

Strengthening forest management for improved biodiversity conservation and climate resilience in the Southern rangelands of Kenya

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10292

Countries

Kenya

Project Name

Strengthening forest management for improved biodiversity conservation and climate resilience in the Southern rangelands of Kenya

Agencies

IUCN

Date received by PM

12/11/2020

Review completed by PM

5/7/2021

Program Manager

Milena Vasquez

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: Please address comments below:

- Expected implementation start and completion dates need to match project duration of 48 months. They are off by a month. Please address. Further, please consider whether 48 months is a realistic duration for this project. We would like to see a harmonized approach with the program and most other child projects as well as the GCP run for 60 months.

- Rio Marker for Climate Change Mitigation should be 2 as it is one of the major objectives of the project.

- Taxonomy: Please remove "Protected Areas and Landscapes"

- Focal area elements in Table A: Please remove focal area elements from BD, LD and CCM and instead assign the whole project amount to the ?IP SFM Drylands? Objective/Program, and enter ?Dryland Landscapes Sustainably managed? as Focal Area Outcome.

4/13/2021: Not all comments cleared. See below:

- Ok duration will be kept at 48 months. However, expected completion date is still off by 3 months. Considering the need for circulation to Council perhaps it would be best to simply change the "expected implementation start date" to 6/30/2021.

-Other comments have been addressed. Cleared.

4/30/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

IUCN - 5 march 2021

- Adressed. It is maintained to 4 years. Duration will be assessed during implementation if there is a need for extension.
- OK. Rio Marker for mitigation has been modified to 2.
- OK. ?protected areas and landscapes? removed

OK. Table A has been modified accordingly

IUCN 30 April 2021

Implementation start date has been changed to 30 June 2021

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/20201: Please address comments below:

- Please review Component 1 Financing Type ? Based on the description it appears this should be categorized as Technical Assistance instead of Investment.

- Comments on the budget:

- Please provide a justification for the vehicles expected to be paid for by the project budget (and what may be covered by co-financing).

- Please ensure that operating costs are covered by the PMC or co-financing. Consider referring to the budget template in the updated guidelines to see appropriate headers for expenditure categories.

- The per diem outlined under operating costs should be assigned to specific travel activities. Otherwise, it cannot be covered by GEF.

- Please clarify why the M&E budget in the Excel sheet is \$110,000 while in the Portal section it amounts to \$190,000. They should match.
- Please provide draft TORs or additional clarifications for the key roles and experts to be hired.
- Please copy-paste budget onto the Portal submission.

4/13/2021:

- Component 1 still shows up as Investment. Please fix.

Comments on the budget:

- Thank you for the additional explanation on the purchase of vehicles. The PM assesses this as appropriate for this project. Cleared.
- M&E budget now matches. Cleared. Please clarify if the expert on M&E listed in the budget under Component 3 should not be instead covered by the M&E budget.
- Thank you for providing the added table with the short TOR descriptions; however, we wonder why these are not part of the Project Document. Please integrate to ensure they will remain consistently applied. We note also that the TOR for the Expert in revolving fund is missing. Also comment on which of these are expected to be local vs. international consultants.
- We note that there are several files named budget in the project documents, some of which do not match the information in the project. Please review documents and delete any incorrectly uploaded file. Also, we note that the budget in the Project Document seems to be wrong as the total do not match. Please fix and upload a new Project Document. And copy-paste a simplified version of the GEF budget (without the additional columns) onto the space provided in the Portal submission.

4/30/2021: The budget in the ProDoc and uploaded to the Portal documents match with each other but they DO NOT match with the project (check the total). Please revise and submitted updated ProDoc. Please also copy-paste the budget onto the Portal submission as well per the guidelines. Other comments cleared.

5/7/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

IUCN ? 5 March 2021

- OK. Component 1 financing type modified to TA

Comments on budget:

- Only one project vehicle is to be purchased within the project's budget. The other vehicles will be provided as part of cofinancing. Motobikes will be purchased within the

project's budget. The budget will cover the operating costs of the vehicles and motobikes in order to carry out the activities within the project area. This is essential to the project successful implementation.

IUCN 30 April 2021

|

- Component has been modified

- Noted

- Noted

- The expert listed in the budget under component 3 should remain under this component. She/he will be in charge of the implementation of the activities related to the monitoring and knowledge management but not of the mid-term and final evaluation. The mid-term and final evaluation will be externalized to ensure the independence of the analysis.

- The TOR table has been added in the PRODOC (annex 11) and the TOR for the expert in revolving fund has been added. We stressed out in the new version for which profile it is required to have national expertise. For the other positions, the experience, whatever the nationality, will be the only criteria for the selection of experts.

Attachments cannot be deleted in the portal once upload. This is something that should be envisaged in updating the portal functionalities. Budget has been updated along with the ProDoc and CEOE request.

- In order to ensure that the activities will be effectively carried out in the field by the various operators, we believe that it is essential to maintain operating costs and per diem when the agents travel in the field. From experience, this is often a critical point in the implementation of projects. The operators have staff assigned to the activities but limited logistical means, and it is essential to be able to go as much as possible in the field to ensure the good implementation of the project.

M&E budget amount in the portal aligned. The table is copied in the portal, as per the excel spreadsheet.

Profile of experts is provided in a separate document

IUCN ? 5 March 2021

All documents have been aligned with the budget. The portal has been updated as well. A revised budget file is submitted.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: Please address comments below:

- Most co-financing letters (including from IUCN, SORALO, ACC, Kajiado, KARLO, Narok) do not specify type of co-financing, so it is not possible to ascertain whether they have been correctly identified. Please submit letters that correctly specify the amount and type of co-financing.

- Please provide specific explanations in the space provided under the Co-financing table for how any co-financing has been identified as investment mobilized.

4/13/2021: Comments not cleared.

- Co-financing letter from Africa Conservation Center specifies \$1,425,000 as in-kind and \$75,000 as grants. Please separate \$1,500,000 amount as described in the letter.

- Co-financing letters from NEMA, Narok, Kajiado, KARLO and Tata all say the co-financing is in kind. This does not match the type of co-financing listed in Table C. Please either submit new letters or fix Table C accordingly.

- As all the co-financing that has been identified as "investment mobilized" in Table C is actually in-kind, this comment has not been addressed either. Based on the letters submitted, no investment has been mobilized. Please clarify.

4/30/2021: Co-financing from TATA and KARLO in Table C is still identified as investment mobilized, but the letters specifically say the type of co-financing is "in-

kind". Thus this comment is not yet addressed. Please fix entry in Table C or get new letters from these sources. Further, if they are in-kind, there is an issue in having no co-financing in this project that can be classified as investment mobilized. Please address.

5/7/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response
IUCN ? 5 March 2021

- Revised co-financing letters specifying the type of co-financing are now attached to the portal submission
- Specific explanation on the identified investment mobilized has been provided in the dedicated field in the portal.

IUCN - 30 April 2021

- The adjustment has been made in the portal
- Co-financing type has been adjusted in the portal
- This is addressed as the co-financing type has been modified to correspond to the letters submitted

IUCN ? 6 May 2021

Addressed. The co-financing table has been updated according to the letters received.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 1/20/2021: Table D is correct.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 1/20/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: Please address comments below

- Core Indicator 3 Area of Land Restored is missing. Please complete.

- If any areas targeted by the project, as described in Output 1.1.2, are classified as High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF), please include a target for Indicator 4.4 and upload relevant documentations that justifies this classification (as per GEF's monitoring guidelines). Otherwise, please remove reference to HCVF areas in output, however, for a project designed under the umbrella of an SFM program, we would welcome those outputs and targets under indicator 4.4.

- Please provide additional explanation on targets and methodologies used for estimating the targets for each indicator. This should be included in the space provided below the Core Indicator table. If the FAO EX-ACT tool was used, please upload.

4/13/2021: Not all comments have been addressed.

- Thank you for providing an estimate for areas of land restored, indicator 4.4 and explanations below the table.

- We are confused by the targets as they are not consistent. The Ex-Act tool estimates a mitigation potential of 13.8 million, but the target reported for the project is only 1.5 million. Please clarify.

- Also, we note that the Ex-Act tool seems to be using different areas than reported in the targets: 50,000 degraded forested areas under improved management, 750,000 ha of grasslands after non-forest land-use change under improved management, 550,000 ha of grasslands under improved management, 1,000 ha of reforested degraded land and 750

ha degraded land to grasslands. This does not match the targeted areas of restored land of 400,000 ha and land under improved management of 200,000 ha. Please clarify.

- The Ex-Act tool also has the wrong amount for project cost.

- Please improve the explanation under section 6) global environmental benefits (GEFTF) to explain how the targets were estimated and show consistency across the documents.

- Please upload relevant documentation for the area identified as HCVF6 and HCVF4 per GEF guidelines.

4/30/2021: Not Cleared.

- Please clarify how \$18,940,500 was calculated as the project cost on the EX-ACT tool as it does not match the project GEF total plus co-financing.

- The EX-ACT tool shows a total area of 699,337, but the project area according to the Core Indicators adds up to 611,029 (1,750 ha restored plus 609,279 ha under improved practices). Please clarify. We believe there may be an extra entry of 750 ha under 4. Grasslands.

- We do not believe the explanations provided are adequate. We would like more details on how the 550,000 ha of grasslands have been identified as under "high intensity grazing" and how the project will directly take it to "improved with medium inputs" as this is the main source of GHG mitigation.

- All other comments cleared.

5/11/2021: Comments above cleared. However, for GHG emission sequestration benefits, please use sub-indicator 6.1 (for AFOLU) and not 6.2 (outside AFOLU).

Agency Response

IUCN ? 5 March 2021

- Indicator 3 Completed in the new version (400,000 hectares)

- Loita and Namanga forests fit into classification of HCVF6: forest areas critical to local communities? traditional cultural identity. Loita fits also into classification of HCVF4 : forest areas providing basic services of nature in critical situations.

- Indicator 4.4 has been included in the new version. We have considered 9,279 ha based on a degradation rate without project of 0.5%/year during 20 years.

IUCN - 30 April 2021

- In the version of the CEOE sent early march the new target is 13,800,000. It has been updated because the use of the Ex-ACT tool highlighted the fact that the previous target was not relevant. The reference to 1,500,000 was not updated in the prodoc. Now done, in the new version.

- The areas have been updated and checked in the prodoc, exact tool and CEOE to be consistent.

- The project cost has been updated in the exact tool.

- The section has been updated to reflect the methodological approach and ensure consistency between the different documents.

- Relevant documentation is provided.

Namanga Hill Water Tower Status Report

<https://watertowers.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/NAMANGA-Status-Report.pdf>

Kenya Indigenous forests status, management and conservation report

<https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/FR-014.pdf>

Pages 122- 127

Loita Forest

Kenya Indigenous forests status, management and conservation report

<https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/FR-014.pdf>

Islands in the Desert? Forest Vegetation of Kenya's Smaller Mountains and Highland Areas

[https://bioone.org/journals/journal-of-east-african-natural-history/volume-91/issue-1/0012-8317\(2002\)91%5b27%3aIITDVO%5d2.0.CO%3b2/Islands-in-the-DesertForest-Vegetation-of-KenyaS-Smaller-Mountains-and/10.2982/0012-8317\(2002\)91\[27:IITDVO\]2.0.CO;2.full](https://bioone.org/journals/journal-of-east-african-natural-history/volume-91/issue-1/0012-8317(2002)91%5b27%3aIITDVO%5d2.0.CO%3b2/Islands-in-the-DesertForest-Vegetation-of-KenyaS-Smaller-Mountains-and/10.2982/0012-8317(2002)91[27:IITDVO]2.0.CO;2.full)

- Explanations have been provided after the project core indicators table. The FAO EX-ACT tool is provided

IUCN ? 6 May 2021

The project cost is 5,354,587 USD + 14,080,000 USD (co-financing) = 19,434,587 USD

The Ex-Act tool has been updated to correct a mistake. The project area adds up to 611,029 ha as previously described (1,750 ha restored + 600,000 ha under improved practices + 9,279 ha of HCVF loss avoided. The area of HCVF loss avoided has been calculated by considering trends in forest degradation over the past years through spatial (GIS) analysis of the project area. Based on this, we forecast the impact after 20 years without the project. **Deforested area avoided : 92 787 ? 83508 = 9279 ha.**

We consider that the HCFV loss avoided will be the consequence of the improved practices in the neighbouring areas (these practices will aim, among other things, to improve the livelihoods of local communities). The problem is that the Ex-ACT tool sums up all the areas, including the forested area. 1,750 ha + 600,000 ha + 9,279 ha + 83,508 ha = 694,537 ha.

Based on the classification (options) on the EXACT tool, The grassland in the project area have been identified as under ?high intensity grazing? because it seems to be the closest classification of the real land use in the project area. It is not severely degraded and we cannot say it is non-degraded. The project will implement activities aiming to increase sustainable management and develop practices to improve the grasslands, that is why we selected ?improved grassland?.

11 May 2021

Addressed.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: Please address comments below:

- This section presents an adequate elaboration of the root causes of land degradation and barriers to supporting sustainable landscapes and production systems in Southern Kenya.

However, there is more information in the ProDoc that is quite relevant and not summarized in the Portal submission. In particular, the Portal section is missing an introduction to the two key counties that are being targeted by the project: Kaijado and Narok. Also, the discussion on land tenure, which is included in the table as a key barrier, but not elaborated upon should be added.

- Please provide a quantified estimate for the impact on the global environment from the climate change (i.e. GHG emissions) and biodiversity perspective as well to complement the information on degradation and erosion provided.

4/13/2021: Comments above cleared.

Agency Response

IUCN - 5 March 2021

BRL to modify on CEOE template and IUCN to include in portal

An introduction has been added and land tenure issues have been described.

Added

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: The baseline scenario as presented in the Portal is missing quite a bit of context, some of which can be found in the ProDoc, but should be better summarized and organized for the Portal.

This section should introduce the institutional and policy context relevant to the project, including national commitments to international agreements and initiatives. It should also include a discussion of previous and ongoing relevant GEF interventions. It should also make reference to any baseline information gathered and gaps identified by the PPG process.

4/13/2021: Comments cleared.

Agency Response

IUCN- 5 March 2021

The section has been modified to address the comment.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1/20/2021: Please address comments below:

- As the project is a child project of the DSL impact program, the alternative scenario should begin with an introduction to the program and this child project's contribution to it, including the shared goals and approaches.
- Changes from PIF are well justified. Please note reference to HCVF as included in an earlier comment.
- We note that the Theory of Change is missing assumptions underlying the causal connections, which includes an analysis of barriers and enablers as well as indicators of success.
- It would be helpful if the project area information was also included in the Portal (there is no need to include the breakdown by ward, but enough to provide a sense of scale and landscape).
- The project notes that a 40% increase in timber resources will be needed to meet expected demand; however there are few measures listed that will address this challenge. Consider incorporating further how the project will address sustainable charcoal and timber production during implementation. It is noted that fast growing invasive species (acacia, grevillea and eucalyptus) are reducing the area available for grazing and that such species are suitable for charcoal production.

Component 1:

- Please clarify the scope of training expected under Activity 1.2 as it relates to 'natural resources management'.
- Please clarify if any outcomes from Component 1 will be directed at informing policy and regulation at a national level as well or limited to the county scope.
- How will Activity 1.4 consider the barriers regarding land tenure?

Component 2:

- Please also add activity level descriptions to Component 2 as in Component 1.

Component 3:

- Please clarify how this component will lead to exchange and coordination with the DSL impact program.

4/13/2021: Comments above have been addressed.

Agency Response

IUCN- 5 March 2021

- An introduction has been added
- OK

An analysis of barriers has been carried out and is summarized in the section 1 of the part II (the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed). The left part of the second figure of the Theory of change highlights the causal connections.

- There is a map into the CEO endorsement form.
- The activity 2.3 in the PRODOC has been detailed to address this comment.

Component 1:

- The scope of training has been clarified in the new version of the PRODOC.

- The component 1 is limited to the county scope. The component 3 will inform decisions at national level.

-- Activity 1.4 aims to develop PES in the project area through supporting the establishment of links with mutual benefits between communities and players to identify. As explained in the PRODOC, TATA is one of them but other private actors could be considered. Other forms of PES at different scales could be identified and

implemented. For example, the livestock value chain benefits from a healthy environment and parts of the profits could go the CBNRM Organizations. This type of arrangement could be formalized at community level between cooperatives and CBNRM Organizations or at county, regional or even national level by mobilizing all the stakeholders in the value chain. Land tenure in this activity does not seem to be a major issue.

Component 2:

- Added in the CEO endorsement form

Component 3:

- Added in the CEO endorsement form

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: Please add additional specific information on the linkages for this child project with the global program. The references to the alignment to LD and CCM focal areas can be removed.

4/13/2021: Comment above has not been addressed. The references to LD and CCM objectives are still there and there was no elaboration on the linkages to the global program.

4/30/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

IUCN - 5 March 2021

Specific information on the linkage have been provided.

The references to the alignment to LD and CCM focal areas have been removed.

IUCN ? 30 April 2021

- The reference to LDN and CCM were removed
- The section of alignment with the child project has been fully revised and updated.

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: No. This section should summarize the global environmental benefits expected to be achieved by the project (i.e. what has been included in the Core Indicator table). Please revise.

4/13/2021: The section is missing information on Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided. Please add. Also, see comment above on the targets and inconsistencies with what is presented in the Ex-Act tool.

4/30/2021: Not Cleared. Please revise as inconsistencies and reference to Indicator 4.4 have not been corrected.

5/7/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

IUCN ? 5 March 2021

This section has been modified to remind the core indicators.

IUCN ? 30 April 2021

The inconsistencies have been corrected and the reference to the indicator 4.4 has been added.

IUCN ? 6 May 2021

There is a specific reference on the HCVF loss avoided in the section (6) global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: It would be useful to see a table of the alignment of the program outcomes and the specific project outputs or how the results framework of this child project will contribute to the program. In addition, please specifically address how this project will contribute to knowledge exchange activities at a programmatic level.

4/13/2021: This section summarizes alignment to the program objectives that could be used in the section 4) alignment with GEF focal area and/or impact program strategies to address earlier comments. We are asking in this section for a more detailed comparison between this project's outcomes and outputs and how they align to those of the program, as well as how the results (i.e. core indicators) will contribute to the results aimed by the program. Finally, what specific knowledge exchange activities (i.e. on what topics, how often, which other child project may be most relevant, etc.) will be pursued by the child project to benefit (and benefit from) the global program. Please strengthen.

4/30/2021: Not Cleared. The section seems to be missing a table that shows the linkages between the impact programme and child project key results . Please revise.

5/7/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

IUCN - 5 March 2021

See section *1c. Child project?*

IUCN - 30 April 2021

The section has been adjusted

IUCN ? 6 May 2021

Sorry for the oversight as the portal is not always easy to manage. The section has been added in the portal.

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: See comments below:

- Please clarify the inclusion of Green Climate Fund to the table as it is not included anywhere else.
- It would be clearer to see the stakeholders organized in the table by stakeholder instead of by Component to avoid repetition. In addition, please add the relevant value chain groups and beneficiaries to the table.
- Considering the description of the role of civil society, please add ?yes? next to co-financier and executor or co-executor.

4/13/2021: Thank you for reorganizing the table - it is much clearer now. Please remove the old table and duplicative information.

4/30/2021: Not Cleared. The duplicate table is still in the Portal.

5/7/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

IUCN - 5 March 2021

- Reference to the Green Climate Fund has been removed in the stakeholder table.
- The table has been reorganized.

Done

IUCN ? 30 April 2021

-

Old table has been removed and replaced by the new one in the portal

IUCN - 6 May 2021

There was only table and no duplication in our version in the portal. In this resubmission, we have cleared all the information in this section and added it again. It should be ok now.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: No. The information provided does not adequately constitute a gender analysis and a gender action plan has not yet been developed. Please provide.

4/13/2021: A gender analysis and draft gender action plan is provided as a separate document. Please update this section to make reference to it. Please also added it to the Project Document (we are worried that as a stand-alone document it has no been properly internalized).

4/30/2021: Cleared

Agency Response

IUCN 30 April 2021

The gender analysis and draft gender action plan have been added in the new annex 10 of the PRODOC and the section 4.6 of the PRODOC has been updated to make reference to it. The CEOE section related to Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment has been also updated to make reference to it.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: The project will involve engagement with private sector through key value chains as well as financial intermediaries. Please add a table to this section to list the relevant stakeholders and roles that have already been identified and elaborated in the ProDoc.

Please also explore opportunities to work on identified value chains in a regional and/or transboundary approach. The activities that are common across the region and many sectors could benefit from a regional approach to engaging the private sector, including: Payments for ecosystem services, especially carbon sequestration, under standardized or harmonized approaches; Charcoal production from sustainably managed sources; Diversification to support smallholder resilience; Plant protection and nutrition initiatives to boost productivity and reduce negative impacts such as nitrogen run off and GHG emissions.

In addition, please provide additional details on how exactly cooperation with Tata Chemicals will look like.

4/13/2021: Comment above not cleared. Please add a table that lists relevant private sector actors in THIS section. Please also provide details on th cooperation with Tata Chemicals.

4/30/2021: Not Cleared. Please address.

5/7/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response
IUCN ? 5 March 2021

For the livestock value chains in the region, formal arrangements involving Kenya and Tanzania (crossborder trade), may be difficult as there are too many non-trade tariff barriers between the two countries. These range from customary issues and beliefs (e.g. Kenya is seen as more industrialized and exploitative), lack of reliable data for planning, health to hygiene regulations (zoonotic diseases).

For a project of this size and timeframe, it may not be possible to pursue this objective.

Details have been provided in the stakeholders table.

IUCN 6 May 2021

A table of private sector actors has been added in the private sector section of the portal

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: Please address comments below:

- The climate risks analysis is not sufficiently elaborated. Please refer to STAP's guidance on the topic.
- The proposed measures to address the risk of overuse of natural resources (and perhaps it should be added further environmental degradation including GHG emissions) are

not enough. Please further clarify how the project will monitor and respond to this risk and specifically identify the key risks with respect to the activities of the project.

- COVID-related risks: we appreciate the risks and measures identified. Please provide a summary of the status of the COVID pandemic and current country response in Southern Kenya to better understand the context of the identified risks.

- In addition, please provide a short assessment of the opportunities this project may bring to support COVID responses and a green recovery. Please refer to GEF guidance paper sent to all agencies on the minimum standards for this assessment.

4/13/2021: Comments above have been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

IUCN ? 5 March 2021

- A climate risk analysis is provided in a separate document.

- The risk of overuse of natural resources is described in the CEO endorsement form (section 5. Risks). We highlighted the need to build the capacities of community based organizations to implement sustainable land management and coercive actions to mitigate such a risk. The project will also support value chain development activities based on a better management of natural resources. The project will more particularly pay attention to the types of linkages established between farmers organizations and private stakeholders. The objective will be to develop livestock or farming activities based on a sustainable management of the natural resources. It should be the condition for the support of the project. In addition, by improving the knowledge on dryland areas, the project will also aim to prevent the overuse of natural resources.

- A summary of the status of the COVID pandemic in Kenya has been provided such as the opportunities the project may bring.

IUCN - 21 April 2021

Private sector role, including TAT, is included in the stakeholders table in the CEO endorsement request.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: Please address comments below:

- The institutional arrangements appear to be appropriate. Please confirm that reference that "IUCN will support the NEMA to ensure execution of administrative and financial matters and will assist in key technical and scientific issues" does not mean that IUCN will provide direct execution support (per GEF guidelines). In this case, please rephrase in order to avoid misunderstandings.

- Please provide information on how the project will coordinate with other relevant GEF projects and other initiatives. In particular, we note that the country has a child project from the FOLUR impact program.

4/13/2021: Comments above have been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

IUCN - 5 March 2021

- IUCN will not have an execution function in the project
- Coordination with other projects will be done through the OFP and the line ministries involved. The coordination and complementarity will be done at the national level but also at IUCN level as there are other projects and initiatives that are happening in the country, which are complementary to this GEF project.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: No. Please add information related to the three relevant conventions. Please also add reference to Kenya's commitment to AFR100. This should not be a bullet point list. Please especially elaborate on the alignment with UNCCD LDN concepts and in as much the project contribute to the implementation of voluntary targets.

4/13/2021: Reference to AFR100 and LDN has been elaborated. This is cleared.

However, the section is missing reference to commitments and national plans relevant to the CBD and UNFCCC. Please add.

4/30/2021: Cleared

Agency Response

IUCN - 5 March 2021

The comment has been addressed in the new version by referring to AFR100.

IUCN ? 30 April 2021

The section has been updated to take into account the comment.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: The KM approach is well described; however, please provide an estimated budget for the activities outlined.

4/13/2021: Thank you for providing a response here; however we ask that you add the estimated budget directly linked to KM in that section in the Portal.

4/30/2021: Cleared

Agency Response

IUCN - 5 March 2021

The budget for the component 3 is 817,520 USD.

If we consider only the part of the budget directly linked to knowledge management it can be estimated to about 700,000 USD.

IUCN - 30 April 2021

The budget on KM has been updated in the portal

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: Yes. As per budget table, it is costed at \$110,000

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: ESS is uploaded and measures to address identified risks and impacts summarized.

Per comment above, please copy paste budget onto portal submission.

4/13/2021: We ask that you try to copy-paste a smaller version of budget onto the Portal as other projects have been able to do. It may require copy pasting it as an image instead of a table.

4/30/2021: Not Cleared. Our guidelines specifically ask for this. If you have issues please contact ITS for support.

5/7/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

IUCN - 5 March 2021

The budget is relatively long table, which cannot be pasted in the portal. It can only be attached to the submission. If we have misunderstood, your guidance on what is needed will help.

IUCN ? 30 April 2021

Apologies but there is no other options for inserting the budget despite our efforts. It is too large. We hope you can understand and clear this comment. The budget is attached anyhow.

IUCN 6 May 2020

Addressed. A version has been copied using same technique as other projects cleared by now.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 1/20/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: No. Please add.

4/13/2021: Council comments and responses were not found in Portal submission.
Please add.

4/30/2021: Not cleared. Council comments and responses are still missing.

5/7/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

IUCN - 5 March 2021

Response to Council comments have been added

IUCN 6 may 2021

Applicable Council comments addressed

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/20/2021: Not all. See comment on climate risk assessment.

4/13/2021: Comments cleared.

Agency Response
IUCN ? 5 March 2021

Climate Risk Assessment is provided in a separate table

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 1/20/2021: Yes.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 1/20/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/20/2021: Not yet. Please address comments provided.

4/13/2021: Some comments were well addressed. Please respond to remaining comments (highlighted in yellow).

4/30/2021: Please address remaining comments.

5/11/2021: Comments have been adequately addressed. One comment on Core Indicators remaining. For GHG emission sequestration benefits, please use sub-indicator 6.1 (for AFOLU) and not 6.2 (outside AFOLU).

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	1/20/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/13/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/30/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/11/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations