



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

GEF ID:	5272		
Country/Region:	Kenya		
Project Title:	Scaling up Sustainable Land Management and Agrobiodiversity Conservation to Reduce Environmental Degradation in Small Scale Agriculture in Western Kenya		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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):	LD-3; BD-2; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$80,000	Project Grant:	\$3,583,800
Co-financing:	\$7,200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$10,863,800
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Mohamed Sessay

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	A letter dated August 29, 2011 (but received on August 31, 2012?) is available. The amount mentioned in the letter only reflects the STAR allocations. However, the table well reflects the use of STAR resources plus the SFM/REDD+ incentive. Cleared.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	The proposed requested grant (LD	

		<p>the PPG, and the fees; BD \$1,129,383) is compatible with the remaining STAR allocations (BD \$2,506,000; LD \$2,316,000). However, the marginal flexibility principle will have to be applied. With this project, the LD allocation will be exceeded of \$106,568.</p> <p>Please, note there is a wrong number in the total of the table B: The total project grant is not \$3,583,800. Please, correct.</p> <p>April 3, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	see above.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	Yes. \$500,000 are requested from the SFM incentive (\$547,500 with the 9.5 percent fees).	
<p>Strategic Alignment</p>	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>The project is build under the LD3, BD2, and SFM/REDD+1 objectives.</p> <p>The project fits with the Aichi target 1 (awareness), 7 (areas under agriculture are managed sustainably) and 15 (ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration. Please, provide a breakdown of the BD budget per each Aichi target.</p> <p>A set of tools from the LADA toolbox will be used.</p>	

		<p>Aichi targets.</p> <p>April 3, 2013 Addressed.</p> <p>Please, include this information in the project document at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>The project idea was included in the NPF.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>6. 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>	<p>The Kakamega forest is a remnant of equatorial rain-forest (240 km²), potentially considered as a UNESCO World Heritage site.</p> <p>Environmental degradation is the main problem identified with different aspects. Several initiatives, mainly related to SLM, are considered to build a baseline scenario.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>- Please, reformulate and be more specific for the outcome 2.1 (reduced forest encroachment and conservation of endangered species).</p> <p>- We suggest to remove all activities and outputs related to PES and ABS. Our experience of GEF investments in PES, in ABS, and STAP's guidance, clearly demonstrate that making reference to PES (and ABS) as tool to achieve SFM is good in theory and raise expectations among the local communities, but rarely deliver tangible and measurable results on the ground. If the PIF makes reference to PES as a potential solution without</p>	

		<p>investment is likely to result in under-delivering. The statement in the incremental reasoning "Develop of Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) framework for PES scheme" reveals very little thinking on what is being proposed".</p> <p>April 3, 2012 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>8. Are global environmental benefits adequately identified, and the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>We understand that the additional GEF funding will help to reach 100,000 farmers with SLM practices among the communities surrounding the Kakamega forest.</p> <p>The expected GEB are 1) a greenhouse gas-absorbing woodland, 2) an internationally critically freshwater source and 3) a significant tropical ecosystem with a wide range of biodiversity. Metrics in t of CO2/year are provided.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement, please provide metrics for hectares of agricultural lands under SLM, hectares of protected forests or under SFM, and provide more information about the PES that is proposed in the result framework.</p>	
	<p>9. 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>Ok for the socio-economic benefits. At CEO endorsement, please include gender dimensions.</p>
	<p>10. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>Addressed.</p>	

	<p>11. 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>Addressed. At CEO endorsement, please provide a full risk analysis.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>The project will share common arrangements with another GEF project. The project will be coordinated with many other projects, initiatives, and partners mentioned in the baseline, notably AGRA and ICRAF.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. - Assess the project's sustainability strategy and the likelihood project outcomes will be sustained or not based on the evidence in the literature. - Are there measures to secure the institutional and financial stability of the project? - Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention strategy and critique the plan for scaling up. 	<p>This is the only and unique equatorial rain forest of Kenya.</p> <p>There is also the potential to scale up the project's intervention strategy with the support of the AGRA (Gates Foundation).</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar</p>		

Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing per component appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The first component on SLM is financed with \$2.1 million from the GEF. The second component on BD (PES) and SFM is financed by \$1.3 million.	
	17. At PIF: Is the amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? Any comment on the indicated amount and composition of cofinancing ? At CEO endorsement: Has cofinancing been confirmed?	UNEP is bringing the equivalent of \$200,000 in cofinancing. At CEO endorsement, please, confirm the cofinancing from the different partners.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The management costs are estimated at five percent.	
	19. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	20. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	21. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	22. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	23. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please, especially refer to the cells 3, 4, and 7. Other responses are expected at CEO endorsement (please, see cell 24).	

		The PIF is recommended for clearance. An amount of \$80,000 is requested for the PPG (+ \$7,600 of fees).	
	24. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please provide a full risk analysis. - Please, confirm the cofinancing. - Please try to improve the cofinancing from UNEP, as well as the involvement of technical staff. - Please provide metrics for hectares of agricultural lands under SLM, hectares of protected forests or under SFM. - Develop the monitoring and evaluation system, notably the evaluation of global environment benefits. - Include the Aichi targets and the indicators in the final project document. - Develop information related to the PES that is proposed in the result framework. - Develop the socio-economic benefits and include gender dimensions. - Provide the tracking tools. - Develop a rationale about the innovative aspects of the project. 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	25. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested and approved? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 11, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 03, 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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**