



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:	\$1,050,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,050,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Milena Vasquez	Agency Contact Person:	

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?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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.