by PY3 and 100,000 ha by PY5 towards more productive and sustainable agricultural ecosystems</p> <p>Potentially 6 percent of today’s basin population (some 1 million people) aware of project activities in target communities, micro-catchments, agro-ecological units through demonstrations and outreach..</p>		<p>Without project information from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - prior assessments of land degradation and impacts in the river basin. -district development and economic reports <p>SLaM interventions monitored by target districts and mapped by target communities- field surveys</p> <p>Outreach assessed through polls (e.g. market places/schools)</p>
<p>Outcomes</p>			
<p>1. Transboundary coordination, information sharing and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms operational and effective in promoting sustainable, productive agro-ecosystems and restoration of degraded lands.</p>	<p>Transboundary agro-ecosystem management programme to reverse land degradation being implemented and monitored in 21 districts and reviewed by national and regional PSCs and project activities and achievements widely shared and available (PY5).</p> <p>Best practices for addressing transboundary land-related constraints through integrated ecosystems and inter-sectoral approaches mainstreamed in planning and development processes, including NAPs, and pilot actions implemented to address transboundary issues in 68 communities (PY3) and replicated in</p>		<p>Reports and decisions of district, national, river basin policy and planning mechanisms</p> <p>Project steering committee reports</p> <p>Technical reports and project progress reports</p> <p>Field surveys</p> <p>National and district financial accounts</p>

Objectives and outcomes	Key Performance Indicators	Baseline	Method of Data Collection (including frequency)
	<p>21 districts (PY5).</p> <p>Regular budgetary allocations from Governments to transboundary coordination and collaboration in the Kagera Basin increased by 10 % (PY5)</p>		
<p>2 Enabling policy, planning and legislative conditions are in place to support and facilitate the sustainable management of agro-ecosystems and the restoration of degraded land.</p>	<p>Priority policy, legal and transboundary issues identified and agreed at community (68), district (21) and river basin levels for SLAM (end PY2) and resulting in supporting policy decisions, regulatory mechanisms and community bye-laws for improved harmonization and application (PY5).</p>		<p>Action plan for the establishment of a supporting policy and legal framework for SLAM across the basin.</p> <p>National and regional workshop reports</p>
<p>3. Capacity and knowledge are enhanced at all levels for the promotion of – and technical support for – sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems in the basin.</p>	<p>Trained technical staff and policy makers in 21 districts - supporting SLAM planning and implementation and using project information resources in their district and communities (PY5)</p> <p>Community members/local decision makers sensitized on SLAM techniques for pastoral, arable, mixed systems and their on- and off-site impacts and benefits (PYs 1-5)</p> <p>FFS members trained and adopting SLM and promoting upscaling on community territory</p> <p>Training materials on best practices /approaches widely available and SLM demonstrations in place.</p>		<p>Project progress reports</p> <p>Reports of staff and other stakeholder training workshops</p> <p>Targets being monitored by the project and districts</p>
<p>4. Improved land and agro-ecosystem management practices are implemented and benefiting land users for the range of agro-ecosystems in the basin.</p>	<p>SLM practices implemented by pilot communities (68 by PY3; 200 by PY5) in demonstrations and farmer plots covering a total of 45,000 ha of land (by PY5) and showing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effective control of soil erosion (no new visual signs) in all target sites; 		<p>LAMIS data (RS/GIS) including field monitoring of target areas</p> <p>Sample surveys of land degradation, agro-ecological systems analysis and agro-biodiversity in target areas by FFS and technical staff will include LADA-</p>

Objectives and outcomes	Key Performance Indicators	Baseline	Method of Data Collection (including frequency)
	<p>- 4 target micro-catchments (PY5) identified an sediment loads monitored (subject to identifying sites where SLM interventions can be applied on a significant area of the catchment and hydrological monitoring can be supported by partner Kagera IWRM, NBI-NELSAP and LVEMP projects);</p> <p>- 30 percent increase in vegetation cover (above and below ground biomass) on pilot 23,000 ha arable and 7,500 ha pasture lands where alternatives to slash and burn are applied (PY5)</p> <p>-20 percent increase in soil carbon stores on farmer study plots and sample arable and pasture lands (PY5) inferred on 30,500 ha of land where SLM is practiced/planned.</p> <p>- 10 percent increase in production (crop; livestock; other goods) by trained farmers/ herders contributing to livelihoods (income; food security; reduced vulnerability)</p>		<p>local visual indicators of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ soil properties and erosion backed up by soil C sampling; ▪ vegetation/litter cover/bare soil/ extent and effect of burning; ▪ water resources and drought ▪ inter and intra-species and habitat diversity ▪ land productivity under different land use types (inputs/ yields/ other NR products e.g fuel) <p>Household surveys in target communities /districts (comparing 360 sample households/ FFS members and controls ; analysis of land degradation, poverty; health; food security, vulnerability inter-relations)</p>
5. Project management structures operational and effective	<p>Project activities executed and outputs delivered in line with workplan and budget</p> <p>Regional PSC and TAC meetings held and guidance given</p> <p>Support visits executed by FAO and Government institutions and PSC/TAC members</p>		<p>Project progress reports</p> <p>Project M&E sstem</p>
Outputs			
1.1A basin-wide coordination mechanism is established to facilitate trans-boundary dialogue, basin-level planning, policy harmonisation and	Sustainable coordination mechanism for SLaM agreed upon among the 4 countries (eventually as part of wider NBI and EAC mechanisms) and reflected in a		<p>Report on options for basin wide coordination of SLaM</p> <p>National policies and action plans reflect</p>

Objectives and outcomes	Key Performance Indicators	Baseline	Method of Data Collection (including frequency)
<p>coordination of national/sub-national actions.</p>	<p>memorandum of understanding.</p> <p>Recommendations to harmonise policies, laws and regulations and address transboundary issues in the river basin developed by an ad-hoc basin-wide task force with stakeholders (PY3) and mechanisms in place for their implementation in 21 districts (by PY5).</p> <p>Transboundary SLM action plans in development/ in place with budget allocations and institutional support.</p>		<p>regional collaboration</p> <p>Reports of RPSC meetings</p> <p>Project progress reports</p> <p>Relevant river basin/district reports reflecting collaboration across borders and among TAMP and partner projects (NBI-NELSAP, LVEMP, ...)</p>
<p>1.2 An efficient basin-wide knowledge management system is established to support information requirements and decision-making processes at all levels.</p>	<p>TAMP knowledge management system established and functioning at all levels (PY2) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Kagera environmental monitoring and information system (EMIS) supported by a GIS and RS tools and linked with LVEMP and NBI databases as appropriate (PY1-5). ○ Pilot district level GISs developed and operational - 1/country (by PY3). ○ Community information centres set up and servicing stakeholders in target communities (PY2). ○ Membership of networks and selected experts from networks supporting TAMP (IW LEARN, WOCAT, ASARECA). 		<p>EMIS, pilot district GIS and community information centre outputs (regularly updated)</p> <p>Project M & E system</p> <p>Project progress reports</p>
<p>1.3 Project monitoring and evaluation systems supporting TAMP implementation and decision making.</p>	<p>M & E system established and functioning</p> <p>Project management and district partners trained in data collection and participatory M&E (by end PY 1)</p>		<p>M&E reports issues in a timely manner</p> <p>Steering committee reports</p> <p>Project progress reports</p> <p>Mid-term (PY3) and final (PY5) evaluation reports</p>

Objectives and outcomes	Key Performance Indicators	Baseline	Method of Data Collection (including frequency)
<p>1.4 Kagera TAMP project management structures are operational and effective.</p>	<p>Project management structures established (PY1)</p> <p>Project staff recruited (PY1)</p> <p>Adequate premises, equipment and support services provided (PY1).</p> <p>Resource mobilisation strategy and co-financing plan regularly updated and shared with partners, in accordance with GEF land degradation co-funding requirements (PY1-5).</p>		<p>Reports of PSC meetings and communications with TAC members</p> <p>Project progress reports</p> <p>Co-financing reports</p>
<p>2.1 Sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems (SLaM) mainstreamed in national development policies and programmes, enhancing synergy among sector strategies and across the river basin</p>	<p>SLaM considerations/actions integrated in annual district development plans and budgets (21),</p> <p>- SLM practices/ approaches mainstreamed into river basin and national agriculture and NR sector action plans (e.g. biennial) and a set of results based indicators used to monitor how they contribute to NAPs (4) and NBSAPs (4) (by PY4-5).</p> <p>Successful and diverse experiences of inter-sectoral processes and systems approaches for SLaM documented annually in 21 districts and the river basin reports and case studies/findings made available for decision making by PSC members (PY4-5)</p>		<p>District development plans</p> <p>National plans reflect SLaM considerations (NAPs, NBSAPs)</p> <p>River basin reports (Kagera, Nile, LVEMP)</p>
<p>2.2 Regulatory actions developed and used to promote - or remove existing barriers to - sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management</p>	<p>Locally adapted by laws developed and agreed at community level (24 cases/ country) (PY3) and implemented (PY5)</p> <p>Best practices for effective policy and legal application/enforcement disseminated in the basin (PY 2-5).</p>		<p>Compendium of byelaws and regulations</p> <p>Reports of stakeholder consultations</p> <p>Project progress reports</p>

Objectives and outcomes	Key Performance Indicators	Baseline	Method of Data Collection (including frequency)
<p>2.3 A coherent strategic and planning framework developed and implemented (from river basin to district/provincial and community levels) to support SLM efforts by rural communities.</p>	<p>National and local government staff trained in land use planning (at least 42 district level; 64 community level) (PY1-5)</p> <p>Land use policy being effectively applied/enforced in 68 communities by PY5.</p> <p>Participatory strategies and action plans developed for SLaM in 21 districts across the basin (PY1-3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ improved pasture and rangelands management (at least 15 areas; 7,500ha) ○ transboundary livestock movements (5 borders) ○ conservation and sustainable use of wetlands (at least 9 areas; 6,000 ha), ○ conservation and sustainable use of agro-biodiversity (68 communities) ○ sustained energy supply (68 communities) 		<p>Reports of workshops</p> <p>Reviews of status and trends and opportunities/options for SLaM</p> <p>EMIS maps, analyses and reports</p> <p>District and community action plans</p> <p>Project progress reports</p>
<p>3.1 Methods and approaches to promote the adoption of SLM practices and agro-ecosystems (pastoral and cropping) are identified, developed and validated through participatory action-research.</p>	<p>Demonstration sites (68) and FFS study plots (136) identified and agreed upon (end PY1), established (end PY2) and FFS study plots scaled-up x 3 (PY4-5)</p> <p>Training materials developed and used in training in 21 districts</p> <p>Advocacy and training materials disseminated and used in 21 districts and 68 communities (PY3), available from community information centres and districts as and when required in the basin (PY 5)</p>		<p>Documentary, educational & training material produced (video films technical and advocacy leaflets, maps, etc.)</p> <p>Training reports</p> <p>Project progress and technical reports</p>
<p>3.2 The quality of services provided to rural communities enhanced, particularly through intersectoral approaches that build on local knowledge and</p>	<p>FFS facilitators/extensionists (150); district staff (4 x 21), community leaders (150) and partner NGO staff (42) trained in PLAR (participatory-learning-action-research)</p>		<p>Field surveys and interviews</p> <p>Training workshop reports</p>

Objectives and outcomes	Key Performance Indicators	Baseline	Method of Data Collection (including frequency)
<p>innovations for improved agro-ecosystems management</p>	<p>approaches (PY 2+) and best practices for SLAM.</p> <p>Target communities (68) benefiting from improved access to service providers competent in SLAM (planning; intersectoral/ systems approaches) and SLM support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 300 technical staff and 200-250 policy makers (15/districts) trained to support SLAM planning and implementation and using project information resources in their district and communities (PY5) <p>120,000 community members/local decision makers sensitized on SLAM techniques for pastoral, arable, mixed systems and their on- and off-site impacts and benefits (PYs 1-5)</p>		<p>District and community reports</p> <p>Project progress reports</p> <p>District polls to assess outreach from SLM demonstrations, information centres, radio, education materials, etc)</p>
<p>4.1 Participatory land management plans are developed and implemented in targeted communities, micro-catchments and wider land units.</p>	<p>100 participatory land use plans and action plans developed (PY2) and being implemented (PY2-4) and replicated x 2 (PY5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o community action plans (68) o micro-catchments (46); o pasture/ range areas (15); o target wetlands (10); o riverbanks (1000km) <p>Capacity built for implementation and monitoring of community action plans (PY1-5) in 136 communities.</p>		<p>Community / district land use plans and management reports</p> <p>Technical reports</p> <p>GIS / RS outputs</p> <p>Project progress reports</p> <p>A set of agreed indicators for monitoring SLM action plans e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduced degradation (burning, erosion, etc.) - improved vegetation cover, soil, water and range quality, resilience to drought - enhanced crop and livestock productivity and effects on livelihoods - increased awareness, information, expertise and institutional support for SLM

Objectives and outcomes	Key Performance Indicators	Baseline	Method of Data Collection (including frequency)
<p>4.2 Improved land use and agro-ecosystem management practices are successfully adopted by farmers and herders in targeted communities and replicated in other areas.</p>	<p>136 communities implementing SLAM (PY5)</p> <p>Wide adoption of improved agricultural systems and management practices including biodiversity conservation by members of 72 farmer/herder groups (PY3) and replicated x 3 (PY5)</p> <p>11,800 farmers trained and adopting /upscaling SLM through FFS approaches (PY3) and a further 1,800 farmers by PY5</p> <p>Local-level indicators of benefits of SLAM (income, household food security, reduced risk) confirmed by all target farmer groups and a sample 10 % of the target population (100,000 persons) (by PY5)</p>		<p>Training reports</p> <p>FFS records</p> <p>GIS / RS maps, analyses and reports</p> <p>Project progress reports</p>
<p>4.3 Market opportunities and other incentive/ benefit sharing mechanisms for the provision of environmental services identified, demonstrated and promoted among land users.</p>	<p>Incentive and benefit sharing mechanisms (monetary; non-monetary) identified and supporting adoption of SLAM and biodiversity conservation, including payments for environmental services (PES), products added-value and marketing in 34 communities (PY 1-5)</p> <p>Incentive/ support mechanisms reaching vulnerable groups (tenant farmers, youth, HIV/AIDS widows/orphans; female headed households) 15% of target population (PY5)</p>		<p>Technical Reports</p> <p>Reviews and records of incentive/benefit sharing measures and options and SLM investments</p> <p>Local surveys on poverty, health, income, vulnerability etc</p> <p>Project progress reports</p>
<p>Output 5.1: Project management, institutional and administrative structures in place and linked to national and regional decision making structures</p>	<p>Regional project coordinator and national project managers in place in offices provided by host government and supported by FAO (HQ, Country reps and regional offices)</p> <p>Activities and products monitored in terms of timeliness, cost effectiveness and</p>		<p>Project progress reports</p> <p>Midterm evaluation report</p>

Objectives and outcomes	Key Performance Indicators	Baseline	Method of Data Collection (including frequency)
	sustainability Regional PSC and TAC operational, linkages made to other national processes and guidance provided Backstopping missions by FAO and Government institutions Mid term evaluation conducted and recommendations implemented Adequate co-funding and human resources to execute project activities		
Output 5.2: Project M&E system and reporting supporting project management and execution.	Continuous monitoring and reporting on project performance Project management and performance review included as part of mid term evaluation		Project progress reports Midterm evaluation report

PROJECT MONITORING REPORTS

The Regional Project Coordinator, in close consultation with the National Focal Points and in collaboration with the FAO Lead Technical Unit and budget holder (NRL), and TCI (GEF Focal Point) will be responsible for the preparation of the following mandatory reports that form part of the monitoring process. The TCI/GEF unit will formally submit the reports to GEF Secretariat.

The timely preparation and submission of the following mandatory reports form an integral part of the monitoring process. All technically cleared reports should be copied to **TC-FPMIS-DataQuality@fao.org** so that they can be uploaded and maintained in the corporate project database under the FAO Field Programme Management Information System (FPMIS).

Monitoring, reporting and evaluation responsibilities are set out in Table 4 and timing and content of the various reports in Table 5. A consolidated M&E Plan and budget can be found in Table 6.

Project Inception Report

The Regional Project Coordinator shall prepare the Project Inception Report in close collaboration with the National Focal Points and FAO. It will include a detailed First Year Annual Work Plan divided into monthly timeframes detailing the activities and progress indicators that would guide implementation during the first year of the project. The Work Plan should include, *inter alia*, dates of specific field visits, national and regional meetings, Regional and National Project Steering Committee and other key decision-making meetings, technical support and review missions, workshops/training sessions to be organized outputs to be produced. The Report will also include the detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation, including any monitoring and evaluation requirements to measure project performance during the year.

The Inception Report will include a detailed narrative on the institutional roles and responsibilities and coordinating action of project partners, progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities, and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation.

The draft report will be circulated to project partners for review and comments. The final version will be submitted by the FAO/LTU to FAO GEF unit (TCI) and the LTU will ensure that the report is posted on the FAO Field Programme Management Information System (FPMIS).

Quarterly Project Implementation Reports (QPIR)

Quarterly Project Implementation Reports are an internal FAO monitoring tool. QPIRs are prepared by the FAO budget holder (BH) and require the BH to review the project regularly, to compare approved work plans with actual performance, and to take corrective action as required. The QPIR is used to identify constraints, problems or bottlenecks that impede timely implementation and take appropriate remedial action. A copy of the QPIR should be provided to the FAO GEF Unit.

Semi-Annual Project Progress Reports

The Regional Project Coordinator, with inputs from the National Project Managers that will have been prepared with National Focal Points, will prepare every six months a Project Progress Report in English, using the standard FAO format, which is attached as an Annex to the Project Document). The Project Progress report should contain, *inter alia*:

- a) an account of actual implementation of project activities compared to those scheduled in the Annual Work Plans, and the achievement of outputs and progress towards achieving the project objectives, based on the project progress and impact indicators as contained in the Project Logical Framework in Annex B, the Project Inception Report and as further defined in Project Year 1;

- b) an identification of any problems and constraints (technical, human, financial, etc.) encountered in project implementation and the reasons for these constraints;
- c) clear recommendations for corrective actions in addressing key problems resulting in lack of progress in achieving results;
- d) lessons learned; and
- e) a detailed work plan for the next reporting period.

Project Implementation Review (PIR)

The Project Implementation Review is an annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF. Starting 2006, the GEF Secretariat provides the scope and contents of the PIR. The PIR is an essential management and monitoring tool and will be an important medium for extracting lessons learned from ongoing projects. Once the project has been under implementation for a year, a PIR must be completed by FAO for the year beginning 1 July and ending on 30 June. The PIR should be discussed by the LTU with the Regional Project Steering Committee and submitted to the TCI/GEF unit. The individual PIRs are collected, reviewed and analysed by TCI/GEF by focal area, theme and region for common issues/results and lessons. The focal area PIRs are then discussed in the GEF Interagency Focal Area Task Forces around November each year and consolidated reports by focal area are collated by the GEF Evaluation Office based on Task Force findings.

Technical and Field Reports

The Regional Project Coordinator will commission technical reports in accordance with the annual Work Plan approved by the Regional PSC. The drafts of any such technical reports must be submitted by the RPC and to the FAO LTU and TCI-GEF for review and clearance, prior to finalization and publication. Copies of the technical reports will be distributed to the participating countries and partners, the GEF Secretariat (as appropriate), FAO Representatives and FAO technical officers and librarians concerned in the FAO Subregional Offices and in FAO headquarters, and posted on the FAO FPMIS.

Project Terminal Report

In the concluding months of the project and not later than three months before the end of the project, the Regional Project Coordinator, in close consultation with the National Focal Points, will prepare a draft Terminal Report for review by the Project Steering Committee, participating countries and FAO. The draft report should be made available to the final project evaluation mission. The Terminal Report will assess in a concise manner, the extent to which the project's scheduled activities have been carried out, its outputs produced, progress made towards the achievement of the Development Objective, Global Environmental Objective and Immediate Objectives based on objectively verifiable project progress and impact indicators, institutional structures and coordination arrangements implemented, and lessons learned. It will also present recommendations for any future follow-up action arising out of the project. Upon conclusion of the project, it will be finalised and submitted to the participating countries (National Steering Committees), Regional Project Steering Committee, technical officers in the FAO Sub-regional Offices and in FAO headquarters and posted on the FAO-FPMIS.

INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

Independent mid-term review and final evaluations will be organized by FAO. Given the tripartite nature of the project, they will be conducted in close consultation with the partners (beneficiary countries and FAO) so as to facilitate the ownership of the findings and recommendations. In this respect, FAO will consult the partners on the timing of the mid-term review and final evaluation, terms of reference and evaluation team composition for appropriate competencies and independence.

Mid-term Review

An independent Mid-term Review will be undertaken at the beginning of Project Year 3. The Mid-term Review will determine progress being made towards achievement of outcomes and will identify corrective actions if necessary. It will include an autoevaluation by countries, and an independent reviewer. It will, *inter alia*:

- a) review the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation;
- b) analyse effectiveness of implementation and partnership arrangements;
- c) identify issues requiring decisions and remedial actions;
- d) identify lessons learned about project design, implementation and management;
- e) highlight technical achievements and lessons learned;
- f) analyse which of the activities could be scaled up, and review proposed modalities for remaining years;
- g) propose any mid-course corrections and/or adjustments to the Work Plan as necessary.

Terminal Evaluation

An independent final evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Regional Project Steering Committee meeting of the participating countries, and will focus on the same issues as the Mid-term Evaluation. In addition, the final evaluation will review project impact, analyse sustainability of results and whether the project has achieved the immediate objectives, global environmental objectives; and contributed towards the development objectives. It will furthermore provide recommendations for follow-up actions.

Table 3: Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation Responsibilities

This table summarizes the responsibilities and timing for the preparation of the monitoring and evaluation reports.

FAO GEF Unit	FAO - Lead Technical Unit and Budget Holder	Regional and National Steering Committees	National Focal Points
<p>Monitor the agreed M&E plan and arrange for independent supervisory visits</p> <p>Receive consolidated half-yearly and annual activity, progress and financial reports and copies of all substantive reports, from FAO</p> <p>Engage and prepare terms of reference for independent M&E consultants to conduct the mid-term reviews and final evaluation</p> <p>Facilitate the selective review of the project by STAP and/or GEFSEC</p> <p>Carry out such other monitoring as is determined in collaboration with FAO (Task Force and Management Team)</p>	<p>Establish reporting guidelines for country leaders, and ensure that they meet reporting dates and provide reports of suitable quality</p> <p>Participate fully in Regional Project Steering Committee and to the extent possible in general project meetings, including meetings of the Technical Committee</p> <p>Review and comment on half-yearly and annual activity and progress reports, Regional Coordinator's reports, Technical Committee's reports, and all substantive reports submitted by countries</p> <p>Prepare consolidated half-yearly progress reports and</p>	<p>Provide overall guidance for the project implementation</p> <p>Reviewing and approving the inception report and annual project work plans</p> <p>Receive consolidated half-yearly activity and annual progress reports, and all substantive reports, and provide policy guidance to the project on any matters arising from a reading of these reports</p> <p>Monitor inputs of international and national partners, ensuring that project obligations are fulfilled in a timely and coordinated fashion</p> <p>Assist in developing linkages with other projects, thus</p>	<p>Prepare national level annual work plans</p> <p>Prepare national inputs for incorporation into the semi-annual Project Progress Reports and annual PIR</p> <p>Supply continuing M & E data in a timely manner for the incorporation into the M&E reports and as requested by Project Management</p> <p>Assist FAO in carrying out special reviews</p> <p>Agree impact indicators at national level and ensure</p>

FAO GEF Unit	FAO - Lead Technical Unit and Budget Holder	Regional and National Steering Committees	National Focal Points
	<p>annual summaries, and forward substantive reports, with comments as appropriate, in a timely manner to FAO-GEF Unit</p> <p>Carry out a programme of regular visits to countries to supervise activities, and pay special attention to those countries with serious implementation problems</p> <p>Establish terms of reference for any scientific advisers (or internal STAT teams) to be engaged as consultants to advise on particular areas of expertise, and/or provide specialized training for participants. Receive and evaluate the reports of these advisers, and act on any problems noted within them</p>	ensuring the wider impact of project work	national M&E system provides appropriate information in a timely manner to the regional system

Commento [FD1]:

Commento [FD2]: Remove "forward to GEF Sec". AFCC prepared Annex 9, which is not reflected in the body of the ProDoc (p 113, 148).

Table 4: Monitoring and evaluation reports

This refers to the six-monthly administrative and financial reporting, with a fixed format to be respected by coordinators at the national and global levels, i.e. from country to FAO. FAO financial rules and procedures will be applied to all reports required under contracts stipulated with entities in the countries.

Report	Format and Content	Timing	Responsibility
Activity and Progress Reports	(Reports will use a standard format to be developed following the FAO Progress Report model)		
Document the completion of planned activities, and describe progress in relation to the annual operating plan	Person reporting and Date Activity name and accomplishments within each activity this half-year	Half-yearly	Country coordinators to FAO (Project Manager) for use as described in Table 3.4 (above)
Review any problems or decisions with an impact on performance	Targets for the next half-year		
Provide adequate substantive data on methods and outcomes for inclusion in consolidated project half-yearly and annual progress reports	Comment on performance on progress toward project goals, and problems/constraints		
Prepare Project Implementation Review (PIR) reports	Report on any unanticipated results and opportunities, and on any checks to project progress Any highlights	Yearly	FAO-GEF Unit to GEF Secretariat
Consolidated Half-yearly Progress Reports	Reports will use a standard format to be developed following the FAO Progress Report model)		

Report	Format and Content	Timing	Responsibility
Provide a summary of half-yearly reports of progress, for FAO monitoring and transmission	<p>Summary of Country Coordinators' reports and participating institutions</p> <p>Report on progress in each project activity, within each Country and in the project as a whole</p> <p>Activities of scientific advisers and specialized training programmes</p> <p>Summary of problems and proposed action</p> <p>Highlights</p>	Half-yearly, within 30 days of end of each reporting period, but not required where a Consolidated Annual Summary Report is due	<p>FAO (Regional Project Coordinator) with input from National/ regional Coordinators for forwarding to LTU, BH and FAO GEF unit and by FAO GEF unit to GEF</p> <p>Regional Project Coordinator will submit reports to the Regional Project Steering Committee</p>
Consolidated Annual Summary Progress reports	(Reports will use a standard format to be developed following the FAO Progress Report model)		
<p>Presents a consolidated summary review of progress in the project as a whole, in each of its activities and in each output</p> <p>Provides summary review and assessment of progress under each activity set out in the annual workplan, highlighting significant results and progress toward achievement of the overall work programme</p> <p>Provides a general source of information, used in all general project reporting</p>	<p>A consolidated summary of the half-yearly reports, with evaluation</p> <p>Summary of progress and of all project activities</p> <p>Description of progress under each activity and in each output</p> <p>Review of delays and problems, and of action proposed to deal with these</p> <p>Review of plans for the following period, with report on progress under each heading</p>	Yearly, within 45 days of end of the reporting period	<p>FAO (Regional Project Coordinator) in collaboration with National Focal Points</p> <p>Regional Project Coordinator will submit reports to the Project Steering Committee and to FAO/TCI for further processing and forwarding by the GEF unit to GEF Secretariat.</p>
Financial reports			
Details project expenses and disbursements	Disbursements and expenses in categories, format and documentation as set out by the FAO under the Contracts /Letters of Agreement (LoAs) to be stipulated	Half-yearly	All contracted institutions, to FAO (Project Manager)
Summary financial reports	(Standardized format, see Financial Procedures Agreement)		
Consolidates information on project expenses and disbursements	Receipts, Disbursements and Net Cash position	Half-yearly, within 30 days of end of period	<p>FAO Budget Holder ; BH submits reports to FAO GEF Unit for internal clearance.</p> <p>Financial reports forwarded by the FAO Finance Division to the GEF Trustee in accordance with the Financial Procedures Agreements between FAO and the GEF Trustee.</p>

TABLE 5: KAGERA TAMP MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN AND BUDGET

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Budget US\$ ^{*1}
Regional Inception Workshop	Regional Project Coordinator - RPC National Project Managers -NPMs FAO (NRL, FAO country offices)	Within two months of project start up	35,000
Project Inception Report	RPC with NPMs + FAO	Immediately after workshop	RPC/NPMs no extra cost FAO staff time in kind
Establish/refine outcome- and site- specific indicators (environmental + socioeconomic)	RPC + NPMs International M&E consultant with guidance of FAO	During year 1	10,000 (2,000/country+2,000 river basin level)
Field based impact monitoring	Oversight by RPC and NPMs Monitoring by district facilitators, local implementing agencies FAO guidance	Continually, but annual analysis prior to progress report, PIR and annual work plan preparation	50,000 (2,500/country/year)
Annual impact monitoring and Adaptive management of SLAM practices and Lessons learnt	RPC with NRL/SAF to oversee SLM activities and monitoring in the basin, in coordination with NPMs (responsible for country level activities and monitoring by national teams/contracts)	Annual Review	40,000 (10,000/country-indicative)
Project Implementation Review – FAO internal monitoring tool	Project Team + FAO	Annual	Project team no extra cost FAO in kind
Regional and National Project Steering Committee Meetings	RPC + NPM Participating countries FAO + Main partners/donors	Immediately after inception workshop and at least once a year	50,000 (travel and DSA costs) FAO staff in kind
Quarterly Project Implementation Reports - QPIR compare delivery with approved work plans; take remedial action	FAO Budget Holder TCOM, TCI/GEF	Quarterly	FAO in kind
6 monthly Project Progress Reports	Project team FAO (NRL, SAF, TCI/GEF, TCOM)	June and December	Project team no extra cost FAO in kind
Technical reports- see below*	Project team FAO (NRL, SAF, Project Task Force) Consultants as required	Indicative list of outputs of contracts/consultancies below	21,000 (review, printing, dissemination of technical outputs)
Supervisory visits to project and field sites	FAO technical missions ³ Government PSC representatives	Yearly or as required	FAO (covered by fee) and GO staff time in kind
Independent Mid-term Review	PBEE –FAO independent evaluation unit) Project team Participating countries FAO-NRL, SAF, TCI/GEF, TCOM	At mid-point of project implementation	39,600
Independent Tripartite Final Evaluation	External Consultant Project team Participating countries FAO (NRL, SAF, PBEE, TCI/GEF, TCOM)	At the end of project implementation	65,000
Lessons learnt	Project team FAO (LTU+ project task force) FAO GEF Unit +TerrAfrica Partners	Yearly	75,000 (av. 3,000 per year for outreach; national and regional experience sharing workshops)
Terminal Report	RPC with support of NPMs FAO	At least one month before end of project	6,000
TOTAL Indicative Cost to GEF project (excludes project team and part of FAO staff time covered by IA fee)			US\$391,600

³ Part of FAO staff time and travel covered by the fee

* Specific technical reports will be developed to guide and monitor project implementation including:

- Sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management guides/manuals for farmer field schools, selected micro-catchments and landscapes
- Community planning guide for SLaM - development, implementation and monitoring of community action plans including land tenure and access to resources
- Incentives and policy for SLaM - including agricultural, environmental and land tenure issues
- SLM baseline studies, indicators and methods for monitoring by FFS, communities and districts

