



FCPF Technical Advisory Panel

Kenya Revised RPP-TAP Comments & Recommendations

**June 28 – July 1, 2010
FCPF Participants Committee
Georgetown, Guyana**

H.O. Kojwang and Kenya TAP review team

Overall Summary of the Review: 1

Strengths of the RPP Document:

- *The document gives a well rounded description of Kenya's forest resources and the inclusion of the extensive savanna bushlands significantly increases the areas that can be managed under REDD+.*
- *The priority given major catchment forests or water towers is compatible with REDD+ and has received significant political support in response to public pressure.*
- *Given her rather limited closed canopy forests, the document rightly stresses the country's opportunities in the areas of enhancement of carbon stocks*
- *The drivers of deforestation and forest degradation are clearly stated and the governance issues that have been behind significant losses of both indigenous and exotic plantation forests have been included.*
- *The proposed REDD+ Strategy is nested within Kenya's wider Climate Change Response Strategy of 2009, This is strategic and places REDD+ within an already existing developmental framework.*
- *The REDD+ strategies are good attempts to counteract the identified drivers of deforestation and degradation*
- *A useful account past efforts to achieve SFM and fight D& D has been given*
- *It also stresses the fact that, with a new forest act and the current policy review, the Kenya Forest Sector is likely to be more effective and relatively free from past political interference*

Overall Summary of the Review: 2

Areas that need further work:

- *The mandate to coordinate REDD+ will be vested in the Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife, rather than a high Apex Body that could coordinate other sectors. The potential pitfalls have been pointed out*
- *While at the national level, the committees proposed are appropriate, the Conservancy Level structures are not yet well defined*
- *The document is still silent on the likely effects on the new Land Policy on REDD+. In addition, no mention has been made in the main text on an impending Bio-Fuel Strategy and how it could affect REDD+.*
- *Coordination with the more powerful Ministries of Agriculture and Energy to influence their policies is still unclear*
- *The proposed MRV system is practical and will monitor carbon and also non-carbon variables such as governance drivers. Other drivers should also be monitored (infra-structure, sector policies, prices etc)*

TAP Recommendations

- *In the absence of an Apex Body the REDD+, the proposed national coordination structure will need strong mechanisms to enable it to generate the much needed cross-sector collaboration on REDD+*
- *To help implementation at the Conservancy Level, the RPP should give further thought on how the conservancies will be strengthened to deliver on REDD +*
- *The likely effects of the new land policy on REDD+ should be factored into the strategies and monitored as a policy driver*
- *The MRV component should monitor more drivers, in addition to those on governance*

Tap Recommendations – Round 1

- *There is need for the RRP to propose the correct placement of the National REDD Steering Committee at a level which will make it function effectively in a cross-sector environment and to minimize the risk of inter-sector conflict.*
- *The historical reasons behind the past losses of forest cover could be better illustrated as that would justify and even embolden the lead sector to pursue some of the institutional and other strategies proposed in section 2 c, to deal with the drivers of D &D*
- *The RPP could highlight existing and past project experiences on SFM and the lessons learnt. At the moment there is no quantitative data on carbon stocks, even from a limited area presented in the RPP*
- *In general the budget sections are not well aligned with the intended programme actions and section 3 is a case in point.*
- *The RPP does not demonstrate an appreciation of Monitoring and Evaluation when in fact, the TAP is aware that the Country has a rich base of past big programmes on which M and E have been applied*

- **Overall Summary TAP Comments First Round**

<i>Component</i>	<i>1a</i>	<i>partially met the standard</i>
	<i>1b</i>	<i>largely met the standard</i>

<i>Component</i>	<i>2a</i>	<i>partially met the standard</i>
	<i>2b</i>	<i>Met the standard</i>
	<i>2c</i>	<i>did not meet the standard</i>
	<i>2d</i>	<i>did not meet the standard</i>

<i>Component</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>partially met the standard</i>
<i>Component</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>partially met the standard</i>

<i>Component</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>partially met the standard</i>
------------------	----------	-----------------------------------

<i>Component</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>did not met the standard</i>
------------------	----------	---------------------------------

Overall Summary

Overall Summary		TAP Comments First Round	Second Round
Component	1a	<i>partially met the standard</i>	<i>meets the standard</i>
	1b	<i>largely met the standard</i>	<i>meets the standard</i>
Component	2a	<i>partially met the standard</i>	<i>partially meets the std</i>
	2b	<i>Met the standard</i>	<i>meets the standard</i>
	2c	<i>did not meet the standard</i>	<i>partially meets the std</i>
	2d	<i>did not meet the standard</i>	<i>meets the standard</i>
Component	3	<i>partially met the standard</i>	<i>meets the standard</i>
Component	4	<i>partially met the standard</i>	<i>meets the standard</i>
Component	5	<i>partially met the standard</i>	<i>largely meets the std</i>
Component	6	<i>did not met the standard</i>	<i>meets the standard</i>