



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1.	BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2.	PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	6
3.	IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	58
4.	SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	73
5.	ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	76
6.	RISKS	79
7.	FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	85
8.	MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	91
9.	STAKEHOLDERS’ ENGAGEMENT	92
10.	GENDER MAINSTREAMING	95
11.	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	97
12.	INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	100
13.	CO-FINANCING TABLE	103

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)
Initial project duration (years):	5 years
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> a) Projects with 1st PIR; b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.	YES

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	April 24th, 2018
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01-Aug-2018
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31-Jul-2023
Revised project implementation End date (if approved) ²	31 July 2024

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	4,157,340
--------------------------------	-----------

¹ As per FPMIS

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

Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	12,500,000
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	3,580,000
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	2,625,138
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	6,936,534

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

⁴ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

⁵ Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	28 th June 2022
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	September 2021
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	February 2022
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	1 st January 2024
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes <i>(See Annex 3 -9)</i>

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	<i>Moderate</i>
---	-----------------

Status

Implementation Status <i>(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	4 th PIR
--	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Meshack Muga	Meshack.Muga@fao.org

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

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

2023 Project Implementation Report

Budget Holder (BH)	Carla Mucavi FAO Representative, FAO Kenya	Carla.Mucavi@fao.org ; FAO-KE@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Agnes Yobteric	agnesyobteric@yahoo.com
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Christophe Besacier, Forestry Officer, Office of the Director – Forestry Division, FAO Rome	Christophe.Besacier@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Pierre, Begat	Pierre.Begat@fao.org

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

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

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

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
	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	i.a) Road map for developing the FLR strategy i.b) NR access and benefits sharing policy approved i.c) Road map for developing the NTFPS management strategy	i) 3 types as follows: i.a) 1 national FLR strategy, including a financial and M&E plan developed and approved. i.b) 1 NR access and benefits sharing policy i.c) 1 NTFPS management strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft Isiolo County Environmental Action Plan (CEAP) and County Climate Change Policy developed, key stakeholders sensitized on the same and approved by the Cabinet Members and awaiting approval by the County Assembly, Isiolo County Rangeland management bill before County Assembly for approval. 	S

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

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

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

¹¹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Moderately Satisfactory** (MS), **Moderately Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU). Refer to Annex 1.

	landscape restoration in Kenya		<p>Technical Working Group (LRTWG), however,</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>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isiolo County Prosopis species management plan developed and operationalised • An improved draft strategy for sustainable commercialization of Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs) in Kenya has been developed and reviewed by the Technical Working Group and endorsement for public participation. • A Five-year FLR Implementation Plan (FOLAREP 2023-2027) with the goal to restore and sustainably manage deforested and degraded landscapes is developed in consultative process and awaiting signing and launch at a date to be set by Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Forestry • A framework for monitoring, reporting and learning on forest and landscape restoration has also been developed in a consultative process and will be launched together with the implementation plan. • Existence and adoption level of specific forest/FLR policies at county level has been assessed including traditional land management systems. Policy influencing plan(PIP) drawn and a poster developed and presented during the XV WFC in South Korea. 	
--	--------------------------------	--	---	--	--	--	--

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the lead up to the online National Landscape Restoration Scaling Conference held in July 2021, various thematic sessions/webinars were 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. • Support and awareness on FOLAREP by key decision makers in the Ministry of Environment, Climate, Change and Forestry was strengthened through their participation in FLR monitoring webinars where FOLAREP was showcased as an avenue for collective monitoring and reporting of FLR in the country. • A restoration monitoring technical working group (Project M&E is part of) has been established and mandated by the Principal Secretary Ministry of Environment, Climate, Change and Forestry (MoECCF) to oversee the design and implementation of a monitoring framework that will guide the country in tracking and reporting 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>her commitments to the AFR100/ Bonn challenge. The Forest and Landscape Restoration Implementation Plan (FOLAREP) has been showcased and accepted by the stakeholders and policy makers as the vehicle to action the activities geared towards restoring the targeted 5.1M Ha of degraded land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity needs for restoration monitoring at county and national levels have been assessed and FLR stakeholders trained on current tools used for landscape restoration monitoring in Kenya • The Natural Resources (Benefit Sharing) Bill 2020 was passed by the Senate on 2nd December 2021. This is a bill for the enactment of an Act of Parliament to establish a system of benefit sharing in natural resource exploitation between resource exploiters, the national government, county governments and local communities; and for connected purposes. • The Forest (Incentives and Equitable Benefit Sharing) regulations (2016) have been reviewed through the leadership of KEFRI with the advice from legal experts from the MoECCF and Attorney General Chambers in consultation with the community represented by the National Alliance of Community Forest Associations 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>(NACOFA). NACOFA are spearheading Participatory Forest Management through CFAs in the country. Regulatory impact assessment and public participation are planned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitization Workshops for Community Forest Associations (CFAs) on Forest Incentives and Benefit Sharing regulations as well as Forest Conservation and Management Act (2016) have been undertaken in all the 10 forest conservancies in the country (Western, Nyanza, Ewaso North, Central, Eastern, Mau, North Rift, Northeastern Coast and Nairobi) and Focused Group Discussions held, and views obtained from local communities from 106 CFAs (180 M and 83F). • An improved draft strategy for sustainable commercialization of Non-Timber Forest Products and Services (NTFPS) in Kenya has been developed and reviewed by a Technical Working Group put in place by MoECCF and sent to MoECCF endorsement for public participation. • The process of the development of NTFPS strategy started by conducting a situational analysis of the NTFPS sub-sector. Fifty (50) 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>institutions from the government, non-governmental organizations and private companies have been consulted and stock of past and ongoing interventions on NTFPS in Kenya taken. 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 has fed into the strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A paper: Towards the development of a strategy for sustainable commercialization of non-timber forest products in Kenya: A situational analysis was presented in the first ever commercial forestry conference and expo in Kenya and during the XV WFC in South Korea. • A new LoA is operational with KEFRI to finalize on the The Forest (Incentives and Equitable Benefit Sharing) regulations and NTFPs strategy. 	
	<p>Outcome 2: 152,661 ha are under improved land</p>	<p>Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares;</p>	<p>i.a) Mt Kulal forest is not gazetted and is managed by CBO "Wazee</p>	<p>Mukogodo ILMAMUSI CFA management plan developed</p>	<p>(i) 152,661 ha in total, as follows: i.a) The total Mount Kulal forest core zone is</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • i.b) Mukogodo Participatory Forest Management plan (PFMP) and Forest management agreement between Ilmamusi CFA and the Kenya forest service (KFS) prepared, signed and launched on 23rd May 	<p>S</p>

	<p>management (including 8,700 ha directly restored and 55,352 ha indirectly restored)</p>	<p>excluding protected areas).</p>	<p>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</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>Management plans updated, including rangeland restoration objectives</p>	<p>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 under improved management (9,470 ha)</p> <p>(i.e) Oldonyiro conservancy is under improved management (52,500 ha)</p> <p>(i.f) Leparua conservancy is under improved management (34,200 ha)</p> <p>(i.g) Makurian and Kuri Kuri group ranches are under improved management</p>	<p>2023. The Plan is anchored under the KFS through Forest Conservation and Management Act of 2016 and it will run for a period of 5 years (2023-2027). The event was graced by partners and stakeholders (FAO, Laikipia Wildlife Forum, Laikipia Conservancy Association, LEWA Conservancy, Impact, Ngare Ndare Forest Trust, African Nature Investors, Borana Conservancy, Olenaicho Range, Loisaba Conservancy, Il-ngwesi Conservancy, Lekurruki Conservancy, Maiyanat Conservancy, Shulumai Conservancy, Kirisia CFA, Mukutan Ranch, Lion Landscapes etc), County and National Government representatives:KFS, KWS, NEMA, National Government Administration Officers (NGAO), MP Laikipia North (Hon. Sarah Korere) and the Ilmamusu CFA/community members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the FMA, Ilmamusu CFA will have access to 18 user rights under the agreement some of which are: medicinal herbs, honey harvesting, grazing, water abstraction, ecotourism, sericulture, tree nurseries, seeds/wildings collection, butterfly farming, fish farming and collection of forest soil and wood and non – wood forest based industries 	
--	--	------------------------------------	---	--	--	---	--

			<p>t 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>(i.f) n/a</p> <p>(i.g) Makurian and Kuri Kuri group ranches have outdated management plans</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • i.a) Mt Kural Participatory Forest Management Plan (2023-2027) approved for implementation by the KFS Chief Conservator of forest (CCF) and launched on 21st June 2023. The Forest Management Agreement was negotiated on user rights, equity distribution of resources and sustainable resource use and management and to be signed the same day the PFMP will be launched. • i.d) Final version of the Oldonyiro Conservancy Management Plan has been produced and cleared by the conservancy board for printing. This will put 52,500 Ha of land under sustainable management. The conservancy has been sub-divided into four units (Narupa, Nanapa, Naapu and Nanapisho) for easier management. The capacity of these 4 conservancy boards has been built on governance and leadership for effective management of the conservancies and restoration initiatives. Awareness creation targeting over 1200 community members from the four conservancy units on forest and landscape restoration and sustainable land management practices has been undertaken. • Sub Catchment Management Plan for Ngare Ndare Water Resource Users Association revised and 	
--	--	--	---	--	--	---	--

						<p>compliant with Water Resources Authority (WRA) requirements benefiting 20,000 residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through TRI project, communities have understood the importance of restoration, conservation, and community management of the conservancies. This is yielding benefits in terms of carbon credits and 4 of the target conservancies have received funding from Northern Kenya Rangelands Carbon Project (NKRCP) to a tune of KES 36 million per conservancy. The amount of carbon stored is verified through soil analysis and biodiversity survey and issued as credits which are sold in the international carbon Market. • (i.b) Capacity of Ilmamusu CFA, which oversees the Mukogodo Forest, has been built by providing support for the constitution review process, putting in place new governance structure and representation, election of new office bearers, training of office bearers in understanding and embracing the Kenya Forest Act 2016 (that guides CFAs and National Forest Reserves). The launched Mukogodo Participatory Forest Management Plan is expected to assist in improved coordination with neighboring conservancies leading 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--



						<p>to improved resource management and decrease in degradation of the forest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • i.b) Ilmamusi CFA has registered with the national alliance of community forest associations (NACOFA) which gives the CFA national recognition and training of the CFA staff and Management committee members done on Resource mobilization. • (i.g) Community stakeholders have been engaged to produce resource use maps following a participatory and landscape approach. Several meetings with traditional leaders from Kuri Kuri and Makurian group ranches have been held and the development of management plans initiated. • (i.g) Kurikuri and Makurian group ranches are now community conservancies and have joined the Northern Rangeland Trust (NRT) structures of conservation and have changed names to Shulumai and Maiyanat community conservancies respectively. • (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 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>group ranches of Shulumai and Maiyanat have been held and rehabilitation of the productive land initiated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (i.f & i.d) Resource mapping for Leparua and Iingwesi conservancies have been carried out and maps and management plans produced (here). A total area of 43,670 ha is under improved management. Brainstorming and community feedback meetings for community buy in have also been held. • (i.d) The Management and Community Development Plan (2021-2030) for Iingwesi 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 the productive land that is degraded by improving the wet and dry season grazing planning, livestock bunching and biomass on degraded areas, clearing/control of invasive species mainly <i>Opuntia Sp.,.</i> The cleared areas to be reseeded with perennial grasses. Community awareness on livestock carrying capacity has been 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>enhanced. 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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (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 land, County spatial planning, settlement planning and wet and dry season grazing management. • (i.f) Leparua, an area once associated with rampant deforestation through charcoal burning, has embraced community management plans, and undertaken natural regeneration 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--


						<p>and controlled grazing as an initiative towards ecosystem restoration. The 102.5 Ha core zone of the conservancy is now a haven to several species of wildlife (elephants, zebra, giraffes, gazelles, antelopes, and different birds) that depend on the same land mass for their food, water, and habitation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (i.g) Awareness creation and zonal elections for Shulumai (Kuri-kuri) and Maiyanat (Makurian) group ranches have been carried out and Maiyanat has officially transited from a group ranch to a community land with a land management committee whose capacity on leadership and management has been enhanced through trainings and exposure visits to more advanced conservancies of Namunyak and Kalama as well as Reteti elephant sanctuary and tree house lodge. • (i.a) The participatory 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
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>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, signed and launched on 21st June 2023.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through the participation in an online webinar on planning and implementing of the Restoration Opportunity Assessment Methodologies (ROAM), 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. 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

		<p>Area of land undergoing restoration (hectares).</p>	<p>In project implementation zone, restoration has not been implemented so far.</p> <p>Between the period of 1986 and 2014 the Mt Kulal Forest lost approximately 20% of its forest cover (Cuni Sanchez 2015).</p> <p>Mukogodo forest covers an area of 30,189 ha. According to Bussmann, 2009, the remaining forest area is much smaller, 2700 ha. Surrounding</p>	<p>FLR plans validated by third quarter of Y3</p>	<p>Direct restoration of 8,700 ha stratified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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) 5,600 ha of improved grasslands in Mukogodo landscape. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 102 Ha of land in Mukogodo Ecosystem(Shulaumai/Maiyanat/Ingwesi/lekuruki and leparua put under restoration through Vallerani system & semi-circular bunds and grass reseeding with 840 Kgs of seeds done.   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8Ha of land put under Agroforestry and 5 Ha put under grass reseeding in Mt Kulal using 1MT of grass seeds of African fox tail. 	<p>MS</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--	--	------------------

			<p>conservancies (rangelands) operated under NRT umbrella cover respectively :</p> <p>i) Lekurruki conservancy : 15,872 ha;</p> <p>ii) Il Ngwesi (9,470 ha),</p> <p>iii) Oldonyiro conservancy (52,500 ha), and iv) Leparua conservancy (34,200 ha) and the Makurian group ranch (5,390 ha) and Kuri Kuri group ranch (3,340 ha).</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To date 1165.04Ha of land has been put under direct restoration options as identified in the ROAM assessments below. • Through collaboration with Africa Nature Investors (ANI), Lion Landscapes and Borana conservancy, 64 Ha of land has been fenced using a modern fence in Maiyanat community land • 74 hectares of land in Oldonyiro conservancy rehabilitated through construction of terraces. • 25 hectares restored through digging and reseeded of 2050 micro catchment in Maiyanat and Shulumai community lands. • 12,630 indigenous trees planted covering an area of over 10 ha of the Mukogodo landscape. • 5 water infrastructures rehabilitated in Mukogodo landscape for improved water access that is benefiting 15,650 people. • Local ROAM was carried out in Mt Kulal and Mukogodo 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
--	--	--	---	--	--	---

						<p>mapping key stakeholders to implement the FLR options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 130,978 ha of land in Mt Kulal landscape has been identified as having potential for restoration. The potential per option are: Rehabilitation of degraded natural forests (46,687 ha); Agroforestry on Cropland (612.5 ha); Tree-based Buffer Zones along roads (1,257.06 ha); Tree-based Buffer Zones along Water Bodies and Wetlands (798.4 ha); and Rangeland’s restoration (81,623 ha). • In Mukogodo Ecosystem, 311,496 ha of land has potential for restoration. Restoration opportunities potential per option are as follows: Rehabilitation of degraded natural forests (23,406 ha); Agroforestry on Cropland (468 ha); Tree-based Buffer Zones along roads (5,453 ha); Tree-based Buffer Zones along Water Bodies and Wetlands (1,167 ha); afforestation and reforestation of natural forests (2,507 ha), and Rangeland’s restoration (278,824 ha). • In Il Ngwesi and Lekuruki conservancies, micro catchment/semi-circular bands (soil and water conservation structures that seek to return vegetation and grass cover in their landscapes) have been 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>constructed in 45.6 ha of land and grass grown in them. This is expected to help in reducing surface water runoff and increased the chances of vegetation growth, This activity has resulted in enhanced cohesion between the neighbouring communities and is expected to lead to mutual restriction of grazing in the worked area (Social fencing) for one to two years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 730 ha in Oldonyiro conservancy are under rehabilitation through clearing of 60ha of invasive species (<i>Acacia reficiens</i>), and gully healing, construction of land terraces in 70 ha, construction of V-pans and semi-circular bands in 600 ha and reseeded in all the 730 ha of bare land with appropriate grass seeds  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 831 community members have been trained (411M and 420F) through exchange visits on the micro catchment technology and 4,000kg of African foxtail grass 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>(<i>Cenchrus Ciliaris</i>), Bush rye grass (<i>Enteropogon macrostachyus</i>) and Masai love grass (<i>Eragrostis Superba</i>) for reseeding of bare lands and micro catchments purchased and delivered to project sites for planting at the appropriate time upon on-set of the rains. The community will be expected to secure their own grass seeds from the planted ones for future planting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-led forest and landscape restoration are underway within Mukogodo forest and surrounding landscapes through Ilmamusi CFA endeavoring to planting over 10,000 trees in Mukogodo forest while establishing micro catchment soil and water conservation structures in 15 Ha of Shulumai and 10 Ha of Maiyanat community lands. • 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 equipment procured and distributed to the project sites. 6 nursery sites in Mukogodo ecosystem and 2 in Mt Kulal have been completed and will 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>be fully operational this year with supply/rehabilitation of water supply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Capacity building of the local communities on protection of degraded sites to promote natural regeneration and replanting has been initiated. A total of 7.8 Ha (3.6 ha in 2021 and 4.2 Ha in 2022) in the Mukogodo Ecosystem has also been planted with assorted indigenous trees. 	
		Number of ha directly contributing to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use	All project sites have the potential to contribute to biodiversity conservation	75% of the draft management plans for the project sites (cf above) include biodiversity	152,661 ha (100% of the management plans for the project sites (cf above) include biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mukogodo PFMP developed to put over 30,189 ha under sustainable use contributing to biodiversity conservation A total of 112,042ha in Leparua, Iingwesi, Lekuruki and Oldonyiro conservancies in Laikipia/Isiolo counties are under improved land management and biodiversity. Through soil analysis and biodiversity assessments done by Northern Kenya Rangelands Carbon Project, the amount of stored carbon 	HS

						<p>has been verified and the communities benefited from carbon credits to a tune of KES 36.3 Million per conservancy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mt Kulal Participatory Forest Management Plan (PFMP) envisions biodiversity conservation and wildlife habitat management in the forested rangeland area of 51,436 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. • Valuation of ecosystem services to support forest and landscape restoration in terms of financing, decision making and implementation of FLR in the two ecosystems has been carried out. A consultant was engaged by TRI project to carry out Total Economic Valuation (TEV) for Mukogodo ecosystem while the Kenya Water Towers Agency (KWTA) engaged a consultant to undertake TEV in Mt Kulal ecosystem with in collaboration with TRI project. Total Economic Valuation of the two ecosystems has provided useful 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>information on regulating, provisioning, supporting and cultural values of the two forests.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The carbon data obtained shall be used to determine carbon sequestration potential of the ecosystems 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 Value (TEV) of Mt Kulal Ecosystem 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. • 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 Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs) and their
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						<p>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 of these NTFPs has been compiled. 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>) var <i>kerensis</i>, <i>Commiphora holtziana</i> and <i>Boswellia neglecta</i>. Honey samples from the three counties were also collected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 within and around the NTFPs has been produced. The observations that Gum arabic was dominant in Isiolo County, and <i>Aloe secundiflora</i> and medicinal plants in Marsabit and have high potential as bio enterprises will lead to their
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						conservation/protection hence improved biodiversity.	
		Number of people directly benefiting from project activities (including capacity building events and trainings) (m/f)	0	4060 HH	circa 8120 HH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity of 8,182 Households/ 40,913 beneficiaries (21,766M, 19,147F) has been strengthened in various project activities. 	S
	Outcome 3: Strengthened institutional capacities and financing arrangements are in place and facilitate large scale restoration	Number of capacity building events and number of m/f attending	0	2 events, 25 people trained, 13 male, 12 female	4 events, 50 people trained (25 male, 25 female)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four TRI Global events held in Kenya(2) , South Korea and Rome Training of 2M staff on SEPAL. Training of 1M, 1F staff from TRI(FAO and KEFRI) on The EX-Ante Carbon-balance Tool (EX-ACT) 	S

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XV World Forestry Congress in Seoul, Korea(2M,2F) • 16 Youth (11M, 6F) supported to participate in the first National Kenya Youth Conference held in Nairobi • Capacity building on tools for restoration monitoring workshop25(15M,10F) • Training on restoration Barometer and National stock take of forest and landscape restoration initiatives18(11M,7F) • Local ROAM training 30(18M,12F) • The capacity of National, County and Community resource persons on planning, implementation, and monitoring of FLR activities built (18 M and 5 F). • 1 ROAM training conducted by BBC International Consultants (12 M, 6F) • 2 Biophysical data collection/Mapathon training (13 M and 5 F) 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

		Evidence of increased capacities of community land management committees	30% Ave. Institutional capacity assessment	Increased capacity level evidenced through scorecards	Increased capacity level evidenced through scorecards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILMAMUSI CFA has been registered with NACOFA (National Alliance for community forest associations and has signed Forest management agreement with the Kenya Forest service and launched its management plan. • Mt Kulal CFA has received a certificate of registration from the Registrar of Societies, Kenya and will be launching its management plan in June 2023. • Ilmamusi CFA, Narupa and Leparua conservancies have all been directly supported by TRI project through letters of agreement with FAO an indication of their strong fiduciary arrangements. • Kurikuri and Makurian group ranches have transited from group ranches to community lands (Shulumai and Maiyanat) under the Land Act 2016 and joined the Northern Rangeland Trust structures of conservation • The TRI project has significantly contributed to the sustainable management of Leparua, Ilngwesi and Oldonyiro conservancies through institutional capacity building and development of management plans and this among other interventions by partners has 	S
--	--	--	--	---	---	--	---

						<p>contributed to their access to carbon credits from NRT carbon project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building of Dupoto Beekeepers Cooperative Society has resulted in increased honey and bee products marketing and the development of a business plan. • Leaders from Lekuruki and Iingwesi communities have been supported to Kuku Ranch in Kajiado County for a rangeland exposure trip and developed skills and acquired knowledge on how to restore degraded lands, exposed on governance mechanisms for successful rehabilitation and helped to understand the techniques of holistic grazing management planning. • The capacity of Ngare Ndare WRUA built through development of their Sub Catchment Management Plan (SCMP), review of their constitution, development of a Memorandum of Understanding between the WRUA and Water Resources Authority (WRA) and creating awareness to the public through radio talk shows on the WRUA framework • Three Water resource users' associations in Mukogodo Ecosystem (WRUAs) trained in management i.e Kudoti, Ngare 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Ndare and Loisukut to facilitate access to the Water Sector Trust Fund (WSTF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Indigenous community living in Mukogodo landscape, the Yaaku is well represented in that the secretary to the Ilmamusu 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. • Through the collaboration of TRI and the FAO Kenya Land Governance Programme, 4 Community land management committees(in IIngwesi, Maiyat (Makurian); Kurikuri(Shulumai) and Lekurrukki Conservancies), 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. 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Iingwesi 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. Makurian Conservancy has also had their community Land registered as Maiyanat Community Land. The process of getting titles for the other conservancies in the Mukogodo and the Mt Kulal Ecosystems as community lands are in the process. • Mukugodo ILMAMUSI Community Forest Association (CFA) was mobilized, and their institutional capacity enhanced through training 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 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of the conservancy structures for Maiyat (Makurian); Kurikuri(Shulumai) 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 (Maiyat) with a land management committee whose capacity on leadership and management has been developed through training and exposure visits to more advanced conservancies of Namunyak and Kalama as well as Reteti elephant sanctuary and tree house lodge. • 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. The two CFAs scored 26% and 33% respectively on the capacity scorecard for 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) has been built through training on group dynamics, leadership, finance 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>management, conflict management and records keeping. The participants were taken through the stages of group formation and constitution making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three Water resource users' associations in Mukogodo Ecosystem (WRUAs) have been trained in management i.e Kudoti, Ngare Ndare and Loisukut to facilitate access to the Water Sector Trust Fund (WSTF) 	
		<p>Number of cross-sectoral government-led coordination mechanisms and/or frameworks incorporating and supporting restoration established/s trengthened 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 Forest and Landscape Restoration Implementation Plan in place with a National FLR advisory committee and a National Steering Committee. <p>FOLAREP coordination structure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The National FLR Advisory committee ✓ National FLR steering committee ✓ County Environmental committees ✓ National FLR technical committee ✓ National Restoration monitoring technical working group ✓ Ward development committees at the landscape/County level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Tree Growing Programme has been put in place by the Ministry of 	<p>S</p>

						<p>Environment, Climate Change and Forestry and FAO is one the committee members. This programme has a joint resource mobilization strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TRI is supporting the establishment of the Environment Sector Intergovernmental Framework for the Kenyan Government for facilitating effective, efficient, impactful, and sustainable processes of consultations and cooperation between the national government and counties. The framework will respond to the tenets of the Intergovernmental Relations Act (IRA) 2012 which sets out the guiding principles for good intergovernmental collaboration. <p>The technical team on FLR in collaboration with CIFOR-ICRAF, World Vision International coordinated 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 held in June 2021. The webinars were 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 2022-2026 has also been</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>showcased as an avenue for collective monitoring and reporting of FLR in the country throughout in these fora.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bonn challenge Barometer champions under the leadership of the ministry of Environment and Kenya forest service is a dedicated group consolidating the gains made by the country in achieving the targets of the Bonn challenge • Technical working group in place to develop a strategy for sustainable commercialization of Non-Timber Forest Products. The strategy has structures almost similar to FOLAREP • A restoration monitoring technical working group (Project M&E is part of) has been established and mandated by the Principal Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forestry to oversee the design and implementation of a monitoring framework that will guide the country in tracking and reporting her commitments of restoring 5.1M Ha under the AFR100/ Bonn challenge. 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The capacity of 3 County Environment Committees for Isiolo, Laikipia and Marsabit have been built and their knowledge of their mandate under the Environmental Management and Coordination Act (Amended) 2015 enhanced and their capacity to identify environmental/restoration issues and effectively address to promote environmental conservation and management at the county level increased. 	
		Number of investment tools developed/improved to support FLR initiatives (i.e. bankable projects, credit lines to bio-enterprises, functional FMCTF)	A Forest Conservation and Management Trust Fund (FCMTF) is being established but is not operational yet		At least 3 investment tools are developed or improved (i.e., bankable projects, credit lines to bio-enterprises, functional FMCTF, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total of 17 Bankable projects as below: 2 Bankable projects - under UNEP Led Restoration factory a partnership between FAO, UNEP, Billion for Bridges (B4B) and Partnerships for Forests(P4F) has supported two Entrepreneurship Support Organizations (Entrepreneurship for Impact(E4I) and Mt. Kenya Hub) to identify entrepreneurs and other Ecopreneurs to undergo a seven-month incubation period to upscale their Restoration related businesses and investments within the country. 3 proposals have been developed and are to be submitted to The TERRAFUND AFR100: “Restoration and protection of Mt Kulal Biosphere Reserve Core Zone 	S

						<p>’ ’ by NMK and Kulal CFA; “ Growing trees in Mukogodo Forest and riparian areas within Laikipia landscape using multiple ecosystem management methods” -LWF and ILMAMUSI CFA - “Restoration and Conservation of Gums and Resins Production Landscapes in Isiolo, Samburu and Marsabit Counties, Kenya” by GARA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The identified Bio-entrepreneurs have been trained to enhance their capacity on enterprise/business identification and development. This was through training on storage and safety mechanisms for NTFPs, analyzing business compliance needs and linkage with markets. • 2 bankable projects - organizations, Horizon Ventures working in production and marketing of Essential Oils and Nailepo Beekeepers in Honey Value chains trained through TRI's Restoration Factory to develop bankable business cases. 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 County Environmental Action Plans (CEAPs) for Isiolo, Laikipia and Marsabit Counties – Supported in collaboration with WVI, it is expected that the FLR activities entrenched in the CEAPs will be included in the upcoming county integrated development plans (CIDPs) hence ensuring County governments allocate annual budget to support restoration activities for sustainability beyond the project period. • 1 Bankable project under Dupoto cooperative society in Mukogodo landscape has been supported and is now bankable project armed with a business plan and well equipped in Apiary and colony management, hive products marketing, quality honey production, seasonal management of bees, group dynamics, leadership, and governance. • 1 Sub Catchment Management Plan for Ngare Ndare Water resource users association (WRUA) has been initiated to conform to the 2010 Kenyan Constitution and the 2016 Water Act (which guides development of water conservation activities within the sub catchment and qualifies the WRUA to fund-raise 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>from Water Sector Trust Fund and other donors on water projects).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 bankable projects under Ilmamusu CFA, Narupa and Leparua (in process) community conservancies have been able to secure direct funding from FAO to undertake various restoration initiatives and not as has been the norm where reaching the communities was through agreements with larger NGOs working in the area. • 4 bankable proposals funded- The four conservancies surrounding Mukogodo forest that the project has supported in developing management/grazing plans have secured an average of KES 36 million shillings as carbon credits. • 1 bankable project under Ramati youth group in Oldonyiro as a bankable project trained by the TRI project on honey production, marketing and processing of honey has secured support of 50 beehives from the Kenya Climate innovation centre (KCIC). The all youth group of 26 members(17M,9F) has 2 women in leadership positions as vice chairlady and treasurer. • 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 was tested through the bridge for billions (B4B) initiative to enhance access to finance by local beneficiaries to support FLR activities	
		Value of resources (public, private, development partners) flowing into restoration				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total of funds reported by government and partners working in the area= USD 48,907,002 as below. • Collaboration with CIFOR-ICRAF in UK-PACT supported project on “ Delivering nature-based solution outcomes through strengthened policy implementation, institutional capacity, and enhanced monitoring and reporting of forest and landscape restoration in Kenya” - GBP 147.005,08 • Leparua, IIngwesi, Lekuruki and Oldonyiro conservancies in Laikipia/Isiolo counties have benefitted from carbon credits averaging KES 36.3 million per conservancy. • The new FAO Digital Lands Governance Program (Governance and Management program of conservancies) will cover all counties in the country hence the 3 project counties will be covered approximately Eur 1,330,777.34 	MS

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USD 38 Million project Towards Ending Drought Emergencies (TWEDE) is covering 11 counties Isiolo and Marsabit among them. • GEF small grants programmes operating in Isiolo and Marsabit among others supported small grants projects in the areas of Biodiversity, Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation, Land Degradation and Sustainable Forest Management. • Kenya Climate innovation centre (KCIC) offers incubation, capacity building and financing options to new, small, and medium business ventures and Kenyan entrepreneurs that are developing innovations to address the challenges of climate change. Ratati Youth group in Oldonyiro has been a beneficiary. • County environmental committee (CEC) meetings held to identify and quantify the resources flowing into restoration at the county level. • KFS and the ministry of environment through the National Tree Planting Campaigns Project has injected KES 170 Million. 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to the attainment of vision 2030 through devolved land reforms in community lands of Kenya EUR 10,441,000 • IMARA (USD 9,405,354) operated in Isiolo, Laikipia Samburu and Marsabit in livelihoods and improved natural resource management and use in the ASALS • Regional Pastoral Livelihood Resilience Project(RPLRP) in 14 counties Isiolo,Laikipia and Marsabit among them <p><i>Source: National Stock take for FLR projects in Kenya(National TWG)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support required from PSC to get information on this indicator • 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</p> <p>Info Hub for KM on FLR fully operative under DF and providing information to stakeholders Y3-Y5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A technical working group earlier formed from various sectors has met and developed user needs and system requirements as well as TORs for the service provider. This is under the current LOA with KEFRI. To ensure the system will be maximumly available the National FLR KM System committee will seek to have a back-up with ICT Authority • Through training and exchange learning of available monitoring tools amongst FLR partners, various tools were showcased with the KEFRI knowledge base as one of them. • The capacity of stakeholders has been built on using various M&E tools including the KEFRIApp (is a mobile app that seeks to establish a species site matching guide for sustainable tree growing in the country to promote resilient tree growing for enhanced livelihoods and climate change mitigation). More training on this to continue to ensure that the App is in use in the project sites. • Further information on the various tools showcased can be found here • KEFRI has held preliminary consultations with various stakeholders to understand the 	<p>MS</p>
--	---	--	---	---	---	--	------------------

						<p>status of FLR Knowledge Management in the country.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	
		<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>GEF Retreat in Nairobi Kenya May 2023</p> <p>The meeting aims at articulating a comprehensive and inclusive RAF action plan aligned with the FAO-GEF Strategy. With a goal of ensuring clarity about roles and responsibilities to ensure effective and smooth management and execution of the GEF Portfolio in Africa</p> <p>Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool v.9.4 training undertaken in Nairobi Kenya in May 2023 bringing together implementers from the restoration initiative (TRI) and The Alliance for Restoration of Forest Landscapes and Ecosystems in Africa (AREECA)</p>	<p>HS</p>

						<p>The fourth TRI Global Knowledge Sharing meeting was held from the 14-18 November 2022 in Nairobi which was attended by 10 people under this project (6 M and 4 F), from FAO Kenya (4M, 1 F), KEFRI (2 M, 1F) ,and community representatives (2F)</p> <p>Kenya National Landscape Restoration Scaling Conference 2022</p> <p>XV World Forestry Congress in Seoul Korea 2nd to 6th May 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 FAO staff, one county government of Marsabit staff and one Kenya forest service staff (2M,2F) participated and made presentations during the congress. <p>3 Day - TRI Knowledge Sharing Webinar Series</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Held on 9th, 16th and 23rd of February 2022 to support knowledge sharing, partnership and exchange of best practices among TRI project teams <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 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>general, FLR approaches and strategies in particular and networked with many other implementers from other countries</p> <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"> • Some key examples of FLR related webinars are, Scaling the Restoration Factory (P4F/UNEP/FAO/Bridge for Billions) TerraFund for AFR100: Financing Innovators That Restore Africa’s Landscapes, Global Initiatives in Science and Practice; Yale Forest Forum: FAO: DEEP DIVE Stakeholder mapping, GEF Virtual Webinar - 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>"Operationalization of GEF Projects" ; Global Pasture Watch: Mapping & Monitoring Global Grasslands and Livestock. FLR monitoring where FAO was a keynote speaker on an inclusive and effective M&E system, Farmer managed 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>	
		Number of TRI-Kenya knowledge products developed, disseminated and accessed through relevant knowledge platforms	0 knowledge products	5 knowledge products	10 knowledge products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAO project partners push for cohesion towards sustainable project implementation. • Community engagement key to attaining sustainable projects • Walk wild event , a 10 kilometer walk brought together over 395 friends of Mukogodo forest. • Walk Wild : Experience Laikipia’ s Hidden Gem 	S

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New approach to rangeland rehabilitation using microcatchments • TRI YiR 2022 Livelihood diversification: an option to enhance smallholder resilience in the face of climate change • Video production on sustainable management of Mukogodo forest landscape. • Grass reseeding. The journey towards land restoration • Policy influencing plan (PIP) poster developed and presented during the XV WFC in South Korea. • A paper: Towards the development of a strategy for sustainable commercialization of non-timber forest products in Kenya: A situational analysis was presented in the first ever commercial forestry conference and expo in Kenya and during the XV WFC in South Korea. • Sub Catchment Management Plan (SCMP) for Ngare Ndare Water resource users’ association. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gnlwfOTB1Ai8LvD3nvz4yY9bW22jRV0/view?usp=sharing • Free Prior and Informed consent (FPIC)- A report on the indigenous
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>people and forest dependent communities in Mt Kulal and Mukogodo landscapes of Kenya.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leparua community conservancy Management & community development plan 2021 – 2025 • Forest and landscape restoration opportunities assessment (ROAM) for Mt Kulal biosphere reserve • Forest and landscape restoration opportunities assessment (ROAM) for Mukogodo landscape. • Chemical characterization of non-timber forest products in Mt Kulal and Mukogodo ecosystems • Gender Based Value Chain Analysis of Non-Timber Forest Products and Services in Mt Kulal, Mukogodo Forest • Resource assessment and mapping of prioritized non-timber forest products with commercial potential in Mt Kulal and Mukogodo Ecosystems • Policy influencing plan for domestication of forest and landscape restoration in Kenya. • Total Economic Valuation of Mt Kulal ecosystem 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Characterization of ecosystem services in Mukogodo ecosystem • Mt Kulal Biosphere Reserve Forest Management Plan (KFMP) 2021 – 2025 • Ilingesi Community Conservancy Management and Community Development Plan (2021-2026) • Published three articles in FLRM Newsletter i.e. making satellite imagery in land use assessment more accessible, value chain analysis for ASAL products prioritizing NTFPS • Through its achievements, the TRI Kenya contributed to the annual year in review(YiR 2021) • 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. 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		Number of lessons learned on forest landscape restoration shared and accessed by stakeholders	0	5	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are normally challenges in realizing the co-finance commitments from various project partners, there is need to set realistic co-finance targets and more inclusion of private sector commitments and synergies • Co-finance from governments and NGOs are often in-kind and we need a tracking tool to capture actual funding • To help support the design of strategies and activities for influencing specific policy change, the TRI developed a Policy influencing plan (PIP) with a visual representation rather than having a long narrative report. This lesson was shared with participants in the XV WFC in South Korea • The policy/legal framework that governs Non timber forest products or commodities in Kenya is weak and the TRI project has done a paper: Towards the development of a strategy for sustainable commercialization of non-timber forest products in Kenya and shared its findings in the XV WFC in South Korea 	S
--	--	---	---	---	----	---	---

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are very many FLR monitoring tools that are currently in use in the country and there is no need to invest in new ones that will duplicate already existing ones. This was shared with FLR stakeholders in a training of data tools to understand the capacity needs for restoration monitoring at county and national levels • A free prior and informed consent (FPIC) was undertaken before activity implementation to assist the community in understanding, appreciating, and supporting the project efforts • 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) as an easy, free and accessible model of land use monitoring • Through Exchange meetings with FLR stakeholders, challenges of restoration monitoring are being addressed by formation of an FLR monitoring taskforce led by KFS and mandated by the cabinet secretary 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>ministry of environment and forestry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• County Environmental action plans (CEAP) developed for the 3 counties and shared with partners/county government in partner review and planning meetings.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings on Section 2

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalization of the Equitable Benefit Sharing regulations, (2016) Finalization of the Non-Timber Forest Products & Services Strategy, to enhance sustainable commercialization of NTFPS. 	KEFRI	October 2023
<p>Outcome 2: 152,661 ha are under improved land management (including 8,700 ha directly restored and 55,352 ha indirectly restored)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hold meetings with Project Managers of identified potential sources of co-financing/collaboration Accelerate Bio enterprise development the private sector 500 Ha put direct seeding-100ha, tree planting-100ha, natural regeneration-300ha and long rooted M-star-100ha 	PMU PMU KEFRI	October 2023
<p>Outcome 4: Improved FLR monitoring, reporting and knowledge dissemination at national level (including for the NCP)</p>	<p>Change the approach towards Knowledge sharing and management and support development of a specific module linked to the KEFRI knowledge base rather than developing a new national FLR Knowledge Management System</p>	KEFRI/PMU	October 2023


3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance in delivering outputs
<p>Outcome 1:</p> <p>The national and county level policy and regulatory frameworks are strengthened to support forest and landscape restoration in Kenya</p>	<p>Number of new or improved policies and regulatory frameworks* adopted that support forest and landscape restoration</p>	<p>Finalization of the Equitable Benefit Sharing regulations, (2016)</p> <p>Finalization of Non-Timber Forest Products & Services Strategy</p> <p>Validation and Launch of FOLAREP</p>	<p>The Forest (Incentives and Equitable Benefit Sharing) regulations (2016) reviewed through the leadership of KEFRI with the advise from legal experts from the MoECCF and Attorney General Chambers in consultation with the community represented by the National Alliance of Community Forest Associations (NACOFA).</p> <p>An improved draft strategy for sustainable commercialization of Non-Timber Forest Products and Services (NTFPs) in Kenya has been developed and reviewed by a Technical Working Group put in place by MoECCF and sent to MoECCF for endorsement for public participation. Four TWG meetings held.</p> <p>FOLAREP reviewed, edited, validated, and launch planned for.</p>	<p>Agreement with KEFRI delayed and was only signed in November 2022</p> <p>Derailed by change of guard at the helm of the ministry of Environment, CC and Forestry</p>
<p>Output 1.1 An FLR strategy is developed, including a roadmap and a monitoring framework to bridge the FLR gaps in the policy framework.</p>	<p>1 FLR strategy developed</p>	<p>Launch of M&E framework</p>	<p>Planning for launch together with FOLAREP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Partnership with UK PACT and TRI Tana project, 7(seven) Engagement and consultation fora covering all 47 counties were held between December 2021–March 2022. The engagements adopted a highly participatory approach, appreciating that each county’s efforts on FLR matters will collectively contribute to Kenya’s 	<p>Derailed by change of guard at the helm of the ministry of Environment, CC and Forestry</p>

2023 Project Implementation Report

			overarching goals and in a bid to ensure proper ownership at the decentralized levels. More information can be found in the trends analysis report .	
Output 1.2 Domestication of relevant international, national NRM policies is facilitated at the county and local levels, especially as it relates to FLR.	Recommendations made towards the amendment of existing laws at the county level to address any policy gap	Hold County Environmental committee meetings	Sensitization sessions for members of the Isiolo County assembly and cabinet members on the draft County Environmental Action Plan (CEAP) and County Climate Change Policy	CEC meetings planned for End of May 2023/Early June
Output 1.3: Policy framework for management and utilization of NTFPS is developed and adopted	NTFP strategy developed Natural resources access and benefits sharing regulations developed	1 NTFP strategy finalized 1 Access and sharing regulation finalized	The draft NTFPs strategy was presented and discussed by a Technical Working Group comprising of among others staff from the Ministry, KEFRI and FAO as it had stalled. A final draft sent to MoECCF for endorsement for public participation Regulations reviewed through the leadership of KEFRI with the advise from legal experts from the MoECCF and Attorney General Chambers	Agreement with KEFRI delayed and was only signed in November 2022
Outcome 2: 152,661 ha are under improved land management (including 8,700 ha directly restored and 55,352 ha indirectly restored)	Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas). Area of land undergoing restoration (hectares). # of people directly benefiting from project activities	152,661 ha 4000 Ha	193,931 Ha of currently landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity - Leparua(34200Ha),IIngwesi(9,470 ha),Kulal core(5700Ha) and buffer zones(46000Ha) Oldonyiro 52,500Ha, Lekuruki 15872Ha, Mukogodo PFMP(30,189Ha), 1,165.04 Ha under direct restoration through Enrichment planting- Mt.Kulal 7Ha, Mukogodo 3.6Ha, Kurikuri forest 4.41Ha, 12.63 Ha in Mukogodo forest and natural grass and shrub lands restored among others.	During the periods of drought, neighbouring communities that are not part of the management plans crossed over and grazed their livestock Slow process of LoA engagement especially with the new format

		10,868 households/ 51,080 people	8182 HH/ 40,913 people reached (21,766M 19,147 F)	
Output 2.1: Ecosystem services are assessed and characterized and land use and land cover changes in selected forests and rangelands are assessed	Assessment of the level of land degradation at county/site level undertaken Maps of local restoration opportunities for each restoration option produced	No assessment targeted		
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	Area of land restored using various restoration techniques.	300 Ha	102 Ha of land under restoration using Vallerani system as well as micro catchment (Earth smiles) and grass reseeding using 840 Kg of African fox tail, Maasai love grass and rye grass. 	Implementation is still ongoing The country was hit by a prolonged drought that hindered most restoration works
			Over 2,500 indigenous tree seedlings were planted in Mukogodo forest in Laikipia County, to conserve and protect the indigenous ecosystem that is the home of	

thousands of pastoral communities and wildlife within the greater Laikipia region during the Inaugural Walk Wild event. The 10-kilometer walk physically brought together 395 people from various walks of life within the country and beyond as well Mukogodo Forest community members and representatives from Mt Kulal and Kirisia forest ecosystems and 58,184 people were reached through [media](#)



FAO team plant a tree at during the Walk Wild event held in Mukogodo Forest on the 19th Nov. 2022

Rehabilitated 5 water projects, 3 boreholes and 2 water source intakes now reaching 15,650 persons in 3,130 households. Each of these water projects is now served by a community water committee responsible for operations and maintenance and trained on operations and maintenance by the water resources authority (WRA) and Mount Kenya-Ewaso Water Partnership (MKEWP).



Construction of micro-catchments to reduce surface runoff as well as act as a reservoir to capture water which increases the infiltration in the soil, increasing germination percentage of seeds already in the ground. Hence increased feed for livestock which is the main source of livelihood for communities in the larger Mukogodo ecosystem.



Grass seeds were procured, and the communities have used them to undertake reseeding activities in their ranches in Mukogodo and Oldonyiro. Grass seeds of


Eragrostis superba Peyr (Maasai love grass) species have been procured and delivered to Mt Kulal (1000Kgs) and Leparua conservancies(930Kgs).




Mukogodo Participatory Forest Management Plan (PFMP) covering 30,189 Ha launched and Forest Management Agreement between Ilmamusi CFA and the Kenya forest service (KFS) signed on 23rd May 2023.



12,130 trees (comprising of *Olea africana*, *Juniperus procera*, *Warbugia ugandensis*, *Moringa oleifera*, *Croton macrostachyus*, *Croton megalocarpus*, *Prunus africana* among others) planted by men, youth and women in Mukogodo forest, schools, dispensaries,

			<p>police lines and office compounds covering an area of over 12 ha of the landscape.</p> <p>Rangeland restoration through micro catchments has seen 42.5 ha of land restored through in Il Ngwesi and Lekurruki conservancies.</p> <p>Makurian and Kurikuri community lands through ILMAMUSI CFA have restored 35 ha through digging and reseeded of 2,050 micro catchment in Maiyanat and Shulumai community lands.</p>  <p>617 ha rehabilitated through construction of semi-circular bunds and reseeded using 3,000 kgs of grass seeds procured and delivered to Narupa conservancy.</p> <p>A total of 72 ha of land cleared of <i>Acacia reficiens</i> (an invasive species) in Oldonyiro conservancy and the same (74 ha) rehabilitated through construction of terraces and planting of grass</p>	
<p>Output 2.3: Knowledge base on NTFPS in the two targeted landscapes and their</p>	<p>NTFPS value chain assessed</p>	<p>No assessment targeted</p>		

<p>commercial potential is generated</p>				
<p>Output 2.4. Bio-enterprises products and services are promoted and commercialized</p>	<p>No and type of Bio enterprises promoted.</p>	<p>850 beehives and other equipment distributed</p>	<p>Community Beekeeping/User groups and Committees have been formed in the project sites. In Mukogodo Ecosystem, the groups have formed an umbrella organisation; Dupoto Cooperative to help enhance productivity and profitability in the honey value chain through aggregation processing and marketing. Honey processing equipment (beehives/centrifuges etc) procured and delivered to the groups in Leparua, Oldonyiro, Mukogodo(Dupoto) and Mt.Kulal.</p>  <p>32 eco-entrepreneurs (16 by Mt. Kenya Hub and 16 by E4Impact) incubated on value proposition, stakeholder mapping and analysis, business modelling and market mapping as well as impact and growth planning.</p> <p>The entrepreneurs were divided into four Sectors: High-Value Crops, Tree and Nursery, Waste and Water Management, and Beekeeping. The eco-enterprises</p>	<p>Long procurement processes</p>

			have been working together and through the support of ESOs have been pitching to market their items/products and create linkage for business expansion and growth.	
<p>Outcome 3 Strengthened institutional capacities and financing arrangements are in place and facilitate large scale restoration and maintenance of critical landscapes</p>	<p># of capacity building events and # of m/f attending</p> <p># of cross sectoral coordination mechanisms in place at the national level</p>	<p>4 events, 50 people trained</p> <p>1 National coordination mechanism in place</p>	<p>5 International and 8 National events 139 people trained(96M/43F)</p> <p>1 – Restoration monitoring technical working group under FOLAREP</p> <p>3 – County Environmental committees</p> <p>1 - National Non timber forest products Technical Working Group</p> <p>1 - National - Knowledge portal Technical Working Group</p> <p>1 –National Benefit sharing Technical Working Group</p> <p>1 Environment Sector Intergovernmental Framework for the Kenyan Government for facilitating effective, efficient, impactful, and sustainable processes of consultations and cooperation between the national government and counties initiated.</p>	Surpassed
<p>Output 3.1. Counties capacities in implementing FLR relevant policies are strengthened.</p>	Capacity built on FLR	County staff, Local NGOs and community groups trained on FLR	<p>The walk wild event” organized by the Ilmamusu CFA funded by the project, physically brought together over 395 stakeholders and the communities to sensitize on a collaborative approach towards forest and landscape</p>	Previously trained ToTs on FLR not undertaking trainings. The assumption was that the counties would cascade this to the wards and villages but counties are not facilitating

restoration. 58,184 people were reached through media.



National and county government, local partners and community review

and planning meeting bringing together 25 participants(19M,6F)

Kenya National Landscape Restoration Scaling Conference 2022 with the theme of consolidating the Kenyan restoration movement

in conjunction with CIFOR-ICRAF to discuss incentives and avenues for resource mobilization to support and scale restoration projects

National CEC Strengthening Workshop in conjunction with CIFOR-ICRAF (22 M, 18 F)

16 Youth (11M, 6F) supported to participate in the first National Kenya Youth Conference held in Nairobi

Inception workshop for a collaborative project between CIFOR-ICRAF and FAO TRI Project on "Delivering nature

			based solution outcomes through strengthened policy implementation, institutional capacity, and enhanced monitoring and reporting of forest and landscape restoration in Kenya, a two-year (2023- 2025) project in two counties i.e. Makueni County and Taita Taveta Counties-60 pax(40M, 20 F)	
Output 3.2. Community land management committees are set-up and working in targeted project sites	Capacity increase In community Land management committees	6 Conservancies surrounding Mukogodo landscape and 2 CFAS	<p>An exposure tour to Kuku Ranch in Kajiado County and training reached 238 (M, F) ? community members from Makurian, Kurikuri, Il Ngwesi and Lekurruki, with support from Northern Rangelands Trust, Laikipia Wildlife Forum, Ol Pejeta, Borana conservancy, Africa Nature Investors (ANI) and Ole Naishu Conservancy.</p> <p>Exchange Visit by Leparua conservancy to Ilngwesi Conservancy by Village based Committee.</p> <p>Gender-sensitive training of 10 ILMAMUSI CFA staff and Management committee</p> <p>5 water project site committees are working under the 5 rehabilitated water infrastructures in Mukogodo ecosystem.</p> <p>Mt Kulal CFA has received a certificate of registration from the registrar of societies, Kenya in September 2022 and are now legally mandated to undertake the restoration and protection activities in Mt Kulal and its rangelands.</p> <p>Leparua and Narupa conservancy management committees operational and able to attract funding from FAO and NRT and other partners.</p> <p>4 Conservancy management committees are active and managing KES 34 million each. These are Oldonyiro, Leparua, Ilngwesi and Lekurukki.</p> <p>Three other groups of council of elders (Wazee wa Mazingira) have also been recognised as legal entities</p>	LoA with Leparua and KEFRI ongoing and further capacity building expected to the CFAs and community groups

			<p>through registration with the Department of Social Services as community-based organizations (CBOs), thus making it easy to work with development partners and accessing FAO funds through LOAs. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Olturot Wazee wa mazingira ○ Larachi Wazee wa mazingira ○ Ngororoi Wazee wa mazingira 	
<p>Output 3.3. Restoration initiatives are coordinated at the national level</p>	<p>National restoration coordination mechanism established</p>	<p>National /County restoration coordination mechanism</p>	<p>Bonn challenge Barometer champions under the leadership of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry and Kenya Forest Service through FAO LOA, has formed a dedicated group consolidating the gains made by the country in achieving the targets of the Bonn challenge.</p> <p>3 CECs formed and operational in Isiolo, Laikipia and Marsbit</p> <p>Sensitization sessions for members of the Isiolo County assembly and cabinet members on the draft County Environmental Action Plan (CEAP) and County Climate Change Policy</p>	<p>Transfer of key persons within the implementing partners.</p> <p>Change in government leadership</p>
<p>Outcome 4: Improved FLR monitoring, reporting and knowledge dissemination at national level and Project implementation based on result-based management.</p>	<p># of operational FLR information systems established</p> <p># of Participation in TRI Annual Knowledge Sharing events</p> <p># of TRI-Kenya knowledge products developed, disseminated</p>	<p>1 national FLR Knowledge Management System</p> <p>Participation in 8 events</p> <p>10 Knowledge products</p> <p>10 lessons learnt</p>	<p>User needs and system requirements for the knowledge portal have been developed and a consultant being hired to develop the system and train end users.</p> <p>TRI staff and partners participated in 13 knowledge sharing events.</p> <p>24 Knowledge products developed and disseminated.</p>	

2023 Project Implementation Report

	# of lessons learned on forest landscape restoration		9 Lessons learnt documented and shared	
Output 4.1. A national FLR Knowledge Management System is developed and implemented	Broadcast/Video on the results of the project prepared	1 Broadcast on FLR	1 broadcast undertaken during the Walk wild event	Long procurement process derailed signing of the LOA with KEFRI to deliver on this output
Output 4.2. Knowledge shared and received within Kenya and outside	Knowledge products with stakeholders from other countries shared	1 PSC meeting 4 Quarterly briefs 1 YiR 1 TRI global event	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fourth TRI Global Knowledge Sharing meeting was held from the 14-18 November 2022 Kenya National Landscape Restoration Scaling Conference 2022 with the theme of consolidating the Kenyan restoration movement was held in November 2022 in conjunction with CIFOR-ICRAF Trained by FAO colleagues from HQ on tools for Restoration monitoring and planning workshop specifically SEPAL under the IMPRESS project Quarterly FAO briefs on the project prepared and shared Contributed to 2023 YiR Updates on GEF 6 shared during FAO-Kenya NRM sub-program end of year progress review workshop Achievements and lessons learnt on GEF 6 presented in various meetings including Kenya National Landscape Restoration Scaling Conference 2022, Regreening Africa Meetings among others A publication on Total Carbon Stock and Potential Carbon Sequestration Economic Value of Mukogodo Forest-Landscape Ecosystem in Drylands of Northern Kenya produced by Nereoh, 	PSC meeting to be held in June/July 2023

			<p>Leley et al 2022. Open Journal of Forestry, 2022, 12, *-* https://www.scirp.org/journal/ojf ISSN Online: 2163-0437 ISSN Print: 2163-0429</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An abstract “Charcoal Value Chain Analysis in Mt Kulal Biosphere and Mukogodo Landscapes in Northern Kenya” accepted for presentation during IUFRO 2024 meeting. • An abstract “Towards the development of a national strategy and action plan for sustainable commercialization of non-timber forest products in Kenya” accepted for presentation during IUFRO 2024 meeting • An abstract on FOLAREP accepted for presentation in the SER2023 conference program <p><u>Webinars and training</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FERM platform (Framework for Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring) • Scaling the Restoration Factory (P4F/UNEP/FAO/Bridge for Billions) • TerraFund for AFR100: Financing Innovators That Restore Africa’s Landscapes, • Global Initiatives in Science and Practice; Yale Forest Forum: • FAO: DEEP DIVE Stakeholder mapping • GEF Virtual Webinar - "Operationalization of GEF Projects" ; • Global Pasture Watch: Mapping & Monitoring Global Grasslands and Livestock 	
--	--	--	---	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology and Innovation for Restoration Monitoring Workshop • 1 Regional Retreat attended by National, Sub-Regional, RAF and HQ GEF Focal points and some National GEF project coordinators in Nairobi and attended by 31 (22M, 9F) participants. There were 4 participants from Kenya (3 M and 1 F). Participants were trained on a number issues relating to GEF and a draft RAF GEF Action Plan was produced. 	
<p>Output 4.3: Project monitoring system providing systematic information on progress in meeting project outcomes and output targets implemented</p>	<p>Results-based project monitoring system in place as well as monitoring of FPIC and community consultation processes</p>	<p>Undertake Knowledge Attitudes and practices survey.</p> <p>Update Geospatial project information into the FERM registry.</p> <p>Partners review and planning meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KAP Survey undertaken as per MTR recommendation in the two landscapes. • Performance Indicator tracking sheets continuously in use to track achievements/milestones. • Continuous Geospatial data collection for restoration points within the landscapes for reporting in the FERM platform. • 1 review and planning and knowledge sharing meetings with partners and other GEF/FFF projects held • 1 PPR/ 1 PIR developed • 2 Quarterly briefs to FAO newsletter 	<p>Acquiring Data on Co-finance from partners remains a challenge as they are not willing to disclose finances.</p>

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)

The Food and Agriculture Organization in collaboration with the Kenya Forestry Research Institute and other partners have been implementing a project supported by the Global Environment Facility in Mount Kulal Biosphere Reserve (Marsabit County) and Mukugodo forest landscape (Laikipia County), in Kenya since 2018. These two landscapes are in dry parts of the country and vulnerable to degradation and climate change. The project has adopted an integrated approach to address deforestation, land degradation and biodiversity loss, targeting policy and institutional capacity while supporting community-led forest and landscape restoration (FLR) and the development of alternative sources of livelihoods. The national and county level policy and regulatory frameworks have been strengthened to support forest and landscape restoration in the two counties and country at large. Forest and landscape restoration implementation plan (FOLAREP) developed, Non-timber forest products strategy drafted, The Forest (Incentives and Equitable Benefit Sharing) regulations (2016) have been reviewed and County Environment Action Plans prepared. A framework for monitoring, reporting and learning on forest and landscape restoration has also been developed. Participatory Forest Management Plans and Forest Management Agreements for the two forests have been developed and launched. Kulal CFA has been registered. The total economic valuation for the two ecosystems has been carried out and estimated at US\$ 85million /year for Mukogodo and US\$ 187.97 million/year for Mt Kulal. A total of 1165 ha and 193,931 ha have been directly and indirectly restored, respectively, using various options identified during ROAM assessment. Gums and resins, aloe, honey and ecotourism have been identified as key bio-enterprises with great potential for development and income generation. 40,913 beneficiaries (21,766M, 19,147F) from 8,182 households had their capacity strengthened in FLR and bio-enterprise development. The project has developed 17 bankable projects, 25 knowledge products and initiated the development of a knowledge management portal for sharing the generated information. Several synergies and complementarities with strategic partners have been established and valuable co-financing realized. Some of the key lessons learnt include: sensitization of local communities on protection of worked sites for sustained results; prioritization of land tenure in ASALS; long and extended dry spells and pandemics (COVID-19, Desert Locust) may affect results; development of bio-enterprises as low ly-ing fruits for FLR is critical; public-private sector partnership in bio enterprise development is crucial; knowledge products to be uploaded to the Knowledge Management portal; synergies and complementarities critical for greater impact and that domestication of FOLAREP in counties is urgent.

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.

	FY2023 Development Objective rating¹²	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹³	Comments/reasons¹⁴ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<i>Most of the major global environmental objectives being addressed by the project have been met and the expected benefits are still on course. Implementation of components 1, 3 and 4 are in compliance with the original plan despite the COVID-19 Pandemic and other internal challenges. There has been very good progress in component 2 especially on areas under improved management and a relative increase in the area directly restored. However, the project is yet to meet the restoration target revised following the MTR due to the extended dry spells. Remedial measures are in place to meet the target by NTE.</i>
Budget Holder	S	S	<i>Project implementation on course despite the delays caused by COVID-19 and the effects of the long and extended dry spells in the project sites. The implementation of the valuable recommendations and the strategic remedial measures provided by the Mid-Term Review are on course. This together with the no-cost extension provided are expected to help in making up for the lost time and realization of the expected targets.</i>
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁵	S	S	<i>Satisfactory. The project is aligned to the national development priorities as articulated in the Bottom-up Economic Transformation Agenda (BETA) and consistent with the Ministry of Environment Climate Change and Forestry's focus areas. The project should, however,</i>

¹² **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹³ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁴ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

¹⁵ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

			<i>enhance its support for a better governance of the environment sector, an enabler for all the other deliverables</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁶	S	S	<p><i>Taking into account the recommendations from the Mid-Term Review, the project has emphasized the implementation of actions on the ground in collaboration with local partners. Several options of restoration have been carried out (such as reforestation, enrichment planting, reseeding of grass and shrub lands through micro-catchments). Great efforts were made to include all stakeholder groups and raise awareness of the importance of Mukogodo Forest Ecosystem: a Walk Wild event was attended by 395 people and over 58 000 people were reached through media. Due to the ongoing drought crisis, the rehabilitation of 5 water projects has a huge impact on the lives of over 15 000 persons in the project site.</i></p> <p><i>In collaboration with UNEP and Bridge for Billions, 32 eco-entrepreneurs attended the Restoration Factory and with local support of Mt Kenya Hub and E4Impact they were trained on business plan development and pitching. One successful Cooperative (Dupoto) has been formed and is successfully building the honey value chain in the project area.</i></p> <p><i>In terms of partnership the project has successfully collaborated with CIFOR-ICRAF and UK PACT programme to engage and consult all 47 counties on the national FOLAREP strategy. At county level, the project is also continuously supporting the County Environment Committees to integrate FLR into their action plans. The project has made good progress in achieving its anticipated results but needs to fully document and disseminate good practices during the last year and ensure the implementation support of livelihoods and bio-enterprises for sustainable results to be achieved.</i></p>
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	S	S	<i>In the reporting period, the project has delivered satisfactorily on the annual workplan and is on track to achieve expected results. To the extent possible, the project should document the mitigation role played by water management interventions on the impact of recent droughts. In the coming reporting period, the sustainability of key interventions should be discussed with key partners, and handover (e.g. Vallerani system) / exit strategies be considered.</i>

¹⁶ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

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

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
	Engage all landscape stakeholders to develop participatory forest management plans for Mukogodo and Mt Kulal and management plans for surrounding community conservancies. Direct and indirect restoration initiatives such as indigenous tree planting and grass reseeding	Mukogodo PFMP signed and launched Mt Kulal management plan validated by KFS and waiting for common date for launch. Oldonyiro conservancy management plan at validation stage Shulumai and Maiyanat community groups joined NRT	Implementation of the plan Date set for end of June 2023 Enrichment planting in Mukogodo and Mt Kulal forests Continue with Assisted natural	KFS/PMU/Ilmamusu CFA PMU

		conservation structures.	regeneration in the rangelands	KFS/PMU
		Tree planting/Agroforestry and reseeded		Conservancies/KEFRI
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)	Community interaction before undertaking any project and following their laid out requirements as	Step 5 and 6 of the FPIC process	PMU

		stipulated in Step 3 and 4 of the FPIC process previously done		
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				
Drought and other natural disasters	Water conservation/Protection Seed banks	Training committee members of 5 rehabilitated water infrastructures Inclusion of seed bank technology in LOAs	Rehabilitate water infrastructures in Mt Kulal Implement the seedbanks	PMU/Partners

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate:

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification
Moderate	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁷ . If not, what is the new classification and explain. Moderate. The risk classification is still valid. As much as new risks have emerged such as drought, it does not affect all 4 components of the project apart from component 2 on restoration and the project area has received rainfall but still vulnerable to drought

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.

¹⁷ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 <https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf>)

6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ¹⁸	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
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.	Moderate to substantial	Y	The project will monitor early warnings for drought and adapt their activities to ensure the building blocks of the project are consolidated and may resist the occurrence of a drought.	Rainfall/Weather situation continues to be monitored. Rehabilitation of 5 water infrastructures (2 Springs and 3 boreholes). Capacity building of Water resource users' association (WRUA) to qualify them to fundraise from Water Sector Trust Fund and other donors	Budget revision to include rehabilitation of more water projects especially in all 8 tree nurseries

¹⁸ Risk ratings means a rating of the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ¹⁸	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Political instability may hinder or interrupt support from the public sector for FLR	Moderate	Y	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 Local leaders involved in FPIC	Awareness raising to continue with the new leaders after the general elections in August
3	Political-institutional risk: Divergent priorities of projects partners and stakeholders with regards to FLR and alternative livelihoods	Low	Y	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. Consultations ongoing in project partners review and planning meetings	Quarterly review and planning meetings used as a tool to check on partner divergent views Good collaboration shown by partners in consulting counties under FOLAREP review

	Type of risk	Risk rating ¹⁸	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	Social risks: Reluctance to participate in the project activities by communities	moderate	Y	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 FPIC step 3 and 4 undertaken	The project has embraced continuous awareness and capacity development of community leaders/opinion leaders
	Community conflicts from Migration of livestock in search of pasture	High	N	This has occurred due to the drought conditions facing the ASAL areas	Water infrastructures are being rehabilitated to support water provision	
5	Project management risks such as delays, overspending, lack of coordination	Moderate	Y	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 Quarterly planning of travel and procurement needs	Quarterly planning of travel and procurement needs is mandatory for all units

	Type of risk	Risk rating ¹⁸	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
6	Ecological risks posed by the implementation of environment restoration activities and water management activities	Moderate	Y	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 have been maintained Laikipia forum has also been key in advising when to undertake certain activities based on their experience in rangeland management	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ¹⁸	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
7	<p>COVID-19 Pandemic 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</p>	Moderate	N	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	<p>Project staff teleworking from home. There is enhanced use of ICT for online meetings and Webinars.</p> <p>Maintaining strict adherence to the Covid-19 regulations to enable some Field activities to take place.</p> <p>Reviews of LOAs for a no cost extension to allow partners to finalize on their activities.</p> <p>Activities that could proceed were allowed to if ministry of health protocols were observed</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Covid-19 pandemic slowed down most project activities that required public gatherings</p> <p>Online meetings and teleworking options have been embraced by FAO</p>

	Type of risk	Risk rating ¹⁸	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
8	Forceful movement of people from the forest by the government may have consequences on project sustainability	Moderate	N	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
9	Interference of project activities by political campaigns to the upcoming general elections	Moderate	N	Early planning of project activities and involving local community/ leaders who will advise on best days to undertake activities	Use of local partners to undertake project LoAs to improve project intervention ownership	Partnering with Local/community organizations observed to be effective

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period

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

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

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
<p>Recommendation 1 (R1) in response to C1 – linked to relevance and sustainability - to FAO, national and sub-national stakeholders: the main findings and recommendations of the Total Economic Value (TEV) Study in the Mount Kulal Biosphere Reserve (MKBR) landscape and the Ecosystem Characterization Study conducted in the Mukogodo landscape should be discussed and reviewed in a workshop with selected stakeholders from the national, county and local communities to assess the ecosystem services that could be developed into voluntary payment for ecosystem services schemes (PES) to support implementation of forest management plans, in particular the Mount Kulal Ecosystem Management Plan (MKEMP) and the forest management plan of the ILMAMUSI Community Forest Association (CFA).</p>	<p>Plans are being put in place for workshops to be done where the results of the TEV and the Ecosystem Characterization could be shared with stakeholders for adoption first. Due to the project time-frames and set targets, the development of PES to support the FLR is not visible, however government institutions, MDAs and other partners may utilize the findings to develop such a scheme; once adopted.</p> <p>Some of recommendations from the surveys have been adopted in the development of the Mt.Kulal Ecosystem Management Plan (MKEMP) and the Participatory forest management plan of the ILMAMUSI Community Forest Association (CFA) in Mukogodo ecosystem which have been launched and FMA signed.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2 (R2) in response to C2 – linked to effectiveness and factors affecting performance – to FAO, the PSC and the PMU: the PSC should elect at least one representative from the Ministry of Industrialization, Trade and Enterprise development (MITED) and at least one from the Private Sector Alliance, plus two from the private sector based in the ASAL region (specializing in gums</p>	<p>The representative for the Ministry of Industrialization, Trade and Investment (MITI) is yet to join the PSC though request for a representative was sent. For KEPSA and Private Sector Reps/consultants have been incorporated in the PSC.</p> <p>They have also been incorporated in the Technical Working Group on the development of a strategy for commercialization of Non-timber Forest Products Strategy</p>

<p>and resins and hay/grass seed/medicinal plants) to become the focal points for guiding the development of the national policy on the development bio-enterprises linked to NTFPS and concentrate resources on the development of incubator services to support a selection of bio-enterprises that have the greatest potential to unite as many end beneficiaries as possible to support the development of economies of scale. It is recommended these representatives are also invited to sit on the national platform being developed to steer the implementation of the Forest Landscape Restoration Implementation Action Plan 2022-2025 (FOLAREP) and provide better guidance on securing alternative funding to donors to support the development of selected bio-enterprises (under Recommendation 1).</p>	
<p>Recommendation 3 (R3) in response to C3 – linked to efficiency and factors affecting performance – to FAO, the PSC and the PMU: the project should be extended by 18 months to recover delays in implementation of main activities caused by external factors. This extension should be conditional on the PMU and implementing partners carrying out a review of the activities and targets listed in the PRODOC to determine which activities should be prioritised and clustered together to promote integrated approaches to realising project outputs. All targets should be reviewed and changed where they cannot be realistically achieved according to the resources, time and capacity available now and during the proposed prolongation period. In all cases activities should be prioritised on the basis they will add</p>	<p>The request for the extension of the project period was granted for a period of 12 Months with the new end date being 31st July 2024.</p>

<p>most value to the FLR process and that there is a realistic chance the bio-enterprises become viable commercial concerns in the extension period. This should be followed by a review of the budget to determine where GEF funds should be prioritized and how new sources of co-finance should be identified and targeted to improve the ASAL project's effectiveness and efficiency.</p>	
<p>Recommendation 4 (R4) on C4 – linked to sustainability and factors affecting performance – to FAO, the PSC, the PMU and GCP: FAO-KE should make provisions to support the ASAL Project identify an effective risk management strategy that can be fully applied (with appropriate and effective mitigation measures) in all activities planned, under implementation and subject to monitoring. This should include the application of R1-R3 proposed above and, if possible, the risk categories applied in the PIR should be harmonised with the same categories applied in the GEF-FAO Guidelines for MTRs.</p>	<p>Due to project time-frame, it was agreed that we shall continue with Risk Matrix (Annex 11), developed during the project development and consider the recommendations in future assignments.</p> <p>The Risk Mitigation measures were also done and thus the PMU is working to ensure, that they apply such mitigation as guided by the matrix.</p>
<p>Recommendation 5 (R5) on C5 – linked to effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact – to FAO/GCU, the PSC, the PMU and GCP: the MTR team recommends all three issues are dealt with through meetings between relevant stakeholders to agree on suitable solutions to the three main issues that are affecting the project's performance and likely to restrict its long-term impact.</p>	<p>There has been continuous engagement with the relevant government ministries, departments and agencies with view of knowledge sharing. In this regard, the project has been working with KEFRI, KFS and NMK which are government agencies. There PMU has been conducting quarterly meetings with all implementing partners to review, evaluate lessons learned/challenges and plan together so that we achieve the desired targets.</p> <p>The project exit strategy will soon be developed as way to ensure sustainability is achieved to continue and replicate the results/ success.</p>

<p>Recommendation 6 (R6)</p> <p>on question 6 (Cross-cutting priorities) – on effectiveness and sustainability – to FAO and the PMU: the MTR team recommends a review of the Environmental and Social Management (ESM) Safeguards 2.1, 2.4, 3.2.2 and 4.7 is conducted in the next PIR, if possible, with the support of FAO’s ESM team. In addition, in support of the dialogue proposed on developing monitoring on the ecological health index of the FLR process in both project sites, discussion should include an assessment on developing indicators that would also facilitate monitoring of compliance with relevant</p> <p>xxvii</p> <p>criteria under Safeguard 2 (Protected areas, buffer zones, or natural habitats) and Safeguard 3 (Access and benefit sharing for genetic resources).</p>	<p>The ESM was well articulated during the project development (Annex 12 below) and the PMU working with implementing partners are working to ensure that the recommended actions and mitigation measures in the ESM matrix are applied during implementation.</p>
<p>Recommendation 7 (R7)</p> <p>on question 7 (gender) – on effectiveness and sustainability – to FAO and the PMU: the PMU should conduct a review of its monitoring of indicators on participation rates to break them down further into youth participation (male/female) and number of women/youths who, for example are members of boards of directors (including bio-enterprises), or who participate in decision-making roles</p>	<p>Tracking of women and men already being done by all partners and going beyond and indicating the roles they are playing eg leadership roles and decision making as well as access to resources especially land and property and access to information through trainings.</p>

<p>Recommendation 8 (R8)</p> <p>on question 8 (links to the global child project) – on efficiency and effectiveness – to FAO, the PMU and GCP: the MTR team recommends that GCP provides a more proactive role in: (i) providing short-term technical assistance to support the implementation of the recommendations of the MTRs with the aim of releasing the PMU from FAO’s recruitment procedures; (ii) the GCP supports all TRI projects agree on applying a set of qualitative indicators to support learning on TRI’s main achievements and shortcomings; (iii) GCP develops a more effective networking facility that is monitored to ensure TRI projects are communicating and exchanging information with each other and, in the case of Kenya, applying synergies to promote a united message on the role of FLR in supporting CCA/disaster risk reduction (DRR), climate change mitigation (CCM)/PES and development of resilient communities and value chains. Meanwhile, the ASAL Project should provide insights into innovative approaches such as the development of linkages with credible public sector institutions (including the Kenya Wildlife Service/Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife) that can provide both technical and production skills to support the development of incubation services and ecotourism services with the private sector that demonstrate the benefits of nature-based solutions to restoration, conservation and sustainable use of forest ecosystems.</p>	<p>The GCP has been supporting in the training of the officers in the project and MDAs. The PMU has continuously been working with county government officers to support implementation as well as tool to ensure sustainability once the project closes since they will remain on the ground with the community.</p> <p>The project has undertaken a Knowledge, attitudes and practices survey after developing qualitative indicators and questions for the survey to get an understanding or learning-why implementation of some restoration activities are not taking root</p> <p>Linkages with county governments has been taken up and are more supportive in giving technical support in terms of graining and capacity building to the communities.</p> <p>E4Impact engagement with social enterprises incubator to support in the mentorship and incubation of restorative enterprises working within the project area.</p> <p>Involvement of government institutions such as NMK which is actively engaged in tourism and culture ministry in promoting ecotourism in Mt Kulal.</p>
---	---

<p>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize</p>	<p>From the planning of the project, development of bioenterprises/ policies and strategies as well as capacity building of community groups were well within sustainability aspects already being undertaken in the project.</p> <p>Each stakeholder has the responsibility and action plan to ensure continuity of project efforts.</p> <p>A workshop has been planned to share the sustainability strategy anchored in the prodoc.</p>
--	---

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines¹⁹. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework	Revision of targets of direct restoration from 8700 Ha to 4000 Ha	Done	Recommended by MTR and approved by PSC
Financial management	The project budget undergoing revision to enhance some budget lines that had been under budgeted and also to allow for use during the extension as below	July 2023	FAO HQ
Implementation schedule	New NTE date	31st July 2024	GEF secretariat
Risk analysis	Added drought	2022	

¹⁹ Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
<i>Government Institutions</i>			
Ministry of Environment and Forestry	The institutional anchor of the project	Chair of project steering committee meetings	Few numbers of staff
Kenya Forestry research institute (KEFRI)	Lead government counterpart and plays a lead role in the execution of project activities.	Engaged in project oversight at PSC Lead in developing Forest regulations on equitable benefit sharing and strategy for sustainable commercialization of Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPS)	Delay in signing of new LOA
Kenya Forest service (KFS)	Sustainable development, management and utilization of the country's forest resources	Lead in developing Kenya forest and landscape restoration implementation action plan (FOLAREP) 2022-2026 Led county consultations on FOLAREP in all 47 counties	
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	Registration of Kulal community forest association	Delay in Registration of KCFA and launch of the management
County government of Marsabit	Policy direction at the county level	Development of county Environmental action plans (CEAPs)	

County government of Laikipia	Policy direction at the county level	Development of county Environmental action plans (CEAPs)	
County government of Isiolo	Policy direction at the county level	Development of county Environmental action plans (CEAPs)	
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT)	Setting up of Community land management committees in targeted project sites	Ilngwesi and Leparua management plans Carbon credits for 4 conservancies in Mukogodo averaging KES 36 million each	LOA to develop Kurikuri and Makurian management plans yet to take off
Laikipia Wildlife Trust (LWF).	Community mobilization and institutional Support to Mukugodo ILMAMUSI CFA and conservancies Board''	Development of 6 water infrastructure Capacity building of dupoto beekeepers Development of sub catchment management plan for Ngare ndare WRUA	
World Vision International	Inclusive action planning	Supported Development of County Environmental Action plans (CEAPs)	Not working in all areas of TRI project
National Community Forest Association (NACOFA)	Collaboration in mobilization of Community Forest Associations	Collaboration in mobilization of Community Forest Associations and supported county and CFA consultations	No formal engagement
Private sector entities			
Entrepreneurship for Impact(E4I) [E4 impact}	Identification and support of entrepreneurs and other Eco-preneurs to undergo a seven-month incubation period to upscale their Restoration related businesses and investments within the country	LOA has been signed on process on going	
Mt. Kenya hub	Identification of entrepreneurs and other Eco-preneurs to undergo a seven-month		

	incubation period to upscale their Restoration related businesses and investments within the country		
<i>New stakeholders identified/engaged</i>			
Narupa conservancy	Community land management	Development of Oldonyiro management plan Soil and water conservation Bioenterprise development- Honey, Beadwork, Animal salt	
ILMAMUSI CFA	Community land/forest management	Community-led Forest and Landscape Restoration Tree planting, Soil and water conservation, spring protection	



10. Gender Mainstreaming



Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	No	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.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	<p>All project activities must be represented by men, women and youth</p> <p>Gender equality is being mainstreamed in all new policy or strategic documents developed by the project, e.g. the FOLAREP, the equitable and benefits regulations and the NTFPS management strategy.</p> <p>Leadership positions encouraged for all support coming from the project. Most community groups have one or two female/Youth in decision making roles especially women treasurers and youth secretaries to the groups</p>
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	In collaboration with the lands programme, communities where Women and youth must be represented are now owning land under the community land act. Case in point is IIngwesi

		community land that has a title deed and have earned carbon credits for sustainable land management
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	<p>Leadership positions encouraged for all support coming from the project. Most community groups have one or two female/Youth in decision making roles especially women treasurers and youth secretaries to the groups.</p> <p>All four conservancies surrounding Mukogodo landscape have gotten Carbon credits and the women and youth are equal decision makers beneficiaries of community projects to be undertaken using these funds</p>
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	<p>In Bio enterprise development, women and youth are expected to take up businesses in Aloe, honey, gum Arabic and ecotourism</p> <p>Carbon credits accrued by conservancies are decided on transparently and inclusively.</p>
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	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.
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	FAO Kenya office has a Gender focal point and Government partner institutions have staff with gender expertise
Any other good practices on gender	Yes	All project staff have undertaken the mandatory gender training as well as having been trained on FAO policy and gender Equity

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
<p>Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Good practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil and water conservation using micro catchment technology • Seedling protection using locally available materials • Engaging local/community groups directly under LoAs to undertake restoration efforts- Brings about ownership • Multistakeholder partnerships in developing policies/strategies- FOLAREP • Policy influencing plan(PIP)
<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>1 broadcast undertaken during the Walk wild event</p> <p>Social media sharing of information on project activities using the FAOKE Twitter handle. @FAOKenya</p> <p>Partner websites and newsletters e.g. LWF Communications</p>
<p>Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people’ s livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.</p>	<p>Testimony from one of the beneficiaries can be found here</p> <p>The Kenya ASAL TRI project with partners and the Ilmamusu community forest association in Mukogodo forest has rehabilitated 5 water projects, 3 boreholes and 2 water source intakes . In total the projects are reaching 15,650 persons in 3,130 households.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;">   </div>

	<p>Micro Catchments – Saving the Land through “Earth Smiles” To Capture Rainwater In ASALS</p> <p>The micro-catchments reduce surface runoff as well as act as a reservoir to capture water which increases the infiltration in the soil. This increases the germination percentage of seeds already in the ground.</p>   <p>Photo by Patrick Mugi,FAO-KE</p>
<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAO project partners push for cohesion towards sustainable project implementation. • Community engagement key to attaining sustainable projects • Walk wild event , a 10 kilometer walk brought together over 395 friends of Mukogodo forest. • Walk Wild : Experience Laikipia’ s Hidden Gem

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New approach to rangeland rehabilitation using microcatchments • TRI YiR 2022 Livelihood diversification: an option to enhance smallholder resilience in the face of climate change • Video production on sustainable management of Mukogodo forest landscape. • Grass reseeding. The journey towards land restoration
<p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.</p>	<p>Aerial view of Micro catchment semi circular bands in IIngwesi community</p> <p>See more in Annex 9: Template reporting indicator 9; Knowledge</p>
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details</p>	<p>Othieno, Joseph (FAOKE) Joseph.Othieno@fao.org</p>

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

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

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

A Free Prior and Informed consent report on the indigenous people and forest dependent communities has already undertaken in Mt Kulal and Mukogodo landscapes of Kenya.

The FPIC process for the two landscapes (Mt Kulal and Mukogodo) was conducted in a participatory manner. The process was structured to ensure that indigenous persons and forest adjacent community were given opportunity to express their views and reassured that the project activities will respect their dignity, rights, interests, cultural specificities and that they will benefit from all the advantages of the project. The exercise was conducted to;

- i. Carry out iterative discussions through which project information was disclosed in a transparent way)
- ii. Design a participatory communication plan
- iii. Seek consent, document Indigenous Peoples' needs that are to be included into the project and agree on a feedback and complaints mechanism

The information was gathered through Literature review and Community consultative meetings. Effort was made to ensure equity in the selection of representatives in the FPIC discussions with emphasis on representation by elders, women groups, user groups including CFA's, the youth, and differently abled persons. The consultative sessions were aimed at (1) providing participants with comprehensive information on the TRI project, (2) participatory mapping of culturally important sites (3) Determine a communication structure and community engagement with a feedback and complaints mechanism. Participatory approaches were used to gather information during the consultation meeting with the community. This was done to ensure that the discussion agendas and control of session was fully given to local communities for a more open discourse. The communities were able to undertake participatory mapping which identified sites that are important to them and were able to clearly articulate activities permissible or not in these sites. The community were also able to outline communication structures and modes they use. They were able to articulate potential conflict that might arise during the project implementation and possible redress mechanism



Figure 1:FPIC community meetings in Oldonyiro, Isiolo county



Figure 2: Participatory mapping of community resources in (a) Arapal, Mt Kulal Landscape and (b) Oldonyiro, in Mukogodo landscape

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

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 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 undertaking honey production is from the Yaaku community.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁰	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²¹	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
WaTER (KEFRI)#	KEFRI	In-kind	500,000	0	0	500,000
CADEP (KEFRI)#	KEFRI	In-kind	4,000,000	360,000	360,000	4,000,000
IPBRCC (KEFRI)#	KEFRI	In-kind	2,000,000	280,000	280,000	2,000,000
Land Prog. (FAO)*	FAO	In-kind	4,300,000	4,300,000	1,500,000	4,300,000
RAELOC (FAO)*	FAO	In-kind	1,700,000	1,700,000	700,000	1,700,000
Biopama(IUCN/EU)	IUCN	In-kind		50,500		
Sevir	Sevir	In-kind		30,000		
Isiolo County	Isiolo County	In-kind		20,000		
Laikipia County	Laikipia County	In-kind		20,000		
Marsabit County	Marsabit County	In-kind		20,000		
NACOFA/WWF	WWF	In-kind		14,655		
UNEP-Nature Kenya GEF 6	UNEP	In-kind		6,034		
UK-PACT-CIFOR-ICRAF	Kenya-UK PACT	In-kind		263,166.5		
Regreening Africa (EU)	EU	In-kind		50,000		

²⁰Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²¹Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions)

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

WVI	World Vision Kenya	In-kind		10,345		
		TOTAL	12,500,000	6,936,534	2,840,000	12,500,000

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

N/A

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

Implementation Progress Rating. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’ s components and activities is in compliance with the project’ s approved implementation plan.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

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

Annex 2.

GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.

Annex 3: Template reporting Indicator 1- Policy

Name of new or improved policy/framework	Date of adoption	Level of adoption	Comments
Forest and Landscape restoration action plan(2022-2026)	Yet to be adopted	National	All 47 counties have given their views on the plan Awaiting signing and launch
Kenya forest and landscape restoration monitoring framework	Yet to be adopted	National	Awaiting signing and launch
The Equitable Benefit Sharing regulations, (2016)	Yet to be adopted	National	At finalization stage
Non-Timber Forest Products & Services Strategy	Yet to be adopted	National	Under development in the current implementation year
Isiolo County Environmental action plan	Nov 2021	Local	Finalized to be used to incorporate environment actions in the county integrated development plans
Marsabit County Environmental action plan	Nov 2021	Local	
Laikipia County Environmental action plan	Nov 2021	Local	
Isiolo County Climate change policy		Local	Sensitization workshop for isiolo county cabinet members & county assembly members. Still at county assembly
Marsabit County integrated development plan	29 th May 2023	Local	Adopted by cabinet assembly
Isiolo County integrated development plan	June 2023	Local	Adopted by cabinet assembly
Laikipia County integrated development plan	March 2023	Local	Adopted by cabinet assembly
Total Number of policies/plans= 11			

Annex 4: Template reporting indicator 2- Restoration

Number of Hectare undergoing Restoration										
Type of land	Number of ha					Grand total of ha	Link towards shapefiles or GIS coordinates for the hectare undergoing restoration			
	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total per Area					
						1173.04				

Area of degraded agricultural land restored 49.3 Ha Mukogodo hay farms, 8 ha Agroforestry	0	0	49.3	8	57.3				
Area of forest or forest land restored- Enrichment planting- kusal 7Ha, Mukogodo 3.6Ha, kurikuri forest 4.41Ha, 12.63 Ha in Mukogodo forest	7	8.01	10	2.63	27.64		https://drive.google.com/file/d/1dEStqJI6WnTqWAKKiMG3TWZHZgya-BV/view?usp=sharing		
Area of natural grass and shrublands restored- leparua core zone102.5 ha, IIngwesi/lekuruki 45.6Ha,Oldonyiro construction of 74 Ha terraces, 300Ha v-pans and 300Ha semi-circular bunds, 60 Ha clearing of invasive Acacia reficiens ,15Ha in Kurikuri, 10 Ha in Maiyanat(bands and reseeded) 5Ha in Mt kusal graslands, 102Ha in Mukogodo surrounding landscapes, 10 Ha under 820 bunds, 64 Ha fenced	0	148.1	759	181	1088.1		Mukogodo Restoration sites.xlsx	Lekurruki Microcatchment Area 2.xlsx	I Ingwesi Micr ocatchment Area 1 (1).xlsx
Area of wetlands (including estuaries and mangroves) restored	0	0	0		0				
Total per year	7	156.1 1	818.3	191.6 3					

Annex 5: Template reporting indicator 3- Improved Management

Number of Hectare put under improved practices							
Type of land	Number of ha					Grand total of ha	Link towards shapefiles or GIS coordinates for the hectar under improved practices
	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total per area		
Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity - leparua(34200Ha),ilingwesi(9,470 ha),kusal core(5700Ha) and buffer zones(46000Ha) Oldonyiro 52,500Ha, Lekuruki 15872Ha, Mukogodo PFMP(30,189Ha),	15,872	95,370	82689		193,931	193,931	https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/11i8td4aa_8xd2ul9Ppp-rlq1jERcfDCI?usp=sharing
Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-					0		

party certification and that incorporates biodiversity considerations.						
Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems	0				0	
Area of High Conservation Value forest loss avoided					0	
Total per year	15872	95370	82689	0		

Annex 6: Template reporting indicator 5- Beneficiaries

# of direct beneficiaries					
Date	Type of support	Benefit generated	Total # of people	# of men	# of Women
30th January 2020	Training/Capacity building	access to programs, services, or education	22	14	8
Friday, September 4, 2020	Knowledge sharing	access to programs, services, or education	26	15	11
26-27 July 2020	Training/Capacity building	Increased access to environmental services	363	280	83
	Training/Capacity building	Increased access to environmental services	1200	511	689
9-10th March 2020	Training/Capacity building	access to programs, services, or education	22	18	4
14 th – 16 th Jan 2020	Knowledge sharing	access to programs, services, or education	14	7	7
	Knowledge sharing	access to programs, services, or education	33	22	11
Friday, November 8, 2019	Training/Capacity building	access to programs, services, or education	15	13	2

29th October 2019	Training/Capacity building	access to programs, services, or education	12	10	2
20th february 2020	Knowledge sharing	Increased access to environmental services	46	38	8
20th february 2020	Knowledge sharing	Increased access to environmental services	68	56	12
21st february 2020	Knowledge sharing	Increased access to environmental services	62	47	15
22nd february 2020	Knowledge sharing	Increased access to environmental services	105	58	47
6th July 2020	Training/Capacity building	Increased access to environmental services	13	10	3
January to May 2020	Knowledge sharing	access to programs, services, or education	60	48	12
January to May 2020	Knowledge sharing	access to programs, services, or education	30	21	9
January to May 2020	Knowledge sharing	access to programs, services, or education	135	98	37
January to May 2020	Training/Capacity building	Increased access to environmental services	2230	1467	763
January to May 2020	Training/Capacity building	Increased access to environmental services	2894	1457	1437
29th May 2020	Knowledge sharing	access to programs, services, or education	36	24	12
15th september 2020	Knowledge sharing	Increased access to environmental services	45	38	7
4th November 2020	Training/Capacity building	Increased access to environmental services	21	17	4
4th November 2020	Training/Capacity building	Increased access to environmental services	21	17	4

29th October 2020	Knowledge sharing	Increased access to environmental services	20	14	6
28th september 2020	Knowledge sharing	Increased access to environmental services	55	42	13
July 2020	Training/Capacity building	Improved afforestation	8	6	2
23rd to 28th August 2020	Training/Capacity building	Increased access to environmental services	18	12	6
	Knowledge sharing	access to programs, services, or education	27	27	0
	Training/Capacity building	Increased access to environmental services	120	90	30
			7,721	4,477	3,244
Jun-21	Training/Capacity building	access to programs, services, or education	8604	3938	4666
Dec-21	Training/Capacity building	Increased access to environmental services	1090	574	516
Dec-21	Knowledge sharing	access to programs, services, or education	215	155	60
Dec-21	Training/Capacity building	Increased access to environmental services	1088	693	395
Jan-22	Training/Capacity building	Increased access to environmental services	2541	1410	1131
AS AT JUNE 2022			21,259	11,247	10,012
July 2022 to Dec 2022	Training/Capacity building	Walk wild event	395	200	195
July 2022 to Dec 2023	Training/Capacity building	training in leadership and governance, financial management and marketing and development of business plans	242	150	92

July 2022 to Dec 2024	Knowledge sharing	exposure tour with support from Northern Rangelands Trust	238	180	58
July 2022 to Dec 2025	In kind support	water projects repaired/constructed	15650	7825	7825
July 2022 to Dec 2026	Training/Capacity building	operations, maintenance and financing trainings conducted for each of the completed water project site committees	88	53	35
July 2022 to Dec 2027	Training/Capacity building	Gender sensitive training of ILMAMUSI CFA staff and Management committee members on Resource mobilization	10	6	4
July 2022 to Dec 2028	Training/Capacity building	Training on leadership and Entrepreneurship for self-help groups executive	27	27	0
July 2022 to Dec 2029	Training/Capacity building	Animal salt production and marketing	30	30	0
July 2022 to Dec 2030	Training/Capacity building	beadwork production	40	40	0
July 2022 to Dec 2031	Training/Capacity building	conservancy board members, leadership and management training	60	51	9
July 2022 to Dec 2032	Training/Capacity building	Community engagement meetings on development of conservancy management plan	974	622	352
July 2022 to Dec 2033	Training/Capacity building	Training of Mt Kulal CFA on group dynamics	53	36	17

2023 Project Implementation Report

July 2022 to Dec 2034	Knowledge sharing	Partners review and planning meeting	25	19	6
July 2022 to Dec 2035	Knowledge sharing	PSC meeting	32	26	6
July 2022 to Dec 2036	Knowledge sharing	fourth TRI Global Knowledge Sharing workshop	0	0	0
July 2022 to Dec 2037	Training/Capacity building	Sepal under the IMPRESS project	2	2	0
Jan 2023 June 2023	Training/Capacity building	Training of Core Implementors in Leparua	30	15	15
Jan 2023 June 2023	Training/Capacity building	Rehabilitation of Rangeland (including Reseeding)	200	140	60
Jan 2023 June 2023	Training/Capacity building	Training of environmental club	270	189	81
Jan 2023 June 2023	Training/Capacity building	Training of 30 morans and Community peace ambassadors on Rangeland Management	30	21	9
Jan 2023 June 2023	Training/Capacity building	Training of 75 Women and Elders on Effective Grazing Plans	75	52	23
Jan 2023 June 2023	Knowledge sharing	Exchange Visit for 35 Community members from village based Grazing Committee	35	24	11
Jan 2023 June 2023	Knowledge sharing	Community Exchange meeting	24	20	4
Jan 2023 June 2023	Knowledge sharing	project partners planning abd review meeting.	29	26	3
Jan 2023 June 2023	Knowledge sharing	Exchange meeting/ field visit	19	17	2

Jan 2023 June 2023	Knowledge sharing	ilmamusi Management Committee meetings	24	14	10
Jan 2023 June 2023	Training/Capacity building	Digging and reseeding of semi-circular bunds at Mayianat and Kurikuri community lands	62	37	25
Jan 2023 June 2023	Training/Capacity building	Digging and reseeding of semi-circular bunds at CFA restoration site	30	17	13
Jan 2023 June 2023	In kind support	Tree planting within Mukogodo Landscape	960	680	280
Total July 2022 to June 2023			19,654	10,519	9,135
Cumulative as at PIR June 2023			40,913	21,766	19,147

Annex 7: Template reporting indicator 6-Coordination mechanisms

of cross-sectoral government-led coordination mechanisms

Event date	Country	Type of coordination mechanism	Function of coordination mechanism	Status	Frequency	# of government institutions	# of economic sectors represented	# of FLR organizations represented	# of women	# of men	Level of effectiveness of the mechanism	Output in terms of improved alignment	Output in terms of emergence of supportive new policies
16th June 2021 NPSC meeting	Kenya	Information-sharing session	Reporting on progress at national and/or international level	On-going	Annually	11	2 - Agriculture, Environment and	12	6	18	4	Redistribution of roles in conservancies between LOA partners to avoid conflict	Support on finalization and signing of Forest and landscape restoration implementation action plan(FOLAREP)
29th June 2021 - FOLAREP Technical	Kenya	Informal/Technical	Identification of ad hoc opportunities for synergies and	On-going	Weekly	5	3 - Agriculture, Environment and	10	4	6	4	Planning for the National Land Restoration Scaling Conference	Engaged high level government delegation who are key policy makers to be aware of the project efforts in developing
24th and 25th March 2022 National	Kenya	Informal/Technical	Reporting on progress at national and/or international level	On-going	As needed	10- KEFRI,KFS,COG,MOEF,NEMA,MOAL	4 - Agriculture, Environment and	28	10	18	4	Training on Restoration barometer and stock take of data on FLR in the country	Support in using the Restoration barometer as a tool for reporting progress towards the Bonn challenge
Dec 2021 to March 2022 County consultative	Kenya	Information-sharing session	Stakeholders consultations and transparency	On-going	As needed	4-County governments, MOEF,KFS,C	3- Agriculture, Economic Planning,	120(20*6meetings)	35	85	3	All 47 counties were consulted in reference to the FOLAREP and operationalizing the	The county economic and planning departments were included in the workshops to support inclusion of FLR
February 2022- County Environment	Kenya	Informal/Technical	Coordinated policy implementation	Initiated	Annually	4- Environment,Interior,Agriculture,N	3- Agriculture, Environment and	61	14	47	2	Marsabit,Isiolo and Laikipia CEC committees were not operational so the meetings were initially	Support in development of county environment action plans that are the vehicles to ensure FLR/environment
10th February 2022- Quarterly	Kenya	Informal/Technical	Information and knowledge sharing on FLR	On-going	As needed	7- KEFRI,KFS,3CG, MOEF,NMK	3- Agriculture, Environment and	18	4	14	4	Review project implementation progress and plan for the activities to be undertaken in the	Information sharing on policies being Supported by the project to ensure buy in from all partners
TWG meeting on FLR Knowledge	Kenya	Informal/Technical	Information and knowledge sharing on FLR	On-going	As needed	7- KEFRI/KFS/KWS/ICRAF/FAO/NEMA/	4- Agriculture, Environment and	11	3	8			
TWG MEETING ON NTFPS	Kenya	Informal/Technical	Stakeholders consultations and transparency	On-going	As needed	7- KEFRI/KFS/KWS/FAO/NEMA/COG/G	4- Agriculture, Environment and	10	4	6			

Total number of coordination Mechanisms = 6 (PSC, FOLAREP TWG, County Environment committees, M&E Technical working group, NTFP TWG, Knowledge Management TWG)

Annex 8: Value of Resources flowing into restoration in TRI

2023 Project Implementation Report

Date	Country	Source	Type of financial inst	Amount(USD)	Amount (in % in direct support of FLR)	FLR specific covenants and/or M&E	Nature of the obligation	Capital provider	Beneficiary	Timeframe	TRI attribution
22nd June 2021 ICRAF/FAO meeting on UKPACT proposal to	Kenya	International public	Grant	75,000	TBD	Yes	Commitment	ICRAF	FOLAREP Technical working group meetings on M&E and	1 Year	Yes
2016 to 2022	Kenya	Domestic public	Government budget	640,000	100	Yes	Commitment	KEFRI(IPBRCC and CADEP)	Marsabit,Isiolo and Laikipia counties	5 Years	Yes
2016 to 2022	Kenya	International private	Grant	6,000,000	100	Yes	Disbursement	FAO Lands and RAELOC	Marsabit,Isiolo and Laikipia counties	5 years	Yes
2021-2022	Kenya	Domestic public	Government budget	20,000	100	Don't know	Disbursement	County Government of Isiolo	community of Isiolo cou	1 Year	No
2021-2022	Kenya	Domestic public	Government budget	20,000	100	Don't know	Disbursement	County Government of Laikipia	Laikipia community	1 Year	No
2021-2022	Kenya	Domestic public	Government budget	20,000	100	Don't know	Disbursement	County Government of Marsabit	Marsabit community	1 Year	No
Feb-22	Kenya	International private	Grant	40,000	100	Yes	Disbursement	World food programme	Community through Co	1 Year	No
Feb-22	Kenya	Domestic private	Grant	13,000	100	Don't know	Disbursement	LISTEN(Agra)	Nursery establishment, Demo plot Information	1 Year	No
2021	Kenya	Domestic public	Government budget	1,700,000	100	No	Commitment	KFS and the ministry of environment through the National Tree Planting	Tree Planting Campaigns	5 years	No
2018-2024	Kenya	Domestic public	Government budget	54,982,500	100	Yes	Commitment	Green Zone Support Development Project Phase II-KFS	15 counties	5 years	No
	Kenya	Domestic public	Government budget	300,000	100	No	Commitment	Forest Irrigation Climate and Green Energy Project			No
2021	Kenya	International private	Grant	3,000	100	No	Disbursement	Demo plot Information - AGRA			No
2021-2022	Kenya	International private	Grant	50,500	100	Yes	Disbursement	Biopama. EU/IUCN - Rapid Response	Ranger support, training, rations and equipment	2 Years	No
2021-2022	Kenya	International private	Grant	30,000	100	Yes	Disbursement	Sevir	Rangeland management	2 Years	No
2021-2022	Kenya	Domestic private	Grant	196,683	100	Yes	Disbursement	LWF	Conservancy contribution to restoration activities	2 Years	Yes
2021-2022	Kenya	Domestic private	Grant	20,000	100	Yes	Disbursement	Laikipia Conservancy	contribution to PFMP	2 Years	No
2021-2022	Kenya	Domestic private	Grant	14,655	100	Yes	Disbursement	NACOFA/WWF	Contribution to Forest and landscape restoration	1 Year	Yes
2021-2022	Kenya	International private	Grant	6,034	100	Yes	Disbursement	UNEP-Nature Kenya GEF 6	Contribution to Forest and landscape restoration	1 Year	Yes
2021-2022	Kenya	International private	Grant	50,000	TBD	Yes	Disbursement	Regreening Africa (EU)	Forest and landscape restoration conference	5 years	No
2021-2022	Kenya	International private	Grant	10,345	TBD	Yes	Disbursement	World Vision	County environmental committte meetings	4 years	Yes

Annex 9: No of Bankable Projects developed

For Private financed proposal											
Name of proposal	Name of venture	Location	Sector	Description of business	Intended restoration objectives and targets	Funding needed	Amount of funding needed (in USD)	Stage achieved (e.g. ideation, incubation ...)*	Interaction with market intermediaries (offtakers, buyers, traders, consumers)	Interaction with investors and financiers	Funding received so far
Doupoto bee keepers cooperative	Doupoto bee keepers cooperative	Laikipia	Environment conservation	Bee keeping	Honey – Predominantly Forest honey drawn from a variety of different trees, shrubs and flowers, supplemented by acacia spp. in the rangelands	Yes	Yes	Incubation	Exploratory meetings	Exploratory meetings	No
Ngare Ndare Water Resource Users Association (WRUA)	Ngare Ndare Water Resource Users Association (WRUA)	Laikipia	Environment conservation	Water management	To balance water resource utilization and conservation by enabling the water resource to be protected, enhanced and where appropriate restored through a participatory agreed platform for planning and implementation.	Yes	Yes	Incubation	Exploratory meetings	Exploratory meetings	No
Restoration of Mukogodo Landscape through bio – enterprise development	Ilmamsi CFA	Laikipia	Environment conservation	Land restoration	150 ha of land restored with trees and grass planted within Mukogodo forest and surrounding landscapes Provide 400 modern energy - saving jikos to CFA members in the 4 surrounding community lands	Yes	Yes	Incubation	Not yet	Due diligence	No

2023 Project Implementation Report

Restoration of Degraded Community Land in Narupa Community Conservancy for Improved Livelihoods”	Narupa conservancy	Isiolo	Environment conservation	Land restoration	600 ha of Community owned and managed land rehabilitated through clearing of the invasive species. The capacity of four (4) groups with 20 (40M 40W) members built on sustainable collection, sorting and sale of gum arabic for improved income	Yes	Yes	Acceleration	Exploratory meetings	Investment received	Yes
Restoration of the Leparua Conservancy through Community Led Initiatives for Social Environmental Benefits and Livelihood Enhancement”	Leparua conservancy	Isiolo	Environment conservation	Land restoration	100 Ha of degraded lands in Almoroti area rehabilitated and restored Capacity of 6 community groups to harvest, add value, package and market honey and bees wax sustainably increased	Yes	Yes	Acceleration	Exploratory meetings	Investment received	Yes
Terra Fund	Laikipia Wildlife forum	Laikipia	Environment conservation	Land restoration	The Project primarily addresses the conceptual priority of supporting action on the ground to contribute to the AFR100 target. The project seeks to grow trees in Mukogodo Forest and riparian areas within Laikipia landscape using multiple ecosystem management methods including: Agroforestry, Applied Nucleation, Assisted Natural	Yes	Yes	Proposal	Not yet	Exploratory meetings	No

					Regeneration, Direct Seeding, Enrichment Planting, Reforestation, Riparian Restoration, and Silvopasture.						
Terra Fund	National museums of Kenya	Marsabit	Environment conservation	Land restoration	Restoration and Protection of Mt. Kulal Biosphere Reserve Forest Core Zone. This is to sustain the work initiated by the FAO's TRI project and in the implementation of the recently signed PFMP (2023-2027).	Yes	Yes	Proposal	Not yet	Exploratory meetings	No

Annex 10: Template reporting indicator 9; Knowledge

# of knowledge products developed and disseminated							
Date of production	Name of the product	Type of product	Format	Upoladed on TRI website	Attribution	Number of hard copy distributed/Link to product	Number of click or download
Apr-19	Project fact /information sheet	Factsheet/brief /commentary	Both	no	Directly developed by TRI	1000	
Apr-19	Project roll ups/banners	Educational/A wareness material	Printed/hardcopy	no	Directly developed by TRI	1	
6th to 12th December 2020	Total economic valuation of Mt Kulal	Report	Digital	no	Jointy developed by TRI and other program	N/A	
23rd January 2021	Characterization of Mukogodo Ecosystem services	Report	Digital	no	Directly developed by TRI	N/A	
21st June 2021	Mt Kulal Biosphere Reserve Forest Management Plan (KFMP) 2021 – 2025	Guidelines	Digital	yes	Jointy developed by TRI and other program	N/A	

24th May 2021	Ilingwesi Community Conservancy Management and Community Development Plan (2021-2026)	Guidelines	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	N/A	
17th June 2021	Policy influencing plan for domestication of forest and landscape restoration in Kenya(Also shared in XVWFC in South Korea)	Guidelines	Digital	no	Directly developed by TRI	https://unfao-my.sharepoint.com/:i/g/personal/patrick_mugi_fao_org/EUVFcZA4LaGrDPRYL5ghYMBmlEFRJNj-zqo9DWIHtvbbA?e=cjjU8x	
11th June 2021	Forest and landscape restoration action plan	Technical tool	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	Final FOLAREP 20230123.pdf	
2nd June 2020	Making satellite imagery in land use assessment more accessible:	Journal article	Digital	yes	Directly developed by TRI	N/A	
19th March 2020	Mount Kulal forest and landscape restoration campaign and launch of tree planting	Educational/A wareness material	Digital	yes	Directly developed by TRI	N/A	
11th October 2020	FAO's support to the ILMAMUSI Community Forest Association in Kenya	Educational/A wareness material	Digital	yes	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	N/A	
6th February 2020	Enabling environment for FLR and non-timber forest products and services in Kenya	Educational/A wareness material	Digital	yes	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	N/A	
16th April 2020	Gender Based Value Chain Analysis of Non-Timber Forest Products and Services in Mt Kulal, Mukogodo Forest	Report	Digital	no	Directly developed by TRI	N/A	
23-30 August 2021	Restoration of Mukogodo Forest, Laikipia, Kenya	Educational/A wareness material	Digital	yes	Directly developed by TRI	http://www.fao.org/in-action/forest-landscape-restoration-mechanism/en/	
Sep-21	Sub Catchment Management Plan (SCMP)	Guidelines	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	N/A	
3/11/2021	Strengthening Mukogodo community forest association good governance and institutional sustainability	Educational/A wareness material	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	https://laikipia.org/2021/11/03/strengthening-mukogodo-community-forest-association-good-governance-and-institutional-sustainability/	

	Ilngwesi Community Conservancy Management and Community Development Plan (2021-2026)	Guidelines	Printed/hardcopy	no	Directly developed by TRI	Il Ngwesi Management Report Pages.pdf	
10th March 2022	Mukogodo community leaders approve rehabilitation of key water points	Educational/Awareness material	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	Mukogodo Community Leaders Approve Rehabilitation of Key Water Points – Laikipia Forum	
10th March 2022	Fostering stakeholder integration	Educational/Awareness material	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	FAO – Fostering Stakeholder Integration – Laikipia Forum	
10th March 2022	Beekeeping, honey and building a business Dupoto beekeepers cooperative	Educational/Awareness material	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	Beekeeping, Honey, and Building a Business Dupoto Beekeepers Cooperative – Laikipia Forum	
14th April 2022	Grass seeding: the journey towards land restoration continues	Educational/Awareness material	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	https://laikipia.org/2022/04/14/grass-seeding-the-journey-towards-land-restoration-continues/	
13th April 2022	Creating a business environment for dupoto beekeepers cooperative	Educational/Awareness material	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	https://laikipia.org/2022/04/13/creating-a-business-environment-for-dupoto-bee-keepers-cooperative-2/	
13th April 2022	Il Ngwesi Community Conservancy Endorses Carbon Fund Projects and Looks To The Future	Educational/Awareness material	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	https://laikipia.org/2022/04/13/126222/	
2nd June 2022	Ilmamusu Road and office signage	Educational/Awareness material	Printed/hardcopy	no	Directly developed by TRI	ilmamusu	
2nd May 2022	sustainable production and utilization of non-wood forest products (nwfps) as a strategy for climate change adaptation and mitigation in kenyan asals presented in XVWFC in South Korea	Educational/Awareness material	Digital	no	Directly developed by TRI	Template-WFC-Kenya-Muga-NWFPS.pptx	
5th June 2022	World Environment day	Educational/Awareness material	Digital	no	Others	https://twitter.com/FAOKenya/status/1533388109576011780?t=jaOc_-T984h06DqXhnQ_w&s=19	

2023 Project Implementation Report

23rd May 2023	Mukogodo Participatory forest management plan 2023-2027	Guidelines	Both	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	Mukogodo PFMP 2023 - 2027.pdf	
21st June 2023	Mt Kulal Participatory Forest Management plan 2023-2027	Guidelines	Both	no	Directly developed by TRI		
23rd May 2023	Mukogodo Forest management Agreement 2023-2027	Guidelines	Both	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program		
21st June 2023	Mt Kulal Forest management Agreement 2023 -2027	Guidelines	Both	no	Directly developed by TRI		
2022	Framework for monitoring reporting and learning on forest and landscape restoration	Technical tool	Both	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	Kenya FLR Monitoring framework.pdf	
2021	Ileparua community conservancy management and community development plan 2021-2025	Guidelines	Both	no	Directly developed by TRI	https://unfao-my.sharepoint.com/:b:/g/personal/patrick_mugi_fao_org/EbY-w3cO8mDtdkjsokaXwBIQPYlaRu-WHFrYUBGLHi6w?e=i7zVjo	
10th November 2022	FAO project partners push for cohesion towards sustainable project implementation.	Educational/Awareness material	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	https://laikipia.org/2022/11/10/fao-project-partners-push-for-cohesion-towards-sustainable-project-implementation/	
11th October 2022	Community engagement key to attaining sustainable projects	Educational/Awareness material	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	Community engagement key to attaining sustainable projects	
11th October 2022	Walk Wild : Experience Laikipia's Hidden Gem	Educational/Awareness material	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	https://laikipia.org/2022/10/11/walk-wild-experience-laikipias-hidden-gem/	
22nd December 2022	over 2,500 indigenous trees planted at the inaugural walk wild initiative	Educational/Awareness material	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	https://laikipia.org/2022/12/22/over-2500-indigenous-trees-planted-at-the-inaugural-walk-wild-initiative/	
2022	Livelihood diversification: an option to enhance smallholder resilience in the face of climate change	Educational/Awareness material	Digital	no	Jointly developed by TRI and other program	TRI YiR 2022	

2022	Sustainable management of Mukogodo forest landscape.	Educational/A wareness material	Digital	no	Directly developed by TRI	Video production	
------	--	---------------------------------	---------	----	---------------------------	----------------------------------	--

Annex 11: Risk Matrix

	Risks	Impact	Probability of occurrence	Degree of Incidence	Mitigation Actions	Responsible party
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.	Moderately high: It may undercut efforts made by the project to develop alternative livelihoods as people prioritize immediate survival over “riskier” entrepreneurship	Medium	Amber	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.	PMU
2	Political instability may hinder or interrupt support from the public sector for FLR	High: Several activities require strong political support.	Moderately high	Amber	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.	PSC, PMU
3	Political-institutional risk: Divergent priorities of projects partners and stakeholders with regards to FLR and alternative livelihoods	Moderately high	Low	Green	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.	PSC
4	Social risks: Reluctance to participate in the project activities by communities	Moderately high	Low	Green	Interest for activities has already been assessed, and the project will be implemented in a highly	PMU

					participatory manner. Partners are closely involved with communities and can relay any concerns early on so as to prevent reluctance from communities.	
5	Project management risks such as delays, overspending, lack of coordination	Moderately high	Medium	Amber	The PMU will be composed of qualified personnel. Oversight by implementing partners, presence in targeted landscapes and well-established processes and monitoring activities will favor an early identification of issues that may hinder project implementation.	PSC, PMU
6	Ecological risks posed by the implementation of environment restoration activities and water management activities	Moderately high	Medium	Amber	The project is supported by KEFRI, KFS and IUCN, which possess a strong knowledge base on environmental management in the region so as to ensure that activities implemented do no harm.	PSC

Annex 12: E&S Classification Certification Form and Risk Mitigation Plan

Project Risk Certification

Entity Number: 641797

Project Title: Support to Sustainable Bioenterprise Development in Healthy Rangelands in the Arid&Semi-Arid Land

Recipient Country(ies): Kenya, Republic of

Estimated total budget in USD: 4,157,340 \$

Risk Certification

Certified by: Besacier, Christophe (FOADD)

Date: 14-Jul-2017

The table below summarizes the environmental and social risks identified in relation to the proposed action.

The proposed action is classified as: **Moderate**

Safeguard Triggered	Risk Identified	Answer	Risk Classification	Reference Guidance	Additional Description (if any)
---------------------	-----------------	--------	---------------------	--------------------	---------------------------------

9	9.2 - Are there indigenous peoples living in the project area where activities will take place?	Yes	Moderate	<p>A Free Prior and Informed Consent process is required.</p> <p>If the project is for indigenous peoples, an Indigenous Peoples’ Plan is required in addition to the Free Prior and Informed Consent process.</p> <p>Please contact the ESM/OPCA unit for further guidance.</p> <p>In cases where the project is for both, indigenous and non-indigenous peoples, an Indigenous Peoples’ Plan will be required only if a substantial number of beneficiaries are Indigenous Peoples. project activities should outline actions to address and mitigate any potential impact.</p> <p>Please contact ESM/OPCA unit for further guidance.</p>	<p>As described in Section 1 of the Project document, the project areas are inhabited by indigenous people that were thoroughly consulted during the PPG (project preparation) phase. The project complies with the Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) principles.</p> <p>The consent of indigenous people to project activities will be free and prior in the sense that it will be given voluntarily and without coercion, intimidation or manipulation. Indigenous people have been consulted during the PPG and gave their informal consent to the project development and intervention, and it will continue to be sought for all activities throughout the project implementation through participatory and concertation mechanisms. For instance, the livelihoods of indigenous people and their dependence on natural resources will be carefully assessed under the second component of the project, and they will be closely involved in the participatory mapping of NTFPs. The ecosystem community action plans will also be developed in close collaboration with local indigenous communities and will aim to directly empower them over the management of natural resources in targeted areas. They will be at the heart of the decision-making processes, of the restoration activities and of the forest and landscape management processes.</p> <p>The consent of indigenous people will be informed as the project will ensure – through its capacity development activities on FLR and participatory mechanism for</p>
---	---	-----	-----------------	---	--

					<p>instance - that relevant information is given to indigenous groups in an accessible manner, involving all vulnerable groups (youth, women, the elderly, and persons with disabilities), and allowing sufficient time for them to discuss in their local language and freely express their consent.</p> <p>The project will aim to respond to the needs and priorities expressed by the indigenous communities involved. The knowledge, cultural systems and institutions of indigenous people will form the basis on which project activities will be implemented. These will be thoroughly assessed during several assessments to be conducted from the onset of the project such as: an assessment on compliance with local legislation, an assessment of ecosystem services, land use and land degradation in selected forests (including participatory mapping), an assessment of NTPFS potentialities, and a capacity needs assessment on implementing FLR relevant policies.</p> <p>The project will ensure that indigenous people are carefully considered in the implementation and development of national policies or strategies in order ensure that their rights are preserved and that their voice is systematically taken into account in the long term in the FLR decision making processes.</p>
9	9.4 - Would this project be located in an area where cultural resources exist?	Yes	Moderate	To preserve cultural resources (when existing in the project area) and to avoid their	The purpose of this project is to protect the forests in which cultural

				<p>destruction or damage, due diligence must be undertaken to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) verify that provisions of the normative framework, which is usually under the oversight of a national institution responsible for protection of historical and archaeological sites/intangible cultural heritage; and b) through collaboration and communication with indigenous peoples' own governance institutions/leadership, verifying the probability of the existence of sites/intangible cultural heritage that are significant to indigenous peoples. <p>In cases where there is a high chance of encountering physical cultural resources, the bidding documents and contract for any civil works must refer to the need to include recovery of "chance findings" in line with national procedures and rules.</p>	<p>activities happens. This project will be very sensitive to the cultural purpose of the forest and all the decision concerning the management of the forest will be made by the indigenous communities.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

RISK MITIGATION PLAN

Environmental and Social Risk Management Plan

Risk identified	Risk Classification	Risk Description in the project	Mitigation Action (s)	Indicators	Progress on mitigation action
Presence of indigenous peoples in the project area	Moderate	The project will be implemented in an area with indigenous communities.	Process of Free, Prior and informed Consent (FPIC)	FPIC report	<i>To be completed during progress report</i>