



PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

Project Title:	Development of SFM and Support to REDD+ for Dryland Forests		
Country(ies):	Kenya	GEF Project ID:	5083
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	617373
Other Executing Partner(s):	Kenya Forest Service	Submission Date:	February 4, 2013 Resubmission February 13, 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-focal Areas	Project Duration (months):	60
Name of parent program (if applicable): ➤ For SFM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Agency Fee:	268,227

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK¹:

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co-Financing (\$)
BD-2	Increase in sustainably managed landscapes that integrate biodiversity conservation	Policies and regulatory frameworks for production sectors	GEFTF	1,162,489	2,800,000
CCM-5	Good management practices in LULUCF adopted both within the forest land and in the wider landscape	Forest and non-forested lands under good management practices	GEFTF	855,067	2,400,000
SFM/REDD-1	Good management practices applied in existing forests.	100,000 ha forests under sustainable management	GEFTF	367,190	2,608,000
SFM/REDD-2	Enhanced institutional capacity to account for GHG emission reduction and increase in carbon stocks	Sub-national forest monitoring system in place.	GEFTF	304,693	2,900,000
Sub-Total				2,689,439	10,708,000
Project management cost ²				134,000	400,000
Total project costs				2,823,439	11,108,000

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To develop participatory sustainable forest management systems in dryland forests for biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and sustainable livelihood benefits.						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co-financing (\$)
Component 1: Development of SFM systems for dryland forests	TA	1.1. Strengthened capacities of stakeholders to implement participatory SFM in	1.1.1. Community management structures/units established;	GEFTF	1,937,439 BD 837, 444 CC 615,980 SFM 484,015	4,600,000

² GEF will finance management cost that is solely linked to GEF financing of the project.

		<p>the main land tenure categories of dryland forests.</p> <p>1.2 Increased dryland forest area under sustainable management resulting in:</p> <p><i>a) 100,000 hectares of dryland forest under participatory sustainable forest management,</i></p> <p><i>b) 100,000 ha of degraded forests restored contributing to combined sequestered and avoided emissions of 99,167tC (363,611 tCO₂e) cumulative through year 5 & 773,500 tC (2,472,556 CO₂e) sequestered and avoided emissions cumulative years 6- 20.</i></p> <p><i>c) Population of selected species in target areas stabilized (species and baseline values will be determined during PPG)</i></p> <p>1.3 Improved livelihoods of local communities based on sustainable production, processing and commercialization of forest products - at least 1000 people benefiting from income generating activities, based on sustainable harvesting of diversified wood and non-wood products (firewood, gums, resins, honey, aloe products) .</p>	<p>1.1.2 A capacity development strategy and plan for participatory SFM and REDD+ prepared based on detailed needs assessment.</p> <p>1.1.3 At least 50 community managers and community support institutions (government, civil society) trained in good governance, participatory approaches to natural resource SFM, biodiversity conservation and business management;</p> <p>1.1.4 Simple technical guidelines for forest restoration including sustainable harvest and regeneration developed</p> <p>1.1.5 A sub-national participatory forest monitoring system developed (to be integrated with the National Forest Inventory)</p> <p>1.1.6 At least 50 community managers and community support institutions trained in forest restoration and in carbon measurement and monitoring.</p> <p>1.2.1 At least 50 community forest management plans (covering ~2,000 ha each), incorporating biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration, developed and implemented.</p> <p>1.2.2 Management plans implemented (100,000 ha of dryland forests under participatory SFM and 100,000 ha of degraded forests restored)</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>1.2.3. Participatory annual reviews and revised planning at the community and national level conducted</p> <p>1.3.1 Sustainable forest-based income-generating activities implemented in selected communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Business plans developed for setting up community scale enterprises - Small scale enterprises setup for production and processing of wood and non-wood forest products. 			
Component 2 Policy and legal framework strengthened	TA	<p>2.1 Legal framework for SFM strengthened</p> <p><i>Indicators: a) 80% of community management structures have legal documents that empower them with control of access and with management, harvesting and marketing rights;</i></p> <p><i>b) 80% of managed forest lands covered by community-controlled, self-financing mechanisms.</i></p>	<p>2.1.1 Subsidiary legislation completed/ revised for SFM in all major land tenure types;</p> <p>2.1.2 National REDD+ sub-strategy developed for dryland areas;</p> <p>2.1.3 Policies and guidelines for SFM for communal lands in dryland forests.</p> <p>2.1.4 Roles, responsibilities and approaches for enforcement in support of SFM defined.</p> <p>2.1.5 Review and update of the Kenya policy for sustainable charcoal production.</p> <p>2.1.6. Legal basis for sustainable financing mechanisms defined, and community controlled forest management funds established.</p>	GEFTF	<p>350,000</p> <p>BD 151, 285</p> <p>CC 111,277</p> <p>SFM 87,438</p>	2,908,000
Component 3 Knowledge management, dissemination of best practices, monitoring and evaluation	TA	3.1. Knowledge management systems developed in support of SFM and REDD+	<p>3.1.1 Best practices and lessons on SFM and REDD+ documented and disseminated;</p> <p>3.1.2. Curricula developed for SFM and REDD+ at university and technical schools</p> <p>3.1.3 Project monitoring and evaluation system</p>	GEFTF	<p>402,000</p> <p>BD 173,760</p> <p>CC 127,810</p> <p>SFM 100,430</p>	3,200,000

			established 3.1.4 Mid-term and final evaluations conducted			
Sub-Total					2,689,439	10,708,000
Project management Cost					134,000	400,000
Total project costs					2,823,439	11,108,000

C. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME IF AVAILABLE, (\$)

-Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount (\$)
National Government	KFS	In-kind	6,000,000
National government	KEFRI	In-kind	2,000,000
GEF Agency	FAO (Direct funding)	Grant	30,000
GEF Agency	FAO National Forest Programme	Grant	578,000
Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)	Government of Finland (MMMB project)	Grant	2,000,000
CBO	Community Forestry Associations	In-kind	300,000
NGO	Kenya Forest Working Group	In kind	200,000
Total Co-financing			11,108,000

D. GEF/LDCF/SCCF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY (IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Funds	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Project amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c=a+b
FAO	GEFTF	Biodiversity	Kenya	1,220,410	115,939	1,336,349
FAO	GEFTF	Climate Change	Kenya	897,671	85,279	982,950
FAO	GEFTF	Multi-focal Areas	Kenya	705,358	67,009	772,367
Total Grant Resources				2,823,439	268,227	3,091,666

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

A.1.1. THE GEF FOCAL AREA STRATEGIES:

- Under the GEF-5 Biodiversity Strategy, the project will contribute to Objective 2 “Sustainably managed landscapes that integrate biodiversity conservation increased” through strengthened policy and regulatory frameworks. Most of the biodiversity of Kenya is found outside protected areas, in the huge areas of unmanaged dryland forests. The participatory forest management systems developed by the Project will explicitly integrate biodiversity conservation into forest management objectives and systems.
- The project directly supports Climate Change Strategy Objective CCM-5, “Adoption of good management practices in LULUCF within the forest land and in the wider landscape”. The Project will develop, for the first time in Kenya, participatory, income-generating, sustainable forest management systems that integrate woodfuel production for dryland forests as well as carbon sequestration and conservation of biodiversity. This will create financial incentives that favor SFM over conversion to agriculture with its accompanying emissions of stored carbon. and bring forest lands under good management practice.
- The Project will support both objectives of the Sustainable Forest Management SFM REDD+ Strategy. Support for SFM/REDD Objective 1, “Good management practices applied in existing forests”, will necessitate the development of new, commercially-oriented management systems that integrate woodfuel production for urban markets along with carbon sequestration and conservation of biodiversity. The Project will draw on best practices, lessons learned and approaches developed for dryland forests in seven West African countries. The Project will support the establishment of a sub-national participatory forest monitoring system and training of community managers and support institutions in carbon measurement and monitoring which contributes to SFM/REDD Objective 2, “enhanced institutional capacity to account for GHG emission reduction and increase in carbon stock”.

A.2 NATIONAL STRATEGIES AND PLANS OR REPORTS AND ASSESSMENTS UNDER RELEVANT CONVENTIONS, IF APPLICABLE, I.E. NAPAS, NAPS, NBSAPS, NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS, TNAS, NIPS, PRSPs, NPFE, ETC.:

4. The proposed project is in line with Kenya's obligations under the multilateral environmental agreements and with Kenya's new national constitution and strategies. Vision 2030 envisages an increase in the land area under forest cover. Kenya's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) seeks to strengthen Kenya's legal framework governing forest resources to ensure that forests are sustainably utilized, conserved or protected. The update of the NBSAP that is underway will seek to improve equitable access and benefit sharing from biodiversity and ecosystem services by 2020.

5. Kenya has ratified the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol and has signed the Copenhagen Accord. In the first National Communication of Kenya to the UNFCCC COP, the forestry sector has been highlighted as the a major contributor of GHG exchanges in the country. One of the two mitigation options proposed in this sector is protection, proper planning and clear definition of land use policy including classification of forests and their management strategies. Kenya's National Climate Change Response Strategy (NCCRS) will coordinate efforts to address climate change. It has been adopted by government and an implementation plan has been developed. The strategy has identified forestry as one of the key sectors for delivering the climate change mitigation and adaptation goals.

6. The draft Technology Needs Assessment highlights the following factors affecting the forest sector that the proposed project will address: (i) limited technological capacity in forest management; (ii) poor frameworks for integrating populations into management planning; (ii) many forests are virtually unmanaged and communities harvest forest products in uncontrolled ways.

7. Kenya has recently taken a major step to address problems of governance in the forestry sector through the creation of the parastatal Kenya Forestry Service under the 2005 Forestry Act. The Kenya Forestry Service strategic plan 2010 – 2014 clearly identifies management of dryland forests and woodlands as a priority area of focus. The National Forest Programme will develop, test and refine joint forest management models with local communities for the ecologically sensitive forests.

8. The country has recently joined the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility and the UN-REDD Programme. As a UN-REDD member, Kenya has engaged in developing a national REDD+ strategy in 3 phases. This project will assist Kenya on aspects related to the first two phases of REDD+, namely Phase 1 (Readiness) and Phase 2 (Demonstration Activities). For Phase 1, the project will contribute to enhance the country's capacities (both at the national and community level) in sustainable silvicultural and forest management practices, which are key to effective planning and implementation of REDD+ activities. In addition, demonstration activities such as the one proposed by this project will directly contribute to enhancing capacities in three of the five REDD+ activities, namely "deforestation", "degradation" and "sustainable management of forests".

This PIF originated from one of the concepts approved in Kenya's National Priority Formulation Exercise (NPFE) entitled: "Mainstreaming Sustainable Forest Management to enhance payment of ecosystem services and support for REDD + Readiness activities in Kenya".

B. PROJECT OVERVIEW:

B.1. DESCRIBE THE BASELINE PROJECT AND THE PROBLEM THAT IT SEEKS TO ADDRESS:

8. Kenya has 24.5 million ha of semi-arid dryland forests commonly called "bush lands." Most of these dryland forests exist outside of protected areas. Most of Kenya's biodiversity is found in the non-gazetted dryland forests. Under the baseline, dryland forests are lost each year primarily through conversion of forests to agriculture but also due to fuel wood use. High density indigenous hardwoods are the preferred targets for the charcoal markets. Threatened dryland tree species include *Melia volkensii* (a hardwood), *Terminalia sp.* and *Moringa oleifera* among others. The valuable *Dalbergia melanoxylon* that is prized as wood for carvings is also endangered and facing local extinction. The East African sandalwood (*Oxylis lanceololata*), a dryland species, has been so over-exploited for use in the cosmetics industry that it has been put under the protection of a presidential ban.

9. Aloes are an important component of the dryland ecosystems where they are associated with species, such as *Acacia*, *Kleinia*, *Cissus*, and *Euphorbia*. It has been suggested that aloes may be primary colonizers of habitats that enable later habitation by other less resilient plants. In this case, they could be critical to improved management and natural restoration of dryland forests. Of the 450 or so taxa of the genus *Aloe* known today; 180 are in Eastern Africa and sixty of those are in Kenya, twenty-five of which are endemic and five of which have been identified as being commercially exploited for the aloe bitter gum trade. For East

African aloes, Red List assessments of twenty-five Aloe species endemic to Kenya were done³. Nine of the species were listed as critically endangered, seven are endangered, four are vulnerable, three near-threatened and two are of Least Concern. The endemic and commercially exploited *A. scabrifolia* was assessed as Vulnerable.

10. Dryland forests are also habitats for the endangered animals such as Grevy's zebra (*Equus grevyi*, EN⁴), and the wild dog (*Lycaon pictus*, EN) in addition to the vulnerable African elephant (*Loxodonta africana*, VU). Dryland forests are home to endangered bird species. More than 40% of Kenya's 60 Important Bird Areas (IBAs) are found in dryland forests. Five globally threatened bird species occur in the areas where the project will work (see Annex A) including; African Crowned Eagle (*Stephanoaetus coronatus*), Hinde's Babbler (*Turdoides hindei* a Kenyan endemic), Martial Eagle (*Polemaetus bellicosus*), Ayres's Hawk Eagle (*Hieraaetus ayresii*) and Lesser Kestrel (*Falco naumanni*) are found in dryland forests. Dryland forests are also used by huge numbers of migratory bird species (both Palaearctic and Afro-tropical).

The forests provide a range of social and economic benefits which include the provision of products such as herbal medicines and gums and resins which are harvested from various trees in drylands. Northern Kenya is estimated to have the capacity to produce 10 000 tonnes of gum Arabica per year of which only 30-50 tonnes are currently consumed by the domestic market. More than 800 tonnes of gums and resins with an estimated value of more than \$0.5 million are exported from Kenya each year. 90 percent of livestock medicines used in drylands are herbal based.

11. **Dryland forest management baseline program.** The annual forest management budget in Kenya is approximately US\$ 5 million. The KEFRI's (see table below) annual budget for targeted research is US\$800,000. The GEF project will complement the KFS forest management budget by helping KFS to extend community-based management to the sustainable management of dryland forests for the sustainable production of wood fuels. No sustainable forest management systems for the production of wood fuels have yet been developed in Kenya. It will also strengthen the legal framework and knowledge management in support of dryland forest management. The project will complement KFS' existing work on dryland research and extension, drawing upon and strengthening the capacity of KEFRI and helping KEFRI to integrate local knowledge into their targeted research. The PIF team estimates that the GEF project will help to top-up or re-orient approximately US\$1.6 million/year of this baseline forest management value, for a total of US\$8 million.

12. **REDD+ program.** As mentioned in the previous section, the Government of Kenya is in the process of developing the National REDD+ Strategy. With support from the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), Kenya has developed a Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) which outlines a plan, implementation of which will help the country get ready for REDD+. Some elements of R-PP including establishment of REDD+ management arrangements, stakeholder consultations, and early action testing of measures under potential sub-strategies are being funded or will be funded by the Government, and the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility. There are related ongoing programs and activities contributing to several components of the readiness plan. FAO through the UN-REDD Programme is providing support to a comprehensive gap analysis of the forest related legal framework relevant to REDD+ and to drafting REDD+ provisions to clarify and regulate major legal issues. A roadmap for the establishment of reference levels and a national forest monitoring system has recently been prepared. As part of the main activities, Kenya Carbon Accounting System (KENCAS) is currently under design with support from the Clinton Climate Initiative and the Government of Australia. The Government of Finland through the Finnish Forest Research Programme (METLA) also is supporting the re-establishment of the National Forest Inventory.

13. Other programs also comprise the baseline program that this project will be designed to complement and "top-up." There are four key projects the KSF is implementing together with international partners that are particularly relevant to and provide the baseline programme for this GEF investment. First, is FAO's own forest related work in Kenya. The GEF initiative will be designed to build upon the community forest association (CFA) work FAO is doing and extend it to dryland forests. The GEF initiative will complement work on total economic valuation of Kenya's forests by highlighting and quantifying the different types of services generated by Kenya's dryland forests. Second, KFS's collaboration with the Finnish government and the work to develop participatory forest management plans will provide a key baseline element to this GEF investment. GEF resources will be used to extend this work into dryland forests and demonstrate strengthened SFM and carbon monitoring elements of such plans. Third and fourth, two community based organizations (CBOs) will provide important elements of this project's baseline program: the Kenya Forest Working Group and the Community Forest Associations (CFAs). The work of these CBOs is very relevant to this program

³ Wabuyel, E. (2006). Studies on Eastern African aloes: aspects of taxonomy, conservation and ethnobotany

⁴ IUCN Red List categories CR = Critically Endangered; EN = Endangered; VU = Vulnerable, NT = Near Threatened

because they address capacity building challenges that are common to all forms of community-based forest management. GEF funding will complement this and enable it to scale up and strengthen its focus in dryland areas.

Baseline projects	Brief Description of Activities	Funding (USD) (2012–2017)
Kenya Forest Service (Government of Kenya) Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create operational institutional management systems for this new agency • Improve management operations of forest stations detailing felling series, planting and other silvicultural operations mainly for timber production • Enforce and apply forest law • National forest extension service 	6,000,000
KEFRI Dryland Forest Research Programme (Government of Kenya) Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of technologies for propagation, establishment and management of endangered dryland tree species • Development of non-wood products including gums, resins etc • Documentation and validation of traditional management of woodland resources 	2,000,000
FAO National Forest Programme (NFP) 2012 - 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainstreaming of forestry in national accounting system. • Development of a system for monitoring and tracking of illegal timber trade (FLEGT) • Community Forest Association capacity building in high rainfall zones. • Develop business plans focusing on income generating activities. • Support to forest subsidiary legislation 	608,000
KFS/ Finland; Miti Mingi Maisha Bora (More trees for better lives) 2010 - 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of participatory forest management plans for non-timber products and services 	2,000,000
Kenya Forest Working Group 2010 - 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy for forest conservation • Training of communities in forest governance 	200,000
Community Forest Associations (CFA) Ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-management of forests reserves for non-timber products and services. • Creation of forest friendly alternative livelihoods 	300,000
Total		11,108,000

14. There are five main human induced direct threats to the huge area of dryland forests of Kenya: a) conversion to high risk, low productivity, marginally sustainable agriculture; b) unsustainable levels of cutting (especially for charcoal and firewood), c) invasive alien species, especially in northern Kenya (*Lantana camara*, *Psidium guajava* *Prosopis juliflora*), d) overgrazing that restricts or prevents the natural regeneration of woody and herbaceous species, and; e) climate change – especially more severe drought. These threats pertain to all three main categories of land tenure – state-owned forests, trust lands (now to be transferred to community ownership under the new constitution) and group ranches.

15. The drivers of conversion to agriculture are poverty combined with the shortage of economic alternatives, the marginal sustainability of rain-fed agriculture (especially of noncommercial crops grown for consumption and the major incentive to gain customary ownership of land by clearing common lands forest for conversion to private farmland. Drivers of unsustainable levels of cutting include open access or poorly controlled access to dryland forests, lack of forest managers and forest management systems, cash needs of rural populations and weak governance and enforcement. The majority of Kenyans in urban and peri-urban areas depend heavily on charcoal as a source of energy for cooking and heating and charcoal production is a major cause of dryland forest degradation. Until very recently, charcoal making was illegal, unregulated and untaxed. State forests, trust lands and group ranches have never been managed for the sustainable production of charcoal. Charcoal making has recently been legalized, but no investments in sustainable management systems for charcoal production have yet been made. Historically, nearly all investments in SFM have targeted productive forests and plantations of the highlands and relatively few investments have been made in dryland forests.

16. Drivers of over-grazing are similar, including open access to dryland forests, loss of forage as more forests are converted to cropland, demographic growth and growth in livestock populations and traditional values placed on ownership of large herds. Potential solutions to these threats include participatory, income generating dryland forest management systems, with strengthened supportive management by government (national or county government), development of economic alternatives and strict protection/enforcement. All

direct threats come primarily from local populations and participatory management is the only potential solution that provides direct incentives for local communities to manage dryland forests sustainably.

17. **Barriers** The baseline projects described in the table above fall far short of what is needed to ensure the development and the extension of SFM to the dryland forests of Kenya. The key barriers that have been identified are summarized here:

18. **Barrier 1: Lack of functioning, income-generating SFM systems that provide strong incentives for community managers and shortage of institutional capacities at the community and community support levels.** This is the single most important barrier. *There are no existing participatory SFM systems for the production of wood fuels* from dryland forests nor are there any pilot initiatives underway to develop them. Charcoal production has not been integrated in any type of dryland forest management. Developing new SFM systems for the first time is a difficult challenge, because they must have a solid ecological and technical base while at the same time giving satisfactory results to community stakeholders in economic, financial and socio-organizational terms. Sustainability depends on adequate regeneration largely from stump sprouts and from natural seedlings, because planting of nursery stock is too costly when managing for low value products like wood fuels. Biodiversity conservation must be integrated into the SFM systems. Although community forestry associations are multiplying, the management systems needed by these CFA for the main commercial product (wood fuels) of most dryland forests do not exist. None of the existing or planned baseline projects plan to invest in the development of participatory SFM systems.

19. *Local communities have little incentive for sustainable use* and conservation of dryland forests because they have not been empowered to control and to manage these forests and to harvest and market forest products like charcoal. They derive little benefit from the present systems of exploitation of dryland forests and what benefits they receive are not tied to the sustainable management of the forests. Sustainable production of wood fuels is generally the main focus of participatory SFM in the dryland forests of Africa, but no management systems exist for the main commercial product – wood fuels. Commercial harvest rights are not tied to sustainable management obligations. *There are no self-financing mechanisms* for dryland forests, and the project will take a step in that direction through assisting communities to set up mechanisms that generate and manage income and might eventually lead to self-financing in the future. There is no mechanism for reinvesting part of the revenues from charcoal and other forest products back into management costs. Management costs have not yet been defined. Normally, costs are covered through the creation of community controlled management funds. None of the baseline projects described in the table above are addressing this.

20. Community managers/co-managers and for community support institutions for participatory SFM do not have the capacities needed for implementing or supporting participatory SFM. Community managers need capacities for SFM and natural resources management, business management, good governance and monitoring and evaluation. The governmental, NGO and private sector entities that will assist communities to develop these capacities need, in turn, to develop such support capacities for the SFM systems to be developed. The appropriate mix of support institutions needs to be defined. Several government, donor and NGO have institutional capacity building programs for rural communities and for some of the types of capacity building that are needed. These approaches, practices and training modules can be adapted, but none of these programs at present are specifically targeted at capacity building for SFM based on extractive use.

21. There is no system for monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) for carbon sequestration in dryland forests nor appropriate tools and capacities to implement such a system. Such a system will have to be based on strong community participation if one is to avoid the REDD+ transaction costs from becoming prohibitive. There is no REDD+ sub-strategy for dryland forests in Kenya..

22. **Barrier 2: Legal and regulatory frameworks for the empowerment of communities for SFM are incomplete and not yet operational and enforcement systems for participatory SFM have not been developed.** Under the new Forest Act, communities may now be empowered to manage or co-manage forest lands, but this has not yet been made operational. The laws themselves have been developed in the absence of tested, proven participatory management systems and will need future revisions based on lessons to be learned. The subsidiary legislation needed for participatory management of gazetted lands, former trust lands and for group ranches is incomplete. There is no clear legal basis for the establishment of community-controlled forest management funds. KFS is working on the subsidiary legislation, but any such legislation that is done in the absence of functioning systems will almost certainly need further revisions later. The legal mandate of KFS concerning former trust lands and on group ranches needs to be clarified. KFS has the oversight mandate of all types of forest in all land tenure systems. Article 5(a) of the Forest Act states: *The functions of the Service shall be to formulate for approval of the Board, policies and guidelines regarding the management, conservation and utilization of all types of forest areas in the country.* However, KFS is yet to formulate the policies and guidelines for SFM of dryland forests in

private/communal lands. Enforcement systems with defined institutional roles and responsibilities have not been developed for participatory forest management for each category of land tenure. Communities and community managers must develop self-enforcement mechanisms for their own members. Once a forest management plan has been prepared and agreed upon by the main actors, then the community management structure is primarily responsible for its implementation. For conflicts between empowered community managers and outsiders, the roles and responsibilities of government authorities must be defined and enforcement systems made operational. Also, community managers must be periodically monitored for compliance. REDD+ has not yet developed a strategy for dryland areas.

23. Barrier 3: Knowledge management systems for SFM are not in place.

Best practices and lessons learned have not been developed and disseminated for the technical, ecological, socio-organizational and economic/financial aspects of participatory SFM. Most critically, the 27 years of experience and lessons learned with community-based forest management for the production of wood fuels in Sahelian West Africa is scarcely known at all in Kenya. There is no system in place for capturing and expanding upon the best practices and lessons learned from operational field sites in Kenya. These need to be developed through the use of periodic annual participatory adaptive management reviews under which management systems are periodically revised and strengthened. The knowledge generated needs to be integrated into training programs at the university and technical school levels. Kenya is fortunate to have forestry training at both the university and technical schools levels, but none of these schools have training in participatory SFM or the REDD+ mechanism. The difficulty of changing entrenched attitudes and behaviors of hierarchical forestry departments is one of the more difficult barriers to participatory forestry development and the integration of participatory forest management in universities and technical schools where foresters are trained is one of the best ways to address this barrier.

B. 2. INCREMENTAL / ADDITIONAL COST REASONING: DESCRIBE THE INCREMENTAL (GEF TRUST FUND) OR ADDITIONAL (LDCF/SCCF) ACTIVITIES REQUESTED FOR GEF/LDCF/SCCF FINANCING AND THE ASSOCIATED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS (GEF TRUST FUND) OR ASSOCIATED ADAPTATION BENEFITS (LDCF/SCCF) TO BE DELIVERED BY THE PROJECT:

24. Investments made by the proposed project all target the removal of barriers to SFM that will result in enhanced biodiversity conservation through sustainable management of the forested component of dryland landscapes, climate change mitigation through enhanced carbon sequestration and major contributions to Kenya's SFM/REDD+ capacities. Current practices, the alternative to be developed and the global benefits of the alternative are summarized in the following table:

Business as -usual scenario	GEF Alternative (Additional Activities)	Global Environmental Benefits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Widespread conversion to agriculture wherever rainfall is marginally sufficient ; Uncontrolled logging for wood fuels, especially charcoal for urban markets; Uncontrolled grazing in communal forests lands; Focus on high value plantations and watersheds, both of them in the highlands, with little attention paid to dryland forests; No participatory management systems yet developed for sustainable production of wood fuel; Communities are not empowered to control, manage, harvest and market products from the forest; Legal frameworks for participatory SFM are inadequate; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Empowerment of communities and development of SFM systems for dryland forests for all major categories of land tenure.; Capacity building for community managers and for community support institutions; Clear incentives for community members, communities and other stakeholders. Policies, laws and regulations will require empowered communities to end deforestation and degradation through adherence to minimal standards to be defined. Community rights to harvest and market forest products will be contingent upon their respect for the new legal framework. Development of self-financing mechanisms for participatory SFM (community managed forest management funds fed with a portion of revenues); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved sustainability and biodiversity conservation on 100,000 ha of forest by project completion. Dryland forests will be regenerated through the restoration of ecological conditions necessary for the natural regeneration (stump sprouts, natural seedlings) and through enhanced natural regeneration (protection from grazing, direct seeding, fire control). Population of targeted aloe species in pilot areas stabilized (species and baseline values will be determined during PPG). Critical habitat for populations of Grevy's zebra, wild dog and other threatened or endangered species identified and under conservation management. Improved SFM and forest restoration work across 100,000 ha contribute to emission reduction (sequestered and avoided emissions)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge management in support of participatory SFM is very poorly developed; • No REDD+ strategy for dryland forests. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal reforms for community empowerment, community-controlled management funds and modifications to enforcement systems; • Knowledge management systems and capacities developed; • National REDD+ strategy development process strengthened. 	<p>of 99,167tC (363,611 tCO₂e) cumulative through year 5 & 773,500 tC (2,472,556 CO₂e) sequestered and avoided emissions cumulative years 6-20. (Note: Emission calculations and parameters available in separate excel sheet submitted with this PIF).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
--	---	--

25. The single most important barrier removal will consist of the development of participatory forest management systems that include the sustainable production of wood fuels. These management systems will create significant financial benefits and employment for local communities and this will create clear incentives for their adoption of sustainable management systems. Legal reforms needed for the development and widespread replication of participatory SFM will be undertaken and management systems will be put under sustainable financing from the beginning with a portion of community revenues reinvested to cover forest management costs. Capacity building will target KFS, community managers and community support organizations. Knowledge management and adaptive management will be key tools and institutional capacities for SFM and REDD+ to be built upon. Core portions of managed forests will be zoned for non-extractive protection to enhance biodiversity conservation and favorable measures for the conservation of rare and endangered species will be integrated into management planning. The definition of cutting cycles and silvicultural practices will ensure high levels of carbon sequestration.

26. **Component 1: Development of SFM systems for dryland forests** will address Barrier 1. It will build upon the very diverse set of baseline initiatives that contribute to different forms of participatory SFM that focus on non-timber forest products and services. As none of the baseline projects are developing participatory SFM for the production of wood fuels from dryland forests, the first component of this project will target the development of participatory forest management systems for the production of wood fuels from dryland forests and will be adapted to cover the major land tenure categories: a) co-management of gazetted state owned forest reserves; b) community-based management of former trust lands that will be transferred to community ownership under the new constitution, and; c) community-based management of dryland forests on group ranches. Under all scenarios, community participation will be voluntary and communities will be the major financial beneficiaries of the management systems developed. Community managers will be legally empowered to control access to the dryland forests they manage and empowered to harvest and market products based on agreed management plans and negotiated contractual obligations. Marketing rights and/or government support will be contingent upon the communities respect for their agreed obligations, especially those needed to ensure sustainability and equitability. A major emphasis will be placed on capacity building for communities and for service providers to the communities. Communities' capacity building will include NRM, good governance, bookkeeping and business management and M&E.

27. Adaptive management will be developed as a key tool for participatory SFM development. An optimal rotation period between successive harvests for wood fuel will be defined and each forest management block be divided into cutting units of the same number as the number of years in the cutting cycle. One cutting unit will be opened for harvest each year. Each management block may contain core biodiversity conservation areas where no cutting will be allowed. Each species will be managed according to its highest value use as decided by the community as a whole. No clear cutting will be done. Harvests for wood fuel may be done by diameter limit or by selective harvest criteria to be developed. Recently harvested units will be protected as needed from fire and livestock. Forest regeneration will be achieved primarily through stump sprouts and natural seedlings and will be enhanced as needed by direct seeding, protection from grazing livestock, fire management or other means. Community members will be hired preferentially for labor as needed for management and they will be paid out of the management fund. All commercial forest users groups should contribute a portion of their revenues to the management fund. Management costs and benefits will be shared equitably. A portion of revenues will go to the community as a whole. The forest will be managed as a community business. Government may decide to levy taxes on revenues/profits as appropriate.

A sub-national monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) system will be developed for dryland forests and will be integrated with the National Forest Inventory. A training plan will be developed and implemented for enhanced capacities for the implementation of the MRV system for dryland forests. The system will include a strong participation of community managers in the monitoring system.

28. **Component 2 Policy and legal framework strengthened** will address Barrier 2. The one baseline initiative identified is not working specifically to develop the legal framework needed to support community-based SFM for the production of wood fuels and there are no such SFM systems under development that can serve for the development of Kenya-specific legislation. Component 2 will strengthen the legal framework for participatory SFM. Appropriate subsidiary legislation will be developed for each land tenure category. Legislation will allow for the creation of community managed forest management funds. New systems of enforcement will need to be developed in support of participatory SFM and their legal basis will be developed as needed. Legislation will define roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders involved. The Forestry Act was developed in the absence of commercially oriented participatory forest management systems and may, itself, need to be amended. A REDD+ sub-strategy will be developed for drylands. It will identify the direct causes of deforestation and degradation as well as the drivers or root causes. The sub-strategy will identify and compare options for reversing deforestation and degradation, it will identify the barriers to the implementation of the best options and will develop pragmatic strategies for overcoming each barrier.

29. Kenya has developed a policy framework for sustainable charcoal production (SCP) that regulates charcoal production. The Forest Act No. 7 of 2005 section 59 provides for formulation of rules for regulating the production, transportation and marketing of charcoal. These rules were gazetted in December 2009 as The Forest (Charcoal) Rules, 2009. The Regulations provide guidelines on the legal requirements for producers, transporters, and traders engaged in the charcoal business. Under the new regulation, all commercial charcoal producers are required to organize themselves and form Charcoal Producers Associations (CPAs) to facilitate sustainable production of charcoal by members. (As we have seen, these sustainable production systems for charcoal have not yet been developed.) There are some gaps/ weaknesses in the rules and regulations. The project will support the strengthening of these and capacity building for their implementation. A new output 2.1.5 has been introduced.

30. **Component 3 Knowledge management, dissemination of best practices, monitoring and evaluation.** Knowledge management capacities will be developed in support of SFM and REDD+ as it applies to dryland forests. Annual adaptive management reviews will bring community support institutions together with community managers at the community level to analyze together the strengths and the weaknesses of the technical, social and economic aspects of the SFM approaches developed. Strengths will be reinforced and measures to overcome/correct for weaknesses will be identified and integrated into the next year's work plan. These adaptive management reviews will be repeated at the regional and national levels, with local representatives and communication mechanisms to ensure that lessons learned and best practices get back down to the community level and are disseminated to all community forestry support organizations throughout the country.

31. The three project components will deliver measureable benefits at the project field sites, Furthermore, the legal reforms, the institutional capacity building and the knowledge management components will create an enabling environment for the widespread future replication and adaptation of the participatory SFM systems and the realization of environmental benefits throughout the dryland forests of Kenya.

32. Project sites: The selection of the project sites was undertaken in consultation with Kenya Forest Service and other key stakeholders. The description of the proposed project field sites are presented in Annex A. The suitability of the sites will be validated or modified during project development. The focus was on dryland forests with the following features:

- forests with important biodiversity
- unmanaged forests that are being exploited unsustainably to supply charcoal to major cities
- forests under the main land tenure categories (government gazette, trust lands and group ranch forests)
- forests for which sustainable forest management systems do not already exist
- forests with high potential for income generation.

B.3. DESCRIBE THE SOCIOECONOMIC BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED BY THE PROJECT AT THE NATIONAL AND LOCAL LEVELS, INCLUDING CONSIDERATION OF GENDER DIMENSIONS, AND HOW THESE WILL SUPPORT THE ACHIEVEMENT OF GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT BENEFITS (GEF TRUST FUND) OR ADAPTATION BENEFITS (LDCF/SCCF). AS A BACKGROUND INFORMATION, READ “[MAINSTREAMING GENDER AT THE GEF](#).”:

33. The project will have major benefits for Kenya at the level of the household, the community, the urban centers and the nation. Participatory SFM will generate sustainable local employment and cash incomes at the

household and the community levels. Most of this will occur during the dry season when economic opportunities in rural areas are at their lowest. Community-management structures will be representative of all members of the community, ensuring that the interests of all user groups, including women and youth, will be represented and will share in the benefits of SFM. The project will focus in particular on sustainable commercial uses of the forests that benefit all stakeholders including community members, communities as a whole, local businesses and service providers, KFS and local government. These benefits will serve as incentives for each stakeholder to support the new SFM systems. In addition to financial benefits, the empowerment of communities will create a sense of pride and of self-sufficiency for local populations.

34. It is expected that dryland forest management will prove to be a more sustainable economic activity than rain-fed agriculture. Drylands are ill-suited to agriculture because of the highly variable and often inadequate rainfall. Soil erosion, soil phosphate/nutrient depletion, declining soil fertility and marginal economic viability are major constraints to the sustainability of dryland agriculture and crop failures due to droughts are common and recurring.

35. Dryland forest management will increase the diversification and resilience of rural economies. The harvest and marketing of most forest products is relatively unaffected by drought. The most extreme droughts may cause tree mortality and the harvest of drought-killed trees can provide critical income at exactly the time when rural populations are the most vulnerable. The empowered community managers will also be in a position to enhance the recovery/regeneration of dryland forest ecosystems that have been degraded by extreme drought and/or climate change.

36. Based on the experience of FAO and many other participatory SFM initiatives in seven semiarid West African countries, this project's participatory forest management systems model will emphasize income and revenue generation for local benefit and local management. Forest management plans will be developed jointly by the forest service and the community, with the community responsible for implementing the plan. The portion of the forest managed for wood fuels is divided into cutting units with the number of cutting units equal to the cutting cycle – typically 9 to 15 years for semi-arid forests. One cutting unit is partially harvested and marketed by the community each year based on agreed silvicultural criteria. Usually, community members do the harvesting and processing (e.g. charcoal making) and are paid as a function of the volume of product each produces at the moment the wood fuels are sold. A portion of revenues is invested back to cover management costs, a small portion goes to the community as a whole and the community pays taxes on the products marketed. Participatory management for, and harvest/ marketing of, non-timber forest products is highly variable based on the nature of each product. Once the management plan is prepared and approved, government's role is primarily one of monitoring and enforcement of compliance by the community, technical support and enforcement when community rights are not respected by outsiders.

37. The project's work to introduce and strengthen community-based SFM in dryland forests will also catalyze the ability of local community forest user groups eventually to access benefits through the REDD+ mechanism in future years. Through its support to the future REDD+ mechanism, this project will support the country to reach Phase 2 of the REDD+ mechanism and build national REDD-readiness.

38. Participatory SFM will be developed as the key strategy for the conservation of forests outside of protected areas. Forest conservation will in turn have multiple environmental and socio-economic benefits for watersheds, biodiversity, carbon sequestration, agriculture, tourism, renewable energy supplies, employment and income generation.

B.4 INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVES FROM BEING ACHIEVED, AND IF POSSIBLE, PROPOSE MEASURES THAT ADDRESS THESE RISKS TO BE FURTHER DEVELOPED DURING THE PROJECT DESIGN:

39. An initial identification and ranking of risks has been conducted as well as a preliminary identification of mitigation measures. Overall, the risks are not exceptionally high and should be manageable. Risks, their ranking and mitigation measures are presented in the following table:

Risk	Rating	Mitigation
The share of the benefits for communities from the marketing of products harvested under SFM that is allowed by government will be too small to serve as an effective incentive for communities to invest in forest management.	Medium	The conditions in Kenya seem relatively promising. Although this has not yet been made effective, the new constitution allows for the transfer of former trust lands to community ownership. KFS has expressed an openness to joint management with communities of gazetted forests. And the community ownership of group ranches should make this option especially doable. Awareness raising about the community rights under the new constitution and the new

		Land policy will also play a key role in the project's work. Experience gained by the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) in community management of national parks and buffer zones will also be considered.
Conflict over land / resource tenure rights.	High	Community participation will be voluntary. The Project will only work with communities that are able to negotiate with their neighbors agreed, clearly defined boundaries to the forest lands they wish to manage. Once empowered, government authorities must defend community rights when there are conflicts with outsiders. The Project will help define clear lines of responsibility for enforcement.
Legal barriers for community empowerment for sustainable commercial exploitation of forest resources including the legal basis for the creation of community-controlled forest management funds.	Medium	These are key points to be negotiated during project development. A clear commitment to community empowerment for all pilot sites, including their right to create community-controlled forest management funds, will be sought from government. If such permission for pilot sites is only done on an exceptional basis, then the Project will make the needed legal reform a high priority to facilitate the replication and adaption of the participatory management systems through the dryland forests.
There is a risk that the ecological characteristics of Kenya's dryland forests will make forest regeneration too difficult and too expensive to make participatory SFM a viable option..	Low	The project will build its work on what works in dryland areas, working closely with KEFRI, the research institute which has extensive experience in this system. As dryland forests have coevolved with man, it is considered likely that they have evolved robust mean of regeneration in response to man's use of fire, grazing animals and clearing for agriculture.
There is a risk that in those areas where overgrazing is a key constraint to forest regeneration, it will not be possible to integrate herders and to protect recently harvested areas from grazing long enough to ensure adequate regeneration.	Medium	This is recognized to be a difficult challenge but such livestock control was demonstrated to be quite feasible without fences on a GEF project in the Senegal River Valley. If the community-controlled forest management funds are used to pay herders to keep livestock out of the sites being regenerated during the rainy season, this should be quite doable.
Extreme climatic events associated with climate change (CC) may affect vegetation regeneration	Low	The creation of empowered community managers with adaptive management capacities may be the best strategy for adapting to CC. It is the present conditions of uncontrolled, open access, and unsustainable use of dryland forests that makes them the most susceptible to climate change. CC may lead to modified ecosystems, but one will always needs resource managers for the modified ecosystems.
The project interventions will not be sustainable. Communities to not continue to control deforestation and degradation and to manage the forests sustainably after the end of the project.	Low	Carbon sequestration will be sustained through the legal requirements for empowered community managers to stop deforestation and degradation and to manage forest sustainably. Communities will know that they may lose their legal rights to harvest market forest products if they do not meet their legal responsibilities. The respect for community rights is dependent, however, on minimum standards of good governance in the institutions of the State. Future REDD+ performance based payments for carbon sequestration will need to be structured in ways that reward good governance in State institutions/
The field sites are in the heart of the charcoal production zones. Charcoal is being harvested intensively and unsustainably. When unmanaged forests are put under management, harvest levels will be decreased and this may cause some leakage for certain period of time.	High	There are two ways that the project will deal with these risk: 1. Kenya has recently introduced rules and regulations for sustainable production of charcoal. The project will support the strengthening and implementation of these. Which would be beneficial both in the short and long term. 2. Elements related to efficiency in production and consumption will be thoroughly explored during the full design of the project. Appropriate activities to be incorporated and presented at CEO endorsement.

		<p>Important to note that even with the short-term leakage, the net benefits of SFM will be positive over time. If the forests are not managed, it would become severely overharvested and most of the standing forest would be severely degraded and most of the carbon sequestered in the forest would be lost to the atmosphere. After several years of overcutting, the amount of charcoal one could harvest per year will then decrease substantially. Under SFM, one will be able to sustainably harvest charcoal every year. One cutting unit will be partially harvested each year -- But each cutting unit will be successfully regenerated and the carbon lost to the atmosphere will be sequestered again over time. The entire forest will benefit from better protection and better regeneration.</p>
--	--	--

B.5 IDENTIFY KEY STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT INCLUDING THE PRIVATE SECTOR, NGOS, CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS, LOCAL AND INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES, AND THEIR RESPECTIVE ROLES, AS APPLICABLE:

Key Stakeholders	Roles and Relevance to Project
Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife	KFS will be the executing agency and key partner on co-management of dryland forests with local communities.
Kenya Forest Service (KFS) REDD+ Secretariat	REDD Sec will coordinate this GEF project's complementary work to the baseline program.
Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI)	KEFRI's regional research centre in Kitui dedicated to dryland forests has experience with technologies for sustainable use of dryland forests. KEFRI will provide baseline information on the extent and coverage of dryland forests in Kenya, the dominant vegetation and tree species, biomass and measurement of carbon stocks.
National Environmental Management Authority	Will provide oversight through monitoring of project activities.
Department of Resource Surveys and Remote Sensing (DRSRS)	DRSRS will be involved in mapping and characterization of dryland forests and will be key to the project's work to strengthen MRV under REDD.
Community Forests Associations (CFA)	CFAs will be empowered through capacity building and creation of enabling policy environment to co-manage forest resources with KFS on gazetted lands or to manage former trust lands and groups ranches with the support of KFS and or other support organizations.
Nairobi University	The University of Nairobi will have responsibility for developing training modules on SFM and REDD+ and for integrating them into their curricula. They will also have responsibilities for supporting the development of adaptive management in support of SFM and for the review and synthesis of best practices and lessons learned.
Kenya Forestry College, Londiani	The college offers training at the diploma and certificate levels, and short courses in forestry and related fields. The college will be involved in developing SFM and REDD+ curriculum for middle level forest managers.
UN REDD Programme	Kenya recently joined the UN-REDD Programme as a partner country and, as such, can take advantage of many benefits of the UN-REDD Program, such as networking and knowledge sharing. This is facilitated by the UN-REDD Programme's online community of practice through its dedicated workspace. Limited funding for targeted support is also available to member countries. In this way, the project will take advantage of the knowledge and technical advice available through the UN-REDD Programme to facilitate the country's progress through the phased approach to full national implementation.
Forest Action Network (FAN)	The role of FAN in the proposed project will be to facilitate capacity building of CFAs and support policy advocacy for empowerment of local communities to co-manage the forestry resources in the territories.

B.6. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:

40. The proposed project will be implemented through national execution by Kenya Forest Service. A Project Steering Committee comprising the key project stakeholders and partners will guide the

implementation process. FAO will provide the technical support and financial oversight. Collaboration with other related initiatives is described below.

41. The proposed GEF project will also compliment the EU/UNEP MAU Forest Project by sharing experiences and joining in upscaling community-based income generating natural resource management lessons. The objective of the proposal is to develop and apply innovative approaches to rehabilitate degraded forests and support the development of alternative livelihoods of the people living around the forest. This project will be expected to contribute to the development of the national SFM strategy for drylands which will be developed with GEF resources and will be shared with the project for upscaling.

42. FAO's Improved Community Drought Response and Resilience (ICDRR) Project 2012 – 2013. The objective of the project is to carry out a national assessment of *Prosopis* biomass in terms of distribution densities, size classes using remote sensing and GIS technology and make estimates for sustainable yields of pods for livestock feeds, charcoal, honey, poles and sawn timber. This project will be useful to the GEF initiative in sharing experiences and know-how for improving the value chain for charcoal production through cover community harvest and marketing of charcoal.

43. The World Bank/KFS Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) project will support Kenya REDD Readiness Preparation, specifically the stakeholder consultations and management arrangements. This GEF initiative will coordinate closely with this work to ensure complementarity, particularly by adding participatory elements to Readiness Preparation in dryland forest areas. This will be detailed during the PPG stage.

44. Efforts will be made to create synergies with other ongoing and proposed initiatives identified under the PPG. KFS will be at the centre stage of all these initiatives and will coordinate the integration of all these activities in order to contribute for greater impact of the proposed national SFM strategy and REDD+ readiness.

C. DESCRIBE YOUR AGENCY'S COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE TO IMPLEMENT THIS PROJECT:

45. FAO has a technical division of forestry well staffed with expertise in various fields of forestry with wide experience globally. At the country level, FAO has a natural resources management unit with a forester liaison officer seconded from KFS. In-house technical expertise, project formulation and resource mobilization capacity, a network of country and field offices and proven ability to execute field projects combine to give FAO a comparative advantage unique in the UN system with respect to supporting GEF objectives and activities related to SFM. Under the UN-REDD Program, FAO has the mandate for providing technical advice and capacity building to countries the development of their national forest monitoring systems and forest reference emission levels and forest reference levels (RELs/RLs).

46. Sustainable natural resources management is a core area of expertise for FAO and sustainable forest management is one of FAO's greatest strengths. Between 1986 and 1993, FAO developed the first large participatory, self-financing dryland forest management pilot project in West Africa, covering 225,000 hectares and functioning very well to this day. From working with farmers in their fields to scientists in their laboratories to policy-makers in their ministries, FAO has a high level of awareness and understanding of the causes and drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and of the various options for the development of sustainable forest and ecosystem management strategies that reduce poverty through the generation of income and employment, that integrate biodiversity conservation into productive forest landscapes and that both mitigate climate change and that provide key tools for rural communities to adapt to climate change. With its combined experience in agricultural and environmental issues as well as its arid zone forestry program, FAO has a strong comparative advantage for providing the type of cross-cutting analysis that is needed for the project, including: broad in-house expertise, information systems and networks, global partnerships and resource mobilization capacity.

47. Through the National Forest Program (NFP), FAO provides support to countries for the mainstreaming of SFM through review of forest policies and strategies, capacity building, knowledge management and resource mobilization. Building on its experience over the past 60 years, FAO is supporting SFM worldwide through a comprehensive programme covering aspects of forest management and conservation, environmental and economic aspects of forest utilization, and policy and institutions. FAO

provides information on all aspects of SFM, direct technical support to countries through normative and field programme activities, develops best practice guidelines and technical tools, strengthens country capacity, catalyzes regional and international cooperation, and serves as a neutral forum.

48. FAO is a founding member of the UN-REDD Program in which FAO, UNDP and UNEP have embarked on a joint programme to provide coordinated REDD support to countries, as consistent with the “One UN” approach. The Joint Programme will provide support for REDD-readiness actions and implementation of the national REDD+ strategy. The proven ability to execute field projects gives FAO a comparative advantage unique in the UN system with respect to supporting GEF objectives and activities.

C.1 INDICATE THE CO-FINANCING AMOUNT THE AGENCY IS BRINGING TO THE PROJECT:

49. FAO co-financing of USD 608,000 will be provided through the following ongoing programmes related to the proposed GEF project: a) FAO grant – FAO Kenya will provide direct support of USD 30,000 towards the project preparation; b) National Forest Programme (2010- 2015) – This project supports KFS in institutional reform and facilitates the incorporation of the forest sector into the national accounting system. The forestry sector supports the productive sectors of the national economy but its contribution has been undervalued. The total Economic Valuation of the forest resources will create awareness and promote understanding for forest conservation among the decision makers. The total budget for the project is USD 300,000; c) Forest Law Enforcement Governance and Trade (FLEGT) (2011 – 2013). This project supports the control of illegal trade of forest products across borders. The project specifically monitors illegal trade of endangered species including African sandal wood and Juniperus sp. The total budget for the project is USD 122,000; d) Capacity building for Community Forest associations on participatory Forest management (PFM) with a budget of USD 66,000; e) Training of stakeholders on collaborative conflict management for enhanced NFP with a budget of USD 25,000; f) Technical Cooperation project (TCP) on Subsidiary Legislation (2010 – 2012) This project supports the government in filling in legislative gaps of the 2005 Forest Act. The project is reviewing the Act with the objective of drafting subsidiary legislation to address gaps and barriers of the forest act. The budget for the project is USD 65,000.

C.2 HOW DOES THE PROJECT FIT INTO THE GEF AGENCY’S PROGRAM (REFLECTED IN DOCUMENTS SUCH AS UNDAF, CAS, ETC.) AND STAFF CAPACITY IN THE COUNTRY TO FOLLOW UP PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION:

50. The proposed GEF project is in line with United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Kenya for the period 2009-2013 which aims at contributing to the realization of National priorities, the achievement of the principles and values embedded in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and vision 2030 of Kenya. This common agenda and framework for all development partners such as the UNDAF and the government of Kenya will work together towards achieving the above stated goals in the geographical regions of the project and lessons learned may be used for scaling up projects in other Districts in Kenya.

51. FAO’s Strategic Framework (2000-2015) has been negotiated with government and identifies the priority areas of FAO support within the framework of the Country Programme framework (CPF). The priority related to the proposed project is Outcome No. 5.3 on Enhancement of Natural Resources and Environment Management for Sustainable Agriculture and Economic Growth. The activities to be undertaken include:

- Support improved environmental management through enhanced environmental information.
- Enhance capacity of communities and institutions to manage natural resources and to benefit from carbon related trade.
- Promote the integration of climate change issues into national agricultural sector.
- Support strengthening of the capacity of national environmental monitoring, policing and law enforcement.
- Use of Farmer Field Schools (FFS) to combat land and forests degradation.
- Provide technical and policy level support to improved land management, adjudication and rights protection.

52. The project will be supervised technically by the Natural Resource Management Unit in FAO Kenya with three technical officers, the Forestry Officer based in the FAO Sub-regional Office in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and the Forestry Officer (Drylands) in the Forestry Department (FAO HQ, Rome).

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [country endorsement letter\(s\)](#) or [regional endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (<i>Month, day, year</i>)
Dr Ayub Macharia	Director General/OFP	NEMA	04.17.2012

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF criteria for project identification and preparation.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (<i>Month, day, year</i>)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Laurent Thomas Officer-in-Charge, Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153, Rome, Italy TCI-Director@fao.org		February 04, 2013	Dan Rugabira, FAO Representative FAO Kenya Nairobi, Kenya	+254 20 7625960	FAO- KE@fao.org
Barbara Cooney FAO GEF Coordinator Email: Barbara.Cooney@fao.org Tel: +3906 5705 5478					

Annex A: Description of the Proposed Project Field Sites

Laikipia County:

53. The first project field site will be in Mukogondo Forest. This is a dryland forest situated in the northern part of the Rift Valley in Kenya. It is a gazetted forest reserve of well over 30,000ha. It provides vital grazing pastures for wildlife and for the livestock of the adjacent Maasai pastoralist community. The Maasai have assimilated the Cushitic Yiaku who lived there and protected the forest in previous centuries. The Yiaku language is now considered to be extinct by UNESCO. Mukogondo Forest is rich in biodiversity; a recent inventory indicates that it is home to 209 bird species, 34 large mammals and 11 small mammals including the threatened wild dog (*Lycaon pictus*). More than 100 species of butterflies are also found in the forest.

54. The forest is under community management for non-wood forest products and has been facing threats from increasing demand of forest products, especially timber and charcoal. There are also ongoing conflicts between the various user groups, especially between pastoralists and agriculturists.

Samburu County:

55. The four forests reserves of the Samburu County, namely Leroghi, Mathews Range, Ndoto and Mt Nyiro, are some of the least studied forests in Kenya. The few biodiversity surveys that have been done on the flora and fauna of the area have shown that it is rich in biodiversity, high in endemism and has a relatively stable population of endangered fauna like elephants, wild dogs, Grevy zebra, cheetah and Mt Uargues guereza among others. However, the least studied of the mammals and the most vulnerable due to habitat degradation and loss are the primates. The recent discovery of a satellite population of de Brazza's monkey in Mathew Range, and new reports of Sykes' and Patas' monkeys (currently under investigation) in Leroghi, are clear indicators. The forest reserves are also rich in plant diversity including the threatened African sandalwood (*Oxylis lanceololata* *Olea Africana*, *Olea capensis* and *Juniperus procera*. Grevy's zebra (EN) are most abundant and most easily observed in the southern portion of their range in southern Samburu and the Laikipia Plateau⁵.

56. The forest reserves in Samburu are under the trustland and managed, until now, by the local authority (county government) under the new Kenya constitution. Over the years the local government has been overwhelmed by the encroachment of the forest and the poaching of wildlife.

Baringo County:

57. The four main blocks of Tugen Hill forests include; Katemok, Tarambas Hill, Kipng'ochoch and Kinyo Forests are classified as trust land forests under the management of the local authority. The new constitution has re-classified the trust land forests as communal land and placed under the management of the National Land Commission. Currently, the forest area of Tugen Hill forests has drastically declined by approximately 20% due to encroachment. The Tugen hills forests are of great importance to the communities living around it for its socio-economic and cultural benefits. The forest species include *Warburgia ugandensis*, *Acocanthera schimperi*, and *Euclea divinorum*, among many others. These forests are also an important source of firewood and charcoal to Nakuru town. It is a source of wood for construction of houses, furniture making, household items and traditional artifacts. The forests of Baringo have a great importance as water catchment areas and feed an important number of flowing streams. They include Kinyo, Endao, Kerio, Kapkiamo, Bemoi, Emkong, Sogom, Kimogombel, Ruwamoi, Toiwon, Smood Falls, Kapkong and Enso Rivers. The introduction of invasive *Prosopis* species in Baringo is a major threat to the lowland forests.

Narok district

58. The Loita forest or *Naimina Enkiyio* (In Maasai, this means the Forest of the lost Child) is one of the group ranch forests and is a largely undisturbed indigenous forests in Kenya. The forest is estimated to cover an area of 330 square kilometers. It covers part of the land used by the Maasai community whose ancestral lands straddle the border with Tanzania. The forest can be classified as a "dry upland forest". Cedar and podocarpus are the two most important types of trees. Other species include *Olea capensis*, *Olea africana*, *Pavetta gardenifolia*, *Juniperus procera*, *Zantholium usambarensis*, and *Warbugia ugandensis*. The forest supports a vast number of mammals, birds and plants. The wildlife species include the elephants, buffaloes, lions, leopards, cheetahs, and over 100 species of birds including some of the endangered species like the grey crested helmet shrike. The Loita forest is also the only Kenyan site for the brown-capped apalis and it also supports such globally threatened species as the redthroated tit, the Jackson's widowbird and the hunter's cisticola. The forest is also rich in wild fruits and medicinal herbs. The forest has about 5 of the most preferred

⁵ The Red List. <http://www.iucnredlist.org/details/7950/0> . Grevy's Zebra.

fruits -- *Carissa edulis* (olamuriaki) *Vangueria apiculata* (olgum) *Pappea capensis* (oltimigomi, orkisikong'o) *Syzygium cordatum* (olairagai) *Flacourtia indica* (oldongururwo) and over 90 medicinal plants.

59. The Loita Maasai are known for their traditional healing. The forest has considerable spiritual and emotional value and thus many rites of passage and other important rituals and ceremonies are done in the forest.