



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

GEF ID:	4362		
Country/Region:	Kenya		
Project Title:	Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Kenya		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4520 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; LD-1; LD-2; CCM-3; CD-2; CD-5; Project Mana; IW-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,000,000
Co-financing:	\$5,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$10,500,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	March 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Danielius Pivoriunas	Agency Contact Person:	Nick Remple

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Kenya is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared 9/28/2010	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A Cleared 9/28/2010	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, endorsed. Cleared 9/28/2010	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	UNDP has been responsible for implementing the SGP globally and in Kenya for the past 17 years, and has developed an efficient and effective approach for the SGP with partners at the national level including Government institutions, other GEF Agencies, bilateral donors and international and national non-governmental organizations. However, further details on arrangements	

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

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 9-8-2010

		for implementation of the project have to be provided. 9/28/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Not exactly. It would be important to receive detailed justification of agency's contribution clarifying where all amounts will be invested and what will be achieved. It would be advisable to the agency to reconsider in kind and cash contribution to the project. 9/28/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, it does. Please provide number of staff and their capacity to implement the project. 9/28/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, BD, CC and LD. Cleared 9/28/2010	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, resources are available. Cleared 9/28/2010  UA 02-04-2011: Cleared Cleared 02/08/2011	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• focal area set-aside?	No. Cleared 9/28/2010	
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	Yes, somewhat aligned. However, capacity development objectives should be included. Please review project document. 10/01/2010  UA 02-04-2011: Cleared Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	Yes, identified. However, objectives for none STAR focal areas should be identified as they are agreed by the Steering Committee of SGP. 10/01/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports	Yes, consistent. Cleared 10/01/2010	

	and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?		
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?	No information is provided. Please provide. 10/01/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
Project Design	12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	It is provided, however it is not clear how extensive information provided in para 8-18 is related to project objectives. 10/01/2010  DZ, Feb 3, 2011: Please clarify which are the baseline activities that will be implemented by the Kenya National Domestic Biogas Program (KNDBP). Since GEF financing concerns TA activities, then all the required investment activities will be covered by cofinancing, so are they the baseline activities? Please clarify during endorsement. Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Capacity of civil society and community based organizations to address problems locally is not addressed. Please provide details 10/01/2010  UA 02-04-2011: The PIF (in particular the BD component) is based on the assumption that local communities have the capacity to develop and implement the proposed activities. The PIF mentions the establishment of specific participatory monitoring systems to verify M&E plan implementation. Credible M&E is also important in view of replication of demonstrated effective forest management by communities. Please provide details during endorsement stage. Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes, sound and sufficiently clear. However, further details on proposed implementation arrangements, procedures for projects selection and etc.	

		<p>should provided. Please provide also details how visibility of the GEF funding through project implementation will be ensured. 10/01/2010</p> <p>DZ, Feb 3, 2011: Outputs 3.1.1, 3.2.1, and 3.1.2 concern clearly TA activities. Output 3.1.3 concerns a credit line, however it is not clear whether the necessary funds are included in the financial data. Furthermore this is an investment output, however the component is characterized as TA. Also, please clarify the output 3.1.5, since there is no mention about its financing or its implementation arrangements in para.36. Finally, please provide more details during endorsement stage how an existing RE unit (output 3.2.2) can provide extra global environment benefit, what kind of barrier prevents its participation to the FIT system, and how the project expects to deal with this barrier. Cleared 02/08/2011</p>	
	<p>15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?</p>	<p>Yes, provided. Cleared 10/01/2010</p>	
	<p>16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes appropriate. Cleared 10/01/2010</p>	
	<p>17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>	<p>No details are provided. Please provide. 10/01/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011</p>	

	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/ adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	Yes. Cleared 10/01/2010	
	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	Yes. Cleared 10/01/2010	
	20. 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)	Yes. Cleared 10/01/2010	
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	Yes, consistent. Cleared 10/01/2010	
	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	Yes. However, further details on rules during project implementation for different stockholders should be provided. 10/01/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Ye. Cleared 10/01/2010	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Not provided. Please provide. 10/01/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, appropriate. However, trainings can not be funded under monitoring section. Agency should be 4%, please make necessary adjustments. 10/01/2010 Changes are made to 8% as agreed.	

Project Financing		Cleared 02/08/2011	
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	Yes, appropriate. Cleared 10/01/2010	
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	Cleared 10/01/2010	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, adequate. Cleared 10/01/2010 UA 02-04-2011: Cleared Cleared 02/08/2011	
	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	Information on tracking tools and indicators is not provided. 10/01/2010 Clarification is provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
Agency Responses	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
Secretariat Recommendation	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
	<b>34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Additional information is requested. 10/01/2010 The PIF is recommended for CEO clearance 02/09/2011	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		

Review Date (s)	First review*	October 01, 2010	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 09, 2011	
	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 comment.