



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

GEF ID:	9659		
Country/Region:	Kenya		
Project Title:	Kenya- Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated Approach		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5468 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 2; BD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$3,826,605
Co-financing:	\$15,565,663	Total Project Cost:	\$19,392,268
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 04, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Ingela Juthberg

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and		

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	1-24-18 No major changes. Description on p. 5 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	1-24-18 Yes. The project is well structure with a clear focus on tackling the outstanding issues in the two target geographies: Tsavo and Maasai Mara Ecosystems. Cleared	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	1-24-18 Yes. Assuming the co-financing becomes available during project implementation. Cleared	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	1-24-18 Yes. See Risk and Mitigation measures on pages 31-33 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	1-24-18 In Table C of CEO Endorsement the Co-financing from Maasai Mara Conservancy Association is: \$2.9M in-kind and \$220K in Grant. The letter makes reference to a total of \$3,120,000 with \$624,000. Please review the Table according to the LoC.	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>1-24-18 Yes. Nevertheless, there are some observations made by the GWP Team (as part of the Coordination Grant), that the GEF SEC would like the Agency to address in the revised TTs.</p> <p>1) In the project identification tab, the GEF ID number is 9659.</p> <p>2) For the core indicator f. # of wildlife/wildlife product seizures at program sites: the TT registered the kgs of ivory and bushmeat to be seized which is great for their own project monitoring. However, the indicator wants to measure the number of seizures. If possible, provide the number of seizures to be aggregated at the program level.</p> <p>3) In the METT tab, Data Sheet 5 is incomplete: "Data sources and methods used to assess the present overall condition of biodiversity in the protected area".</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>1-24-18 Yes. Cleared</p>	
	9. Does the project include a	1-24-18	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes Cleared	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	1-24-18 Yes. Pages 37-38 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	1-24-18 No. Please address issues under 5 and 6. Thanks. 1-29-18 This project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.	
Review Date	Review	January 24, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 29, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.