



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

GEF ID:	5083		
Country/Region:	Kenya		
Project Title:	Capacity, Policy and Financial Incentives for PFM in Kirisia Forest and integrated Rangelands Management		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$2,823,439
Co-financing:	\$8,675,178	Total Project Cost:	\$11,548,617
PIF Approval:	February 20, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Luca Alnovi

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?	Yes	YES. No change from PIF.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	There is a letter of endorsement with the right project title and the right GEF amounts. The letter is signed by Dr. Ayub Macharia who was the OFP in April 2012 (the letter is in date of April 17, 2012). In addition to the project grant, an amount of \$50,000 has been planned. Addressed.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	The project is in line with the UNDAF (2009-2013) and the FAO's programme framework.	YES. No change from PIF.

*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.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	A Natural Resource Management Unit of three persons is based in the FAO's office in Nairobi. A senior forestry officer based in the regional office of Addis Ababa will help. Additional support can be provided by the forest unit from the FAO's HQ in Roma.	YES. No change from PIF.
Resource Availability	6. 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? 	Yes. The project grant is within the available STAR resources for Kenya. CCM (MB), 08/28/12: Addressed.	NOT CLEAR. The proposed amount has increased from \$3,091,666 to \$3,093, 275, even though Kenya's GEF-5 STAR allocation was fully utilized. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the proposed grant does not exceed the amount approved at PIF. April 26, 2016 Addressed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	The grant is within the resources available for: - BD - CC (CC-M, MB, 08/28/12) Addressed.	NOT CLEAR. Please address the recommendation above. The proposed BD amount has increased from \$1,336,349 to \$1,337,959. April 26, 2016 Addressed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	NA

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	The project triggers the SFM incentive with a ratio of 3:1 (\$3 from STAR for \$1 from the SFM incentive).	YES. No change from PIF.
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>The project is aligned with BD, CC, and SFM/REDD+ objectives.</p> <p>(CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): addressed.</p>	<p>YES. No change from PIF.</p> <p>April 26, 2016</p> <p>There are changes in comparison with the PIF.</p> <p>The project now contributes to BD objective 2 outcome 2.1 "Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation". The number of ha under improved management that mainstream biodiversity conservation practices into productive landscapes is not enough. You should ideally make reference to a certification system or equivalent. Maybe the PFM agreements or the conservancy systems are acceptable, but please detail the obligations under each system.</p> <p>In the BD tracking tools, there is a reference to FSC, but there is no mention of FSC in the project document or the request for CEO endorsement. Please, clarify.</p> <p>June 22, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>(CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): addressed.</p>	YES. No change from PIF.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant	It is mentioned that the project is in line with national strategies on biodiversity (NBSAP) and climate change. It is also mentioned that the project is in line with	YES. There has been considerable changes to the scope and focus of the project, but it remains broadly in line with relevant national strategies, plans

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>the Kenya Forestry Service Strategic Plan and the National Forest Program.</p> <p>Please, explain how this project is aligned with the NPFE for Kenya.</p> <p>(CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): Please reference Kenya's National Communications (if there are data available for the current version under preparation). Also, please clarify the project consistency with the ongoing Technology Needs Assessment (TNA) supported by UNEP. The PIF needs to state its linkages to the convention obligation (National Communication) for the TNA for Kenya.</p> <p>Please, note that at CEO endorsement, we would like to see more details about strategies, plans, and reports to be clear on the consistency of the approach and figure out how this project fits with national orientations. Thanks.</p> <p>10/03/2012 Addressed.</p>	<p>and reports, including Kenya's Constitution of 2010, which established County Governments; the Vision 2030; the 2005 Forest Act; and the 2014 National Forest Policy.</p>
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>- The development and reinforcement of capacities is included in each component and for the various level of partners.</p> <p>- (CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): However, there are a number of references to capacity building components yet there is not a clear link to SFM/REDD Objective 2 which calls for enhanced</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11 and 13, please revisit and revise, as needed, the sustainability strategy described in Section 5 of the FAO Project Document.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>institutional capacity to account for GHG emission reduction and increase in carbon stock. This linkage should be made more clearly. For example, there needs to be a better explanation about how project objectives will result in increased C stock.</p> <p>- Also, elements of sustainability are lacking to understand how the approach will be self-financed after the project. Please, explain.</p> <p>October 3, 2012 Not adequately addressed. Please provide a detailed account of how this project links with REDD+ and CCM5 objectives and results in increased carbon stock in light of harvesting and charcoal production. Perhaps a better labeled spreadsheet of carbon calculations and sources cited will clear this up, but at present the capacities proposed for development do not appear to contribute to sustainability of C or socioeconomic benefits.</p> <p>February 8, 2013 Thanks for the efforts and the response. However, we still have difficulties to understand the reasoning and the information presented in the spreadsheets. Not sure the information still answers our question about how continued timber harvesting and charcoal production will influence the C stocks under this project. However, it is</p>	<p>April 26, 2016 Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>probably not useful to add more back and forth on this issue. Because monitoring, evaluation and information management is a large part of this project, we hope that a particular attention will be paid to these activities during project preparation. A detailed attention will be given to them at CEO endorsement, notably how the results are verified and evaluated, and how the information is managed.</p> <p>Cleared.</p> <p>For the remaining question related to potential leakage effect, please refer to the cell 13.</p>	
Project Design	<p>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?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We would like to remind that a PIF should be limited to 10 pages. We invite the Agency to revise and reduce the length of the document. - We would notably like to invite the Agency to revise/reduce the chapter B.1. and B.2 (7 pages) and provide a more consistent information. It is relatively difficult to figure out the logical reasoning between the five threats (section 13), the eight barriers (sections 14-22), and how the GEF project will provide an added value on the top of the nine cofinancing projects. - Section 24 and following table: We would like to understand how the GEF project will be incremental on the top of the nine baseline projects. It seems that 	<p>NOT CLEAR. The baseline situation and baseline scenario with regard to deforestation and forest degradation, and the associated GHG emissions are not clearly defined or quantified in the Request for CEO Endorsement. Similarly, while the current situation is well described, it is not clear how the capacities of KFS and targeted CFAs would evolve over the coming years given the several baseline investments planned and underway.</p> <p>As for the threats to the Kirisia Ecosystem, the Request for CEO Endorsement does not specify and, where possible, quantify their relative importance.</p> <p>With regard to the baseline initiatives</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the other projects are parallel, but the proposed GEF investments have not really been presented as a logical complement of these projects. Please, revise, and justify the strategic choices to use the GEF grant based on a deeper analysis of the baseline projects. This justification is needed for all components of the projects: the first component of participatory forest management, the second component on legal issues, and the third component on the REDD+ strategy (here please, use the REDD+ readiness project as a base).</p> <p>- Section 13 (line 17): In the same sentence, opposite solutions are proposed, as the need of participatory forest management and top-down management. Please, explain and/or correct. Please, justify the choices.</p> <p>October 3, 2012 This comment has not been addressed adequately. Please more fully describe the baseline including other related activities going on the in the country (eg. Kenya REDD+ Program). This will provide for an improved incremental reasoning for the need for capacity building and other activities, which only may be incremental.</p> <p>February 8, 2013 Addressed.</p>	<p>and the associated amounts of co-financing, the Request notes that the annual budget of KFS is approximately \$5 million. At the same time KFS would provide a total of \$3,255,500 in co-financing towards the proposed project, or 13 per cent of its annual budget. This does not seem realistic given that the gazetted forest in Kirisia, at 91,000ha, accounts for less than three per cent of Kenya's total forest area (GFRA 2010).</p> <p>Moreover, given that the KEFRI baseline program referenced in the Request for CEO Endorsement is focused on research, a total co-financing contribution of \$3.6 million over five years seems very high.</p> <p>With respect to the several donor investments and actions listed in the description of the baseline scenario, it is not entirely clear how these relate to the confirmed sources and amounts of co-financing listed in Table C; and how some of the national projects and programs would impact on forest management specifically in Kirisia.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) specify the rate of deforestation and forest degradation and the associated GHG emissions in the targeted area under the baseline scenario (i.e. in absence of the proposed project, but considering the many baseline investments underway); (ii) clarify how</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>the institutional and technical capacities of KFS and targeted CFAs could be expected to evolve under the baseline scenario; (iii) among the threats to the Kirisia Ecosystem described on pp. 8-13, please specify their relative importance from the perspective of deforestation, forest degradation and biodiversity loss; (iv) review the co-financing amounts provided by KFS and KEFRI; and (v) specify the co-financing amounts associated with the relevant donor investments listed on pp. 16-17.</p> <p>April 26, 2016</p> <p>i) Important complements have been provided. Nevertheless the calculation of the GHG benefits still remains unclear: how the carbon stock of the intact forest could be 144tC/ha and the baseline expected carbon losses associated with deforestation -168.6 tC/ha? How this last figure is calculated? Are 6,5% equivalent to 0,0065 in the calculation? The result of 180,874 tCO₂/yr is incorrect p.25 of the project document. Regarding the enhancement of carbon stocks (ECS) by natural regeneration, how the long term average carbon stock can be applied to the calculation of the carbon stock after the project duration of 5 years? How the ECS will go on at the same rate (new area of +10,000ha every 5 years) after the end of the project? For the SFM activities, where do the 29 t C losses come from?</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Please review the calculation of the GHG benefits, verify the accuracy of the results using a recognized methodology such Ex-ACT tool (which is an FAO tool) and present the calculation and results in a simpler manner i.e without repeating the calculation in the document and in the annex.</p> <p>Item iv (cofinancing): based on the comment expressed last time, we take note of the decrease of cofinancing for KFS and KEFRI, respectively from 3.255 million and 3.6 million to \$500,00 each. However, we did not find any explanation or clarification on these amounts. Please, clarify.</p> <p>The points ii, iii, and v are addressed.</p> <p>June 22, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11 and 13, please review and revise, as needed, Section B.3 of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>April 26, 2016 Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>1- From a general point of view, it will be better to have a more concise text focusing on the information that is requested under each question and particularly for the incremental reasoning (see B.2, p.9-13). All outcomes, outputs, and activities should be justified in addition of baseline activities financed by the cofinancing projects.</p> <p>2- Section 29: "the three project components will deliver measurable benefits at the project field sites". We are not sure how to capture the results on the field for the last two components. Please, explain.</p> <p>3- (CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): Please, explain what is done by other projects on wood fuel and charcoal management. And explain how the GEF funding will be used on these aspects. Social and economic information are lacking on this topic. We do not understand the reasoning and the principles to create incentives that will favor SFM over conversion to agriculture.</p> <p>4- For instance, it is mentioned that participatory SFM will generate sustainable local employment and cash incomes at the household and community levels. Please, explain the principles and how the sustainability will be ensured after the project.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11. In absence of a clear baseline scenario the incremental reasoning cannot be adequately assessed.</p> <p>With respect to Component 1, specifically, it is not clear to what extent the proposed project would complement the support that targeted CFAs and KFS would receive through other initiatives under the baseline scenario. Moreover, given that KFS is the executing agency to the proposed project, "lobbying" KFS to increase the number of forest rangers posted to Kirisia does not seem convincing (output 1.1.2). Finally, given the importance of Component 1 it is not clear why the proposed GEF amount towards the component has been reduced by 27 per cent from PIF.</p> <p>As for Component 2, it is not clear how the proposed project would engage with stakeholders to inform the proposed policy and legal changes, and within what time frame those changes could be implemented. "Lobbying" the national and county governments is again proposed, which does not seem appropriate given that the government is a partner in executing the project. In absence of a clearer incremental reasoning the proposed, significant increase in the GEF investment towards Component 2 (41 per cent) does not seem justified.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>5- (CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): Please, explain better what will be financed by other partners under REDD+, and justify the use of GEF grant for specific and additional activities.</p> <p>6- (CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): Section 40, 41, 42: There needs to be a more clear justification of how the project will provide climate change mitigation global environmental benefits (GEB). As written sustainability is focused on supplies of wood fuel for urban areas and diversification and resilience of rural economies. There is an unclear reference to sustainable forest management and conservation, and in particular a focus on access of international positive incentives. That is not a strong enough justification. The linkages need to be clear and directly aligned with GEB.</p> <p>7- (CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): The project appears to highlight reforestation to provide for sustainable supplies of charcoal. However, there is little evidence that there will be an increase in carbon stocks, or that GHG emission will be reduced. How will reforested areas be counted if they will be used for harvest for charcoal production?</p> <p>8- (CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): Since the small charcoal production operations are highly inefficient and contribute GHG, including methane, to the atmosphere,</p>	<p>With regard to Component 3, finally, there have been several reviews of PFM and CBFM in Africa and globally. It is therefore not clear what gaps the proposed Output 3.1.1 would fill. Output 3.1.2, in turn would seem to duplicate the capacity building activities proposed under Component 1; whereas Output 3.1.3 does not present a convincing incremental reasoning for GEF financing. Overall, the proposed, significant increase in the GEF investment towards Component 3 (95 per cent) does not seem justified.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 11, please strengthen the incremental reasoning accordingly. Specifically, (i) clarify the complementarity of the proposed capacity building efforts under Component 1 vis-à-vis relevant, ongoing and planned baseline investments; (ii) consider alternative sustainability strategies to KFS lobbying the government for more resources; (iii) clarify the pathway to legal and policy change under Component 2 and, accordingly, consider reducing the associated GEF amount in line with the approved PIF; and (iv) consider streamlining and, accordingly, considerably reducing the GEF amount associated with Component 3 by folding relevant capacity building activities under Component 1 and removing</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>there may be an opportunity to reduce GHG emissions by improving the charcoal production technology in the country. This is not discussed in the document. Also, there is no evidence on the net gain in C stock or how the amount of cutting in other areas of the country or outside the country may be influenced by this project.</p> <p>9- Please, remember that under the SFM/REDD+ programme, forest restoration and reforestation are welcome, but we do not recommend afforestation that can lead to a land use change. Please, confirm that no afforestation will be financed by GEF funds.</p> <p>10- In the component 3, we do not understand how the training of 120 students can be included as an indicator of the KM systems developed in support of SFM and REDD+. It seems that the output 3.1.3 should be financed by the cofinancing as a business-as-usual activity. We do not find any convincing element in the text explaining the reasoning for this activity. Please, remove.</p> <p>October 3, 2012</p> <p>See (4): This is partly addressed. Please explain how harvesting and charcoal production will be sustainable after the project both economically and in the</p>	<p>outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.3 or providing a much stronger incremental reasoning for GEF financing.</p> <p>April 26, 2016 Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>currency of GEB for C. Reasoning has not yet been adequately developed for net positives after the project.</p> <p>See (6): This has not yet been adequately addressed, perhaps due to unclear calculations table and lack of reference for data. Please be clear in presentation of calculations how GEB for C are calculated under the proposed project. Please ensure to account for GHG emissions other than CO2 emitted with charcoal production.</p> <p>Also, response to comments indicated that the World Bank FCPF supports the REDD+ arrangements, etc. This should be explained in baseline then this project can build upon that in the incremental activities.</p> <p>See (8): Point taken on clean charcoal production operations being beyond the scope of this project. However, the second part of this comment has not been adequately addressed. Although this project has many benefits beyond potential C emission avoidance, it has been presented as having C benefits so the GHG emissions from charcoal production should be part of the GEB calculations.</p> <p>Please, note that the PIF on charcoal submitted by UNDP has not been rejected per se. UNDP informed us that they will withdraw the PIF as Kenya has</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>apparently decided to program their CC resources on another priority (energy).</p> <p>February 8, 2013 Actually, we are of course keen with support of SFM, especially because of the multiple environmental and social benefits SFM projects can provide. However, this FAO project on sustainable fuel wood production is touching a potentially very sensitive issue, notably when looking at the justification of the use of CCM and SFM resources. At the end of the day, we have to be sure that the whole approach is positive in terms of carbon impact.</p> <p>Our understanding is that it is one point to introduce SFM practices for fuel wood production, but the charcoal demand will remain at least the same, if not higher, while the harvested biomass will be less important in the restored forest landscapes. This implies a high risk of leakage that must be acknowledged and taken into account. Therefore, to justify the use of CCM funding, mitigation measures should be clearly incorporated and explained (e.g. increased efficiency, alternative fuel sources). Requesting CCM funding supposes that the use of CCM funding leads to net carbon benefits. The considered measures for that may have to include activities beyond SFM (improved cookstoves, improved charcoal manufacturing processes).</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>1- The result framework is clear with three technical components. We appreciate that 60 percent of resources are used for the component 1 to develop participatory forest management systems.</p> <p>2- However, we will need further justification and details to figure out what will really be done. These points are linked to questions raised in the cell 13.</p> <p>3- For the component 1, four outputs are proposed that describe processes and principles. However, it is relatively difficult to figure out the reasoning, the justification, and what kind of activities will be implemented at the end.</p> <p>4- (CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): Please detail what you mean by the establishment of participatory forest management system, and how GHG emissions will be reduced or avoided.</p> <p>5- (CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): Please detail how the forest management funds would be used to incentivize members of the community (example in section 44) and how this aligns with focal area objectives.</p> <p>6- (CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): Please detail, in complement of cofinancing projects and government policies, what do you mean in the output 1.1.1 on operational</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11 and 13, please revise the project framework accordingly.</p> <p>April 26, 2016 Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>forest management systems, by "technical systems for sustainable harvest and regeneration developed".</p> <p>7- Maybe there is a problem with the definition of what outcomes and outputs are. We invite the agency to refer to GEF guidelines. For instance, the output 1.1.4 "increased employment and income based on forest product value chain and local business development" is not really an output. We do not find enough explanation on how this "output" will be targeted.</p> <p>8- (CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): The components 2 and 3 should be revised after a better analysis of national documents, strategies, and the REDD+ Readiness Preparation Proposal. The knowledge management and adaptive management tools (or processes) should be described. Please, explain how these tools will contribute to the outcome.</p> <p>October 3, 2012 See (2): Please detail the activities of the REDD+ substrategy and provide more justification on why college classes rather than other forms of education (production of best management practices, extension services) are most appropriate.</p> <p>See (4): Although participatory management was better described the second part of this comment is not</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>adequately addressed. Please explain how this will lead to reduction or avoidance of GHG emissions.</p> <p>See (5): Please be explicit in the PIF what kind of incentives will be used (not monetary).</p> <p>See (6): Thank you for explanation of technical systems in response to comment. Please describe how the systems will consider CO2 targets in terms of meeting the outcomes for C emission avoided in 1.1.b.</p> <p>See (8): Thank you for explanation of adaptive management in text. Please explain how in the adaptive management process monitoring will be conducted and the results used in adjustment of the planning process to ensure objectives are met.</p> <p>February 8, 2013 Point taken, addressed.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>1- (CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): Section 24 : the GEB are not adequately described because there is no explanation of how the values (ha and tC/year) were derived. Please provide the details on how the values are calculated and approximate total emission reduction (both direct and indirect, if feasible).</p> <p>2- Also, the GEF alternatives in this section are not adequately explained (for instance, add a section on how the</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. The methodology is sound, but the baseline scenario and assumptions for deforestation, forest degradation and associated GHG emissions and biodiversity loss are not clear described in the Request for CEO Endorsement. Moreover, Table A suggests a zero baseline for PFM and restoration activities, which does not seem consistent with the activities undertaken under the baseline scenario, including</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project will look like without the GEF and detail the added value of the GEF).</p> <p>3- (CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): Some activities may not be appropriate for these focal areas. For example, categories that should be re-evaluated include capacity building to support institutions, training, incentives for community members and stakeholders, and legal reforms, which should probably be funded by the country. Please develop the incremental reasoning.</p> <p>4- (CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): Metrics should be presented for use in monitoring for success. An explanation should be provided of how adaptive management will be used to improve the subsidiary legislation (sections 17, 24)</p> <p>October 3, 2012 - Assuming the institutional capacity building is for Kenya's REDD+ program this is appropriate, but if it is for another institution there will be a need to understand what are the efforts of the government and potentially what are the other supports (bilateral, multilateral, etc). The GEF can only be increment to such initiative. We will be pleased to discuss further (but out of this review), as this point seems recurrent in many other PIFs developed by FAO.</p> <p>- Thank you for the table of calculations</p>	<p>by AWF, KCFA, KFWG and GBM.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 11, please review the expected global environmental benefits and revise the project results framework (Annex A) and the relevant tracking tools accordingly.</p> <p>April 26, 2016 Addressed (but check the comment on carbon accounting please).</p> <p>June 22, 2016 Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>but we will need more explanation of the table before we can evaluate (no legend, no notice, no explanation, rather difficult to figure out).</p> <p>- In building the case for incremental benefits, please be sure to include the estimates of C before the project in the baseline. Also, please explain how will CO2 benefits be addressed or influenced by approaches taken in the technical systems for sustainable harvest and regeneration.</p> <p>- The issue of identifying metrics for monitoring success has not been adequately addressed. Please identify what indicators of success will be used and how the results of monitoring success will help inform planning decisions.</p> <p>February 8, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>- The gender aspects are included in the monitoring aspects.</p> <p>- The whole approach aims to generate socio-economic benefits. However, the principles and the sustainability of the approach are not listed. A section on the sustainability will be welcome.</p> <p>October 3, 2012. Still it is not clear how the socio-economic benefits will be measured and what will be the indicators of sustainability. Please discuss this in</p>	<p>YES. The expected socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are adequately described in the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>tandem with the sustainability of GEB for C.</p> <p>February 8, 2013 Thanks to include a comprehensive risk analysis at CEO endorsement and develop the socio-economic aspects, including gender issues.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>Most of the partners and stakeholders who are mentioned are governmental or scientific institutions. Please confirm that a deep analysis of local partners will be included in the PPG and that partnerships will be developed with key stakeholders on the ground.</p> <p>October 3, 2012 Addressed.</p>	<p>YES. Public participation, including CSOs and local communities, is adequately described in the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>
	<p>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)</p>	<p>Please include a risk analysis in the PPG and provide a robust risk analysis at CEO endorsement (see also cell 31).</p> <p>October 3, 2012 - We did not find responses for this question. We consider it will be included in the PPG and in the CEO endorsement. Please confirm.</p> <p>February 8, 2013 Cleared.</p> <p>- In the same time, please include in the risk analysis an accounting of consequences of unsustainability of wood fiber production after the end of project. Also, for the consequences of not meeting expectations for GEB for C.</p>	<p>YES. Major risks and relevant risk mitigation measures have been adequately described in the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>The project is complementary of other efforts on SFM and REDD+ in the country.</p> <p>(CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): addressed.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>April 26, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>We understand that the Kenya Forest Service will be the main executing partner. However we will need more details on the role of local stakeholders.</p> <p>(CC-M, MB, 08/28/12): If we welcome the partnerships with other national governmental or scientific institutions, we need a re-evaluation of whether the training planned for Nairobi University and Kenya Forestry College should be retained in the proposed project.</p> <p>October 3, 2012 - Please justify more clearly why university training rather than other forms of education (extension) is required.</p> <p>February 8, 2013 - We still believe the rationale to justify the use of GEF resources is not obvious and should be covered by other sources of financing. We do not welcome this activity. At CEO endorsement, please reinforce the justification for university training or, preferably, find other partners to finance it.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	<p>YES.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13 and 15 above. There are significant changes to the baseline scenario and associated sources of co-financing, the breakdown of GEF funding by component, and the estimated GEBs that are not clearly described or justified in the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11, 13 and 15; please ensure that changes from PIF are clearly described and justified.</p> <p>April 26, 2016 The changes are significant, but explained under the light of the PPG results. The project will have to be recirculated to the Council before CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>
	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?	<p>Project management costs should strictly be under 5 percent of the GEF grant used for technical activities (i.e. \$2,670,076). Please revise the management costs under \$133,504.</p> <p>October 3, 2012 Again, five percent of the GEF grant used for technical activities (i.e.</p>	YES. The proposed GEF funding level for project management is appropriate.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>\$2,674,606) represents \$133,730. Please, revise the management costs accordingly. At CEO endorsement, if there is a justification to go beyond 5 percent, Please, provide a detailed budget that will thoroughly be reviewed. Thanks.</p> <p>February 8, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>We acknowledge the use of 60 percent for the component 1. As requested above, we need more information on the role of cofinancing projects to understand and justify the use of GEF resources for the component 2 (legal framework on SFM) and the component 3 (REDD+ framework).</p> <p>October 3, 2012 Please, provide the budget breakdown per focal area in the table B (result framework). It will be easier to check the use and eligibility of activities under each focal area strategy. Thanks.</p> <p>February 8, 2013 Addressed.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13 and 14 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 11, 13 and 14, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly.</p> <p>April 26, 2016 Not addressed.</p> <p>1) The lines of text that are proposed to explain the decrease in cofinancing are unclear (section 4). The decrease of cofinancing of around \$2.5 million is technically due to a decision to count \$500,000 of cofinancing for KFS and KEFRI, rather than the \$3.655 and 3.6 million.</p> <p>2) The letter from FAO mentions a cofinancing in kind, while a cofinancing in grant is mentioned in the table B. Please correct either the letter of cofinancing or the table. Of course, as mentioned in previous reviews, a cofinancing entirely in kind will seriously weaken the whole reasoning of</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			the project.
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>The cofinancing shows a ratio of 1:4. This is a minimum for such project and the number of potential partners active on SFM. Try to increase the cofinancing at CEO endorsement and confirm it.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. Some of the co-financing amounts do not seem credible. Moreover, the amounts of in-kind co-financing appear very high.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 11, please review the sources, amounts and types of co-financing listed in Table C, and ensure that adequate confirmation is provided for all co-financing.</p> <p>April 26, 2016 - See item 24. - At PIF level, we recommended to increase the cofinancing. At CEO endorsement, the cofinancing has now decreased from a ratio of 1:4 to 1:3, with most the partners proposing a cofinancing in kind.</p> <p>June 22, 2016 Point taken.</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>The cofinancing is composed by a number of projects and investments developed by the Agency, the government (Kenya Forest Service, Dryland Forest Research Programme), partners (Finland, FCPF, EU, UNEP), and national and local stakeholders (Kenya Forest Group, Community Forest Associations).</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 11 and 25 above.</p> <p>April 26, 2016 Please clarify the nature of cofinancing from FAO (in cash or in kind) and rectify either the table B or the letter of confirmation.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			June 22, 2016 Addressed.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 15 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 15, please revise the relevant tracking tools accordingly.</p> <p>April 26, 2016 The project targets 91,452 ha of forests under Participative Forest Management and 50,000 ha of rangelands. This information is coherent in the BD and CCM tracking tools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the SFM tracking tools though, we find the following metrics: 10,000 ha of forests for regeneration, 17,000 ha of forests under SFM (avoided deforestation), and 45,000 ha of areas under protection or enhancement that are not forests. However, in the project document, these 45,000 ha are classified as "forests under protection". Please clarify. - In the monitoring programme, most of the indicators are in percentage (25% increase in households, 25% increase in honey production, 10% increase in income from other NTFPs, etc.): were the baseline data prepared for all these indicators during the PPG? If it is not the case, we wonder if it is reasonable to promise all the baseline at inception or during the first year of the project. Please, clarify.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			June 22, 2016 Addressed.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		YES.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 15 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 15, please revise the response to the STAP comment regarding the assessment of global environmental benefits.</p> <p>April 26, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		<p>NOT CLEAR.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide, in Annex B of the Request for CEO Endorsement, a clear response to the comments made by the GEF Council (Japan, Germany, US).</p> <p>April 26, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the points above.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage		<p>October 3, 2012 We thank the Agency for the PIF improvement. However, some points have not been addressed. The PIF cannot be recommended.</p> <p>February 11, 2013 The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, consider the cell 13. Other points will particularly be reviewed at CEO endorsement (see cell 31 for a summary).</p> <p>February 13, 2013 Thanks for the prompt reaction and the additional information. The project is recommended for clearance.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The GEB must be more carefully described. Please confirm that carbon benefits calculations account for current carbon stocks and GHG emissions from charcoal production, and also during the project and beyond account for the short rotations and GHG emissions from charcoal production. - Confirm cofinancing. - Provide a full analysis of local stakeholders and detail partnerships arrangements. - Include a comprehensive risk analysis at PPG level. Please, include any potential case of leaching that might occur. - During the PPG, please determine whether the ecological characteristics of Kenya's dryland forests will make forest 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>regeneration too difficult or expensive, and what besides plantations would be the fall-back plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During the PPG, please explore how this approach will be sustainable after the project ends. Include a section on sustainability in the CEO endorsement. - Pay attention to socio-economic aspects, including gender issues. - Improve the carbon reasoning (and include the potential leakages). It is one point to take into account the gains in sequestered carbon due to the restoration of degraded forests. However, the notion of "avoided emissions" is more difficult to capture in this case. - Please, reinforce demonstration showing that the sustainable management of the forest and the sustainable harvesting of wood fuel will allow both to harvest at least the same quantity of fuel wood as before and to sequester extra carbon on top of this harvesting. - Reinforce the GEF reasoning at CEO endorsement to justify the incremental aspects of proposed activities (university training for instance). - Please, provide a monitoring plan including key-species and metrics. (please, include these elements in the PPG). - Please, reinforce demonstration showing that the sustainable management of the forest and the sustainable harvesting of wood fuel will allow both to harvest at least the same 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		quantity of fuel wood as before and to sequester extra carbon on top of this harvesting. Please include for that purpose a comparison of the situation with and without GEF of GEF funding for CO2 stocks and CO2 extraction. - Please detail the activities associated with output 2.1.5, their expected CO2 impact, their sustainability and the expected buy in of the concerned stakeholders.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		YES.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 21, 24, 25, 26, 26 and 29. April 26, 2016 Not yet. Please address the remaining comments above. June 22, 2016 All points have been addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement, after a four week web-posting period to inform the GEF Council.
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 28, 2012	July 31, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 03, 2012	April 26, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 11, 2013	June 22, 2016
	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?	NA
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	NA
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	The PPG is recommended for clearance.
	4. Other comments	This PPG request has been done under the new streamlined process: no start date, no completion date, no itemized budget, no justification of activities. We just approved a number and a breakdown per focal area.
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 19, 2013
	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.