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

GEF ID:	**9556**		
Country/Region:	**Kenya**		
Project Title:	**Restoration of arid and semi-arid lands (ASAL) of Kenya through bio-enterprise development and other incentives under The Restoration Initiative**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	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):		**BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$4,157,340**
Co-financing:	**$12,500,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$16,807,340**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jean-Marc Sinnassamy**	Agency Contact Person:	**Christophe Besacier**

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		

[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
	degradation, issues of sustainability, 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?	Yes. PPG amount is available.	
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes. PPG amount is available.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?	Yes, SFM amount for PPG is available.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	Yes. The PPG is within the norm and recommended for CEO approval. The parent PFD has been approved by Council on June 8, 2016.	
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?	- Table A and B: there is a minor problem of rounding: for the GEF project grant, the sum of the amounts = $4,157,341 and not $4,157,340. Please, correct. - A revised letter of endorsement dated on February 2, 2016 was sent after the project package, with the right amounts. Addressed. - p85 of the project document on FAO's role: please, clarify the first sentence meaning that FAO will be the GEF agency of the project as well as the financial and operational executing agency. - Please, confirm that the project implementation arrangements are compatible with the GEF Policy (GEF/C.41/06/Rev.01). An important control function includes the clear separation of project supervision (sometimes referred to as implementation) functions from project execution functions. February 8, 2018 Addressed.	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The result framework is coherent to achieve the proposed outcomes. Some clarifications would however be welcome: - Output 1.3: are you including charcoal in the NTFPS? Is there a reference you can provide to justify this? (Activity 1.3.2, p13); - Output 2.4: we take not of the proposed process; we understand that the selection of NTFPs will be decided after mapping, characterization and assessment of the eventual value chains (output 2.3). However, some information or data should be available on the different NTPFE or should have been collected during the PPG. Please, provide an indicative list of NTFPs and their potentialities. - Output 3.3: clarify what the GEF will finance under this output; is there any other sources of financing? and how sustainability aspects are considered for this coordination mechanism? February 8, 2018 - We take note that charcoal production contribute to $300 million to the national economy: this is why a $4.1 million project should carefully think about the best use of GEF	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		resources on such issue. - Project Management Costs: no cofinancing is mentioned for PMC. It is not acceptable. We expect to see a cofinancing ratio in the range of the project cofinancing ratio, or explanations what it is not the case. March 14, 2018 Addressed.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	No. A section is lacking to explain how the proposed approach is cost-effective in comparison with other solutions or alternatives. February 8, 2018 Addressed.	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Addressed.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	Letters of cofinancing are included in the package. All the cofinancing is in-kind. Please, confirm that the proposed cofinancing projects do not include GEF or LDCF resources. February 8, 2018	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Addressed.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	- In the tracking tools, when a number is requested and you have this number, please just insert the right number; avoid a text asking to check another table. Thanks. Please, correct LD and SFM tracking tools with carbon values. Table E, Corporate Results: - Can you really claim 152,661 ha of landscapes managed for global important biodiversity? Please provide a rationale on which biodiversity of global importance will be improved. - The number of ha of different land uses is not included (agriculture, rangeland, pastoral, forestry...), but we can read the mention "to be determined through ROAM assessment to be conducted during the project year 2: This way of doing is not aligned with GEF policies since GEF4. In previous GEF cycles, up to GEF3, the experience showed that when baseline data are not available at CEO endorsement, there are few chances to have this information later. It is definitely not a good practice to not provide this information at CEO endorsement - the purpose of the PPG is notably to gather this information. It seems to us that you have this information at least partially: you	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		needed this information to feed the EXACT tools and some of this information is also included in the detailed result framework and the targets (annex 1 of the project document). Please, complete the baseline data in the Tracking Tools? - Could you please transform the targets in households in number of people. - The CR2 includes SLM in agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes: why did you take the whole project area minus the forest core zones? - EXACT tools: we will provide comments on the excel tables by email. March 14, 2018 Complementary exchanges took place on carbon calculations. Addressed.	
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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?	We appreciate that a list of projects addressing similar issues is available (sustainable land management, landscape restoration, water trust fund, etc.). However, as the executing partners are very often the same (KEFRI for instance), we would like 1) confirmation that there is no duplication of efforts (see the Water	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		project and the Adaptation project developed by KEFRI), and 2) more information on the mechanisms that are planned to facilitate coordination and exchanges. This is particularly important for the #9139, #9326, #5272, and #5083 (this last one implemented by FAO). February 8, 2018 We welcome the principle of joint work-plans with other projects, and the implementation of the Landscape Restoration Technical Working Group. We will be pleased to stay informed on these two points. Addressed.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	- A Monitoring and Evaluation Plan is available.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	There is KM plan and dedicated funding in Annual TRI KM events.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	NA	
	• STAP	Please, provide a table of responses from STAP comments (those who are applicable for this project): provide	

[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
		responses/clarifications, and references in the project document where we can check how STAP comments have practically been addressed. February 8, 2018 Addressed.	
	• GEF Council	Comments made at PFD level have been responded (annex F). Addressed.	
	• Convention Secretariat	NA	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	The project cannot be recommended yet for CEO endorsement. Please, address the comments above. - In the project document, include the longitude and latitude coordinates of field sites. - Provide a table of responses of STAP and Council Members. These comments were made at PFD level, just include the responses to the comments that are appropriate to the considered project. - Check the numbers (table A and B notably). February 19, 2018 The first resubmission (January 25, 2018) was followed by a second resubmission on February 19, 2018.	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		March 14, 2018 All points have been addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement (after the Council information period).	
Review Date	Review	January 09, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 14, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		