

Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Plan Idea Note (R-PIN): External Review Template

Guidelines for Reviewers

Select a mark from the following scale: NA: Not Addressed. 1: Inadequately addresses criterion. 2: Barely addresses criterion. 3: Average, or adequately addresses criterion. 4: Good job of addressing criterion. 5: Excellent job of addressing criterion.

1) Country submitting the R-PIN: KENYA	
2) Date of Review: 25 June 2008/July 4 2008	
I. Summary Assessment of the Quality and Completeness of the R-PIN: <i>Note with value of 1 – 5</i>	Mark (score):
Criterion (i): Ownership of the proposal by both the government and relevant stakeholders:	3
Criterion (ii): Consistency between national and sectoral strategies and proposed REDD Strategy:	3
Criterion (iii): Completeness of information and data provided:	4
Criterion (iv): Clarity of responsibilities for the execution of REDD activities to be financed:	3
Criterion (v): Feasibility of proposal and likelihood of success:	3
SUMMARY SCORE: <i>add scores above and enter sum into box on right</i>	SUM = 16
<p>Improvements the country could make to R-PIN, and any TA needs for it:</p> <p><i>The R-PIN clearly demonstrates that there is a need for concerted action on deforestation, and on gathering and analyzing data systematically, but it is not really clear from the PIN what concrete activities would be carried out (apart from a 4-step exercise listed in 9c).</i></p> <p><i>The plans for REDD, though interesting, are mainly expressed in general terms, e.g. "setting up a fund for payment of land users". Also an analysis of the reasons for the current poor data situation would be helpful</i></p> <p><i>It is neither clear on how REDD readiness funds will help overcome the barriers to implementation of the 2005 Forest Act, particularly if these barriers are institutional.</i></p> <p><i>Because the R-PIN is not fully worked out, it is difficult to assess the proposal in a satisfactory way. The following elements would need special attention in a revision of the R-PIN, or a potential R-Plan:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. It should be clear when KFS will receive the authorization from the Government to act as FCPF focal point</i> <i>2. Clarifications regarding to open use of satellite imagery and some of the data basis, such as the area of forest plantation in 2002 and 2005</i> <i>3. More details on the planned coordination with other organization and strategies could be provided</i> <i>4. More precise and specific information on how the REDD strategy will contribute to the implementation of the Forest Act 2005 and others strategies and programs of the Government</i> 	

5. *More clarity is needed on the strategies for ensuring the rights of indigenous peoples and forest dwellers.*

II. Participants Committee Selection Criteria: Information

Relevance of country in REDD context: Priority to countries with: (i) substantial forest area and forest carbon stocks; and (ii) relevance of forests in economy, including livelihoods of forest dwellers and Indigenous Peoples:

Kenya does not have vast rainforests but a few mountain forests, which are very important as water sources as well as for biodiversity; these have been relatively well protected in the past. However the semi-arid woodlands need much more protection, which is also important from a climate change adaptation viewpoint. Population pressure and the importance of wood products in the subsistence economy have resulted in many places in severe degradation of (woody) vegetation and soils. There are few truly indigenous peoples or people who are 100% dependent on forest but the vast majority of the population use firewood or charcoal on a daily basis.

Geographic and biome balance: across the world's main forest biomes.

Kenya is quite representative for many African countries that are situated in the woody savanna belt and in tropical submontane biomes. Thus, a well elaborated REDD scheme could be of interest for the wider region with semi-humid to semi-arid climates. The dry forests and woodlands are often large emitters of carbon dioxide through degradation.

Variety of approaches: Proposed innovative approaches to tackling deforestation and degradation; methods; testing new mechanisms and distribution of REDD revenues; and/or regionally important leadership.

The proposal is incomplete in this regard and difficult to assess. Forest corridors and stricter protection of water catchments forests is proposed. To deal with dry forest deforestation/degradation, some 'out of the forest' options such as improved stoves or the promotion of non-conventional species such as bamboo to relieve pressure from firewood are suggested. Payments for environmental services (PES) are suggested but not further worked out. No relation to regional leadership is made.

III. Detailed Review of R-PIN Responses to Template Questions:

Please review the R-PIN quality and completeness in terms of addressing the major questions in the FCPF R-PIN template.

1. Government focal point, and ownership and consultation in producing the R-PIN:

The Kenya Forest Service (KFS) is identified as Focal Point though still has not yet been authorized by Government to fulfill that role.

Other government agencies consulted include Kenya Wildlife Service and Kenya Forest Research Institute as well as Directorate of Resource Surveys/remote Sensing, and Ministries of Agriculture, Planning, Lands etc. In addition various NGOs, local and international, participated in writing or consultations. The Embassy of Finland as the major donor agency in the forest sector was also consulted. Thus, there is a good level of consultation; however there has not been any substantive participation of the private sector and from communities.

2. Identification of institutions responsible for: forest monitoring, law enforcement, conservation, and coordination across forest, agriculture and rural development:

There are various organizations (public, private and NGOs) involved with the forest sector in Kenya: Nature Kenya; Department of Resource Survey & Remote sensing (DRSRS); Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS); Kenya

Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI); Regional Centre for Mapping of Resources for Development (RCMRD); World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF); United Nations Environment Program (UNEP); World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF); National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA); Ministry of Lands; Community Forest Associations (CFAs); Forest Conservancy Committees (FCC); Green Belt Movement (GBM); Kenya Forest Working Group (KFWG); Forest Action Network (FAN); Kenya Forestry College; Universities; among others.

The presence of such a variety of organizations is, on the one hand, an asset, but, on the other hand, also poses a serious challenge for coordination and definition of clear outputs and outcomes of the project.

3. Current country situation:

Where do deforestation and forest degradation occur, main causes, estimates of greenhouse gas emissions, data available? Key issues in forest law enforcement and forest sector governance?

The reasons for deforestation/degradation are clearly identified, including direct and indirect drivers, although without geographical specification. The different needs and priorities according to the different livelihood types are well presented.

The main causes listed are: Continuation of unsustainable utilization of forests, inadequate law enforcement, poverty and inadequate resource mobilization, unclear legal framework for trust-lands, shifting cultivation system, pressure for expansion of agricultural land, settlement and development, unsustainable charcoal production and marketing, overgrazing, forest fires, wildlife damage and the conversion of privately owned natural forest into commercial types of plantation.

The core reference as regards to statistics on deforestation rates is the Forest Resource Assessment of FAO (FRA 2006). No other independent references e.g. based on satellite data, are provided. There is no discussion about the reliability of the figures provided to FAO or how they were derived. Some critical assessment and analysis of the weaknesses of these estimates could strengthen the R-PIN. Such assessment could illustrate the difficulties that Kenya faces in reporting accurately to FAO and the need for much more systematic data and analysis. Regarding forest plantation there is some contradiction in the report: in 2002 the planted area is indicated with 120,000 ha and in 2005 with 200,000 ha; on the other hand the deforestation rate is indicated with 12,000 ha/year between 2000 and 2005; some clarifications should be provided in this regard.

The general data situation is poor (e.g. the most recent district-based mapping is from 1978) and there is only patchy information on most of the dry forest areas. Mountain forests have had inventoried periodically. The R-PIN proposal should clearly indicate what the priority data needs are.

Kenya estimates the average carbon stock to 348 tCO₂/ha in above-ground and below-ground biomass and a forest-based CO₂ emissions to 4,276,000 tones. However, the information base for quantifying GHG emissions is still insufficient in terms of availability and quality of data

The key issue on law enforcement is identified as relating to implementation of the Kenya Forest Act 2005 that includes various changes in the forest governance structure, including giving communities greater rights in participation in forest management. Nevertheless it is yet not clear how this new Forest Act will be implemented and enforced. The proposal could make more clear how the REDD strategy will contribute to the implementation of this new Forest Act.

4. Data available on indigenous peoples and forest dwellers?

The R-PIN identifies a number of tribes that are almost entirely forest dependent. In general terms, most reviewers thought there was sufficient clarity about indigenous peoples and forest dwellers and their differences. However, the IP reviewer found it unfortunate that forest dwellers seemed to be mixed with other local communities in the data.

It is not clear from the R-PIN if quantitative information will be made available over time.

5. Current strategy in place to address deforestation and forest degradation. What stakeholder process was used to arrive at it?

No assessment has been made in the R-PIN of the effectiveness of past policies (what worked, what did not). Past programmes that addressed deforestation and degradation failed mainly due to 2 factors: lack of clarity of tenure and access rights and low performance of the State authorities in addressing the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation.

In respect to the existing strategies, the R-PIN simply states that the 1994 Forest Master Plan was not implemented due to lack of political commitment and resources; more analysis on why this plan was not implemented would be helpful. A lot of emphasis is given on the progressive aspects of the new 2005 Forest Act which asks for much more participation from the private sector and communities. There have been several consultation processes including at national and sub-national levels. Indeed there has been a recognized stakeholder consultation process in the sector in recent times; however the R-PIN does not demonstrate the participation of indigenous peoples and forest dwellers in the 2005 strategy. Consultations were not directly linked to REDD, but included relevant issues as e.g. land tenure and land use regulation.

Very little information is provided in the PIN on the participatory processes used for the development of the new forest strategy and forest policy that is being developed in 2008.

The proposal recognizes that “The involvement of these stakeholder groups in the preparation of a national REDD program is considered to be a key success factor not only for a REDD but for the development of forests and forestry in Kenya”.

Again the challenge of coordination appears in order to maximize the synergies and outcomes of the various forest sector strategies/policies with the REDD strategy.

6. What would be needed to reduce deforestation and forest degradation? Has country considered the potential relationship between REDD strategies and country’s broader development agenda?

No clear indication has been made in the R-PIN on how REDD strategies relates to the broader development agenda. A number of strategies and cross-sectoral programmes are listed, all of which could individually be useful, although they do not really form a coherent strategy yet. Also, the effectiveness of these (e.g. improved stoves) in the past has not been reviewed. Cross-sectoral linkages are seen in area of water catchments by the power sector; water security is a major issue in relation to deforestation. Various other poverty alleviation and agricultural programmes are identified. Links are made with A/R CDM projects.

Has any technical assistance been received, or is planned on REDD?

There are currently some funded activities to control deforestation (illegal logging etc) but these were not planned in relation to REDD. There has not been any direct support to REDD activities so far. The Government of Finland is supporting the forest sector reform in Kenya. In the second phase of this programme to be implemented, the intention is to support the preparation of a national forest inventory as a baseline for REDD. It is not clear from the R-PIN to what extent Finland would provide particular support in forest carbon inventories and what Kenya is requesting from the FCPF in this regard.

7. What stakeholder consultation process would country use for developing and implementing REDD under FCPF support?

There is the intention to create a REDD Coordinating Task Force that will be coordinated at the Ministry of Environment to develop a platform including NGOs, private sector and other Ministries to develop a strategy for a national REDD program. A special REDD forum will be established at each of the ten Forest Conservancy Committees (FCC) covering most forested areas in the country. At the local level the district development committees would take the lead in consultations. It is also stated in the R-PIN that the new Community Forestry Associations (Forest Act 2005) could be used as consultative forums. This would include participation by indigenous people and forest dwellers, however there are no indicators created for monitoring progress.

The success will depend on transparency, coordination and reporting at the different levels.

8. Implementing REDD strategies: challenges to introducing effective REDD strategies, and how might they be overcome? Would performance-based payments through REDD be a major incentive for implementing a more coherent strategy to tackle deforestation?

The R-PIN identifies the challenges in the following areas: policy and legislation; institutional building; sustainable forest management, participation of indigenous peoples, forest dwellers and local communities, and information. For each identified challenge some corresponding strategies are proposed. It is recognized that the implementation of these strategies corresponds not only to REDD but are useful for the overall development of the sector.

What is missing in the R-PIN (and still needs to be defined) are the priority challenges that the requested FCPF program is supposed to address.

No clear answer is given on performance based payments and how REDD funds could help build a more coherent strategy for controlling deforestation. REDD payments (both upfront and performance payments) are recognized in the R-PIN as important. However upfront payments are considered key to start activities in REDD while performance payments are regarded as complementary to other payments/income for forestry activities.

9. REDD strategy monitoring and implementation:

How forest cover and land use change are monitored today, and any constraints in this approach?

According to the proposal “the monitoring of forest cover and forest density changes in Kenya is not properly coordinated in systematic manner, there are several individual activities in forest mapping in the broad sense” ... “there is no REDD monitoring system in Kenya”.

There is no coordinated monitoring system today and the unsystematic, fragmented nature of current monitoring practice is identified as a problem, particularly the fact that different methodologies are used at different times (or not documented). Several independent experiences with good monitoring systems are considered as a basis for a national monitoring on REDD.

Stated constraints:

- Available satellite images do not cover all forest areas in Kenya
- Aerial photographs are available nationwide from 1999, 2001, 2003 but not from subsequent years
- Limited practical experience with GHG inventories
- Inadequate institutional arrangements e.g. DSRS and KFS and standard analysis procedures
- Absence of an integrated forest management information system

According to the proposal: “The main limitation ... is that the satellite images and the data are often not publicly available, the data collection and analysis methodology is not documented in order to use it for follow-up surveys and a comprehensive framework to make sure that different case studies are compatible for national level analytical work does not exist”.

If the disclosure issue in respect to satellite imagery cannot be solved, REDD monitoring at national level could hardly be realized.

10. Additional benefits of potential REDD strategy, and how to monitor them: biodiversity and rural livelihood?

The R-PIN lists potential additional benefits according to three categories: social, economic and environmental. Many of them are clear and obvious; however in some cases it is not clear how a REDD program (especially at the national level) could have such an additional benefit. There is no statement about how biodiversity would be monitored.

The Kenyan Forest Service is planning to measure social benefits of participatory forest management through other programmes than REDD and no special plans are given for monitoring social impacts of REDD. This is acceptable, as long as the participatory management is carried out in places where REDD activities are taking place. The National Bureau of Statistics is relied on to monitor potential indicators for improved livelihood.

With regards to Payments for Environmental Services, the R-PIN notes that “Kenya is aiming to streamline PES into Government policies in the framework of the REDD program. The Government is expecting that there is a future market for global public goods and it will develop a conducive market environment. The example from Costa Rica will serve as a model”.

Interestingly it is mentioned in the R-PIN that monitoring additional benefits would be very complex. This is a fact that many other proposals deny when declaring potential benefits of future REDD programs.

11. What assistance is country likely to request from FCPF Readiness Mechanism?

The request for assistance concerns technical and financial issues as well as capacity building. Activities are specified in the proposal, but their successful implementation will depend much on the capacity to coordinate and complement with other programs and organizations.

Listed tasks include the creation of an internal fund to reward land users; the development of a reference case for agro-forestry; the development of community action plans including payment systems, and organizing farmers into forest production cooperatives; the design of an inter-organisational monitoring system, and a pilot PES system for the country. No information is given about what sort of assistance (for what tasks specifically and how much) Kenya would be asking from FCPF.

12. Donors and international partners already cooperating with country on REDD.

United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) and Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Finland); they supported the R-PIN development process.

13. Country's Potential Next Steps and Schedule:

Presentation of the proposal to the FCPF, secure partnership arrangements with FCPF, start REDD activities including consultation. As Kenya awaits the result of the FCPF R-PIN submission, a REDD enabling environment will be established in Kenya involving NGOs, private sector and development partners.

14. Attachments and their usefulness:

- List of acronyms → very useful
- References quoted → useful
- Map of Kenya's forests → useful (but better quality of data and map needed)
- IUCN critically endangered species in Kenya → not very useful