



# GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Restoration of arid and semi-arid lands (ASAL) of Kenya through bio-enterprise development and other incentives under The Restoration Initiative			
Country(ies):	Kenya	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	9556
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	GCP/KEN/090/GFF
Other Executing Partner(s):	KEFRI	Submission Date:	15 December 2017
		Resubmission Date:	23 January 2018
		Resubmission Date:	16 February 2018
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-focal Areas	Project Duration (Months)	60
Integrated Approach Pilot of:	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Program: SGP	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Parent Program	TRI – The Restoration Initiative	Agency Fee (\$)	374,161

## TABLE A: FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
BD-4 Program 9	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	1,770,965	4,500,000
CCM-2 Program 4	Accelerated adoption of innovative technologies and management practices for GHG emission reduction and carbon sequestration; Policy, planning and regulatory frameworks foster accelerated low GHG development and emissions mitigation.	GEFTF	442,741	1,000,000
LD = 2 Program 3	Support mechanisms for forest landscape management and restoration established; Improved forest management and/or restoration; Increased investments in SFM and restoration.	GEFTF	300,000	1,500,000
LD-3 Program 4	Support mechanisms for SLM in wider landscapes established; Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities based on gender sensitive needs; Increased investments in integrated landscape management.	GEFTF	257,854	1,500,000
SFM = 3	Integrated landscape restoration plans to maintain forest ecosystem services are implemented at appropriate scales by government, private sector and local community actors, both women and men.	GEFTF	1,385,780	4,000,000
<b>Total project costs</b>			<b>4,157,340</b>	<b>12,500,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF and CBIT programming directions.

## B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

**Project Objective:** To restore deforested and degraded lands through the FLR approach and enhance the socioeconomic development of local communities through the development of bio-enterprises of NTFPS in arid and semi-arid lands.

**Indicators:** (i) % of land that is degraded over total land area in targeted landscapes; (ii) # of people benefiting from FLR interventions; (iii) # of tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e directly mitigated through project activities over a 20-year period.

**Targets:** (i) 20% decrease (feasibility to be confirmed through ROAM assessment); (ii) 10,868 households/ 51,080 people directly benefitting from project activities (tbc through surveys at project inception); (iii) 820,089 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e.

Project Components/ Programs	Financing Type <sup>3</sup>	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(In \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
1. Policy Development and Integration	TA	<p>1.1 The national and county level policy and regulatory frameworks are strengthened to support forest and landscape restoration in Kenya</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i> (i) # and type of relevant FLR-related action plans and policies developed and adopted</p> <p><i>Targets:</i> (i) 3 types including: i.a) 1 FLR strategy, with M&amp;E and financial plan; i.b) 1 NR access and benefits sharing policy i.c) 1 NTFP policy framework</p>	<p>1.1.1: A FLR strategy is developed, including a roadmap and a M&amp;E framework, to bridge the FLR gaps in the policy framework</p> <p>1.1.2: Domestication of relevant international, national NRM policies is facilitated at the county and local levels, especially as it relates to FLR</p> <p>1.1.3: Policy framework for management and utilization of Non-Timber Forest Products and Services (NTFPS) is developed and adopted</p>	GEFTF	368,085	3,350,000
2. Implementation of Restoration Programs and Complementary Initiatives	Inv/TA	<p>2.1 152,661 ha are under improved land management and 8,700 ha of deforested and degraded lands are directly restored.</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i> (i) # of ha of land under improved land management in the two landscapes. (ii) # of ha under direct restoration, stratified by land management practices. (iii) # of ha directly contributing to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use</p>	<p>2.1.1: Ecosystem services are assessed and characterized and land use and land cover changes in selected forests and rangelands are assessed</p> <p>2.1.2: FLR activities are implemented in the two targeted landscapes and ecosystem management plans and community action plans for selected landscapes are developed and implemented</p>	GEFTF	2,431,725	3,450,000

<sup>3</sup> Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

		<p>(iv) # of people directly benefiting from project activities (including capacity building events and trainings) (m/f)</p> <p><u>Targets:</u>  (i) 152,661 ha  (ii) direct restoration of 8,700 ha stratified as follows:  ii. a) Natural forest regeneration of 1,100 ha in MKBR (including the enrichment of 200 ha of critically degraded areas within the MKBR core zone)  ii. b) 400 ha of improved grasslands in lower MKBR  ii. c) 200 ha of agroforestry in MKBR  ii. d) Natural forest regeneration of 1,000 ha in Mukugodo  ii. e) Enrichment of 400 ha of critically degraded areas within Mukogodo forest)  ii. f) 5600 ha of improved grasslands in Mukogodo landscape  (iii) 152,661 ha  (iv) circa 10,868 households/ 51,080 people</p>	<p>2.1.3: Knowledge base on NTFPS in the two targeted landscapes and their commercial potential is generated</p> <p>2.1.4: Bio-enterprises products and services are promoted and commercialized</p>			
3. Institutions, Finance, and Upscaling	TA	<p>3.1 Strengthened institutional capacities and financing arrangements are in place and facilitate large scale restoration and maintenance of critical landscapes</p> <p><u>Indicators:</u>  (i) # of capacity building events and # of m/f attending  (ii) Evidence of increased capacities of community land management committees  (iii) # of coordination mechanisms in place at the national level  (iv) # of investment tools developed/improved to support FLR initiatives (i.e credit lines to bio enterprises, functional FMCTF)</p> <p><u>Targets:</u>  (i) 4 events, 50 people trained (25 male, 25 female)</p>	<p>3.1.1: Counties capacities in implementing FLR relevant policies are strengthened</p> <p>3.1.2: Community land management committees are set-up and working in targeted project sites</p> <p>3.1.3: Restoration initiatives are coordinated at the national level</p> <p>3.1.4: Access to climate and restoration finance is improved</p>	GEFTF	753,838	3,076,500

		<p>(ii) Increased capacity level, evidenced through scorecards.</p> <p>(iii) 1 National coordination mechanism in place for FLR planning, resources mobilization, implementation and monitoring</p> <p>(iv) At least 3 investment tools are developed or improved (i.e. credit lines to bio enterprises, functional FMCTF)</p>				
4. Knowledge, Partnerships, Monitoring and Assessment	TA	<p>4.1 Improved FLR monitoring, reporting and knowledge dissemination at national level (including for the NCP)</p> <p><u>Indicators:</u></p> <p>(i) # of operational FLR information systems established</p> <p>(ii) Participation to # of TRI Annual Knowledge Sharing events, Biennial Restoration Finance events, and TRI-sponsored South-South exchanges addressing restoration</p> <p>(iii) # of TRI-Kenya knowledge products developed, disseminated and accessed through relevant knowledge platforms</p> <p>(iv) # of lessons learned on forest landscape restoration shared and accessed by stakeholders</p> <p><u>Targets:</u></p> <p>(i) A national FLR Knowledge Management system is developed and implemented</p> <p>(ii) Participation to at least 8 events</p> <p>(iii) 10 knowledge products</p> <p>(iv) 10</p>	<p>4.1.1: A national FLR Knowledge Management system is developed and implemented</p> <p>4.1.2: South-South knowledge is shared</p> <p>4.1.3: Participation to TRI global knowledge network</p> <p>4.1.4: Result-based monitoring system providing systematic information on project progress is established.</p>	GEFTF	405,723	2,000,000
Subtotal					3,959,371	11,876,500
Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup>				(select)	197,969	623,500
<b>Total project costs</b>					<b>4,157,340</b>	<b>12,500,000</b>

<sup>4</sup> 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.

### 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	KEFRI – WaTER	In-kind	500,000
Recipient Government	KEFRI CADEP-SFM	In-kind	4,000,000
Recipient Government	KEFRI Integrated program to build resilience to CC and adaptive capacity of vulnerable communities in Kenya	In-kind	2,000,000
GEF Agency	FAO Land Programme	In-kind	4,300,000
GEF Agency	FAO RAELOC	In-kind	1,700,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>12,500,000</b>

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

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee <sup>a)</sup> (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total (c)=a+b
FAO	GEF TF	Kenya	BD	N/A	1,770,965	159,387	1,930,351
FAO	GEF TF	Kenya	CC	N/A	442,741	39,847	482,588
FAO	GEF TF	Kenya	LD	N/A	557,854	50,207	608,061
FAO	GEF TF	Kenya	SFM	N/A	1,385,780	124,720	1,510,500
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>					<b>4,157,340</b>	<b>374,161</b>	<b>4,531,500</b>

a ) Refer to the Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies

### E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS<sup>5</sup>

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	152,661 ha
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	*148,861ha
4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO <sub>2e</sub> mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	** 5,954,109 tons of CO <sub>2e</sub> from 820,089 tons of CO <sub>2e</sub> (direct) + 5,134,020 tons of CO <sub>2e</sub> (indirect)

\*Total project area minus the forest core zones.

<sup>5</sup> 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.

\*\* Estimate has been made using the EX-Ante carbon-balance tool (EX-ACT, version 7). An EX-ACT summary sheet is available in Annex 10 of the Prodoc.

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

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### **A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>6</sup>**

#### *A.1. Project Description*

##### **The global environmental problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed**

The project will be implemented in two landscapes, Mount Kulal Biosphere Reserve (MKBR) and Mukogodo Forest and surrounding conservancies and group ranches, located in three Arid and Semi-Arid Land (ASAL) counties, namely Laikipia, Marsabit and Isiolo. The main factors posing a threat to the environment in the project area, are strongly interrelated. They can be summarized as follows:

##### Deforestation and land degradation leading to the loss of ecosystem services

Despite their significant importance in the communities' livelihoods, forests and lands are threatened by deforestation and degradation on both project landscapes. It is estimated that the MKBR has lost approximately 28 ha of forest per year between 1986 and 2014. Over this period, Mount Kulal therefore lost 20% of its forest cover (Cuni Sanchez, 2016) and Mukogodo forest is losing 383 ha of its forest cover annually (KWTA, 2015). This increases the pressure on existing forests and on their natural resources to provide their vital ecosystem services.

This is due to unsustainable forest use which includes:

- Logging by pastoralists for fuel wood, building materials and for the construction of livestock enclosures;
- Overgrazing by livestock, which removes the understory and prevents forest regeneration;
- Unsustainable pruning and cutting of lower branches and young seedling for fodder. As livestock numbers increase, pasture / forage resources are becoming overgrazed. Overgrazing is related to the fact that pastures are poor and in constant deterioration, also the livestock breeding system is dominated by an extensive model (i.e. unimproved animals and pastures and declining productive capacity).
- Transition of forest land to agriculture due to agriculture expansion and intensification;
- Grass fires, lit by pastoralists to regenerate pastures, further eroding the forest edge;
- High reliance on firewood and biomass products such as charcoal for energy. In the Mukogodo region, this is the case for 97% of the population.

These practices are driven by population growth which rises demand for land. Influential individuals have acquired lands, initially held in trust by communities, for private and commercial purposes. Insecurity due to ethnic conflicts with neighboring communities also pushes pastoralists to marginal and drier areas leading to their degradation.

As forest recedes, dry-season grazing areas are becoming permanent grazing areas, preventing forest and land regeneration and enhancing land degradation. This leads to loss of biodiversity and undermines food production which decreases food security. Invasive species that have been introduced to reverse degradation have led to further degradation, such as *Prosopis juliflora* and *Leucaena*. Other invasive species present in the area include *Opuntia* and *Accacia Reficiens*. In targeted conservancies, *Opuntia spp.* have spread in degraded areas due to dispersal by elephants and baboons which feed on their fruit, and to people using it for fencing homesteads. *Sansavieira spp.* have also spread as a result of overgrazing and land degradation, preventing the regeneration of other species.

ASAL communities have continued to rely heavily on pastoral livestock production systems. Having livestock is culturally very important and as the population grows so does the herd. The over stocking of livestock is therefore a key driver of environmental degradation in ASALs as it leads to overgrazing and destruction of existing vegetation, with terrible consequences for local communities.

<sup>6</sup> 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.

Land degradation has indirectly triggered and increased conflict risks in Kenya especially among rural communities. As forest cover decreases, ethnic groups who have no traditional right to the forest start using it, generating conflict over its limited resources. In addition, since they are not members of the traditional protectors of the forest, they have no long term interests in forest conservation.

#### Climate Change and variability

Kenya is a net emitter of GHG, and the Land use, land use change and forestry (LULUCF) is the second most important contributor with 20 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> eq. per year, which corresponds to 37.55% of the total country's emissions.

Both project sites involve forests that are located in regions that are described as semi-arid, arid and even very-arid, which makes them highly vulnerable to any change in environmental conditions, in particular to climate change. Among other factors, El Niño and La Niña make Kenya prone to cyclical prolonged droughts and serious floods, especially in the ASALs. According to Kenya's Second National Communication, "droughts are projected to become more extreme over the coming decades". These are already getting worst as over the last few years, ASALs have experienced much longer dry periods than ever before, with devastating effects. Overall, the cost of climate change impacts, and especially of droughts and floods, could be equivalent to 2.6% of Kenya's GDP by 2030.

In ASALs, droughts cause the starvation of cattle herds and conflicts over the use of land. They also have a direct impact on deforestation and land degradation, as cattle will overgraze or graze in the forest to survive. Increased climate variability can easily disrupt livelihoods as "75 per cent of the total agricultural output is produced on these small-scale farms rendering the sector highly vulnerable to extreme weather events and the changing climatic conditions of shifting rain patterns and drought. Climate change is adversely affecting the stability of the sector." (NEMA, 2015)

#### Water scarcity

As a water scarce country, access to water is a crucial issue and a possible important environmental threat. In particular, ASALs already receive less than 900 mm of rain each year. Water resources are affected by inter- and intra-annual rainfall variability, including the extremes of flooding and drought.

Forests play an important role in preserving water availability and quality. As an example, they help control erosion which is very high in the drylands where rainfall intensity is usually high, yet very short, with high evapotranspiration rates. Thus, in landscapes such as Mount Kulal, which is a water tower located in a 100% arid county, water is of critical importance for the survival of human, flora and fauna of the region including livestock. Water resources are however threatened by poor management practices, poor infrastructure and lack of water catchment protection. This could ultimately have an enormous impact on the region's water supply which depends on this water tower. The same is true for the Mukogodo forest given its important function as a water tower for its landscape. Pressure from human use and limited management capacity, even where Water Resources User Association (WRUAs) exist, constitute a threat for water access in the region.

Droughts constitute a major threat to both human lives and biodiversity. The Naibunga conservancy, which is also part of the Mukogodo landscape, notes that "in recent years, major droughts have occurred in 1964, 1984, 1992, 2000, 2009 and 2013-2015". The frequency and severity of droughts has increased due to climate change and degraded land. They mention that "this has increased human-wildlife conflict due to scarcity of water, and most people migrated with their livestock outside the conservancy. The community is dependent on relief food during the dry season.

Climate change may further reduce the availability of water resources through altered rainfall patterns, higher evaporation, lower lake levels, accelerated loss of glaciers and rising sea level." (NEMA, 2015).

#### Loss of biodiversity

According to IUCN, Kenya possesses a high level of biodiversity. For instance, it ranks second in terms of mammalian species diversity. This generates important tourism revenues, equivalent to approximately 25% of GDP. However, threats to biodiversity in Kenya are multiple, and include human-wildlife conflict, poaching, overexploitation and human encroachment (human settlements and expansion of their livelihood activities of agricultural and livestock development) due to population increase (NEMA, 2015). Climate change also threatens biodiversity as it causes changes in habitats and an increase of infectious diseases leading to death of wildlife population.

MKBR is an example of a location where human encroachment threatens biodiversity. The area is recognized as a UNESCO MAB Reserve, but characteristic endemic species are under threat because of weak management capacities.

#### Poverty and conflict

ASALs have some of the highest poverty levels and lowest levels of human development in Kenya, with over 60% of the population living below the poverty line (Njoka, 2016). High poverty rates in ASALs constitute an important environmental threat, as poverty leads to the continued tilling of already degraded areas and forces further expansion into fragile areas with no proper incentive for

sustainable land management (SLM). Population pressure is causing people to overexploit and carry out unsustainable practices in fragile areas.

The causes of poverty in Kenya are multiple, and include illiteracy and poor health services, the lack of employment opportunities, poor infrastructure to access markets, ethnic conflicts, among several others. Poverty thus generates a high dependence on natural resources for survival.

Conflicts arise mainly over pasture and water. Boundary conflicts exist between Isiolo and Laikipia, and between group ranches. Encroachment of livestock from neighboring areas is also an increasingly important source of conflict. In Mount Kulal, invasions from by ethnic groups who have no traditional right to the forest are frequent. They are not members of the traditional protectors of the forest (WWM) and therefore have no long term interests in forest conservation.

**Three type of barriers hindering FLR in Kenya were identified in the PPG phase, as follows:**

1. *Policy barriers:* There are a number of ongoing FLR related initiatives being implemented by various institutions, but institutional coordination at the national and county level is limited. Despite the various FLR and land management policies and strategies approved at the country level, there are currently insufficient policy and legal frameworks at local level to manage forests sustainably with local communities and promote FLR, which prevents or at least hinders the coordination of efforts in this area.

Additionally, where the policy framework exists, implementation and enforcement practices are still weak. The creation of County Land Management Boards (CLMBs) was certainly an important part of this process, but their specific responsibilities are often unclear. Efforts have so far focused on improving land tenure and defining strategic objectives for environmental management at the county level. However, implementation of FLR is still lagging, both at county level and at local level.

While recognized in the Forest Conservation and Management Act (2016), benefit-sharing from forest resources has not yet been operationalized nationwide, and there is a lack of clarity as to how benefits are to be shared. Currently, benefit-sharing is achieved through direct negotiations between Kenya Forest Services (KFS) and conservancies. This means that the policy framework for the development of non-timber forest products and services (NTFPS) is also weak and does not regulate or support their development in any ways. A policy has been drafted but has not been approved yet.

2. *Limited livelihood options:* ASALs populations face numerous environmental and geographic constraints in their livelihoods options. Given the arid condition of the land, the opportunities for agricultural production are limited and communities turn to livestock to ensure their livelihoods. However, population growth has led to an increase in the livestock above the capacity of the land to sustain them. As an adaptation measure, communities progressively switch from cattle to small stock, since it requires less volume of grass and can be sold more easily. Still, livestock now competes with wildlife for pasture and often enters the forest when food becomes insufficient elsewhere. This dependence on livestock makes communities highly vulnerable to climate variability and in particular to droughts which are increasingly recurrent, threatening forests and biodiversity.

Access to water resources is also uncertain, as water infrastructure is limited and often distant. Current water management practices insufficiently protect water catchments, which are vulnerable to deforestation and land degradation.

General infrastructure, and in particular roads, is often lacking. On the Mount Kulal site, geographic isolation is a challenge for everyday life, and in particular for access to markets.

While there are NTFPS that could be commercialized, there is limited information about ecosystem services and the potential for development NTFPS. Value chains and market access options for NTFPS are neither known nor structured, and their potential for alternative livelihoods is largely unexploited.

3. *Poor capacity:* Human capacity for FLR implementation in ASALs is limited as communities lack the capacity to design and implement Sustainable Land Management (SLM), sustainable ecosystem management, and FLR plans. Community, local and national leaders lack awareness on FLR issues, and they also lack the skills and knowledge on FLR and ecosystem management. Limited human capacity also results from the lack of knowledge sharing, partnership and collaboration among FLR stakeholders.

Capacity is also hindered by the limited role of women and youth who are not empowered to make decisions and tend to be excluded from the processes, despite them having organized groups that can be mobilized in support of FLR.

At county level, there are also important capacity gaps in the institutions who lack of institutional capacities to implement FLR, despite the existence of Environmental Management Committees (EMC) and CLMBs. In addition to the above-mentioned policy framework, institutions often lack the human resources with relevant capacity, for example with the appropriate technical background in terms of FLR or water catchment management.

Currently, an adequate FLR knowledge and knowledge sharing mechanism is also lacking. Expertise on relevant tools and knowledge on FLR is not widespread. FLR knowledge is concentrated within a few institutions like KEFRI, KFS and a few CSOs.



In terms of financial resources, accessing finance for environmental projects has long been a challenge, and often funds must originate from donor organizations. Barriers for local communities to access funding, either private or public are enormous as they lack the capacity to present proposals in a way that speaks to funding agencies.

### **The baseline scenario and associated baseline projects**

Several projects and programmes linked to FLR (either addressing the causes of degradation or setting up the basis for restoration) are being implemented in the country. The TRI child project will create synergies with the following projects and programs. The project's incremental value is further explained in section 4 below.

*Baseline projects providing co-financing.*

**FAO Support to the attainment of Vision 2030 through devolved land reforms in community lands of Kenya (Land Programme).** Timeline: August 2016 – July 2021 (Phase I). Budget: USD 11,757,800.

Kenya's 2010 constitution sought to increase people's access and control over land, given that 70% of the land was still held under customary tenure system. This insecure access to land has remained an "emotive, contentious and an obstacle to social cohesion and economic growth" given the ways in which it limits capacity to "construct livelihoods, overcome poverty and malnutrition, and improve food nutrition and security". Devolution, which involves "relocating power away from a central focal point" (Fisher) was one of the key concepts articulated in the constitution, and several bills have subsequently been implemented or are being debated in this sense. Along with devolution came the establishment of County Land Management Boards (CLMBs) whose mandate is "to manage all public and unregistered community land, to keep copy of the registry and to conduct research on historical land injustices that need to be addressed including exercising the right of women's access to land", but also to plan for land use and to coordinate with communities.

In the midst of this transition, there is a need to strengthen the legal and policy framework at the county level, and build capacity for improved land management. The Land Programme's overall objective is "to improve food security through equitable and secure access and management of land for better livelihoods and socioeconomic development in all counties as per Vision 2030." The Land Programme is expected to last for 15 years and be implemented in three 5-year phases. Phase I focused on addressing community land rights and responds to the needs of ASAL counties around land (communal pastures, natural resources management and conflicts, establishment of registries, etc.).

Its four main expected results are:

- Land administration and management established in selected counties;
- Participatory land use planning initiated and planning methodology established in selected counties;
- Land Policy and legal framework for improved land governance at county established and rolled out in line with the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure;
- Knowledge management and capacity of research institutions on national land issues strengthened.

The TRI Kenya project will work hand in hand with the Land Programme, as the latter strengthens the policy and administrative foundations that will enable TRI Kenya to reach its full potential.

**FAO/European Union (EU) Reviving ASAL Economies through Livestock Opportunities and Improved Coordination (RAELOC).** Timeline: September 2015 – August 2018. Budget: USD 6,757,000.

RAELOC aims to contribute to the Ending Drought Emergencies (EDE) strategy which builds on the National Policy for the Sustainable Development of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands. The EDE's objective is to strengthen the resilience of livelihoods in ASAL to the effects of drought and climate change, using two main strategies: i) strengthening the basic foundations for growth and development, such as security, infrastructure and human capital and ii) strengthening the institutional and financing framework for drought risk management (DRM). The EDE is operationalized through six common program frameworks. RAELOC supports the EDE through improved food and nutrition security of the targeted population, more specifically through livestock opportunities and improved coordination.

RAELOC targets all ASAL counties, however, a specific focus and resources are being placed on the following seven counties: Turkana, Samburu, Isiolo, Marsabit, Kitui, Tana River and Garissa.

During its second year of implementation, the FAO took part and provided advice to the management structures of the Common Framework Pillar 4 (Sustainable livelihoods), Pillar 6 (Institutional Development and Knowledge Management), and to the ASAL Donor group meetings. The project also commissioned a study on coordination that recommended structures and actions to improve coordination. RAELOC also supported the accelerated implementation in Participatory Natural Resources Management in five counties, namely Garissa, Isiolo, Marsabit, Samburu and Tana River. In addition to this, an eradication strategy for *Peste des petits ruminants* was drafted and several disease surveillance activities were implemented.

RAELOC has also supported two food security assessments as well as a resilience baseline assessment in Kitui, Marsabit and Isiolo. A gender capacity needs assessment was also conducted to inform trainings on integrating gender and HIV/AIDS into agriculture that were conducted in Marsabit, Isiolo, Samburu, Tana River, Turkana, Garissa and Kitui counties.

The TRI child project will build on activities initiated by RAELOC on rangeland management methodologies and practices and will complement them through support to implementing concrete rangeland restoration activities in the targeted conservancies in Mukogodo landscapes and concrete sustainable livestock management practices, including grazing management plans, in the two targeted landscapes.

**KEFRI programs.** KEFRI undertakes research projects in five areas related to forestry. In addition, it leads five eco-region research programs which are organized by geographic coverage, namely: Central highlands, Drylands, Rift Valley, Lake Victoria basin, and Coastal. In addition, the Forest Products Research Centre covers the entire country.

Among the projects relevant to this Kenya TRI project are the following:

- **Integrated Programme To Build Resilience To Climate Change and Adaptive Capacity Of Vulnerable Communities In Kenya.** This programme seeks to enhance resilience and adaptive capacity to climate change of selected communities in various Counties in Kenya in order to increase food security and environmental management. It develops and implements integrated adaptive mechanisms to increase community livelihood resilience to climate change.  
  
The total project budget is USD 9,998,302 and the amount transferred to date is USD 4,956,906, meaning the project is at mid-term and can already generate some lessons learned to be used by this restoration initiative. It is active in 21 counties including Laikipia and Marsabit counties. The project is executed by three organizations: KEFRI, Tana and Athi Rivers Development Authority (TARDA) and Coast Development Authority (CDA).
- **Capacity Development Project for Sustainable Forest Management in Kenya (CADEP-SFM).** This 5 years project is funded by JICA and aims at strengthening the national capacity at national and county levels for sustainable forest management. It is implemented by the MENR, KFS, KEFRI and the County Governments. It covers the following five components:
  - Policy support implemented by the MENR: enhanced implementing and monitoring capacities of forest –related policies; prepare policy briefs based on the results of monitoring.
  - Pilot implementation through County Government and Private sector (implemented by KFS): Assist two pilot Counties to promote sustainable forest management; design and implement a scheme to work with private sector to promote the use of improved seedlings.
  - REDD+ Readiness Support implemented by KFS: Develop NFMS (National Forest Monitoring System); develop and evaluate FRL (Forest Reference Level); create 2020 Land Cover/Land Use map.
  - Tree Breeding implemented by KEFRI: Improve seed orchards and seed stands; support to establish seed orchards in the pilot Counties.
  - Regional Cooperation implemented by KEFRI: Collect and share good practice information for strengthening the resilience to climate change; hold regional cooperation meetings and forum.
- **Kenya Water Tower Protection and Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation (WaTer) programme:** This 6-year project is funded by the EU and aims to “support the eradication of poverty through enhancing the productivity of ecosystem services in two of Kenya’s water towers: Mount Elgon and Cherangany hills and its ecosystems covering 11 counties”, namely: Trans-Nzoia, Bungoma, West Pokot, Egeyo Marakwet, Nandi, Uasin Gishu, Kisumu, Kakamega, Busia and Siaya County. This EUR 5 million project, which was launched in June 2016, will improve the “quality and quantity of ecosystem services provided by Kenya’s water towers through increased forest cover, improved landscape and natural resources management and waste management systems leading to increased benefits to rural communities from forest, agriculture and agro-forestry land use systems.” (KEFRI, 2017).

The proposed project will complement activities undertaken by the WaTer programme in two of Kenya’s water towers, applying best practices and lessons learned from this programme in water management activities that will be undertaken in the MKBR and Mukogodo forest.

It will also draw on lessons learned from the CADEP-SFM project on tree breeding and will complement the policy support provided to forest management implementation and monitoring related policies.

In terms of the knowledge base for the two targeted landscapes, the project will build on research activities initiated by KEFRI in the Upper Ewaso Ngiro River Basin and activities undertaken by the NMK in the MKBR. It will be filling the knowledge gap and characterizing their ecosystem services, including the potentialities in terms of NTFPS development.

KEFRI will also provide PMC-related co-financing (in-kind) by hosting the Project Management Unit - making available office space and equipment to the PMU members. Cars will also be made available to the project task force during some supervision missions.

#### *Other associated initiatives*

**Lake Turkana Wind Power (LTWP) project.** Given the strong winds observed in the region between Lake Turkana and Mount Kulal, and also in line with Vision 2030's priorities, the LTWP project is the largest investment in Kenya's history. The Lake Turkana Wind Power Consortium is currently building a wind farm that will count 365 turbines, its associated overhead electric grid collection system and a high voltage switchyard. The project will also rehabilitate approximately 200 km of existing road between Laisamis and Loyangalani.

When its construction is completed, in 2017, the LTWP will provide 310 MW of renewable energy to Kenya's national grid, which is the equivalent of approximately 15% of Kenya's energy capacity. This energy will be bought by the Kenya Power & Lighting Company Ltd at a fixed price for 20 years. Each turbine will produce 0.850 MW with a height of 44 m. The project has rented 150,000 acres (60,703 ha) of land to the Government of Kenya for 99 years for the project (ADB, 2011) (LTWP, 2017).

LTWP's environmental and social impact assessment identified positive and negative economic, social, and physical impacts of the project as well as mitigation measures for the negative impacts. It proposed the creation of a corporate social responsibility (CSR) program as a means to implement several of these mitigation actions (ADB, 2011). For this purpose, the project created the Winds of Change Foundation (WoC) to improve the livelihoods of the communities in the project area. Over the 20-year lifetime of the project, WoC should contribute approximately Euro 10 million (USD 11.3 million) to the following focus areas (LTWP, 2017):

- Enhancing employability through primary/secondary education support and vocational training support;
- Enhancing access to health services by supporting health education and facilities; and
- Providing water, specifically for the health and employability initiatives to provide a sustainable impact and improve livelihoods. In the medium term this focus will shift to emphasize livelihoods activities.

In the MKBR, the TRI project will closely work with the WoC initiatives, leveraging their ongoing and future activities on environment, education, water access and livelihoods; using their community platform to facilitate project implementation; and complementing their activities with concrete FLR activities on the ground.

**KEFRI other initiatives.** In addition to the co-financing projects listed above, KEFRI is implementing the following research projects that will generate useful information to the TRI activities:

- **Using integrated modeling framework to evaluate the impact of human-induced land use/land cover change on carbon dynamics in Upper Ewaso Ngiro River Basin (UENERB):** Funded by the United States National Academy of Science Partnerships for Enhanced Engagement in Research (NAS-PEER), this project seeks to "evaluate the performance of integrated and nested modeling framework in predicting the impacts of human-induced land-use/land cover changes to dynamics of water and carbon fluxes of wooded and open grasslands". This research project is currently under implementation in Il Motiok group ranch and Mpala Ranch in the Mukogodo landscape.
- **Integrated collaborative research on climate change, water resources and food security in UENERB for sustainable management and enhanced ecosystem health:** The UENERB covers an area of about 15,634 km<sup>2</sup> that extends from "high potential" areas of Mount Kenya and the Aberdares down across six ASAL counties in northern Kenya. The rangelands are becoming increasingly degraded due to an increase in pressure resulting from growing human and animal populations. The interconnections between the various ecological and human processes across the diverse ecosystems and multiple interactions is not well understood and prevents the definition of strategies for sustainable development. This research project, which has been approved but has not yet started, will therefore "carry out an integrated research to characterize UENERB to address challenges of ecosystem degradation, climate change, water resources and food insecurity for sustainable management and enhanced ecosystem health."

**KFS Forest Farm and Dry Land Forestry Program.** This department of KFS provides technical support to the counties and advisory services for forest management. It also promotes biomass energy development and utilization, forestry technology development and transfer, private and farm forestry, dryland and forest conservation, farmer field school (FFS), and other participatory forest management. It has been putting forward innovations and strategies to support the achievement of Vision 2030 10% forest cover target as per KFS 1st Strategic Objective ("Increase Net Forest Cover"). Among these are the following (KFS, 2017):

- Promote on-farm forest plantations using a business approach;
- Farm Forestry Field Schools: Extension methodologies;
- The school greening program;
- Urban tree planting amenity program;
- Development of charcoal industry (Formation of Charcoal Producers Associations and value chain development);

- Woodland management planning for livelihood improvement;
- NTFPs development (Gums and resins);
- Partnerships and stakeholder participation in forestry development;
- Bamboo growing and value chain development;
- Engagement of County Governments in forestry development.

This GEF project will leverage the capacity building and infrastructure development and market value chain strengthening supported by this project, as well as the efforts to increase resilience of farmers to weather-related shocks. GEF investment will bring added value by strengthening national and institutional and technical capacity, as well as information systems that will strengthen the efficacy of decision-making for agricultural adaptation to climate change.

**The proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project.**

The development objective of the TRI Kenya project is to contribute to the restoration of degraded and deforested landscapes in arid and semi-arid lands in Kenya for resilient economic development and livelihoods and improved ecosystem functioning, in support of Kenyan pledge to the Bonn Challenge.

Its overall objective is to restore deforested and degraded lands through the FLR approach and enhance the socioeconomic development of local communities through the development of bio-enterprises of NTFPS in ASALs. Its goal is to reduce the overall proportion of degraded land by 20% in the areas covered by the project.

The situation of the project sites, and more broadly of the ASAL regions in Kenya, is critical, with a dependency of the population on livestock for their livelihoods, increasing pressure on land and ecosystems, and an increasing frequency of droughts. For this reason, this TRI child project proposes an integrated approach that promotes bio-enterprises, more specifically ones that rely on commercialization of NTFPS, as alternative livelihoods in a way that generates an incentive for communities to protect their forests and landscape, and to promote FLR. Thus, the project will increase the resilience of targeted communities and lead to the direct restoration of 8,700 ha of deforested and degraded wood and shrub lands and indirect restoration of 55,352 ha.

This will be achieved through the following four components (aligned with the other national projects under TRI): Component 1: Policy Development and Integration; Component 2: Implementation of restoration programs and complementary initiatives; Component 3: Institutions, Finance and Upscaling; and Component 4: Knowledge, Partnerships and Monitoring and Assessment. The following section describes the scope of the components in terms of outputs and outcomes expected to be achieved, aiming at overcoming the barriers described earlier.

The selected project sites are listed in the table below (further description of the project sites and selection criteria are provided in section 1.1.2 of the Prodoc).

County	Landscapes and specific sites	Area (Ha)	Households
Marsabit (Laisamis)	Mount Kulal Biosphere Reserve	Forest core zone: 1,100 ha	1187
	Arapal	42,810	380
	Gatab	7,1490	600
Laikipia (Laikipia North)	Mukogodo Forest	30,189 ha total area, out of which forest core zone = 2,700 ha	6933
	Il Ngwesi conservancy	9,470	586
	Makurian group ranch	5,390	323
	Kuri kuri group ranch	3,340	405
	Lekurruki conservancy (Sieku)	15,872	454
Isiolo	Oldonyiro conservancy	52,500	n/a

Leparua conservancy	34,200	n/a
---------------------	--------	-----

## Component 1: Policy Development and Integration

Outcome 1: The national and county level policy and regulatory frameworks are strengthened to support forest and landscape restoration in Kenya

While important legislation and policy changes have been undertaken in recent years at the national level in the field of forest management and FLR, the overall consolidation of these policies, calls for further planning at county level and for the consolidation of regulatory frameworks at the national level, as highlighted in the recent FLR policy review conducted by KFS. In addition to FLR, the question of benefit sharing needs to be further discussed and clarified through a specific NTFPS policy if these are to be put forward as an alternative and sustainable livelihood.

Output 1.1: An FLR strategy is developed, including a roadmap and monitoring framework to bridge the FLR gaps in the policy framework

*Activity 1.1.1. Review the policy and legal framework for upscaling landscape restoration in Kenya conducted in 2016, and develop a specific FLR strategy, including a financing investment plan.* The Landscape Restoration Technical Working Group (LRTWG) identified the most pressing FLR challenges and opportunities, developing maps and statistics presenting restoration options. This now requires some level of operationalization for these ideas to translate into an actual strategy for FLR. The TRI Kenya project will support the LRTWG to develop a roadmap for designing this strategy and to further develop the strategy. The approach proposed is participatory, with the LRTWG and experts undertaking consultative meetings with stakeholders and hosting a consultative workshop. KFS and KEFRI expertise will lead the process to ensure good ownership. This support should be provided during the entire project duration, with a mid-term target being the development of the roadmap which should be undertaken during Project Year (PY) 1 and 2, and the final goal being the adoption of the strategy by the end of PY 4.

Output 1.2: Domestication of relevant international and national NRM policies is facilitated at the county and local levels, especially as it relates to FLR

*Activity 1.2.1. Assessment of the existence and adoption level of specific forest/FLR policies at county level, including traditional land management systems:* Along with devolution comes the need to adapt the related policy framework at local level, which is what will be undertaken in both Marsabit and Laikipia. This will be achieved with the support of external consultants who will undertake policy meetings with county officials and public officers. The project will review current FLR and NRM practices and existing legislative frameworks in both counties and identify policy changes or gaps that need to be filled to further domestication. Recommendations will be made to county governments. As it is a foundation of the activities of the project, this study will be conducted during PY 1.

*Activity 1.2.2. Review the level of compliance of local and customary by-laws to the county and national policy framework:* Along with a policy gaps analysis and a review of current FLR and NRM policies and practices, the project will also analyze the level of compliance of local by-laws to the county and national FLR policy framework and propose adjustments to ensure coherence of the overall policy and legal framework. This segment of the study will also be conducted during PY 1 and early PY 2.

*Activity 1.2.3. Make recommendations towards the amendment of existing laws at the county level to address any policy gap:* Building on the studies undertaken under the previous activities, this activity will entail the provision of technical advice by consultants to update Marsabit's and Laikipia's legislation. The Project Management Unit (PMU) will also support the process by sharing knowledge and fostering dialogue around the issues at stake. This will involve holding an awareness raising workshop, facilitating policy dialogue meetings and overall advocacy for the new legislative framework. The PMU will have a clearer vision of the actions and timeline for this activity and for activity 1.2.4 by the end of PY 1, but it is likely that it will be ongoing for at least PY 2, 3 and 4.

Output 1.3: Policy framework for management and utilization of NTFPS is developed and adopted

*Activity 1.3.1 Support the development of the "Natural resources access and benefits sharing" policy:* Given the current lack of clarity as to how benefits derived from forest services are to be shared, the project will attempt to fill this policy gap by facilitating the process of finalizing and obtaining approval for this policy, which is currently in draft form. This will be achieved through the provision of external technical advice but also the mobilization of expertise from KEFRI and KFS and the organization of participatory meetings and a consultative and validation workshop, with the aim of obtaining approval by the middle of PY 3. Building on this, the project will support the development of a benefit sharing agreement between KFS and IIMAMUSI CFA in Mukogodo forest.

*Activity 1.3.2. Support the development of a Non Timber Forest Products and Services (NTFPS) management strategy:* Closely linked to the benefit-sharing policy, and essential for the long term sustainability of bio-enterprises promoted under this project, is the development of a NTFPS management strategy that would provide priorities, guidelines and support for the development of sustainable NTFPS, in particular when it comes to defining a framework for sustainable charcoal production. While legislation exists

about charcoal, the challenge remains to attain sustainability and to support the principles of environmental integrity. KEFRI and KFS will provide their expertise in support for the development of this strategy, which will be complemented with the inputs of external consultants who will hold multi-stakeholder consultation meetings and a validation workshop. This process will also be able to build on previous experience from the early implementation of the activities on the ground from Component 2. A roadmap for developing this strategy will be prepared during the first half of PY 3, when the benefit-sharing policy is close to being approved. The actual development of this strategy will take place during the final years of the project, with the target of having a final strategy by the end of the project.

## **Component 2: Implementation of Restoration Programs and Complementary Initiatives**

Outcome 2: 152,661 ha are under improved management (including 8,700 ha directly restored and 55,352 ha indirectly restored)

Output 2.1: Ecosystem services are assessed and characterized and land use and land cover changes in selected forests and rangelands are assessed

*Activity 2.1.1. Assessments of existing ecosystem services in selected forests to obtain a detailed picture of the environmental and social context in the Mount Kulal and Mukogodo forests landscapes.* A household surveys baseline assessment will be conducted during project inception. In addition, an ecosystem services expert will be recruited to conduct the assessment of existing ecosystem services. This will be undertaken during PY 1 and PY 2, and will feed into the ROAM assessment to be conducted as part of activity 2.1.2.

*Activity 2.1.2. Assessment of the level of land degradation at county/site level:* The ROAM, produced by IUCN and the World Resources Institute (WRI), provides a flexible and affordable framework for countries to rapidly identify and analyse areas that are primed for FLR and to identify specific priority areas at a national or sub-national level. This methodology was used in developing the assessment of FLR opportunities in Kenya, and will now be downscaled to provide detailed information specific to the project landscapes and specific sites. The ROAM application will deliver for the two intervention areas the following six products: a) a shortlist of the most relevant and feasible restoration intervention types across the assessment areas; b) identified priority areas for restoration; c) quantified costs and benefits of each intervention type; d) estimated values of additional carbon sequestered by these intervention types; e) a diagnostic of the presence of key success factors and identification of strategies to address major policy, legal and institutional bottlenecks; and f) an analysis of the finance and resourcing options for restoration in the assessment area. This will be implemented by an external team of consultants on PY 1, along with the ecosystem services assessment. The ROAM application will use GIS data available and combine it with additional participatory diagnostics at site level through focus groups and meetings as well as field visits.

*Activity 2.1.3. Production and diffusion of maps of local restoration opportunities for each restoration option:* The results of the ROAM assessment will be printed and shared at large within concerned communities to spread the information about what can be achieved through restoration. This will take place by the end of PY 2.

*Activity 2.1.4. Awareness raising activities on SFM and FLR:* In addition to spreading information about restoration opportunities, the project will seek to build awareness on the importance of sustainable forest management (SFM) and restoration, in order to build support for the activities to be implemented. Specific awareness raising campaigns will be implemented in the targeted communities during PY2, PY 3 and PY 4 by the PMU.

Output 2.2: FLR activities are implemented in the two targeted landscapes and ecosystem management plans and community action plans for selected landscapes are developed and implemented

### ***In Mount Kulal Biosphere Reserve (MKBR):***

*Activity 2.2.1. Support to the finalization and implementation of the Mount Kulal ecosystem management plan, development of community action plans:* During PY 1, the project will provide technical support to the Mount Kulal WWM to finalize its ecosystem management plan and develop community action plans that will enable it to plan a sustainable future for MKBR. The draft of this plan has been developed with technical support provided by National Museum of Kenya (NMK). The management plan will include a presentation of the ecosystem and the risks it is facing, the management structure, its priorities and its short, medium and long term goals along with a budget. This management plan will clarify the needs and expectations for support from the project for the implementation phase. Specific annual actions plans will be developed based on this management plan. IUCN Kenya and NMK will be providing technical support in finalizing this plan and developing the actions plans.

Subsequently and according to the plans, technical (from NMK among others) and financial support will be provided to implement part of the actions planned.

*Activity 2.2.2. Restoration.* 1,700 ha will be directly restored under this activity.

In MKBR, the main threats are linked to livestock grazing into the forest. Restoration activities will therefore include the following:

- a. Restoration around the protected forest and promotion of alternatives to livestock grazing within the core zone of the forest allowing natural forest regeneration (1,100ha), through:
  - grass reseeding campaigns in lower MKBR within fenced enclosures (400 ha): fencing of enclosures using traditional community fencing; protection of grazing from livestock and wildlife; establishment of dry season grazing reserves; recovery of perennial grass root systems.
  - promotion of sustainable pasture management; technical support will be provided to revise and enforce the grazing plans and to manage pasture within the enclosures;
  - development of 200 ha agroforestry around the protected forest using fodder trees to prevent intrusion in the forest and other trees to diversify income generation and reduce soil degradation.
- b. Enrichment of critically degraded areas within the MKBR core zone. 50 ha will be enriched per year from Y2 to Y5. *(NB: these ha are included in the 1,100)*

To support these activities, two tree nurseries will be set up for indigenous species in MKBR. Technical support and equipment will be provided to establish two tree nurseries for providing indigenous trees (including fodder trees) for the planting campaigns. This will include technical support to bring piped water nearby the nurseries and stock water. Basic training in seed technology and nursery management will also be providing. The ROAM assessment will allow to map more precisely the needs and identify specific intervention sites for tree or grass planting and other sites that must be fenced for natural regeneration. The PMU, NMK and other partners to be identified during PY1 will be providing technical support to these activities. This will be taking place as of mid PY 2.

*Activity 2.2.3 Water management improvement within Mount Kulal water catchment - Water infrastructure rehabilitation and fencing water sources:* Water catchments within MKBR core zone are hotspots of degradation and deforestation as herders keep livestock around the catchments to access water. As current water management practices insufficiently protect water catchments within the targeted forest core zone, the project will support the protection and the management improvement of the water catchments within the MKBR core zone, contributing to natural forest regeneration by ensuring the sustainability of water resources. This support will also contribute to secure access to water for local communities, building their ownership and involvement in proposed restoration activities. In line with the community's ecosystem management plan and NMK's plan, the project will propose the rehabilitation of water catchment protection infrastructures, the construction of additional water tanks along with pipes to bring water from catchments, and the rehabilitation of existing infrastructure, like the pipeline, masonry tank, trough, and the kiosk. Some of these should be used for the tree nurseries. This will be undertaken by private contractors in PY 2 and 3.

*Activity 2.2.4 Setting-up a local revolving fund for the promotion of restoration activities and income generation activities (IGAs):* The project will support the setting up and the initial capitalization of a local revolving funds to support the local community activities either directly linked to restoration or IGAs linked to either less degradation or restoration. The focus of the fund on NTFPS also aims at generating an incentive for ecosystem protection. In addition to encouraging restoration, this fund will enhance community resilience by promoting alternative livelihoods. It is also linked to the bio-enterprise activities described in 2.4.

#### ***In Mukogodo forest and surrounding landscape:***

*Activity 2.2.5 Support to the development and implementation of Mukogodo ILMAMUSI CFA participatory forest management plan:* The Mukogodo forest is classified as a forest reserve (30,189 ha) managed by the IL MAMUSI CFA (including Il Ngwesi, Makurian, Mukogodo aka. Kuri Kuri and Sieku aka Lekuruki). The CFA consists of the four group ranches surrounding the forest (Okello, 2005), including the Lekuruki and Il Ngwesi group ranches which have established community conservancies that are currently operating under the umbrella of the Northern Rangeland Trust (NRT). Each group ranch provides three forest rangers/scouts to monitor forest activities within the forest, supported by the NRT.

Using data collected through the ROAM, the management plan will receive technical support from both KFS and IUCN. It will include a presentation of the context, a management structure, a long term vision along with short and medium term objectives, an action plan with a timeline and a budget. It will also include a risk analysis. While this plan will be developed before the NTFPS strategy is completed, it will also take into account the development of NTFPS and establish related management procedures. Because of its participatory nature, the management structure and the priorities will be elaborated through a participatory consultative process. This will be undertaken during PY 2 so that it can use knowledge research conducted by the project during PY1.

*Activity 2.2.6 Support the development of conservancies and group ranches management plans:* Similarly and in the meantime, NRT will provide technical support for the conservancies and group ranches to develop or update their management plans, which should also be aligned with the ILMAMUSI CFA forest one.

*Activity 2.2.7 Establishment of 6 tree nurseries for indigenous species, tree planting campaigns in the Mukogodo forest:* Restoration activities in the Mukogodo forest will be a common effort from ILMAMUSI CFA along with KFS, Laikipia wildlife Forum (LWF) and NRT, to nurse and plant indigenous species. The Mukogodo forest has been degraded by overgrazing and overuse and some critically degraded areas need to be enrich to find back their original balance. 100 ha of the forest will be enriched per year from Y2

to Y5 for a total of 400 ha. By contributing to restoring the surrounding conservancies (see below), the project will also contribute to reduce the pressure on the Mukogodo forest by providing alternatives to population residing into the conservancies and raising awareness regarding natural resources management and conservation.

*Activity 2.2.8 Restoration in Lekurruki, Il Ngwesi, Oldonyiro and Leparua conservancies, and Kurikuri and Makurian group ranches:*

As part of the management plans (activities 2.2.5 and 2.2.6), key activities will be defined to promote land restoration and reduce degradation within the conservancies and group ranches, very often linked to overgrazing and unsustainable pasture management triggering the vicious circle of land degradation. The project is aiming at restoring conservancies' pasture capacity through grass reseeding and management, and at promoting sustainable pasture management through the promotion and enforcement of grazing plans. This will take off the pressure on overgrazed areas and allow for grassland natural regeneration. The following activities will be undertaken:

- Demarcation of range sites to be restored based on ROAM results;
- Seed production projects on private land surrounding the conservancies: hay and seed production from Rhodes grass (*Chloris gayana*). Farmers will be encouraged to plant Rhodes grass on drier land which is less risky than maize. The funds will be used to buy seeds from existing grass growers and pass on to new grass farmers;
- Range seed production (fencing enclosure of *Cenchrus*, *Brachiara*, *Themeda*, *Eragrostis*) on group ranches under direction of NRT/ IUCN/ Mpala Research center. At least 80 ha of land will be fenced, protected and managed to produce range seeds. Seeds from one ha of seed production can sow 100-200 ha;
- Rangeland reseeding campaigns will be organized under the supervision of NRT and IUCN using seeds produced in the fenced areas; an estimated 1 400 ha will be targeted per year from year 2 to 5 (a total of 5,600 ha). These reseeding campaigns will happen in enclosures, discussed and prepared with local communities, to avoid as much as possible wildlife and outsider's livestock intrusion. This technique, used in private ranches, has proven to be efficient.
- Rangeland condition monitoring: Rangeland officers (who sit on every grazing committees) will be trained for every site to be able to report on rangeland conditions;
- Development and implementation of dry and wet season grazing plans annually;
- Organization of inter conservancy meetings to discuss rangeland management;
- Technical support from NRT to the development and enforcement of grazing by-laws. The project will collaborate with local communities and surveillance personnel already in place; this will cover the entire area of the conservancies (112,042 ha); and
- Clearing/control of invasive species e.g. *Opuntia* and *Accacia Reficiens*.

Given the existence of draft management plans for some of the group ranches and conservancies (Lekurruki among others), the efforts of the conservancies' boards, group ranches committees, and the NRT will focus on implementation of the FLR activities. While some activities may be undertaken as soon as PY 1 as planned by their management plan, other activities will benefit from the knowledge basis built during project activities.

Through these activities (2.2.7 & 2.2.8) 6,000 ha will be directly restored. It is also estimated that the planning work in the Forest and the work in the surrounding conservancies and group ranches, promoting alternatives to livestock grazing within the forest, will allow for natural forest regeneration in 1,000 ha of the forest. It is therefore estimated that direct restoration will happen over 7,000 ha in the Mukogodo Landscape.

Thanks to activities 2.2.5 to 2.2.8., we can consider that the project will have an indirect impact on 55,352 ha including 1/3 of the conservancies/ranches surface ( $120,772/3 = 40,257$  ha) through the grazing plans in the improved management plans and 50% of the Mukogodo Forest zone ( $30,189/2 = 15,095$  ha) thanks to increase surveillance and replication of activities.

*Activity 2.2.9 Water management improvement:* In their management plans, the different conservancies will identify water management priorities. Efficient water management will significantly contribute to the sustainability of the ecosystems that they are trying to protect. Indeed, these ecosystems are extremely prone to drought undermining restoration efforts. To date it has been identified that Lekurruki conservancy will require the construction of a sand dam, of rock catchments and of storage tanks, as well as expand piped water to settlements. Il Ngwesi will also require some investments but these will be determined while developing the management plan.

Output 2.3: Knowledge base on NTFPS in the two targeted landscapes and their commercial potential is generated

This activity will be undertaken in all of the targeted communities of the two landscapes, namely Gatab and Arapal in Mount Kulal, the 2 group ranches and 2 conservancies around Mukogodo forest in Laikipia and Leparua and Oldonyiro conservancies in Isiolo. This activity will be implemented with strong linkages to restoration activities as the development of NTFPS should support reduced degradation and improve restoration of landscape. These activities will inform the development of sound bio-enterprises (output 2.4)



*Activity 2.3.1 Mapping, classification and characterization of NTFPS potentialities in the 2 targeted landscapes:* As per the participatory Market Analysis & Development methodology (a participatory training methodology that aims to assist people in developing forest-based income-generating enterprises while conserving natural resources” (FAO, 2017)), this involves mapping NTFPS resources and products. Special attention will be paid to integrating women into the process from this early stage. This should be undertaken in PY 1 by a specialist from KEFRI through multiple multi-stakeholder discussion workshops in each site.

*Activity 2.3.2 Assessment of NTFPS commercialization potential:* This will constitute a second phase to this analysis, and will help build a full understanding of the market potential of the identified NTFPS. A long list of NTFPS will be developed and their market potential evaluated along with an assessment of their potential economic returns. In addition to communities, the specialist should also consult with private operators. Recommendations for a shortlist of products and services will be made. This should also be undertaken by KEFRI in PY 1.

*Activity 2.3.3 Assessment of NTFPS value chain:* The previous analysis will be completed with a value chain analysis from the commercial and the environmental perspective. The purpose of this study will be to identify the NTFPS that are economically sustainable but also environmentally sustainable, taking into account the entire value chain on the different project sites. A final shortlist of products will be elaborated on this basis. The outcomes of these three studies will be shared with relevant communities during workshops that will seek to build interest to the process and to the opportunities. KEFRI will undertake this activity. This assessment will be finalized by early PY 2.

#### Output 2.4: Bio-enterprises products and services are promoted and commercialized

*Activity 2.4.1 Identification of viable bio-enterprises and training in post-harvest mechanisms, processing, stock, marketing:* Based on the knowledge acquired with previous activities, each forest or conservancy will decide which NTFPS it wishes to focus on and develop a short plan on how to achieve this. The project will provide support as needed during this process, and will subsequently help communities identify their training needs in post-harvest mechanisms, processing, storage and marketing to start/set up bio-enterprises.

The identification of viable bio-enterprises will be conducted in the first quarter of PY 2, with training conducted during the following two quarters. KEFRI will coordinate this work. The approach will be to support around 12 bio-entrepreneurs groups in total (1 or 2 groups per site). The series of training will follow the Forest and Farm Facility (FFF) approach and will be conducted in the field to a group of 30 members maximum, pre-identified and engaged in each training session. These groups will also be involved in restoration actions as part of output 2.2, in order to create strong linkages between restoration actions and bio-enterprises development opportunities.

*Activity 2.4.2 Bio-enterprises equipment:* The project will purchase the equipment required for processing and packaging of selected NTFPS. The details and modalities for support will be clarified during the detailed planning for the project so as to align expectations, and actual contribution agreements will be developed following the final identification of NTFPS (Activity 2.3.1), in parallel with training activities, starting on the 2nd quarter of PY 2.

*Activity 2.4.3 Training of NTFPS producer groups in sustainable management and utilization of natural resources:* As part of the series of trainings that will be provided under the FFF approach, this training is essential to ensure that the exploitation of NTFPS is conducted in a sustainable way. There have been cases in the past where honey has been harvested in an unsustainable way with cutting of the trees holding beehives (Borghesio & Laiolo, 2004). For this reason, field training sessions will be conducted by KEFRI staff during PY 2, in preparation for the initiation of bio-enterprises activities.

*Activity 2.4.4 Entrepreneurship training and existing Forest and Farm Facilities visit exchanges:* Entrepreneurship training will also be provided to ensure that the more promising entrepreneurs possess the necessary skills to manage a financially sustainable business. This will include general management, bookkeeping, marketing and communications. The project will organize exchange visits with the FFF projects in Kenya, particularly with the Laikipia products based associations and the Yaaku Cultural Group – which among others works on honey production - to benefit from knowledge exchange and training. This training should be initiated before the bio-enterprises are operational, but may be continued throughout the project.

*Activity 2.4.5 Development of marketing and commercialization strategies for key identified products:* Marketing and commercialization are among the most important barriers that rural communities face when attempting to make a living out of their local products. With support from KEFRI and from external specialists, the marketing and commercialization plans will be adapted to the specific value chains and target markets identified by communities and promising entrepreneurs in activity 2.3.1. This will be undertaken in PY 3.

*Activity 2.4.6 Charcoal value chain assessed and sustained:* Charcoal production has been identified as being a source of revenues for many communities. It is said to contribute KES 32 billion (USD 300 million) to the Kenyan economy. Its commercial potential is therefore undeniable, but its production has been unsustainable in Kenya for many years. Until realistic energy alternatives are available, the charcoal industry must become more efficient. The legislative and business environment is still ambiguous, and for this

reason charcoal production is one of the main drivers of forest and woodland degradation. Finding ways to produce charcoal in a sustainable manner at market rates is thus a challenge, and the answer may be found through the analysis of its value chain. This assessment will be undertaken with KEFRI and KFS expertise and the support of a consultant during PY 3.

*Activity 2.4.7 Exchange visits to successful bio-enterprises:* These visits will be organized prior and during the operational phases of bio-enterprises, so that communities can benefit from direct observation of practices elsewhere and replicate best practices into their own bio-enterprises. Depending on the final selection of bio-enterprises, the visits would be organized simultaneously for relevant representatives from each community to visit together bio-enterprises of interest to all of them, for example related to honey processing and marketing. Two such visits will be organized during the duration of the project, along with two additional visits that may be of interest for specific communities, for example if a representative from Oldonyiro conservancy wishes to visit another gums and resins bio-enterprise.

### **Component 3: Institutions, Finance, and Upscaling**

Outcome 3: Strengthened institutional capacities and financing arrangements are in place and facilitate large scale restoration and maintenance of critical landscapes

Output 3.1: Counties capacities in implementing FLR relevant policies are strengthened

*Activity 3.1.1 Build individual capacity on planning, implementation and monitoring of FLR activities:* They will be implemented starting mid-PY 1 and during the entire duration of the project, based on the previously established plan.

Capacity-building activities will focus on FLR training, both at the county and at the landscape level. Two specific trainings will be conducted: one training on planning and implementing FLR (to be managed by KFS) and one rangeland monitoring training (to be managed by NRT). Additional capacities will be built under the other components and the activities presented below. The Global Child project will provide tools and material for capacity building to be used by the project. It is expected that by the end of the project, the capacity-level for FLR implementation will be between 2 and 3 in average.

Output 3.2: Community land management committees are set-up and working in targeted project sites

In Mount Kulal:

The land tenure in the Mount Kulal location is communal with no individual or group ranch title. The authority of traditions, elders and chiefs has remained high in the villages due to their somewhat isolated location. The community management is based on traditional management structures and organized through the Umbrella community-based organization (CBO) "wazee wa mazingira" (Elders of the Environment – WWM) active in all four sub-locations of Mount Kulal. The management of the forest is arranged through WWM regulations and local bylaws. The forest has been mapped by the WWM with help from the National Museums of Kenya (NMK).

*Activity 3.2.1 Institutional Support to the environment elders committee (WWM):* Some of the already-identified needs involve management governance training, training on biodiversity conservation and management, and an increase in patrolling /surveillance capacities. This activity will be undertaken by NMK, starting by the end of PY 1.

*Activity 3.2.2 Support the establishment of the WRUA to facilitate access to the Water Sector Trust Fund (WSTF) and other funds:* Sustainable water management is a crucial issue for MKBR as one of Kenya's key water towers and especially given its location in the heart of an arid area. For this reason, a formal entity, a Water Resource users Association (WRUA) should be established that will facilitate cooperative sharing, managing and conserving of the water resources. The project will support the creation of this entity by mobilizing stakeholders around the ideas, leading public consultations, guiding the election of a committee, and guiding the committee through the registration process. Once established, the WRUA will be eligible to submit proposals to the WSTF for Water Resources Investments. The WSTF is well functioning and its mandate is "to finance water and sanitation services for the poor and underserved communities in rural and urban areas". Its mandate includes "provision of conditional and unconditional grants to the Counties" and also "assist in financing the development of and management of water services in the marginalized and underserved areas".

TRI Kenya's support would help identify specific water resource management issues and develop a proposal for the Water Resources Investments in order to obtain funding for the development of a sub-catchment management plan. The support will also include identifying other funds that could support the activities of the WRUA. Within the limits of available resources, the project will then help the WRUA fulfil the requirements to access these additional funds. The WRUA will be set-up and registered by PY 2 and technical support in developing a bankable proposal will be provide by PY 3.

In Mukogodo forest landscape:

The Mukogodo forest is classified as a forest reserve (30,189 ha) managed by the IL MAMUSI CFA (II Ngwesi, Makurian, Mukogodo aka. Kuri Kuri and Sieku aka Lekuruki). The CFA consists of the four group ranches surrounding the forest (Okello, 2005), including

the Lekurruki and Il Ngwesi group ranches which have established community conservancies that are currently operating under the umbrella of the Northern Rangeland Trust (NRT).

*Activity 3.2.3 Institutional Support to Mukugodo ILMAMUSI CFA and conservancies Board and group ranches committees:* KFS, LWF and NRT will provide technical support to institutions and committees to ensure their smooth functioning. This will be undertaken as from the middle of PY 1.

*Activity 3.2.4 Support the WRUAs in accessing the WSTF and other funds:* As in Mount Kulal, LWF and NRT will help the local WRUAs identify their specific water management issues and submit proposals to the WSTF for Water Resources Investments. They will also identify other relevant funds to support their activities. This part of activity 3.2.4 can be undertaken jointly with the same segment of activity 3.2.2. Within the limits of available resources, the project will then help WRUAs fulfill the requirements to access these additional funds.

#### Output 3.3: Restoration initiatives are coordinated at the national level

*Activity 3.3.1 Establish a permanent national restoration coordination mechanism* to coordinate all the restoration initiatives in Kenya and promote restoration. Given that the absence of a permanent coordination mechanism for FLR has been identified as a key barrier to FLR implementation nationwide, this project support such a coordination unit which will be embedded in KEFRI and supported technically by KFS. This permanent coordination mechanism will build on the work conducted as part of the LRTWG, which is a non-permanent working group. The role of this mechanism will be to plan for FLR in a coordinated manner, to enhance the national and local capacity to access national and international funding for FLR, to coordinate FLR implementation, and monitor its results. Analysis, consultations and design work for the design of this mechanism will take place during PY 1. The mechanism will then be rolled out with the target to have it operate normally by PY 3.

#### Output 3.4: Access to climate and restoration finance is improved

*Activity 3.4.1 Support the operationalization of the Forest Conservation and Management Trust Fund (FCMTF) and facilitate the access to this fund by local beneficiaries:* This fund, which is currently under development, was created in the Forest Conservation and Management Act (2016) with the purpose “to nurture, promote and inspire innovations in forest conservation”. It will be managed by a Board of Trustees appointed by the Cabinet Secretary, and a Chairperson and four other members. The FCMTF will be capitalized by the government of Kenya, funds collected from forest beneficiaries, profits made from investments by the management Board, grants and other donations. The TRI Kenya project will support the development and operationalization of the new FCMTF through two institutional and operational trainings and technical support provided to the management Board by specialized trainers (PY 2 and 3) and by facilitating access to the fund for target communities.

*Activity 3.4.2 Capacity building for accessing other international funds (including the LDN fund):* During PY 2 and 3, trainings of key national experts and institutions’ representatives will be organized on the main procedures to improve access to international funding for restoration such as the Land Degradation Neutrality Fund, etc. These funds could be directed to the FCMTF. Some of these trainings will be organized in direct collaboration with the Global Child Project and its financial component led by UNEP.

*Activity 3.4.3 Linkages between bio-enterprises (including FFF supported private operators) and potential investors:* The TRI Kenya project will work with AFRACA and/or NetFund or any other potential business incubator to identify a limited number of more promising bio-enterprises to help them scale up their business. The selection for these bio-enterprises will start during PY 3, so as to leave project-supported bio-enterprises time to prove themselves. The selection criteria will be established in the planning stages of the project but will certainly include criteria combining financial and environmental sustainability with good governance. The support provided by the TRI Kenya project will include technical advice to build an enhanced business plan to present to investors, and participation to networking events to present the company to potential investors.

*Activity 3.4.4 Facilitation of access to credit / finance instrument for bio-enterprises / “bankable proposal” workshop:* As of PY 3, KEFRI and KFS will start preparing the functional bio-enterprises to be financially sustainable. Given that access to finance is an important barrier for bio-enterprises, the project will seek to build the bio-enterprises internal capacity to access funding by training them to prepare proposals tailored to private banks requirements.

### **Component 4: Knowledge, Partnerships, Monitoring and Assessment**

#### Outcome 4: Improved FLR monitoring, reporting and knowledge dissemination at national level and Project implementation based on result-based management

##### Output 4.1: A national FLR Knowledge Management system is developed and implemented

*Activity 4.1.1 Develop a FLR Knowledge Platform:* The FLR Portal. The project will support the design and establishment of an FLR knowledge platform, which will include a Knowledge Management supporting infrastructure and electronic filing systems. It will be used as an FLR knowledge products repository and will allow an easy access to FLR information, targeting varied audiences and allowing edits and open forums discussions and learning to promote open-access approach to data, information and project

documentation. All knowledge generated throughout this TRI project, such as the ROAM assessment and the assessment of existing ecosystem services and analysis of land use and land cover changes will be documented and made available within this portal. As for the coordination mechanism, this mechanism will be embedded within KEFRI. It will be designed in PY 3 and implemented in PY 4 and 5. The GCP will provide guidance on the development of such a platform and on the mechanisms for knowledge dissemination.

*Activity 4.1.2 Prepare and disseminate knowledge products about best practices and lessons learned in FLR, SLM and community forest management:* During PY 4 and PY 5, the project will elaborate a synthesis of all new knowledge acquired about community-led FLR and also all good practices and lessons learnt in the domains of FLR in ASAL and bio-enterprise development. This synthesis exercise will allow the project to produce an interesting lessons learned document that will be highly interesting for other ASAL counties and conservancies in Kenya, as well as other countries facing similar challenges. All information collected and compiled will be disseminated via the FLR knowledge platform. This will be led by the PMU but a consultant will be involved to develop the materials. This material will also enrich the knowledge sharing tools developed by the GCP to support FLR in the TRI countries and beyond.

**Output 4.2: Knowledge shared and received within Kenya and outside**

*Activity 4.2.1 Sharing knowledge products with stakeholders from other countries:* On an ongoing basis, use the mechanisms and activities put in place by the GCP such as the Community of Practices, to share the learnings from the TRI Kenya project with stakeholders worldwide

*Activity 4.2.2 Sharing with project stakeholders of knowledge and information from other countries:* On an ongoing basis, the PMU will remain aware of initiatives of interest conducted in Kenya other countries, in particular initiatives from TRI, and circulate this information among the project stakeholders to increase their knowledge base.

*Activity 4.2.3 Participate in TRI Yearly global knowledge network events:* Project representatives will participate in TRI annual Knowledge Sharing events, to share and gain knowledge as well as to be trained on particular topics chosen in agreement with all the TRI countries. The trainings during these events will be trainings of trainers so that other trainings can be organized in country to disseminate the knowledge. The organization of these meetings are the responsibility of the GCP.

**Output 4.3: Project monitoring system providing systematic information on progress in meeting project outcomes and output targets implemented**

*Activity 4.3.1 Implement a results-based project monitoring system, including baseline research, data analysis and reporting:* The project will develop a detailed monitoring and evaluation plan that will use a results-based management approach. During PY 1, the project will hire an M&E specialist to design and establish an M&E system to obtain information on progress in meeting targets, evaluating results and facilitating the systematization of experiences. The Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) will advise the PMU on this. Throughout the duration of the project, monitoring reports will be prepared by the PMU according to the M&E system. The results matrix (Annex 1) presents the expected results from the project, related indicators and measurement methods and tools that will be used. Throughout the project duration, annual financial audits will be conducted to ensure that resources are appropriately used as planned.

*Activity 4.3.2 Conduct a mid-term review:* During PY 3, an independent mid-term review will be conducted by experts selected by the FAO with the approval of the Project Steering Committee (PSC). The technical mid-term review will be important to assess independently the level of achievement of the project goals and also to assess the project management effectiveness. Recommendations to eventually modify and update some of the outputs and activities will also be made if judge relevant and necessary.

*Activity 4.3.3 Conduct a final evaluation:* During PY 5, an independent final evaluation will be conducted. Lessons learnt and recommendations produced by the final evaluation will be fundamental for future replication and scaling up restoration initiatives.

**Incremental cost reasoning**

Project activities have been designed in order to complement or build on the existing baseline projects, and to address directly the barriers that remain to be addressed after their implementation.

The table below presents the incremental cost reasoning for each project outcome:

Outcome	Baseline Scenario	GEF Alternative Scenario
Outcome 1: The national and county level policy and	At the national level, a number of laws and policies support FLR, starting with the Constitution and Vision 2030 which set the	The proposed project will support the LRTWG in developing a specific FLR national strategy.

Outcome	Baseline Scenario	GEF Alternative Scenario
<p>regulatory frameworks are strengthened to support FLR in Kenya</p>	<p>10% land cover target. The Forest Act (2005), the National Forest Policy (2015), the Forest Conservation and Management Act (2016), and the Community Land Act (2016) constitute the foundations of FLR action in the country. The LRTWG has coordinated the assessment and mapping of restoration opportunities at the national level. A specific policy and legal framework review to guide scaling up of landscape restoration in Kenya was also conducted in 2016, calling for the development of a specific national restoration strategy.</p> <p>The devolution process seeks to transfer responsibilities to counties in many areas, including forest and land management.</p> <p>The FAO Land Programme is supporting this process from the perspective of land tenure to ensure that communities formalize their access to land and start implementing land management plans. The Land Programme also strengthens the policy and legal framework around land governance at county level. Phase I of the Land Programme focuses on ASALs.</p> <p>The FAO RAELOC project conducted a resilience assessment which focused among others on Isiolo and Marsabit. This assessment identified that these counties vulnerability resided largely in its limited livelihoods alternatives. It also promoted rangeland management practices and methodologies.</p> <p>There is no policy framework for NTFPS.</p>	<p>At the county level, it will work hand in hand with the Land Programme. GEF funding will complement the Land Programme by focusing on FLR and identifying policy gaps while enhancing the application of bylaws in the two target ASAL's counties.</p> <p>These synergies are further highlighted by the fact that Phase I of the Land Programme, which will be implemented largely at the same time as the TRI Kenya project, will also focus on ASAL counties, and specifically in Marsabit and Laikipia. As the Land Programme plans on working closely with counties governments, the TRI Kenya project will be able to leverage on the ground the achievements of the Land Programme, including the stakeholder mapping that will be performed in the coming month by the Land Programme. Such synergies have already been demonstrated during the PPG stage, the Land Programme project team having participated to the data collection field mission.</p> <p>Both project landscapes are set to benefit from the work performed upstream by the Land Programme, as the Mount Kulal forest is not yet registered, and as group ranches and conservancies seek to improve their control over their community land.</p> <p>The GEF funds will actively support the development of a national NTFPS policy in order to provide a framework for alternative livelihoods. This need has been confirmed by the RAELOC's resilience assessment, among others. It will help further the FLR objectives of this GEF-funded project by generating incentives for communities to protect and restore forests in order to benefit from their ecosystem services.</p>
<p>Outcome 2: 152,661 ha are under improved management (including 8,700 ha directly restored and 55,352 ha indirectly restored)</p>	<p>While restoration opportunities were assessed and mapped at the national level, the assessment has not yet been downscaled at the local and site specific level.</p> <p>The Land Programme is helping communities secure tenure of their lands, prevent land grabbing and implement participatory land management.</p> <p>Deforestation is driven by overgrazing which is reinforced by population growth and recurring droughts due among others to climate change.</p>	<p>GEF funding will be used to complement all baseline initiatives by supporting concrete restoration activities on the ground in rangeland and forest areas. The GEF project will support the assessment of the level of land degradation at county/site level (downscaled ROAM) including participatory mapping and stakeholder mapping.</p> <p>This GEF projects will support improved grazing plans and management of pasture as this is one of the major challenges for sustainable livestock, key to survival for many communities.</p>

Outcome	Baseline Scenario	GEF Alternative Scenario
	<p>FAO RAELOC focuses on implementing coordination mechanisms for drought management and field-level implementation and scale up of successful rangeland management plans.</p> <p>KEFRI's research, including Laikipia County ecosystem services assessments and tree breeding experiences, builds the knowledge base on 1) measurement of impacts of human-induced land use and land cover change on carbon, 2) the interrelations between climate change, water and food security for SLM and ecosystem health, and 3) tree breeding. The WaTer Programme aims to protect two water towers while addressing climate change issues.</p> <p>KFS also aims to increase tree cover in ASALs through forest stations, tree planting, forest protection, management plans, and the organization or groups to protect forests.</p> <p>Multiple projects and initiatives support sustainable natural resources management in Kenya, either directly or indirectly. Among them WoC intervenes around Mount Kulal in support of access to education, health and water management as well as livestock management. In the mid-term, WoC plans to increase its focus on livelihood activities, and also to organize more capacity-oriented activities, such as environmental awareness and education. This has already started, as LTWP has supported the creation of a platform to discuss inter-community issues, such as cattle rustling.</p>	<p>The GEF funds will build on KEFRI's research activities and results, including Laikipia County ecosystem services assessments and tree breeding experiences.</p> <p>While the focus on NTFPS is rather innovative compared to other current initiatives in the country, it is in line with both the Land Programme and RAELOC as it provides alternative livelihoods that will decrease pressure for deforestation and generate an incentive to protect and restore forests and landscapes. NTFPS will decrease the pressure for holding herds of livestock above the capacity of the land to sustain them, and therefore limit desertification. In addition, by diversifying the population's sources of income, it also increases their resilience.</p> <p>This could not be achieved without the tenure security that is implemented by the Land Programme, as well as the participatory management it supports. By helping communities design and implement ecosystem management plans, the GEF funds will go one step beyond the Land Programme.</p> <p>GEF funds will also integrate water issues into the equation as part of the ecosystem-based approach. While the WaTer project is not implemented in the same geographic areas as this project, GEF funds will enable communities in Marsabit, Laikipia and Isiolo to learn from what is implemented by the WaTer program and replicate some of its aspects elsewhere.</p> <p>Finally, the restoration and bio-enterprise activities will complement a large number of initiatives already active on project sites but that do not specifically address FLR.</p> <p>Promoting restoration actions and bio-enterprises development, the GEF funds will complement WoC activities to enhance livelihoods, including its water related activities. WoC projects that support livestock management are even more related since, in addition to supporting improved livelihoods, they may also help protect the environment and the forest from livestock intrusions in search of water or food. The TRI child project intends to leverage WoC's ongoing and future activities on environment, education, water access and livelihoods introducing an ecosystem based perspective while covering the incremental cost associated to implementing concrete FLR activities on the ground.</p>

Outcome	Baseline Scenario	GEF Alternative Scenario
<p>Outcome 3: Strengthened institutional capacities and financing arrangements are in place and facilitate large scale restoration and maintenance of critical landscapes</p>	<p>There are a number of ongoing FLR related initiatives being implemented by various institutions, but institutional coordination at the national and county level is limited.</p> <p>Both RAELOC and the Land Programme set important foundations for the development of local capacities to implement FLR.</p> <p>In addition, multiple public institutions and ministries are also involved in building capacities in topics related to FLR (KEFRI, KFS).</p> <p>The FCMTF, when it becomes operational, will finance sustainable forest management and FLR. But communities need to be supported to be able to develop proposal acceptable by the fund.</p> <p>Finally, access to financial instruments that invest in environment projects exists, such as the Green Climate Fund (GCF), but the capacity to present proposals is often limited.</p> <p>In terms of financial mechanisms to support FLR, NETFUND finances green business incubation, research programs and organizes environmental awards which reward innovative ideas in environmental management. Its main topics include agri-business, energy, governance, resource-based waste management and water. About 40 projects have received NETFUND support to date.</p>	<p>GEF funding will contribute to strengthen the coordination of FLR initiatives and promote FLR at the national level by supporting the establishment of a national restoration coordination mechanism building on the LRTWG efforts.</p> <p>GEF funding under this project will be used to strengthen capacities at various levels, from the counties capacity to implement FLR to the conservancies' capacity to submit project proposals and access FLR national and international financing.</p> <p>At the county level, a specific needs assessment will assess in a detail manner which capacities are required to enhance FLR implementation. This will be complementary to other initiatives in the region, in particular with the Land Programme.</p> <p>At the community level, capacity will also be enhanced in FLR and ecosystem management, which will complement again the Land Programme and RAELOC's efforts.</p> <p>GEF funding will directly contribute to increased access to finance mechanisms in FLR. By operationalizing the FCMTF, this project will directly contribute to increasing funding opportunities in FLR in areas that are of particular interest to ASALs in general, and to the intervention landscapes in particular. Without GEF contribution, the operationalization of the FCMTF could be delayed, thus delaying its capacity to produce positive impacts on Kenyan forests.</p> <p>The project will build capacity to reach additional funding targeted to FLR which could go through the FCMTF or support directly FLR activities.</p> <p>GEF funds will also directly support promising bio-enterprises from project sites to access financial resources by supporting linkages with potential investors and by facilitating their access to credit.</p>
<p>Outcome 4: Project implementation based on result-based management, lessons learned disseminated within TRI and application of project lessons learned in</p>	<p>KEFRI's research projects, the Land Programme and RAELOC aim not only to achieve the specific objectives of their programs, but to share lessons learned in order to increase the knowledge base and improve future practices.</p>	<p>As part of the global initiative, GEF funds will contribute to share its experience within its community of practice, fostering South-South exchanges and sharing information at a broader scale, within the other child projects from The Restoration Initiative (TRI). These efforts will complement efforts made by baseline projects to disseminate information at the national level. This will contribute to building a strong knowledge base</p>

Outcome	Baseline Scenario	GEF Alternative Scenario
future operations facilitated		that will benefit the target populations beyond the reach of each program, and the advancement of restoration at large.

### Global environmental benefits (GEFTF)

The application of the integrated approach to FLR will lead to an increase in the forest cover and to the restoration of degraded grasslands. The project aims to directly restore 8,700 ha of deforested and degraded lands on the two targeted sites. This will involve implementing sustainable land management practices and improving water management, which will ensure long-lasting benefits from sustainable use of the land and increased biodiversity.

The project will also support the development of bio-enterprises of NTFPS, which will generate alternative sources of income in order to decrease pressure on land use as well as an incentive to use lands sustainably. This has the additional benefit of diversifying the sources of income which increases the population's resilience to climate change and to extreme climatic events, like droughts.

At a larger scale, the project aims to achieve the following global environmental benefits:

- Direct restoration of 8,700 ha of degraded lands and forests, and indirect restoration of 55,352 ha of degraded land;
- Protection and restoration of ecosystem services and biodiversity provided in these areas including wildlife;
- About 148,861 ha of production systems under sustainable land management
- At least 152,661 ha maintaining globally significant biodiversity and ecosystem goods and services
- The overall mitigation benefits will amount to 5,954,109 t CO<sub>2</sub>eq for a 20 year period

The project will support the achievement of the following Aichi targets:

Target 1 - By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably (in 5th NBSAP 2015, this is realized through CFAs, WRUAs, PPP, community based conservation initiatives);

Target 7- By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity; (in 5th NBSP, through participatory forest management plans); and

Target 15 - By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.

The fifteenth of the seventeen proposed Sustainable Development Goals is to "Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss". Specifically, the project will contribute directly to Sustainable Development Goal 15.1 "by 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements."

### Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up

#### Innovativeness

The approach to restoration promoted by the project is particularly innovative as it proposes an all suit of activities to achieve results at the ecosystem/landscape scale.

Through FLR, this project embraces the concept of ecosystem-based management. The UNCBD defines the ecosystem-based approach as a "strategy for the integrated management of land, water and living resources that promotes conservation and sustainable use in an equitable way". The approach is based on scientific methodologies that focus on the biological organization of ecosystems, which comprises the key processes, functions and interactions among organisms and their environment. The ecosystem-based approach recognizes that humans are an integral part of ecosystems. The TRI Kenya project adopts an ecosystem-based approach to restoration - for example by promoting in identified sites land natural regeneration – and is innovative in its support to the integration of this approach into regulatory frameworks.



The innovative character of the project can also be seen in the use of innovative participatory assessment methodology such as ROAM, which provides a flexible and affordable framework for countries to rapidly identify and analyze areas that are fit for FLR and to identify specific priority areas at a national or sub-national level. In the case of the TRI Kenya project, the downscaled ROAM assessment will allow to map out and identify sites for tree or grass planting, and other sites for natural regeneration or water catchment protection.

Another core innovative component of the project is the support provided to bio-enterprises relying on forest products. This support will be based on the Market Analyses and Development participatory methodologies that aims to provide training to forest-based bio-entrepreneurs to help them develop IGAs while conserving natural resources. This approach enables bio-entrepreneurs to be an integral part of the forest management decision making processes.

The project will also promote the innovative Forest Farm Facility (FFF) approach through visit exchange with FFF projects in Kenya. The Forest Farm Facility was born from a partnership between FAO, IIED, IUCN and AgriCord. It aims to “promote sustainable forest and farm management by supporting local, national, regional and international organizations and platforms for effective engagement in policies and investments that meets the needs of local people”. This approach acknowledges that families, communities and indigenous people have responsibilities for managing forests; and that there is a huge potential to improve both livelihoods and forest protection by encouraging an enhanced relationship between communities and governments.

Finally, the project promotes innovative financing mechanisms such as the setup of local revolving funds for communities to implement restoration or IGA that are either based on NTFPS or that are environmentally sustainable. This type of financing mechanism is innovative in the sense that it enables an enhanced environment management by improving livelihood and removing barriers to credit access, while not prescribing specific actions. In addition, the project will support the operationalization of the FCMTF that promotes innovation in forest conservation. Such financing mechanisms are innovative in themselves as they catalyze private sector engagement in FLR, and incentivize investments in restoration.

#### Potential for scaling-up

The project’s potential for scaling up is real both in Kenya and internationally. Through its first component, the project will strengthen the legal framework at the county level to address any policy gaps regarding FLR, which will facilitate the replication of other restoration initiatives throughout the targeted counties. In addition, the project will support the development and implementation of policies and strategies at the national level – such as an FLR strategy, the National Resources and Benefit Sharing Policy and the NTFPS management strategy - that will encourage the replication of FLR activities throughout the national territory.

Through its third component, the project aims to coordinate restoration initiatives at the national level via a dedicated coordination mechanism, into which the project results and lessons will be fed, facilitating the replication of the project approaches and results in other initiatives.

The project will also support an increased access to FLR financing. This will be achieved through the enhanced access to several complementary financial mechanisms – revolving funds, trust fund, linking entrepreneurs and investors, and global funding through LDN Fund and other international funds - that will facilitate the replication of FLR initiatives in the country.

As part of the global TRI program, the results and lessons learned of the Kenya project will be shared and disseminated at the global level, among the 11 other child projects as well as at a wider scale. The TRI Program’s links to the wider restoration community, particularly through the Global Partnership on Forest and Landscape Restoration (GPFLR), and through the Program’s global awareness and communications campaign, ensures that projects and Program’s impact will not be limited to TRI countries.

#### Sustainability

**Environmental sustainability:** The whole project strategy is built around environmental sustainability. The project aims to address environmental issues and root causes to restore and maintain deforested and degraded landscapes. FLR is anchored in an environmentally sustainable approach that aims to bring back the good functioning of ecosystems and the overall quality of the environment in the long term, while improving local communities’ livelihoods.

In its first component, the project will check if targeted counties comply with existing legislation regarding FLR, and will address any identified policy gaps to ensure that FLR is an integral part of the legal and policy framework, which will ensure the sustainability of project activities since this framework will continue in the long term.

Through its second component, the project aims to directly restore 8,700 ha of deforested and degraded lands and indirectly restore 55,352 ha which will directly contribute to conserving, protecting and enhancing natural ecosystems. The approach undertaken by the project is sustainable as it will closely involve relevant local stakeholders to ensure that they build ownership and continue implementing FLR in the long term.

The project will include communities from the assessment of land degradation in the targeted sites through participatory mapping to the implementation of restoration activities. It will also support forest-based bio-enterprises to diversify local communities’

livelihoods while promoting an efficient use of resources and the conservation of the forest. In addition, the project will build capacity among key county-level stakeholders to implement FLR relevant policies. These different measures will directly contribute to the environmental sustainability of project activities as it will improve efficiency in the use of forest resources while contributing to conserving, protecting and enhancing natural ecosystems.

**Financial and economic sustainability:** Project interventions will seek to ensure a viable anchor into existing local and institutional systems to create favourable conditions for the sustainability of the achievements and to ensure sustainable management of investments. In this perspective, the integration of FLR in the national and local policy, legal and strategic framework will ensure the institutionalization of a regular support from the government and local communities. The project will support FLR integration in the national and local frameworks through the development and implementation of strategies, policies and bylaws, as well as by setting up mechanisms such as a national coordination mechanism for restoration initiatives.

At the local level, the project will support forest-based enterprises in the production of their products and services while ensuring an efficient use of forest resources. In addition, the project will facilitate the linkages between these entrepreneurs and potential investors, as well as their access to credit, to help them scale up their activities. The income generated by this sustainably managed enterprises will ensure that they can continue their activity after the project end and in the long term. In addition, the project will support the setup of revolving funds in targeted areas to finance local communities' restoration activities and IGAs.

At the national level, the project will develop capacities among key stakeholders on how to access international funding for FLR – from the GCF or LDN fund for instance. This will directly contribute to the financial sustainability of the project as such funding could help continue and scale up FLR activities in the country. As part of the TRI Program, the project will participate in global workshops organized by the initiative on financing restoration, which will be a great opportunity to identify and leverage additional funding sources for FLR in Kenya.

### **Social sustainability**

*Indigenous peoples:* the project areas are inhabited by several indigenous people that were thoroughly consulted during the PPG phase. The project complies with the Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) principles.

The consent of indigenous people to project activities will be free and prior in the sense that it will be given voluntarily and without coercion, intimidation or manipulation. Indigenous people have been consulted and informed during PPG field missions, and representatives from indigenous communities in the project area gave their overall informal consent to the project architecture during the PPG validation workshop that took place in Nairobi the 6th of July 2017. Informed consent will continue to be sought for all activities throughout the project implementation through participatory and concertation mechanisms. As mentioned above, the child TRI will work hand-to-hand with the Land Programme, targeting the same project sites and beneficiaries. As part of the first and second components, the Land Programme will conduct consultative and iterative meetings, focus groups and awareness raising sessions with community members, focusing on land rights and land planning. Stakeholder mapping will be conducted as part of these consultative meetings. The program will support the establishment of digitized community land registries, and will identify land tenure regimes to allow the identification of the areas that can be planned.

Furthermore, as part of TRI, the livelihoods of indigenous people and their dependence on natural resources will be carefully assessed under the second component of the project, and they will be closely involved in the participatory mapping of NTFPs. The ecosystem community action plans will also be developed in close collaboration with local indigenous communities and will aim to directly empower them over the management of natural resources in targeted areas. They will be at the heart of the decision-making processes, the restoration activities and the forest and landscape management processes.

The consent of indigenous people will be informed as the project will ensure – through its capacity development activities on FLR and participatory mechanism for instance - that relevant information is given to indigenous groups in an accessible manner, involving all vulnerable groups (youth, women, the elderly, and persons with disabilities), and allowing sufficient time for them to discuss in their local language and freely express their consent. Awareness raising sessions and knowledge dissemination will be a key priority of both the Land Programme and the Child TRI at the local level. The TRI will work through community focal points (one per project site) to ensure information is well disseminated to community members.

The project will aim to respond to the needs and priorities expressed by the indigenous communities involved. The knowledge, cultural systems and institutions of indigenous people will form the basis on which project activities will be implemented. These will be thoroughly taking in consideration during all the assessments to be conducted from the onset of the project such as: the assessment on compliance with local legislation, the assessment of ecosystem services, land use and land degradation in selected forests (including participatory mapping), and the assessment of NTFPS potentialities.

The project will ensure that indigenous people are carefully considered in the implementation and development of national policies or strategies in order ensure that their rights are preserved and that their voice is systematically taken into account in the long term in the FLR decision making processes.

During PPG phase, FPIC step 1, 2 and partially 3 was conducted (see Prodoc section 2.3 for more details). Due to time and financial constraints, also the desire not to stimulate too much anticipation for the TRI project before it has been designed and funding approved, it was concluded that the best approach will be to complete the FPIC process during the project's inception period, when there is a project team in place. The project manager will prioritise catalysing work specifically with this community to reassure and confirm that the project will respect their dignity, rights, interests, cultural specificities and that they will benefit from all the advantages of the project. This will include the "series of steps and iterative phases are needed before the community can arrive to a collective decision of consent or withhold-consent" using participatory engagement (consultations and negotiations) as the means and tools through which FPIC can be achieved.

*Human Rights Based Approaches (HRBA):* The project complies with the HRBA in the sense that it supports both communities right to food, and decent employment. Land restoration is closely linked to food security as it allows to bring back the good functioning of ecosystems that provides numerous services to local communities. For instance the restoration of grasslands and pasture land will ensure that livestock is better fed, and in a sustainable manner, which will contribute to enhancing the food security of local communities.

The project will also contribute to offering local communities decent employment through the development and strengthening of economically viable and environmentally sustainable bio-enterprises, which will improve local communities' livelihoods in the long term.

*Capacity development:* Capacity Development is one of the key approaches of the project to contribute to the sustainability of the project results through deepening the country ownership and leadership of FLR processes. The project will address all three capacity development dimensions: individual capacities, organizational capacities, and enabling environment. To do so, capacity building activities will be implemented, and progress will be tracked through the project M&E framework.

Individual capacities will be strengthened through a variety of trainings provided to a wide range of beneficiaries from the local communities to government stakeholders throughout the project. For instance, capacity building activities on the implementation of FLR policies will target public sector institutions, communities, and CBOs. The project will also build awareness on the importance of FLR. The project will also support the development of capacities for NTPFS bio-enterprises through a variety of trainings, such as: training in post-harvest mechanisms, processing, stock, marketing; training in sustainable management and use of natural resources.

The project will strengthen organizational capacities, mainly by providing support to a number of management committees such as the environment management committee and elders committee in Mount Kulal, and the Il Mamusi CFA and conservancies Board and group ranches committees. The project will also support the establishment of a national restoration coordination mechanism that will coordinate all related initiatives and will promote restoration in the country. Finally, the project will support the operationalization of the FCMTF as a formal entity supporting the financing, management and conservation of forest resources.

The enabling environment will be strengthened through the first component of the project that focuses on Policy Development and Integration. Through this component, the project will contribute to strengthening the national and county level policy and regulatory frameworks to support FLR. In particular, the project will support the development of a specific FLR strategy, a Natural resources access and benefits sharing policy, a NTPFS management strategy, as well as the development of county level laws to address identified policy gaps. In addition, the project under its third component will build capacity among government stakeholders on how to access international funding for restoration.

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

The project is nested within The Restoration Initiative (TRI), a program designed and led by 3 GEF Agencies (FAO, IUCN and UNEP), and developed to make a significant global contribution to restoring ecosystem functioning and improving livelihoods through the restoration of priority degraded and deforested landscapes, in support of the Bonn Challenge. The TRI program consists of 11 National Child Projects (NCP) in 10 countries of Africa and Asia, and it is supported by a Global Learning, Financing, and Partnerships project (GCP) to develop and disseminate best-practices and tools, catalyse investment in restoration, expand the scope of countries and actors engaged in forest and landscape restoration, and realize benefits at scale. Mechanisms have been built to ensure cross-fertilisation between the project, other Child Projects - especially in neighbouring African countries - and the overall program. On one hand, the Kenya project will benefit of the wealth of international experts, lessons learned, and best practices in the domain of FLR, that the GCP will make available to the national components, for example to support the numerous capacity development initiatives foreseen within its work plan (training courses, international workshops, etc.). On the other hand, the Kenya project will feed its achievements, practices, and lessons learned into the GCP, thus contributing to creating a critical mass of knowledge that will be available to all TRI program partners.

The cooperation between the Kenya project and the GCP will also be critical in the area of Monitoring and Evaluation. The harmonization of M&E systems among all TRI partners will be facilitated through a Program-level tracking tool, developed within the GPC, and integrated into all child projects, thus allowing for greater compatibility and utility of aggregated M&E data.

Further information on the integration of this NCP with the TRI Global project and overall TRI Program is provided in Annex 9 of the Prodoc.

*A.3. Stakeholders.* Identify key stakeholders and elaborate on how the key stakeholder's engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project. Do they include civil society organizations (yes  /no )? and indigenous peoples (yes  /no )? <sup>7</sup>

During the PPG, two missions were conducted to potential project sites in addition to several meetings and interviews conducted with national institutions and partners, which allowed the PPG team to conduct consultations and to identify several key stakeholders for the project intervention. The table below gives an overview of all stakeholders relevant to the project's intervention.

All the stakeholders were consulted during the PPG and their inputs were taken into account while preparing this project document. Consultations were undertaken in particular during two different site visits to each of the targeted landscapes, as well as into the capital cities, and the 2 workshops (inception and validation)

The means for consultation included one to one meetings, informal interviews and group discussions. One to one meetings were mostly used to consult with government representatives and with community leaders. Informal interviews and group discussions were used with community members. The groups consulted included youth, women, and elders. While they often represented less than 50% of the group, women were involved in all group discussions. Some women only groups were also formed to ensure freedom of speech. Given the predominance of indigenous populations on the project landscapes, they were also involved in all discussions. Consultations covered all the aspects of the project: socio-economic issues, FLR and institutional and policy framework. These consultations allowed the collection of first-hand information on the context, needs and priorities of the community in terms of FLR and NTFPS, which guided the selection of the above-mentioned activities.

While receptive to the approach of the project, some indigenous people in the Mukogodo landscape raised the following arguments, which were considered while preparing the project and will have to be kept in mind throughout its implementation:

- Their cultures and ways of life differ considerably from the dominant society;
- Their cultures are under threat, in some cases to the point of extinction;
- The survival of their particular way of life depends on access and rights to their lands and the natural resources thereon;
- They suffer from discrimination as they are regarded as less developed and less advanced than other more dominant sectors of society;
- They often live in inaccessible regions, often geographically isolated;
- They suffer from various forms of marginalization, both politically and socially.

During project implementation, this participatory approach will be maintained and even strengthened, as the project is geared towards empowering local population and communities to undertake new IGAs. The project will reinforce the structures that the communities have created to manage their environment, such as the conservancies and the WRUAs. As such, consultations will continue throughout the project.

Stakeholders		Role in the project
<b>Government stakeholders</b>		
MENR	KEFRI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead executing partner</li> <li>• Host the PMU and coordinate project activities</li> <li>• Secretariat of the PSC</li> <li>• Technical leadership for policy development and for NTFPS assessments: Mapping, classification and characterization at site level of NTFP, assessment of NTFPs commercialization potential, assessment of NTFP value chain of main NTFPs, support to value chain development</li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup> 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.

Stakeholders		Role in the project
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of expertise for restoration activities and coordination: set-up of nurseries for restoration activities and training of people for collecting seeds/seedlings</li> <li>Supervision of other implementing partners</li> <li>Technical and financial reporting</li> <li>Coordination with on-going baseline research projects</li> </ul>
	KFS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Executing partner for the project</li> <li>Member of the PSC</li> <li>Leads the development of FLR strategy and NTFPS policy</li> <li>Coordinate the work within Mukogodo forest together with the CFA</li> <li>Leads the LRTWG</li> <li>Develop a national restoration coordination mechanism</li> <li>Capacity building of CFAs</li> <li>Coordination with Forest Farm and Dry Land Forestry Program</li> </ul>
	KWTA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interest in sustainable water management on the project sites: Exchange of information</li> </ul>
	KWS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support to biodiversity conservation</li> <li>Support to eco-tourism activities as a bio-enterprise</li> </ul>
	NETFUND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribution to the selection of promising bio-enterprises</li> <li>Exchange of information on NTFPS opportunities and value chains</li> <li>Grants to more promising bio-enterprises</li> </ul>
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries	KALRO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hosts the Arid and Range Lands Research Institute</li> <li>Sharing of information on sustainable livelihoods in ASALs</li> <li>Operator for provision of Rhodes seeds together with private land owners</li> </ul>
NEMA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity building of landscape/environmental committees</li> <li>Environmental awareness generation</li> <li>Enforcement of environmental regulations</li> </ul>
NDMA		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide information on drought situation (VCI)</li> </ul>
Ministry of Water and Irrigation	Water Resources Management Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of water resources and water management information</li> <li>Capacity building of WRUAs</li> </ul>
County governments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members of the PSC</li> <li>Support to project implementation</li> <li>Budgetary support</li> <li>Political will</li> <li>Support for policy development and regulatory improvements</li> <li>Benefit from capacity-building</li> </ul>
NMK		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Member of the PSC</li> <li>Support to implementation in Mount Kulal (management plan design and implementation, restoration activities, institutional support)</li> </ul>
<b>International organizations, NGOs, CSOs, CBOs</b>		
FAO		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GEF Implementing agency</li> <li>Member of the PSC</li> <li>Oversight and technical backstopping</li> <li>Strong linkages with Land Program and RAELOC</li> <li>Overall delivery of project objectives</li> <li>Monitoring and evaluation</li> </ul>
IUCN		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential executing partner for participatory mapping, support to the development and implementation of Mount Kulal management plan, governance support and training for local committees (to be confirmed)</li> <li>Member of the PSC</li> <li>Technical backstopping</li> </ul>

Stakeholders	Role in the project
Community Groups (CFAs, conservancies, group ranches)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community mobilization</li> <li>• Implementation of restoration practices in their lands</li> <li>• Main beneficiaries</li> </ul>
NRT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Member of the PSC</li> <li>• Training of conservancy management teams on governance and grazing committees</li> <li>• Technical backstopping on restoration approaches</li> <li>• Resource mobilization</li> <li>• Sharing of information</li> </ul>
Laikipia Wildlife Forum (LWF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional support to ILMAMUSI CFA</li> </ul>
Women and youth groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active role in the implementation of some activities</li> <li>• Specifically targeted beneficiaries due to their higher vulnerability</li> </ul>
<b>Other groups</b>	
LRTWG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Receive support from the project</li> </ul>
Private sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply of inputs</li> <li>• Linkage to markets</li> </ul>

*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 (to be determined during baseline study)?<sup>8</sup>

During the PPG studies, gender sensitive consultations and data analysis processes were conducted to ensure that the project fully recognizes women as key stakeholders when it comes to managing land, using natural resources and ensuring food security. The project complies with the GEF policy on Gender Mainstreaming as it contributes to "promote the goal of gender equality through GEF operations". The project will proactively seek to ensure meaningful participation of women taking into account the specific constraints and barriers they may face. The project will promote the participation and empowerment of women to strengthen their roles in planning and decision-making, and to improve their livelihoods and living conditions.

Under the first component on Policy Development and Integration, the project will ensure that women participate as much as possible in the strengthening, development and implementation processes of the legal and policy framework on FLR. Gender equality will also be carefully mainstreamed in all new policy or strategic document developed by the project, such as for instance the FLR strategy, the Natural Resources and benefits sharing policy, or the NTFPS management strategy. Mainstreaming gender equality into these documents will ensure that women are systematically considered in the long term when it comes to FLR and natural resources use.

The project will also pay a special attention to women from the onset of the mapping of NTFPS potentialities. This will ensure that women's financial objectives and the NTFPS resources they depend on for their livelihoods are carefully considered and identified from the beginning in order to assess their commercialization potential and value chain. The special attention given to women in this early-on assessment will allow the project to support and train women bio-entrepreneurs in the development of their economically viable and sustainable economic activities. This will directly contribute to women's empowerment in the long term.

Gender equality will also be considered when developing and implementing the ecosystem community action plans in targeted sites, and project activities will involve women closely in decision-making processes and restoration activities.

Women will also be targeted by the capacity needs assessment in implementing FLR that will be conducted under the third component, as well as by the follow-up capacity development activities proposed by the project in order to ensure the institutional and legal framework, the management structure and processes, and the human resources management are all gender-sensitive.

The project will therefore pay a special attention to the needs, priorities and constraints of both women and men, it will contribute to the equitable access to and control over natural resources, and it will ensure that women and men equally participate in and benefit from the project intervention.

<sup>8</sup> Same as footnote 8 above.

A.5 Risk.

Project risks have been identified and analysed during the preparation phase and mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design of the project.

	Risks	Impact	Probability of occurrence	Degree of Incidence	Mitigation Actions	Responsible party
1	<b>Drought</b> may take place before the project has enabled communities to start diversifying their livelihoods. It may be so severe that it threatens crop, livestock survival, and forests thus curtailing the basis for development of value chains appropriate for food security.	Moderately high: It may undercut efforts made by the project to develop alternative livelihoods as people prioritize immediate survival over “riskier” entrepreneurship	Medium	Amber	The project will monitor early warnings for drought and adapt their activities so as to ensure the building blocks of the project are consolidated and may resist the occurrence of a drought.	PMU
2	<b>Political instability</b> may hinder or interrupt support from the public sector for FLR	High: Several activities require strong political support.	Moderately high	Amber	The project will reach out to decision makers to raise awareness and interest for FLR independently of their political orientation. This will be done at all levels, to maximize the capacity of the project to reach its objectives.	PSC, PMU
3	<b>Political-institutional risk:</b> Divergent priorities of projects partners and stakeholders with regards to FLR and alternative livelihoods	Moderately high	Low	Green	Project partners will undertake several consultations to reach consensus on key issues during project implementation. Main project partners will be meeting at least once a year through the project steering committee.	PSC

4	<b>Social risks:</b> Reluctance to participate in the project activities by communities	Moderately high	Low	Green	Interest for activities has already been assessed, and the project will be implemented in a highly participatory manner. Partners are closely involved with communities and can relay any concerns early on so as to prevent reluctance from communities.	PMU
5	<b>Project management risks</b> such as delays, overspending, lack of coordination	Moderately high	Medium	Amber	The PMU will be composed of qualified personnel. Oversight by implementing partners, presence in targeted landscapes and well-established processes and monitoring activities will favor an early identification of issues that may hinder project implementation.	PSC, PMU
6	<b>Ecological risks</b> posed by the implementation of environment restoration activities and water management activities	Moderately high	Medium	Amber	The project is supported by KEFRI, KFS and IUCN, which possess a strong knowledge base on environmental management in the region so as to ensure that activities implemented do no harm.	PSC

#### A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.

The Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources (MENR) will be the institutional anchor of the proposed project. KEFRI will be the lead government counterpart and will play a lead role in the execution of project activities as well as the day-to-day monitoring. KEFRI will be engaged in project oversight (Steering Committee) and will provide technical inputs (focal point liaising with the Project Management Unit) as well as implementing project activities (through Letters of Agreement - LOAs). The technical execution of the project will be carried out by a multitude of operational partners as outlined in Prodoc Table 13 (pg.84). -The FAO will be the GEF agency responsible for monitoring and providing technical backstopping during project implementation. As requested by the national operational partners, FAO will provide direct support services, including procurement and contracting services, fully embedded in the PMC of the project. This is in addition to its role as GEF Agency. FAO will sign a Government Cooperation Project (GCP) Agreement with MENR. The GCP Agreement will outline the roles and responsibilities of the FAO and MENR, including legal aspects of collaboration such as responsibilities for facilitating inputs, copyrights among others. For project technical execution, KEFRI will oversee restoration activities and bio-enterprises development, including the mapping, classification and characterization at site level of NTFPS, the assessment of NTFPS commercialization potential, the assessment of NTFPS value chain of main NTFPS, the support to value chain development, and the setup of nurseries for restoration activities and training of people for collecting seeds and/or seedlings.



NRT will be involved as an executing partner regarding rangeland management work that will be conducted in Lekurruki, Il Ngwesi, Oldonyiro, and Leparua conservancies, and also in Kurikuri and Makurian group ranches. KFS will be involved for Mukogodo Forest and also for the work to be conducted on restoration policies as part of component 1 and finance as part of component 3. LWF will be involved in institutional support to IL MAMUSI CFA. Another organisation to be identified will be associated as an executing partner for participatory mapping in the two targeted landscapes, support to the development of Mount Kulal management plan together with NMK, NKM could be associated to implement FLR activities in Mount Kulal as well as governance support for Mount Kulal committee and training for local committees in this project landscape. Additional project partners for implementation will include the Livestock State Department.

Letters of Agreement (LoA) with partners will be confirmed during project inception in agreement with the project PSC, confirming the most appropriate partner for each activity. FAO will provide overall technical, methodological, administrative and procurement support to the execution of the project, in close cooperation with KEFRI, IUCN Kenya and other stakeholders.

County governments will be involved and associated to all activities performed in the field through their County Environment Committee (CEC). Technical experts will be seconded to the CEC (local technicians based in Gatab and in Nanyuki), and paid by the project while the CEC will provide necessary support in order to guarantee their involvement in the project while strengthening their capacities. Wards will be informed and associated to the different community consultations and participatory meetings, making sure project activities are aligned with local needs and priorities. PCU and Project experts will give technical and methodological support for activities implementation.

### **National Project Steering Committee**

The national PSC, will have the role of overseeing and coordinating the project's yearly planning and implementation. It will be chaired by the MENR and will be comprised of representatives of the following institutions: FAO, KEFRI, KFS, IUCN, NRT, NMK, the 3 county governments, and the GEF focal point. PSC TORs are included in the Prodoc section 3.2.

### **County project steering committees**

Three county project steering committees will also be set-up and will include representatives from the key institutions involved at the county level, namely county government representatives, local organizations such as the NRT, LWF, WWM, group ranch and community representatives, FAO and IUCN. As similar county project steering committees already exist in Marsabit and in Laikipia for the implementation of the Land Programme, these should be used for the TRI Kenya project. A new committee will however have to be created in Isiolo. The final member list of for will be established during the project inception phase following consultations with county authorities. The specific roles and responsibilities of these committees include:

- Represent the interests of key project stakeholders at the county level;
- Review and endorse county work plans;
- Ensure consistency with county development plans;
- Ensure linkages and provide recommendations to the PSC
- Monitor project progress, the achievement of project objectives and provide comments on key reports or outputs; and
- Meet at least twice a year, and on an ad hoc basis as necessary

**Project Management Unit (PMU).** A PMU funded by the GEF will be established within KEFRI premises in Nairobi, and will include:

- A National Project Coordinator (NPC), with a restoration background;
- A National technical assistant, with a business development and/or a bioenterprise background;
- A part-time Chief Technical Advisor (CTA);
- A part-time Monitoring and Evaluation expert;
- A Financial Manager; and
- A Local Technician based in Gatab

The PMU staff will be recruited by the project and will report to the NPC. The project will also work through community focal points in each pilot site (8 in total), ensuring that information and knowledge are well disseminated to local communities and helping the communities understanding the implementation modalities, the expected outputs and the proposed project activities. They will also be key actors in awareness raising activities.

The institutional arrangements of the components and project management mechanisms are schematized in the organigramme in the ProDoc section 3.2.

### **Coordination with other initiatives**

The project will closely collaborate with other child projects under the TRI initiative in general and with the other one in Kenya in Particular. The Global TRI Steering Committee (Program SC) will ensure alignment and synergies within the program during the implementation of the child projects

The project will collaborate with other ongoing or planned GEF projects in Kenya. It will ensure open and regular communication with the other on-going GEF projects to share lessons learned and avoid duplication, which should be mutually beneficial. The relevant projects are summarized in the table below.

GEF projects in Kenya with which the TRI project will develop collaboration

GEF ID	Project Title	Project Objective	GEF Agency	Status
9326	RLACC - Rural Livelihoods' Adaptation to Climate Change in the Horn of Africa	To improve the resilience to climate change of pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in targeted areas	AfDB	Project Approved for implementation in February 2016
9241	Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Kenya	To enhance and maintain socio-ecological resilience of selected landscapes and seascapes through community-based initiatives in selected ecologically sensitive areas in Kenya	UNDP	Concept approved in June 2016
9139,	Food-IAP: Establishment of the Upper Tana Nairobi Water Fund (UTNWF)	Conservation of the Upper Tana River basin with improved water quality and quantity for downstream users and maintaining regular flows of water throughout the year; enhancing ecosystem services, improving human well-being and quality of life for upstream local communities.	UNEP	Project approved for implementation in July 2016
5272	Scaling up Sustainable Land Management and Biodiversity Conservation to Reduce Environmental Degradation in Small Scale Agriculture in Western Kenya	Promote the adoption and adaption of sustainable land and forest ecosystem management (SLEM) practices across the productive landscape of Kakamega-Nandi ecosystem	UNEP	Project approved for implementation in July 2016
5083	Capacity, Policy and Financial Incentives for PFM in Kirisia Forest and integrated Rangelands Management	To deliver multiple BD, CC and livelihood benefits from 91,452 ha of Kirisia Forest under PFM and 50,000 ha of rangelands under Holistic Natural Resources Management respectively	FAO	Project Approved for implementation in August 2016

Coordination with the initiatives mentioned in the table above will focus on exchanging lessons learned and sharing technical expertise and will be established through partnership agreements and joint work-plans. To ensure effective coordination, joint work-plans will be established during Year 1. Moreover, the strengthening of the Landscape Restoration Technical Working Group under Output 1.1, will provide a platform and a mechanism to improve the coordination of FLR activities on the ground, across institutions and projects. As the PMU will be hosted in KEFRI, technical working groups to coordinate KEFRI's FLR work will be conducted regularly to avoid duplications.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

#### *A.7 Socio-economic benefits.*

The TRI Kenya project is in line with the ecosystem-based management approach which takes into account and integrates the different set of interactions on a given ecosystem from which the communities depend. It will consider jointly the ecological, socio-economic, agricultural and cultural aspects of FLR and the role of all concerned stakeholders. In an effort to generate sustainable change, the

project will not focus only on bio-enterprises, but it will also support an enabling environment for bio-enterprises development and more broadly for FLR. The bio-enterprise development activities will be implemented along with concrete restoration and land management activities. All in all, the project estimates that at least 8,120 rural households will indirectly benefit from FLR interventions.

The direct restoration of 8,700 hectares of forests landscapes directly pursued by the project will bring further direct and indirect economic and social benefits to the weakest segments of the rural society. Through Component 2, the project will identify viable bio-enterprises and will provide training in post-harvest mechanisms, processing, stock, and marketing. Bio enterprises will be identified with the aim to yielding economic benefits to rural communities. Specific equipment and support will be provided for processing and packaging most promising NTFPS. At least 12 bio-entrepreneurs groups will be supported. The series of training will follow the Forest and Farm Facility (FFF) approach and will be conducted in the field to a group of 30 members maximum, pre-identified and engaged in each training session, meaning that at least 360 persons will be trained and supported in bio enterprises development.

The project will also support the rehabilitation of water infrastructures in all locations of project interventions. It will furthermore support the setting-up of local revolving funds for promotion of restoration activities and income generation activities (IGAs). The project will provide the initial funding and establish the functioning of the fund which will be available to the local population to restoration finance activities or IGAs that are either based on NTFPS or environmentally sustainable. In addition to encouraging restoration, this fund will enhance community resilience by promoting alternative livelihoods. The focus on NTFPS also aims at generating an incentive for ecosystem protection. This revolving fund will be designed along the lines of the Community Environment Conservation Fund (CECF) that IUCN has launched in Uganda and that promotes:

- Diversity – of the economy, livelihoods and nature. Diverse markets or farming systems give people the alternatives they need to be adaptive. Enhancing and protecting biodiversity by maintaining, or recreating, natural diversity also ensures the availability of the ecosystem services needed to buffer climate impacts, such as storage of water in vegetated riverine habitats and sustains life and productivity;
- Sustainable infrastructure and technology – landscape management that recognizes, encourages and combines the presence, development and maintenance of both engineered and ‘natural infrastructure’, as well as adaptable and sustainable technologies for their management, reduces vulnerabilities. Infrastructure includes not only engineered responses, such as the sinking of boreholes, but also ‘natural infrastructure’, such as healthy and functioning wetlands and floodplains that store water, lower flood peaks or buffer surrounding lands from flooding;
- Self-organization - a critical characteristic of resilient, highly adaptive communities is participatory governance and self-empowerment ;
- Learning – ensuring that individuals and institutions are availed, and can make use, of new skills and technologies as they become available helps them to make more effective use of information and thus to develop effective adaptation strategies (IUCN, 2013)

According to IUCN, “the fund delivers improved environmental management because it enables improvements in livelihoods by removing barriers to accessing credit and not by prescribing specific actions”.

#### *A.8 Knowledge Management.*

Component 4 of the project “Knowledge, partnerships, monitoring and assessments” will be mostly devoted to knowledge management, monitoring, and evaluation. Under this Component, the dissemination of TRI-related lessons learned and best practices from the TRI network will contribute to developing national capacity. Workshops and meetings will be organized among concerned target actors to disseminate the lessons learned and best practices developed within the wider TRI program.

More specifically, the GCP will also support the national Child projects to produce information on successes and failures so as to be able to capitalize on experience in a systematic way within all the TRI child projects. This harmonised lessons learned will feed into a FLR Knowledge Platform to be set-up under component 4 of this project: The FLR Portal. The project will support the design and establishment of an FLR knowledge platform, which will include a Knowledge Management supporting infrastructure and electronic filing systems. It will be used as an FLR knowledge products repository and will allow an easy access to LFR information, targeting varied audiences and allowing edits and open forums discussions and learning to promote open-access approach to data, information and project documentation. All knowledge generated throughout this TRI project, such as the ROAM assessment and the assessment of existing ecosystem services and analysis of land use and land cover changes will be documented and made available within this portal. The GCP will provide guidance on the development of such a platform and on the mechanisms for knowledge dissemination. This information will also be relayed by the GCP to be used by projects beyond Kenya’s frontiers.

A communication plan will be developed early in the project by the PMU, describing how the direct and indirect beneficiaries will be regularly informed of the achievements of the project. This will be implemented by the Department of Communication of FAO Kenya together with the PMU.

The wide range of communication and visibility tools and approaches are planned throughout the implementation period of the project to raise awareness of the project's key messages, achievements and support scaling-up of the results, including:

- Articles including testimonials of beneficiaries regularly developed and posted on the websites of KEFRI, FAO and GEF, also in the bulletin of FAO Kenya, in the local press, but also in the Knowledge management platform to be established by the project;
- A range of different forms of communication and visibility raising activities will be carried out during the implementation period of this project:
  - ✓ Leaflets showing the achievements and impact will be produced and will carry GEF logos and FAO;
  - ✓ Creation of a FLR knowledge management platform;
  - ✓ Press releases will be regularly prepared and disseminated;
  - ✓ Signposts displaying GEF and FAO logos with a key project message will be made and posted on the intervention sites;
  - ✓ Stickers with the logos of the GEF and FAO will be produced and displayed on any hardware available all throughout the project.
  - ✓ A Roll Up banner will be designed and placed in key locations (FAO offices, KEFRI, special events etc.).

## **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, INDCs, etc.:

The project will contribute to Kenya's engagement towards the implementation of the Rio conventions through its focus on sustainable agriculture and land management, on the conservation and rehabilitation of key ecosystems and on the nexus between development objectives and environmental sustainability. In particular, the project proposal is aligned with the 5<sup>th</sup> NBSAP of Kenya (2015) as already evidenced in earlier sections of this document.

The project will contribute to the nation-wide effort to curb the GHG emission curve, as outlined in the iNDC (2015 – see prodoc sub-section 1.5.2). The project is further consistent with priorities identified in the NCs to the UNFCCC, particularly the Second National Communication (2015). This latter not only underlines the potential important contribution of the agriculture sector to achieving GHG emission reduction targets, but also underlines the fragility and vulnerability of forest ecosystems to the impacts of climate change.

The project is aligned to several national development goals and policies as detailed in Section

## **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

The M&E tasks and responsibilities, specifically described in the Monitoring and Evaluation table below, will be achieved through:

- Day-to-day monitoring and supervision missions of project progress (PMU);
- Technical monitoring of indicators (PMU);
- Mid-term review and final evaluation (independent consultants and FAO Office of Evaluation); and
- Oversight, monitoring and supervision missions (FAO).

During inception phase, the PMU will establish a system to monitor the project's progress. Participatory mechanisms and methodologies to support the monitoring and evaluation of performance indicators and outputs will be developed during the project inception workshop. The tasks of monitoring and evaluation will include: (i) presentation and explanation (if needed) of the project's Results Framework with all project stakeholders; (ii) review of monitoring and evaluation indicators and their baselines; (iii) preparation of draft clauses that will be required for inclusion in consultant contracts, to ensure compliance with the monitoring and evaluation reporting functions (if applicable); and (iv) clarification of the division of monitoring and evaluation tasks among the different stakeholders in the project. The CTA and the M&E expert will prepare a draft monitoring and evaluation matrix that will be discussed and agreed upon by all stakeholders during the inception workshop. The M&E matrix will be a management tool for the NPC, and the Project Partners to: i) bi-annually monitor the achievement of output indicators; ii) annually monitor the achievement of outcome indicators; iii) clearly define responsibilities and verification means; iv) select a method to process the indicators and data.

The M&E Plan will be prepared by the CTA and the M&E expert in the first six months of the PY1 and validated with the PSC. The M&E Plan will be based on the M&E Table below and the M&E Matrix and will include: i) the updated results framework, with clear indicators per year; ii) updated baseline, if needed, and selected tools for data collection (including sample definition); iii) narrative of the monitoring strategy, including roles and responsibilities for data collection and processing, reporting flows, monitoring matrix, and brief analysis of who, when and how will each indicator be measured. Responsibility of project activities may or may not coincide with data collection responsibility; iv) updated implementation arrangements, if needed; v) inclusion of the tracking tool indicators, data collection and monitoring strategy to be included in the mid-term review and final evaluation; and vi) calendar of evaluation workshops, including self-evaluation techniques.

The day-to-day monitoring of the project's implementation will be the responsibility of the NPC and will be driven by the preparation and implementation of an AWP/B followed up through six-monthly PPRs. The preparation of the AWP/B and six-monthly PPRs will represent the product of a unified planning process between main project stakeholders. As tools for results-based-management (RBM), the AWP/B will identify the actions proposed for the coming project year and provide the necessary details on output and outcome targets to be achieved, and the PPRs will report on the monitoring of the implementation of actions and the achievement of output and outcome targets. Specific inputs to the AWP/B and the PPRs will be prepared based on participatory planning and progress review with all stakeholders and coordinated and facilitated through project planning and progress review workshops. These contributions will be consolidated by the NPC in the draft AWP/B and the PPRs.

An annual project progress review and planning meeting should be held with the participation of the project partners to finalize the AWP/B and the PPRs. Once finalized, the AWP/B and the PPRs will be submitted to the FAO Lead Technical Officer (LTO) for technical clearance, and to the Project Steering Committee for revision and approval. The AWP/B will be developed in a manner consistent with the Project Results Framework to ensure adequate fulfilment and monitoring of project outputs and outcomes.

Following the approval of the Project, the PY1 AWP/B will be adjusted (either reduced or expanded in time) to synchronize it with the annual reporting calendar. In subsequent years, the AWP/Bs will follow an annual preparation and reporting cycle as specified below.

#### Indicators and information sources

In order to monitor the outputs and outcomes of the project, including contributions to adaptation benefits, a set of indicators is set out in the Project Results Framework. The Project Results Framework indicators and means of verification will be applied to monitor both project performance and impact. Following FAO monitoring procedures and progress reporting formats, data collected will be sufficiently detailed that can track specific outputs and outcomes, and flag project risks early on. Output target indicators will be monitored on a six-monthly basis, and outcome target indicators will be monitored on an annual basis, if possible, or as part of the mid-term and final evaluations.

Information sources and means of verification for the measurement of indicators are specified in the project results framework for all indicators.

<b>M&amp;E Activity</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>budget</b>
<b>Inception Workshop (IW)</b>	PMU, FAO Kenya	Within two months of project start up	USD 10,000
<b>Surveys to determine TT baseline values</b>	PMU and service providers	Within three months of project start up	USD 0 - data is collected by the PMU.
<b>Project Inception Report</b>	PMU, cleared by FAO LTO, LTU, BH, and the GCU	Immediately after the workshop.	USD 0 - project inception report is developed by the PMU.
<b>Field based impact monitoring</b>	PMU, project partners and local organizations.	Periodically - to be determined at inception workshop.	USD 30,000
<b>Supervision visits and rating of progress in PPRs and PIRs</b>	PMU; FAO (FAO Kenya, LTO). FAO-GCU may participate in the visits if needed.	Annual or as required	The visits of the LTO and the GCU will be paid by GEF agency fee. The visits of the NPC and CTA will be paid from the project travel budget
<b>Project Progress Reports</b>	BH with support from PMU, with inputs from KEFRI, PSC members and other partners	Semi-annual	USD 0 (as completed by CTA and PMU)


<b>Project Implementation Review report</b>	BH (in collaboration with the PMU and the LTO) Drafted by the NPC, with the supervision of the LTO and BH. Approved and submitted to GEF by the FAO-GCU	Annual	Paid by GEF agency fee
<b>Tracking Tool</b>	PMU supported by the LTO	Project start-up, mid-Term and project end.	USD 0 - data is collected by the PMU.
<b>Co-financing Reports</b>	BH with support from PMU and NPC with input from other co-financiers	Annual	Completed by NPC and CTA
<b>Technical reports</b>	PMU, BH, LTO & Participating Units	As appropriate	USD 10,000 (Report on best practices and lessons learned)
<b>Household survey baseline assessment</b>	PMU, enumerators	Within 6 month of project start-up	USD 20,000
<b>Mid-term Review (MTR)</b>	MTR: FAO Independent Evaluation Office, in consultation with the project task force , including the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit and others	At mid-point of project implementation	*USD 30,000 for independent consultants and associated costs. In addition the agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
<b>Final evaluation</b>	Under the responsibility of FAO Independent Office of Evaluation in consultation with the project team including the GCU and other partners	At the end of project implementation	*USD 40,000 for external, independent consultants and associated costs. In addition the agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
<b>Terminal Report</b>	PMU, LTO, TCSR Report Unit	At least two months before the end date of the Execution Agreement	USD 7,000
<b>Total Budget</b>			USD 147,000

\* The estimated costs of the MTE and TE have been proposed based on the intention to group the FAO TRI child projects together and carry out a cluster evaluation where possible. Technically and from a project management point of view, the TRI child project teams will benefit from the knowledge sharing and exchange of lessons.

**PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)**

**A. GEF Agency(ies) certification**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies<sup>9</sup> 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
Alexander Jones, Director, Climate and Environment Division		16 February 2018	Christophe Besacier Forestry officer, Forestry Department, FAO	+390657055508	christophe.besacier@fao.org
Jeffrey Griffin Senior Coordinator, FAO GEF Coordination Unit. Climate and Environment Division.			Paola Palestini Technical Officer FAO –GEF Coordination Unit, Climate and Environment Division		paola.palestini@fao.org

<sup>9</sup> GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF and CBIT  
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-August2016

**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).

Please see Annex 1 in the Prodoc.



**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).

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>10</sup>**

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

PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: 150,000			
	<i>GEF AMOUNT (\$)</i>		
	<i>BUDGETED AMOUNT</i>	<i>AMOUNT SPENT TO DATE</i>	<i>AMOUNT COMMITTED</i>
PROFESSIONAL SALARIES	7,143	0	7,143
CONSULTANTS	72,700	84,685.01	5,998.85
TRAVELS	50,500	30,194.75	1,390.39
WORKSHOPS	19,657	16,606.79	3050.21
EXPENDABLE PROCUREMENT		857.74	
OTHER OPERATING EXPENSES		73	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>150,000</b>	<b>132,417.00</b>	<b>*17,583</b>

\*The balance will be used during project inception to collect missing baseline information.

<sup>10</sup> 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/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A

## ANNEX E: CHILD PROJECT ALIGNMENT WITH TRI PROGRAM

Criteria	Child project design features aligned with criteria
Project interventions are designed/informed by forest landscape restoration best practices and are in line with support for the Bonn Challenge	<p>The TRI Kenya project is in line with the ecosystem-based management approach which takes into account and integrates the different set of interactions on a given ecosystem from which the communities depend. It will consider jointly the ecological, socio-economic, agricultural and cultural aspects of FLR and the role of all concerned stakeholders. It was designed and informed by FLR best practices acquired over years by both FAO and KEFRI.</p> <p>The project directly support Kenya's pledge to the Bonn Challenge which is to restore 5.1 million hectares by 2030, of which 1 million ha is planned to be from restoration of forest lands.</p>
Project strategy employs TRI strategic approach, and includes work under each of the four TRI Programmatic components	The project results framework is aligned with the four TRI programmatic components and includes activities and outputs under the four components.
Project anticipates making use of supports from TRI Global Learning, Finance, and Partnership project (the Global Child project)	The project anticipates support from the GCP on the knowledge sharing aspects, and the setting-up of the development of the FLR Knowledge Platform, among others.
Project anticipates making contributions to the capture and dissemination of knowledge, for the benefit of all TRI child projects	Under component 4, the project plans to develop a lessons learned supports that will be presented to other TRI child projects during annual TRI knowledge sharing events to promote the approach and lessons learnt during the project implementation.
Project design recognizes institutional linkages with the Global Child project, including with TRI Program Advisory Committee, for adaptive management.	Institutional linkages with the TRI program Advisory Committee are drawn under the Institutional framework and implementation arrangements section. It is anticipated that the project will incorporate recommendations of the Advisory Committee into their work plans and operations.
Project includes a planned activity and dedicated funding for participation in Annual TRI Knowledge-Sharing workshops	Project activity 4.2.3 is focused on the participation in Global TRI Yearly events and a specific amount of money was set aside to cover this participation.
Project funding and anticipated global environmental benefits are in-line with estimates made at the time of PFD submission/approval	<p>Project funding is in-line with estimates made at the time of PFD approval, including co-financing figures.</p> <p>BD and LD benefits are in line with estimates made at the time of PFD approval, although the direct</p>

	restoration target is lower as the PPG concluded that the one defined in the PFD was overambitious taking into account accessibility to the sites and national context.
Other (including any additional support for partnership and knowledge sharing activities with TRI partners)	

**ANNEX F: ADDRESSING STAP AND GEF COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS ON THE TRI PFD IN TRI CHILD PROJECT SUBMISSIONS**

TRI implementing partners and child project development teams appreciate the guidance and comments received from STAP and the GEF Council at the time of TRI PFD approval, in June 2016. The comments recognize and reflect the significant challenges of designing and implementing a well-integrated and well-coordinated program spanning two continents, including countries with large differences in their capacity to implement FLR, and that that delivers on the overarching vision for a GEF program as “... a series of interconnected projects under a common objective, and whose anticipated results are more than the sum of its components.”<sup>11</sup>

In the development of TRI child projects during the PPG phase, to address the concerns raised by GEF STAP and Council members and that are shared by TRI Implementing partners and stakeholders, the following measures, described in the table below, were undertaken.

<b>Council member and/or STAP comment</b>	<b>TRI Agencies response</b>
<p><b>GEF STAP review, para. 2 – “The Program will need to set a clear Theory of Change and develop uptake pathways that will involve stakeholders at all levels, creating the right incentives and institutional structures to overcome the many barriers to forestland restoration. This STAP screen of the PFD on The Restoration Initiative (TRI) is mainly concerned with whether the Program sets the appropriate scientific and technical guidance to develop innovative, integrative and effective projects in the various partners countries. With such a wide mandate, TRI could, without the necessary program framework, revert to a</b></p>	<p><b><i>TRI Theory of Change</i></b></p> <p>A clear Theory of Change for TRI, based on extensive literature review and partner experience in FLR, was further developed during the PPG stage, and is presented in Section 3.1 of the TRI Global Child project document (page 35-38).</p> <p><b><i>To support the integrated design of child projects:</i></b></p> <p>Building upon early consultations with all TRI countries and continuing throughout the PPG phase, TRI Implementing partners have worked to strengthen understanding and ownership of the TRI Program among child project development teams and key partners. Activities included training events and workshops beginning with the <i>TRI Global Launch Workshop</i> held in Douala, Cameroon, October 31-Nov 2, 2016, and that was attended by representatives from all 12 TRI child projects, as well as bilateral meetings and</p>

<sup>11</sup> GEF (2014). *Improving the GEF Project Cycle*. Page 8. GEF/C.47/07/Rev.01. GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-August2016

collection of standard conservation forest projects.”

**GEF STAP review**, para. 3 – “STAP supports the intended structure of this Program, consisting of a set of national projects that are collectively linked via Component 4 and its provision of lessons, learning, assessment and monitoring. There is, however, a danger that national projects may be formulated locally with only superficial guidance from South-South exchanges, program monitoring systems, best-practice databases and other provisions on Component 4. The ten countries involved have very different approaches to science, project development and project implementation. Some have good scientific support; others are weak. Some have top-down approaches to project design; others have embraced participation by local stakeholder groups.”

**GEF STAP review**, para. 7 – “It is difficult to see how the list of projects and potential global benefits represents anything more than a set of individual projects unrelated to each other and not deriving any inputs from the Program Framework. How do the components in the PFD inform these projects?”

**GEF STAP review**, para. 9 – “In conclusion, STAP believes that this PFD represents a good starting point for a coordinated effort at FLR. However, there remains the

follow-up activities conducted by all Implementing partners with their respective TRI national child project development teams. The TRI theory of change, Program design, M&E systems, and key elements of TRI, particularly those focused on enhanced learning and collaboration, were a key part of the agenda of these meetings and activities. Through these efforts, stakeholder understanding of TRI and their ability to design child projects well-aligned with the TRI PFD was enhanced.

While the TRI PFD provides sufficient flexibility to allow countries to tailor interventions to meet their specific challenges and needs, a high degree of overlap exists among TRI countries in so far as the existing key challenges to implementation of FLR. As a result, the overall four-component thematic structure of TRI has been prioritized and adopted by all child projects, and will provide a firm basis for South-South learning and collaboration across the portfolio of TRI projects that, upon initial reading, may appear unrelated to one another.

The design of the TRI Global Child, through which integrated support will be provided to national child projects along each of the four TRI PFD components, was informed by extensive stakeholder surveying, consultation and analysis of the highest-value support best provided from the Global child project in partnership with national projects (see Annex 6 of the TRI Global Child project document for more detailed information on findings from PPG-stage surveying of TRI national child project teams).

***To support enhanced learning, collaboration, and partnership***

To facilitate the enhanced learning, collaboration and partnership among TRI program partners and relevant external partners and initiatives that is essential to realization of enhanced programmatic benefits, all TRI child projects include the following design elements and features:

- Dedicated funding and support for annual participation of at least 2 child project team members in all *TRI Annual Knowledge Sharing Workshops*.
- Support for participation of project stakeholders in *TRI FLR Communities of Practice*, to be established, coordinated and supported in large part by the TRI Global Child project under Component 2 of the Global Child.

<p>significant concern of how the Program Framework will provide the necessary guidance for child projects, other than in broadly general rhetorical terms? This includes the following elements for a truly innovative and integrative Program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project design and development</li> <li>▪ Analysis of costs and benefits of different restoration approaches [see related Council comment and Agency response below]</li> <li>▪ Intended use of tools across child projects [See STAP comment and Agency response below]</li> <li>▪ Contributions to a learning platform, and</li> <li>▪ Exchange of lessons and project experience”</li> </ul> <p><b>Germany</b> – “Child projects appear to stand alone with no conceptual input from the program. It is difficult to derive how the program framework will guide the child projects in core issues of institutional and operational sustainability, such as extension and service systems, technical education, land tenure and incentives.”</p>	<p>The TRI Global Child will support the systematic capture, enhancement, and sharing of FLR knowledge through development and dissemination of harmonized tools and processes for capture of information; development of case studies and policy briefs and other informational materials; enhancement of the existing body of FLR knowledge to make these resources more useful and widely accessible; and sharing of experiences via facilitated online Communities of Practice, the <i>Annual TRI Global Knowledge Sharing Workshops</i>, other events, workshops and trainings, as well as through Program and Agency partner web platforms.</p> <p><b><i>To support coordination and adaptive management of TRI</i></b></p> <p>The TRI Global Child project will play a principal role in overall Program coordination, monitoring, and facilitation of adaptive management. Key functions and services provided by the Global Child in this capacity include support for a Program Advisory Committee, Global Coordinating Unit, Program portal, harmonized TRI GEF tracking tool, and midterm Program review and terminal evaluation.</p> <p>All TRI child projects, in their respective project documents, have clearly defined institutional linkages to key TRI Program partners. These include operational and reporting linkages between all national child project and the TRI Global Child project and its Global Coordination Unit, the TRI Program Advisory Committee, and between TRI child projects themselves.</p>
<p><b>Germany</b> – “Germany suggests further clarification, how the program is meant to encourage political will for governance reform and investment into restoration approaches. Political will appears as an assumption rather than a purpose of the program.”</p>	<p><b><i>To support strengthening of political will for FLR-related policy and governance reform</i></b></p> <p>All TRI national child projects have developed tailored interventions aligned with Component 1 of the TRI PFD, <i>Policy Development and Integration</i>, and that are intended to strengthen political will and support for governance reforms supporting FLR. Examples of these efforts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Assessments of national and sub-national policy and regulatory frameworks and how they may be enhanced and/or strengthened to further support FLR</li> <li>▪ Support for identification and uptake of FLR supportive policies through filling in of knowledge gaps, awareness and outreach campaigns, and through support for robust cost benefit analysis of FLR benefits and costs through use of</li> </ul>

	<p>ROAM or other similar methodologies (8 of 11 TRI national child projects include support for use of ROAM).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support for generation of a Bonn Challenge pledge in several TRI countries that have not yet made a pledge: Guinea Bissau, Myanmar, and Tanzania.</li> </ul> <p>The Global child project will work in tandem with national projects to support in-country efforts to enhance the enabling in-country policy environment for FLR. Work will include development of relevant case studies and policy briefs, high-level workshops, and an awareness-raising campaign featuring restoration champions from within and outside TRI countries.</p>
<p><b>Germany</b> – “Economic models on costs and benefits of landscape restoration need to be exemplified in order to underpin the plans for private investment generation.”</p>	<p><b><i>To support scaled-up investment in FLR, including from the private-sector</i></b></p> <p>TRI partners have encouraged the incorporation and use of robust methodologies for estimating the cost and benefits of proposed restoration interventions. This includes support for use of ROAM, that will be utilized by 8 of 11 TRI child projects.</p> <p>The need for cost-benefit analysis to facilitate private-sector investment in FLR is acknowledged by all TRI partners and is a key part of the programs of work of all three partner Agencies. Relevant analyses and findings that will be shared with and disseminated to TRI partners over the course of TRI include IUCN’s work with the Coalition on Private Sector Investment in Conservation (CPIC) (supported in-part by GEF Project ID 9914). Under component 2 on Knowledge Sharing &amp; Capacity Building, the thematic of cost benefit analysis has been designated as a key interest by the national TRI teams. It will certainly be one of the topic to receive support from the Global Child. Several national TRI teams have included activities on this thematic in their respective Project Documents.</p> <p>In addition, Component 4 (Output 4.1.1) of the TRI Global Child project includes support for the generation of case studies examining relevant FLR interventions, and that will include assessment of the associated cost and benefits.</p>
<p><b>Germany</b> – “Germany recommends incorporating coordination and networking with existing initiatives and programs in the field of landscape</p>	<p><b><i>To support coordination and networking with relevant external initiatives</i></b></p>

<p>restoration at international as well as national levels more systematically.”</p>	<p>A number of relevant national and international GEF and non-GEF interventions have been identified by the national child projects, for which the projects will take full account of and/or with which the projects will develop appropriate links. This will ensure that the national child projects benefit from collaboration with other relevant initiatives and build on lessons learnt in other projects. It also ensures that the child projects can provide a platform for bringing together a wide range of different initiatives and partners in each country around a common sustainable land management and landscape restoration agenda.</p> <p>The TRI child project in Kenya, will closely collaborate with other child projects under the TRI initiative in general and with UNEP’s child project in Kenya in particular. The Global TRI Steering Committee (Program SC) will ensure alignment and synergies within the program during the implementation of the child projects</p> <p>The project will collaborate with other ongoing or planned FLR relevant projects in Kenya. It will ensure open and regular communication with the other on-going projects to share lessons learned and avoid duplication. The projects with whom close coordination will be sought include both GEF projects (listed in the CER pg.34) as well as non –GEF projects as mentioned in Prodoc pg.35 to 39. Coordination will focus on exchanging lessons learned and sharing technical expertise and will be established through partnership agreements and joint work-plans. To ensure effective coordination, joint work-plans will be established during Year 1. Moreover, the strengthening of the Landscape Restoration Technical Working Group under Output 1.1, will provide a platform and a mechanism to coordinate FLR related activities on the ground across institutions and projects. As the PMU will be hosted in KEFRI, technical working groups to coordinate KEFRI’s FLR work across projects will be conducted regularly to avoid duplications.</p>
<p><b>GEF STAP review, para. 9 –</b> <i>Comment from above regarding PFD and how Program will provide guidance for “...intended use of tools across child projects”</i></p>	<p><b><i>How Program will provide guidance and support for use of FLR tools</i></b></p> <p>The Global Child project, together with the larger project support teams of the TRI Implementing Agencies, will provide a number of key FLR-related support services to child projects, including support for the use of FLR-relevant tools. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Technical support for implementation of the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM), to be provided by IUCN’s Global Forest Programme and Regional FLR hubs.</li> <li>▪ Technical support to all national child project teams in the development of bankable proposals and other mechanisms to</li> </ul>



mobilize increased funding for FLR, to be provided by UN Environment's Finance Initiative. Support for mobilization of finance will also include development and delivery of an online course on FLR finance in partnership with Yale University (Output 3.1.2).

- The FLR Communities of Practice will be supported from within Component 2 of the Global Child project, under management by FAO.
- As noted above, Component 2 of the TRI Global Child will also include support for the systematic capture, enhancement, and sharing of FLR knowledge through development and dissemination of harmonized tools and processes for capture of information (Outputs 2.1.1, 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.5.1).
- Component 1 of the TRI Global Child project includes support for the development of a *TRI Global Communications and Outreach strategy*, with substantive inputs and participation from TRI country project teams. The strategy will codify objectives and approaches in communicating about the TRI program with internal and external audiences. The strategy will be accompanied by a 'TRI Communications Toolbox,' to include templates and flyers and other communication tools, regularly updated by the Global Child GCU, to help facilitate consistent and coordinated communication on TRI by all national child project. The Global Child project will provide continual support to all national child projects in the use of these communication resources.
- Component 3 of the TRI Global Child includes support for development of an *Enabling Investments Rapid Diagnostic Tool* (Output 3.1.1). The Tool will allow actors in each TRI country (and others) to identify key in-country policy, regulatory, institutional, and/or financial obstacles that currently stand in the way of investing in restoration activities. It will likewise provide suggested measures for reform, depending on the bottlenecks identified.
- Component 4 of the TRI Global Child includes support for the development, refinement, and use of a tool for assessing impacts to biodiversity from FLR (Outputs 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3). Guidance and support will be provided to all national teams on the use of this tool.
- Other targeted assistance, including support for the design and establishment of effective and harmonized FLR monitoring systems, will also be provided through the Global Child project to all national child project teams.

In addition, TRI Agencies will support the sharing of independent evaluation teams (using same evaluation team for 2 or more TRI child projects) and methods in the undertaking of mid-term and terminal evaluations, to facilitate cost savings and increase cross-

	<p>compatibility of evaluations (further information on this is provided in Section 5.5 of the Global Child project document).</p>
<p><b>Japan</b> – “When considering a target country in GEF projects, it is important to take into consideration the impact of externalities and scale of economy (GDP, foreign currency reserves etc.) of each country, with a view to effective utilization of limited GEF resources.</p> <p>In general, while we acknowledge that the GEF allocates fund along with the STAR system, Least Developed Countries (LDCs), lower income countries and less developed region in these countries should be prioritized in allocating GEF resources.</p> <p>Accordingly, the funding for the projects that take place in countries with larger economic scale should be covered by co-financing of related institutions instead of GEF resources.</p> <p>From these points of view, GEF secretariat may wish to reconsider whether the target countries and regions.”</p>	<p><b><i>On the selection and composition of countries in TRI</i></b></p> <p>TRI implementing partners acknowledge the comments from Japan regarding the composition of TRI countries. When the TRI program was being developed through the work of TRI countries, TRI Implementing Partners, and the GEF Secretariat, extensive efforts were made to notify countries with potential restoration opportunities about the emerging GEF-6 TRI program, and whether participation in the Program might be of interest. This occurred largely through the extensive networks of the three TRI Implementing Partners, and also via communications between GEF-eligible countries themselves. The selection process for TRI was largely a country-driven process, and entirely voluntary. As noted above, despite significant differences among TRI countries, a high degree of overlap exists in so far as the existing key challenges to implementation of FLR. As a result, a firm basis exists for South-South learning and collaboration across the portfolio of TRI projects.</p>
<p><b>France</b> – “The initiative targets 9 countries, from which 5 in Africa (CAR, Cameroon, Guinea-Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe and Tanzania) and 3 in Asia (China, Myanmar and Pakistan). These countries have very different economic and political situations. The program consists mainly in 9 national projects put together. The national experiences</p>	<p><b><i>On the benefits of country diversity to TRI and the importance of learning from and sharing what works, including contextual factors and other country/project-specific variables</i></b></p> <p>TRI partners agree that the diversity of countries participating in TRI, while presenting certain technical challenges, also affords a significant opportunity to test, refine, and share findings from country experiences on FLR that will, if successfully supported, benefit both TRI countries and other FLR initiatives. Related support would necessarily include support for robust knowledge capture of TRI experiences, thorough analysis of findings including</p>

<p>could be useful for the 3 GEF agencies to benefit from the diversity of national contexts in order to promote same approaches in other countries and to feed general approaches and goal setting in the general monitoring of the Bonn Challenge. It would be therefore useful to apply participative approaches and not only international top down approaches of “best practices” or “monitoring tools.”</p> <p>“The implementation of concrete actions (for land management and restoration) represents 48% of the GEF contribution. The methodology for these actions is not presented (the monitoring tools, type of projects, “best practices” are described instead). A list of national resources requests is provided with about 40 projects. The approaches of how to improve land management and restore degraded land on each of these 40 individual projects will probably be the key issue of success of the initiative and, if successful, it will be the most useful lesson to be learned and shared. It would be then useful to understand how the actions will be implemented and with what kind of support (local structures, capacity building).”</p> <p>“On the public policy level, it will be important that (i) the intended use of 4 tools are not replacing national approaches and policies, and that (ii) they will be used to the extent that there are considered by countries as</p>	<p>contextual factors and other country- and project-specific variables that may be at play, and South-South knowledge sharing. As noted above, these are key components of TRI, integrated in the design of all TRI national child projects, and supported through dedicated work of the TRI Global Child project – particularly Global Child Components 2-4.</p> <p>In particular, all TRI child projects include the following design elements and features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Dedicated funding and support for annual participation of at least 2 child project team members in all <i>TRI Annual Knowledge Sharing Workshops</i>.</li> <li>▪ Support for participation of project stakeholders in <i>TRI FLR Communities of Practice</i>, to be established, coordinated and supported in large part by the TRI Global Child project under Component 2 of the Global Child.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the TRI Global Child will support the systematic capture, enhancement, and sharing of FLR knowledge through development and dissemination of harmonized tools and processes for capture of information; development of detailed case studies and policy briefs and other informational materials with robust analysis of contextual factors; enhancement of the existing body of FLR knowledge to make these resources more useful and widely accessible; and sharing of experiences via facilitated online Communities of Practice, the <i>Annual TRI Global Knowledge Sharing Workshops</i>, other events, workshops and trainings, as well as through Program and Agency partner web platforms.</p> <p><b><i>On the importance of ensuring that support provided (tools, approaches, capacity building, etc.) is not replacing national approaches and that support provided is demand-driven and appropriate to country context and involving participatory approaches</i></b></p> <p>TRI partners agree that, both from an efficiency standpoint and also in terms of supporting uptake and sustainability, successful achievement of TRI country FLR objectives will depend in large part on ensuring that supported work does not duplicate or replace existing country efforts and approaches on FLR that are working, and that the kinds of support provided from TRI are appropriate to country context and targeted at the right institutional level(s). For this reason, as noted above, the TRI PFD affords country partners</p>
--	---

appropriate to the countries' policies and at the right institutional level.”

the flexibility to tailor interventions to meet their specific challenges and needs. This flexibility is in turn reflected in the diversity of projects, approaches, and targeted stakeholders of the 11 TRI national child projects. Moreover, the design of child project interventions is informed by robust stakeholder analysis to ensure that interventions are targeted at, and include the participation of stakeholders at the appropriate intentional level and department, including relevant external stakeholders.

Examples of this diversity of context-specific TRI interventions and support, including participatory approaches, include:

- Guinea Bissau, where TRI will support community-led participatory planning, implementation and monitoring of restoration of degraded mangrove habitat and degraded rice fields.
- China, where experiences from TRI-supported restoration of pilot sites will directly inform ongoing policy reform processes concerning the management of State Forest Farms.
- Sao Tome, where a national system for FLR monitoring will be developed through TRI, supporting country efforts towards FLR
- Pakistan, where Sustainable Forest Management Plans will be developed and implemented in a participatory manner following local demand.

As noted above, the design of the TRI Global Child, through which integrated support will be provided to national child projects along each of the four TRI PFD components, was informed by extensive stakeholder surveying, consultation and analysis of the highest-value support best provided from the Global child project in partnership with national projects (see Annex 6 of the TRI Global Child project document for more detailed information on findings from PPG-stage surveying of TRI national child project teams).