



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review 2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



### 1. Basic Project Data

#### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Africa
<b>Country(ies):</b>	Kenya
<b>Project Title:</b>	Capacity, Policy and Financial Incentives for PFM in Kirisia Forest and integrated Rangelands Management
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/KEN/073/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	5083
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	BD-2, CCM-5, SFM/REDD+-1, SFM/REDD+-2
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Kenya Forest Service, Kenya Forest Research Institute, Kenya Wildlife Service and Suyian Trust for partnership
<b>Project Duration:</b>	FSP

#### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	03 August 2016
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	1 July 2016
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	30 June 2021
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	N/A
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	N/A

#### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	USD 2,823,439
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	USD 8,675,178
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):</b>	1,002,316

<sup>1</sup> as per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> In case of a project extension.

<sup>3</sup> Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

<sup>4</sup> This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019<sup>5</sup></b>	1,785,000
--	-----------

### Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	22 <sup>nd</sup> August 2018 (Next one scheduled on 11 July 2019)
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	December 2019
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	N/A
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	Yes
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	No
<b>Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:</b>	30 June 2021
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>6</sup></b>	No

### Ratings

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	S	
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	S	
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	Medium	

### Status

<b>Implementation Status</b> <i>(1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	2nd PIR
--	---------

<sup>5</sup> Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

<sup>6</sup> Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

## Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Philip Kisoyan, Forest and GEF officer, FAO Kenya	<a href="mailto:Philip.kisoyan@fao.org">Philip.kisoyan@fao.org</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Nora Berrahmouni, Senior Forestry officer, FAO Regional office for Africa	<a href="mailto:nora.berrahmouni@fao.org">nora.berrahmouni@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Gabriel Rugalema, FAO Representative, FAO Kenya	<a href="mailto:Gabriel.Rugalema@fao.org">Gabriel.Rugalema@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division</b>	Chris Dirkmaat, Paola Palestini,	<a href="mailto:Chris.Dirkmaat@fao.org">Chris.Dirkmaat@fao.org</a> <a href="mailto:Paola.Palestini@fao.org">Paola.Palestini@fao.org</a>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Objective(s):</b> To deliver multiple BD, CC and livelihood benefits from 91,452 ha of Kirisia Forest under PFM and 50,000 ha of rangelands under Holistic Natural Resources Management respectively						
<b>Outcome 1:</b>  Strengthened capacities of stakeholders implement PFM in the main land tenure categories of dryland forests delivers 2,935,701 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq;	KFS and CFA Institutional Capacity as measured by the UNDP standard capacity scorecard for CFA, KFS, KWS, and HNRM	Less than 50 points	25% increase in capacity from baseline	50% increase in capacity scores over baseline measured by UNDP standard capacity scorecard	Three new CFAs have been established & registered and KFS/KWS undergoing capacity development	S
	Area of degraded forest habitats undergoing reforestation/restoration and their GHG emissions avoided	0 Ha	5,000 ha	10,000 ha with 1,324,441 tCO <sub>2</sub> eq (direct) avoided;	0 ha (implementation delayed as it was decided that is was crucial to first establish the three CFAs prior to the reforestation/restoration activities to ensure the sustainability of results, piloting of	N/A

<sup>7</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Marginally Satisfactory** (MS), **Marginally Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU).

					restoration approaches will start at the coming phase of LoAs)	N/A
					()	
					Project has not yet implemented activities (activities to put Kirisia forest under fire protection and ranger monitoring, including establishment of outposts, as well as establishment of three tree nurseries, one for each CFA, will take place in the coming phase of LoAs	
	Areas of forest under protection management regime and their GHG emissions avoided	0 Ha	15,000 ha	45,000 ha with 630,912 tCO2eq (direct) avoided	Within the new management plan the new CFAs have identified areas of rehabilitation and sites for the establishment of tree nurseries for tree seedlings bulking, one in each forest block. The project has worked with 1 community conservancy to develop a conservancy	N/A
	Area under SFM and their GHG emissions avoided	0 Ha	15,000 ha	17,000 ha with 980,348 tCO2eq (direct) avoided		N/A

	Rangelands being managed by HNRM plans	0 Ha	25,000 ha rangelands under HNRM plans with 10% increase in productivity of degradation over baseline.	50,000 ha rangelands under HNRM plans with 25% increase in productivity of degradation over baseline.	<p>management plan for Nkoteiya community conservancy covering 17,000 Ha</p> <p>Natural regeneration is occurring in some areas with less grazing pressure (Natural regeneration has not been measured at this point but during the KFS mapping and zonation of the forest and widespread natural regeneration was observed in non-grazing areas of the forest and the ongoing monitoring will provide actual acreage).</p> <p>Project has not yet implemented activities under this objective</p> <p>The new CFAs will identify areas within their forest blocks to be put under forest</p>	MS
--	--	------	---	---	--	----

					<p>protection management regime</p> <p>0 ha</p> <p>Project has not yet implemented activities under this objective General delay in the project implementation due to late start and prioritizing the forest activities. Implementation will start in the coming phase).</p> <p>Kirisia Forest Ecosystem Management Plan has been developed which guide the three CFAs to develop sub-CFA participatory forest management plans (PFMP) and agreements to disseminate the overall management plan to site specific contexts where it is applicable. All the plans will mainstream SFM</p> <p>0 ha</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>Project has not yet implemented activities under this objective</p> <p>Plans are underway to establish HNRM Plans for 3 conservancies.</p>	
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b> Wildlife dispersal areas and migratory corridors secured to improve integrity of the Kirisia ecosystem as a wildlife refuge and critical part of maintaining the Samburu Heartland as a functioning ecosystem:</p>	<p>Percentage of landscape being managed under conservancies with agreements for protecting migratory corridors</p> <p>Incidents of poaching for various species</p>	<p>3 conservancies active, 6 in initial stages, none of them have migratory corridor protection agreements</p> <p>Kirisia currently leads in incidents of poaching of elephants in the Northern Landscape</p>	<p>6 conservancies operational and have high scores on the UNDP capacity assessment scorecard (for institutional capacity)</p> <p>No further increase in poaching incidents from baseline</p>	<p>12 conservancies with agreements being honoured that protect wildlife</p> <p>At least 40% decrease in incidents of poaching related deaths of wildlife species</p>	<p>9 community conservancies (Kalama, Meibae, Ngilai, Kalepo, Nalowuon, Sera, Westgate, Nkoteya and Ltungai) are operating in Samburu County. The project has worked with the community conservancy to map out and secure wildlife corridors linking it to Kirisia Forest</p> <p>Kenya wildlife service are reporting reduced incidents of poaching of zebra due to reduced demand for bush meat, elephant poaching is reported at minimal levels and no rhino poaching</p>	<p>S</p> <p>S</p>



					incident have been reported. No exact numbers have been provided by KWS Poaching in Northern Rangeland Trust (NRT) managed community conservancies (9 in Samburu) have reported a decline in poaching	
<b>Outcome 3: Income from honey, tourism and other NWFPs providing financial incentives for PFM and conservation and increase household incomes by more than 25% for participating households</b>	%age increase in household incomes from NWFPs	30%	- 15% income increase from NWFPs over baseline for participating households	- 25% income increase from NWFPs over baseline for participating households	<p>Existing NWFP value chains have been assessed and 3 value chains have been identified for further development in the next reporting period. These include; Honey, Aloe and Gums &amp; Resins.</p> <p>In addition, an assessment on sustainable charcoal production and capacity development of Samburu Charcoal producer group and a related sustainable charcoal production strategy has been established.</p> <p>The Samburu County Tourism Strategic</p>	S

					Plan is underway to inform the fundraising strategy for the county.	
<b>Outcome 4: Knowledge systems inform adaptive management in PFM</b>	Lessons available from PFM inform policy implementation	National PFM policy was informed by lessons but more needed to expand beneficiation from PFM by communities	Lessons on CFAs available	County Government has adopted lessons in local level PFM	Kirisia Forest Ecosystem Gender Analysis has been established and is readily available to inform policy and management development; CFA board members have been facilitated to learn from best practises in PFM from Nyeri county; Nkoteyia community conservancy facilitated to learn from best practices of wildlife and rangeland management; Kirisia ecosystem awareness booklet and comic book (for schools) developed to expand awareness; Kirisia/samburu bio-cultural protocol is being developed to inform forest and rangeland policy	S
<b>Outcome 5: Subsidiary legislation and</b>	Number of County level strategies and plans supporting	2005 Forestry Bill allows PFM but not harmonized with	Policy and legal gap analysis completed, gaps	80% of community management structures have legal documents	A sustainable biomass energy production and	S

<b>guidelines for County level implementation of the PFM National Policy of 2005 emplaced, informed by Community Bio-cultural community protocols</b>	participatory PFM developed	County policies	identified and recommendations for addressing them available	that empower them with control of access and with management, harvesting and marketing rights	management strategy has been developed (see output 3)  Samburu/Kirisia forest ecosystem community Bio-Cultural Protocol has been developed  Kirisia forest Biodiversity assessment has been developed	
---	-----------------------------	-----------------	--	---	---	--

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating <sup>10</sup>

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<b>Outcome 1: Strengthened capacities of stakeholders implement PFM in the main land tenure categories of dryland forests delivers 2,935,701 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq;</b>			
Area of degraded forest habitats undergoing reforestation/restoration and their GHG emissions avoided	Three new CFAs have been established & registered. FAO will partner with the CFAs and KFS to implement regeneration activities as per the PEMP. Communities will be consulted on areas of the forest to be managed and facilitated to establish by-laws to restrict grazing by browsers grazers (goats) to allow for natural regeneration.	FAO in partnership with KFS and local CFAs	June 2021
Areas of forest under protection management regime and their GHG emissions avoided	The new CFAs will identify areas within their forest blocks to be put under forest protection management regime and forest stations are being established and the capacity strengthened for CFAs, Community Conservancies, KFS and KWS.	FAO in partnership with KFS and local CFAs	June 2021
Area under SFM and their GHG emissions avoided	Kirisia Forest Ecosystem Management Plan has been developed which guide the three CFAs to develop will own participatory forest management plans (PFMP) and agreements. All the plans will mainstream SFM	FAO in partnership with KFS and local CFAs	December 2019
Rangelands being managed by HNRM plans	HNRM plans are being established for three new community conservancies and FAO will work with existing community conservancies using NRT model (and other institutions) to update existing management plans to HNRM plans and support implementation of the same.	FAO in partnership with KWS, NRT and community conservancies	June 2020

<sup>10</sup> To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

## 2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs <sup>11</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>12</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>13</sup>					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
<b>Output 1.1:</b> Kirisia CFA empowered to provide community leadership PFM of 91,452 ha of Kirisia forest in strong and widely representative partnership with KFS	Q 1 Y 3		Three new CFAs have been established and registered.  CFAs and KFS Capacity has been strengthened				50%	FAO will collaborate with the CFAs and KFS to implement regeneration activities as per the PEMP. Communities will be consulted on areas of the forest to be managed and facilitated to establish by-laws to restrict grazing by browsers grazers (goats) to allow for natural regeneration.
<b>Output 1.2:</b> KFS provided with operational capacity to implement forest management, protect forests from fire, put 45,000 ha under Forest Protection	Q 2 Y 2		Sites for three new forest stations/CFAs Offices & Fire Towers identified and mapped				20%	KFS will be facilitated to establish three new forest stations (previously one) & three fire and watch towers; once this is finalized the fire management plan will be developed
<b>Output 1.3:</b> Forest Management Plan upgraded to Kirisia Ecosystem Management Plan, with a biodiversity monitoring program	Q 4 Y 2		Zonation of Kirisia forest has been done and forest maps updated  Kirisia forest management plan updated and developed to one				50%	Three new CFA forest management plans is underway

<sup>11</sup> Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

<sup>12</sup> As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

<sup>13</sup> Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

			Forest Ecosystem Plan. Three CVAs constitutions developed and disseminated					
			Biodiversity assessment of Kirsia forest is underway					
<b>Output 1.4:</b> Design and implement a forest rehabilitation/ reforestation program which puts 10,000 ha under regeneration and 17,000 under SFM	Q 4 Y 5		Zoning of priority areas for forest rehabilitation and regeneration underway  Sites for forest restoration/regeneration and establishment of tree nurseries has been identified.				10%	Priority areas for natural regeneration, active rehabilitation and by-laws are being established to form the basis of forest rehabilitation in the project  CFAs will be facilitated to establish one tree nursery in each forest block
<b>Output 1.5:</b> Design and implement HNRM plans for 50,000 ha of rangelands	Q 4 Y 5		Conservancies to design and implement HNRM Plans have been identified and consulted				10%	HNRM plans are being established for two new community conservancies and FAO will work with existing community conservancies under NRT management (and other institutions) to update existing management plans to HNRM plans and support implementation of the same
<b>Output 2.1:</b> Important dispersal areas and migratory corridors mapped and protection negotiated with land users/owners	Q 2 Y 4		Identification and Mapping of critical wildlife migratory corridors have been accomplished.  Mapping of high value biodiversity areas underway				40%	Mapping of important biodiversity areas is underway and will form the basis of the partnership with the new community conservancies
<b>Output 2.2:</b> Support to 3 existing and establishment of 6 new conservancies proposed by the County Government (government co-finance)	Q 1 Y 3		Work to establish and or support new community conservancies underway  The project has facilitated KWS to ensure that new and existing conservancies understand national legislation				30%	9 conservancies under the management of Northern Rangeland Trust currently exist in Samburu County and the project is facilitating KWS to establish and raise awareness of two new community conservancies is underway

<b>Output 2.3:</b> Equipment and materials for wildlife monitoring and protection within and outside the Forest to cover the Kirsia ecosystem	Q 4 Y 5						0%	Not yet started
<b>Output 3.1:</b> Promoting high volume buying market linkages for honey and smoothening supply chains	Q 1 Y 5		<p>Assessment and capacity strengthening for Samburu Bee-keepers Cooperative has been done.</p> <p>Project partner Kenya Water Towers Agency has delivered beehives and processing equipment to Samburu beekeepers cooperation. The project will bank and enhance these activities.</p>				10%	Not yet started
<b>Output 3.2;</b> Tourism development model developed, to deliver benefits to the local communities	Q 4 Y 5		<p>The inception workshop for stakeholders to develop the roadmap for Samburu County Tourism Strategic Plan has been accomplished and once the plan is finalized, it will inform the fundraising strategy for the county.</p> <p>The workshop identified and delivered on the existing opportunities, high-end infrastructure, top &amp; signature experiences, environment and culture for Samburu County.</p>				20%	Tourist materials and mapping of potential tourist areas underway to inform tourism development in the Kirsia forest (once conservancies and CFAs has become fully operational and accruing benefits to local communities)
<b>Output 3.3:</b> Other NWFPs with potential identified and strategy for commercial exploitation designed and implementation started	Q 4 Y 5		<p>The feasibility study of sustainable biomass energy production has been established.</p> <p>The feasibility of other NWFPs in the Kirsia landscape</p>				30%	<p>Work completed to establish a strategy for sustainable biomass production and management in the Kirsia landscape</p> <p>Work completed to establish three NWFPs business strategies</p>

			established					
<b>Output 4.1:</b> A carbon, biodiversity and livelihoods monitoring plan designed, implemented, lessons being used to inform adaptive management and Carbon accounting	Q 4 Y 5		A gender assessment for Kirisia forest ecosystem has been developed				75%	Gender considerations from the Kirisia gender assessment has been mainstreamed in all project activities
<b>Output 4.2:</b> Knowledge management system set up, informed by project review and evaluations (Project M&E formulated, MTR and FE undertaken)	Q 3 Y 5		Knowledge management system				0%	Not yet started
<b>Output 4.3:</b> Resource Centre established and operationalized, local traditional knowledge documented (Co-finance)	Q 4 Y 5		Resource Centre				0%	Not yet started
<b>Output 5.1:</b> Subsidiary legislation and guidelines for participatory forest management submitted to government for approval	Q 4 Y 4		Awareness creation achieved and Bio-Cultural Protocol booklet developed for the Samburu Community and Kirisia forest ecosystem  Kirisia Forest Ecosystem Gender Analysis has been established and is readily available to inform policy and management development				50%	Work is progressing well
<b>Output 5.2</b> Advocacy/Awareness, County and National government lobbied to adopt proposed policy reforms	Q 3 Y 5		Awareness and advocacy meeting with County and National political leaders on the importance of sustainable forest management in the Kirisia landscape has been achieved				20%	Work is progressing well



## Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

**Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):**

- Established and Registered three new CFAs and Kirisia Forest zoned and mapped into 3 forest blocks for ease of management by the three CFAs
- The Kirisia Forest Management Plan upgraded to Kirisia Forest Ecosystem Management Plan and it paved way for the development of Forest Management Agreements between CFAs and KFS
- The Identification and the mapping of critical wildlife migratory corridors and mapping of high value biodiversity areas have been accomplished
- The feasibility study of sustainable biomass energy production and other NWFPs in the Kirisia landscape finalized
- Awareness creation on Bio-Cultural Protocol and community capacity building booklet developed for the Samburu Community and Kirisia Forest Ecosystem. The booklet will be used for capacity building of communities.
- A child friendly comic booklet for Kirisia Forest Ecosystem has been developed. This booklet will be used to create awareness about the Kirisia Ecosystem and the conservation of environment.

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

In the reporting period, the project experienced some challenges that were more external in nature. The main challenges included:

- Drought that ravaged the county forced pastoralists to move into the forest partly disrupting the CFA formation process
- Forest boundary dispute between the group ranches and KFS in some sections of the forest
- Human wildlife conflict especially the destruction of crops.

## Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	<b>FY2019 Development Objective rating<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>FY2019 Implementati on Progress rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	Project implementation was initially delayed due to the political environment both nationally in Kenya and locally in Samburu County. Perception of the project is now favourable and direct implementation and project partner implementation (KFS, KEFRI, KWS etc) has picked and progressing well..
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>The project is behind schedule but the issues that caused the delays have been resolved and the key implementing partners are well set to fast track the project implementation as agreed in the PSC. The midterm review will inform better the situation and if there's need of any remedial measures</i>
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>Despite the slow kick off the project, partners and FAO have been able to speed up the implementation of the project. The next project steering committee meeting to be held in July 2019 will be a great opportunity for project partners to present achievements, discuss challenges, and identify a strategy to plan forward and continue a speedy delivery of the project. Human wildlife conflict issue will be given a priority. FAO will be supporting the organization of a capacity building workshop (covered by FAO own resources) involving at least 10 African countries and stakeholders including Kenya to exchange knowledge and case studies on addressing these issues. Representatives from the project will be invited.</i>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<i>Considerable efforts were made by the project team to get the project back on track. The Mid -term review, scheduled for this year will further look into corrective actions to ensure the achievement of project outcomes and objectives.</i>

<sup>15</sup> **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>16</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>17</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

### 3. Risks

#### Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>18</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Moderate	valid

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

#### Risk ratings

RISK TABLE					
The following table summarizes risks identified in the <b>Project Document</b> and reflects also <b>any new risks</b> identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, <b>as relevant</b> .					
	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force

<sup>18</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

<sup>19</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

<sup>20</sup> If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

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	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.	Kirisa CFAs has been established to facilitate efficient, economical and sustainable forest management. A number of NTFP value chains are being supported	
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.	High	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 stakeholder have bought in in the process. Transparent and free elections of CFA boards 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	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	

	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	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.	
	Extreme climatic events associated with climate change (CC) may affect vegetation regeneration	Low	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 project interventions will not be sustainable. Communities do not continue to control reforestation and degradation and to manage the forests sustainably after the end of the project.	Low	Project results will be sustained through empowerment of CFAs to manage the forest sustainably while deriving their livelihoods. Communities will know that they may lose their legal rights to harvest and market forest products if they do not meet their legal responsibilities.	Economic incentives, information and management capacity of surrounding communities and government partners are strengthened. Political will has been secured and all partners are on board.	

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

<b>FY2018 rating</b>	<b>FY2019 rating</b>	<b>Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Medium</b>	Medium	The risk has not change in any significant manner

## 4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months<sup>21</sup>

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project Outcomes</b>	NO	N/A
<b>Project Outputs</b>	NO	N/A

### Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project extension</b>	<div>Original NTE: 30 June 2021</div> <div>Revised NTE: to be revised during MTE</div> <div>Justification:</div>

---

<sup>21</sup> Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

## 5. Gender Mainstreaming

**Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?**

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment? Please briefly indicate the gender differences.

- A gender analysis was conducted in the initial stages of the project and the results and recommendations of the analysis are being mainstreamed in all project activities.

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender impacts and results?

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

- The project has revised the Monitoring and Evaluation framework including gender disaggregated
- All staff in the project has undergone gender training and the FAO gender focal point is part of the management team.

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over forest resources;
- improving women's participation and decision making in CFA management
- Supporting women groups in NTFPs enterprises.

## 6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

**Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.**

If applies, 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

## 7. Stakeholders Engagement

Various stakeholders are actively engaged in the project, these include;

- Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF)
- County Government of Samburu
- Kenya Forest Service (KFS)
- Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS)
- Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI)
- Suyian Trust
- National Museums of Kenya (NMK)
- Kenya Tourism Board (KTB)
- CFAs and Community conservancies
- Community members

In this reporting period, FAO has established and signed the Letters of Agreements (LoA) with four main partners as follows;

- KFS - charged with the objective of strengthening of the Leroghi-Kirisia forest ecosystem management and capacity building of key stakeholders
- KWS - entrusted with the objective of strengthening the management of critical wildlife corridors/habitats and support to community managed conservancies.
- KEFRI – The LoA entails the development of Non-Timber Forest Products and Services (NTFPs) and capacity building of key stakeholders
- Suyan Trust – The LoA provide the documentation and publications on the biodiversity of Leroghi-Kirisia Forest and Samburu Community Bio-Cultural Protocol

**Stakeholders' engagements were as follows;**

- Inception workshop for stakeholders on Baseline assessment and feasibility study of non-timber forest products and services in the Kirisia forest ecosystem – facilitated by KEFRI on 31<sup>st</sup> July to 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2018.
- Project Launch Activities and Technical Review Meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> – 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2018
- Stakeholder workshop on sustainable biomass energy management strategy development held on 12<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2018
- Conservancy Management Plan Scoping Meeting and Field Reconnaissance for Nkoteya Conservancy held on 26<sup>th</sup> -29<sup>th</sup> September, 2018
- Stakeholder workshop to review the existing Leroghi-Kirisia forest management plan to ecosystem management plan and undertake CFA ad-hoc committee consultations held on 15<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2018
- Samburu County Charcoal Producer Association training on Biomass Energy production and management 28<sup>th</sup> Jan. – 1<sup>st</sup> Feb. 2019
- Stakeholder workshop on Organizational Capacity Assessment for Community Forest Association held on 25<sup>th</sup> Jan. 2019



**Stakeholders' engagements continued...**

- Stakeholder workshop for the development of the Samburu County Tourism Strategic Plan held on 1<sup>st</sup> – 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2019
- Stakeholder workshop on the sharing of the draft income generating strategies for Honey/bee keeping and Aloe held on 23<sup>rd</sup> – 24<sup>th</sup> May 2019
- Stakeholders workshop on Honey and Aloe value chains and marketing linkages held on 25<sup>th</sup> – 28<sup>th</sup> June 2019
- Stakeholder workshop on the Analysis and Presentation of Zero draft of Kirisia Ecosystem Management plan held on 3<sup>rd</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup> June 2019
- Sensitization and capacity building workshop for the newly elected CFAs on Leadership and Governance held on 18<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> June 2019
- One day workshop on validation of Kirisia Ecosystem Plan held on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2019
- One day stakeholders meeting on the mini-launch of Kirisia Ecosystem Plan and the new CFAs held on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2019

## 8. Knowledge Management Activities

**Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval**

FAO in partnership with KFS facilitated Kirisia forest community to zone the forest into three blocks for ease of management. In each block, democratic elections were undertaken to elect Community Forest Association officials. The new CFAs will be trained and empowered to manage their blocks while deriving their livelihoods from sustainable bio-enterprises.

The CFA elections were preceded by wide stakeholder consultations covering the community villages around the forest. This approach was able to reach a wide range of stakeholders. For local community participation, all nine villages surrounding Kirisia Forest were engaged in focused group discussions. These are Baawa, Lodojek, Tamaiyoi, Ledero, Porro, Angata Nanyukie, Loikas, Ngari and Shabaa.

The discussions were guided by a detailed checklist aimed at gathering all the needed information ranging from socio economic status (infrastructure, livelihoods, community based organizations, energy sources and usage), biodiversity status (governance of natural resources, resource use conflicts, environmental threats and challenges), soil and water conservation status and measures, and socio economic and biodiversity project impacts at household and community levels. The focused group discussions also made suggestions on key recommendations to address current problems. Group discussions were supplemented by the use of questionnaires that were filled by other local community representatives from the nine villages. Gender participation in terms of youth, men and women was also a key factor considered in identification of local community representatives to ensure the capture of diversity of issues across gender.

Project activities in the news:

<https://www.facebook.com/KenyaForestService/posts/1982687181836750>

<https://blog.werobotics.org/2019/05/06/new-pilot-program-will-use-drones-to-monitor-forest-health-in-kenya/>

## 9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>22</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	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 Forestry Service (KFS)	In kind	500,000	215,000		
National government	Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI)	In kind	500,000	150,000		
National government	Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS)	In kind	500,000	90,000		
Multi-lateral	FAO	In kind	3,446,178	1,200,000		
County government	Samburu County Government	In kind	2,515,000	300,000		
CBO	Community Forestry Associations	In kind	414,000	80,000		
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8,675,178</b>	<b>1,785,000</b>		

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

The co-financing budget is low than expected and mainly attributed to low budgeting from the national government. Most activities are still underway and the co-financing is expected to pick up. The county government of Samburu has developed a new County Integrated Development plan with more fund allocation to natural resource management and this will further enhance the co-financing budget.

<sup>22</sup> 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.

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

**Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **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** – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **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.