



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	15
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	22
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	27
6. RISKS	29
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	34
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	35
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	36
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	39
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	41
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	44
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	45

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	East Africa
Country (ies):	Kenya
Project Title:	Capacity, Policy and Financial Incentives for PFM in Kirisia Forest and integrated Rangelands Management
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/KEN/073/GFF
GEF ID:	5083
GEF Focal Area(s):	BD-2, CCM-5, SFM/REDD+-1, SFM/REDD+-2
Project Executing Partners:	Kenya Forest Service, Kenya Forest Research Institute, Kenya Wildlife Service and County Government of Samburu
Project Duration (years):	5 years
Project coordinates:	<i>Naramat Forest Block - N1.191435 E36.619347 - N1.161116 E36.640873 Nailiepunye Forest Block - N1.286144 E36.662434 - N1.242733 E36.741486 Nkarro Forest Block - N1.020411 E36.811649 - N0.945309 E36.853703</i>

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	03 August 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	25 th January 2017
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31 st December 2022
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	31 st December 2022

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 2,823,439
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	USD 8,675,178
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	USD 2,322,645
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	USD 4,349,199.2

¹ As per FPMIS

² If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.

³ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

⁴ For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

⁵ Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	2 nd December, 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	N/A
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	Completed
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	November 2022
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	Satisfactory
Overall implementation progress rating:	Satisfactory
Overall risk rating:	Moderate

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Moderate
---	----------

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	5 th PIR
--	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Philip Kisoyan GEF- Coordinator FAO Kenya	Philip.Kisoyan@fao.org
Budget Holder	Carla Mucavi FAO Representative, FAO Kenya	Carla.Mucavi@fao.org ; FAO-KE@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Christophe Besacier, Forestry Officer (NFO),	Christophe.Besacier@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Chris Dirkmaat, Executive Officer, OCB Paola Palestini, GEF Technical Adviser, OCB	Chris.Dirkmaat@fao.org Paola.Palestini@fao.org

⁶ The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

⁷ The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)

(All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual)

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
Objective(s): Strengthened biodiversity conservation and enhance carbon sequestration through participatory sustainable forest	Outcome 1: Strengthened capacities of Kenya Forest Service (KFS) and Community Forest Associations (CFAs) in Participatory Forest Management (PFM)	Area of degraded forest habitats	0 Ha		10,000 ha with 1,324,44 tCO ₂ eq	Three CFAs have been established & registered and zonation of Kirisia forest has been done and forest maps updated. KFS and KWS have undergone capacity development in forest and wildlife surveillance and monitoring. The introduction of Drone Technology for wildlife monitoring and surveillance is underway The KFS and CFAs were trained on carbon value due to the regeneration and rehabilitation of the forest and this was clearly documented to show the monetary value that can accrue from this conservation initiative.	S

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

⁹ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

¹⁰ Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic Co-benefits as well.

¹¹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**, **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

<p>management systems in dryland public and communal lands</p>		<p>undergoing reforestation, restoration and/or natural regeneration and their GHG emissions avoided</p>		<p>5,000 ha restoration</p>	<p>(direct) avoided</p>	<p>The restoration strategy was commenced and it used a combination of approaches including natural regeneration through participatory management, as well as enrichment planting of local species (trees and other species). Indeed 140,000 ha is under restoration; 20 ha through natural regeneration and 120 ha under enrichment planting. This restoration initiative is supported by Kenya Forest Service (KFS), County Government of Samburu as well the established and functional CFAs.</p> <p>Forest restoration implementation was delayed to begin in the current reporting period as it was critical to give priority to the establishment of the three existing CFAs prior to the reforestation/restoration activities to ensure the use of best practices, and participatory identification, planning and management of areas under restoration, enabling therefore sustainability of results.</p> <p>The project and the partners developed a detailed forest wide monitoring strategy which has focused more on the established restoration sites and to put approaches in place for sustainable forest management. In partnership with KFS and East African Wildlife Society (EAWLS), restoration works targeting farmer households on the provision of fruit and agroforestry tree seedlings is underway. The project in</p>	
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------	---	--

						collaboration with the Kenya Water Towers Agency (KWTA) has commenced the protection works for three water springs in Kirisia Forest.	
		Areas of forest under protection management regime and their GHG emissions avoided	0 Ha CFA - 20% KFS (Maralal)- 35.5% KWS (Maralal)- 40%	15,000 Ha under protection 25% increase in capacity from baseline	91,452 ha with 630,912 tCO2eq (direct) avoided 50% increase in capacity scores over baseline measure d by UNDP capacity scorecar d	<p>This outcome is linked and complementary to the above outcome on restoration. The Kirisia Forest Ecosystem Management Plan (2019-2029) has been finalized. Three participatory forest management plans contextualized to the 3 CFA forest blocks have been finalized for use in the negotiation of the forest access rights by the CFAs and user groups. Three Community Forest Associations established and functional with 100 volunteer community scouts managing the grazing and protection of critical sites. The CFAs have fundraised through the project partners and Suyan Trust has supported scouts with uniforms, trainings and other necessary equipment for forest monitoring and surveillance.</p> <p>CFA constitutions are being implemented to regulate forest operations and the use of forest resources.</p> <p>The capacity of the three CFAs and their respective User Groups has been strengthened. Learning exchange and knowledge transfer visits to performing and best practice CFAs in the country has been achieved. The CFA members carried home the lessons including CFA governance/leadership structures, FMAs and access to forest user rights, Eco-Tourism and Enterprise Development, Livelihood Activities among others.</p> <p>The capacity of both CFAs and KFS has been improved through trainings and the provision of equipment for forest management and monitoring hence the dysfunctional</p>	S

					<p>relationships between them has been drastically smoothed out.</p> <p>The CFAs have voluntarily initiated tree planting drives in green spaces administered by secondary and primary schools, identified/recruited forest scouts, formed grazing management committees, continued with community sensitization through own public meetings and initiated their own mechanisms of controlling movement in and out of forest by livestock. Thus, clearly showcasing their improved capacities. KFS Maralal forest station has been equipped with a tractor (110 HP) and Trailer, Water bowser and 4 motorbikes have been handed over for forest management/conservation activities.</p> <p>One advanced mapping drones for detailed mapping of Kirisia forest (to detect restoration and degradation priority areas and land use change mapping) and an advanced surveillance drone (to detect poachers and forest fires) will be procured and handed over to the project government partners.</p> <p>The biodiversity assessment of Kirisia forest has been achieved and the report has been developed to inform protection and management of endangered/threatened fauna and flora</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Naramat CFA has informally negotiated with KFS for access rights to utilize a 5 Acre space in the forest for the establishment of an apiary and a tree seedling nursery and they have generated an income of Kshs. 700,000 from the sale of honey and seedlings which was used to procure a motorbike and for grading of a 4KM access road for use in the monitoring of the forest</p> <p>Restoration strategy through 20,000 ha natural regeneration and 120,000 ha enrichment planting have begun including the promotion of fruit trees and agroforestry initiatives at the household level since the establishment of the community forest associations which are co-managing the forest together with Kenya Forest Service. A total of 38,983 indigenous tree seedlings of assorted species are available in all the tree nurseries within the three forest blocks for protection and establishment. The bee keeping and the indigenous tree species propagation activities by the community tree nursery at Naramat block was documented and it featured in the State of World Forests Conference that took place in May 2022 in South Korea.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		Area under SFM and their GHG emissions avoided	0 Ha	5,000 Ha under SFM	17,000 ha with 980,348 tCO ₂ eq (direct) avoided	The development of Kirisia Forest Ecosystem Management Plan (2019-2029) put the entire forest of 91,452 ha under forest protection: The plan has been ratified by KFS, County Government and local communities. The ongoing engagement by KFS with the community to achieve the 5-year participatory forest management plans (2022-2027) and the forest management agreements in which a minimum of 17.000 Ha of forest Utilization zones e.g. plantations, grazing areas, firewood collection etc. will be identified and put under SFM. The PFMPs and FMAs which will act as the legal document and plan for co-management and sustainable forest management of the three forest blocks constituting Kirisia forest and will thus formalize protection of the forest and SFM for 17.000 Ha.	S
	Outcome 2: Integrity of the key (Kirimon) wildlife migration corridor connecting Kirisia wildlife refuge to the Samburu heartland secured	Percentage of the key (Kirimon) wildlife corridors being managed under conservancies with protection agreements established	0 community conservancies in the key (Kirimon) wildlife migratory corridor connecting Kirisia forest to the Samburu Heartland	Draft community conservancy management plan 25% increase	1 community conservancy established in the key (Kirimon) wildlife migratory corridor with agreements being	The Community Conservancy Fund Act, 2020 was enacted to give the Community Conservancies autonomy to operate independently with the leadership of an independent Board. This autonomy will inform the basis for future engagement by all partners with the Community Conservancies. The establishment of a position/office of County Conservancies Coordinator has guided on the support given to the wildlife rangers/scouts with salaries by the County Government. Major mapping of high value biodiversity areas has been completed and the important biodiversity areas have been mapped and will inform the next steps in the engagement by partners. Some rare biodiversity has been discovered through the project assessments and further highlights the importance of Kirisia Forest as a biodiversity hotspot. This includes <i>Adolphus mathewsensis</i> , which previously only has been sighted in the Ngeng valley in the Mathews	S

			Nkoteiya Conservancy 42%		honoured that protect wildlife		
					50% increase in capacity scores over baseline measured by UNDP capacity scorecard		
	Outcome 3: Income from honey, and other NWFPs providing financial incentives for PFM and conservation and	% increase in household incomes from NWFPs	KES 42,561 (Average income per annum/HH from Forest products)	15% income increase from NWFPs over baseline for	25% income increase from NWFPs over baseline for	Existing NWFP value chains have been assessed and 3 value chains namely honey, Poultry and Kitchen gardens have been identified and are being developed in partnership with East African Wildlife Society, KFS and the CFAs. An assessment on sustainable charcoal production and capacity development of Samburu Charcoal Producer Association (CPU) were undertaken The project has supported the CFAs to undertake livelihood activities which include honey production and processing, poultry, and kitchen garden interventions. The project has also	MS

	<p>increase household income by more than 25% for participating households</p>			<p>participating households</p>	<p>participating households</p>	<p>factored in the support on the procurement of 135 beehives, micro-processing and harvesting equipment for honey and wax for the 3 CFAs.</p> <p>Due to the rare voluntary relocation of people from Kirisia forest, various other stakeholders including WVK, BOMA Project and Suyan Trust have developed interest in Kirisia and have committed to support CFAs with more beehives and other livelihood interventions.</p> <p>Five Community tree nurseries have been established to allow the project, project partners and other stakeholders to procure tree seedlings for restoration and agroforestry directly from the community.</p> <p>The Development of tourist material for Kirisia forest to raise awareness about tourist attractions, environment and culture of Kirisia forest among exiting and new tourist has been implemented and materials produced and printed to be shared with relevant partners for use.</p> <p>The development of the Samburu Tourism Strategic Plan is ongoing to be launched in September 2022. The Tourism Strategic Plan has focused on the strategies to revive the tourism circuits connecting Samburu County with Marsabit, Isiolo and Baringo Counties as well as on marketing of the existing tourist attraction sites.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	--	--

<p>Outcome 4: Knowledge systems inform adaptive management in PFM</p>	<p>Lessons available from PFM inform policy implementation</p>	<p>National PFM policy as informed by lessons but more needed to expand beneficiaries from PFM by communities</p>	<p>Lessons on CFAs available</p>	<p>County Government has adopted lessons in local level PFM</p>	<p>Gender considerations which include gender mainstreaming and inclusion of women, youth and minority communities from the Kirisia gender assessment has been mainstreamed in all project activities.</p> <p>Community Based Carbon Monitoring System for Kirisia Forest has been established and community resource persons trained in close collaboration with the CFAs. It recommends for Kirisia Forest Community Monitoring Programme to be hinged and aligned to the National Forest Monitoring System as well as to strengthen the capacity of CFAs and community resource persons so that they can improve the accuracy and efficiency of data collection for the forest monitoring system.</p> <p>The carbon value due to the regeneration and rehabilitation of the forest was clearly documented to show the monetary value that can accrue from this conservation initiative.</p> <p>Kirisia carbon assessment/baseline has been completed and the report is available</p> <p>Project M&E framework has been updated</p> <p>Mid-term review report findings and its recommendations are being implemented and applied in the planning and implementation of activities in this last phase of the project.</p>	<p>S</p>
<p>Outcome 5: Subsidiary legislation and guidelines for County level implementation of the</p>	<p>Number of County level strategies and plans supporting participatory</p>	<p>0 County Strategies/plan/policies on PFM and environment</p>	<p>Policy and legal gap analysis completed, gaps identified</p>	<p>80% of community management structure</p>	<p>Legislation and guidelines for participatory forest management submitted to government for approval</p> <p>Awareness booklet and awareness comic book (for schoolchildren) has been completed and printed for distribution to the relevant stakeholders for use in awareness and education on conservation</p>	<p>S</p>

	<p>PFM National Policy of 2005 in place informed by Community Bio-cultural community protocols</p>	<p>PFM developed</p>	<p>ntal managem nt 2005 Forest ry Bill allows PFM but not harmo nized with Count y policie s</p>	<p>and recomme ndations for addressin g them available</p>	<p>s have legal documen ts that empower them with control of access and with manage ment, harvestin g and marketin g rights</p>	<p>Kirisia Forest Community Bio-Cultural Protocol developed and will be published in the coming phase of the project. The BCP will inform future policy developments.</p> <p>The project has participated in the development and review of the Samburu County Rangelands & Planned Grazing Policy</p> <p>The Samburu County Climate Change and Forest Conservation Management Policies have been developed with the support of a policy expert recruited by GEF-5 Project in close collaboration with County Government department of Environment, NR & Energy. The project partners were also involved throughout the process of developing the two policies and they have contributed valuable resources in terms of finances and expertise.</p> <p>Awareness and advocacy meetings with County and National political leaders on the importance of sustainable forest management in the Kirisia landscape has been continued</p> <p>Awareness created among the local community on participatory forest management and the role of CFAs through the local FM radios and community engagement meetings. The CFAs in partnership with the other partners have picked the role of sensitization through community barazas and local FM radio talks. This initiative enabled a reach out to a large audience within Kirisia and other water towers in the county.</p>	

Action Plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>3: Income from honey, and other NWFPs providing financial incentives for PFM and conservation and increase household income by more than 25% for participating households</p>	<p>The PFM Plans, Livelihood and income generating activities will continue in the remaining period of the project. The remaining period will leverage on synergies from the project partners to enhance these activities. E.g. Secure and implement significant new user rights for communities within the PFM plans, agreements and County level legislation/policy and expand the scope of potential enterprises and ways to add value beyond the existing NWFPs and enterprises currently earmarked. Where government, controlled pilots resist new user rights can be recommended to ‘test’ the approach at a small scale first. These can be linked to Outcome 5. Demonstration is often the best way to build confidence/trust in an approach for example have a pilot on sustainable firewood use and marketing</p> <p>The project should also investigate the possibility of enabling CFAs to retain a share of the revenue from confiscated illegal forest produce. This creates incentives for forest monitoring and create much needed income for the CFAs.</p> <p>Focus on carbon financing and tourism, although important, should play a smaller role as the short time sustainability of this may not be realistic. Instead the project should focus more on building formal enterprises on/from existing informal enterprises to harness skills, demand and market links. Examples were herbal medicines for humans and cattle, firewood sales and charging outside pastoralist an access fee for grazing. It was recommended that a CFA/PFM marketing site be set up and promoted in Maralal where PFM products can be differentiated from non-PFM</p>	<p>Project Manager, FAO Kenya GEF Team, KFS project focal point</p>	<p>Y6Q1</p>

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Workplan)

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.0	Strengthened capacities of Kenya Forest Service (KFS) and Community Forest Associations (CFAs) in Participatory Forest Management (PFM)			
Output 1.1. Kirisia CFA empowered to provide community leadership PFM of 91,452 ha of Kirisia forest in strong and widely representative partnership with KFS	- Coverage of CFA membership for the target area; - No CFAs	- Over 60% of community coverage; - 3 CFAs established and leadership democratically elected	The capacity of the three CFAs and their respective User Groups has been strengthened through learning exchange and knowledge transfer visits to performing and best practice CFAs. The CFA members carried home the lessons including CFA governance/leadership structures, FMAs and access to forest user rights, Eco-Tourism and Enterprise Development, Livelihood Activities among others. The CFAs and user groups have launched more livelihood/income generating activities which include honey production and processing, sale of tree seedlings and income generation from in-kind and exchange visits to the forest. This reporting period has observed an increased number of new partners including WVK, BOMA	Considerable effort has been focused on establishing the three new CFAs which was unforeseen at the beginning of the project. The CFAs are now formed and development of official forest management agreements is underway. These unforeseen activities have delayed and/or refocused other activities in the project

¹² Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹³ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

			<p>Project and Suyan Trust joining the partnership to enhance the capacity and support the CFAs in many other ways</p> <p>Recruitment and registration of CFA members has been going on and membership has increased from 2565 from the last reporting period to 3877 member; translating to 66% increase in the CFA membership.</p> <p>The number and capacity of established tree nurseries across the 3 CFA forest blocks has increased from 3 to 5 existing tree nurseries.</p>	
<p>Output 1.2 KFS and CFAs provided with operational capacity to implement forest management, protect forests from fire, put 91,452 ha under Forest Protection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of Rangers/ Scouts at Kirisia Forest Station increased and trained; - Areas of coverage under protection by the rangers and scouts; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 100 KFS and community Rangers/scouts involved in monitoring and management of Kirisia forest - 50,000 Ha - 3 fire towers constructed 	<p>Construction of two fire towers has been completed and handed over to the respective CFAs The procurement for the construction of one outpost in Nkarro is at an advanced stage</p> <p>Tractor (110 HP) & Trailer, water bowser and motorbikes have been handed over to KFS and other partners to be used for forest management/conservation activities.</p>	<p>According to policy, each CFA requires a forest station, so as there is 3 CFAs, there has to be three compared to the envisaged 1 at the design stage of the project when there was only 1 CFA (not operational). KFS will finance the shortage of the two outposts through co-financing.</p>
<p>Output 1.3: Forest Management Plan upgraded to Kirisia Ecosystem Management Plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of management plan upgraded; - Number of forest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3 forest management plans operational integrated with community 	<p>Three participatory forest management plans contextualized to the 3 CFA forest blocks have been finalized for use in the negotiation of the forest access rights by the CFAs and user groups. 3 Community Forest Associations established and functional with community scouts managing the grazing and protection of critical sites.</p>	<p>The development of Ecosystem management plan (2019-2029) has been completed. Five year Participatory Forest Management Plans (2022-2027) for the three CFAs is underway and it will give rise to the signing of Forest</p>

	management plans with incentives for communities and partnership;	carbon monitoring mechanism, participation of forest adjacent communities and incentive mechanism - Three Forest Management Agreements signed between CFAs and KFS - Baseline data for community carbon monitoring mechanism available;	The next step will be to ratify these Forest Management Agreements between the CFAs and KFS. These FMAs will spell out all the forest user rights for the CFAs	Management Agreements (2022-2027) between KFS and CFAs. These plans will integrate forest and biodiversity conservation and monitoring functions.
Output 1.4: Design and implement a forest rehabilitation/ reforestation	Area of land under the program developed	- 10,000 ha improved tree/seedling cover with	120,000 ha of restoration sites for enrichment planting 20.000 ha for natural regeneration have been established and rehabilitation work is underway Other than the one tree nurseries established and supported by the project in each of the three CFA	One tree nursery has been established in each CFA to support livelihoods and restoration. More training and infrastructures required to strengthen the capacity of the groups.

<p>program which puts 10,000 ha under regeneration and 17,000 under SFM</p>		<p>1,324,441 tCO₂eq (direct) avoided;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 restoration strategy developed for Kirisia Forest - 17,000 ha of forest resources zoned for SFM in the participatory forest management plans including areas outside the forest with 980,348 tCO₂eq (direct) avoided; 	<p>forest blocks; the CFAs/user groups have established 5 more tree nurseries across Kirisia Forest. This has increased the inventory of tree seedlings available for rehabilitation of degraded areas in Kirisia Forest</p>	<p>Enrichment planting at the established restoration sites is underway</p> <p>With the voluntary move out of community members residing within the forest and the participatory forest management plans/agreements in place; further natural regeneration will occur</p>
<p>Outcome 2.0</p>	<p>Integrity of the key (Kirimon) wildlife migration corridor connecting Kirisia wildlife refuge to the Samburu heartland secured</p>			
<p>Output 2.1</p> <p>Important dispersal areas and wildlife migratory corridors mapped and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information material on dispersal areas and wildlife migratory 	<p>1 regulatory framework established with agreements/ MoUs among Community</p>	<p>The Community Conservancy Fund Act, 2020 is being implemented by the County Government and other partners and the capacity of Nkoteiya Community Conservancy has improved drastically.</p> <p>In partnership with EAWLS, a dossier for designating Opiroi Cliffs as an Important Bird Area (IBA) prepared</p>	<p>Biodiversity mapping nearly complete and the Kirisia-Nkoteiya wildlife corridor secured</p> <p>Project to focus only on one corridor and community</p>

<p>protection negotiated with land users/owners</p>	<p>corridors for negotiation; - Number of agreements / MoUs</p>	<p>Conservancies, KWS, County Government of Samburu, NRT land users/owners for the key (Kirimon) wildlife migratory corridor;</p>	<p>and submitted to national and global IBA Secretariats. Many steps designed to implement this critical designation are underway and the approval of this report by the secretariats will open more avenues in tourism attraction and income generation for Nailiepunye CFA and its communities</p>	<p>conservancy to avoid spreading too thin.</p>
<p>Output 2.2 Support the establishment of a new conservancy proposed by the County Government</p>	<p>Number of conservancies supported; Percentage of the key (Kirimon) wildlife corridor being managed under community conservancy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 community conservancy established and trained for participatory enhanced community wildlife management - 30% of Kirimon wildlife corridor under management - Community Conservancy management plan 	<p>The project supported Nkoteiya Community Conservancy to procure and restore the water heating system for the whole conservancy lodge by use of solar power. The project has commenced the procurement of tents to be installed at the conservancy lodge to increase bed capacity</p> <p>The Nkoteiya community conservancy board benefited from an exposure and learning tour to other performing community conservancies and lessons learnt from the tour are being implanted to improve the operations/management and performance of the conservancy</p>	<p>Project to focus on securing the Kirisia-Nkoteiya wildlife corridor (one conservancy).</p> <p>Other project partners are conducting considerable work with community conservancies in other areas in Samburu.</p>

		for enhanced institutional capacity with MoU/agreements signed		
<u>Outcome 3.0</u>	Income from honey, and other NWFPs providing financial incentives for PFM and conservation and increase household income by more than 25% for participating households			
<u>Output 3.1</u> Promoting high volume buying market linkages for honey and smoothening supply chains	- Increase in production of honey; - Increase in quantity of honey reaching market; Business plans for a honey processing refinery in place	- Increased honey production by 25% of current baseline; - A business strategy completed and fundraising in progress;	The project has procured 135 beehives and distributed to the CFAs/user groups in the three forest blocks. The procurement of the micro-processing and harvesting gears for the apiaries is underway. Three more apiaries have been established covering the three CFA forest blocks The project has signed the LoAs with the CFAs to undertake livelihood activities which include honey production and processing, poultry and kitchen garden interventions. The LoAs implementation in the three CFAs is ongoing.	The user groups require organization, more training and honey handling equipment to enable convenient delivery to the cooperative for processing
<u>Output 3.2</u> Tourism development model developed, to deliver benefits to	- Tourism development strategy in place with a clear plan	- A final tourism strategy available in tandem with improved forest and natural	The development of the Samburu Tourism Strategic Plan is nearly completed and will be established and launched in September 2022. This strategy has identified resources available across Kirisia Forest to be exploited by the CFAs in	Focus will be shifted to support community members with more tangible livelihood activities and support existing enterprises to reduce pressure on the forest and generate income for the community and the forest management.

the local communities	for mobilizing resources;	resources management and equitable sharing of benefits from future returns on tourism;	consultation with KFS for eco-tourism activities geared towards income generation	Some resources have been shifted to focus on livelihood developments.
Output 3.3: Other NWFPs with potential identified and strategy for commercial exploitation designed and implementation started	Income generation strategy for identified NWFPs (using the Market Analysis and Development Approach);	Identified NWFPs are commercially available for income generation;	Other than the one tree nurseries established and supported by the project in each of the three CFA forest blocks; the CFAs/user groups have established 2 more tree nurseries. This has increased the inventory of tree seedlings available for rehabilitation of degraded areas in Kirisia Forest hence income generation for the CFAs/User groups Three more apiaries have been established covering the three CFA forest blocks. This will enable increase income generation for CFAs in the future. In June 2022 the project also piloted an agroforestry programme focusing on fruit and fast growing tree species. The pilot covered 101 farmers and the wider campaign will reach 1,500 farmers and will improve livelihoods, climate resilience and food security.	Focus will be shifted to support community members with further tangible livelihood activities and support existing enterprises to reduce pressure on the forest and generate income for the community and forest management.
Outcome 4.0	Knowledge systems inform adaptive management in PFM			
Output 4.1: A community carbon monitoring	- Number of community carbon	- 3 community carbon monitoring	The findings and recommendations from Kirisia carbon assessment/baseline report have been	Gender assessment, carbon assessment and biodiversity assessment were completed and the recommendations in the reports

mechanism, developed	monitoring mechanisms developed; - Number of permanent sample plots;	plans integrated in PFMPs 3 permanent sample plots established	incorporated in the development of PFMPs and will be implemented once the PFMPs start its operation	for all these assessments will be incorporated in the PFMPs and FMAs
Output 4.2: Knowledge management system set up, informed by project review and evaluations (Project M&E formulated, MTR and FE undertake	- Number of Knowledge management system set up Number of project evaluations conducted	Final Evaluation (FE)	Project M&E updated Mid-term review report findings have been discussed and the recommendations have been implemented and applied in the planning for the remaining project phase	The project team reviewed the MTR report in depth, provided the management response and taken the necessary action to implement recommendations.
Output 4.3: Participatory communication for PFM and Traditional Knowledge developed and documented	Number of documentation collected/developed	At least 10 documentations describing best practices, lessons, indigenous knowledge	The restoration strategy for natural regeneration and enrichment planting has been developed The Participatory Forest Management Plans (PFMPs) for the three CFAs are at an advanced stage of completion The strategy to designate Opiroi Cliff as an Important Bird Area has been developed to be implemented in the remaining phase The Tourism Strategic Plan for Samburu County is underway	Following the MT recommendations the activity was changed to only focus on documents produced

Outcome 5.0	Subsidiary legislation and guidelines for County level implementation of the PFM National Policy of 2005 in place informed by Community Bio-cultural community protocols			
<p>Output 5.1: Subsidiary legislation and guidelines for participatory forest management submitted to government for approval</p>	<p>Number of policies, guidelines and protocols developed for approval;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 1 final bio-cultural community protocols available; - 3 county level policies related to PFM and NRM - 2 county-specific legislation to guide the implementation of the PFM policy of 2005 developed for approval; 	<p>Rangelands & Planned Grazing Policy in which the project has participated in its development has been enacted and passed as an Act of the Assembly by the County Assembly</p> <p>The Samburu County Climate Change and Forest Conservation Management Policies have been developed and enacted into Acts of the Assembly with the support of a policy expert recruited by GEF-5 Project in close collaboration with County Government department of Environment, NR & Energy. The project partners were also involved throughout the process of developing the two policies and they have contributed valuable resources in terms of finances and expertise.</p>	<p>The project has supported Samburu County Assembly and Government to develop needed PFM legislation</p> <p>The policy expert and the project team have delivered the two new policies for the county government</p>
<p>Output 5.2: Advocacy/Awareness, County and National government lobbied to adopt the proposed policy reforms</p>	<p>Number of local community groups involved in advocacy;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 60% of local community groups represented in the project site ; CFAs represented in county 	<p>Engagement with the National and County Government leaders on matters conservation and management of Kirisia Landscape has continued in the reporting period</p> <p>Awareness creation and sensitization forums among the local community on participatory forest management and the role of CFAs have been</p>	

		<p>environmental committee</p>	<p>revamped through the local FM radios and the onsite meetings</p> <p>Many more partners have joined the project and the County Government in the conservation of Kirisia Landscape efforts. This partnership has created a multiplier effect in the conservation activities within and across Kirisia Forest borders</p>	
--	--	--------------------------------	--	--

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.

Further capacity development of the three new Community Forest Associations (CFA) in Kirisia forest

- CFA constitutions validated as well other related by-laws and policies
- Community scouts recruited and regular operations carried out to regulate the forest use
- CFA Knowledge exchange visit carried out to Mount Kenya Forest to learn from best practices in community forest management in Kenya
- CFAs supported to carry out voluntary tree planting and formation of grazing committees and control of movement of livestock In the forest
- CFAs has negotiated user rights with KFS which is generating revenues for the CFA which is to be spent on motorbikes and murrum road rehabilitation (co-finance)
- CFAs and KFS supported to improve the previously dysfunctional relationships and relationships are now on good terms yielding very good collaboration.
- CFAs and KFS sensitized to integrate the HNRM plans and grazing agreements as an integral part of the PFMPs
- Community advocacy was boosted on the need of PFM and the PFMP process through school outreach, local FM radios and community barazas

LoAs:

- Ongoing implementation of the LoA with KFS to develop the participatory forest management plans and the forest management agreements for the three CFAs as well as to develop and implement a restoration strategy for the forest
- Ongoing implementation of the LoA with East Africa Wildlife Society to develop organizational capacity of the CFAs and develop viable livelihood activities
- Ongoing implementation of the LoA with Kenya Water Towers Agency to rehabilitate forest springs
- Ongoing implementation of the LoAs with the 3 CFAs to undertake livelihood activities which include honey production and processing, poultry, and kitchen garden interventions
- Ongoing implementation of the LoA with NRT to develop the County Tourism Strategy

Infrastructure support

- Tractor (110 HP), tipping trailer, water bowser and 4 motorbikes have been handed over to KFS to improve the capacity of the institution in the conservation and restoration efforts.
- The procurement of fire-fighting equipment is under way
- The construction of forest fire towers has been completed and the procurement for the construction of 1 ranger/scout outposts is underway
- Concept for rehabilitation of 20 Km murrum roads developed and co-finance with KFS agreed

Reports and assessments

- Biodiversity assessment of Kirisia Forest completed
- Bio-cultural Protocol for Samburu/Kirisia forest completed

- Kirisia Awareness booklet complete
- Kirisia children awareness comic book complete
- The restoration strategy for natural regeneration and enrichment planting has been developed
- The Participatory Forest Management Plans (PFMPs) for the three CFAs are at an advanced stage of completion
- The strategy to designate Opiroi Cliff as an Important Bird Area has been developed to be implemented in the remaining phase

Policy and management

- Samburu County Government supported (through project partner NRT) to enact The Community Conservancy Fund Act, 2020
- Project has supported the establishment of a position/office of County Conservancies Coordinator which enabled the County government to pay salaries to wildlife rangers/scouts
- The Samburu County Rangelands & Planned Grazing Policy in which the project has participated in its development has been enacted and passed as an Act of the Assembly by the County Assembly
- The Samburu County Climate Change and Forest Conservation Management Policies have been developed and enacted into Acts of the Assembly with the support of a policy expert recruited by GEF-5 Project in close collaboration with the project team and County Government department of Environment, NR & Energy.

Livelihood development

- The project has developed three community managed and business-oriented tree nurseries (one for each CFA) to supply the project with indigenous tree seedlings for forest restoration as well as to supply the surrounding communities with agroforestry and fruit seedlings on a commercial basis.
- The project has secured co-finance (through project partners KFS, KWTA, WFP, world vision) which supported the CFA user groups with beehives, harvesting and processing equipment. User groups have enhanced honey production and are currently increasing revenues
LoA development with the three CFAs underway to support the CFAs and forest user groups to develop livelihoods in the honey, poultry and kitchen garden/tree nursery value chains. The CFAs will also be directly supported through procurement of tools, input, equipment and processing machinery and also be supported to develop business plans for these value chains
- More than 100,000 tree seedlings (indigenous + exotic species) and 2,400 Hass avocado seedlings for forest restoration as well as for agroforestry at the farmers' household

Restoration

- CFAs have been supported to conduct forest restoration, implement various plans and strategies developed in the Kirisia Forest Ecosystem Management Plan and to develop social fencing of areas to allow for natural regeneration. Forest areas previously settled are regenerating naturally and the forest is showing improvement in forest health and biodiversity as an increased natural regeneration is occurring across all forest blocks
- The forest fires and illegal activities in the forest have reduced due to the enhanced capacity of KFS and the regular surveillance by the community scouts
- Restoration sites for natural regeneration and enrichment planting have been established

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

- While the GoK and group ranches members were resolving the conflicting boundaries of Kirisia Forest and those of the adjacent group ranches especially on the northern part of the forest ; activity implementation was halted to allow for the smooth process of consultations with the interested parties. However, the boundary dispute was resolved amicably.
- The project was put on temporary hold awaiting an assessment/investigation of the moving out of community members residing within Kirisia forest
- Invasion by the 2nd and 3rd generation swarms of Desert Locust in some parts of Kirisia Forest which destroyed some species of trees
- Occurrence of COVID-19 pandemic resulting in the postponement of project planned activities and meetings as well as the field visits by the project partners and consultants
- The prolonged and ongoing drought in Kenya and the project area has really affected the smooth implementation of activities, especially the restoration works.
- Delays in the development, review and closure of the LoAs by partners due to the Covid-19 restrictions and lockdown
- The project has carried out implementation of activities without a substantive LTO for some period and this has affected the smooth routing for implementation of the same

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	FY2022 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	Project implementation was initially delayed due to the political environment both nationally in Kenya and locally in Samburu County. The effect of this hitch was transferred to the successive fiscal years hence the general delay. The perceptions of the project became favourable and direct implementation and project partner implementation had picked and progressed well. The recent incursion of Covid-19 Pandemic and the associated restrictions as well as the prolonged drought in Kenya and the project area has negatively impacted the smooth pace of implementation and slowed the trajectory to the achievement of results in the reporting period
Budget Holder	S	S	The project significant achievement was securing the goodwill from the local communities and political leaders. This enabled the establishment of the community forest associations and development of the Participatory Management Plan for long-term restoration of Kirisia forest. The forest is now co-managed by the Kenya Forest Service and the Community Forest Associations (CFAs). The capacity development of the CFAs has improved livelihoods while restoring the forest ecosystem.

¹⁵ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.

For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸			Comments and ratings from OFP were not received within the set deadline for PIR final submission (OFP office going through a transition)
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	S	<p>The project has been able to achieve several key actions planned for the period July 2021 to June 2022 in particular: (1) establishment of three new CFAs , (2) establishment of community tree nurseries to allow stakeholders to procure tree seedlings for restoration and agroforestry directly from the community, (3) development of Ecosystem management plan (2019-2029 in Kirisia forest and (4) development of the Samburu Tourism Strategic Plan to be launched in September 2022</p> <p>Due to COVID 19 constraints, several actions have been delayed or postponed. In this difficult context the PMU has managed to still advance well most of the activities. The project team reviewed the MTR report in depth, provided the management response and taken the necessary action to implement recommendations during the period July 2021- June 2022.</p>
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	S	The project is successfully landing towards the end of project implementation. Despite 2022 being an election year with challenges affecting the implementation pace, most of the recommendations made at MTR where addressed - a prioritization exercise identifying key pending deliverables was conducted by the project Management Unit. The Final Evaluation had to be postponed because of the election period – consequently extending the NTE by 4 months.

¹⁸ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

¹⁹ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
	ESIA Report recommendations	Report shared with KFS	KFS to establish Social safeguards focal point and grievance and redress mechanism	KFS

ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social (ESS) Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Moderate	Still Valid

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
No

²⁰ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	The benefits for communities under SFM in Leroghi Forest too small to serve as an effective incentive for communities to invest in forest management.	Medium	Yes	Through KFS/CFA partnership, the communities will benefit from environment friendly bio enterprises agreed in the new management plan. The awareness raising targeting decision-makers has been included in the design to mitigate this risk.	Kirisia CFAs have been established to facilitate efficient, economical and sustainable forest management. A number of NTFP value chains are being supported	

²¹ Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	The displaced pastoralists living in Leroghi Forest will resist the adoption of the new range management systems and the new rules for access and use of the natural resources of Leroghi Forest.	Medium	Yes	The local communities holding the traditional tenure rights to Leroghi Forest will be empowered and will be structured within the CFA. The CFA will be responsible for enforcing the new rules governing access and use that are negotiated between KFS and the CFA. This arrangement will build upon, and reinforce, traditional Samburu governance systems.	In-depth and sensitive sensitization of all community and government partners has been conducted and all stakeholders have been bought in the process. Transparent and free election of CFA board has been completed.	
3	There is a risk that the ecological characteristics of Leroghi and group ranch forests will make forest regeneration too difficult and too expensive to make participatory SFM a viable option.	Low	Yes	The highest value tree, cedar, is the one with the greatest natural capacity for regeneration on the deforested areas and is the most resistant to livestock. Protection from livestock will be critical and will be done in consultation with respective CFAs. It is expected that once tree cover of indigenous species is re-established, one will also re-establish the ecological conditions needed for natural regeneration of both native flora and fauna	Natural regeneration occur in areas with protection and ecological integrity is still enough for revival of the ecosystem	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	There is a risk that in those areas where overgrazing is a key constraint to forest regeneration, it will not be possible to integrate herders and to protect recently harvested areas from grazing long enough to ensure adequate regeneration.	Medium	Yes	This is recognized to be a difficult challenge but with support from CFAs and community elders, such livestock control is feasible.	Herders are sensitized and by-laws are being developed. The project is developing information material and working with community conservancies to reduce the pressure on the forest.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
5	Extreme climatic events associated with climate change (CC) may affect vegetation regeneration	Low	Yes	The creation of empowered community managers with adaptive management capacities may be the best strategy for adapting to CC. It is the present conditions of uncontrolled, open access, and unsustainable use of dryland forests that makes them the most susceptible to climate change.	The National and County Government are supported to develop Climate Change & Rangeland Management Policies and the related Legislations to enable mechanisms to be put in place to combat land degradation and strengthen mechanisms to cope with the effects/impact caused by extreme climate	
6	The project interventions will not be sustainable. Communities do not continue to control deforestation and degradation and to manage the forests sustainably after the end of the project.	Low	Yes			

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
7	<p>COVID-19 Pandemic: The project field activities may be disrupted / delayed due to frequent lockdowns and restrictions on travel and face to face meetings. This may cause delays in procurement of goods and services. The pandemic might also result in more people losing their jobs and livelihoods hence overexploitation of natural resource may occur especially on the fragile ecosystems</p>	Medium	No	<p>Identify and implement activities that can be done by the project staff and partners while keeping safe from COVID-19. Embrace safe working procedures/policies put in place by FAO and the government</p> <p>The promotion of livelihoods based on diversification of sustainable harvesting and processing of NTFPs is a key strategy of the project to build resilience and sustain biodiversity. The project will make further efforts in adapting marketing strategies to support communities/ producers' access to market as needed despite disruptions.</p>	<p>There is enhanced use of technologies for virtual meetings and Webinars. Maintaining strict adherence to the Covid-19 regulations to enable some field activities to take place. Consider for a no-cost extension for LoAs with partners to allow for smooth finalization of activities.</p>	<p>The country has been on and off the lockdowns and movement in the capital city and neighbouring counties that led to halting of some project activities. The nationwide curfew is still in effect</p>
8	<p>Desert Locust</p> <p>The project field activities may be disrupted/delayed due to the invasion of desert locust in East Africa. The desert locust have destroyed large areas of agricultural, rangeland and forested areas in Kenya which may result in decreased livelihood activities and restoration. However, the desert locust normally occurs with 100 years interval.</p>	Medium	No	<p>Extensive field operation and collaboration with the Government of Kenya to identify infected areas and spray the swarms to contain the desert locust and remove it from Kenya and neighbouring countries.</p>	<p>Due to the interventions of FAO, the desert locust has been contained in Kenya and no longer poses as a threat to project implementation.</p>	

Project overall risk rating (Low, Moderate, Substantial or High):

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	M	This classification is medium due to the voluntary movement of people out of Kirisia forest and have settled in their respective group ranches. The National Government have participatorily resolved and fixed the forest boundaries with the group ranches.

7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
<p>Recommendation 1: Undertake an independent rapid assessment of the movement of people, establish grievance redress mechanisms, safeguards and where necessary mitigation strategies.</p>	<p>An independent assessment of Environmental and Social Safeguards has been undertaken by an independent consultant and the report informed the way forward on the environmental and social safeguards and mitigation measures. It recommended that the project and executing agencies should magnify the structure, function and suitability of the project grievance redress mechanisms so as to arrest risks and challenges before escalation.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2: With the delay at the beginning combined with a very ambitious spread of outcomes, prioritize and consolidate a focus on getting the PFM process complete with new rights, responsibilities and benefits of communities secure.</p>	<p>The development of the participatory Forest Management Plans (PFMPs) has begun. These plans will give rise to legally binding Forest Management Agreements (FMAs) for each of the three CFAs in Kirisia forest. KFS and FAO will facilitate CFAs to have a strong and informed voice in the negotiations and development of the forest management agreements.</p> <p>Forest Management Agreements shall include a strong focus on real incentives for the local community members to get engaged in the PFM process and shall also include tangible and sustainable rights for forest adjacent communities to utilize natural resources within the forest in a sustainable manner.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3: Focus more strongly on communicating, reorienting and capacity building of government stakeholders on the rationale, principles and procedures of PFM, so that the 'reconnection'</p>	<p>Revision of project communication strategy to focus on the Key theory of change of Participatory Forest Management more explicitly</p> <p>The process for the development of a participatory video on the success of the establishment of the three CFAs in Kirisia forest, the process, the benefits and the impact. Including stakeholders from the community, local and national government, partners and FAO. The video will be</p>

message is clear and institutionalized by project end.	informative to guide further PFM negotiations and management in Kirisia and elsewhere. This video will clearly showcase the legal process of PFM, PFM rights and responsibilities and many more
--	---

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	No
--	----

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule	NCE	From 24 th July to 31 st Dec 2022	
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other			

²² Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) being the chair of the Project Steering Committee	Provide leadership and political good will to the project and all partners Chairing the PSC meetings	Chaired the Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting 2021 in Maralal on the 2 nd Dec. 2022.	-
County Government of Samburu	Environmental/NRM conservation and tourism	- Participated in all the project activities in the reporting period - Provided leadership in the development of the County CC & Forest Management Policies and the related legislations - Participated & provided the technical expertise in the agro-forestry program	-
Kenya Forest Service (KFS)	- Coverage & Management of forests - Lead agency in the implementation of GEF-5 Project	- Implementing an ongoing LoA on PFMPs and Restoration of Kirisia forest - Sensitization Meetings for the Election and/or Nomination of Local Planning Team Members for the 3 CFAs in Kirisia Forest	-
Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS)	Wildlife Management in the country and county	- Knowledge Exchange/Transfer Visit for Nkoteiya Community Conservancy Board to Learn from Best Practices in the Management of Community Conservancies	-

		- Benchmarking Tour for learning of best practice by key partners in the development of Samburu County Tourism Strategic Plan to Maasai Mara Conservancies and Game Reserve	
National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA)	Environmental Management and Governance	Participated in all the project activities in the reporting period - Provided technical expertise in the development of the County CC & Forest Management Policies and the related legislations	-
Kenya Water Towers Agency (KWTA)	Coverage and management of Water Towers	Implementing the LoA on the protection of water springs in Kirisia Forest	-
East Africa Wildlife Society (EAWLS)	- Train the CFAs and User Groups on enterprise development - develop viable enterprises for the CFAs/User Groups	Implementing an LoA on CFAs Enterprises Development	-
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
BOMA Project	Implementing livelihood and NRM program for women in Kirisia	Implemented an going NRM Project in Kirisia forest	-
Private sector entities			
Suyan Trust	- Creating awareness through environmental education/advocacy - Protection of Kirisia forest as a water tower through tree planting and alternative livelihoods	- Supported livelihood interventions for CFAs and the scouts - Facilitated the scouts and CFAs to protect the forest from fires	-
Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT)	Sustainable management of rangelands and wildlife	Supported on the development of livelihood interventions for women and youth	-

	in the Samburu Landscape	- Supported the implementation of the Nkoteiya Community Conservancy Management Plan - Provided leadership in the development of the Samburu Tourism Strategic Plan	
Others[1]			
3 CFAs (Naramat, Nkarro & Nailiepunye)	Legal/registered Local Community Structures to represent the forest adjacent communities in the co-management of Kirisia Forest	Implementing 3 LoAs on organizational development and governance, forest restoration and agroforestry	-
New stakeholders identified/engaged			
N/A			

[1] They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women’s groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then.

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) <u>during this reporting period.</u>		
Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	- A gender analysis was produced at the inception stage of the project. Results and recommendations of the gender analysis is being mainstreamed at all stages of the project - Socio-economic baseline has been produced, disaggregating data on livelihoods, forest use etc based on sex among other factors.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	- Ensure the 2/3 gender rule is observed in constituting the community leadership and engagement structures e.g. CFA leadership Committee, Community Forest Scouts,
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	- closing gender gaps in access to and control over forest resources
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	- Improving women's participation and decision making in CFA management (the project is actively promoting active participation of women in the membership and leadership of the three CFAs supported by the project)
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	- Supporting women groups in NTFPs enterprises and promoting commercialization on traditionally women dominated NTFPs (e.g. the project is supporting the CFAs to establish four commercial tree nurseries using established

2022 Project Implementation Report

		women and youth groups as the basis for the nurseries. This to promote women’s participation both in the Samburu economy and the leadership in forest resources utilization and conservation, a traditionally male dominated domain).
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project has revised the Monitoring and Evaluation framework including gender disaggregated data - Baseline has been updated with gender disaggregated data to inform project activities and allow for comparison during evaluations and reviews
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	All staff in the project has undergone gender training and the FAO gender focal point is part of the management team.
Any other good practices on gender	No	

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
<p>Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.</p>	<p>As at now, the project does not have a knowledge management strategy.</p> <p>Good practices:</p> <p>The project has had a remarkably success in transforming the narrative regarding Participatory Forest Management and Community Forest Associations among forest adjacent communities around Kirisia forest. The transformation of the narrative was needed as the view towards PFM and CFAs were hostile at the beginning thus the project embarked on a widespread and sensitive communication/sensitization campaign including officers from KFS, County Government, Community and FAO Kenya. This led to the buy-in from local leaders, community representatives, politicians and government officials and the decision made for the formation of the three new CFAs and formalization of forest co-management between KFS and the local community. The success can be showcased by the successful election of CFA officials which elected both male and female representatives to the key positions in the CFAs (Samburu community is a strictly patrilineal society). The elections gathered more than 5,000 local community representatives. The project will recruit a Knowledge management specialist to capture and organize the lessons learnt and knowledge management products and a strategy for their dissemination and use.</p>
<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.</p>	<p>Yes; the project has a communication strategy. The communication strategy is built on the following overall objectives;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To create awareness on the importance of Kirisia Forest to the people of Samburu and neighboring counties. • To document indigenous knowledge and use it for partnership in managing the forest • To begin to foster lasting equitable collaboration with the partners in managing and protecting the forest for future <p>The project has managed to produce an awareness booklet for adults and an awareness comic book for school going children to be used to increase awareness of the importance of Kirisia forest. The project manager together with representatives from the local CFAs and KFS have participated in a number of radio talks on the local FM to increase awareness of the project and the importance of Kirisia forest</p>

	<p>Widespread media coverage of the establishment of the new CFAs and the voluntary move out from local community members residing within Kirisia Forest.</p>
<p>Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.</p>	<div data-bbox="474 304 1307 613"> </div> <div data-bbox="695 636 1300 663"> <p>Harvesting of honey and wax at Tamiyoi Apiary in Naramat CFA</p> </div> <div data-bbox="474 674 1317 863"> </div> <div data-bbox="474 877 1446 905"> <p>Women Members planting and tending tree seedlings at Tamiyoi Tree Nursery in Naramat CFA Block.</p> </div> <div data-bbox="474 919 1325 1188"> </div> <div data-bbox="553 1211 1442 1239"> <p>Training of Women & Youth members of the CFAs on management and husbandry practices</p> </div> <div data-bbox="474 1249 1330 1438"> </div> <div data-bbox="474 1451 1442 1520"> <p>CFA scouts utilizing both aerial and ground skills for surveillance of the forest for forest fires and illegal activities.</p> </div> <div data-bbox="474 1640 691 1667"> <p>Agroforestry campaign</p> </div>



[FAO Kenya](#), funded by the [Global Environment Facility](#) (The GEF) and in partnership with [Kenya Forest Service](#), [East Africa Wildlife Society](#), [Samburu County Government](#) and local Community Forest Associations is piloting an agroforestry programme in Lgos, Mungur, Ng'ano, Porro and Sungur areas in Naramat forest block, Kirisia forest, Samburu. The pilot is part of a larger agroforestry programme which will be rolled-out in the landscape adjacent to Kirisia forest, Samburu. The aim is to reach over 1,500 farmers and schools through training, distribution and planting of over 20,000 fruit - and 200,000 fast growing agroforestry trees suitable to the environmental conditions around the forest. The programme will promote tree planting and agroforestry, a practice with limited adoption in the Samburu culture, with the aim to reduce pressure on Kirisia forest while also providing alternative and sustainable tree-based livelihoods to the local forest dependent community. This will also enhance food and nutrition security and increase resilience against droughts and climate change.

2022 Project Implementation Report

	<p>“With the FAO training on avocado farming and distribution of avocado seedlings and other agroforestry trees, I can diversify my income with avocados is which is more reliable than livestock herding during droughts. The avocado will still allow me to continue livestock practices as it is not too time consuming” Lazaru Lekupe – Naramat Forest Block</p>
<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p>	<p>https://www.facebook.com/FAOKenya/posts/175740918233803 https://www.facebook.com/FAOKenya/posts/166356575838904 https://www.facebook.com/FAOKenya/posts/152784930529402 https://twitter.com/FAOKenya/status/1542376761152966656?s=20&t=5yZOo-3vbcdR3X0BWGQng https://twitter.com/FAOKenya/status/1544592177761746944?s=20&t=5yZOo-3vbcdR3X0BWGQng https://twitter.com/FAOKenya/status/1533388109576011780?s=20&t=5yZOo-3vbcdR3X0BWGQng https://twitter.com/FAOKenya/status/1527689211746426880?s=20&t=5yZOo-3vbcdR3X0BWGQng https://twitter.com/FAOKenya/status/1527623924778946560?s=20&t=5yZOo-3vbcdR3X0BWGQng https://twitter.com/FAOKenya/status/1527609112997109760?s=20&t=5yZOo-3vbcdR3X0BWGQng https://twitter.com/FAOKenya/status/1527591272822804482?s=20&t=5yZOo-3vbcdR3X0BWGQng https://twitter.com/FAOKenya/status/1522505808235405312?s=20&t=5yZOo-3vbcdR3X0BWGQng https://twitter.com/FAOKenya/status/1542376761152966656?t=2PN7PvhrferUsl_curfn5g&s=08</p>
<p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.</p>	<p>https://youtu.be/DWtslaGVf_U</p>
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point’s Name and contact details</p>	<p>Othieno, Joseph (FAOKE), (National Communication Specialist) Joseph.Othieno@fao.org</p>

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.

If applicable, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities.

N/A

Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

N/A

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (Confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
National Government	Kenya Forest Service (KFS)	In kind	500,000	300,000.00	149,223.88	500,000.00
National Government	Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI)	In kind	500,000	173,741.39	173,741.39	500,000.00
National Government	Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS)	In kind	500,000	278,434.67	208,826.00	500,000.00
National Government	Kenya Water Towers Agency (KWTA)	In kind	-	6,000.00	-	15,000.00
National Government	NG-CDF – Samburu West Constituency	In kind	-	24,500.00	-	50,000.00

²³ Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

2022 Project Implementation Report

National Government	Kenya Forest Working Group	In kind	800,000	-	-	-
Multi-Lateral	FAO	In kind	3,446,178	2,803,822.64	1,236,980.58	4,500,000.00
County Government	County Government of Samburu	In kind	2,515,000	319,417.00	300,000.00	2,515,000.00
TNC	Northern Rangeland Trust (NRT)	In kind	-	5,000.00	97,483.00	102,483.00
TNC	Suyan Trust	In kind	-	27,400.00	-	60,000.00
NGO	ACTED	In kind	-	150,000.00	-	150,000.00
NGO	World Vision Kenya	In kind	-	21,000.00	-	21,000.00
UN Agency	WFP	In kind	-	36,000.00	-	36,000.00
CBO	Community Forestry Associations	In kind	414,000	203,883.50	-	485,436.89
TOTAL			8,675,178	4,349,199.2	2,166,254.85	9,434,919.89

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives)
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits)
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
-----------------------------------	--

Risk rating. It should assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.