



GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Establishment of the Upper Tana-Nairobi Water Fund (UTNWF)			
Country(ies):	Kenya	GEF Project ID: ¹	9139
GEF Agency(ies):	IFAD	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Other Executing Partner(s):	The Nature Conservancy; Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, National Museums of Kenya, Water Resources Management Authority and Kenya Forest Services	Submission Date:	14 April 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-focal Areas	Project Duration (Months)	60
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Program: SGP	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Parent Program	Fostering Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in Sub-Saharan Africa	Agency Fee (\$)	648,166

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES²

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
LD-1 Program 1 (select) IAP-Food Security	Improved agricultural management. Functionality and cover of agro-ecosystems maintained.	GEFTF	440,400	3,500,000
LD-1 Program 2 (select) IAP-Food Security	Increased investments in SLM.	GEFTF	1,000,000	7,500,000
LD-4 Program 5 (select) IAP-Food Security	SLM mainstreamed in development investments and value chains across multiple scales. Innovative mechanisms for multi-stakeholder planning and investments in LSM at scale.	GEFTF	2,160,435	26,185,330
BD-4 Program 9 (select) IAP-Food Security	Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management. Sector policies and regulatory frameworks incorporate biodiversity considerations.	GEFTF	1,800,500	12,365,000
CCM-2 Program 4 IAP-Food Security	Accelerated adoption of innovative technologies and management practices for GHG emission reduction and carbon sequestration.	GEFTF	1,800,500	11,500,000
Total project costs			7,201,835	61,050,330

¹ Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

² When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#).

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: A well-conserved Upper Tana River basin with improved water quality and quantity for downstream users (public and private); maintaining regular flows of water throughout the year; enhancing ecosystem services, specifically food security, freshwater and terrestrial biodiversity; and improving human well-being and quality of life for upstream local communities.						
Project Components/ Programs	Financing Type ³	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
Component 1: Water Fund Platform institutionalised	Inv TA	<p>1.1 Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platform supports policy development, institutional reform and upscaling of INRM</p> <p>1.2 Policies and incentives support climate smart smallholder agriculture and food value chains in financially viable and sustainable watershed stewardships</p>	<p>1.1.1 UTNWF is operational as a legal entity under GoK regulations.</p> <p>1.1.2 UTNWF's sustainable finance mechanism is established and operational.</p> <p>1.1.3 Advisory structures for the WF established at national and county levels.</p> <p>1.1.4 The economic monitoring of return on private sector investment through the WF is enabled.</p> <p>1.2.1 Innovative operations, communications and capacity development strategies ensure the UTNWF is responsive to the needs of its stakeholders.</p> <p>1.2.2 Water Fund Payment for Ecosystem Services Mechanisms established for delivering incentives to targeted upstream smallholders (♀ and ♂) to sustainably manage land.</p>	GEFTF	1,540,000	6,522,000
Component 2: Improved Upper Tana catchment ecosystems that support livelihoods, food security and economic development	TA	2.1 Increased land area, freshwater, and agro-ecosystems under INRM and SLM	<p>2.1.1 Diversified and climate-resilient agricultural production systems that increase food security and household incomes promoted across 1,000,000 ha in the Upper Tana counties.</p> <p>2.1.2 Carbon stocks in the targeted Upper Tana sub-catchments enhanced and GHG emissions reduced in productive landscapes.</p>	GEFTF	4,318,890	48,573,330

³ Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

			2.1.3 Riparian zone, wetlands protection and restoration increased. 2.1.4 Rural road and quarry management following BMP to reduce sediment run-off.			
Component 3: Robust knowledge management and learning systems implemented to direct UTNWF management and to share lessons both nationally and regionally	TA	3.1 Institutions capacitated to monitor Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) 3.2 M&A framework supports the integration of climate resilience into policy making 3.3 Knowledge management and sharing of lessons learned is facilitated	3.1.1 Biophysical monitoring protocols established and integrated across key partners. 3.2.1 Socio-economic monitoring, analytical and reporting tools adapted and institutionalized within the WF for livelihoods and resilience assessments. 3.3.1 Knowledge sharing and management platform appropriate to UTNWF stakeholders' needs established. 3.3.2 Lessons from UTNWF used in at least 2 other watertowers in Kenya with feasibility assessments undertaken, plus suggested pilot interventions. 3.3.3 Increased contribution to national, regional and international MEA dialogues.	GEFTF	1,000,000	3,669,000
Subtotal					6,858,890	58,764,330
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⁴				GEFTF	342,945	2,286,000
Total project costs					7,201,835	61,050,330

C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
Recipient Government	Government of Kenya, through its loans from IFAD	Loans	37,886,000
Intl. NGO	The Nature Conservancy (TNC)	In-kind	3,000,000
Private Sector	Water Fund Consortium	Grants	6,000,000
Private Sector	Water Fund Consortium	In-kind	4,000,000

⁴ For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

Recipient Government	County Governments	In-kind	6,850,000
Others	International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)	In-kind	750,000
CSO	KENAFF	In-kind	410,064
CSO	Green Belt Movement	In-kind	300,182
CSO	NDEKA	In-kind	199,284
CSO	SACDEP	In-kind	167,000
Beneficiaries	Upper Tana smallholder farmers	In-kind	1,487,800
Total Co-financing			61,050,330

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee ^{a)} (b) ²	Total (c)=a+b
IFAD	GEF TF	Kenya	Land Degradation	IAP-Food Security	1,800,459	162,041	1,463
IFAD	GEF TF	Kenya	Biodiversity	IAP-Food Security	900,229	81,021	1,231
IFAD	GEF TF	Kenya	Climate Change	IAP-Food Security	900,229	81,021	1,231
IFAD	GEF TF	Kenya	IAP Set Aside	IAP-Food Security	3,600,917	324,083	1,927
Total Grant Resources					7,201,834	648,166	7,850,000

a) Refer to the Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS⁵

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society	Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares	<i>hectares</i>
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	<i>1,000,000 hectares</i>
3. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services	Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins;	<i>1 Number of freshwater basins</i>
	20% of globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels	<i>Percent of fisheries, by volume</i>
4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO _{2e} mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	<i>1,646,000 metric tons</i>
5. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern	Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides)	<i>metric tons</i>
	Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury	<i>metric tons</i>
	Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC)	<i>ODP tons</i>
6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks	Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries	<i>Number of Countries: 1</i>
	Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries	<i>Number of Countries: 1</i>

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Fund) in Annex D.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF⁶

A.1. *Project Description*. Elaborate on: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative

⁵ Update the applicable indicators provided at PIF stage. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period.

⁶ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF, no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

scenario, GEF focal area⁷ strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) [incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and [co-financing](#); 5) [global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

In principle, there are no substantial changes proposed in comparison with the components and activities identified in the child project concept note. Project Document provides much more detail for each of the sub-items.

Through intensive stakeholder and partner discussions, the results framework of the child project concept note was slightly modified and adapted without altering the overall implementation strategy. Annex F details and explains the specific changes to the results framework. However, during the design process the United Nations Environmental Programme withdrew from the project, to focus its resources in the development of another GEF 6 investment in the Lower reaches of the Tana Basin outside of the upper catchment. The GoK subsequently have reissued the endorsement letter naming IFAD as the sole implementing agency.

For further information, please also refer to the Project Document, particularly to:

Environmental challenges, root causes and barriers - Section I A and B, pp 2 - 10;

Baseline scenario and baseline projects - Executive Summary, pp viii - ix; Section II C, pp 18 - 21;

Alternative scenario - Section I B and C, pp 8 - 12;

Incrementality and additionality - Section IV D, pp 32 - 35; Section II C, pp 18-21;

GEB - Attachment 6.1;

Innovativeness, sustainability and scale-up - Section IV E, pp 35 - 36; Section, pp 21-22.

A.2. Child Project? If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

This is a child project under the FSIAP. The UTNWF's three components are fully in line with the overall FSIAP approach, i.e. the first component aims at establishing a multi-stakeholder platform to improve institutional frameworks; component two applies integrated approaches to achieve best management practice for scaling up; and component three focuses on monitoring and assessment of ecosystem services, environmental and socio-economic benefits as well as resilience and adaptation.

To the FSIAP, the UTNWF will contribute an established Water Fund as a model for sustainably supporting (hydro-) ecosystem services in a large water basin; two feasibility studies to adapt the model to different water basins; lessons learned and practices on influencing policy design and implementation for improved and integrated natural resource management, particularly with regard to watershed management and climate-smart agriculture; SLM implemented on 337,000 ha and a further 663,000 ha influenced to adopt SLM; a positive balance on CO2 equivalents of -1,647,000 tonnes mainly through land use changes; 21,000 households engaged in SLM, climate risk reduction and disaster risk reduction activities; a monitoring and assessment framework in line with the FSIAP approach, with national and local organizations capacitated to monitor GEBs; socio-economic and resilience assessments conducted and their results referenced in at least 2 county development plans; and 2 information exchange centers, among others.

A.3. Stakeholders. Identify key stakeholders and elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project. Do they include civil society organizations (yes ☒ /no ☐)? and indigenous peoples (yes ☒ /no ☐)?⁸

No major changes to concept note: The Water Fund will be a broad-based multi-stakeholder platform, consisting of private sector partners, para-statal public utility companies, NGO and governmental agencies at federal and county levels (comp. 1). Implementation activities in the Tana Basin (comp. 2) will be carried out jointly with NGO, county government agencies and in close engagement and collaboration with the beneficiaries itself. M&A in component 3 will involve above stakeholders as well as research institutions such as CIAT and ICRAF.

The Project Document's Appendix 5 and its attachments provide further detail on implementation arrangements and the roles of partners and stakeholders respectively.

⁷ For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target\(s\)](#) the project will directly contribute to achieving..

⁸ As per the GEF-6 Corporate Results Framework in the GEF Programming Directions and GEF-6 Gender Core Indicators in the Gender Equality Action Plan, provide information on these specific indicators on stakeholders (including civil society organization and indigenous peoples) and gender.

A.4. *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.* Elaborate on how gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men. In addition, 1) did the project conduct a gender analysis during project preparation (yes ☒ /no ☐)?; 2) did the project incorporate a gender responsive project results framework, including sex-disaggregated indicators (yes ☒ /no ☐)?; and 3) what is the share of women and men direct beneficiaries (women about 60%, men about 30% and youth at about 10%)? ⁹

All stakeholders, partners and collaborators will be engaged in project planning and implementation, including a) workshops; b) data acquisition; c) a participatory decision making process to clarify roles, responsibilities and respective expected contributions to the project. The CSO and county partners of the project will directly engage local communities as target audience and multipliers for this project.

Many of the CSO partner organizations, e.g. the Green Belt Movement, have long-standing expertise in targeting women and marginalized population groups in their activities. The UTNWF builds on a three-year pilot phase in which it became apparent that women and youth form the majority of vulnerable target groups in terms of poverty and/or food insecurity. Therefore, particular attention will be given to reach these, e.g. through targeted incentives (such as improved stoves, biogas, employment and alternative livelihood opportunities) and through improving decision making opportunities in local institutional processes, e.g. in user associations or catchment committees, aiming for improved access to land and water. This is equally demonstrated in a set of gender- and age-disaggregated indicators in the results framework. The M&A framework also contains gender-sensitive provisions and will integrate indicators from the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) into its socio-economic surveys.

The Project Document's Appendix 2 especially refers to poverty, targeting and gender issues and includes an attachment with an IFAD gender checklist that was adhered to during project preparation.

A.5 Risk. Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

No major changes to concept note. The existing risks were further elaborated as in the above table:

Risk	Risk Mitigation Measures	Rating
Weak capacities of devolved structures to manage implementation of activities	The project is being implemented under a public private partnership, a concept that is new to most public and private sector players. Some partners, including counties, may have limited capacity in terms of staff numbers, skills, experience and resources. The project will link with local and national partner organisations with relevant implementation and technical experience. Where appropriate, the project will provide capacity development as demanded by the partners to strengthen their delivery in the project.	M
Ongoing devolution process	With the devolution process ongoing, the sharing of responsibilities between national and county governments is still to be fully determined, adding to capacity challenges in executing tasks at the catchment level. The project will engage both levels of Government - the national and county levels. This will include, but not be limited to KWS, KFS, NEMA, County Commissioners, and County Directors for Water, Environment, County Executive Committees (CECs) for Water, Environment and Agriculture. At the same time, the ongoing devolution process opens opportunities as well, as the planning for major sectoral and overall development policies and strategies at county level can be supported and strengthened	M
Lacking coordination among partners leading to inconsistent approaches	Many partners at local, national and international scale invest in conservation and SLM practices in the catchment, often with duplicating or overlapping and even sometimes contradicting practices and approaches to SLM, INRM and monitoring and evaluation of their interventions. The UTNWF aims at providing a common platform for the promotion and M&E of SLM practices.	M

⁹ Same as footnote 8 above.

Climate related risks of droughts, floods and/or other weather incidents	UTNWF integrates resilience and adaptation strategies into its monitoring framework and its intervention activities to provide for biophysical measures to improve soil stability, erosion mitigation and climate-smart agricultural practices, as well as socio-economic coping mechanisms, incl. empowerment of marginalised groups and broader livelihood options	M
Insecurity about public private partnership modalities	Private sector partners have expressed concerns over the efficient use and the likely impacts of their resources and investment pledges. The UTNWF design team therefore suggested a Charitable Trust as the preferred legal status for the Water Fund to provide equal representation in the management of the Fund and return on investment. This was strongly supported by the private sector partners and endorsed by GoK. UTNWF will further seek to closely involve the PPP Unit of the in The National Treasury for synergies and sharing lessons	L

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination. Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives. UTNWF will be executed by The Nature Conservancy (TNC), together with several implementation partners, including the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, National Museums of Kenya, Water Resources Management Authority and Kenya Forest Services, through a direct grant agreement between IFAD and TNC, with disclosure to the National Treasury. Other partners include the public and private sector partners that will constitute the Board of Trustees of the WF, Research Institutions and County Governments. To exercise its oversight, MENR will work with the executing agency/project management unit to establish a Project Steering Committee and Technical Committees with appropriate representation from UN convention focal points and both national and county levels to ensure alignment of the Project to ongoing programmes and activities of public and private sector partners of the UTNWF. MENR will maintain its oversight role over the project, while delegating day-to-day management and implementation to TNC, which will set up, coordinate and host a Project Management Unit (PMU) on behalf of the WF Board of Trustees.

To achieve the long-term sustainability of the GEF investment there needs to be a seamless transfer of oversight and management from the GEF-supported project, UTNWF, to a public-private partnership – the Water Fund. Based upon an extensive consultative process with all partners that reviewed the various legal options available in Kenya, the preferred legal constitution of the WF is for a Charitable Trust instead of an NGO or Ltd. Company. The Government of Kenya has embraced public-private partnerships and has since established a Private-Public Partnership Unit at The National Treasury. The WF concept was introduced to the Unit head and the project will further engage with this PPP Unit for synergies and sharing lessons.

For further information and organigrammes, please consult the Project Document's Appendix 5 including its attachments.

The project builds upon approaches and lessons learned through the GEF-supported Mount Kenya Environmental Pilot Project (MKEPP, GEF ID # 1848) investing in community-based natural resource management initiatives and Green Water Credits, a project that explored compensations for water management by large groups of farmers to increase both water quality and quantity. Project preparation was further enhanced by lessons learned and collaboration with the Upper Tana Catchment Natural Resources Management Project (UTaNRMP), an IFAD investment in a partly overlapping geographic area. During project implementation, close coordination with IFAD's Kenya Cereal Enhancement Programme - Climate Resilient Agricultural Livelihoods Window (KCEP-CRAL), particularly on nutritional aspects and with regard to value chains, is already incorporated into the intervention strategy, as well as with the World Bank's KAPSLMP (GEF ID # 2355), employing local SLM practices in different catchment areas. During the design of the proposal communication was established with the GIZ Water Resource Management Advisor, and exchange of information and lessons learned with relevant German programmes in Kenya was agreed upon, particularly a) Food Security and Resilience in Kenya; b) Soil protection and rehabilitation for food security.

For further detail, please refer to the Project Document's section III D (lessons learned, pp. 22-24), the description of component 2 (Section II C, pp 18-21), particularly Table 2 on the linkages among UTNWF, UTaNRMP and KCEP-CRAL and the reference to relevant Kenyan projects.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7 Benefits. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

The combination of socio-economic and environmental benefits is inherent to the water fund concept. The Project will support smallholder farmers in the Upper Tana catchment to adopt climate-smart sustainable land management practices, with the aim to increase food security and climate adaptation potential at household level, to stabilise and restore ecosystem services of the targeted area, to conserve and protect the catchments' ecological integrity and to improve water quality and quantity for both upstream and downstream water users. These measures benefit local farmers' livelihoods, food security and resilience through increasing agricultural yields and introducing climate-smart agricultural techniques, and thus reducing soil erosion that is so damaging both to crop production and to downstream water quality and supply.

Further socio-economic benefits will include, among others

a) Upstream/locally: improved and diversified livelihoods through improved agricultural yields, rainwater harvesting kits, introduction of household level bio gas plants, improved stoves, beekeeping, and the provision of seedlings for agroforestry; improved resilience through disaster preparedness, erosion risk reduction and empowerment of marginalized groups in local decision making processes.

b) Downstream/nationally: Improved water quality and quantity, leading to better productivity in water-dependent sectors, higher agricultural yields, hydropower production and to reduced maintenance/service costs for water infrastructure.

Direct links between socio-economic and environmental benefits exist for i) the overall concept of a water fund, i.e. downstream water users benefit economically from improved water quality and quantity and invest into ecosystem conservation upstream. Further, and more specifically, associations can be established for ii) improved productivity - soil retention/erosion risk reduction - agroforestry - improved soil cover/vegetation; iii) diversified and bettered livelihoods - resilience potential - reduced pressures and stressors on ecosystem services.

A.8 Knowledge Management. Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

A full component of the project is dedicated to knowledge management and monitoring & assessment. Please refer to the Project Document, Section II C, pp 21 - 22; Section III C, pp 25 - 26; Appendix 6 with its attachments.

The tools and approaches for the project's M&A framework were chosen with the aim to a) deliver substantial information and knowledge on the ground, b) provide policy-relevant lessons nationally, and c) be in line with the overall approach chosen by the FSIAP, so as to allow for programme-wide cross-learning among the 12 participating sub-Saharan African countries and beyond.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

B.1 Consistency with National Priorities. Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:

The UTNWF is fully in line with Kenyan national priorities, as described in the Project Document, Section I C, pp 6- -8, and particularly its Attachments 4.1 - 4.3.


C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN: The M&E framework for the project is detailed in Appendix 6, with a summary of RIMS and GEB monitoring tools (attachment 6.1), an M&E budget overview (attachment 6.2), key

elements of the KM and communication strategy (attachment 6.3) and national data sources for environmental monitoring (attachment 6.4).

PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies¹⁰ and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (MM/dd/yyyy)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Perin Saint Ange, Associate Vice- President, Programme Management Department, IFAD		14 April 2016	Stephen Twomlow Environment and Climate Division IFAD	+39 06 5459 2681	s.twomlow@ifad.org

¹⁰ GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, and SCCF
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-Dec2015

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).
The full results framework can be found in the Project Document, pages xiv - xvii;
In addition, Attachment 6.1 provides a summary of RIMS and global environmental benefits assessment and tracking tools.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

GEF Review: The PFD was cleared without any further issues that needed to be addressed. The proposed child project is fully aligned with the PFD. Informal/upstream GEF Secretariat comments are covered within the IFAD-internal process through the Country Portfolio Management Team (CPMT).

Please refer to Annex E on the various comments and review queries and how these were incorporated into the project design.

Annex F exemplifies and explains the changes in the results framework between PFD and CEO endorsement stages

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹¹

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: US\$ 137 615				
PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED	GEF/LDCF/SCCF AMOUNT (\$)			
	BUDGETED AMOUNT	AMOUNT SPENT TO DATE	AMOUNT COMMITTED	AMOUNT UNCOMMITTED
INTEGRATED NRM, SECAP	8 000.00	4 497.82	3 324.46	177.71
INSTITUTIONAL CONTRACT	55 600.00	16 500.00	38 500.00	600.00
TECHNICAL TEAM LEADER	30 200.00	12 126.62	16 212.00	1 861.38
GHG AUDIT AND M&E	8 000.00	6 641.85	-	1 358.15
ECONOMIC FINANCIAL ANALYSES	10 200.00	9 915.72	-	284.29
LEAD NATIONAL CONSULTANT	11 115.00	10 132.50	-	982.50
FINANCIAL EXPERT AND COSTABS	11 000.00	-	10 838.50	161.50
PROCUREMENT EXPERT	3 500.00	1 663.20	-	1 836.80
TOTAL	137 615.00	61 477.71	68 874.96	7 262.33

¹¹ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)