



Integrated Landscape Management for conservation and restoration of the Mt. Elgon Ecosystem in Western Kenya

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10598

Countries

Kenya

Project Name

Integrated Landscape Management for conservation and restoration of the Mt. Elgon Ecosystem in Western Kenya

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

12/2/2021

Review completed by PM

3/4/2022

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
March 4, 2022

Addressed.

March 1st, 2022

- We alerted ITS to update the project duration, as well as the project submission date (that has not been changed by the way).
- The third point is addressed in the table A. However, the text in the portal and the prodoc has not been updated. The para 235 on LD and BD objectives and the table 4 under "Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies" should be removed.
- In addition, please add a sentence or two explaining how this project will be well connected with others under the FOLUR IP through the global platform. Thanks.

January 5, 2022

Calendar:

- The project was submitted on December 2, 2021, not 6/8/2020, please, correct.
- Between the proposed expected start and completion dates (6/1/2022-6/1/2027), there is a period of 60 months, while 48 months is mentioned in the duration. Please, confirm.

Table A:

- Please only report under the FOLU IP Objective 'Transformation of food systems through sustainable production, reduced deforestation and land degradation from commodity supply chains, and increased landscape restoration?'. Remove the reference to BD1.1 and LD1.1 objectives. To be applied in the portal and the project documents.

Agency Response

04 March 2022

The table and reference to LD and BD objectives in para 235 have been removed. We have introduced a sentence highlighting the link to others through the global platform (para 235).

Thank you.

Regarding the submission date, strange because we see the right date in the system.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 1st, 2022

Addressed.

January 5, 2022

Table B

- Result framework: the changes with the initial concept are described and justified based on the PPG.
- Please, check the observations below on the connection with the Global Platform, Uganda, and the private sector. Some adjustments may be needed in the result framework.
- Laying out: please note that the table is going out of the margins in the portal and the text in the output column is not readable. Please, adjust.
- The project management costs seem low (3.2%). This may be possible because no national project coordinator nor financial officer are covered in the budget. Please, confirm.
- Note that if the pmc need to be increase at one point (after exchanges with the control quality, you will have to find a way to increase the cofinancing part proportionally.

Agency Response

- Addressed, please see responses below.
- We have corrected the layout.
- We confirm the project management cost (3.2%).
- We also take note of the co-financing proportionality requirement.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 11, 2022

Cleared.

January 5, 2022

Evidences are available for each line of cofinancing.

Addressed.

Agency Response

10 March, 2022

1. [Co-financing](#) table has been corrected - yes it is in-kind.

We confirm that FAO \$7,155,860 grant considers only the amount for Kenya during the GEF project implementation.

2. Core Indicator 11 in Annex A 'Project Results Framework' has been corrected.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

10 March 2022

3. Status of utilization of PPG has been updated with details in column ?Amount Committed?.

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 1st, 2022

Addressed.

January 5, 2022

- The area under improved management to benefit the biodiversity is 20,000 ha in the core indicator section. We understand with the annex A that these 20,000 ha include 19,900 ha of terrestrial landscapes and 100 ha of wetlands. However, could you please clarify the nature of activities you will develop on these 100 ha of wetlands (beyond awareness with the International Crane Foundation)?

- Carbon calculation: the overall target seems ambitious. We take note of the EXACT tables, however we would like to understand better some parameters: it seems that the numbers used in the EXACT tools are not consistent with the project description.

- - In the EXACT table, we see that the project will avoid deforestation of 6,947 ha in total. However, the prodoc or the portal, there is no clarification or explanation about how this result will be obtained and how this number was calculated. This is the most important

point as such avoided deforestation appears quite ambitious if we consider the total area of influence of the project for improved management and restoration.

- - In regard to forest management, we learn in the Ex-ACT tool that 39,500 hectares of ?planted tropical mountain systems? and 15,909 hectares of ?Tropical mountain systems? are better managed. Again, these numbers do not appear in the prodoc or the portal. These numbers may be related to the core indicators 4.1 (20,000 hectares) and 4.3 (30,000 hectares) but you need to explain the differences and/or make the information coherent.
 - - Under section 6 of the CER ?Global environmental benefits?, and probably under the section 241, please provide the clarifications needed, with the right numbers consistent with the Ex-ACT tables. The justification of the deforestation avoided in particular is important as it is currently missing and it provides a benefit of 2.2 Mt CO₂e emission avoided.
- We understand that 43,000 beneficiaries are targeted under the component 2, but please explain how you reached 60,000 beneficiaries.

Agency Response

- The project will build on the experience of the International Crane Foundation and Endangered Wildlife trust to work with local communities through sustainable livelihood support and conservation agreements to reduce threats to Grey Crowned Crane. The project also aims to work with County Governments to look at policy and governance framework to limit/reduce encroachment of important wetlands. Local community organizations, such as the WRUA, will be facilitated to undertake wetland restoration activities (re-planting of appropriate tree/vegetation species in riparian areas of wetlands, removal of any invasive vegetation around wetland areas, controlling water abstraction in upstream areas, reduction of soil erosion measures such as terracing in community farms near wetlands, etc).

- Indeed the avoided deforestation might have been estimated very ambitiously. At the moment over one quarter of the project targeted forest sites is degraded (10,884 ha of plantations and 946 hectares of natural forest. Through the project we foresee to provide alternative livelihood creation, and improved capacity for managing sustainable the natural resource base, to ensure no further degradation of the natural forest. With regards to the plantations, there is a huge planting backlog for KFS to provide support to CFA's, but we estimated that through our project interventions (improved management planning and engagement, livelihood support to CFA members, enhanced capacity to set-up nurseries), that less people will be inclined to further degrade existing plantations. We have revised the ambitious estimations to at least reduce 30% of the total hectares being degraded, so for a total of around 1.39 M tCO₂e.

- The project will support the development and implementation of integrated landscape management plans across the four identified sub-counties and large parts of the area falls under protected area (including plantations) which are co-managed by community forest associations. The 39,500 hectares of plantations and 23,203 hectares of tropical mountain systems (3435 natural forests and Cheptikale reserve 19768 ha) are the surfaces of current

forest plantation blocks and Cheptikale reserve (protected areas) within project sites. The project will support capacity development of CFAs on integrated landscape management planning and support development of the Community-Forest Management Plans for the CFA plantation/forest area as well as support the Cheptikale Indigenous Peoples to develop and implement a sustainable management plan for the reserve they are managing with the County.

- The emissions avoided are added to the CER section.
- 43,000 beneficiaries will be directly reached through value chains interventions under component 2, the remaining 17,000 people will benefit from capacity building, knowledge sharing and policy development under component 1,3 and 4.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 5, 2022

Yes, the proposed project borrows from Five-year Country Integrated Development Plans for the Bungoma and Trans Nzoia counties where there are clear directions for agriculture, markets, and ecosystem restoration.

In addition, the National Coffee revitalization programme, the Kenya Coffee Platform, and associated coffee value chain projects provide appropriate entry points. Several partners are considered as executing or cofinancing partners: Kenyan institution, Rainforest Alliance, International Crane Alliance, E4Impact Foundation...

Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The proposed scenario is justified with the selection of the Mt Elgon landscape within Bungoma and Trans Nzoia counties, an inclusive landscape planning approach notably to empower all stakeholders involved in the considered value-chains (mainly coffee, but also maize which contributes to land degradation), including the vulnerable and marginalized groups. The Ogiek community is an important indigenous community with a long tradition of forest management. Equality and gender issues are integrated in the approach.

The Theory of Change shows a logical path to achieve the expected outcomes.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. The project fits the FOLUR framework (see further the connection with the FOLUR Global Platform).

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 1st, 2022

Addressed.

January 5, 2022

Yes (see items related to the indicators, though).

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Addressed.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 1st, 2022

Addressed.

January 5, 2022

- Under the Child project section: correct ?28 country projects? as there are 27 countries in the FOLUR.

- The description of the coordination with the Global Platform stays general and mainly focused on KM. Could you please elaborate further on the interaction of the project with the GP, especially on the Platform ?Pillar B: Policy and Value Chain Engagement?.

- On the relation with Uganda, some resources are budgeted to set a Platform to ensure exchanges between the two countries, which is good. In addition to the proposed interventions for this Platform (KM, traditional community networks and secure Bio-cultural Community Protocols), we suggest adding a dialogue including the private sector and notably the big companies to promote further the sustainability of practices in the targeted landscapes. Please, adjust.

Agency Response

- Yes, 27 countries. Now corrected.

- Indeed the intention is for the project to benefit from technical assistance including tools and approaches from all the Global FOLUR Platform and specifically from Pillar B. This linkage and support that will be sought from the Global Platform is now reflected in the project framework and the revised description of component 4 (paragraphs 217 and 222 and table 8 FOLUR IP Linkages).
- Thank you for the suggestion. We have incorporated this element ? paragraph 233.

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. See annex L on the Gender Action Plan.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 1st, 2022

Addressed.

January 5, 2022

- We appreciate the work undertaken at PPG and the consultations (annex I2).
- However, in the project document and the result framework, it seems to us that the engagement with the private sector stays very general and succinct. Could you please elaborate further on how each type of private sector stakeholders will engage in the project along the different value chains (coffee, maize).

Agency Response We have elaborated the engagement with the private sector (paragraph 276) and have created a table describing the role each private sector will play during project implementation.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 1st, 2022

- Thanks for the clarifications and evidences. I approved the implementation arrangements that make sense in the current situation with local and indigenous communities. This approval is confirmed by GPU management. However, please, pay attention to maintain the FAO executed actions under a reasonable proportion. We agreed with the proposed activities representing 11% of the project budget.

Cleared.

January 5, 2022

- It seems that FAO is undertaking several executing functions beyond usual tasks related to M&E (\$595,060 or 11% of the project budget). Please, confirm.

- If this is the case, you need to justify this choice: why not a full National Implementation Modality or a third partner? especially for the aspect related to the microproject grants, \$100,000, the small grant support to Ogiek, \$130,000, and Indigenous Knowledge products, \$10,000.

- Moreover, the list of tasks and their associated budgets should be included in a request from the GEF OFP.

We notably appreciate the connection with the TRI child project.

Agency Response

Yes, the Government has requested for limited execution support from FAO. These services are requested based on the Environmental and Social Safeguards and Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) assessment of the indigenous and local communities in Mt. Elgon Ecosystem. The assessment found that the communities have ongoing territorial disputes with the lead national executing agencies and this poses a significant risk for direct project implementation by the national agencies.

Request from the GEF OFP attached.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, socio-economic benefits are included in the ToC, reflected in the result framework, and included the M&E system.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 1st, 2022

We take note of the description of the vehicle fleet from the Kenyan Forest Service in the two considered regions (Kitale, Bungoma). It does not seem that the vehicles can be covered by cofinancing which would have been the preferred option. The request for vehicles is moreover reasonable and directly responds to the project needs. Cleared from my side.

January 5, 2021

Budget in the portal:

Line 27: the activity is not readable. We suppose we should read ?Facilitate access to services and information (act 2124-2126)?. Please, correct.

Line 42: could you please clarify what you call ?spot checks??

Line 89: the activity is not readable. Please, correct.

Line 85, 88 & 96: we can understand the need for 4 motorcycles (\$8,000), a project vehicle (\$40,000). However, you need to justify these expenses and we would like to know the baseline situation in terms of vehicles for the different project partners. Please, detail the existing and operational vehicles used by the executing partners. Thanks.

Agency Response

- Spot checks are periodic assessments carried out to verify that project funds were used for the intended purpose, consistent with execution agreements. They are conducted by an audit/accounting firm. The scope is not as extensive as an audit.
- Clear, readable budget presented.
- Executing partner's inventory of vehicles in the project area is attached. It shows that the cars are very old and will not be able to support the project for the next five years. Hence the inclusion of one vehicle in the budget.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 11, 2022

All the points are cleared. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement and Council circulation (FOLUR IP child project).

March 9, 2022

Please, address the following comments from the control quality:

1. Co-financing:

- Both Bungoma County and Trans Nzoia co-financing letters indicate the co-financing will be "in-kind" and "recurrent expenditures". Therefore, change "Public Investment" to "In-kind".

Recipient Country Government	Bungoma County	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	10,635,
Recipient Country Government	Trans Nzoia County	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	10,379,

- FAO \$7,155,860 grant: Based on the info provided, the baseline project is a "global" program. Please confirm the reported amount is proportional only to Kenya which supports the GEF project, and will be available for disbursement during the GEF project implementation.

2. Core Indicators: Annex A "Project Results Framework" the value under Core Indicator 11 is not aligned with Core Indicator table. In the Core Indicator table its disaggregated 50% between men and women. The Results Framework indicated at least 30% women. Please, correct.

3. On Status of utilization of PPG: please provide the details in column "Amount Committed" so we can assess the accuracy of the calculations.

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG and financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 150,000 (KEN/906/GFF)			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent to date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
(5013) Consultants	87,992	62,721	
(5014) Contracts	9,360	9,360	
(5021) Travel	26,512	14,841	
(5023) Training	26,000	4,200	
(5024) Expendable Procurement	136	0	
Total	150,000	91,519	

March 4, 2022

The project is recommended for CEO endorsement and Council circulation (FOLUR IP child project).

March 1st, 2022

Please, address the pending comment in the item 1. Upon receipt of a revised package, the project will be recommended for CEO endorsement and Council consultation.

January 5, 2022

The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.

March 1st, 2022 Please, address the pending comment in the item 1. Upon receipt of a revised package, the project will be recommended for CEO endorsement and Council consultation.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/5/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/1/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/4/2022	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations