



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

GEF ID:	9139		
Country/Region:	Kenya		
Project Title:	Food-IAP: Establishment of the Upper Tana Nairobi Water Fund (UTNWF)		
GEF Agency:	IFAD	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		LD-1 Program 1; LD-1 Program 2; LD-4 Program 5; BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$137,615	Project Grant:	\$7,201,835
Co-financing:	\$61,050,330	Total Project Cost:	\$68,389,780
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	Agency Contact Person:	Stephen Twomlow

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		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,		

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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		
Review Date	Review		
	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?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Overall there are few major changes from the project concept presented at PFD approval, and the below comments are provided with a view to strengthening the alignment of the proposed project with the overall objective and outcomes of the Food Security IAP.</p> <p>In terms of the baseline description, the Detailed Design Report provides an overview of state of food insecurity at the national level, but not specifically for the targeted watershed.</p> <p>The proposed project seeks to foster multi-stakeholder and multi-scale collaboration and coordination to promote the scaling up of integrated natural resources management. It is not entirely clear, which stakeholders will participate in the proposed Water Fund, and how such a platform will improve collaboration, coordination and policy coherence between the agriculture and the environment sectors.</p> <p>Indicator 6 under Outcome 1.2 suggests that the proposed project</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>would promote policy reform at the federal as well as the county levels, but the associated target refers only to three county development plans. How will the project contribute towards coordinated watershed management at the federal level?</p> <p>The Logical Framework suggests that indicators 1 and 2 will be disaggregated by age and gender. It would be helpful if the project document could provide the number of women among the estimated 94,500 individual beneficiaries.</p> <p>Component 3 sets out to strengthen the capacities of partner institutions to monitor global environmental benefits. It is not clear what partner institutions will be targeted, however, and whether such capacity development would encompass the use of relevant tools to monitor and assess resilience.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify the baseline situation with respect to food insecurity in the targeted areas; (ii) provide further details regarding participation in the proposed Water Fund, and how such a platform will improve collaboration, coordination and policy</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>coherence between the agriculture and the environment sectors; (iii) specify what federal policies would be strengthened under Outcome 1.2; (iv) provide the number of women among the estimated 94,500 individual beneficiaries; and (v) clarify what partner institutions will be targeted for capacity development under Component 3 and whether such capacity development would encompass tools to monitor and assess resilience.</p> <p>06/10/2016 -- YES. The re-submission addresses the recommendations made in the previous review.</p>	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>YES. The project structure and design are sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 1 above, however.</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	YES. The grant and co-financing amounts are appropriate and adequate, and the cost-effectiveness of the proposed design is clearly demonstrated in IFAD's Detailed Design Report.	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of	YES. Relevant risks and appropriate, associated risk mitigation measures are clearly described in the Detailed	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Design Report.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	YES. Confirmation is provided for all sources, amounts and types of co-financing.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	YES. Relevant tracking tools have been completed.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	YES. Coordination with other relevant initiatives is clearly described in the Request for CEO Endorsement and the Detailed Design Report.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	YES.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	YES.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	NA	
	• STAP	YES.	
	• GEF Council	YES.	
	• Convention Secretariat	NA	

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?	NOT YET. Please refer to Section 1. 06/10/2016 -- YES.	
Review Date	Review	May 03, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 10, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		