



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9674		
Country/Region:	Kenya		
Project Title:	Strengthening National Institutions in Kenya to Meet the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement and Sharing Best Practices in the East Africa Region		
GEF Agency:	CI	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CBIT-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,000,000
Co-financing:	\$1,100,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,150,000
PIF Approval:	November 09, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	Agency Contact Person:	Orissa Samaroo

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	MGV, November 4, 2016: Yes. The project is aligned with the Capacity Building for Transparency Initiative (CBIT).	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV, November 4, 2016: Yes, the project is aligned with Kenya's national strategies and plans and its INDC.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	MGV, November 4, 2016: Yes. This	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	project will support the development of Kenya's capacities to meet the requirements of the transparency framework under the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, in particular as they relate to the national AFOLU MRV system, SLEEK. The AFOLU sector has been identified as the source of 75% of Kenya's GHG emissions.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MGV, November 4, 2016: Yes, the project will enhance SLEEK to support Kenya to meet the transparency requirements under the Paris Agreement.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MGV, November 4, 2016: Yes.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV, November 4, 2016: The project will not involve indigenous people. Various universities and research institutes will be involved. Gender mainstreaming is a key priority.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	MGV, November 4, 2016: N/A. Resources will come from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	MGV, November 4, 2016: N/A	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	MGV, November 4, 2016: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	MGV, November 4, 2016: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	MGV, November 4, 2016: N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MGV, November 4, 2016: P.M. recommends CEO Approval once Letter of Endorsement has been submitted.	
Review Date	Review	November 04, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	DS, November 21, 2017: Changes have been presented in the CEO Approval request, however, all changes are based on insights gained during PPG phase and seem justified. The project as presented with changes seems to target the contextual needs	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		and circumstances of the country.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>DS, November 21, 2017: Partly unclear. Please explain why the implementing agency is not part of the Project Steering Committee in the 'Project Execution Organizational Chart' (page 21), including how the project will ensure adequate oversight and accountability.</p> <p>DS, December 12, 2017: Comment cleared.</p>	This section (Para 33 of the ProDoc) and Page 20 of the CEO approval template have been updated to clearly reflect that the CI-GEF Agency will be part of the Project Steering Committee and will provide technical and financial oversight.
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>DS, November 21, 2017: Partly unclear. Please provide an explanation as to the cost-effectiveness of the approach to train government staff, including with a view to establishing and retaining long-term national capacity (rather than short-term) to meet the enhanced transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement. Also, please describe whether Vital Signs and GHG Management Institute's involvement will mean that international consultants will deliver key components of the project? If so, how is this going to reduce reliance on international consultants in the long term, as a means of enhancing cost-effectiveness?</p>	<p>The GHG Management Institute will focus on training of Government Officials, specifically existing sectoral climate change desk officers who are responsible for reporting in their respective ministries and institutions including Sleaf Element Working groups (for the land sector). There will be continued training of new staff through the establishment of the Kenyan GHG certificates that are taught through the Kenya School of Government ensuring the continuity and sustainability of the capacity building component of the project. Once trained, staff through the Climate Change Directorate will develop the general guidelines, tools and emissions reports across the sectors (Output 1.3.2,1.3.3,1.3.4,1.3.9).</p> <p>Since the project will focus on training national staff, there are no expectations that will be a reliance on international consultants in the long</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		DS, December 12, 2017: Comment cleared.	term. While GHGMI and Vital Signs will be in charge of component delivery, they will work closely with the Climate Change Directorate(CCD). Specifically, in component one, GHGMI will work with the CCD to build the capacity and provide guidance to government staff on MRV. In component three, Vital Signs will work with the CCD to coordinate transparency related activities. It is expected that the platform will be hosted and managed by the Climate Change Directorate.
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	DS, November 21, 2017: Yes.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	DS, November 21, 2017: Co-financing of \$1,100,000 in in-kind contributions from the national government, the implementing agency and GHG Management Institute have been confirmed. However, Table A lists co-financing of \$1,050,000. Please check figures for consistency. DS, December 12, 2017: Comment cleared.	The inconsistencies with the co-financing have been updated.
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	DS, November 21, 2017: Partly unclear. The tracking tool has been submitted, however, please note that (1) the tab on mid-term results is not to be filled in before mid-term	The tracking tool has been updated.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>implementation stage has been reached; (2) the tab on final results should be filled in only at project completion stage; (3) what is needed at CEO approval stage is information on expected results and the baseline, which currently seem to largely be identical. Please correct tracking tool and resubmit including information on expected results at CEO approval stage vis-à-vis the baseline.</p> <p>DS, December 12, 2017: Comment cleared.</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>DS, November 21, 2017: Partly unclear. Please provide a brief description of other, non-GEF support for climate transparency, if existing, such as by PATPA or ICAT, and explain how the CBIT project will interlink and complement any other support.</p> <p>DS, December 12, 2017: Partly unclear. Project is complementary to other initiatives, as outlined in the project document. However, the complementarity with ICAT support is still partly unclear, given the lack of details provided in the project document on for instance</p>	<p>The project is complementary to other projects including ICAT (ProDoc Para 96-97), JICA capacity development for sustainable forest management (ProDoc Para 100-101), UVIO forest management information system (Prodoc Para 104-105), National Forest Programme and PATPA (ProDoc Para 96-115) which together are aimed at helping Kenya meet its NDC commitments either directly through improved forest management or indirectly through improving capacity of staff to report as well as improved data and information systems and knowledge exchange. Through Component 3, the project will build a coordination platform as well as bring together key actors from these and other ongoing projects to support coordination of these activities and reduce</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>the status of current ICAT support, milestones achieved in strengthening the MRV system to date and how CBIT will interlink in practice with ICAT in support of the climate change directorate of the government. This is particularly relevant in so far as the general aim of ICAT and CBIT support in Kenya seem to overlap. Please provide further information on the aforementioned items, in addition to confirming that consultations with ICAT have been carried out during PPG phase.</p> <p>DS, December 18, 2017: Comments cleared.</p>	<p>duplication of efforts as well as identify areas of complementarity and share resources as necessary.</p> <p>CI-GEF Agency, 15th December 2017 Both ICAT and CBIT activities are under the Climate Change Directorate (CCD) and ICAT was consulted and its activities considered in the PPG phase and the formulation of the ProDoc. ICAT activities started in 2017 and should be completed in 2019. To this date, ICAT has completed a scoping mission and produced a guidance document with plans to implement the guidance document in 2018 and 2019. http://www.climateactiontransparency.org/icat-guidance</p> <p>Specifically, ICAT seeks to support Kenya's efforts to establish a domestic Measurement, reporting and verifiable (MRV) system for tracking of NDC implementation in the energy and transport sectors while CBIT-Kenya seeks to build the capacity of the stakeholders inclusive of all 6 IPCC Sectors.</p> <p>The ICAT and CBIT project will interlink through inclusion of activities and information generated by the ICAT project in the CBIT MRV platform (Output 3.1.1) allowing the CCD to have a comprehensive GHG MRV system.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>In addition, consultations with ICAT during the PPG phase noted that the budget for the proposed ICAT activities is quite small. CBIT-Kenya activities will therefore support ICAT activities, especially on capacity development for data management to track NDC implementation for the transport and energy sector (Output 1.2.1 and 1.1.1). ICAT will also be among the identified stakeholders included in the knowledge sharing and coordination activities identified under Output 3.1.2,3.1.3,3.1.4).</p> <p>Please see Page 21-22 of the CEO approval template for more information.</p>
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	DS, November 21, 2017: Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	DS, November 21, 2017: Yes.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 	DS, November 21, 2017: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>DS, November 21, 2017: Not yet. Please address comments under Question 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8, and submit revised CEO Approval request.</p> <p>DS, December 12, 2017: Not yet. Please address remaining comment under Question 8, and submit revised CEO Approval request.</p> <p>DS, December 18, 2017: Comments cleared. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.</p>	
Review Date	Review	November 21, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	December 12, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	December 18, 2017	