



Draft Minutes of Inception Workshop for KM:Land Initiative: First Phase

Medium Sized Project: Ensuring Impacts from SLM – Development of a Global Indicator System

30-31 July 2007, UNU-INWEH, Hamilton, Ontario

Chair: Andrea Kutter (GEF Sec)

Rapporteurs: Harriet Bigas and Caroline King (UNU)

Summing Up: Maryam Niamir-Fuller (UNDP-GEF)

Participants in Hamilton:

GEF Sec:	Andrea Kutter
STAP:	Michael Stocking
UNDP:	Maryam Niamir-Fuller
World Bank:	Enos Esikuri (Sam Wedderburn unable to attend)
UNU:	Zafar Adeel and Caroline King

Participants by Teleconference (31st July 08:30-10:30)

UNEP:	Mohammed Sessay (Tessa Goverse unable to attend)
IADB:	Henry Salazar and Ricardo Quiroga

Unable to Attend:

ADB:	David Macaulay
AfDB:	Daniele Ponzi
IFAD:	Sheila Mwanundu
FAO:	Barbara Cooney

Summary Findings:

- Updated strategic focus of the MSP, in order to contribute to the development of GEF-5
- Opportunity for the MSP to lead LD and other Focal Areas in the identification of integrated impacts
- High priority for all members of the InterAgency Working Group to take part in steering the KM:Land process
- High priority to cooperate with ongoing GEF initiatives, such as TerrAfrica and LADA
- High priority to ensure involvement of Project Managers (including non UN staff-members) in the training and capacity development activities of the project, as well as the substantive discussions on indicator development

Action Items for the InterAgency Working Group:

- Confirmation of participation in 1st Expert Workshop (and 2nd Working Group meeting), 28-30 August, Iceland
- Completion of Agency co-financing and Project Manager contact databases
- Confirmation of convenient dates for proposed remaining Working Group Meetings, and identification of any forthcoming meetings that may provide opportunities for combined scheduling of Working Group meetings

(please email to cking@inweh.unu.edu)

Monday 30th July, 2007

Opening Session

Welcome remarks were presented by the Chair, Andrea Kutter, on behalf of GEF-Sec, noting the strategic importance of the MSP to the GEF Secretariat, in order to demonstrate the impacts achieved by the SLM portfolio under GEF-5. Zafar Adeel, UNU-INWEH welcomed participants to Hamilton for the meeting, and expressed appreciation of the assembled interagency 'brain-trust' for the project. Maryam Niamir-Fuller, UNDP, noted the challenges for the project that have resulted from delays to its start-date, adding to the urgency of the need to present indicators of impact to the GEF Council. Enos Esikuri, World Bank, commended the project on its timely and far-reaching objectives, and noted the opportunity for leadership in the Land Degradation (LD) Focal Area (FA) on the identification of impacts to benefit not only the FA, but the GEF as a whole. Michael Stocking, STAP, observed that while the project had been delayed, its strategic importance had increased considerably.

An overview of the MSP objectives and modus operandi was presented by Zafar Adeel. Dr Adeel updated the group on progress since the pre-project meeting in January, 2007, announcing the reapproval of the project in May 2007, and the Memorandum of Agreement for the project implementation signed by UNU-INWEH in July, following negotiations with UNOPS. Dr. Adeel highlighted the objectives of the Inception Workshop to achieve consensus on the following aspects of central importance to the ongoing project planning (see the full agenda in appendix 1 to this document):

- Finalization of the MSP Logframe
- Agreement on schedule of activities
- Recommendations for the first expert workshop
- Selection of the Expert Advisory Group
- Finalization of Agency co-financing arrangements
- Approval of the Working Group modus operandi

At this stage, the Working Group would have the option to request GEF Council approval for significant changes to the project design (-although in the event, no such fundamental changes were found necessary). Discussions during this session immediately highlighted strategic issues to be incorporated into the project design, based on the new directions of GEF-4, and the need to assist with the development of FA strategies for GEF-5. In particular, the following issues need to be incorporated:

1. The LD FA should lead the process of integration of the NR focal areas (BD, IW and LD), and therefore, be mindful of indicators already developed and of processes underway to redefine the indicators in the other focal areas;
2. Interlinkages with relevant activities in other FAs should be fostered, eg with LULUCF under development in the CC FA;
3. Cross-cutting issues within the GEF of which all FAs need to be mindful include climate proofing, SFM and UNFF processes;
4. Programmatic approaches have been introduced to the LD portfolio as a "layer" in between global and project layer. While the project sets out to provide indicators to address the two levels: portfolio and project, some flexibility will be required to accommodate programmes and their RBM needs through a suite of options, to address different context and scales;
5. GEF has introduced a number of innovations: a new project cycle, RBM framework, and cost effectiveness. These must be taken into account;
6. Development of a "land related" target under MDG-7, should be encouraged by the project, in order to mainstream the M&E framework into Agency operations;
7. Allocation of funds for GEF-4 complete, therefore the MSP cannot lead immediately to into an FSP, as originally proposed.

Session 1: Review of Recent GEF TAG Progress on LD Knowledge Management

An analysis of the TAG recommendations and their significance for the MSP was presented by Andrea Kutter. Based on these recommendations, the final versions of the GEF-4 Strategy is now in circulation for approval by the Council. According to this strategy, the objective of the GEF Focal Area in Land Degradation (Desertification and Deforestation) is to reduce and reverse current trends in land degradation through the operation of sustainable land management policies and practices that simultaneously generate global environmental benefits and support local and national development. The strategy includes definition of objectives, impacts and indicators for the LD FA as follows:

Strategic Objectives	Expected Impact	Impact Indicators	Sources of Verification
Strategic Objective 1: To develop an enabling environment that will place sustainable land management in the mainstream of development policy and practices at regional, national and local levels	Overall decrease in trend and/or severity of land degradation	% Increase in Net Primary Productivity (NPP) and Rain-use Efficiency (RUE)	GLADA and LUCC mapping; CRIC reports; National GHG inv.
	Protected ecosystem functions and processes, including carbon stocks in the soil, plants and biota, and fresh water	% Increase in carbon stocks (soil and plant biomass) and/or % availability of fresh water	Carbon facilities, remote sensing (NDVI)
Strategic Objective 2: To scale up sustainable land management investments that generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods.	A decrease in the vulnerability of local populations to the impacts of climate change	% decrease in mortality rates consequent upon crop failures and livestock deaths	National surveys and statistics
	Improved livelihoods of rural (usually resource-poor) land users	% decrease in number of rural households below the poverty line	National economic statistics; development reports
	Diversified funding sources for SLM	% increase in diversity of funding sources (e.g. private sector, CDM)	National economic statistics; development reports

The MSP is referred to in the strategic document with a footnote to say that the listed indicators will be further developed during the implementation of the MSP. The strategy refers to priority ecosystems. An annex containing maps to support decision-making includes maps from a variety of sources. The priority ecosystems essentially arise from an overlay of all the maps; and the maps in effect constitute indicators of the expected impacts.

Participants agreed that the KM:Land Working Group process should add to the progress made by the TAG by:

1. Correcting the exact wording of the Objectives (to match RBM terminology);
2. Reviewing the list of expected impacts to refine/add as necessary;
3. Reviewing the list of impact indicators to refine/add as necessary;
4. Enabling the “priority ecosystems” developed by TAG, including the mapped priorities of ISRIC, to be revisited once indicators have been developed;
5. Providing guidance and suggesting a tracking system and targets for the key indicators to be monitored in GEF-5 and beyond, according to targets to be set at that time;
6. Making an effort to tackle the issue of attribution / contribution;
7. Developing a system to capture benefits to enable C/B analysis on LD projects (therefore to define cost effectiveness of projects).

Discussions highlighted the opportunity for the MSP findings to contribute to and inform the preparation of the GEF-5 LD focal area Strategy.

Session 2: Review of Complete MSP Logframe

A presentation of the MSP Overall Logframe: objectives, outcomes, outputs and indicators was made by Zafar Adeel, focusing on revisions to the original logframe in the approved project document. Some revisions were necessary because the original multi-authored document contained some inconsistencies. In addition, the passage of time had altered a number of the baselines and indicators proposed. No substantial changes to the articulation of Objectives and Outcomes were proposed before the Inception Workshop, however, when the Working Group considered the Objectives and Outcomes in light of the preceding strategic discussions, a series of revisions to the definition of the project Outcomes were inserted. (see the final revised logframe in appendix 2 to this document).

Overall Goal:

The Overall Goal of the project: ‘To contribute to enhancing ecosystem integrity, stability, functions and services through GEF-supported land degradation mitigation activities’ remains untouched from the original approved document.

Project Objective:

The Project Objective remains: ‘To establish the conditions which will support the application of knowledge management principles to support coherent strategy and direction’. The indicator was modified slightly to incorporate the strategic contribution to the focal area strategy discussed by the Working Group in the previous session.

4 Outcomes:

The Outcomes designed for the MSP do not change substantially, although some polishing to the articulation of Outcomes 2 and 3 was inserted. Outcome 1: ‘Global and local-level indicators demonstrate global environmental and livelihood-related impact derived from actions on combating land degradation’ remained as it has been since the approved document. While Working Group noted that the MSP planned to deliver indicators at two levels: global (portfolio) level and project level, it was noted that issues of scale, and the introduction of programmatic approaches will require a range of different indicators for the project level. Therefore, the project will aim to provide a suite of options from which selections can be made, according to the nature of project / programme.

Outcome 2 was inappropriately worded in the approved document as an output rather than an outcome. This was corrected to: ‘A framework for Knowledge Management and Capacity Building for SLM is in place’. The Learning Network becomes the indicator. The activities to be undertaken under this outcome will focus on the opportunity to synthesize science and lessons learned emerging from the FA projects. In order to this, a Forum for the exchange of ideas, and a mechanism for collation and synthesis will be required. Outputs and activities under this outcome will be further developed to incorporate these innovations, leading to the better achievement of the desired outcome and the overall project objectives. Output 2.3 from the approved document: ‘A proposal for an Inter-Agency GEF-funded full-size project, the second phase of the programme’ was removed because insufficient funds will remain in GEF-4 to fund an FSP, and if a hiatus is created, this will lead to loss of momentum. A better option would be to begin a PIF after the MSP, focusing on the next phase development, in order to bridge the gap until GEF-5 in October 2009.

Outcome 3 was refocused on result based management at the FA level, with a more defined output focusing on developing a common tracking tool by end of the MSP (to be applied under GEF-5).

A risk and assumptions table is to be developed and inserted. One important risk discussed by the Working Group concerned shifting Council views on the validity and nature of GEBs of LD FA. Substantial shifts in the definition of GEBs would delay the process of indicator development to capture impacts relating to GEBs.

Session 3: Review of Project Schedule and Planning for Project Activities

A presentation of the updated detailed project schedule was made by Caroline King, including discussion of the timing and objectives of meetings scheduled as major milestones within the two-year timeframe of the project. Changes proposed in session 2 somewhat altered the proposed schedule. An updated version is included in appendix 3 to this document. Major milestones identified were identified as follows:

Date	Milestone Event	Brief Description
28-30 August, 2007	1 st Expert Workshop	<p>‘Evaluation of available indicators and development of a Learning Network’</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiate the work of the KM:Land Expert Advisory Group; • Review current practices in indicator usage in the GEF LD Focal Area; • Evaluate and select global-level indicators; • Discuss the scope and priorities for an SLM Learning Network. <p>Held in Selfoss, Iceland. Attended by Working Group, Expert Advisory Group, Selected GEF Project Managers, wider group of experts</p>
December, 2007	Meeting of Expert Advisory Group	<p>Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screening and Testing Indicators; • Final Selection of Global level and Project level Indicators; • Outline for Development of Guidance Materials; • Finalize Capacity Needs Assessment and Planning for Training Workshops • Review Design of Survey of Project Managers on Indicator Retrofitting Feasibility Issues • Review Learning Network Training Strategy; • Plan Learning Network Capacity Building and Dissemination. <p>Location to be discussed with Working Group – suggested locations: Hamilton or Nairobi Attended by Project Team and Expert Advisory Group</p>
April, 2008	2 nd Expert Workshop	<p>Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present Completed Indicator Selection; • Design of Measures for Review and Update; • Reports on Pilot Testing of Indicators; • Review results from Survey of Project Managers; • Review Plans for Regional Training; • Interaction with GEF Learning Networks. <p>Location to be discussed with Working Group -suggested locations: Alexandria Participants- similar composition to 1st Expert Workshop + Other Learning Networks</p>
June, 2008-	4 Regional Training Workshops	<p>Possibly to reflect GEF Regions: LAC, ECA, Asia, AFR</p> <p>Details to be discussed with Working Group</p> <p>Scope to be set by Capacity Needs Assessment</p> <p>To be coordinated with other efforts eg TerrAfrica and LADA</p> <p>To depend on development of partnerships with centers of excellence</p>
November, 2008	Global Conference	<p>Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Showcase Achievements • Focus on Learning Network <p>Location to be discussed with Working Group</p> <p>Participation: as wide as possible, dependent on co-financing</p>

Overall project schedule:

The project activities are tightly packed into a 2-year period. Over two months were lost due to delays in finalization of an MOA for transfer of funds from UNOPS. While UNDP usually sets the end date for a project in relation to the date of signature by the executing agency (in this case UNOPS). UNDP agreed to consider the possibility of setting the end-date 2 years after the actual disbursement of funds from UNOPS to UNU, i.e. July 2009. This would allow the project workplan to be maintained as planned.

Additional deadlines:

The Council has requested updated information on RBM from all focal areas by April 2008. However, this does not allow time for 2nd Expert consultation. GEF Sec confirmed that the project should present information available at the time, with a final version anticipated in Nov 2008.

Contractual research activities:

Events identified above represent deadlines for contractual research on various substantive components of the project. Contractual research on indicator short-listing is already underway by an international consultant, for presentation at the 1st Expert Meeting. Following this meeting, further contractual research will be carried out to refine indicators, and prepare for selection and testing at the project level. Contractual arrangements should not be made between two GEF projects (eg LADA and KM:Land). UNEP, FAO, UNU and UNDP will discuss content and modality for cooperation, ideally within existing respective project budgets.

Web-based Learning Interface:

The original plan for UNEP to host the learning network and website was revised by UNEP before the inception. UNU is developing the website itself, and will continue consultation with the group on how best to ensure its sustainability.

Project managers' capacity needs assessment:

Capacity needs assessment will address the needs of project managers for training during the MSP regional workshops to either retrofit the indicators, or to adapt projects under preparation to them. This activity should take place early in the project schedule, with the engagement of project managers, in order to enable proper planning for the workshops.

Further refinement of plans for activities:

Working group comments will be invited regarding plans for future activities, including meetings. A detailed discussion of upcoming project activities will be scheduled to take place in a closed Working Group Meeting, to take place on 30 August in Selfoss, Iceland, following the First Expert Workshop. Information about scheduling of future Working Group meetings is included in Session 5, below.

Tuesday 31st July, 2007

Session 5: Teleconference: Review of Current Working Group Activities

Mohammed Sessay (UNEP), Henry Salazar (IADB) and Ricardo Quiroga (IADB) joined the meeting for the teleconference. Khalida Bouzar (IFAD) sent apologies, Sam Wedderburn (World Bank) was unable to join for technical reasons.

Maryam Niamir-Fuller presented a summary of decisions reached during the first day of the Inception. No further comments or questions on progress so far were added by participants in the teleconference.

An update on the results of the pre-Inception email consultations was presented by Caroline King. No difficulties with the email consultations were identified by the WG.

Expert Advisory Group Selection

Participants agreed to increase the number of EAG members from 4 to 6, in order to ensure a quorum at meetings. Experts (subject to confirmation) as follows (alphabetical order):

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| a. Charles Hutchinson (U of Arizona) | confirmed – can attend 1 st Expert mtg |
| b. Wafa Essahli (CENSAD) | confirmed – can attend 1 st Expert mtg |
| c. Peter Frost (CIFOR) | declined – cannot attend 1 st Expert mtg |
| replaced by Ravi Prabhu (CIFOR) | confirmed – can attend 1 st Expert mtg |
| d. Rashid Hassan (CEEPA) | declined – cannot attend several meetings |
| e. Cheryl Palm (U. Columbia) | confirmed - cannot attend 1 st Expert mtg |
| f. John Pender (IFPRI) | confirmed – cannot attend 1 st Expert mtg |
| g. Bob Scholes (CSIR) | confirmed - cannot attend 1 st Expert mtg |
| h. Lawrence Townley Smith (AG Canada) | confirmed – can attend 1 st Expert mtg |

Balances amongst the group concerning gender, regional representation, disciplinary focus and knowledge of GEF vs fresh perspective were considered as important factors in the selection.

Status of information base on LD Project Managers for engagement in project activities

UNDP, UNEP and World Bank have provided information on Project Managers. Some gaps remain to be filled in World Bank and UNEP information. A question was raised as to whether Agency staff or contract staff hired to manage activities were to be listed. It was agreed that the Agency staff should be engaged in the MSP activities, since all agencies need to take part throughout the process. However, non-staff members who are managing projects should also benefit from the project, and particularly from the training and other opportunities to be provided through the project.

Where funds are not available from their own projects, funds from this MSP may be used to support participation in activities by Project Managers who are not Agency staff. UN Agency staff members should use Agency financing to pay for their own travel and participation. This can be listed as co-finance to the project.

The Working Group proposed managers of selected long-established projects to take part in the 1st Expert Workshop:

Name	Project	Agency
Prof. Sam Chema	Development and Implementation of a Sustainable Resource Management Plan for Marsabit Mountain and its associated Watersheds, Kenya	UNEP
Mutsa Masiyandima	Sustainable Management of Inland Wetlands in Southern Africa: a Livelihoods and Ecosystem Approach	UNEP
Prof. Edwin A Gyasi	Sustainable Land Management for Mitigating Land Degradation, Enhancing Agricultural Biodiversity and Reducing Poverty (SLaM), Ghana	UNDP
Michel J Tankoano	Partnership Programme for Sustainable Land Management (CPP), Phase 1, Burkina Faso	UNDP
Ousmane Seck	Agricultural Rehabilitation and Sustainable Land Management Project, Burundi	World Bank
Alvaro J. Soler	Ecosystem Restoration of Riparian Forests in Sao Paolo	World Bank
Malcolm Jansen and Chenco Norbu	Multi-Sectoral Mechanism and Incentives for Sustainable Land Management, Bhutan	World Bank
Hans Eschweiler	LDC-SIDS	UNDP
Robert Everitt	CACILM	ADB
Freddy Nachtergaele	LADA	UNEP/FAO

Agency Co-financing Contributions

The status of contributions was presented and confirmed during the Inception (see table below). Some contributions are still to be confirmed. Contributions of co-financing in the form of travel to meetings should be calculated based on the list of scheduled meetings included in the following section of this report. UNU requests that information still outstanding to be forwarded as soon as possible to cking@inweh.unu.edu.

Agency Co-financing Contributions to 'Ensuring Impacts from SLM'					
Agency	Classification	Type	Purpose	Amount (US\$)	Status*
UNDP	IA	In-kind and cash	cost of participation/ facilitation in expert consultations (two technical staff for two consultations at average \$8000 each = 32,000) + cost of participation/ facilitation in regional meetings (one staff for three regional meetings? = \$6000 each, or \$18,000).	50,000	Confirmed
UNDP	IA	Cash	contribution to consultant costs, including travel and fees ; exact use to be determined by UNU in consultation with UNDP	10,000	Confirmed
UNEP	IA	In-kind	Under Internal Consultation	35,000	Confirmed
UNEP	IA	Cash	UNEP is not able to provide cash contribution as foreseen, but will continue to discuss with DEWA for other contributions.	0	
WB	IA	In-kind	Travel of staff	To be calculated after Inception based on number of meetings	estimated
UNU	Inter-governmental organization	In-kind	Staff costs not covered by MSP	50,000	Confirmed
IFAD	EA	In-kind		35,000	Confirmed
AfDB	EA	In-kind	Travel of staff		estimated
IADB	EA		Will consider contribution by end of year when internal reform is completed		
Sub-Total Agency Contributions (minimum)			(Not including WB and AfDB travel:)	180,000+	

Open discussion on Project Modus Operandi of InterAgency Working Group:

It was confirmed that the members of WG are expected to be Agency staff, not project managers, in order to avoid any conflict of interest. The members of the WG are listed at the beginning of this report. The participation of the WG members is essential in order to enable KM:Land to fulfill its purpose as a consultative process. Participation in the initiative is, furthermore, in the interests of all agencies, since the project will set the indicators against which their projects will be measured. The project team will do all that is possible to facilitate participation by the WG members, and will continue to consult them on the schedule and location of meetings. The project will plan meetings well in advance, in order to ensure that as many members as possible are able to participate.

There will be at least six obligatory meetings in the life cycle of the project, in addition to any other opportunistic meeting as needed. Future obligatory ones will either be held on the margins of existing meetings where the majority of WG members are present, or if not, then on a rotating basis at the seat of the WG member agencies (e.g. Nairobi, Manila, Tunisia, Washington DC, Rome, New York). Members of the Working Group are expected to travel to attend the Working Group meetings if they are not hosted at their home institutions. The cost of travel to attend Working Group meetings should be listed as Agency co-financing to the project.

Members of the Working Group are requested to forward information to the project with regard to forthcoming meetings that may provide opportunities for the Working Group to convene, and through the addition of side-meetings.

The six core WG meetings proposed are as follows:

1. Inception Meeting, Hamilton 30-31 July 07;
2. 1st expert consultation, Iceland 30 Aug 07;
3. After EAG meeting Dec 07 and before April 08 Council (Feb-Mar 08) in order to review draft report to Council. **Nairobi has been suggested as a possible location for this meeting, subject to UNEP willingness to host the meeting**
4. Follow-up meeting to 2nd Expert consultation + retreat of WG/LD TF to discuss tracking tool April 2008 - **UNU proposes Alexandria as a location for the 2nd Expert Workshop.**
5. before Nov 08 council (June – Oct 08) in order to verify final report going to Council **eg in New York or Washington directly after June Council.**
6. final; e.g. to review Terminal Evaluation, and to discuss PIF for next phase. (Feb – April 09). **To be hosted by one of the Development Banks, eg AfDB, Tunisia.**

Session 6: Preparation for First Expert Workshop (Iceland)

A draft agenda for the First Expert Workshop of the MSP on 'Evaluation of Available LD Indicators and Development of a Learning Network', to be held in Selfoss, Iceland, 28-30 August, 2007 was presented by Caroline King. The updated draft, emerging from these discussions is enclosed in Appendix 4 of this report. The workshop devotes two days of discussion to the selection of indicators, and a further half a day the creation of a Learning Network.

Overview of the workshop agenda

Members of the Working Group reviewed the agenda, proposing refinements, insertions and other improvements. On the first day of the workshop, following the introductory session, a series of presentations and discussions will consider existing indicators that capture global impacts from SLM, and the use of indicators by GEF projects. On the second day, the focus will move to the discussion of the indicator short-list and indicator selection for the MSP. An initial selection will be made at the global level, and discussions will consider issues for connection of the global level indicators to the project level, as well as the assessment of project-level capacity needs to be addressed through training activities to take place later in the project.

Adjustments to the agenda in light of the Inception discussions so far

During the Inception teleconference, the Working Group members succeeded to identify 10 project managers to be invited to the First Expert Workshop. This will enable the workshop to address issues relating to the use of indicators at the project level. A session on the first day will include presentations by project managers. On the second day, the discussion of project-level issues will include break-out groups led by members of the Expert Advisory Group, in order to identify relevant issues for the project-level indicator selection and capacity needs assessment.

Other refinements to the agenda

A series of side-meetings are proposed to take place around the Expert Workshop. The first will be a dinner meeting for the Expert Advisory Group, to take place on the evening of the 27th, in order to orient them with regard to the project. A closed Working Group meeting will take place on the afternoon of the 30th. A separate agenda will be developed for this meeting, which will review plans for the ongoing activities of the MSP.

Follow-on from the Expert Workshop

Immediately following the Expert Workshop, during the International Forum on Soils, Society and Global Change, the SLM Learning Network will be launched. Findings from the Expert Workshop will be presented to a Working Group during the Forum (Working Group 4), and during the final plenary. These findings will, in turn, be transferred to the COP. A representative from the Working Group will be selected to present the findings in Madrid.

Closing Session

Final remarks to wrap up the meeting discussions were presented by Maryam Niamir-Fuller. Thanks to the active participation of the Working Group members, a great deal had been achieved during the Inception Workshop, and the project can now begin its work in earnest. All those who took part were warmly thanked for their contributions to the lively discussions. If the consultative process continues so well throughout the project, it will be a highly enjoyable and productive exercise for all involved.

Closing remarks from each of the participants echoed the positive outlook for the project, and reaffirmed the commitment of GEF Secretariat, STAP, and the Agencies to take part actively in the ongoing consultations. On behalf of UNU-INWEH, Dr. Zafar Adeel expressed pleasure that UNU was able to provide a forum to bring together the different members of the UN family in collegial discussions, in order to facilitate the collation and use of scientific knowledge generated by SLM experiences for decision-making purposes.

Appendix 1: Agenda

KM:Land Initiative: First Phase

Medium Sized Project: Ensuring Impacts from SLM – Development of a Global Indicator System

Inception Workshop

30-31 July 2007

UNU-INWEH, Hamilton, Ontario

McMaster University Downtown Center, 50 Main St East, Room 203

Monday – 30 July 2007

Chair: Andrea Kutter (GEF Sec), Rapporteur: Harriet Bigas (UNU)

Opening Session

09:30 Welcome Remarks (UNU-INWEH, GEF Sec, UNDP)

09:45 Overview of the MSP Objectives and Modus Operandi (Zafar Adeel)

10:15 *Coffee Break*

Session 1: Review of Recent GEF TAG Progress on LD Knowledge Management

10:45 Presentation and Analysis of TAG Recommendations Significance for the MSP (Andrea Kutter and Michael Stocking)

11:15 Discussion of Significance of TAG Recommendations for KM:Land and MSP

12:00 *Lunch*

Session 2: Review of Complete MSP Logframe

14:00 Presentation of Overall Logframe: objectives, outcomes, outputs and indicators (Zafar Adeel)

14:30 Discussion

15:30 *Coffee Break*

Session 3: Review of Project Schedule and Planning for Project Activities

15:45 Presentation of Updated Project Schedule (Caroline King)

16:15 Discussion of Schedule and Plans for Future Meetings (eg regional workshops, etc)

16:45 Presentation of Current Agency Co-financing Table (Caroline King)

17:00 Discussion of Additional Co-financing Opportunities for project activities

Session 4: Closing Session

17:15 Wrapping Up of Working Group Recommendations (Maryam Niamir-Fuller)

17:30 Meeting Adjourned

Dinner

Tuesday – 31 July 2007

Chair: Andrea Kutter (GEF Sec), Rapporteur: Caroline King (UNU)

Session 5: Teleconference: Review of Current Working Group Activities

08:30 Review of Adjustments to Project Implementation Agreed During Day 1 of Inception (Recap of Inception Day 1) (Maryam Niamir Fuller)

08:45 Questions or Comments from Working Group

09:00 Update on Results of Working Group Email Consultations (Caroline King)

- confirmation of Expert Advisory Group Members
- status of information base on LD Project Managers
- status of Agency co-financing information

09:10 Discussion

09:30 Open discussion on Project Modus Operandi: any concerns or issues to be addressed regarding:

- consultation of Working Group members (already begun through email consultations)
- scheduling and attendance of Working Group meetings
- proposed Working Group retreat
- communication with and engagement of Project Managers
- capacity development activities for Project Managers
- looking ahead to 2008 GEF Council

10:30 Conclusion

10:30 *Coffee Break*

Session 6: Preparation for First Expert Workshop (Iceland)

11:00 Presentation of Agenda and Participants (Caroline King)

11:30 Discussion

12:00 Wrapping Up of Working Group Recommendations (Maryam Niamir-Fuller)

12:15 Final Discussion

12:30 Meeting Adjourned

Lunch

Appendix 2: Revised Logframe

Narrative summary	Indicator	Baseline	Target and benchmarks	Means of verification and frequency	Assumptions
Overall Goal: To contribute to enhancing ecosystem integrity, stability, functions and services through GEF-supported land degradation mitigation activities					
Project Objective (for Phase I): To establish the conditions which will support the application of knowledge management principles to support coherent strategy and direction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribution of knowledge to project design and FA strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documented lessons on from LD projects not available for use in design of new projects No GEF-5 strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By the end of the project, documented lessons are available from the project website for use in the development of new projects GEF-5 strategy informed by project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project website GEF-5 strategy 	
Outcome 1: Global and local-level indicators demonstrate global environmental and livelihood-related impact derived from actions on combating land degradation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of integrated project-level and global indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary global indicators and indicators used in individual projects are not integrated with one another or connected to learning processes within the wider community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By year 2, 20% of projects submitted for approval under GEF-4 use indicators that build on the proposed indicator set for SLM. (under GEF-5 this percentage should increase further) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual review of project submissions 	
<i>Output 1.1.</i> Selection Criteria for Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria established 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria proposed by project team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 4 months of the start of project implementation, a set of selection criteria for both global and local-level indicators has been adopted for use by the Expert Advisory Group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project reports 	

<i>Output 1.2.</i> Set of Selected Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set of indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicators generated by individual projects are not selected through transparent debate concerning their scientific merits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 8 months of the start of project implementation, a set of global and local -level indicators has been developed for use in SLM projects and programs through open scientific debate on their merits and short-comings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project reports, web-site 	
<i>Output 1.3.</i> Guidance materials on standards for measuring and reporting on these indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No guidance materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 15 months of the start of project implementation, guidance materials on standards for measuring and reporting have been produced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project reports, web-site 	
<i>Output 1.4.</i> Guidance disseminated to all stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Managers' access to guidance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A survey of project managers undertaken 18 months after the start of project implementation indicates that all available Project Managers have access to guidance material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey 	Project Managers are available to respond to Project survey
<i>Output 1.5.</i> Measures for review and update of indicators and guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy to systematize review and update 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No system for review and update 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 15 months of the start of project implementation, a strategy for systematizing review and update of the indicators framework has been produced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project reports 	

<p>Outcome 2: A framework for Knowledge Management and Capacity Building for SLM is in place</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Network 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No learning network exists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Network Launched 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project website and interface 	
<p><i>Output 2.1.</i> Initial Learning Network and planning of future activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Network events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No learning network events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 18 months of the start of project implementation, at least 2 global learning network meetings have been held (one global workshop, and participation in the LD global conference) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project reports 	
<p><i>Output 2.2.</i> Synthesis of lessons on SLM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forum for information sharing between project stakeholders • Mechanism for synthesis of scientific knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No forum for information sharing • No mechanism for synthesis of scientific knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online Forum up and running • Mechanism for synthesis developed • Within 15 months of the start of project implementation, initial synthesis products are available for use in project design and capacity building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project reports 	

<p>Outcome 3: A process is defined to establish a monitoring and evaluation system that supports result based management for SLM projects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline of an M&E system at the focal area level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No outline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By the end of the project, an outline for a tracking tool to be implemented during the follow-on project has been developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project reports 	<p>Willingness of GEF and other SLM stakeholders to consider harmonization</p>
<p><i>Output 3.1.</i> Consensus reached on a tracking tool that supports adaptive and result based management for SLM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultations in support of tracking tool development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consultations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 6 months before the end of the project, consultations have been completed for a strategy for harmonized monitoring and evaluation through a tracking tool to be implemented in the follow-on project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project reports 	
<p><i>Output 3.2 :</i> Outline for development of a harmonized monitoring and evaluation system</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options for harmonization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OECD, WB and UNDP activities on Result based management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options proposed 3 months prior to end of MSP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project report 	
<p>Outcome 4 : Adaptive Management and lessons learnt</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
<p><i>Output 4.1</i> Evaluation of MSP and adaptations to project design as a result of M&E</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSP M&E Plan and budget fully respected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&E reports 	
<p><i>Output 4.2 :</i> Efficient delivery of MSP (Performance and results)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain a minimum project disbursement rate of 60% per year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project implementation reports 	

Appendix 4



KM:Land Initiative: First Phase

Medium Sized Project:

Ensuring Impacts from SLM – Development of a Global Indicator System

First Expert Workshop:

Evaluation of Available LD Indicators and Development of a Learning Network

28-30 August 2007

Iceland

The KM:Land Initiative is intended to lay the foundations for a comprehensive system to track progress across the LD Focal Area and its portfolio of projects. Under this MSP, indicators to demonstrate the benefits derived from actions on sustainable land management will be developed, as a first step in this process. The First Expert Workshop is to be attended by the members of the InterAgency Working Group, the Expert Advisory Group, selected GEF Project Managers, and other Experts taking part in the project activities.

The key objectives of this First Expert Workshop of the MSP on Evaluation of Available SLM Indicators and Development of a Learning Network are to:

- Initiate the work of the KM:Land Expert Advisory Group;
- Review current practices in indicator usage in the GEF LD Focal Area;
- Evaluate and select global-level indicators;
- Discuss the scope and priorities for an SLM Learning Network to be launched during the International Forum on Soils, Society and Global Change and COP 8, immediately following the Workshop.

Draft Agenda

28 August 2007

Chair: Anna Tengberg (UNDP), Rapporteur: Caroline King (UNU)

Session I: Introduction to the Expert Workshop

- 09:30 Welcome Remarks (UNU-INWEH, SCS, GEF Sec, UNDP)
- 09:45 Overview of the First Expert Workshop Objectives and Modus Operandi (Zafar Adeel)
- 10:15 Overview of the GEF LD Focal Area and Ongoing Strategic Discussions (Andrea Kutter)
- 10:45 Overview of Global Environmental Impacts from SLM Projects to be Captured by Indicators at the GEF Project and Portfolio Levels (Michael Stocking)
- 11:00 Overview of KM:Land Objectives and Ongoing Activities on Indicator Development (Caroline King)

11:15 *Coffee Break*

Session II: Thematic Discussion on the Use of Indicators to Capture SLM Impacts

- 11:30 Ongoing Parallel Indicator Work: Potential inputs to KM:Land (15 minutes each)
 - Examples of relevant indicators already explored by DesertNet (Ulf Hellden)
 - 2010 Biodiversity Indicators (Neville Ash)
 - Carbon Sequestration Indicators (David Skole)
 - Relevant indicators already explored by GLADA and LADA (Freddy Nachtergaele)Discussion
- 13:00 *Lunch*
- 14:30 Ongoing Parallel Indicator Work: Potential inputs to KM:Land (cont. 15 minutes each)
 - Examples from Indicators for Capacity Building and Mainstreaming in LDC/SIDS context (Hans Eschweiler, UNDP)
 - Relevant indicators already explored by SIP/TerrAfrica (Dominique Lantieri, Stephen Danyo or Christophe Crepin?)Discussion
- 15:30 Current GEF Project-level Characterization of Desired Impacts and Indicators (15 minutes each)
 - GEF Secretariat Overview (Andrea Kutter, GEF Sec)
 - UNEP LD Projects Overview of Projected Impacts and Indicators: Selected Examples (Gemma Shepherd, UNEP DEWA)Discussion
- 16:00 *Coffee break*
 - Sustainable Land Management for Mitigating Land Degradation, Enhancing Agricultural Biodiversity and Reducing Poverty (SLaM), Ghana (Edwin Gyasi)
 - Multi-Sectoral Mechanism and Incentives for Sustainable Land Management, Bhutan (Chenco Norbu and Malcolm Jansen)
 - Development and Implementation of a Sustainable Resource Management Plan for Marsabit Mountain and its associated Watersheds, Kenya (Sam Chema)
 - Ecosystem Restoration of Riparian Forests in Sao Paolo (Alvaro Soler)Discussion
- 18:00 Meeting adjourned

Expert Advisory Group Dinner

29 August 2007

Chair: Maryam Niamir-Fuller (UNDP), Rapporteur: Caroline King (UNU)

Session III: Global Indicator Short-listing and Selection

- 09:30 Indicator Selection Criteria: Expert Advisory Group Comments (10 minutes each)
Discussion
- 10:30 Proposed Global Level Indicator Short-List (David Niemeijer)
Discussion
- 11:30 *Coffee break*
- 11:45 Causal Network Analysis Approach to Development of an Integrated System of Indicators at Global and Project Levels (David Niemeijer)
Discussion
- 13:00 *Lunch*
- 14:00 Proposed Global Level Indicator Selection (Zafar Adeel)
Discussion
Expert Advisory Group Comments on Strengths and Weaknesses of Indicators Selected (any remaining gaps in selection to be addressed before Dec '07 adoption of indicators) (10 Minutes Each)
- 16:00 *Coffee break*

Session IV: Project Level Issues in Indicator Harmonization and Assessment of Capacity Needs

- 16:15 Small break-out groups led by Expert Advisory Group members
- 17:00 Presentation of group findings by Expert Advisory Group Members
- 17:30 Discussion
- 18:00 Meeting Adjourned
- 18:30 Group Dinner

30 August 2007

Chair: Zafar Adeel (UNU-INWEH), Rapporteur: Caroline King (UNU)

Session 6: Planning for SLM Learning Network

09:30 Overview of SLM Learning Network Development Objectives (Caroline King)

09:45 Existing Learning Networks and Experiences (15 minutes each)

- Current GEF FA Networks: IW:Learn, BiDi, Adaptation (Andrea Kutter)
- SLM Sub-networks: LDC SIDS, WISP (Maryam Niamir Fuller, UNDP)
- CACILIM?
- WOCAT (HansPeter Liniger)

11:00 *Coffee Break*

- International Traditional Knowledge Network (ITKN)? (Pietro Laureano)
- CWANA+/Oasis (Mohamed El Mourid, ICARDA) or CGIAR system?
- FEWSNET
- TerrAfrica?

12:00 Discussion of Learning Network Strategy: (Zafar Adeel)

- Scope: analysis of state of knowledge on LD and ‘shopping list’ of themes and best practices that require attention
- Modalities
- Priority Products

13:00 *Lunch*

14:00 Wrapping Up Recommendations to Global Forum to Soils Society and Global Change and UNCCD COP 8 (Maryam Niamir Fuller)

14:30 Meeting Adjourned

15:00 Closed Working Group Meeting