GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	**4827**		
Country/Region:	**Kenya**		
Project Title:	**Enhancing Wildlife Conservation in the Productive Southern Kenya Rangelands through a Landscape Approach Kenya**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-2; BD-2; BD-1; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$100,000**	Project Grant:	**$3,990,909**
Co-financing:	**$24,820,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$28,910,909**
PIF Approval:	**March 28, 2012**	Council Approval/Expected:	**June 07, 2012**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Veronica Muthui**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	3-15-12 Yes. Cleared	12-17-13 Yes Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	3-15-12 Yes. There is a LoE from the OPF dated February 13, 2012 for a total of $4.5M. Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	3-15-12 Yes. Cleared	12-17-13 Yes Cleared
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	NA

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	3-15-12 Yes. Details provided on pages 13-14 of PIF. Cleared	NA
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	3-15-12 Yes. Kenya has a balance of BD $7,006,000 as of today. Cleared	12-17-13 Yes Cleared
	• the focal area allocation?	3-15-12 Yes. Kenya has a balance of BD $7,006,000 as of today. Cleared	12-17-13 Yes Cleared
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	NA
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	3-15-12 Yes. Cleared	12-17-13 Yes. BD-2 and BD-1. Cleared
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	3-15-12 Yes. BD-1 and BD-2. Cleared	12-17-13 Yes. BD-2 and BD-1. Cleared
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	3-15-12 Yes. This project was prioritized by the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE) exercise following a detailed in-country consultation, led by the OFP. GEF SEC reviewed this NPFE and provided comments in two occasions.	12-17-13 Yes Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	3-15-12 Yes. Cleared	12-17-13 Yes Cleared
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	3-15-12 Yes. The three baseline projects are relevant and well described. Cleared	12-17-13 Yes Cleared
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		12-17-13 Yes Cleared
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	3-15-12 Yes. But not clear if sufficient to change the status quo. See other points of the review. 3-27-12 Issues properly addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared	12-17-13 Yes Cleared
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	3-15-12 1) Component 1: 1.1.) Are the 5,583 Km2 of the 6 Group Ranches (around Amboseli) the only target for this component? 1.2) What are the legal bases for the co-management framework involving	12-17-13 Yes Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		private sector, communities and NGOs and other relevant stakeholders? Same for "Management Commission", and "Kenya Wildlife Conservation Forum". Do these institutions have enough weight to confront heads-on the issues at hand? 2) Component 2: 2.1) The geographic scope of the project is difficult to visualize. The target appears to be the 1000 Km2 of the National Parks. When referring to Tsavo, does it include Tsavao West as well as Tsavo East?? 2.2) Where are the 500 Km2 of the proposed conservancies in the group ranches in relation to Tsavo and Chyulu? A map similar to that provided for Amboseli would facilitate understanding of the geographic scope of the project. 2.3) Please be more specific about the following output: "Integration of biodiversity considerations into the operations of key economic sectors through: a) incentivizing sustainable resource use through product branding and other market mechanisms (e.g. premium sale of organic products)". What economic sectors, goods and services are you refereeing to? This is massive if the project intents to cover them all.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		2.4) Please clarify the geographic scope and the level of engagement in the following output: "Implementation support to critical activities identified in a landscape land use plan (e.g. zoning for agriculture, core protection, sanctuaries, ecotourism lodges, camping sites, settlement areas, infrastructure such as roads, clinics, schools, etc.)". Considering the other outputs, these are far too many fronts unlikely to be properly covered with the budget allocated to this component. 3) Component 3. This is the hardest to visualize. 3.1) What is the geographic scope for this component? There is reference to the greater Amboseli (including Chyulu and Tsavo), but also 5 conservancies. No financial resources would be sufficient to get the proposed outputs in these vast areas. Need to narrow down the area and communities targeted for interventions. 3.2.) What is the legal status of the "conservancies" in Kenya? 3.2) What do you mean by "Safeguards for financial, technical and business management support to avoid promoting practices with negative impacts on BD"? This is very vague. How does this look on the ground?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		3.3) What production practices are you refereeing to in "Production practices on group ranches and private lands for >50% of Greater Amboseli landholders are compatible with best practices in biodiversity management objectives while providing livelihoods to stakeholders". As above, this is too broad. 3.4) What does the following output mean on the ground? "Ongoing paradigm shift from unsustainable to sustainable natural resource use (tourism, improved livestock, revenue diversification) sustained". What activities would lead to this change? 3.5) Target for providing microcredit. This is a huge undertaking in itself. 3-27-12 Issues properly addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	3-15-12 The financial viability of the incremental reasoning is in question. Not clear how the proposed activities will enable those on the ground to depart from the status quo of land subdivision, accompanied by fencing, overgrazing, extension of agriculture and unplanned human settlements.	12-17-13 Yes Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		3-27-12 Issue properly addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?	3-15-12 The economic benefits for land owners of not fencing, not subdividing and not selling increasingly smaller pieces of land is not clear. Are the stakeholders in open opposition to this historic trend? 3-27-12 Issues properly addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared	12-17-13 Yes Cleared
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	3-15-12 It is not clear if the Massai and owners of the Group Ranches are fully on board and willing to participate in this project. Why are they Tier 3 in the stakeholder table (p.13). Should not they be Tier 1 (assuming the order matters)? 3-27-12 Issues properly addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared	12-17-13 Yes Cleared
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	3-15-12 The greatest threat to the integrity of the Southern Rangelands is the subdivision of the Group Ranches which is, as stated in the PIF, "often accompanied by fencing, overgrazing, extension of agriculture and unplanned human settlements. The process continues today, with group ranch committees voting to subdivide entire ranches into	12-17-13 Yes Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		small parcels of 24 to 40 hectares to be dispersed among ranch members and the trend is towards increasing fragmentation of the ecosystem". This historical trend, with the formation of group ranches in the 1960's, that allowed members to gain collective group title to their land, is not recognized as a threat in the PIF. This threat is compound with increased population growth. Please address the issue, considering the opportunity cost for the owners of the Group Ranches of not subdividing and fencing their lands. What is that this project offers them Not to continue the historic trend? This needs to be fully clarified not only in the Table of Threats (B.4) but in other core sessions of the PIF (to be indicated). 3-27-12 Issues properly addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	3-15-12 Yes. Cleared	12-17-13 Yes Cleared
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	3-15-12 Yes. The project will be implemented through the Kenya Wildlife Service, in close collaboration with the Maasai Wilderness Conservation Trust and other partners (such as the African	12-17-13 Yes Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Conservation Center). Cleared	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		12-17-13 Yes Cleared
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	3-15-12 It is 4.5% of the GEF request and 7% from co-management. Cleared	12-17-13 Yes. It is 4.78%. Cleared
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	3-15-12 Yes. Investments are significant. Nevertheless, the geographic scope of the project needs to be clarified to evaluate if the investments are likely to have an impact on the ground, or get diluted all together. 3-27-12 Issues properly addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared	12-17-13 Yes Cleared
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	3-15-12 Co-financing ratio is 1:7. Cleared	12-17-13 Co-financing letters were provided for all co-financiers. The LoC from Massai Wilderness Conservation Trust requires explanation as the amounts in the details do not add-up to $12.25M. An email was sent to UNDP for clarification.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	3-15-12 The co-financing for this project ($28M) is significant (but see item 24),	12-17-13 Yes. UNDP brings $1.0M in cash. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		especially considering that it is all in cash. UNDP is brining $1M. Cleared	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		12-17-13 Yes. Cleared
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		12-17-13 Yes Cleared
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		12-17-13 Responses to comments from germany were included in the CEO Endorsement. There is also reference to the pages where these clarifications were made both in the CEO Endorsement and ProDoc. Cleared
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	3-15-12 No. Please address issues under items 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 24. Thanks. 3-27-12 Yes. This PIF is recommended.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of		12-17-13 Yes Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		12-17-13 Yes. NOTE: GEF SEC expects a responde to the email requiring clarification on LoC from MWCT before issuing letter of approval.
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 15, 2012	December 17, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 27, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	5-15-12 Yes. The PPG has the following components: 1. Baseline data collection 2. Assessment of institutional arrangements and capacity of different agencies 3. Feasibility analysis, budgeting. Cleared
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	5-15-12 Yes. GEF is contributing $1,600/week for local consultants and $2,500/week for international consultants. Travel expenses are $120K of which #30K are from GEF. Justification for Travel Expenses will be made over email. In an email dated 5-15-12, the GEF Responsed: "The US$ 30,000 from GEF will support travel required to ensure full consultation of a broad range of relevant

		stakeholders during the project formulation process. Public transport system is poorly developed in Kenya in general and very limited in the Amboseli ecosystem, making it expensive to traverse the breadth of the expansive ecosystem. This is necessary because the Amboseli ecosystem is very large (over 50,000 square kilometers) and although the project initiatives will be piloted in a smaller part of the ecosystem, it is necessary to ensure adequate representation of the various production systems within the ecosystem". Cleared
Secretariat Recommendation	**3. Is PPG approval being recommended?**	5-15-12 Yes. This FSP is recommended for CEO Approval. Note: The clarification on Awaiting response from Agency about Travel Expenses. Email sent 5-15-12 Agency responded. See item 2. Cleared
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 15, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.