



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2021 – Revised Template



Period covered: 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa			
Country (ies):	Kenya			
Project Title:	Restoration of arid and semi-arid lands (ASAL) of Kenya through bio-enterprise development and other incentives under The Restoration Initiative			
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/KEN/090/GFF			
GEF ID:	9556			
GEF Focal Area(s):	BD-4, CC-2, LD-2, LD-3, SFM-3			
Project Executing Partners:	Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI), Kenya Forest Service(KFS), National Museums of Kenya(NMK), Northern Rangelands Trust(NRT), Laikipia Wildlife Forum(LWF)			
Project Duration:	5 years			
Project coordinates: (Ctrl+Click here)	No	Name of site/Intervention	GPS Coordinates	
	1.	Mt Kulal	N 2° 41' 17" E 36° 56' 20'	
	2.	Mukogodo forest	N 0° 24' 56" E 37° 14' 13"	
	3.	Gatab Tree planting	N 2° 38' 33" E 36° 55' 47"	
	4.	Ilingwesi community conservancy- Management plan)	N 0° 18' 0" E 37° 22' 0'	
		Mukogodo Tree Nurseries	37 N	UTM
	5.	Sieku Tree nursery	0309866	0040310
	6.	Nadungoro Tree Nursery	0309787	0040365
	7.	Oi Kinyei (Makurian) Tree Nursery	0298083	0035728
	8.	Doldol (Kurikuri) Tree Nursery	0296118	0044220
	9.	Arjiju (Makurian) Tree Nursery	0304553	0034545
10.	Ilingwesi tree nursery	0309425	0037811	

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	April 24th, 2018
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01-Aug-2018
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31-Jul-2023
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	N/A

¹ As per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

Actual Implementation End Date³:	N/A
--	-----

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	4,157,340
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	12,500,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2021 (USD m):	1.111.299
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2021⁵	USD 2,840,000 1,067,217.99 - New co finance from KEFRI (NPSC approved)

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee Meeting:	16 th June 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	September 2021
Actual Mid-term review date:	N/A
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022)⁷:	Yes
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:	31 st July 2023
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022):	No
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁸	Yes - Core indicators

Ratings

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends - only for projects that have ended.

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

⁵ 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.

⁶ The MTR should take place about half point between EOD and NTE – this is the expected date

⁷ Please note that the FAO GEF Coordination Unit should be contacted six months prior to the expected MTR date

⁸ 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

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	S	<i>Overall, the project GCP/KEN/090/GFF is progressing well against its development objective and planned outcomes and outputs. The project has been able to achieve several key actions planned for the period July 2020 to June 2021. Unfortunately, due to COVID 19 constraints, several actions have been delayed or postponed to the second half of the year 2021. Mid-Term Review at the end of this year is expected to provide a valuable opportunity for putting in place strategic remedial measures to make up for the lost time and development of an appropriate and sustainable exit strategy</i>
Overall implementation progress rating:	S	
Overall risk rating:	Medium	

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Meshack Muga, National Project Coordinator - GEF 6, FAO Kenya	Meshack.Muga@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Christophe Besacier, Forestry Officer, Office of the Director – Forestry Division, FAO Rome	Christophe.Besacier@fao.org
Budget Holder	Carla Mucavi FAO Representative, FAO Kenya	Carla.Mucavi@fao.org ; FAO-KE@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Paola Palestini, GEF Coordination Unit, FAO Rome	Paola.Palestini@fao.org

2. Progress Towards Achieving Project Objectives and Outcome (DO)

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

Project objective and Outcomes (as indicated at CEO Endorsement)	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ¹¹
<p>Project Objective: To restore deforested and degraded lands through the FLR approach and enhance the socioeconomic development of local communities through the development of bio-enterprises of NTFPS in arid and semi-arid lands.</p>	% of land that is degraded over total land area in targeted landscapes	<p>Mt. Kulal forest itself is more or less intact, though degradation is apparent around the settlements like Gatab. Mount Kulal forest core zone is 1,100ha. Between the period of 1986 and 2014 the Mt. Kulal forest lost approximately 20% of its forest cover (Cuni Sanchez 2015). Mukogodo forest covers an area of 30,189 ha. Mukogodo landscape is facing a myriad of constraints, problems and challenges, which pose a great threat to its sustainability. According to Bussmann, 2009, the remaining forest area is much smaller, 2700 ha. These include overgrazing, increased settlement in the forest reserve, erosion and inadequate utilization of the indigenous knowledge, increased pressure from the neighboring communities and increased risks for fire outbreak. Surrounding</p>	5% decrease	20% decrease	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline assessment of Mount Kulal and Mukogodo Ecosystems done through collect earth on land use patterns. Mount Kulal had grasslands as dominant land use (75%) and smaller proportion of forest area (14%), while in Mukogodo forest areas occupied 45% of the landscape and the grassland represented 51% • The ROAM assessment has been undertaken in both project sites with the following findings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mt Kulal degraded area: 27,874 ha ○ Mukogodo degraded area: 23,406 ha • The degradation maps from the Local ROAM exercise can be found Here • There will be need to negotiate for the new realistic targets during MTR 	S

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ 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)**.

		conservancies (rangelands) operated under NRT umbrella cover respectively: i) Lekurruki conservancy (15,872 ha); ii) and ill Ngwesi (9,470 ha), iii) Oldonyiro conservancy (52,500 ha), and iv) Leparua conservancy (34,200 ha) and the Makurian group ranch (5,390 ha) and Kurikuri group ranch (3,340 ha). Rangeland are degraded, including bare soils. Their exact level of degradation will be assessed during the ROAM assessment				
	# of people benefiting from FLR interventions	No benefit has been derived from FLR yet	5,434 households/ 25,540 people directly benefitting from project activities	10,868 households/ 51,080 people directly benefitting from project activities	To date 1735 Households/ 8671 beneficiaries (5184M, 3487F) have benefited from capacity building. The first year the project embarked majorly on policy and regulatory frameworks at national level and the trainings were at Trainer of trainers (TOT) level. Beneficiaries at this level were minimal. The numbers are expected to grow exponentially when these draft policies undergo consultations and awareness raising at the local/landscape level and the trainings to reach household beneficiaries through the already trained TOTs.	S
	# of tons of CO2e directly mitigated through project activities over a 20-year period	0	410024.5 tCO2 -eq	820,089 t CO2-eq	To be estimated at mid and end of project	S

Outcome 1: The national and county level policy and regulatory frameworks are strengthened to support forest and	Number of new or improved policies and regulatory frameworks* adopted that support forest and landscape restoration	(i) Policy and legal framework review to guide scaling up of landscape restoration conducted in 2010 by KFS and the Kenya Landscape Restoration Technical Working Group (LRTWG), however,	i.a) Road map for developing the FLR strategy i.b) NR access and benefits sharing policy approved	i) 3 types as follows: i.a) 1 national FLR strategy, including a financial and M&E plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The five-year (2021-2025) FLR Implementation Action Plan (FOLAREP) with the goal to restore and sustainably manage deforested and degraded landscapes, has been developed A financing plan or methodology to actualize and fund the plan is in place. 	MS
--	---	---	--	--	--	----

<p>landscape restoration in Kenya</p>		<p>i.a) no FLR related plan exists at national level.</p> <p>i.b) Draft NR access and benefits sharing policy exists but had not been approved yet.</p> <p>i.c) No NTFPS specific policy exists.</p>	<p>i.c) Road map for developing the NTFPS management strategy</p>	<p>developed and approved.</p> <p>i.b) 1 NR access and benefits sharing policy</p> <p>i.c) 1 NTFPS management strategy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft FOLAREP was shared with Chief Executive Officers for KEFRI and KFS for review and comments Engagement with County Government and other stakeholders at the county levels has been undertaken to ensure proper ownership at the decentralized levels. • FOLAREP has been reviewed for domestication of FLR policies to the devolved functions and a policy influencing plan (PIP) developed. • The reviewed FOLAREP was presented to stakeholders including policy makers, civil society, community, INGOs, private sectors in Isiolo, Marsabit and Laikipia, National Government Ministries of Environment and Forestry, Agriculture, Trade and Cooperatives, Water, National Environmental management Authority, Kenya Forest Service Water Resources Management Authority and Kenya Forestry Research Institute. • In the lead up to the National Landscape Restoration Scaling Conference to be held in July 2021, various thematic sessions/webinars have been held including youth engagement in ecosystem restoration; Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration (FMNR) as a key restoration approach; Forest and Landscape Restoration (FLR) monitoring; and Private sector engagement in landscape restoration. During these sessions, FOLAREP objectives were shared with the FLR stakeholders who participated in the meetings. • The Chief Administrative Secretary, Ministry of Environment, Principal Secretary Ministry of Agriculture and the 	
---------------------------------------	--	--	---	--	--	--

					<p>Chief Conservator of Forests graced the FLR monitoring webinar among other stakeholders where FOLAREP was showcased as an avenue for collective monitoring and reporting of FLR in the country.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County consultations have been undertaken in 5 counties; Kitui, Meru, Embu, Isiolo and Samburu and more consultations are in the pipeline and will require collaboration with other partners/projects in order to have an effective integrated restoration driven by inter-sector- partnerships and targeting multiple benefits to people and the environment. • The Equitable Benefit Sharing regulations, (2016) has been reviewed in consultation with the community represented by the National Alliance of Community Forest Associations (NACOFA) who are spearheading Participatory Forest Management in the country. • Sensitization Workshops for Community Forest Associations (CFAs) on Forest Incentives and Benefits Sharing regulations as well as Forest Conservation and Management Act, 2016 have been undertaken in all 10 forest conservancies in the country (Western, Nyanza, Ewaso North, Central, Eastern, Mau, North Rift, North Eastern Coast and Nairobi) and Focused Group Discussions held and views obtained from local communities from 106 CFAs. (180 M and 83F). • In the development of the Non-Timber Forest Products & Services Strategy, to enhance sustainable commercialization of NTFPS, a situational analysis of the
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>NTFPS sub-sector was conducted consultatively with 50 institutions from the government, non-governmental organizations, private companies to take stock of past and ongoing interventions on NTFPS in Kenya.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Besides situational analysis report, a road-map for the development of the strategy was produced and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee. Additional information has been obtained through project activities on development, value chain analysis and characterization of bio-enterprises that will feed into the strategy 	
<p>Outcome 2: 152,661 ha are under improved land management (including 8,700 ha directly restored and 55,352 ha indirectly restored)</p>	<p>Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas).</p>	<p>i.a) Mt. Kulal forest is not gazetted and is managed by CBO "Wazee wa Mazingira" (WWM). A plan for use of forest resources on Mt Kulal is being developed (draft ready by July 2017) with support from National Museums of Kenya (NMK)</p> <p>i.b) Mukogodo forest is managed by the ILMAMUSI Community Forest Association (CFA). Their management plan is outdated.</p> <p>i.c) Lekurruki conservancy management plan drafted. Include a "rangeland conditions improvement" objective</p> <p>i.d) Il Ngwesi, Oldonyiro and Leparua conservancy management plan outdated.</p> <p>(i.e) n/a</p>	<p>Mukogodo ILMAMUSI CFA management plan developed</p> <p>Actions planned under the "rangeland conditions improvement" objective are agreed upon</p> <p>Conservancies management plan developed, including rangeland restoration objectives</p>	<p>(i) 152,661 ha in total, as follows:</p> <p>i.a) The total Mount Kulal forest core zone is under improved management (1,100ha)</p> <p>i.b) Mukogodo forest under improved management (30,189 ha total area, core zone: 2700 ha)</p> <p>i.c) Lekurruki conservancy is under improved management (15,872 ha)</p> <p>i.d) Il Ngwesi conservancy is</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i.g) Community stakeholders engaged to produce resource use maps following a participatory and landscape approach. Several meetings with traditional leaders from Kuri Kuri and Makurian group ranches held to initiate the development of management plans (i.g) Awareness meetings with local communities, to ensure buy in from all local stakeholders, on the steps and benefits of establishing the conservancy structures for both group ranches of Kuri Kuri and Makurian. (i.f & i.d) Resource mapping and development of maps for Leparua and Ilngwesi conservancies have been undertaken as well as brainstorming and community feedback meetings for community buy in. The management plans for these conservancies have been endorsed for printing and represent a total area of 43,670 ha put under improved management. 	<p>S</p>

		<p>(i.f) n/a (i.g) Makurian and Kuri Kuri group ranches have outdated management plans</p>	<p>Management plans updated, including rangeland restoration objectives</p>	<p>under improved management (9,470 ha) (i.e) Oldonyiro conservancy is under improved management (52,500 ha) (i.f) Leparua conservancy is under improved management (34,200 ha) (i.g) Makurian and Kuri Kuri group ranches are under improved management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i.d) The Management and Community Development Plan (2021-2026) for Ilingwesi Community Conservancy has been developed detailing threats to natural resources such as charcoal burning and invasive species and the Community Conservation priorities such as management of human wildlife conflict, rangeland rehabilitation, settlement planning and governance. The project intends to initiate rehabilitation of of the productive land that is degraded by improving the wet and dry season grazing planning, livestock bunching and bomas on degraded areas, Clearing/control of invasive species mainly <i>Opuntia Sp.</i>, Reseeding with perennial grasses and Increasing community awareness on livestock carrying capacity. Use of Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR &NR) is also being promoted together with the grazing plan to support restoration in the conservancies. The framework plan will continue even outside project resources (i.f) The conservancy management plan 2021-2026 for Leparua Conservancy has also been developed with community resource mapping of natural capital/assets and their uses such as rivers, dams, forests (Diverse species of trees and uses wildlife and its benefits). It has also outlined livelihood opportunities that are nature based e.g. Tourism, bee keeping, smart farming, livestock production, gums, and resin collection. The impact envisioned in 5 years is Securing land ownership and effective management through Registration of
--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>land, County spatial planning Settlement planning and Wet and dry season grazing management. Awareness creation and zonal elections for Kurikuri and Makurian group ranches and Makurian has officially transited from a group ranch to community land with a land management committee whose capacity on leadership and management has been developed through trainings and exposure visits to more advanced conservancies of Namunyak and Kalama as well as Reteti elephant sanctuary and tree house lodge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (i.b) Through the improved CFA governance and management structure, the basis is set to develop the Mukogodo Forest Management Plan with better alignment and coordination with neighboring conservancies which would lead to improved resource management and decrease degradation of the forest itself. • (i.a) The management plan for Mt. Kulal Ecosystem has been revised for improved management of 51,436 ha (5670 ha Core zone and 45,766 ha Buffer zone around the Core zone). The revised plan has incorporated additional comments from a wider spectrum of stakeholders, the proposed programs are broader with more focus on ecosystem approach rather than just the forest alone. The plan, has been validated by stakeholders, presented to the community for endorsement and a finalized plan is ready for signing by the Kenya Forest Service
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>and the Marsabit County Government and official launching on 18th June 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through the participation to online webinar on planning and implementing Restoration Opportunity Assessment Methodologies, organized by the TRI Global Programme, the project team gained valuable experience from other TRI countries. This has been useful in the local site-specific ROAM process. • Local ROAM was carried out in all the project sites and data of available information mined to define better the local land degradation problem in the two landscapes, their causes, effects, and possible FLR interventions as well as mapping key stakeholders to implement the FLR options 	
	<p>Area of land undergoing restoration (hectares).</p>	<p>In project implementation zone, restoration has not been implemented so far. Between the period of 1986 and 2014 the Mt. Kulal forest lost approximately 20% of its forest cover (Cuni Sanchez 2015). Mukogodo forest covers an area of 30,189 ha. According to Bussmann, 2009, the remaining forest area is much smaller, 2700 ha. Surrounding conservancies (rangelands) operated under NRT umbrella cover respectively: i) Lekurruki conservancy: 15,872 ha; ii) Il Ngwesi (9,470 ha), iii) Oldonyiro conservancy (52,500 ha), and iv) Leparua</p>	<p>FLR plans validated by third quarter of Y3</p>	<p>Direct restoration of 8,700 ha stratified as follows: ii. a) Natural forest regeneration of 1,100 ha in MKBR (including the enrichment of 200 ha of critically degraded areas within the MKBR core zone); ii. b) 400 ha of improved</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 hectares of forest or forest land was directly restored through growing of 7,031 assorted indigenous trees and 600 fruit trees grown in Mt Kulal core zone. • Eight Community resource persons have been trained on nursery establishment and management and the indigenous trees to be planted in the two ecosystems identified through consultations with KEFRI, KFS staff on the ground, local community groups and based on indigenous knowledge and previous studies in these areas. Some potential areas for restoration have also been selected based on discussions with partners on the ground (KFS, NRT and LWF) and local community groups. This will be acted upon for restoration by comparing with the results of the Local ROAM that has already been done. 	<p>MS</p>

		<p>conservancy (34,200 ha) and the Makurian group ranch (5,390 ha) and Kuri Kuri group ranch (3,340 ha).</p>		<p>grasslands in lower MKBR; ii. c) 200 ha of agroforestry in MKBR; ii. d) Natural forest regeneration of 1,000 ha in Mukogodo Forest; ii. e) Enrichment of 400 ha of critically degraded areas within Mukogodo forest); ii. f) 5600 ha of improved grasslands in Mukogodo landscape.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity of the local communities on protection of degraded sites to promote natural regeneration and replanting have been initiated. A total of 3.6 ha in the Mukogodo Ecosystem has also been planted with assorted indigenous trees. • Promotion of rangelands reseeding through grass reseeding in Il Ngwesi, Lekurruki, Oldonyiro, Makurian, Kurikuri targeting reseeding 100 ha per 9 conservancy has been carried out in preparation for action during the Sept/October 2021 short rains • Mobilization of communities to clear 1300 ha with invasive <i>Acacia reficiens</i> in Il Ngwesi, Lekurruki, Oldonyiro, Makurian and Kurikuri in preparation for the land rehabilitation in the coming year has been done in partnership with NRT • Nursery equipment for establishing 8 tree nurseries of indigenous species to be manned by the trainees have been procured and distributed to the project sites. Establishment of 6 nurseries in Mukogodo ecosystem has been completed, though a few issues (mainly water supply) are yet to be sorted out before they can be fully operational. 	
	<p>Number of ha directly contributing to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use</p>	<p>All project sites have the potential to contribute to biodiversity conservation</p>	<p>75% of the draft management plans for the project sites (cf above) include biodiversity</p>	<p>152,661 ha (100% of the management plans for the project sites (cf above) include biodiversity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement with IUCN and STAR assessment to support identifying biodiversity hot spots. Potential restoration needs linked to threatened species has been initiated. • Leparua, lIngwesi, Lekuruki and Oldonyiro conservancies in Laikipia/Isiolo counties are under improved land management and biodiversity. • The Mt Kulal management plan envisions biodiversity conservation and wildlife 	<p>S</p>

					<p>habitat management in the forested area of 5670 ha through minimal impact ecotourism (e.g. walking, bird watching); monitored extraction of resources and maintaining nature trails. Other management options planned for are Protection of plant and fauna through awareness raising, Reintroduction of some wildlife species and temporary ban on grazing in degraded areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valuation of Ecosystem services to support forest and landscape restoration in terms of financing, decision making and implementation of FLR in the two ecosystems. A consultant was engaged for the work in Mukogodo Ecosystems while the Kenya Water Towers Agency (KWTA) through support of TRI project, undertook the resource assessment in Mt. Kulal . • Total Economic Valuation of the two ecosystems has been collected and regulating, provisioning, supporting and cultural values of the forests obtained. • The carbon data obtained shall be used to determine carbon sequestration potential of the ecosystem as well as its contribution to the national and international obligations of carbon stocks (Contribution to the overall country commitment on Nationally Determined Contributions). • The current total economic valuation of Ecosystem Services for Mt. Kulal is estimated at KES 20.1 billion/year. The largest value is from indirect use consisting of regulatory and support services estimated at KES 18.1 billion/year (90%) as compared to KES
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>1.95 billion/year (9.95%) from direct use composed of provisioning services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft TEV report for Mt Kulal can be found here • The total economic value (TEV) of Mukogodo landscape was estimated at about KES 9.1 billion /year (US\$ 85mill. /year). In terms of relative contributions to total value, regulating and supporting services comprise the greatest component of TEV about 50 percent - emphasizing the importance of indirect-use values in forest ecosystems. • Knowledge base on NTFPS and their commercial potential was generated through Chemical and physical Characterization of potential NTFPS from Mt Kulal and Mukogodo ecosystems by KEFRI and the compliance to specific minimum parameters in accordance with market standards tested. Collected samples included: Aloe bitter gum from <i>Aloe secundiflora</i> sap, Opuntia fruits, Bark and leaves from medicinal plants (<i>Acacia tortilis</i>, <i>Boscia</i> sp.), sampled gums and resins from already harvested <i>Senegalia senegal</i> (formerly <i>Acacia Senegal</i>) <i>var kerensis</i>, <i>Commiphora holtziana</i> and <i>Boswellia neglecta</i>. Honey samples from the three counties were also collected. A report on chemical and physical characterization of these NTFPs has been compiled. • Resource maps showing location and densities of the prioritized NTFPs as well as marking Global Positioning System (GPS) points of NTFPs in the two ecosystems and their estimated densities, ecological data and species diversity
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>within and around the NTFPs has been produced. Observations made were that Gum arabic and honey were dominant in the project sites in Isiolo County, sites in Marsabit County are dominated by <i>Aloe secundiflora</i> and medicinal plants while areas in Laikipia County were the only ones with eco lodges (Iingwesi and lekurruki).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charcoal value chain in the two ecosystems has been assessed and the driving factors, the key actors and players, the legal and institutional frameworks supporting the sub-sector identified so as to provide a sound basis for policy development towards economic and environmental sustainability of the industry in the two landscapes. 	
	Number of people directly benefiting from project activities (including capacity building events and trainings) (m/f)	0	4060 HH	circa 8120 HH	<p>Capacity of 1735 Households/ 8671 beneficiaries (5184M, 3487F) has been strengthened in the following areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Use data collection exercise using Collect Earth, 2nd global TRI workshop in Rome, Community awareness meetings in development of management plans/group constitutions supported by NRT, NMK, LWF Validation of project reports and outcomes such as value chain assessment report and natural resource access and benefit sharing policy roadmap. Local ROAM assessment Developing draft regulation on equitable benefit sharing Preparation, validation and launching of Mount Kulal Biosphere Reserve Forest Management Plan 	S

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trainings on handling visitors, biodiversity conservation, choice of sites, firefighting, monitoring forest health to forest guides and scouts • Leadership and management trainings/exchange visits for conservancy land management committees 	
<p>Outcome 3: Strengthened institutional capacities and financing arrangements are in place and facilitate large scale restoration.</p>	<p>Number of capacity building events and number of m/f attending</p>	0	<p>2 events, 25 people trained, 13 male, 12 female</p>	<p>4 events, 50 people trained (25 male, 25 female)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two TRI Global events held in Kenya and Rome (8 M and 1 F) • 2 Biophysical data collection/Mapathon training (13 M and 5 F) • 1 ROAM training conducted by BBC International Consultants (12 M, 6F) • The capacity of National, County and Community resource persons on planning, implementation, and monitoring of FLR activities built (18 M and 5 F). 	S
	<p>Evidence of increased capacities of community land management committees</p>	tbd		<p>Increased capacity level evidenced through scorecards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In collaboration with FAO EU Land Programme, 4 Community land management committees have been established and their capacity strengthened (reaching 2432 persons 1534 Male and 898 female) on their functions and roles such as; Oversight function in land planning allocating land and natural resources to livestock or agriculture, Housing and public services, how to interface with the public to administer all categories of land and coordinate with the Community Land Boards to resolve disputes between communities. • The Ilingwesi conservancy has been registered as a community land and a title deed issued. This was the first community in Kenya to receive a communal title deed for their land under the new community land act. The process of getting the other 	S

					<p>conservancies in the Mukogodo and the Mt. Kulal Ecosystem are in the process of being registered as community land to acquire their titles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mukogodo ILMAMUSI Community Forest Association (CFA) was mobilized and their institutional capacity enhanced through trainings and exchange visits. As a result, the CFA formed a community board with representation from all the conservancies and reviewed their constitution through Community mobilization and awareness and sensitization on elections of board members and having regular board meetings • The Indigenous community living in Mukogodo landscape, the Yaaku is well represented in that the secretary to the CFA was elected from this community and therefore free prior and informed consent (FPIC) is addressed through this organ as all initiatives in the landscape must have a nod from the CFA. 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional capacity assessment has been conducted to establish the capacity level of Kulal community forest association which is the management committee in Mt Kulal project site and Ilmamusi CFA from Mukogodo landscape which scored 26% and 33% respectively on the capacity scorecard for assessing capacity development among environmental institutions; • The capacity of 363 (280 men and 83 women) members of Mt. Kulal Biosphere Reserve Community Forest Association (KCFA) and Elders Environmental Committee (WWM) built through trainings on group dynamics, leadership, finance management, conflict management and records keeping. The participants were taken through the stages of group formation and constitution making. • Three Water resource users' associations in Mukogodo Ecosystem (WRUAs) trained in management i.e Kudoti, Ngare Ndare and Loisukut to facilitate access to the Water Sector Trust Fund (WSTF) • Establishment of the conservancy structures for Kurikuri and Makurian group ranches are ongoing as a means of building their capacity to manage the conservancies. Makurian group ranch has officially transited from group ranch to community land with a land management committee whose capacity on leadership and management has been developed through trainings and exposure visits to more advanced conservancies of Namunyak and Kalama as well as Reteti elephant sanctuary and tree house lodge.
--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Number of cross-sectoral government-led coordination mechanisms and/or frameworks incorporating and supporting restoration established/strengthened at national and sub-national levels in TRI countries</p>	<p>While there is a FLR Working Group hosted by KFS, its aim and objectives are limited to project level activities and do not focus on policy and institutional coordination aspects</p>		<p>1 National coordination mechanism in place for FLR planning, resources mobilization, coordinating of implementation and monitoring</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A National Coordination mechanism for FLR with steering and coordination committees at the national, county and ward/local levels in place. The county environmental committees have been incorporated as the county and local structures rather than forming new ones to avoid duplication of roles. • The technical team on FLR has been in the forefront in collaboration with ICRAF, World vision coordinating a series of FLR related webinars e.g. FMNR (Farmer managed natural regeneration) FLR monitoring and private sector involvement as part of planning for the National Landscape Restoration Scaling Conference slated for June 2021. The webinars have been graced by the Chief Administrative Secretary, ministry of environment, principal secretary ministry of agriculture and the chief conservator of forests who are part of the policy makers in FLR in the country. FOLAREP 2021-2025 (Forest and landscape implementation action plan) has also been showcased as an avenue for collective monitoring and reporting of FLR in the country through out in these fora. 	<p>S</p>
--	---	---	--	---	--	-----------------

	<p>Number of investment tools developed/improved to support FLR initiatives (i.e. bankable projects, credit lines to bio-enterprises, functional FMCTF)</p>	<p>A Forest Conservation and Management Trust Fund (FCMTF) is being established but is not operational yet</p>		<p>At least 3 investment tools are developed or improved (i.e. bankable projects, credit lines to bio-enterprises, functional FMCTF, etc.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A learning guide for forestry and farm producer organizations and SMEs on developing viable and bankable business plans has been developed by FAO Farm Forest Facility and is being tested through the bridge for billions (B4B) initiative to enhance access to finance by local beneficiaries to support FLR activities. The guide will also be piloted through 1 online targeting at least 50 people and 1 face-to-face targeting at least 30 people. 	<p>S</p>
--	---	--	--	--	--	-----------------

	<p>Value of resources (public, private, development partners) flowing into restoration</p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on consultations with the National Treasury on funding of FLR activities in the country, the following potential sources of finances for restoration related activities exist in the country and discussions on synergies and collaboration with them is planned : Green bonds, Green Climate Fund, Financing locally led Climate actions, REDD+ financing, National Adaptation Fund, Presidential directive (10% CSR for 10% tree cover), NAP readiness fund coordinated by FAO, GIZ-landscape funds, WWF Consortium, IMARA- World Vision, GZ-ADB, Care International, GCF supported Pan African Justice Alliance (PACJA) and GCF supported TWENDE. • Two entrepreneurs/participants from Kenya are currently undergoing the 4-month Restoration factory online mentorship programme, this is meant to support them better organize their enterprises and have them adapt to the entire value chain from production to market/consumer level. The two enterprises are Horizon Ventures who are working in production and marketing of Essential Oils and Nailepo Beekeepers in the Bee/Honey Value chains. The programme is through online platform where the entrepreneurs work on modules to support in business development and then discuss virtually with the assigned mentors who then validate the modules in the platform. • Bio-entrepreneurs trained to enhance their capacity on enterprise/business identification and development. This was through trainings on storage and safety 	<p>S</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	-----------------

					<p>mechanisms for NTFPs, analyzing business compliance needs and linkage with markets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ROAM - restoration financing and resource mobilization has identified financing mechanisms at global, regional, national and local levels that proposals for restoration efforts can target 	
<p>Outcome 4: Improved FLR monitoring, reporting and knowledge dissemination at national level (including for the NCP)</p>	<p>Number of operational FLR information systems established</p>	<p>Currently there is no harmonized FLR information system.</p>	<p>Partnership signed with service provider by end Y1</p>	<p>(i) A national FLR Knowledge Management system is developed and implemented Info Hub for KM on FLR fully operative under DF and providing information to stakeholders Y3-Y5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KEFRI has held preliminary consultations with various stakeholders to understand the status of FLR Knowledge Management in the country. • The objective of the FLR portal is to provide a one-stop shop online platform for FLR knowledge, share FLR information and connect people to FLR experts. Progress made so far is: Mapping of Existing Knowledge, Initiatives and Platforms Linked to FLR in Kenya, A SWOT Analysis of identified Knowledge Sharing Portals, 11 Institutions Identified and being engaged to form the National FLR KM Committee which will discuss the roadmap, design and content of FLR KM System. • The 11 institutions include: ICT Authority, KFS, FAO, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and Cooperatives, Council of Governors, ICRAF, Wild wide Fund for Nature (WWF),Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), National Alliance for Community Forest Association(NACOFA), and World Resources Institute (WRI) 	<p>MS</p>

	<p>Number of Participation in TRI Annual Knowledge Sharing events, Biennial Restoration Finance events, and TRI-sponsored South-South exchanges that address restoration.</p>	<p>No participation yet</p>		<p>Participation in 8 events</p>	<p>1st global TRI workshop – Naivasha, Kenya</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 FAO staff and 2 KEFRI staff participated in this workshop and gained a lot of information and knowledge about the project in general, FLR approaches and strategies in particular and networked with many other implementers from other countries <p>2nd global TRI workshop - Rome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three members of the project management unit and 1 KEFRI staff gained valuable knowledge and experience related to planning, implementing and monitoring restoration interventions, common approaches, tools and methodologies, challenges, experiences and lessons learned during the first year of implementation. The main thematic areas were: Forest Genetic Resources and Biodiversity, EX-ACT & ROAM, Local FLR Finances/IES and Policy Influencing Plan (PIP) and Data Collection & Analysis, Monitoring & Evaluation. <p>Online sharing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following the covid-19 pandemic, information sharing has gone digital e.g. through webinars on FLR and best practices and case studies and the D-groups where participants from various countries access and share information with counterparts from other countries. Some key examples of FLR related webinars are, FLR monitoring where FAO was a keynote speaker on an inclusive and effective M&E system, Farmer managed 	<p>HS</p>
--	---	-----------------------------	--	----------------------------------	--	-----------

					<p>natural regeneration, TRI Monitoring and Evaluation webinar, reducing deforestation and enhancing forest conservation through international trade policy, Mapping Together: A guide to Monitoring Forest and Landscape Restoration Using Collect Earth Mapathon, locally led adaptation and disaster risk management anchor events at Climate Adaptation Summit 2021, Youth Power in restoration, (Locally Controlled Forest Restoration): ‘A governance and market oriented approach for resilient landscapes among others.</p>	
	<p>Number of TRI-Kenya knowledge products developed, disseminated and accessed through relevant knowledge platforms</p>	<p>0 knowledge products</p>	<p>5 knowledge products</p>	<p>10 knowledge products</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A project fact/information sheet detailing the project sites, objectives, the partners and bio enterprises was developed and used in sensitization meetings with the community and local/county leadership and partners to give a snapshot and clear understanding to the stakeholders on what the project was all about. Project banners and roll ups have also been prepared and used to give the project visibility during various functions. • Total Economic Valuation of Mt Kulal ecosystem • Characterization of ecosystem services in Mukogodo ecosystem • Mt. Kulal Biosphere Reserve Forest Management Plan (KFMP) 2021 – 2025 • IIngwesi Community Conservancy Management and Community Development Plan (2021-2026) • Three abstracts have been submitted and approved for the World Forestry Congress in Korea in 2022. 	<p>S</p>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy influencing plan for domestication of forest and landscape restoration in Kenya 	
	Number of lessons learned on forest landscape restoration shared and accessed by stakeholders	0	5	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FLR Monitoring through collect earth has been shared with FLR sector players e.g. ICRAF, WRI, EU, KFS, KEFRI, and decision makers from Ministry of environment and forestry, ministry of agriculture and the council of governors (Counties) during FLR monitoring webinar where FAO was a key speaker • Through Exchange meetings with FLR stakeholders, challenges of restoration monitoring are being addressed by formation of an FLR monitoring taskforce led by KFS • The GEF-6 project staff held a meeting with the World Vision staff and agreed on modalities of working together and sharing information e.g. each will invite the other when they are having community or quarterly meetings. • The importance of planning and review meetings, the project has embarked on this and has brought a lot of synergies and understanding of partner/stakeholder approaches and reduced duplication of efforts. This can be showcased by the tree planting exercise held in Mt Kulal where all partners came together and also in Mukogodo where duplication was avoided when KEFRI opted to undertake all costs towards a tree planting exercise 	MS

					<p>which otherwise the project was going to incur.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NTFPS harvesting and marketing is a very sensitive issue and caution needs to be applied especially when engaging with sector players who may have a negative history with the communities • The project has also learnt from GEF-5 on the importance of community participation in forest management especially on involuntary movement of people from the forest. Currently within the project implementation, the interests and consent of the Yaaku community living within Mukogodo forest are addressed by having one of their own as the secretary to the ILMAMUSI CFA which engages in all FLR initiatives in the landscape. 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>Outcome 1: The national and county level policy and regulatory frameworks are strengthened to support forest and landscape restoration in Kenya</p>	<p>Consultations and sensitization on FOLAREP to be done at the county or regional levels by KFS. ICRAF partnership in this collaboration has been initiated</p> <p>Finalization of the Equitable Benefit Sharing regulations, (2016)</p> <p>Development of the Non-Timber Forest Products & Services Strategy, to enhance sustainable commercialization of NTFPS.</p>	<p>KFS/PMU</p> <p>KEFRI</p> <p>KEFRI</p>	<p>June 2022</p>
<p>Outcome 2: 152,661 ha are under improved land management (including 8,700 ha directly restored and 55,352 ha indirectly restored).</p>	<p>Direct restoration/enrichment planting within the forest/agroforestry/natural and assisted natural regeneration within the rangelands</p>	<p>KEFRI/KFS/LWF/NRT/PMU</p>	<p>June 2022</p>
<p>Outcome 4: Improved FLR monitoring, reporting and knowledge dissemination at national level (including for the NCP)</p>	<p>Development of the FLR portal and documentation and access of lessons learned on forest landscape restoration by stakeholders</p>	<p>KEFRI</p>	<p>June 2022</p>

3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs (Implementation Progress, IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as planned in the Annual Work Plan)

Outputs ¹²	Expected completion date ¹³	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁴					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments Describe any variance ¹⁵ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1: An FLR strategy is developed, including a roadmap and a monitoring framework to bridge the FLR gaps in the policy framework.	Q3Y2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A roadmap for FLR Action Plan development prepared and validated 50 participants (37M,13F) from various institutions were involved in various FLR development fora A draft FLR Action Plan, monitoring framework & financial plan developed Drafting of the document was led by KFS incorporating experts from other relevant national government ministries and agencies, Council of governors, non-governmental organizations, and the academia. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FOLAREP objectives were presented online during the planning meeting/ Webinar for the National Land Restoration Scaling Conference attended by 178 participants and graced by the Chief Administrative Secretary (CAS), ministry of environment, Principal secretary Min of agriculture and the chief conservator of forests County consultations on FOLAREP undertaken in 5 counties i.e. Kitui, Meru, Embu, Isiolo and Samburu and more consultations are in the pipeline. This is meant to have an effective integrated restoration driven by inter sector partnerships and targeting multiple benefits to the local community and the environment. It will also enhance participation and ownership of the devolved units and communities of the FOLAREP 				90% County consultations remaining	A decision was made by National project steering committee to change the output from a strategy to an action plan as there are several strategies at the ministry without action plans to facilitate actions on the ground
Output 1.2: Domestication of relevant international, national NRM policies is facilitated at the county and local levels, especially as it relates to FLR.	Q4Y4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A consultant engaged and desk reviews on domestication of specific forest/FLR policies at county level initiated and ongoing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A policy-influencing plan (PIP) of FOLAREP to the devolved county units has been prepared in a participatory manner. This will enable effective integrated restoration driven by inter-sector-partnerships and targeting multiple benefits to people and the environment. 				90% Engagement with counties	Field consultations with target counties undertaken to come up with the PIP
Output 1.3: Policy framework for management and utilization of Non-Timber Forest Products	Q3Y3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A roadmap for the development of a strategy on sustainable commercialization of NTFPs prepared and validated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 14 NTFPs were identified: gums and resins, seed oil, essential oils, indigenous fruits, African indigenous vegetables (AIVs), medicinal plants, aloes, forage (foliage & grass), barks and natural fiber, poles, withies 				30%	

<p>and Services (NTFPS) is developed and adopted.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A situational analysis and status of intervention on NTFPS sub-sector undertaken • Consultations on NTFPS with 50 institutions from the government, non-governmental organizations, private companies and community associations within Nairobi, Coast, Eastern, Lake Basin and Rift Valley regions carried out • The NPSC approved that the development of the Natural resources access and benefits sharing policy be replaced by the finalization of Forest (Equitable Benefit Sharing) Regulations • A roadmap for the finalization of Forest (Equitable Benefit Sharing) Regulations that had been initiated in 2016 developed and validated. 	<p>& fitos, forest products insects and ecosystem services, fungi and associated microorganisms, dyes and tannins, wood fuel, and ecotourism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature review undertaken on their Production, harvesting, post-harvest handling, processing, trade and marketing, research and innovations, challenges and gaps. • SWOT analysis for each identified sub-sector • Strategies for intervention identified. • Established that there are 7 Policies, 10 Management Strategies, 1 Bill and 9 Acts that are relevant to NTFPS • Stakeholder consultation meetings in the 3 counties to identify key gaps; No Policy/Management strategies on NTFPS were identified in any of the three counties. They rely on national government policies, there is inadequate enforcement of quality control and lack of expertise to undertake resource mapping. • key potential interventions identified included: identification of green destination guidelines in the ecotourism sub-sector, mapping of wood fuel resources, establishment of local tree nurseries to raise over-exploited preferred dye and tannin species, value chain analysis of poles, withies and fitos as well as enhancing value addition, processing, packaging, branding and certification for medicinal plants. • The Equitable Benefit Sharing regulations, (2016) was further reviewed in consultation with the community represented by the National Alliance of Community Forest Associations (NACOFA) who had practiced Participatory Forest Management were generating income from the process. 					
---	--	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

¹² Outputs as described in the project log frame 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.

¹³ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹⁴ 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)

¹⁵ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensitization Workshops on Forest Incentives and Benefits Sharing as well as Forest Conservation and Management Act, 2016 for Community Forest Associations (CFAs) have been undertaken in 9 out of 10 forest conservancies in the country (Western, Nyanza, Ewaso North, Central, Eastern, Mau North Rift, North Eastern and Coast) and Focused Group Discussions held and views obtained from local communities from 106 CFAs (180 M and 83F). 					
<p>Output 2.1: Ecosystem services are assessed and characterized and land use and land cover changes in selected forests and rangelands are assessed.</p>	<p>Q3Y2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selection and Identification of a consultant to undertake an analysis of ecosystem services undertaken and engagement process ongoing Review and gap identification of existing ecosystem services in Mount Kulal and Mukogodo forest landscapes initiated Assessment and characterization of Ecosystem services in Mt.Kulal initiated and ongoing through KWTA Biophysical baseline assessment of Land use and Land use changes in two project sites undertaken 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kenya water towers agency supported by FAO/TRI undertook a Total Economic Valuation in Mt. Kulal Ecosystem and the data collected involved carbon stock (Below and aboveground), soil mineral assessment, market survey and socio-economic assessment. The total economic valuation of Ecosystem Services for Mt. Kulal is estimated at KES 20.1 billion/year. The largest value is from indirect use consisting of regulatory and support services estimated at KES 18.1 billion/year (90%) as compared to KES 1.95 billion/year (9.95%) from direct use composed of provisioning services. Ecosystem assessment undertaken in Mukogodo Ecosystem involved a detailed quantitative assessment that resulted in identification of a diversity of ecosystem services (ES) such as provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural, educational services. The total economic value (TEV) of Mukogodo landscape was estimated at about KES 9.1 billion /year (US\$ 85mill. /year). In terms of relative contributions to total value, regulating and supporting services comprise the greatest component of TEV about 50% emphasizing the importance of indirect-use values in forest ecosystems. Training of local resource persons in ROAM undertaken and the Local ROAM initiated in the project sites with data mining of available information and defining the land degradation problem, their causes, effects, and possible interventions 			<p>60 %</p>	<p>Finalization of the Local ROAM process to be completed when Covid-19 measures are relaxed. TEV for Mt Kulal yet to undergo stakeholder validation</p>	

<p>Output 2.2: FLR activities are implemented in the two targeted landscapes and ecosystem management plans and community action plans for selected landscapes are developed and implemented.</p>	<p>Q3Y4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Management plan for Mt. Kulal Ecosystem revised and shared with stakeholders • Sites for FLR activities identified • 8 Trainees for training in nursery establishment and management identified • Development of management plans for Ilingwesi and Leparua conservancies initiated and resource maps produced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mt Kulal management plan was presented to stakeholders in an online meeting for validation and based on comments, it was revised, and a finalized plan is ready for signing by the Kenya forest service and a launch planned for June 2021. • Training of 8 local trainees from the two Ecosystems on tree nursery establishment and management was carried out. • Resource mapping and development of maps for Leparua and Ilingwesi conservancies have been undertaken and the plans have been endorsed for printing. • Kurikuri and Makurian group ranches have held leaders and community awareness creation meetings and conducted zonal elections. Makurian has officially transited from group ranch to community land with a land management committee • 7 ha of enrichment planting of critically degraded areas within the Mt Kulal core zone and 0.6 ha of Agroforestry within homesteads and institutions and 3.6 ha enrichment planting in Mukogodo landscape • Through the Mt Kulal management plan, Zonation of Mt Kulal core and buffer zones in to management units as well as protection of degraded sites in forest through restrictions, protection (e.g. fencing off, placing thorny branches) and replanting is actioned to promote natural regeneration of 51,436 ha (5670 ha Core zone and 45,766 ha Buffer zone • KEFRI researchers taking into account the local knowledge, engaged and trained the community in species appropriateness in the ecosystems 			<p>10 %</p>	<p>Establishment of 8 tree nurseries of indigenous species derailed by delays in the procurement of the tools and equipment.</p>
<p>Output 2.3 Knowledge base on NTFPS in the two targeted landscapes and their commercial potential is generated.</p>	<p>Q1Y3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value chain analysis of Non-Timber Forest Products carried out and key products with commercial potential identified • Report validated through an online stakeholders’ meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chemical and physical Characterization of potential NTFPS from Mt Kulal and Mukogodo ecosystems by KEFRI to test compliance to specific minimum parameters in accordance with market standards. • Resource maps showing location and densities of the prioritized NTFPs as well as marking Global Positioning System (GPS) points of NTFPs in the two ecosystems and their estimated densities, ecological data and 			<p>60%</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 value chains were selected: Gum Arabic, Gum resins, Honey, Aloe and Ecotourism A situational analysis and status of intervention on NTFPS sub-sector has been undertaken 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> species diversity within and around the NTFPs has been documented Charcoal value chain assessed to identify the driving factors, the key actors and players and identify the legal and institutional frameworks supporting the sector Bio enterprises and Entrepreneurs and cooperatives identified and assessed and gaps in business management skills, documentation/record keeping, Equipment for harvesting and processing, marketing structures e.g. collection centers, packaging identified to be addressed through practical/on ground training 					
Output 2.4 Bio-enterprises products and services are promoted and commercialized.	Q2Y4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key bio-enterprises to be promoted and commercialized identified during a value chain analysis of the NTFPS in the two ecosystems. These include: gums and resins, essential oils, aloe, honey and ecotourism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training program for use in production, harvesting and post-harvest handling, processing, bulking, and marketing of the gums, resins, honey, bee product, aloes developed. Training guide on business development produced Training module on storage and safety mechanisms for NTFPs developed. A list and specifications of critical bio-enterprise equipment developed. Market/business analysis of the immediate compliance needs and their respective quality parameters to breach markets undertaken. Guidelines and associated costs on the establishment of ecotourism facilitates in Mt. Kulal developed. Linkage of gums and resins and beekeeping cooperative groups with markets initiated. 			20 %		
Output 3.1: Counties capacities in implementing FLR relevant policies are strengthened.	Q1Y5	This was planned for and included in the LOAs with KEFRI and KFS but are yet to be done	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing in tandem with other activities such as the development of FOLAREP, KFS has done county consultations where the technical team has sensitized the counties on the action plan. Two County government staff from Laikipia and Marsabit counties’ trained on the ROAM process alongside other partner staff based in the counties i.e. Laikipia wildlife forum (1) and Northern rangeland trust (2) ,Ilmamusu CFA (1) and Mt Kulal representative (1) 			50 %	Physical meetings/training hindered by the COVID-19 Pandemic	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KFS has done 4-day training on FLR approaches to 15 rangers/officers manning the two ecosystems in the project sites. This was geared towards supporting the implementation of the restoration works and monitoring of the restoration progress in the landscapes. • Information on Ecosystem services assessment and total economic valuation on both ecosystems has been shared with the counties which is relevant for ensuring that they give priority to conservation of the ecosystems in the county integrated action plans. • Training programmes for FLR trainings developed • The capacity of National, County and Community resource persons on planning, implementation, and monitoring of FLR activities built (18 M and 5 F). 				
Output 3.2: Community land management committees are set-up and working in targeted project sites.	Q1Y5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 community land management committees set up and functional in the project sites • Mukogodo ILMAMUSI CFA was mobilized and their institutional capacity enhanced. • Community mobilization and awareness meetings held • Election for Ilmamusi board members • Training of the newly elected ILMAMUSI board • Review of the CFA constitution • 3 board meetings held 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 363 (280 men and 83 women) members of Mt. Kulal Biosphere Reserve Community Forest Association (KCFA) and Elders Environmental Committee (WWM) trained on group dynamics, leadership, finance management, conflict management and records keeping. • Three WRUAs trained – Kudoti, Ngare Ndare and Loisukut • Resource mapping and development of maps for Leparua and Iingwesi conservancies • Brainstorming and community feedback meetings for community buy in. • Community awareness creation meetings and zonal elections for Kurikuri and Makurian group ranches held. • AGM meeting for Makurian group ranch held and it has officially transited from a group ranch to community land. • The leaders and management committee members went on an exchange visit to the more advanced conservancies of Namunyak and Kalama as well as Reteti elephant sanctuary and tree house lodge. 			50%	<p>This has been done earlier than anticipated in collaboration with the EU Funded Land Program</p> <p>ILMAMUSI CFA supported through LOA with Laikipia Wildlife Forum.</p>
Output 3.3: Restoration initiatives	Q3Y4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of FLR coordination mechanism entrenched in FOLAREP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FOLAREP Technical working group is operational and has undertaken webinars in FLR monitoring and farmer 			30%	County coordination

are coordinated at the national level.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The establishment of the following committees and the proposed terms of reference approved by the project steering committee: National FLR Steering Committee (NFLRSC), National FLR Coordination Committee (NFLRCC) and National FLR Technical Working Group (NFLRTWG) 	<p>managed natural regeneration and is involved in planning for the National Landscape Restoration Scaling Conference (June 2021) which will catalyze a National Movement for Realizing the Vision of the UN Decade of Ecosystem Restoration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Technical Working Group was formed during the initial preparation of the plan and maintained to be incorporated to support its implementation. 					meetings yet to take root because of the pandemic
Output 3.4: Access to climate and restoration finance is improved.	Q4Y4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultations with the national treasury initiated and a concept note shared requesting for support on FLR activities Financial plan embedded in the FLR action plan Potential sources of funding for FLR such as Green bonds, GCF, Financing locally led Climate actions, REDD+ financing, National Adaptation Fund, Presidential directive (10% CSR for 10% tree cover), NAP readiness fund coordinated by FAO, GIZ-landscape funds, WWF Consortium, IMARA-World Vision, GZ-ADB, Care International, PACJA (GCF) identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two entrepreneurs, Nailepo Bee Keeping and Horizon Venture-Essentials are being engaged in the Restoration Factory with bridge for billions(B4B) to develop their capacity to business modeling and planning and understanding of the finance sourcing for business growth while supporting FLR. A Bio-enterprise business guide has been developed by FAO and there is concerted effort to -customize it to project approach and pilot through 1 online (attended by at least 50 people) and 1 face-to-face (attended by at least 30 people) in the project implementation Proposals are currently being developed to fund community-based organizations in forest-based livelihoods sectors through the IKEA Green Entrepreneurship Initiative 			30%		
Output 4.1: A national FLR Knowledge Management system is developed and Implemented.	Q2Y5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk studies carried out and indicate that FLR knowledge management is not systematically collected, organized, stored and shared. Road map for the development of a national FLR Knowledge Management system developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mapping of Existing Knowledge, Initiatives and Platforms Linked to FLR in Kenya A SWOT Analysis of identified Knowledge Sharing Portals undertaken. 11 Institutions Identified to form the National FLR KM Committee which will discuss the road map, design and content of FLR KM System. The design proposed is as follows Registration Log in: -Add/edit Institution or project, data, information, maps, photos, success stories, events etc. Approval -All content added will need approval 			30%		Mapping of knowledge platforms outside Kenya was proposed for addition

			<p>Publishing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Once published content is viewable by public. -Comments, social media sharing, downloading, tagging, Q&A is allowed. • The roadmap and platform design shared with stakeholders in a webinar on FLR monitoring 					
<p>Output 4.2: Knowledge shared and received within Kenya and outside.</p>	<p>Q3Y5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Communication strategy developed • 10 monthly reports submitted to the ministry of Environment and Forestry, 2PPR s produced and uploaded in FPMIS • 4 articles published in FLRM newsletters • 1 article published in 2019 year under Review • The project team learned about a training manual on SME development prepared by Farm Forest Facility (FFF) and that this will be piloted through the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forest and Landscape Restoration (FLR) Monitoring Webinar held on 23rd April 2021 to share knowledge, call for synergies, collaborations on FLR development, implementation, monitoring and reporting and showcase existing national environment and FLR monitoring frameworks. • Lessons learnt, gaps and way forward for FLR monitoring in Kenya was discussed by the following partners/stakeholders: World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), Kenya Forest service, Regreening Africa, European union, council of governors, Ever greening Africa, World Resources Institute, FAO and was attended by the Chief Administrative Secretary, ministry of environment, principal secretary ministry of agriculture and the chief conservator of forests who are key decision makers in terms of policy in the FLR sector. • An annual PSC was held and PIR report and work plan and budget shared • Monthly reports prepared and submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Forestry • Quarterly briefs developed and shared through the FAO Kenya Newsletter • Semi-annual report (PPR) done, approved, and uploaded on FPMIS • Participated in Webinars on FLR implementation, monitoring and finance where best practices and case studies were shared. • Information on Characterization of ecosystem services in Mukogodo ecosystem and Mt. Kulal Biosphere Reserve Forest Management Plan (KFMP) 2021 – 2025 shared with stakeholders for information and validation through zoom meetings 			<p>40%</p>	<p>On course</p>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRM Sector meetings to share information, successes/solutions to challenges with other FAO NRM projects e.g. Lands Programme, GEF 5, Farm and Forestry facility held. • The NPC presented a paper on gums and resins in a meeting organized by Ministry of Devolution and hosted by UN Strategic Partnerships office, IMARA workshop in Isiolo and KFS Foresters workshop in Isiolo • Youth in Mukogodo reached through a WhatsApp platform hosted by the LMAMUSI CFA and the county government of Laikipia (Front Runners of Mukogodo) where Information on Mukogodo restoration is shared. • The ILMAMUSI CFA supported through partnership with Laikipia wildlife forum to have a website www.ilmamusi.org 					
<p>Output 4.3: Results – based management project monitoring system providing systematic information on progress is established.</p>	<p>Q4Y4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring and Evaluation plan developed • Biophysical baseline land use data collection, analysis and report done • Socioeconomic baseline survey done in Mt Kulal ecosystem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socioeconomic baseline survey undertaken in Mukogodo ecosystem • Performance Indicator tracking table designed and reported to track the targets set in the M&E plan. • Contributed to inputting data to record geospatial information for monitoring ecosystem restoration in the Framework for Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring – FERMI developed by FAO in readiness for the launch of the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration in early June. • Quarterly Partner planning and review meetings held • Field monitoring visits undertaken to follow up on LOA implementation and identify bottlenecks in implementation and provide remedial actions 				<p>40 %</p>	<p>Collect Earth used</p> <p>Data collection using Collect mobile</p>

4. Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on Project Implementation

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

The project has so far benefited 1735 Households/ 8671 beneficiaries (5184M, 3487F). Baseline assessment of Mount Kulal and Mukogodo Ecosystems was done through collect earth on land use patterns. The ROAM assessment has been undertaken in both project sites and degradation maps produced indicating that 27,874 ha of Mt Kulal and 23,406 ha of Mukogodo are degraded. The five-year (2021-2025) FLR Implementation Action Plan (FOLAREP) with the goal to restore and sustainably manage deforested and degraded landscapes, has been further reviewed by a policy consultant. A policy influencing plan (PIP) has been developed. The reviewed FOLAREP was presented to a wide section of stakeholders including Webinars during the Planning for the National Landscape Restoration Scaling Conference graced by senior government officials from key relevant institutions and five County consultations meetings (Kitui, Meru, Embu, Isiolo and Samburu). The Equitable Benefit Sharing regulations (2016) has further been reviewed in consultation with the community represented by the National Alliance of Community Forest Associations (NACOFA) and views obtained from local communities from 96 Community Forest Associations (CFAs). Additional information has been obtained through various project activities that are going to feed into the development of the Non-Timber Forest Products & Services Strategy, to enhance sustainable commercialization of NTFPS. Resource mapping and development of maps for Leparua and IIngwesi conservancies have been undertaken representing a total area of 43,670 ha put under improved management. The Management and Community Development Plan (2021-2026) for IIngwesi *Community* Conservancy has been developed detailing threats to natural resources and the community conservation priorities. Makurian has officially transited from a group ranch to community land with a land management committee whose capacity on leadership and management has been developed through trainings and exposure visits to more advanced conservancies. Resource management in Mukogodo forest and its landscapes has also been improved through reviewing the constitution of ILMAMUSI CFA. The management plan for Mt. Kulal Ecosystem has been revised, validated and launched for improved management of 51,436 ha (5670 ha Core zone and 45,766 ha Buffer zone around the Core zone). Local ROAM has been carried out in all the project sites and data of available information mined and land degradation problem defined in the two landscapes, their causes, effects, and possible interventions established, key stakeholders of implementation of FLR options identified, and stock taking of existing restoration initiatives carried out. Community resource persons have been trained on nursery establishment and management and used in the establishment of 6 tree nurseries. Appropriate indigenous trees to be planted in the two ecosystems have been identified in a participatory manner and so far 7 ha of enrichment planting of critically degraded areas and 0.6 ha of Agroforestry carried out in Mt Kulal Ecosystem and 3.6 ha in Mukogodo Ecosystem. A total area of 112,042 ha in Mukogodo Ecosystem and 51,436 ha in Mt Kulal Ecosystem are under improved land management which includes biodiversity. The management plans envision biodiversity conservation and wildlife habitat management in the forested area through minimal impact ecotourism (e.g. walking, bird watching); monitored extraction of resources and maintaining nature trails. Data for the Total Economic Valuation of the two ecosystems has been collected and regulating, provisioning, supporting and cultural values of the forests obtained. The total economic value (TEV) of Mukogodo landscape was estimated at about KES 9.1billion /year (US\$ 85million /year) while that of Mt. Kulal was about KES 20.1 billion /year. Knowledge base on NTFPS and their commercial potential was generated through Chemical and physical Characterization of potential NTFPS from Mt Kulal and Mukogodo ecosystems by KEFRI and the compliance to specific minimum parameters in accordance with market standards tested. A Report on Chemical and physical Characterization has been compiled. Resource maps showing location and densities of the prioritized NTFPs has been produced. Charcoal value chain in the two ecosystems has also been assessed and the driving factors, the key actors and players, the legal and institutional frameworks supporting the sub-sector identified so as to provide a sound basis for policy development towards economic and environmental sustainability of the industry in the two landscapes. The learning guide for forestry and farm producer organizations and SMEs on developing viable and bankable business plans developed by FAO Farm Forest Facility and being tested through the bridge for billions (B4B) initiative is critical to enhance access to finance by local beneficiaries to support FLR activities. Several potential sources of finances for restoration related activities exist in the country and

discussions on synergies and collaboration with them is planned. Two entrepreneurs/participants from Kenya underwent a 4-month Restoration factory online mentorship programme to better support and organize their enterprises and adapt to the entire value chain from production to market/consumer level. Preliminary consultations with various stakeholders on the status of FLR Knowledge Management in the country has been carried out, existing knowledge, initiatives and Platforms Linked to FLR in Kenya mapped, A SWOT Analysis of identified Knowledge Sharing Portals carried out, 11 Institutions Identified and being engaged to form the National FLR KM Committee which will discuss the roadmap, design and content of FLR KM System. Information generated from the project has been shared through various means including but not limited to the following: webinars, D-groups, newsletters, reports and meetings.

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

COVID- 19 halted or caused delays in some project activities. Other means of undertaking the activities were used e.g. Virtual meetings where there was no need for physical meetings
Long procurement processes e.g. for tree seedlings for direct restoration. The project through the sector lead has requested for the sector to have one procurement/operations officer to aid in hastening the process.

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.

	FY2021 Development Objective rating¹⁶	FY2021 Implementation Progress rating¹⁷	Comments/reasons¹⁸ justifying the ratings for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<i>Meeting of most of the major global environmental objectives being addressed by the project and the expected benefits are on course. Implementation of components 1, 3 and 4 are in compliance with the original plan despite the COVID-19 Pandemic. However, component 2 requires some remedial action</i>
Budget Holder	S	S	<i>Project implementation on course though most activities were delayed due to COVID-19 restrictions and thus leading to low delivery. Strategic remedial measures needed to make up for the lost time. Mid-Term Review expected end of year and will provide valuable assessment and recommendations for the project.</i>

¹⁶ **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.

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

¹⁷ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁸ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

<p>GEF Operational Focal Point</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><i>Despite the adverse effects of Covid-19 pandemic, alternative and innovative measures were used in communicating with critical stakeholders during capacity building and other activities to ensure conformity to Government of Kenya’s Ministry of Health containment measures and guidelines for the pandemic. It is recognized that though limited restoration initiatives were carried out due to unfavourable weather conditions in the two ecosystems and Covid-19 pandemic, plans are in place to upscale these in the next financial year. Protection and periodic monitoring of planted sites should be enhanced to ensure sustained success. The project has also obtained useful results from the Gender based Value chains studies that should be applied to impact the livelihoods of vulnerable communities in the two ecosystems (as low hanging fruits) and also used as a basis for replication and up scaling of the activities in the future to enhance sustainability of the initiated restoration efforts. Gaps identified in the development of the identified priority bio enterprises need to be addressed through multi-institutional field based training with clear deliverables. Conceptualization of both exit and sustainability strategies by both the Project funders/implementers on one hand and a combination of Government of Kenya Institutions and communities on the other hand should be initiated as this is critical for the realisation of the long term impacts of the project.. Overall, the implementation of the project is and has been on course and we as a government pledge our full support to the project.</i></p>
---	-----------------	-----------------	--

<p>Lead Technical Officer¹⁹</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>S</p>	<p><i>The project has been able to achieve several key actions planned for the period July 2020 to June 2021 including: (i) the development of a national Action Plan for FLR, (ii) the engagement with the local communities through development of Mt. Kulal Community Forest management plan, various capacity building programmes, the establishment of four community land management committees and 6 tree nurseries (iii) the revision of the management plan for Mount Kulal, (iv) the finalization of local ROAM to allow local stakeholders to implement restoration investments based on well prepared/relevant restoration plans and (v) the identification of entrepreneurs currently engaged in the first cohort of the Restoration Factory in order to develop bankable projects. Unfortunately, due to COVID 19 constraints, several actions have been delayed or postponed to the second half of the year 2021. In this difficult context the PMU has managed to advance well the political related interventions thanks to a strong ownership both at national and at county level. The synergies developed between the two TRI projects currently implemented in Kenya seems excellent with several actions co-organized during the period July 2020-June 2021 (e.g. joint virtual ROAM training held during the summer 2020).</i></p> <p><i>The implementation of FLR investments on the ground in the targeted sites should be considered as a priority during the next period (July 2021-June 2022). The Mid-Term Review, planned for the end of the year 2021 (Q4) / beginning of the year 2022 (Q1), will be an excellent opportunity to better analyse the COVID 19 impact on this project GCP/KEN/090/GFF, to revise/adjust eventually the project targets and to provide recommendations to the Project Management Unit (PMU)</i></p>
---	-----------------	-----------------	--

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

FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	S	<p><i>Overall, the project is progressing well against its development objective and planned outcomes and outputs. Although some outputs have not yet met planned mid-term targets, the implementation status suggests the project is satisfactorily progressing within its 5-year framework.</i></p> <p><i>This FY served to set the groundwork and build the necessary foundations for successful field implementation of FLR options planned for the coming years. Several critical assessments were carried out informing key action plans at both national and local level, while at the same time building national capacity in FLR monitoring and tracking tools. Conservancy, forest, and management plans have been consolidated, and critical land committees and CFA's engaged and revitalized – this requires major efforts and is a key ingredient to success. The Mid-term revision this year will be an important opportunity to identify strengths and gaps and help the project plan where efforts should be placed also in view of the exit strategy.</i></p>
--	----------	----------	---

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved ESM plan, when appropriate. 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. Please add recommendations to improve the implementation of the ESM plan, when needed.

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				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
	Process of Free, Prior and informed Consent (FPIC)	The Indigenous community living in Mukogodo landscape (the Yaaku) is well represented in management of the	More leadership representation and capacity building on nature-based solutions to be undertaken	PMU

		<p>landscape with the secretary to the CFA having been elected from this community. The impact being that the community is recognized and involved in decision making.</p> <p>One candidate in the restoration factory who is engaged in honey production is from the Yaaku community</p>		
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 Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid²⁰. If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Medium	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>
N/A

²⁰ **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.

6. Risks

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE				
<p>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. Please make sure that the table also includes the Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant.</p>				

	Risk	Risk rating ²¹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²²	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Drought may take place before the project has enabled communities to start diversifying their livelihoods. It may be so severe that it threatens crop, livestock survival, and forests thus curtailing the basis for development of value chains appropriate for food security.	Medium	The project will monitor early warnings for drought and adapt their activities so as to ensure the building blocks of the project are consolidated and may resist the occurrence of a drought.	This is being done but will be intensified as restoration activities continue to be implemented on the ground. Partnership with the county governments to ensure timely sharing of rainfall information	Water management improvement in Lekurruki, Il Ngwesi, Makurian and Kurikuri conservancies is under discussion for support under Laikipia wildlife forum
2	Political instability may hinder or interrupt support from the public sector for FLR	Medium	The project will reach out to decision makers to raise awareness and interest for FLR. This will be done at all levels, to maximize the capacity of the project to reach its objectives.	Awareness raising has been carried out and ongoing. Engagement of local leaders in all project interventions to ensure their support	

²¹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High

²² 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".

	Risk	Risk rating ²¹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²²	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Political-institutional risk: Divergent priorities of projects partners and stakeholders with regards to FLR and alternative livelihoods	Low	Project partners will undertake several consultations to reach consensus on key issues during project implementation. Main project partners will be meeting at least once a year through the project steering committee.	Consultations maintained with key partners in project steering committee meeting held in June 2021 to approve work plans and budgets and review progress	Quarterly review and planning meetings used as a tool to check on partner divergent views
4	Social risks: Reluctance to participate in the project activities by communities	Low	Interest for activities has already been assessed, and the project will be implemented in a highly participatory manner. Partners are closely involved with communities and can relay any concerns early on so as to prevent reluctance from communities.	Participatory approach has been embraced in all project activities with active involvement of community representatives	The project has embraced continuous awareness and capacity development of community leaders/opinion leaders
	Forceful movement of people from the forest by the government may have consequences on project sustainability	Medium	Strengthening of social safeguards and developing a grievance redress mechanism	A participatory forest management approach with representation from all relevant stakeholders.	Based on experiences from the GEF 5, there was voluntary movement of people from the forest but this posed a challenge of others wanting to remain hence risk of provoking government intervention
5	Project management risks such as delays, overspending, lack of coordination	Medium	The PMU will be composed of qualified personnel. Oversight by implementing partners, presence in targeted landscapes and well-established processes and monitoring activities will favour an early identification of issues that may hinder project implementation.	Qualified staff engaged as PMU. Regular consultations maintained with partners, BH, CTA and LTO Early planning of procurement processes	Covid-19 pandemic slowed down procurement e.g. of nursery materials and equipment

	Risk	Risk rating ²¹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²²	Notes from the Project Task Force
6	Ecological risks posed by the implementation of environment restoration activities and water management activities	Medium	The project is supported by KEFRI and KFS which possess a strong knowledge base on environmental management in the region so as to ensure that activities implemented do no harm.	Regular consultations with KEFRI and KFS has been maintained	
7	COVID-19 Pandemic interfered with field activities due to restrictions on travel and meetings and delays in procurement of goods and services. Furthermore, the pandemic also resulted in more people losing their jobs and returning to the countryside, which might cause extra pressure/degradation if not properly managed. The pandemic also affected the tourism industry and travel of persons in and out of the country which hindered the promotion and marketing/export of value chains with a high restoration potential hence less economic profitability	Medium	Identify 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	Project staff teleworking from home. There is enhanced use of ICT for online meetings and Webinars. Maintaining strict adherence to the Covid-19 regulations to enable some Field activities to take place. Reviews of LOAs for a no cost extension to allow partners to finalize on their activities.	The project staff reviewed some of the LOAs and have accelerated the implementation of activities that were pending from the previous year. They have all been done and now closing the LOAs in readiness for the coming year.

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

FY2020 rating	FY2021 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	Medium	Though there is a lot interest for on ground implementation of activities by key stakeholders and the project is being implemented in a highly participatory manner, the COVID -19 Pandemic continues to interfere with field activities due to restrictions on travel and meetings and delays in procurement of goods and services

**7. Adjustments to Project Strategy –
Only for projects that had the Mid-term review (or supervision mission)**

If the project had a MTR review or a supervision mission, please report on how the MTR recommendations were implemented as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	

Adjustments to the project strategy.

Please note that changes to outputs, baselines, indicators or targets cannot be made without official approval from PSC and PTF members, including the FLO. These changes will follow the recommendations of the MTR or the supervision mission.

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outputs		
Project Indicators/Targets		

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, mid-term review, final evaluation 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
<p>Project extension</p>	<p>Original NTE: Revised NTE:</p> <p>Justification:</p>

8. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges, and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged: World vision through their IMARA programme were identified as key stakeholders as they work in the same ecosystem and work with the same community groups the project is working with. They have been engaged especially at ground level where we invited them for partners review and planning meetings which they attended and enhanced collaboration and synergies.

Through a consultancy on enhancing capacity on enterprises and business identification, engagement is through facilitating a meeting of key partners and projects working in the area including IMARA

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project.
- Please indicate if the project works with Civil Society Organizations and/or NGOs
- Briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

Stakeholders	Engagement with the project
Ministry of Environment and Forestry	Chair of project steering committee meetings Facilitates good governance in the protection, restoration, conservation, development and management of the environment and natural resources for equitable and sustainable development
National Environment Management Authority (NEMA)	It ensures general supervision and coordination of all environment matters and leads the implementation of all environment policies.
Kenya Forest Service (KFS)	Lead in developing Kenya forest and landscape restoration implementation action plan (FOLAREP) 2021-2025
Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI)	Lead in developing Natural resources access and benefits sharing" policy and NTFP strategy
Kenya Water Towers Authority (KWTA)	The authority on water resources in Kenya and has identified 28 water towers, including Mount Kulal and Mukogodo forest
Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS)	National parks and wildlife conservation areas fall under its jurisdiction. Its role also involves developing benefit sharing mechanisms for communities living in wildlife areas, and management plans for community and private wildlife conservancies and sanctuaries.
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries	Ensures food security through creation of an enabling environment and ensuring sustainable natural resource management.
National Drought Management Authority (NDMA)	Provides up to date information and early warnings on drought events
Kenya Agriculture and Livestock Research Organization (KALRO),	Coordinates and regulate all aspects of research in agriculture and livestock development, and promote the

	application of the research findings and technologies in the country
National Museums of Kenya (NMK),	Lead in the Finalization of Mount Kulal Ecosystem Management Plan and training of the Kulal Biosphere Reserve Community Forest Association
Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT)	Setting up of Community land management committees in targeted project sites
Laikipia Wildlife Trust (LWF).	Community mobilization and institutional Support to Mukugodo ILMAMUSI CFA and conservancies Board''
World Vision	Inclusive action planning
Gum Arabic and Resins Association (GARA)	An association registered to promote gums and resins production, trade and marketing that is a member of the project steering committee
Farm Forestry Facility (FFS)	A project by FAO that works with forest and farm producers with project sites in Laikipia
UN-Environment/Nature Kenya	This is the 2 nd Kenya TRI project
ICRAF	Preparation of the National Agroforestry Strategy

Please also indicate if the private sector has been involved in your project and provide the nature of the private sector actors, their role in the project and the way they were involved

The project has partnered with ICRAF on planning for Launching the National Land Restoration Scaling Conference in Kenya in June 2021 and there has been a series of webinars in readiness on this and the private sector involvement in FLR is featured.

Through a consultancy on enhancing capacity on enterprises and business identification, private sector has been engaged in carrying out a market/business analysis to form market linkages with private sector actors (hotels, tour operators, supermarkets and exporters) and formally link 2 gums and resins cooperative societies and the 3 bee keeping cooperative societies with market.

9. 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 made at formulation or during execution stages? Please briefly indicate the gender differences here.

The project has relied on the gender capacity needs assessment conducted by an FAO programme RAELOC (Reviving ASAL Economies through Livestock Opportunities and Improved Coordination) carried out in Marsabit and Isiolo. This is being used to inform trainings and integrate/mainstream gender in all project and partner activities.

The project has also conducted a socioeconomic baseline assessment with the following areas of focus.

- Literacy levels of both men and women, the household leadership and management styles (Men/Women/Children headed).
- A gender focused analysis of knowledge of policies and legislation on forest and landscape restoration.
- Access, control and use of natural resources as well as socioeconomic activities and income for both men and women.
- Access to information and trainings on natural resource management and access to finance e.g. revolving funds for both men and women.
- Representation of either gender in decision making processes and institutions
- Gender Roles and responsibilities in relation to collection, use and sale of non-timber forest products

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

- Yes. The project through its M&E plan is tracking gender disaggregated data of people directly benefitting from project FLR activities and interventions. Tracking the results is being done through periodic field monitoring and monthly partner reports of client reach in activities assigned or agreed in letters of agreement.
- The Impact of gender results will be done periodically through surveys on increased capacity of men and women in natural resource management, improved access to information and finance and changes in income and control/use of natural resources as well as leadership and representation in decision making processes.

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

- There is a gender focal person in the FAO office and all project staff have undertaken the mandatory gender training as well as having been trained on FAO policy and gender Equity.
- The other institutions have gender policies and ensure gender considerations in their projects and employment but may require additional support and capacity building of officers assigned to these roles.

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

- The project through ensuring women participation in the strengthening/ development of policies, strategies, action plans on FLR and in strengthening of community structures or committees the project will contribute to improving women's participation and decision making. Gender equality is being mainstreamed in all new policy or strategic documents developed by the project, e.g. the FLR action plan, the equitable and benefits sharing policy and the NTFPS management strategy.

- The project recognizes women as key stakeholders in managing land and using natural resources and has undertaken a Gender Based Value Chain Analysis of Non-Timber Forest Products and Services which has identified women's financial objectives, specific constraints and the NTFPs resources they depend on for their livelihoods. In developing these potential value chains and addressing the bottlenecks, the project will contribute in closing the gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources and generate socio-economic benefits or services for women and hence in the long-term women's empowerment. Capacity building of community groups through the restoration factory is being undertaken by two individuals of both genders.

10. Knowledge Management Activities

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

- 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.

The Kenya TRI project is part of the global TRI programme and interacts with other TRI countries and shares experiences, lessons learnt and best practices through webinars and the restoration initiative d-groups. Information is shared through quarterly TRI newsletters, the d-groups, and the annual global TRI workshops. Articles are also published and distributed/shared through FLRM Newsletters.

The project envisions having in place a knowledge management system on FLR. KEFRI has been contracted to develop the FLR Portal. Discussions with key stakeholders have been initiated and a stakeholders' forum to identify the requirements is planned and once this is done, apps, databases, visualization, and reporting tools will be designed and developed and used in knowledge management.

- Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.

Yes. The project has recently drafted a communication strategy whose objectives are to:

- Create awareness on the importance of the forests and landscapes to the communities living around the forest
- Foster a sense of pride and ownership of forests from the community living around the forest
- Create an attitude and behaviour change towards the forest for a harmonious and sustainable existence

Communication activities undertaken are:

- Sharing the FLR implementation action plan with key stakeholders in the FLR sector including policy makers such as the chief administrative secretary of the ministry of environment and forestry, principal secretary ministry of agriculture and the Kenya forest service chief conservator of forests
- Showcasing of FLR monitoring tools used by FAO i.e. Collect Earth. This was done as a panel presentation by the M&E officer during an FLR monitoring webinar.
- Talk by the M&E officer on establishing a credible and inclusive monitoring system for restoration in Kenya to be able to report on international commitments to key FLR stakeholders in Kenya.
- Production of 2 resource maps of conservancies in the Mukogodo ecosystem
- Social media sharing of information on project activities using the FAOKE Twitter handle. @FAOKenya e.g. Assessing Restoration opportunities amid Covid-19, Virtual web-based video conference Training on Restoration opportunities assessment Methodology and webinars on Forest and landscape monitoring and evaluation, Healthy forests mean healthy people etc.
- Partner websites and newsletters e.g. LWF Communications, Mukogodo forest: Making Strides towards Management of Laikipia's biggest forest reserve among others

- Quarterly briefs for the FAO Kenya newsletters
- The NPC presented a paper on gums and resins in a meeting organized by Ministry of Devolution and hosted by UN Strategic Partnerships office
- Media coverage of the tree planting in Mt Kulal.

Planned communication activities:

- Story on the adaptation of the recommendations of the FLR strategy
- Story on the adaptation of the recommendations of Assessments of existing ecosystem services
- Documentary on FLR activities on ground
- Production and diffusion of maps of local restoration opportunities through Printing of maps, Comic book for children, Calendar, Posters, Skits and Bulk SMS.
- Photo/Video and text story on FLR activities
- Grazing maps
- Songs about healthy and productive cattle as a result of enforcing sustainable grazing methods
- All weather name tags for those who planted trees to foster pride in the community
- Aerial shots of the final nursery grown

The articles developed are; value chain analysis for ASAL products, making satellite Imagery in land use assessment more accessible towards FLR, Creating enabling environment for Forest and Landscape Restoration and Non –Timber Forest Products and Services in Kenya, TRI child project quarterly newsletter and the Restoration Year in Review (YiR) 2019 and 2020.

- 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. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.

The project has undertaken a biophysical baseline survey, land use data collection using satellite imagery/ collect earth and involved various stakeholders from the project sites and partnering organizations in a process called mapathon. This is expected to give the project a good basis of intervening to sustainably manage the environment and the livelihoods of the people living in these landscapes.

One of the project partners had this to say;

"The MAPATHON process was very useful to us in Nature Kenya. It opened the world of open access GIS tools which can be used to assess restoration change in our target landscapes. These tools are easy to use and rely on stakeholder inclusivity in the assessment process. This legitimizes the results we recorded. We intend to replicate these lessons in our Tana River Delta TRI program." Paul Gacheru, Nature Kenya.



Figure 1: Participants in a Mapathon exercise collecting land use data via satellite imagery (Photo by Patrick Mugi FAO-Kenya)

7, 031 assorted indigenous trees and 600 fruit trees within the Mt Kulal ecosystem were planted. This also acted as the launch of a campaign in Forest and Landscape restoration.



Figure 2: Tree planting in Mt Kulal Photo by Elijah Mboko FAO

Women groups in Mt Kulal were supported by the programme to undertake tree protection of the planted trees to ensure a high survival rate. The women used locally available materials and their coordinator Shukri Lasapicho said “This project has come to benefit us both environmentally through the trees and also providing our women with work which means meat on the table.”



Figure 3: Unprotected seedling
Photos by Patrick Mugi, FAO



Figure 4: Protected seedling using locally available materials



Figure 5: Local ROAM Assessment at Gatab, Mt Kulal Ecosystem
(Photo by Emily Njagi-KEFRI)



Figure 6: Community engagement led by the local chief on the ROAM process
(Photo by Patrick Mugi FAO-Kenya)

- Please provide links to publications, leaflets, video materials, related website, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.
- Enabling environment for FLR and non-timber forest products and services in Kenya

<http://www.fao.org/in-action/forest-landscape-restoration-mechanism/resources/detail/en/c/1273467/>

- Making digital technology and satellite imagery in land use assessment more accessible towards FLR

<http://www.fao.org/in-action/forest-landscape-restoration-mechanism/resources/detail/en/c/1258045/>

- c) A study on value chain development in the Kenyan Arid and Semi-Arid lands

<http://www.fao.org/in-action/forest-landscape-restoration-mechanism/resources/detail/en/c/1258403/>

<http://newsletters.fao.org/q/16vqwx56ezp/wv>

Does the project have a communication and/or knowledge management focal point? If yes, please provide their names and email addresses

Our communication focal point is: Lydia Limbe –Lydia.Limbe@fao.org

The Lead implementing partner (KEFRI) has Victor Kamau as the knowledge management expert:vkamau@kefri.org

11. 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

Do indigenous peoples have an active participation in the project activities? How?

Yes. Indigenous people are involved in the project.

Indigenous people were consulted and informed during PPG field missions, and representatives from indigenous communities in the project area gave their overall informal consent to the project architecture during the PPG validation workshop that took place in Nairobi the 6th of July 2017.

A Participatory approach to all project processes and activities has been taken to ensure free and prior consent of any indigenous people who may be in the project site. The ILMAMUSI CFA in Mukogodo landscape and Wazee Wa Mazingira in Mt Kulal are the two community structures that the project is using to reach and communicate with the community. The county governments of Marsabit, Isiolo and Laikipia are also fully informed prior to any intervention by the project so as to build a sense of ownership and respect.

For instance, the Yaaku/mukogodo community live or reside within Kurikuri and Lekuruki group ranches which are represented in all decision-making processes concerning Mukogodo forest.

Another Indigenous community is the IIngwesi community who reside in IIngwesi and Makurian group ranches. The leadership of the ILMAMUSI, which is an acronym for all the group ranches within the landscape, is composed of leaders of the group ranches forming the committee and board of the CFA (Community forest association). Their interests are thus catered for under all interventions by the project since the project uses the community structure (ILMAMUSI CFA) to reach the beneficiaries.

In case of grievances by any of the communities, they have their own local problem resolving structures that are respected by all and are very effective in resolving disputes as no one goes against them. Provincial administration for arbitration is usually the last option and is rarely taken.

After the new constitution of ILMAMUSI CFA, elections were held, and a Yaaku community member is now the secretary to the CFA.

One candidate in the restoration factory who is engaged in honey production is from the Yaaku community.

12. Innovative Approaches

Please provide a brief description of an innovative²³ approach in the project / programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.

SATELLITE IMAGERY IN LAND USE ASSESSMENT

Digital technology and satellite imagery were used in the assessment of sample plots during biophysical baseline survey. It stands out as an innovation because it is faster than on the ground methods and facilitates long-term monitoring of land coverage and usage. The project can now monitor and plan the use natural resources including monitoring deforestation and desertification.

It is also an inclusive approach of land use and land use change assessments where stakeholders, local government, non-governmental institutions and the community are involved in the process hence ensuring ownership and sustainability of project interventions and results.

The project is also innovative in the sense that it integrates bio-enterprise development with restoration of landscapes thus providing short term benefits to the local communities as the long-term benefits of restoration are awaited.

The project has also collected socioeconomic data using the FAO open foris collect mobile which is a flexible data collection tool for field-based surveys and does not require internet access while collecting data apart from uploading. It is thus very effective in the project sites which are very remote.

Assessing Restoration opportunities amid Covid-19 using web-based video conference application where trainers from Colorado, USA were able to train local resource persons from four clusters in different regions of Kenya.

Use of locally available materials to fence/protect planted seedlings- A weaving method used by women in basketry was used and the livestock cannot be able to destroy the trees

The Restoration Factory

An e-learning program that assists restoration entrepreneurs in developing enticing and attractive business models of restoration. It harnesses the expertise of a community of private sector mentors who are committed to guide their mentees through each step of their business through tailored support.

²³ Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

13. Possible impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project

Please indicate any implication of the Covid-19 pandemic on the activities and progress of the project. Highlight the adaptative measures taken to continue with the project implementation.

- Are the outcomes/outputs still achievable within the project period.

Field activities and meetings were derailed by the country lockdown and curfew. This has necessitated a second review of LOAs for a no cost extension to allow partners to finalize on their activities. We are still implementing LOA activities for 2019/2020

Procurement of nursery materials and seedlings was delayed, and we were not able to time the rainy season for establishment as well as tree planting exercise envisioned for the Mukogodo ecosystem in March/April 2021.

- Will the timing of the project MTR or TE be affected/delayed?

The MTR will go on but the expectation of having implemented at least 50% of the activities will not be realized.

- What is the impact of COVID-19 on project beneficiaries, personnel, etc.

Project beneficiaries eg those trained as nursery attendants cannot understand why the equipment were not made available in time for the rains as the pandemic had affected the procurement process.

Teleworking is only possible for office based work or zoom meetings that do not require physical meetings. As for field activities the output of staff has been affected as they cannot achieve their work plans in full.

- Are there good practices and lessons learned to be shared?

There is enhanced use of ICT for online meetings and Webinars.

Maintaining strict adherence to the Covid-19 regulations to enable some Field activities to take place.

14. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁴	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2021	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
KEFRI	WaTER Towers project:	In-Kind	500,000	N/A		
	CADEP-SFM project	In-kind	4,000,000	360,000		4,000,000
	Integrated program to build resilience to CC and adaptive capacity of vulnerable communities in Kenya	In-Kind	2,000,000	280,000		
FAO	FAO Land Programme		4,300,000	1,500,000		4,300,000
	FAO RAELOC		1,700,000	700,000		700,000
	TOTAL		12,500,000	2,840,000		9,000,000

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

²⁴ 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.