



Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Kenya

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

10359

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

CBIT/NGI

☐ CBIT

☐ NGI

Project Title

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Kenya

Countries

Kenya

Agency(ies)

UNDP

Other Executing Partner(s)

UNOPS

Executing Partner Type

Others

GEF Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Biodiversity, Biomes, Grasslands, Mangroves, Desert, Lakes, Tropical Dry Forests, Coral Reefs, Sea Grasses, Agriculture and agrobiodiversity, Mainstreaming, Fisheries, Species, Illegal Wildlife Trade,

Threatened Species, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Productive Seascapes, Productive Landscapes, Coastal and Marine Protected Areas, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Land Degradation, Food Security, Land Degradation Neutrality, Land Productivity, Land Cover and Land cover change, Carbon stocks above or below ground, Sustainable Land Management, Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands, Sustainable Livelihoods, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Sustainable Forest, Sustainable Agriculture, Drought Mitigation, Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques, Income Generating Activities, Sustainable Fire Management, Sustainable Pasture Management, Ecosystem Approach, Forest and Landscape Restoration, Forest, Drylands, Influencing models, Demonstrate innovative approach, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Stakeholders, Type of Engagement, Partnership, Participation, Consultation, Information Dissemination, Civil Society, Academia, Non-Governmental Organization, Community Based Organization, Communications, Public Campaigns, Education, Behavior change, Awareness Raising, Indigenous Peoples, Private Sector, Financial intermediaries and market facilitators, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, SMEs, Beneficiaries, Local Communities, Gender Equality, Gender results areas, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Access and control over natural resources, Participation and leadership, Access to benefits and services, Capacity Development, Gender Mainstreaming, Women groups, Gender-sensitive indicators, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Food Security in Sub-Sahara Africa, Integrated Programs, Diversified Farming, Smallholder Farming, Multi-stakeholder Platforms, Agroecosystems, Land and Soil Health, Sustainable Production Systems, Gender Dimensions, Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration, Sustainable Food Systems, Landscape Restoration, Integrated Landscapes, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Learning, Indicators to measure change, Theory of change, Adaptive management, Innovation, Knowledge Generation

Rio Markers**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 0

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Submission Date

5/3/2021

Expected Implementation Start

8/1/2021

Expected Completion Date

8/1/2025

Duration

48In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

252,294.00

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-1-1	Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as within production landscapes and seascapes	GET	1,770,484.00	2,000,000.00
LD-1-4	Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape.	GET	885,242.00	1,600,000.00
Total Project Cost(\$)			2,655,726.00	3,600,000.00

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

To enhance and maintain socio-ecological resilience of selected landscapes and seascapes through community-based initiatives in selected ecologically sensitive areas of Kenya for global environmental benefits and sustainable development.

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
-------------------	----------------	-------------------	------------------	------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
1. Resilient rural landscapes for sustainable development and contribution to global environmental protection	Technical Assistance	<p>1.1- Ecosystem services and biodiversity within targeted landscapes and seascapes are enhanced through multi-functional land-use systems.</p> <p>1-2- The sustainability of production systems in the target landscapes is strengthened through integrated agro-ecological practices.</p> <p>1.3- Livelihoods of communities in the target landscapes and seascapes are improved by developing eco-friendly, climate-adaptive, small-scale community enterprises with clear market linkages</p>	<p>1.1.1- Community level small grant projects in the selected landscapes that restore degraded land, improve connectivity, support innovation in biodiversity conservation and optimization of ecosystem services (including reforestation of riparian gallery forests, enhanced connectivity for wetlands, rangelands and priority conservation areas; water catchment protection; participatory monitoring of species; restoration of biological corridors)</p> <p>1.2.1- Targeted community projects enhance the sustainability and resilience of production systems, including soil and water conservation practices, silvopastoral and</p>	GET	1,974,911.00	2,000,000.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
2. Landscape governance and adaptive management for upscaling and replication	Technical Assistance	<p>Outcome 2.1- Multi-stakeholder governance platforms strengthened/in place for improved governance of target landscapes and seascapes for effective participatory decision making to enhance socio-ecological landscape resiliency.</p> <p>Outcome 2.2- Knowledge from community level engagement and innovative conservation practices is systematically assessed and shared for replication and upscaling across the landscapes, across the county, and to the global SGP network</p>	<p>2.1.1- A multi-stakeholder governance platform in each target landscape develops and executes multi-stakeholder agreements for execution of adaptive landscape management plans and policies and enhanced community participation in land-use decision making and management</p> <p>2.1.2- A landscape strategy developed and implemented by the multi-stakeholder platform for each corresponding target landscape to enhance socio-ecological resilience through community grant projects</p> <p>2.2.1- Landscape/seascape learning supports community level project management, capacity</p>	GET	419,352.00	1,000,000.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
3. Monitoring and Evaluation	Technical Assistance	3.1 Project implementation and results effectively monitored and evaluated.	3.1.1- Protocols and procedures in place to facilitate participatory monitoring and evaluation.	GET	135,000.00	400,000.00
Sub Total (\$)					2,529,263.00	3,400,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
GET			126,463.00		200,000.00	
Sub Total(\$)			126,463.00		200,000.00	
Total Project Cost(\$)			2,655,726.00		3,600,000.00	

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00
Recipient Country Government	County government of Baringo	Grant	Investment mobilized	200,000.00
Recipient Country Government	County government of Baringo	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	250,000.00
Recipient Country Government	County government of Kwale	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	250,000.00
Civil Society Organization	CSOs Grantees	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,700,000.00
Recipient Country Government	County Government of Kwale	Grant	Investment mobilized	50,000.00
Recipient Country Government	County Government of Isiolo	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	300,000.00
Recipient Country Government	County Government of Samburu	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	300,000.00
Private Sector	Base Titanium	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	29,000.00
	Base Titanium	Grant	Investment mobilized	21,000.00
Total Co-Financing(\$)				3,600,000.00

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

The investments mobilized required discussions on the scope of SGP, the needs and barriers in various landscapes, and the kind of value addition that co-financiers could provide. This resulted in increased commitment of co-financing by partners who recognize the value of SGP interventions at landscape-level. In particular, County governments have expressed their support for SGP through co-financing commitments, so that SGP can better support and inform county-level planning on biodiversity and land degradation. The listed investments for government partners come from their current and upcoming budgets, tied specifically to funds earmarked for environmental and community livelihood initiatives.

Specifically, the County governments will leverage investment through funds that support operations of Wildlife Conservancies and locally managed marine areas in each county. Furthermore, the County government of Baringo will invest a percentage of the funds accrued from the tourism of Lake Bogoria National Reserve to boost community livelihood initiatives in the landscape. There is also investment mobilized from a private sector partner - Base Titanium. The investment mobilized comes from their work on collecting discarded plastic (pollution) and recycling it.

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	GET	Kenya	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	1,770,484	168,196
UNDP	GET	Kenya	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	885,242	84,098
Total Grant Resources(\$)					2,655,726.00	252,294.00

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required

☐

PPG Amount (\$)

84,000

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

7,980

Agenc y	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programmin g of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNDP	GET	Kenya	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	56,000	5,320
UNDP	GET	Kenya	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	28,000	2,660
Total Project Costs(\$)					84,000.00	7,980.00

Core Indicators

Indicator 3 Area of land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
6000.00	6000.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
6,000.00	3,000.00		

Indicator 3.2 Area of Forest and Forest Land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	1,000.00		

Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (incl. estuaries, mangroves) restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	2,000.00		

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
15000.00	20000.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
10,000.00	15,000.00		

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
5,000.00	5,000.00		

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title	Submitted
-------	-----------

Indicator 5 Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
12,000.00			

Indicator 5.1 Number of fisheries that meet national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
--------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------

Type/name of the third-party certification

Indicator 5.2 Number of Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs) with reduced pollutions and hypoxia

Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (achieved at MTR)	Number (achieved at TE)
0	0	0	0

LME at PIF	LME at CEO Endorsement	LME at MTR	LME at TE
------------	---------------------------	------------	-----------

Indicator 5.3 Amount of Marine Litter Avoided

Metric Tons (expected at PIF)	Metric Tons (expected at CEO Endorsement)	Metric Tons (Achieved at MTR)	Metric Tons (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	3,000	7,500		
Male	3,000	7,500		
Total	6000	15000	0	0

Part II. Project Justification

1a. Project Description

The thrust of the project, the main components and outcomes have remained the same. During the PPG, a clearer, more detailed understanding was obtained of the types of activities CSOs will be carrying out and the kind of beneficiaries they will be supporting. The PPG also provided an opportunity to understand more fully the current threats and barriers, as well as opportunities for synergies, and innovations; these are described more fully in the attached project document. PPG consultations also yielded improved understanding on the kind of collaborations and partnerships government, civil society and private sector can develop to achieve broader landscape-level impacts. In general, minor changes were made from the PIF, primarily as a result of extensive consultations and additional information. These are captured in the table below:

At PIF stage	Change at CEO Endorsement
Co-financing USD 3,100,000	<p>Co-financing has increased to USD 3,600,000. Advances made during SGP-06, and consultations and deliberations on SGP-06, motivated partners to increase commitments to the projects. All four county governments increased their commitments. There is also a new co-financier that was not anticipated during the PIF - Base Titanium, a private sector partner removing plastic pollution from coastal zones, has been interested to contribute to SGP-07.</p> <p>Two previously anticipated partners Northern Trust and The Nature Conservancy are no longer identified as co-financiers. The emergence of COVID-19 and the financial stresses that these have imposed is the reason for this.</p>
Number of Direct Beneficiaries: 6,000.	The number of direct beneficiaries was increased to 15,000. This resulted from a better understanding of the breadth of interventions, the size of constituencies that CSOs address, and from learning from results and attained under SGP-06 and beneficiary populations.
Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas) (Hectares) from 15000 to 20,000 ha;	The area of landscapes under improved practices has increased from 15,000 hectares estimated under the PIF, to 20,000 hectares at CEO Endorsement. The reason for this is improved understanding of the boundaries of the landscapes that will be addressed, the potentials of activity, and through results achieved under SGP-06.
Total area under improved management (Hectares) 33,000;	The total area under improved management has increased due to the aforementioned increase in area of landscapes under improved practices. The total area under improved management foreseen at CEO Endorsement is 38,000 hectares.

No component on monitoring and evaluation	A component on monitoring and evaluation has been added to ensure that sufficient attention is paid to monitoring results. This is a lesson learned from SGP-06, and a means by which to assess the impact of the project. Activities under this component will also ensure that social safeguards are respected and that the project monitors the ongoing inclusion of marginalized voices, of women, indigenous communities and youth. M&E budget equals 5% of total project budget.
---	--

1) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed

There are no significant changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF.

While many civil society actors work on sustainable development-related issues in the selected landscapes, the necessary collective action in Kenya for adaptive management of resources and ecosystem processes for sustainable development and global environmental benefits, is hindered by organizational weaknesses of the communities living and working in affected landscapes and seascapes, to act collectively and strategically to lobby and effect changes in policy in building social and ecological resilience.

Community based organizations in the target landscapes often lack essential adaptive management capabilities in the areas of: (1) identifying the full effects of unsustainable livelihood practices; (2) technical know-how, innovation and experimentation capacities in converting to sustainable, alternative sustainable livelihood practices; (3) a lack of capacity and technical expertise in monitoring results from initiatives and identifying best practices and applying lessons learned; (4) effectively lobbying government for changes in policy that would harmonize conservation and development; and (5) organizational abilities to become effective agents for the coordinated, long term development or maintenance of socio-ecological landscape resilience.

The main drivers causing the rapid deterioration of socio-ecological resilience in the target landscapes are pressures from growing local populations around vulnerable ecosystems and resources, and impacts from their unsustainable practices. These include overgrazing, poaching (wildlife and marine species), pollution (including marine plastics), hunting, and upstream activities negatively impacting water resources, coral reefs and coastal zones. Other threats to ecosystems include human-wildlife conflict, poor fishing methods, invasive species, unsustainable tourism, poor rangeland management practices, bushfires and human encroachment - many of which are linked to livelihood activities by socio-economically vulnerable populations. Large-scale infrastructure/development initiatives, with promises of improved economic outcomes, further cause threats to vulnerable ecosystems. In addition to these are the impacts of climate change on both ecosystems and people which further lead to degradation of ecosystems. The relative importance of these direct threats varies with the conservation issues and landscapes.

There are several major infrastructure development projects at different stages of planning and implementation in Kenya. For example, construction has started for components of the US\$25 billion Lamu Port Southern Sudan and Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) Corridor programme which, among other things, has planned airports and resorts cities close to Samburu-Isiolo Conservation areas of the

rangelands of Northern Kenya. At Shimoni, plans are underway for construction of a new fish port, while a large scale sugar cane plantation- Kwale International sugar-(KISCO) has already been established. These large scale development projects come with social and ecological challenges that need to be articulated, and addressed by strong local and national institutions.

Agriculture (including livestock) and fisheries remain vital for the survival of communities but are often carried out in unsustainable ways. For instance, agriculture encroaching on key forests and wildlife habitats and corridors, takes place while using ineffective or damaging production methods. Agricultural expansion also threatens mid- and upper-catchments of Lake Bogoria, impacting the flow of Ewaso Nyiro river which is the lifeline for SICA. Land based activities, such as deforestation, overgrazing, poor farming practices, including use of chemicals and fertilizers, riparian land clearing and poor solid waste management affect marine ecosystems around Shimoni-Vanga.

Unsustainable fisheries also impacts the local environment. The use of gear that is likely to deplete fish stocks is illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) along with fishing practices that undermine marine ecosystems (corals, sea grass beds) and livelihoods. Poaching of wildlife species and marine resources has, in some cases, increased dramatically in recent years, for instance poaching of elephants, rhinos, and sea turtles. An expanding illegal market for wildlife products and weak enforcement and compliance regimes in Kenya and other countries that remain as markets or transit zones for illegal wildlife products are quickly eroding previous species conservation achievements.

Pollution of coastal waters and scarce freshwater resources continues to the detriment of both ecosystems and water users despite the presence of regulations. Plastic pollution has become one of the most pressing environmental issues, as rapidly increasing production of disposable plastic products overwhelms the world's ability to deal with them. Millions of animals are killed by plastics every year, from birds to fish to other marine organisms. Within Shimoni-Vanga seascape, marine plastics is a major issue. In 2019, more than 24 tonnes were collected within the seascape during International Coastal Cleanup Day. Poor management systems, lack of sustainable technologies for recycling plastic and weak linkages with private sector are some of the hindrances to resolving the huge marine plastics menace. Although the government is addressing the plastic issue through the ban on single use plastic and the recent ban on plastics in protected areas, there is still more to be done. There is waste that comes from international waters and a need for local awareness, on why and how waste can negatively impact biodiversity and people's livelihoods, and a need for enforcement and linkages with the private sector for promotion of innovative ways for recycling and benefitting communities.

Kenya has limited greenhouse gas emissions per capita but is still increasingly suffering from the adverse impacts of climate change. For instance, ecosystems, biodiversity, economic activities, livelihoods and food security are vulnerable to both extremes of the results of changing rainfall patterns ? floods and droughts.

Exploration for oil, gas and minerals and the extractive industry at large, has grown rapidly in recent years with new resources being uncovered/discovered and gradually becoming the basis for large-scale production. Some of these discoveries and exploitations underway are unfortunately located in areas rich in biodiversity and areas of great importance to peoples' livelihoods and culture. The large-scale

exploration of geothermal energy in rangelands of Northern Kenya and exploration for hydrocarbons in Southern coastal of Kenya (Shimoni-Vanga Seascape) are some of the outstanding examples.

COVID-19 will also exacerbate some of the social threats that communities are facing in each site, which will in turn impact the way natural resources are used or conserved. There is already a high unemployment rate, especially among the youth, and COVID-19 has impacted the agriculture and tourism sectors dramatically (See Annex 16). It is anticipated that further employment stress will force many to turn to natural resources in desperation.

Despite Covid-19 hampering economic growth, it is anticipated that growth in Kenya's economy will continue to be driven by sectors such as agriculture, transportation, and in the medium-to long term, tourism. It is therefore essential to devise strategies to address the threats associated with these sectors and to 'green' a growing Kenyan economy that has already become a lower middle-income country in advance of its 2030 target. It is also necessary to take this hiatus in international tourism and agriculture to *build back better* in ways that support the resilience of communities. GEF-SGP will support and work with government and other stakeholders in promoting a green economy approach to development through county policy and development planning support. The vision here is to provide tangible recommendations and inputs to county policy, which will serve as an opportunity for community interventions to feed directly into county planning.

The key barriers that prevent local action from building socio-ecological resilience in the selected landscapes include:

. *Barrier 1:* Community organizations in the target landscapes and seascapes lack a larger, more long-term vision and strategy for ecosystem and resource management and suffer from weak adaptive management capacities exemplified by the proliferation of unsustainable livelihoods practices and the lack of know-how in pursuing alternative sustainable livelihoods. **At the same time, natural resource management mandated authorities and non-state actors are themselves challenged in terms of financial and human resources, technology and other capacities.**

Communities in general engage in unsustainable farming, grazing, forestry and fishing practices as they are driven by pressures of poverty and lack the necessary know-how to engage in alternative sustainable farming, grazing and fishing. This lack of know-how makes quick profits generated from unsustainable practices (illegal fishing, timber and wildlife poaching) more attractive to engage in as the returns are relatively large and have a quick turnaround. **State and non-state agencies such as ministries and NGOs who manage resources in these landscapes have inadequate knowledge on alternative livelihoods or may not have financial support, or the mechanisms available by which to disseminate capacity building tools on livelihoods alternatives.** In order for any initiatives to be successful, grants will have to consider how the pressing needs, and socioeconomic crises of communities will be addressed. The project will thus invest in livelihoods to incentivize sustainable interventions, and provide pilots and demonstrations on low-cost sustainable interventions.

. *Barrier 2:* Community organizations in the target landscapes and seascapes have insufficient capacities and voice to efficiently and effectively advocate policy changes at the local and national levels to support landscape and seascape resilience.

Some local and national policies for natural resources management and related developments have gaps which adversely affect the sustainability of community efforts in protection and restoration. These need to be analysed, critiqued and changed or enhanced as necessary. Without the necessary policy changes, community efforts in landscape and seascape protection will be weak and ineffective. Community organisations need to increase their capability to analyze and critique policy and advocate reforms to challenge land and natural resources management, raise questions regarding the potential incompatibility of development and conservation policies, and reform generally poor or weak governance over natural resources. They also require forums through which they can share their expertise, opinions and feedback. Civil society organizations may also lack financial resources/means to attend and participate meaningfully in agenda-setting meetings and conferences.

? Barrier 3: Community organizations do not coordinate with others in taking collective action in favor of landscape resilience outcomes built on global environmental benefits and the strengthening of social capital.

To achieve meaningful impacts on ecosystem processes and functions to favor landscape resilience it is indispensable that community organizations act collectively and in synergy. This requires coordination among communities within an agreed strategic framework as well as a recognition of the importance of developing social capital through organizational interactions within networks and with external agents. In some instances, community institutions at grassroots compete amongst themselves rather than working together, particularly to attract limited resources. Some may have differing/conflictual approaches to sustainable natural resources management and become hindrances to their own growth and development. There may also be a lack of resources to convene, arrange for cross-landscape collaborations, and in some cases, organizations may also not be aware of what other groups are doing and what potential partnership opportunities may exist. Currently, multi-stakeholder partnerships in the critical land/seascapes addressed by SGP-6 require further strengthening to holistically address the broader range of issues affecting community organisations and coordination. In terms of the new landscape - SICA in the range lands of Northern Kenya - this type of multi-sectoral platform does not exist around which sustainable development activities can coalesce. Organizations typically work independently with very scarce resources, and there has been some skepticism of large international NGOs. There is thus the opportunity for locally-led and managed sustainable activities, but the driving resources have not been available.

. Barrier 4: Community organizations lack the financial resources to motivate and support land and resource management practices and sustain or scale up successful experiences.

Community organizations rarely if ever have sufficient capital to take risks with innovations of untested or un-experienced technologies, methods or practices. At initial stages of familiarization and limited testing of new initiatives, approaches or technologies, grant funding is sufficient to buy down the most perceived risk, especially when accompanied by targeted technical assistance. Once the risk is perceived to have diminished sufficiently, and with a concomitant rise in capacities, community organizations may feel comfortable accepting low-interest loans to sustain innovations that require substantial capital outlay.

. *Barrier 5*: Women and indigenous communities are underrepresented in sharing traditional knowledge and expertise on sustainable development issues.

Women and indigenous communities hold much of the traditional knowledge that can be mobilized for improved sustainable development practices. However social barriers often prevent women and indigenous communities from participating or setting the sustainable development/conservation agenda. Also, women in different communities face differing challenges (see Gender Section) - in some there are geographic mobility limitations for women, in others there are limitations to the kind of organizational roles women can play, in particular limitations for occupying leadership or decision-making positions. Women and indigenous communities are often not included in organizational decision-making as they often do not have the financial capacity to participate in these discussions. Indigenous communities are often not informed of larger meetings and conferences as they are typically far removed from places where such discussions are held. The distances are both expensive and culturally challenging to overcome, and there is a tendency to ignore both women and indigenous voices. In order for sustainable practices to be truly mainstreamed, or for best practices to be upscaled, it is necessary to include marginalized communities.

These barriers result in the continued practices of unsustainable farming, grazing and fishing and or coordination among stakeholders in the landscapes, driven by inadequate training and skills, lack of awareness and information, inadequate funding and incentives and poor infrastructure. Community-driven development (CDD) and integrated landscape management (ILM) are necessary for enhanced socio-ecological resilience i.e. human well-being, food security, climate change mitigation/adaptation and conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services at community level and replicated at a larger landscape scale. Women are particularly disadvantaged and excluded in terms of access to useful and affordable financial products.

2) The baseline scenario or associated baseline projects

SGP Kenya will continue building strong partnerships to deliver impacts at scale and to confront complex challenges facing the target sites. The sustainable management of Kenya's vital natural resources relies on the decisions and actions of a range of Kenyan government entities both at National and County level and non-government partners including local communities, professional NGOs and the private sector. SGP recognizes the need for, and importance of, collaboration and will therefore seek to strengthen and streamline collaborations into effective partnerships. The varied levels of partnership will help to deliver the complementary strengths of the partners and provide resources for the achievement of the project outcomes. As reflected in the project baseline, there are a number of government and non-governmental organizations, as well as private sector companies that will partner with SGP to deliver the program outcomes. The following key partnerships and programs have been identified; the Stakeholder Engagement Plan in Annex 7 includes additional information on strategies of engagement:

Government

State Department of Fisheries and Blue Economy (SDFandBE), along with other national institutions and CSOs, are implementing the Kenya Marine Fisheries and Social Economic

Development (KEMFSED) Project within Kenya coastal counties, including Shimoni-Vanga seascape in Southern Kenya. The state department of fisheries has been instrumental in the establishment and strengthening of locally managed marine areas, referred to locally as *tengefus*. There are clear areas of convergence between KEMFSED project and proposed outcomes of this project including strengthening governance and management of Kenya's renewable marine resources towards ensuring long-term sustainability of fish stocks and strengthening livelihoods in coastal communities through provision of a combination of technical and financial support. This will include demand-driven sub-projects and complementary capacity building and training of beneficiaries. Women, youth and vulnerable and marginalized groups will be specifically targeted by creating opportunities along the value chain. The **Kenya Marine Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI)** and the **Kenya Forest Services (KFS)** will also be key partners, in particular through the Vanga Blue carbon project/Mikoko Pamoja Project Partnership on mangrove conservation and restoration that they are conducting. KMFRI, will partner with SGP in Shimoni-Vanga seascape, where several projects that compliment this project are taking place. This includes the UNEP and International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) funded project on managing mangroves for climate change regulation and other ecosystem services in Kenya. The project promotes mangrove conservation for increased environmental services such as fish breeding areas, and sea grass and coral reef protection for increased ecosystem productivity that improves community wellbeing. Vanga Blue Forest Project is a particularly critical partner in replicating and upscaling mangrove conservation initiatives which previously received support from SGP, such as the conservation of Gazi Bay mangrove ecosystem. These partnerships will continue to build synergies and upscaling of each other's work.

County Governments- SGP will also work closely with the county governments of Kwale, Baringo (Lake Bogoria landscape), Samburu and Isiolo (SICA) to actualize the project. Robust policy and legal frameworks at county level will cement and ensure long term sustainability of community initiatives supported under GEF 7. At the same time, county governments will be critical for the functionality of the multi-stakeholder's platforms to ensure long term success of the conservation and community development programmes at landscape level. SGP-7 will also support county governments by providing draft sustainable development policies produced through the multi-stakeholder platforms to be incorporated in county planning.

Three counties (Kwale, Samburu and Isiolo) are also targeted to benefit from Kenya Off-grid Solar Access Project (K-OSAP), a World bank project housed at the Ministry of Energy. The project development objective is to increase modern energy services in underserved counties of Kenya through the implementation of mini-grids for community facilities, enterprises, and households, stand-alone solar systems and clean cooking solutions for households, and solar water pumps for community facilities. All these can provide opportunities for synergies and collaboration with SGP outcomes and outputs of this project.

Kenya Forest Service has a National Tree Campaign, which aims at increasing country tree cover to 10%, as per constitutional requirements. The project converges well with SGP initiatives to improve land productivity, reduce land degradation and improve water catchments. All three landscapes will benefit from this initiative.

Civil Society and NGOs

The Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT) will contribute to the achievement of outcomes and outputs of this project in the Northern Rangelands landscape around Samburu and Isiolo conservation areas. The NRT has well-established and well-funded programmes that support local communities to improve management of range lands for livestock and wildlife production. This is a Trust made of community organizations dedicated to conservation, which also includes indigenous community groups from Northern Kenya. Communities are supported to convert the land-use of their communally-owned land from group ranches to community wildlife conservancies. NRT mobilizes resources to support setting up of the conservancies, including development of management plans, infrastructural improvement, marketing and training. The Samburu-Isiolo Conservation Area, which SGP targets for support in GEF 7, is surrounded by four conservancies, all of which receive support in varying degrees from NRT. Communities that reside within the production landscape of the Samburu-Isiolo Conservation Area (SICA), and who will receive support from SGP, are also members of the conservancies.

WWF Kenya- There are currently two ongoing WWF Kenya initiatives, which will contribute to the achievement of the outcomes and outputs of this project. First through a 3.5 million Euros forest landscape restoration project funded by the government of Germany through the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety. The project supports local communities to restore degraded terrestrial and mangrove forests for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, while ensuring improved safeguards are in place to protect them against impacts from new large-scale economic developments, like the ones being experienced in Shimoni-Vanga and SICA. Secondly, WWF-Kenya is piloting sustainable and efficient off-grid cooling solutions to minimize post-harvest losses in selected areas of the coast. This project will be used to promote widespread use of clean, efficient cold storage facilities along the fisheries value chain. The initiative implements the Kigali Amendment of the Montreal Protocol which aims to mitigate the adverse effect of climate change and global warming by helping developing countries transition to energy-efficient, climate-friendly, and affordable cooling solutions. The SGP will partner with WWF in replicating and building on the successful elements of these projects (restoration of degraded ecosystems, improving environmental and social safeguards in large scale developments with regard to increasing public awareness and knowledge sharing on conservation and biodiversity and the role of indigenous communities and women, and energy efficient and clean energy projects at community level).

The Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association (KWCA) is a landowner-led national membership organization representing community and private conservancies in Kenya. KWCA works with conservancy landowners and regional conservancy associations to create an enabling environment for conservancies to deliver environmental and livelihood benefits. SGP will continue partnering with the Association in GEF 7 to ensure that the experiences from the large movement of community conservancies in Kenya informs the development of the new conservancies in the Lake Bogoria and Southern Kenyan landscapes. The Association will also support training and provide advice on legal matters to new conservancies to help them meet the requirements of the Wildlife Act and other norms.

Ecotourism Kenya is a national non-governmental organization promoting responsible tourism practices. The 'Community Enterprise Development Program' implemented by Ecotourism Kenya aims at promoting the development of community-based tourism enterprises in the country. Ecotourism Kenya also manages a certification scheme for tourism accommodation facilities based on environmental and social criteria and is in the process of drafting guidelines for 'green destinations' in Kenya, recognizing that certifying facilities is not sufficient and does not cover the wide range of

tourism activities. SGP will partner with this organization to support community groups interested in graduating to eco-tourism ventures.

Wetlands International- Lakes Bogoria and Elementaita are both RAMSAR sites. SGP will invite **Wetlands International** to partner with national and local CSOs working to protect these important areas and identify local level livelihood activities that can be conducted without negatively impacting wetlands

International Organizations

GIZ has several programs and activities in Kenya relevant to the objectives of SGP's Seventh Operational Phase. In agriculture, GIZ activities focus on innovation to increase employment, food security and drought resilience. Other areas of support include renewable energy and good governance with a focus on combating corruption. During the inception phase, SGP will collaborate with GIZ opportunities for joint activities.

The **UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)** collaboration in the country aims at creating a more competitive and productive agricultural sector and increase food security for Kenyans. FAO's assistance focuses on five outcomes: agriculture-based livelihoods and sectors are supported by an enabling policy, strategy and investment environment that promotes equality and inclusivity; productivity of medium- and small-scale agricultural producers is increased, diversified and aligned to markets; management of land, water and other natural resources is improved for enhanced food security and socio-economic development at national, county and community levels; livelihood resilience of targeted, vulnerable populations is improved; access to and use of information, innovation and a global pool of knowledge and expertise drive holistic growth in the agricultural sector. FAO's work to address climate change in the agriculture, forestry and fisheries sectors is also of relevance to SGP's OP6 objective.

SGP will also collaborate with the **GEF Africa Environmental Health and Pollution Management Program**, funded by the World Bank, to reduce exposure to mercury and POPs pollution in the pilot sites and strengthen institutional capacities to manage and regulate mercury use in artisanal small-scale gold mining and e-waste. SGP will collaborate in knowledge and capacity building, policy dialogue and regulatory enhancements and demonstrating and application of Technological Tools and Economic Approaches.

SGP will endeavor to cooperate with **UN Women** as much as possible. UN Women Kenya has a number of programs and initiatives relevant to SGP, for example, their initiative to empower women economically and support gender sensitive solutions to credit and lending barriers. UN Women also has a program targeting women leaders and young potential female leaders to strengthen women's ability to participate effectively in governance structures and to influence the gender equality agenda.

World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)- The Centre generates science-based knowledge on the diverse roles that trees play in agricultural landscapes, and uses its research to advance policies and practices and their implementation to benefit the poor and the environment. SGP will partner with ICRAF for scientific and technical advice in the implementation of the landscape approach and sustainable

rangeland management in the Lake System in the Rift Valley and Southern Kenyan production landscapes.

Private Sector

Renewable energy and energy efficiency partnerships. As indicated in Section III - Strategy, SGP expects to achieve its climate change mitigation results mostly through CSO-private sector and government partnerships. Although specific private sector partners will only be identified once joint proposals have been received and appraised by the NSC against agreed criteria, a first consultation workshop that took place during project preparation confirmed that there are a large number of companies motivated to develop joint proposals to enable communities in un-served/underserved areas to benefit from modern and sustainable energy services. The key will be that these energy efficient partnerships will have to serve the conservation of biological diversity, and support improved SLM practices.

There exists a particular entry point for establishing partnerships between SGP grantees and private sector on value addition of raw natural resources that are sustainably harvested and marketed with improved production of various community products. These include honey, seeds, maize, beans and seaweed. Some of the potential private sector partners identified during PPG are Baraka Honey of Egerton University, SIDCO Kenya Limited, interested in seed production around lake Bogoria, and C-weed cooperation, interested in the seaweed industry. In plastic waste management for improved livelihoods for the local communities along Shimoni-Vanga, there exist potential linkages between women and youth groups who conduct beach clean ups with plastic collecting companies. Two such companies were identified during this PPG, namely Jinplastics and Modern soaps.

3) The proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project

The relevance and feasibility of the proposed outcomes and outputs have been refined through extensive consultations during the preparation phase of the project, and expert review. The Project Components and Outcomes remain the same as in the PIF, however, Activities, Indicators and Targets to achieve these have been further refined through a series of stakeholder consultations and field visits, and considering the findings of the Gender Action Plan.

The **objective** of the project is to enhance and maintain socio-ecological resilience of selected landscapes and seascapes through community-based initiatives in selected ecologically sensitive areas of Kenya for global environmental benefits and sustainable development.

The GEF-funded alternative will be delivered through two Components (with a third for M&E):

- . **Component 1-** Resilient rural landscapes for sustainable development and contribution to global environmental protection
- . **Component 2-** Landscape governance and adaptive management for upscaling and replication
- . **Component 3-** Monitoring and Evaluation

Under Component 1, the following **outcomes** are anticipated:

- . 1.1 Ecosystem services and biodiversity within targeted landscapes and seascapes are enhanced through multi-functional land-use systems.
- . 1.2: The sustainability of production systems in the target landscapes is strengthened through integrated agro-ecological practices.
- . 1.3 Livelihoods of communities in the target landscapes and seascapes are improved by developing eco-friendly, climate-adaptive, small-scale community enterprises with clear market linkages

Under Component 2, the following **outcomes** are anticipated:

- . 2.1 Multi-stakeholder governance platforms strengthened/in place for improved governance of target landscapes and seascapes for effective participatory decision making to enhance socio-ecological landscape resiliency
- . 2.2 Knowledge from community level engagement and innovative conservation practices is systematically assessed and shared for replication and upscaling across the landscapes, across the county, and to the global SGP network

Under Component 3, the following **outcome** is anticipated: **Project implementation and results effectively monitored and evaluated.**

Activities under each component and outcome will take place in the selected landscapes.

Under **Outcome 1.1, Ecosystem services and biodiversity within targeted landscapes and seascapes are enhanced through multi-functional land-use systems**, the project recognizes that one of the effective means of engaging various levels of community and government is through improved and integrated land use, while ensuring connectivity. This involves strategies of rehabilitating degraded ecosystems, fostering a shared understanding on the importance of ecosystem services and how best to manage them, and contributing to improved and sustainable land use. Interventions under this outcome will require restoration as well as a shared vision of how to rehabilitate for the purposes of conserving biodiversity. The landscape strategy will require various community groups to work together, supporting actions in different ecosystems so that they may yield collective benefits. This outcome will be delivered by:

Output 1.1.1- Community level small grant projects in the selected landscapes that restore degraded land, improve connectivity, support innovation in biodiversity conservation and optimization of ecosystem services (including reforestation of riparian gallery forests, enhanced connectivity for wetlands, rangelands and priority conservation areas; water catchment protection; participatory monitoring of species;).

The activities carried out under this outcome will include:

- . Conservation and restoration of mangrove ecosystems (including replication of successful projects like Mikoko Pamoja conducted under SGP-06)
- . Restoration and rehabilitation of native vegetation, including riparian forests in middle and upper catchments /woodlands, coastal areas
- . Identification and dissemination of sustainable rangeland management practices such as: sustainable land use/ranch management plans, and holistic range management; strengthening traditional mechanisms for grazing control; protection of seasonal rangeland reserves; infrastructure improvements (such as establishing watering points), promotion of traditional biodiversity, developing integrated livestock and wildlife management plans, establishing predator proof mobile bomas and improved grass establishment
- . Disseminating best practices of terrestrial management of plastic waste to avoid risks to marine biodiversity and environment
- . Expanding coral reef restoration programme through identifying and mapping degraded areas, identifying potential seed harvesting sites, collection of the seeds and establishing nurseries, replanting and management of planted areas
- . Replicating successful Sea Grass Ecosystem Restoration programs in areas where it has not been piloted
- . Capacity building/training initiatives for engaging local communities, especially women and youth in landscape resilience activities
- . Disseminating best practices on sustainable use of biodiversity, such as habitat restoration, use of NTFP
- . Restoration of traditional/cultural natural resources management systems and practices such traditional grazing plan, forest management practices, water resources management and utilisation, traditional crops
- . Public awareness campaigns and educational programmes to promote behavioural change particularly in the areas of waste management/pollution and risk to biodiversity, agricultural practices, indiscriminate grazing, burning, heavy use of chemicals; strengthening environmental awareness/education programme targeting communities, youth schools/colleges on conservation and sustainable land management

Under Outcome 1.2: The sustainability of production systems in the target landscapes is strengthened through integrated agro-ecological practices, the project acknowledges that agricultural production offers an entry by which sustainability measures can be promoted, while supporting livelihoods. It is also a sector where there is room for innovation and sharing of best practices. Given that the project is primarily targeting rural communities, agriculture is the most relevant sector to address, as it is directly connected to livelihoods, sustenance, connection to the land and to traditions, supports the sense of community and is most closely associated with the use of natural resources. Within rural communities, baseline assessments have shown that women play a critical role in the transition to more sustainable land management systems, such as agroecology, leading the way in introducing innovations in techniques and procedures. In the baseline, it was revealed that communities are facing greater challenges given the lack of water, poor quality of soil,

use of chemicals, overgrazing, burning and lack of know-how on how to increase production given these constraints.

Output 1.2.1- Targeted community projects enhance the sustainability and resilience of production systems, including soil and water conservation practices, silvopastoral and agroforestry systems; agro-ecological practices and holistic grazing and the following associated activities will help address these challenges:

- . Improve water management, including water catchment supported small scale irrigation schemes
- . Promote indigenous knowledge and traditional crops, especially neglected native crops
- . Promote rural farmers' adoption of climate-smart agricultural practices
- . Support land management practices which promote diversification, and agroforestry, as well as intercropping, mulching, and composting and erosion control
- . Promote an integrated approach between farming and potential impacts on marine environment
- . Make productive use of renewable energy (e.g. solar pumps for small scale agriculture and farm produce preservation)
- . Improve access to innovative clean cooling options in both agricultural and fisheries supply chains
- . Remediate on-farm irrigation to improve water management and decrease wastage
- . Support county government to implement county special plans and other development plans through coordinated CSO actions, including public awareness and participation in development of policies and development programme/plan related to sustainable management of natural resources

Under **Outcome 1.3- Livelihoods of communities in the target landscapes and seascapes are improved by developing eco-friendly, climate-adaptive, small-scale community enterprises with clear market linkages**, the project seeks to strengthen communities' livelihoods by promoting and upscaling sustainable enterprises. With its rich cultural heritage and diverse landscapes, the communities under this project have a plethora of activities at the local scale that could yield greater socioeconomic and environmental benefits. These enterprises need accompaniment, organizational development, and support in business planning to make initiatives profitable. They also require the opportunity to pilot various activities to see which can be managed by the communities and which can be viable. Initiatives under this outcome will assist organizations to carry out sustainable production, while establishing the necessary market linkages. Most importantly, activities under this outcome are directly linked to strengthening livelihoods, which is a key factor in ensuring sustainability. It also gives the space to smaller CBOs to test initiatives, or upscale them, which they have not been able to do previously due to the lack of resources. Given the economic challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, these activities are all the more crucial to ensure that people can derive livelihoods from sustainable means (please see Annex 16 for more risks and opportunities under COVID-19). There is one output foreseen under this outcome:

Output 1.3.1- Targeted community projects promoting sustainable livelihoods, green businesses and market access, including ecotourism; ecological conversion of waste; beekeeping; green value-added agro-businesses integrated into value chains, micro-processing. The activities intended to deliver this output are the following:

- . Improvement of mariculture practices to avoid depleting natural resources and supporting sustainability
- . Supporting turtle conservation activities (eco-tourism)
- . Support small farms/kitchen farms using innovative technology like vertical bags for improved nutrition, biodiversity conservation, food security and livelihood improvement for women in the islands
- . Scale-up and foster linkages between community group waste collectors, and private sectors in plastic waste recycling /enterprises to improve the value chain in waste management and promote sustainability in waste enterprises, and reduce impacts on vulnerable biodiversity
- . Increasing pasture production/seedlings (mangrove, fruit trees) and supporting a circular economy
- . Supporting butterfly farming which has both a conservation value, income generation and eco-tourism potential and increases incentives for protecting forests and mangroves
- . Improving marketing of sustainable fisheries
- . Scale-up women led beekeeping enterprise by enhancing production capacity, value addition and quality assurance and market linkages at bigger scale.
- . Supporting women's groups in marketing of sustainable products; linking producers directly to consumers and fostering financial literacy
- . Upscaling artisanal/handicrafts, especially beadwork (especially in Lake Bogoria and SICA landscapes); in the context of COVID-19, finding digital means to upscale some of these local initiatives
- . Supporting groups/cooperatives in accessing revolving credit using lessons learnt from previous such interventions
- . Providing capacity-building for developing management skills for entrepreneurs, supporting sustainable packaging/marketing, quality control
- . Investing along the value chain to increase value addition of products e.g. gum arabica, fish, honey, fruits
- . Supporting smaller enterprises to obtain eco-tourism status e.g. eco lodges, safari walks and adventures, bird watching, camping tents, curio shops, guidebooks

- . Support not-for-profit training centers for guides and scouts where they can learn about biodiversity conservation and ecotourism principles
- . Promoting sustainable livestock husbandry techniques (predator proof bomas, improved breed, marketing strategies)
- . Support community-based ecotourism projects to recover from COVID-19 impacts (marketing, infrastructure refurbishment, boats, traditional food kiosks, etc).

The first component under **Component 2** is **Outcome 2.1- Multi-stakeholder governance platforms strengthened/in place for improved governance of target landscapes and seascapes for effective participatory decision making to enhance socio-ecological landscape resiliency.**

Under this outcome, in the GEF alternative, activities will focus on establishing recognizable, functioning local governance platforms in the selected landscapes. Under SGP-6, a number of organizations came together, and convened to establish two multi-stakeholder platforms; one at the Lake Bogoria production landscape and the other at the Shimoni-Vanga production seascape. Under SGP-7, the platforms will be further enhanced and sustained, cover a greater area, include new partners, and deepen the participation of the private sector whose activities impact the land/seascape. In fact, the project will be receiving co-financing from a private sector partner who will support in reducing plastic pollution from vulnerable coastal areas with important biodiversity.

In the Northern Rangelands site, a multi-stakeholder platform will be established. The governance platform in each landscape will serve as a point of collaboration and coordination, knowledge-sharing, assessing progress against various environmental indicators, responding to environmental shocks and most importantly, planning on how to protect valuable natural resources while ensuring livelihoods. Partners will be able to disseminate information through this platform, develop and adopt landscape goals and objectives and collect lessons learned. The platform will also serve a socio-cultural role in bringing together people of different livelihood activities, genders, and socioeconomic class. It will be situated at the landscape level, allowing local organizations to determine their landscape priorities, objectives and strategies. The multi-stakeholder model offers a platform through which collectively owned issues can be articulated, and can provide a venue for communal needs and concerns to be expressed. In order to ensure that all voices are considered in the multi-stakeholder platform, efforts should be made to reach out to existing women's grassroots groups and organizations, as well as youth-based groups in each one of the landscapes so that they are incorporated in these regional networks.

There are two outputs planned under this outcome. Under **Output 2.1.1- A multi-stakeholder governance platform in each target landscape develops and executes multi-stakeholder agreements for execution of adaptive landscape management plans and policies and enhanced community participation in land-use decision making and management**, activities will include:

- . Establishing a representative multi-stakeholder platform in the SICA landscape that includes participation of women, private sector partners, local governments, local community organizations and interests

- . Facilitating three multi-stakeholder platforms for regular meetings, reporting, incentivizing participation. To ensure participation of women, scheduled meeting times and how this may conflict with women's labour or household/childcare responsibilities should be considered, location, and whether this poses risks to women; as well as the need to provide childcare services of some sort.
- . Training of multi-stakeholder members on good governance, gender mainstreaming, organizational management, and monitoring and evaluation to enhance capacities
- . Conducting joint activities among communities, government agencies, private sector to improve surveillance and monitor against illegal activities of natural resources
- . Disseminate social and environmental best practices in the development and implementation of large-scale investment projects within conservation/ecologically sensitive areas to decrease risks experienced by vulnerable communities (e.g Shimoni fish port and Lamu Port-South Sudan-Ethiopia-Transport (LAPSSET) Corridor)
- . Establishing long-term co-financing structures to ensure sustainability of multi-stakeholder platforms

Output 2.1.2- A landscape strategy developed and implemented by the corresponding multi-stakeholder platform for each target landscape to enhance socio-ecological resilience through community grant projects, will address some of the issues identified in the PPG and the Mid-term Review of SGP-6. The PPG phase identified important issues and concerns in each landscape, as well as key institutional actors, who will be invited to participate in and support multi-stakeholder platforms. The strategic partner organization in each landscape will have the role of convening and supporting the respective multi-stakeholder platform in the development of a landscape strategy, including a shared vision, while acknowledging shared challenges and activities needing to be addressed. Strategies for Lake Bogoria landscape and Shimoni-Vanga seascape were developed at the start of GEF 6. These will be revised and enriched to capture the progress made in GEF 6 and the barriers and gaps that still remain to be addressed. The key activities under this output will include:

- . Identify landscape-level priorities in accordance with different visions of the stakeholders, and specifically include the perspectives of marginalized communities, women and youth
- . Clarify roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders in contributing to landscape resilience
- . Plan and carry out baseline assessment in each landscape against which results can be measured
- . Map/zone communal natural resources and critical ecosystems e.g. indigenous/cultural sites, for better protection, and integrate this mapping exercise into county planning

Under **Outcome 2.2- Knowledge from community level engagement and innovative conservation practices is systematically assessed and shared for replication and upscaling across the landscapes, across the county, and to the global SGP network,** the project recognizes that some larger initiatives can upscale results beyond landscapes. One of the priorities under this output is to strengthen regional collaborations, and strengthen partners that can provide organizational

accompaniment/ development, business development, integration of activities to smaller community groups, so that they may reach more actors and help consolidate and align their activities.

Under this outcome, the many lessons learned through individual grants will be brought to the fore and shared with other communities, organizations, and replicated as needed. The aggregate activities at the landscape level can also serve as potential for upscaling at the province and national level. Opportunities will be sought with research institutes, government entities and national-level NGOs to share some of the lessons learned and best practices identified by the project. Activities under this outcome can also help leverage other funds, and support South-South partnerships.

There are two outputs planned under this outcome. Under **Output- 2.2.1 Landscape/seascape learning supports community level project management, capacity building, project monitoring and learning**, the project seeks to support local organizations in strengthening their organizational capacities, administrative practices, gender-responsive approaches and sensitivity to socioeconomic, ethnic, inequalities, ability to leverage funds, and upscale their sustainable practices. This is a core issue to ensure sustainability and to provide an incentive for participation on the parts of smaller organizations, which may have to sacrifice time/resources to participate in SGP multi-stakeholder meetings. The key activities under this output include:

- . Support community organizations to document baselines, and measure change from project inputs?improving their own monitoring and measurement capacities
- . Showcase best practices, systematizing lessons learned, so that they can be shared in a usable manner
- . Strengthen the capacity of civil society organizations to effectively respond to NR issues at landscape level

Under **Output 2.2.2- Knowledge from community project innovations is identified during participatory evaluations, codified and disseminated to multiple audiences, for replication and upscaling**.

- . Supporting peer-to-peer learning exchanges, demonstrations and pilots from different parts of the landscape and across landscapes
- . Developing and supporting implementation of NRM policies, by-laws etc., at county level
- . Documenting indigenous knowledge and best practices, and disseminating these among key stakeholders
- . Developing policy-relevant recommendations on natural resource management (especially proving recommendations on county policies)
- . Establish integrated ecosystem plans for buffer zones and production areas (outside of Protected Areas)
- . Produce digital videos, documents, pamphlets, training materials, whatsapp messaging/groups for appropriate audiences

- . Design a Communications Strategy and a Knowledge Management strategy with specific approaches to reaching different audiences; these strategies must take COVID-19 challenges into account
- . Provide environmental education to youth through schools and community groups to enhance knowledge of conservation, sustainable livelihood opportunities, and actions that can be taken at the local level to build resilience

Under Component 3- Monitoring and Evaluation, and **Outcome 3.1- Project implementation and results effectively monitored and evaluated** there is one output. **Output 3.1.1- Protocols and procedures in place to facilitate participatory monitoring and evaluation.** Activities under this output are designed to put in place enabling procedures and protocols to facilitate effective monitoring & evaluation. The project inception workshop, to be held within 60 days of CEO endorsement, is a critical milestone on the implementation timeline, providing an opportunity to validate the project document, revise and finalize the stakeholder engagement plan; confirming governance implementation arrangements, including agreements with responsible parties; assessing changes in relevant circumstances, particularly COVID-related protocols, and making adjustments to the project and program results framework accordingly; verifying responsibilities; updating the project risks and agreeing to mitigation measures and responsibilities; and agreeing to the multi-year work plan. An inception workshop report will be prepared and disseminated among the NSC members.

Monitoring indicators in the project results framework, project risks, implementation of the stakeholder engagement plan and implementation of the gender action plan will be carried out by the Country Programme Management Unit. Project monitoring will also include measuring resilience indicators through the life of the project to measure change.

According to GEF requirements, two independent evaluations will be carried out in the project, a midterm review and terminal evaluation, at least one month before the midterm and terminal evaluations. The project management team will carry out assessments of the GEF core indicators and other results requiring verification/analysis. These assessments will include GIS mapping of project interventions and uploading the geospatial information onto the SGP Learning Forum e-platform.

4) Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTE, LDCF, SCCF, CBIT and co-financing

Baseline projects as well as other contributions to the project's baseline and co-financing are given in UNDP Project Document Section IV (Results and Partnerships) for each project component, and Section IX (Financial Planning and Management). There are no changes from the PIF in the incremental reasoning or the expected contributions from the baseline. The project has been designed with the expectation that with GEF financing, the outcomes will be achieved in each landscape. The manner in which, and the form that some of the interventions may take, will differ based on the individual landscape context, the baseline, and the kinds of CSOs that will receive grants from SGP-07. The following table highlights some of the specifics anticipated per landscape. Overall, SGP-07 will benefit from the knowledge and learning gleaned from SGP-06, some key differences being:

? SGP's engagement with the county governments will be more structured for more synergies, delivery of coordinated activities and achieving higher level results. This level of engagement is one that the

county governments are also interested in. In this phase, SGP is exploring the possibility of developing an MOU that clearly spells out the roles and responsibilities of each of the parties, which will in turn support CSO activities and the broader sustainability framework in each county. This will also enhance county-level ownership, allow for more opportunities of engagement between CSOs and local government, and greater coordination of delivery of activities and services.

? This phase will require more rigorous monitoring and mentoring of grantees by larger strategic partners, so that the baseline capacities of smaller CSOs in this regard are improved. This will also allow SGP to showcase its results and achievements in a more coherent way, and allow SGP to identify which initiatives produce what impacts.

? This phase will provide a clearer proposal template so that community groups are able to fill it out appropriately, and so that smaller organizations have the same opportunities to engage as larger groups with more administrative experience.

? CSOs will be encouraged to submit high quality proposals early in GEF-07 to take advantage of the four-year window, and avoid being rushed to complete projects. Despite COVID-19, there have been high levels of engagement with CSOs in the project sites during the PPG, so that actors are informed of and are ready to engage as the project commences. In GEF-06 the first proposals were poor; in this phase, at inception, clear guidelines will be provided early on so that expectations are well-defined.

Landscape	Baseline (Business-as-usual)	SGP-06	SGP-07

Shimoni-Vanga Seascape in southern Kenya	Local community (BMUs, CFAs) institutions exist but are weak, with minimal capacity to influence NRM governance.	Multi-stakeholder governance platform established for improved governance of the seascape for effective participatory decision making to enhance socio-ecological landscape resilience.	<p>In SGP-07, three multi-stakeholder platforms will be strengthened by enhancing roles of the county government and diversifying membership, so as to facilitate enhanced ownership by key stakeholders, synergies and linkages among various community-level interventions, promote social cohesion and generate greater impacts and results in the landscape through cumulative interventions. In Shimoni-Vanga, efforts will be made to formalize structures, by developing an MOU, establishing thematic-based sub-committees, and supporting the platform to take custody of key documents, such as the baseline assessments and adaptive landscape strategies. In addition, it will be important to establish linkages with relevant county structures. While SGP-06 was more formative in nature, this phase will be about execution.</p> <p>Strengthened local community institutions effectively co-managing the Shimoni-Vanga seascape to build resilience, while providing policy recommendations and finding ways to mitigate large-scale development projects.</p> <p>Successes and achievements upscaled and replicated, through effective knowledge management measures and participation with the national government and NGOs. This is currently being done under SGP-06, but started very late, because there was a delay in getting projects approved, which delayed implementation. In SGP-07, the proposal-writing process will be more streamlined, clearer and encouraged far earlier in the project cycle, so that this does not happen. This will allow for greater capture of results and knowledge gleaned.</p> <p>Landscape strategy for building social, economic and ecological resilience in place. In Shimoni-Vanga, such a landscape strategy is operational from SGP-06; under SGP-07, key stakeholders will reflect on how it should be adapted, reflect on achievements, challenges, lessons learned, and new objectives. This will also take COVID-19 impacts into account to ensure that any such strategy incorporates a 'building back better' approach.</p> <p>Establish/strengthen linkages with tertiary institutions and research organizations to facilitate exchange and adoption of knowledge from communities to tertiary/research institutions and vice versa.</p> <p>Facilitate the establishment of a donor/development partner round table to promote exchange of information to reduce duplication and enhance synergy among donors and development partners, which are</p>
	Weak enforcement of laws and minimal monitoring, control and surveillance of locally managed marine areas.	Local institution strengthening: The main thrust has been on the Beach Management Units (BMUs) to conduct monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) of locally managed marine areas, restore ecosystems and improved engagement in NRM governance.	
	Few livelihood support initiatives/enterprises started but weak with no clear sustainability mechanisms/ market linkages	Market linkages for various enterprises including plastic waste value chains, tourism ventures, boat operators and value addition initiated	
	Limited capacities of local governance bodies and communities to access suitable solutions and financial resources.	Multi-stakeholder governance platform established for improved governance of the seascape for effective participatory decision making to enhance socio-ecological landscape resilience.	
	General absence of experience sharing platforms to disseminate and share lessons and experiences of good practices.		

Lake Bogoria Ecosystem in the World Heritage Site of the Kenya Lake System in the Great Rift Valley (Kenya Rift Lakes Region)	Local community (WRUAs,) institutions exist but are weak, with minimal capacity to influence NRM governance.	Local institution strengthening focusing on community wildlife conservancies and mid and downstream Water Users Associations for improved governance of the ecosystem	Greater synergies and linkages among various community-level interventions, so as to harmonize them, increase value-added of existing initiatives, promote social cohesion and generate greater impacts and results in the landscape through cumulative interventions. Part of this will also focus on climate-related emergencies experienced under SGP-06 (e.g. flooding). In SGP-06, some grantees' homes were destroyed, and they had to re-locate. But by empowering local communities to engage in activities that improve livelihoods, that enhance entrepreneurial skills, and that generate income, we reduced vulnerability to natural disasters and increased their coping abilities. These threats raised awareness of how disaster risk reduction should be incorporated throughout all activities.
	Women and indigenous communities are under-represented in sharing traditional knowledge and expertise on sustainable development issues.	Multi-stakeholder governance platform (with strong gender representation) established for improved governance of the landscape for effective participatory decision making to enhance socio-ecological landscape resiliency	Market linkages will be upscaled to include other value chains than the ones piloted in SGP-06. Further, more investments will happen along the value chain (e.g. processing, transformation, distribution), to further enhance the resilience of value chains supported in SGP-06. The value chains supported in SGP-06 are still quite weak and or nascent?SGP-06 piloted two pasture value chains in Lake Bogoria. The key will be to support these, link to appropriate market instruments, inputs and partners.
	Absence of experience sharing platforms to disseminate and share lessons and experiences of good practices.		Renewable energy piloted in SGP-06 is now used to fuel sustainable interventions in SGP-07.
	Few livelihood support initiatives/enterprises started but weak with no clear sustainability mechanisms/ market linkages	Market linkages for various enterprises including establishment of bio-enterprises e.g honey value chain for women groups	Landscape strategy updated from SGP-06, for building social, economic and ecological resilience in place, taking into account new challenges posed by COVID-19, environmental and sustainability threats. The landscape strategy from SGP-06 is operational, and under SGP-07, key stakeholders will reflect on how it should be adapted, reflect on achievements, challenges, lessons learned, and new objectives. This will also take COVID-19 impacts into account to ensure that any such strategy incorporates a ?building back better? approach.
	Limited capacities of local governance bodies and communities to access suitable solutions and financial resources.	Partnerships between CSOs and private sector to broaden the scope of renewable energy uptake by local communities at household level and to promote the use of renewable technologies	Strengthen and formalize SGP's engagement with the county government to clearly spell out roles and responsibilities of each party. This will enhance ownership and active participation by the county government, lend to greater synergy and coordination and long-term sustainability.
			Lessons learned from SGP-06 reveal the value chains that can be upscaled in SGP 07. The sustainability of production systems in the target landscapes is strengthened through integrated agro-ecological practices, which

The Samburu-Isiolo (SICA) Conservation Areas in the arid rangelands of Northern Kenya	<p>Community organizations lack the means and/or knowledge to plan, manage and coordinate their rural production landscapes with a long-term vision for the conservation of biodiversity, improvement in connectivity and increase in the productivity of ecosystem goods and services.</p> <p>Women and indigenous communities are under-represented in sharing traditional knowledge and expertise on sustainable range land management</p> <p>Limited capacities of local governance bodies and communities to access suitable solutions and financial resources.</p> <p>General absence of experience sharing platforms to disseminate and share lessons and experiences of good practices.</p>	No interventions under SGP-06.	<p>Local institutions (wildlife conservancies, pastoral groups, traditional women's institutions and water users' groups) strengthened for improved governance of the ecosystems</p> <p>Synergies and linkages among various community-level interventions, so as to harmonize them, increase value-added of existing initiatives, promote social cohesion and generate greater impacts and results on the landscape through cumulative interventions.</p> <p>The sustainability of production systems (agro-pastoralism, irrigated agriculture and wildlife conservation) in the target landscapes is strengthened through integrated agro-ecological practices</p> <p>Multi-stakeholder governance platform initiated for effectiveness improved governance and participatory (including promoting gender balance and women involvement) decision making to enhance socio-ecological landscape resiliency.</p> <p>Landscape strategy for building social, economic and ecological resilience in place</p>
---	---	--------------------------------	---

In terms of the overall alternative scenario, without GEF financing, there will continue to be a disconnect among stakeholders with an ad hoc approach to development interventions; initiatives from different communities, organizations, and local governments will not be coordinated around a shared agenda or vision, with a view to attain larger socio-ecological landscape impacts.

Biodiversity threats will remain as usual; the project seeks to change the business-as-usual scenario by supporting initiatives that reverse negative impacts of current behaviours in landscapes and restore and

rehabilitate degraded ecosystems while promoting livelihood activities that promote sustainability. Without these, it is foreseen that degrading practices will continue, particularly on the agriculture, tourism and wildlife exploitation ends.

Smaller community organizations will not be able to pilot or advance their innovative and sustainable practices thereby remaining at a small-scale without having a larger impact. For those associations that require project grants to advance their socially responsible, sustainable and biodiversity-friendly enterprises, they may not be able to pursue their initiatives or obtain capital to do so, thereby impacting their livelihoods and possibility of increasing sustainable products on the market.

CSOs will not receive the kind of organizational capacity building that they need. CSO skills will remain marginally improved based on previous SGP cycles, but the opportunity to attain new organization strengths will remain stunted. This is particularly so on the administrative side of applying gender analysis, developing effecting indicators and monitoring and evaluation approaches; applying and leveraging other resources, and improving enforcement.

There will be a lost opportunity of sharing best practices and lessons learned, and of generating greater knowledge amongst communities. This also minimizes opportunities for upscaling lessons learned at the policy level, especially when there is interest on the part of county governments to attract policy recommendations. Individual groups will continue to generate results, lessons learned and best practices in ways that are not centralized or collected, thereby losing opportunities for replication as well.

There will be a lost opportunity to test and pilot initiatives. These are crucial to ensure innovation, advancing previous technologies, or identifying what the best methods are with particular livelihood/restoration activities.

Indigenous Peoples networks will continue to have limited voice in various local stakeholder fora. Their knowledge, experience, and practice will not be integrated into a holistic landscape approach.

Gender will not be integrated as a vital consideration to landscape development. Unequal access to resources, unequal participation will continue; opportunities to mainstream gender considerations into the activities of CSOs will be lost.

5) *Global environmental benefits* (GEFTF)

SGP-07, will support community-driven planning and management of critical selected landscapes aimed at achieving global environmental and local sustainable development benefits. Community organizations will enhance their adaptive management capacities, cultivate resilience by strengthening their capacities for innovation across the landscape and throughout the local economy, and privilege no-regrets actions and initiatives. SGP will support community organizations to take collective action through a participatory landscape planning and management approach aimed at enhancing socio-ecological resilience from innovative livelihoods producing local and global environmental benefits.

Global Environmental Benefits: The project is aligned with the following GEF-7 focal area objectives:

? **BD-1-1:** Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors.

? **LD-1-4:** Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape.

The global environmental benefits generated by SGP-07 are estimated based on the expected number of grants awarded and experiences in earlier operational phases of the SGP in Kenya. Aggregate benefits over the longer term will be a function of the synergies created between projects through programmatic and collaborative approaches. GEF support will be catalytic in mobilizing action at local levels to innovate new strategies and practices to improve the management of vulnerable natural resources and ecosystems. More importantly, the programme will enhance the capacity of stakeholders in different sectors and at different levels (NGOs, CBOs, etc.) to promote participatory resource management. The lessons learned from the community and landscape level initiatives will be analyzed by multi-stakeholder groups at landscape and regional levels for potential policy inputs and disseminated to other landscapes and communities where they will be up-scaled, mainstreamed and replicated, as well as integrated into other local and national level programs.

The expected project results with respect to the GEF Core Indicators are outlined below and recorded in the Core Indicator Worksheet in Annex 13.

GEF Core Indicators	Proposed end-of-project targets and descriptions
Core Indicator 3: Area of land restored (hectares)	End-of-project target: 6,000 hectares (ha) This will be achieved through the restoration of mangrove ecosystems (including replication of successful projects like Mikoko Pamoja conducted under SGP-06); rehabilitation of native vegetation, including riparian forests in middle and upper catchments /woodlands, coastal areas; replicating successful Sea Grass Ecosystem Restoration programs in areas where it has not been piloted.
Core Indicator 4: Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)	End-of-project target: 20,000 ha The area of landscapes under improved practices will be achieved through a variety of coordinated interventions, including but not limited to: implementing sustainable rangeland management practices such as: sustainable land use/ranch management plans, and holistic range management; strengthening traditional mechanisms for grazing control; protection of seasonal rangeland reserves; infrastructure improvements (such as establishing watering points), promotion of traditional biodiversity, developing integrated livestock and wildlife management plans, establishing predator-proof mobile bomas and improved grass establishment. The project will also support the improved use of natural resources and water management including water catchment supported small scale irrigation schemes. The project will also support rural farmers to adopt climate-smart agricultural practices and land management practices which promote diversification, and agroforestry, as well as intercropping, mulching, and composting and erosion control. The project will invest in the restoration of traditional/cultural natural resources management systems and practices such traditional forest management practices, and utilization of traditional crops, and decreasing the use of burning and heavy use of chemicals.

GEF Core Indicators	Proposed end-of-project targets and descriptions
Core Indicator 5: Area of marine habitat under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)	End-of-project target: 12,000 ha The project will work in the marine environment and the coastal zone to ensure coordinated and mutually beneficial actions. This will be achieved through expanding coral reef restoration programmes through identifying and mapping degraded areas, identifying potential mangrove seed harvesting sites, collection of seeds and establishing nurseries, replanting and management of planted areas, and managing plastic pollution negatively impacting marine biodiversity, and mariculture practices to avoid depleting natural resources and supporting sustainability. The project will further support turtle conservation activities
Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment	End-of-project target: 15,000 (7,500 men and 7,500 women) The number of direct beneficiaries were based on the number of projected grants, and geographic sites where they will be conducted. It is anticipated that project beneficiaries will receive capacity development, improved skills, investments for biodiversity protection and sustainable land management, strategic inputs into livelihoods, opportunities for synergies and partnerships.

6) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up

Innovation ? SGP Kenya will foster the application of a landscape approach in each of the three ecologically sensitive areas in which it proposes to implement the project; that is the Kenya Rift Lakes region of the Great Rift Valley, the rangelands of northern Kenya and the marine ecosystem of southern Kenya. With the experience gained from having implemented the COMPACT Initiative[1] around the Mt. Kenya World Heritage Site for slightly over a decade, and the knowledge and experience gained from landscape initiatives in other SGP countries[2] as well as SGP-06, this project will promote a participatory, multi-stakeholder process that will facilitate joint planning, implementation and monitoring of activities. Due to COVID-19, communities are facing a new series of challenges, which combined with environmental degradation will require new solutions. In particular, the project will have to target sustainable livelihoods, given the economic decline in peoples' livelihoods, but will have to identify new ways of securing access to markets, and lifting people out of poverty without turning to over exploitation of natural resources. Similarly, while ecotourism will be promoted by the project, it may turn towards domestic tourism, with opportunities for increased national interest and awareness in conservation and celebrating biodiversity and landscapes (beyond the wildlife). This may also be an opportunity to address some of the challenges that exist with business-as-usual tourism practices in the landscapes, and identify coordinated means and protocols to create an eco-shift so that when tourism takes up again, it can be managed with sustainable guidance.

COVID-19, also provides an opportunity to rethink food and value chains in particular, where/how food is grown and how to buy locally?the issue of health can also allow an opportunity to promote

sustainably produced goods. This will require innovative agricultural processes (agroforestry, composting, use of greywater, etc.) and more public sensitization on the merits of chemical-free foods.

The project will also seek innovative ways to manage waste that is destroying biodiversity, both marine and terrestrial wildlife, by finding ways to convert, reuse, transform and increase awareness.

Another innovation under this project will be for the project to input more directly into county policy. While previous SGP phases have allowed for consultations and generation of knowledge, SGP has not directly inputted into county policy. Given the SGP experience, and the appetite expressed during the PPG, there is a real opportunity for SGP to work in tandem with county governments to devise policy, leveraging the successes of grantees and addressing their needs.


Sustainability ? the Kenyan Constitution, revised in 2010, set the stage for devolution of some government responsibilities and functions to the county level. Institutional structures are in place to facilitate the operationalization of a two-tier devolved governance system. During implementation of this project in GEF 7, SGP Kenya will seek to establish strong partnerships with county governments, who understand the value of maintaining and enhancing landscape resilience through biodiversity and ecosystem conservation, sustainable land management and climate mitigation/adaptation, and who are willing to invest in the implementation of the project at the landscape level because the outputs and outcomes will contribute towards realizing the development and environmental objectives of the county. It is envisioned that such a partnership forged with a county government will contribute towards the sustainability and up-scaling objectives of the GEF SGP in Kenya.

At the same time, the sustainability of landscape management processes and community initiatives is predicated on the principle ? based on SGP experience - that global environmental benefits can be produced and maintained through community-based sustainable development projects. Previous phases of the SGP Kenya Country Programme have identified and promoted clear win-win opportunities with community initiatives and clusters of initiatives in areas such as marine conservation with a focus on mangrove conservation and establishment of community-managed marine areas, improved sustainable land management practices, sustainable forest management and utilization of non-timber forest products, fuel-efficient stoves, renewable energy technologies, including biodigesters and solar energy applications and others. Sustainability of landscape planning and management processes will be enhanced through the formation of multi-stakeholder partnerships, involving local government, national agencies and institutions, NGOs, the private sector and others at the landscape and community levels and the adoption of multi-stakeholder partnership agreements to pursue specific landscape level outcomes. NGOs with proven capacities will be called upon to support community projects and landscape planning processes, and technical assistance will be engaged through government, NGOs, universities, academic institutes and other institutions.

Potential for scaling up - successful interventions under each thematic area can be replicated/upscaled in other landscapes and biogeographic regions of the country facing similar issues of development and environmental protection and management. Through improved financial capacities, grantees may ensure progressive innovation and broader adoption. Resources will be made available through the SGP strategic project grant modality to finance key elements of the upscaling initiatives to reduce the risk to other donors and investors. Multi-stakeholder partnerships will identify potential upscaling

opportunities, analyze and plan upscaling processes, engage established microcredit and revolving fund mechanisms to finance upscaling components, design and implement the upscaling programme, and evaluate its performance and impacts for lessons learned for adaptive management, policy discussion and potential extension of the model to other areas of the country. Identification of specific potential upscaling initiatives will take place during project preparation.

Fig. 3: Upscaling in the COMDEKS process



[1] See: UNEP, 2014. *Green Economy Assessment Report ? Kenya*. UNEP, Nairobi.

[2] The list of possible partners in this section is not exhaustive but indicative. As implementation progresses opportunities to collaborate with other institutions, programs and donors are likely to emerge.

[3] COMPACT (*Community Management of Protected Areas Conservation*) is an initiative that was designed to complement and add value to existing conservation programmes, by supporting community-based initiatives that increase effectiveness of biodiversity conservation and improve livelihoods of local people. See, for example, whc.unesco.org/document/134265

Engaging Local Communities in Stewardship of World Heritage: a methodology based on the COMPACT experience.

For example, SGP implements the Japan-financed COMDEKS initiative in 20 countries around the world; it focuses on community-based landscape planning and management for socio-ecological

resilience. For more information, please see <https://comdeksproject.files.wordpress.com/2014/10/communities-in-action-comdeks-web-v2.pdf>.

1b. Project Map and Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

Please refer to Annex 1 of the Project Document.

1c. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

2. Stakeholders

Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase:

Civil Society Organizations Yes

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Yes

Private Sector Entities Yes

If none of the above, please explain why:

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan for SGP-07 is based on two essential elements: consultation and participation with all relevant stakeholders at the national, regional and landscape levels (see Annex 7 in attached Project Document). The focus of the stakeholder engagement plan is to have a multi-stakeholder approach and to ensure that the project leverages work that is already being done so as to best use resources and to create the kind of synergies and partnerships that achieve impacts, while including marginalized and vulnerable populations. The PPG process entailed extensive consultations at the local government and CSO levels to understand the types of activities planned and being designed to ensure that this project mutually supports other initiatives that will support landscape resilience.

The attached project document includes details on the process of stakeholder identification and the rationale for collaborating with different categories of stakeholders. The summary below highlights the key stakeholders and their role in the project; further details are provided in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Annex 4) appended to the Project Document.

The primary stakeholders of the Kenya SGP Country Programme are the **community-based organizations** (CBOs) and **local communities** who will receive grants to produce benefits to local sustainable development and the global environment. Women, minority groups, indigenous groups and youth will be especially invited to participate in the landscape planning and management processes as well as to submit project proposals for specific initiatives, to ensure that there are mechanisms for advancement for marginalized groups.

NGOs, whose work has been to support CBOs and communities in pursuing local sustainable development actions, are also important stakeholders. These will include those NGOs who have the interest and capacities to provide key support services to community-based projects, including technical assistance and capacity development, while also complimenting initiatives for greater impact at the landscape level.

County governments are key stakeholders; under the Kenya constitution, the 47 county governments have specific mandates on the governance of national resources, fisheries, agriculture and livestock development among others. In order to improve biodiversity conservation and reduce land degradation, the project will partner and collaborate with county governments so as to inform their policy agenda, foster joint learning activities, and create greater linkages among local communities and the county governments. In this respect, county governments of Kwale, Baringo, Samburu and Isiolo are important players.

In addition to the county governments, **national government ministries** such as Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MENF), Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries, Ministry of Water and Sanitation and Irrigation and Ministry of Energy, and SAGAs including State Department of Fisheries and Blue Economy (SDFandBE), Kenya Forest Service (KFS), Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) and National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), will be core partners for project implementation. The project will seek alignment with their programming.

During the project preparatory process, key stakeholders were identified first from SGP 6 multi-stakeholder platforms, partners and grant applicants in two of the three landscapes. In the pilot landscape, national government agencies, county governments, NGOs and CSOs were consulted to generate a list of local-level organizations. Teams implementing projects in the landscapes were consulted, and lists of stakeholders were triangulated.

Due to the COVID 19 pandemic, innovative ways of stakeholder consultation were devised. This included the use of online platforms like zoom, telephone conference interviews and use of questionnaires to reach a breadth of stakeholders. Larger NGOs and County government representatives were used as proxies through which smaller community groups could be accessed. During meetings, particular attention was made to ensure the voices of women, youth and the marginalized groups was heard. Please see Annex 7 for the detailed Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement

Summary of the project stakeholders and their roles in the project:

Community organizations: Principal participants in landscape planning exercises; partners in the multi-stakeholder partnerships for each landscape; signatories to community level partnership agreements; implementing agents of community and landscape level projects. The project will pay special attention to organizations run by and for women, minority groups, indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities and youth. Examples of the kinds of community groups that would implement projects are; Water River Users Associations (WRUAs), Community Forest Associations (CFAs), Community-led and owned Wildlife Conservancies and Beach Management Units (BMUs) all of which are gazetted in the Water Act, the Forest Act, Wildlife Management Act, and the Fisheries Act respectively, as community associations for co-management of natural resources.

SGP National Steering Committee: Functions as Project Steering Committee and is composed of civil society, academia, government; reviews and approves land/seascape strategies; advises regarding multi-stakeholder partnership composition and TORs; approves criteria for project eligibility for each land/seascape based on proposals by multi-stakeholder partnership and SGP Operational Guidelines[1]¹; reviews and approves projects submitted by SGP Country Programme Manager; provides oversight and accountability.

NGOs: Lead and facilitate participatory baseline assessments and landscape planning processes, as requested; partners in multi-stakeholder partnerships for each land/seascape; signatories to community level partnership agreements; provide technical assistance to community organizations for implementation of their projects; potential participant on policy and innovation platforms.

County governments: Participate in baseline assessments and landscape planning processes; partners in multi-stakeholder partnerships for each land/seascape; primary participant on policy and innovation platforms. In each of the Counties in which the project will be operational, partnership will be established/strengthened with the relevant County Executive Committees (CECs) to facilitate leveraging of funds, linkages with county development plans and promote scale-up/replication of community projects.

National government agencies: Partners in multi-stakeholder partnerships for each land/seascape; as relevant or appropriate, provide technical assistance to community organizations for implementation of their projects; primary participants on landscape policy and innovation platforms. All national agencies with mandates to develop natural resource-based activities, and those with conservation and regulatory functions will be consulted to provide policy inputs, technical assistance and implementation support. Examples include the Kenya Wildlife Service, Kenya Forest Service, KMFRI, MENF, Kenya Fisheries Services, Ministry of Water and Irrigation Development, and the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries.

Private sector: Partners in multi-stakeholder partnerships for each landscape; signatories to community level partnership agreements, as appropriate; potential participant on policy and innovation platforms. SGP will also partner with private sector on plastic waste management (turning trash into cash),

tourism promotion and marketing and providing market for various community products along value chain.

Academic and research institutions: Assist in participatory baseline assessments and landscape planning processes; partners in multi-stakeholder partnerships for each landscape; provide technical assistance to community organizations for implementation of their projects; potential participants on policy and innovation platforms. These includes Kenya Marine and Fisheries Institute (KEMFRI), Kenya Forest Research Institution (KEFRI), Egerton University, Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organisation (KALRO).

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only;

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor; Yes

Co-financier; Yes

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body; Yes

Executor or co-executor; Yes

Other (Please explain) Yes

as participants in the landscape government platforms.

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Provide the gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assesment.

Key Gender Issues in the Project Landscapes

GEF7 proposes to work in three landscapes, the Samburu-Isiolo Conservation Areas (SICA) in the arid rangelands of northern Kenya; the Lake Bogoria Ecosystem in the World Heritage Site of the Kenya Lake System in the Great Rift Valley Lakes Region; and the Shimoni-Vanga seascape of southern coastal Kenya). Women in the three landscapes face similar challenges and prospects from a general women's rights perspective in Kenya context. Kenya has made significant advances in gender equality and women's empowerment particularly in the areas of constitutional protections. There's also improvement in access to healthcare, access to education and poverty reduction. However, the impact of legal and policy frameworks on the lives of women and girls has been undermined by weak implementation and a lack of gender-responsive budgeting. Hence, women still face challenges, including the ability to participate effectively in conservation efforts and organisations owing largely to compromised decision-making and leadership spaces. The foregoing situation is exacerbated by social and cultural norms that are biased against women's effective participation in social, economic, and

political arenas. Harmful practices and sexual violence also restrict women's freedom and equal access to opportunities. Overall, impunity and weak accountability measures, traditional justice systems, harmful attitudes, lack of systematic and credible data, as well as laxity to address women's rights violations continue to negatively affect the efforts to enhance the status of women's rights in Kenya.

In addition to the foregoing overall depiction, the stakeholder engagement revealed the following key gender issues in the project landscapes:

- **Unequal gendered relations, practices and attitudes:** In all three landscapes, the root cause of many of the challenges that women face could be traced back to unequal gendered relations. Women in these landscapes which are largely traditional are still discriminated against from social, economic and cultural perspectives and this in turn affects their access to resources as well as significant development initiatives such as conservation projects.
- **Exclusion of women in key conservation efforts:** In all three landscapes, the proximity of women to restoration and conservation efforts seems to be minimal. Where they are involved it is seen predominantly in the way of small economic engagements. Yet women possess skills, expertise and indigenous knowledge that can be harnessed and where needed enhanced for their meaningful participation in conservation efforts.
- **Capacity challenges among stakeholders:** Worsening the exclusion of women in conservation efforts is the seemingly limited gender competence among stakeholders such as implementers. While most could identify the challenges that women in their respective landscapes faced, such knowledge was mostly not followed by corresponding action. This challenge was similarly illustrated by county government actors as each landscape lacks a policy at the county level such as a Gender Inclusion Framework. The engagement of women is therefore arbitrary and not in pursuit of any policy objective.
- **Environment related challenges:** Climate change and its resultant adverse effects such as drought or excessive flooding disproportionately affect women in the landscape since they bear the biggest brunt from a socio-economic perspective in terms of loss of livelihoods and an exacerbation of their unequal and unpaid labour burden. A few examples below illustrate this point:
 - In Lake Bogoria, scarcity of water impedes women's beekeeping efforts as bees relocate in search of water. To mitigate this challenge, they endeavour to provide water for the bees which is also a challenge since it makes the activity more time- intensive taking away from their ability to undertake other activities.
 - In addition, in both Lake Bogoria and SICA landscapes, the burden of the search for water during drought is placed on women preoccupying significant amounts of their time and barring them from attending capacity building activities on good agro-ecological practices
- **Resource constraints:** In all three landscapes, women reported resource constraints as a major limiting factor in the implementation of conservancy efforts or other good practices.

- **COVID 19:** In all three landscapes, the impact of COVID 19 worsened the challenges that women were already undergoing, resulting mostly in lost livelihoods.

Given the foregoing challenges, SGP Kenya has in GEF 7 prioritized the inclusion of women.

In GEF 6, gender mainstreaming was a project consideration as evidenced by the presence of a GEN 2 gender marker, a narrative section illustrating the intention to mainstream gender and the project results framework contained gender indicators. The midterm review report, however, indicated that the project did not include a specific analysis of gender issues in the target landscapes-seascape. And that whereas the landscape-seascape strategies included mention of giving priority to proposals that include issues associated with women empowerment, there were no specific gender mainstreaming targets in the landscape/seascape strategies. In GEF 6, the development of these strategies was led by the respective strategic partners (who are grantees), and guided by the use of a template that was developed under the Community Development and Knowledge Management for the Satoyama Initiative (COMDEKS) programme. Although the land/sea-scape strategies did not include gender mainstreaming targets, the strategic partners supported women groups to develop proposals in response to the advertised Call for Proposals and submit them to the SGP office. In addition, the Small Grants Programme requires grantees to provide gender disaggregated data in their reporting.

In learning from and improving on GEF 6, in GEF 7, a gender analysis has been undertaken accompanied by a detailed, separate and specific Gender Action Plan that contains specific gender-related indicators and targets. In addition, the baseline studies preceding the development of the landscape/seascape strategies will now include gender as a main priority. In addition to resulting in gender responsive landscape/seascape strategies, these studies will also serve to stimulate and position the grantees to incorporate gender in their planning as well as implementation. In light of the Gender Action Plan, reporting in GEF 7 will also necessarily include performance on gender related indicators and results.

In GEF 7, the project includes a series of specific measures to contribute to empowering women in the areas of intervention and to help address social and economic inequality. These measures are categorized based on the following main objectives:

- ? Gender assessment: in order to facilitate SGP's and the implementers ability to identify and respond to specific gender needs and perspectives, comprehensive socio-ecological baseline studies will be undertaken in each of the landscapes to identify gender equality related status and gaps.
- ? Women's participation in governance and overall representation: in GEF 7 women will be targeted and included in all initiatives towards strengthening ecosystems including in: decision-making, and environmental optimization and conservation initiatives. From a governance perspective, there is a strong desire to strengthen the governance of landscapes through the targeted and meaningful inclusion of women in multi-stakeholder platforms. In this regard certain minimum quotas are recommended and precise targets captured in the Gender Action Plan.
- ? Capacity building: GEF 7 includes capacity building initiatives tailored at enhancing women's skills to engage in sustainable agro-ecological practices particularly those resulting in income-generation. Capacity building and advocacy initiatives will focus on agro-ecological practices as well as improved market access.

? Knowledge management: one of the key targets for the GEF 7 project is the establishment of a knowledge management system. Women's participation in innovative initiatives will be tracked with the objectives of documentation and to facilitate cross-learning across various groups and stakeholders as well as providing critical learnings for SGP to inform future projects. Documenting the experiences of young women and those utilizing indigenous knowledge systems will be prioritised.

COVID-19: In all three landscapes, the impact of COVID 19 worsened the challenges that women were already undergoing resulting mostly in lost livelihoods, increasing their household labour and often being put in caregiving roles. The barriers imposed by COVID-19 will be considered in the stakeholder engagement plan, and project Communication and Knowledge Management strategies will aim to ensure that women are engaged and actively addressed through project activities.

Please see the Annex on the Gender Action Plan for additional information.

SGP Kenya strongly believes in fostering a gender-responsive approach that is built into the project as a series of gender-sensitive indicators in the results framework. These include the following:

- ? Number of direct project beneficiaries disaggregated by gender (individual people)
- ? Number of indirect project beneficiaries disaggregated by gender (individual people)
- ? Percentage of women with improved participation and decision-making in natural resource governance
- ? Number of farmers (agriculture and livestock) adopting sustainable practices, disaggregated by gender
- ? Number of women benefiting from economic benefits and services from SGP projects
- ? Number of women-led community organizations participating in multi-stakeholder platforms
- ? Number of landscape case studies (including gender results)

Available online at: <https://sgp.undp.org/global-publications/1254-sgp-operational-guidelines-op7.html>

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Yes

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; Yes

Improving women's participation and decision making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women Yes

Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

Yes

4. Private sector engagement

Elaborate on the private sector's engagement in the project, if any.

As indicated in Section III ? Strategy of the Project Document, SGP expects to achieve results through CSO-private sector and government partnerships. Although specific private sector partners will only be identified once joint proposals have been received and appraised by the NSC against agreed criteria, a first consultation workshop that took place during project preparation confirmed that there are a large number of companies motivated to develop joint proposals to enable communities in un-served/underserved areas to benefit from modern and sustainable energy services or to help fuel interventions in the area of biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management.

This project is further receiving co-financing from a private sector partner, demonstrating the high level of engagement and potential for CSO-private sector collaboration on plastic pollution reduction in the coastal zones, which is impacting both terrestrial and marine environments.

There also exists an entry point for establishing partnerships between SGP grantees and the private sector on value addition of raw natural resources that are sustainably harvested and on marketing and improved production of various community products. These include honey, seeds, maize, beans and seaweed. Some of the potential private sector partners identified during PPG are Baraka Honey of Egerton University, SIDCO Kenya limited interested in seed production around lake Bogoria and C-weed cooperation interested in seaweed industry. In plastic waste management for improved livelihoods for the local communities along Shimoni-Vanga , there exist potential linkages between women and youth groups who conduct beach clean ups with plastic collecting companies. Two such companies were identified during this PPG namely Jinplastics and Modern soaps.

5. Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

The project is deemed ?moderate risk? in light of the COVID-19 pandemic which may cause project delays, challenges in reaching more remote communities that do not have access to electronic communications, prevent the physical gathering of civil society organizations and limit the type of demonstrations and peer learning opportunities that are meant to be conducted early in project implementation.

As per standard UNDP requirements, the Country Programme Manager/Project Manager will monitor risks quarterly and report on the status of risks to the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP Country Office will record progress in the UNDP Risk Register and management responses to critical risks will also be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR. The complete list of risks is in the Risk Register Annex 5; the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) is in Annex 4 of the Project Document.

6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Please refer to Section VII Governance and Management Arrangements of the ProDoc, which describes the Roles and responsibilities of the project's governance mechanism.

Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF financed projects and other initiatives.

?Support to Sustainable Bio-enterprise Development in Healthy Rangelands in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands of Kenya? (2018-2023) is a GEF project that SGP will seek to partner with. It is being implemented by the UN Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and Government Departments. This project seeks to provide alternative models for sustainable land management, restoring degraded lands, and supporting the development of diversified livelihood options, which include enhanced use of non-timber forest products (NTFPs), such as gum resins, honey and agave, as well as through the development of ecotourism. SGP will strive to synergize with partners of this project given the relevance of its objectives to the Lake Bogoria and SICA landscapes in terms of improved rangeland management, alternative and diversified sustainable livelihoods for the communities and restoration of degraded areas.

?Scaling up sustainable land management and agro-biodiversity conservation to reduce environmental degradation in small-scale agriculture in Western Kenya? project (2017-2021) is being implemented by the Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization (KALRO) is partnering with the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) and funded by GEF. The development objective of the project is to promote the adoption and adaption of sustainable land and forest management (SLM/SFM) practices across the productive landscape of Kakamega-Nandi ecosystem while the global environment objective is to reduce land and ecosystem degradation, conserve agro-biodiversity and contribute to climate change adaptation and mitigation. While the project is being implemented in a different region of the country, SGP will learn from its application of participatory and experiential learning, innovation platforms and value chain approaches. Among other possible types of collaboration, there may be opportunities to organize community exchange visits and view pilots and findings.

?Global Indigenous Peoples and Community-Conserved Areas and Territories (ICCA) Support Initiative (COVID-19 response)? funded by the German Federal Ministry of the Environment (BMU) ? USD 300,000 will be provided to SGP project beneficiaries to support civil society initiatives and actions by Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) to address the COVID-19 response and green recovery.

SGP will also work closely with **USAID Kenya** in various programmes that focus on food security, **Kenya Resilient in Arid Lands Partnership for Integrated Development (Kenya RAPID)** project (2015-2020) whose objectives and goals are relevant to SGP work in the SICA landscape in the rangeland of Northern Kenya, especially in increasing access to water and sanitation for people and water for livestock, and rebuilding a healthy rangeland-management ecosystem. The three strategic objectives that guide the program are (i) a responsive and accountable governance framework at county government level that ensures sustainable provision of water and pasture; (ii) replicable and scalable business models for sustainable WASH and livestock service delivery have been developed and operationalized; and (iii)

communities have increased access to sustainable WASH services and improved rangeland management. The relevance to SGP is that the project can derive learning on governance frameworks at landscape level, development of sustainable livestock business models, sustainable rangeland management and improved access to WASH services.

Kenya Marine Fisheries Social Economic Development (KEMFSED) Project (US\$ 100 million; 2020-2025) funded by the World Bank will be carried out in the *Shimoni-Vanga seascape* (Southern Kenya landscape). It is to be executed by the State Department of Fisheries and Blue Economy (SDFandBE). Some of the key objectives of the project include: (i) Support to the Government of Kenya in strengthening governance and management of Kenya's renewable marine resources towards ensuring long-term sustainability of fish stocks. This will be done through an improved policy and regulatory framework, and implementation of specific measures intended to protect marine resources; (ii) To strengthen livelihoods in coastal communities through provision of a combination of technical and financial support. This will include demand-driven sub-projects and complementary capacity building and training of beneficiaries. Women, youth and vulnerable and marginalized groups (VMGs) will be specifically targeted by creating opportunities along the value chain. Given that the SGP seeks to support improved and sustainable management of natural resources, and support the livelihoods of local communities, SGP-7 will support this World Bank initiative and leverage some of the resources being invested.

In the Lake Bogoria (Kenya Lake System in Great Rift Valley landscape), RECONCILE, a national NGO with expertise in **land-use rights and drylands management**, is supporting participatory rangeland management by hosting a range of trainings. The topics of the trainings include pasture management, rangeland re-seeding and rangeland management policy. The project is implemented within selected areas of the County, including the production landscape of Lake Baringo. Their partner of choice within the landscape is Irong conservancy; one of the conservancies targeted for support by SGP in GEF 7. Another project being implemented in the same landscape is by the NGO 'Pamoja for Transformation'. This project documents sustainable indigenous land management practices, especially on beekeeping and herbal medicine. SGP-7 can upscale some of these trainings and build partnerships with the facilitators to share some of the capacity building tools and results at the multi-stakeholder levels.

Baringo (Lake Bogoria landscape) and Samburu (SICA) counties are beneficiaries of **FAO land governance programme** which is also co-funded by the European Union and covers another eight counties in Kenya. This programme has the purpose of facilitating counties to make geospatial technology systems available, accessible and functional for effective planning and decision making. The objective of this land governance programme is to improve food and nutrition security through equitable and secure access and management of land for better livelihoods and socioeconomic development in all counties as per Vision 2030. In Baringo, a GIS lab has already been set up. The lab will facilitate the counties to: a) support spatial and land use mapping; b) inform county government development planning; c) improve documentation of community land rights for recognition, protection and registration of communal tenure rights; d) estimate crop yield mapping and health assessment; e) facilitate surveillance and predictive mapping of diseases for early warning and early action; e) map landscapes in terms of natural resource use, management and degradation (including forests, soils, water and irrigation and wildlife); f) assess suitability of selected value chains to inform revenue collection and county investment in agriculture; and

g) facilitate agricultural census and adoption of precision agriculture practices using satellite data. This project will complement the objectives of the GEF 7 project very well in the three landscapes.

The US government has a range of projects it supports in Baringo county through various agencies including the Department of State, USAID, Kenyans and Americans in partnership to fight HIV/AIDS, Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Department of Defense and US Department of Agriculture (USDA). The key projects cover topics such as **community conservancy, democracy and security, economic growth and food security, environment, health, self-help fund, education and youth empowerment**. SGP-7 will seek out the conservation activities as well as the critical partners that have contributed to successes to ensure synergies and inclusive partnerships.

Christian Aid is working with over 30 partners across 20 counties in Kenya, mainly in arid and semi-arid lands including Baringo, Samburu and Isiolo counties. Their work focuses on four key areas: 1) Health and nutrition, 2) Climate change and energy, 3) Inclusive markets and 4) Humanitarian and resilience. These topics are central to SGP 7 in various counties covered under the project. For example, SGP 7 can work with ?Climate Justice Resilience Fund project? (2018-2021), which strengthens pastoralist communities? resilience to climate change in the Samburu county in SICA in northern Kenya and identify best practices and challenges to consider. This project is being implemented by national organizations including Caritas Maralal, PACIDA and IMPACT.

SGP-7 will also build on **Samburu Pastoral Livelihoods Improvement Programme (SAPLIP)** which facilitates the process of climate change adaptation and mitigation in Samburu County. It is implemented by World Vision Kenya with funding from the EU. It introduces the Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration (FMNR) approach which is a rapid, low cost and easily replicated approach to restoring and improving agricultural, forested and pasture lands. Samburu residents are being trained on how to regenerate indigenous trees and shrubs from tree stumps, roots and seeds. FMNR has a significant and positive impact on income (poverty alleviation), food security (including the volume of food, energy content and dietary diversity), disaster resilience and reduction of conflict. The project is addressing the following issues: (i) poor crop yields due to poor soil fertility, soil erosion, drought, flood or wind damage; (ii) decreasing income for those in natural resource-based livelihoods such as farming, herding or selling of wood; (iii) charcoal and honey which leads to chronic or increasing poverty; (iv) insufficient wood supplies for cooking or building; (v) security issues for women and children due to walking long distances to find fuel wood; (vi) food insecurity and malnutrition conflicts over natural resources. These issues are similar to those addressed by GEF 7 in SICA.

In addition, in Samburu county, the SGP-7 project will be complemented by the **NAWIRI programme**, which is a Mercy Corps-led consortium of Kenyan and international partners for Development Food Security Activity (DFSA) in Turkana and Samburu counties of Kenya. It is funded by USAID's Office of Food for Peace and will run from 2019-2025. The NAWIRI program will be implemented through a phased approach that emphasizes learning, partnership, and co-creation with government, civil society, communities, and the private sector to drive sustained reductions in acute malnutrition in both counties.

The **Vanga Blue Carbon Project** is a carbon offset project which is community-led mangrove conservation and restoration project based in Vanga area. It aims to provide long-term incentives for mangrove protection and restoration through community involvement and benefit. The project includes the

sale of carbon credits on the voluntary carbon market, verified by the Plan Vivo carbon trading standard. It builds on the success of a similar project (Mikoko Pamoja) in Gazi, a community just a few kilometres north, which has been trading mangrove carbon credits on the Voluntary Carbon Market since 2012. Vanga Blue Forest is expected to cover 460ha of mangroves and avoid emissions of over 106,929 tCO₂-eq while earning the community over US\$400,000 among other benefits over the 20 years' crediting period. The project is supported by Leonardo DiCaprio Foundation, Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

[6] <http://www.fao.org/kenya/news/detail-events/en/c/1206305/>

[7] <https://fmnrhub.com.au/projects/kenya-samburu-pastoral-livelihoods-improvement-programme>

7. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions from below:

NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

The proposed project provides support to, aligns with and is relevant to a number of Kenya's national environmental objectives, strategies and development plans. The project will address governance issues in natural resources and environment, thus contribute to the country's constitutional provisions on these aspects as spelled out in the Constitution of Kenya which offers guiding principles on the governance of land, environment and natural resources. In terms of environment and natural resources, the constitution provides for administration of environment and natural resources, including obligations in respect of the environment, enforcement of environmental rights, agreements and legislation relating to natural resources. Some of the key outstanding stipulations under the constitution, which have a bearing on the GEF 7 project are:

- a) Ensure sustainable exploitation, utilisation, management and conservation of the environment and natural resources, and ensure the equitable sharing of the accruing benefits
- b) Work to achieve and maintain a tree cover of at least ten per cent of the land area of Kenya
- c) Encourage public participation in the management, protection and conservation of the environment;

In addition to the constitution, Kenya's national development plans and priorities are captured collectively under Vision 2030 which is the country's development blueprint. The Vision aims at making the country an industrialized middle-income nation, providing high quality of life for all citizens. It aims at ensuring a clean, secure and sustainable environment by 2030. In particular, Vision 2030 aims at increasing forest cover and promoting clean and healthy environment for every citizen. The vision also aims at improving the country's capacity for adapting to global climatic change and harmonization of environmental laws for improved environmental planning and governance. Management of natural resources such as forests,

freshwater sources and rangelands as well as improvement of livelihoods cut across components of the social pillar and are activities realizable under GEF 7 project.

The proposed GEF 7 project is also strongly linked to the Environmental Management and Coordination (Amendment) Act, 2015 which is the framework law for environmental management in the country. The Act addresses the environmental concerns and safeguards against degradation within various ecosystems discussed in the GEF 7 project. It also emphasizes participation by stakeholders in the development and implementation of policies, plans and processes for the management of the environment. The implementation of the GEF 7 project in the three areas will take into account various provisions of the EMCA such as Environmental Impact Assessments and Audits especially when developing facilities that require infrastructure such as ecotourism sites.

The project will address issues related to forests which are important in addressing climate change and building strong resilience. This will be best demonstrated in Shimoni-Vanga seascape and Lake Bogoria landscape by bringing on board provisions of the Forest Policy (2020), Forest Conservation and Management Act, 2016 and National Forest Programme 2016-2030. These instruments provide the legal framework for the management of forest resources in the country. The Act provides for the establishment, development, sustainable management, utilization as well as conservation of forest resources for the socio-economic development of the country and environmental sustainability through the KFS.

Some of the GEF 7 project initiatives will be implemented in wildlife conservation and management areas. Activities implemented in this area will be guided by the National Wildlife Conservation and Management Act 2013 and draft policy on wildlife which govern conservation of wildlife within and outside protected areas. The policy supports community initiatives towards conservation and plays an advisory role to the local communities by providing regulations that enable the generation of optimum returns from wildlife.

The Government has identified agriculture as an important vehicle for realization of its food sufficiency and employment creation objectives. The Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Authority (AFFA) Act No. 13, 2013 provides for improved farming practices (development, preservation and utilization of agricultural land), outlines good practices in agriculture and fisheries, soil and water conservation on agricultural land, protection against degradation, protection of water catchment areas and preservation of soil and its fertility. The Act also provide for establishment of cooperatives for farmers or similar organizations to support production and marketing of agricultural produce. These relate well with activities that will be supported in GEF 7 on land preservation, productivity, resilience and market access and linkages.

The GEF 7 project resonates well with some provisions of the Water Act, 2016. This legislation lays out a mechanism for development of a national water resources management strategy, for the protection, management, use, development, conservation and control of water resources and water sources. The strategy devolves the authority over the conservation of water catchment areas to local stakeholders to manage them in collaboration with Water Resources Authority (WRA) and Water Resource Users Associations (WRUAs) established under the Act. A landscape such as Lake Bogoria will greatly benefit from this law as will Ewaso Nyiro river, which is critical for survival of SICA.

The proposed project aligns well with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry Strategic Plan 2018-2022. The GEF 7 project will contribute towards the following strategic objectives: (i) protect and manage the

environment for sustainable development and posterity; (ii) protect and restore forest ecosystem for the benefit of the present and future generation, (iii) increase forest and tree cover to enhance social-economic benefits of the Kenyan people and healthy environment, (iv) to create enabling environment for good governance in environment and natural resources management, and (v) enhance climate change resilience and low emission development pathway in all economic sectors for sustainable development and posterity. The project will also contribute to the aspirations of other related policies, plans and programmes related to forestry such as Kenya Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) Implementation Action Plan 2021-2025, National Strategy for Achieving and Maintaining over 10% tree cover by 2022 and Kenya's commitment to the Bonn Challenge and Africa Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative 100 (AFR100) of restoring 5.1 million hectares of deforested and degraded land by 2030.

In the biodiversity focal area, the project responds to the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). In the next four years the project will focus on assisting communities to contribute to the first three goals of the NBSAP which are (i) maintaining a high quality environment for sustainable livelihoods for all Kenyans; (ii) guaranteeing inter and intra-generational sustainable use of natural resources; and (iii) maintaining ecological and ecosystem processes. The new National Oceans and Fisheries Policy (2008), the Africa Blue Economy Strategy 2019, National Mangrove Forest Management Plan 2015-2025 and Kenya Wildlife Service's regulations related to marine protected areas provide the framework for SGP's interventions in coastal and marine areas. Kenya is in the process of developing a Blue Economy policy and strategy and national marine spatial plan which will involve the Shimoni-Vanga seascape.

Beyond the national level, achievement of the project objectives will be aligned to the aspirations of the global 2030 goals (Sustainable Development Goals). GEF SGP 7 will align with the Decade of Action declared by world leaders at the SDG Summit in September 2019 which called for action and delivery for sustainable development, and pledged to mobilize financing, enhance national implementation and strengthen institutions to achieve the Goals by the target date of 2030, leaving no one behind. The project will address the following SDGs:

Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere

Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture

Goal 7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all

Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns

Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts (taking note of agreements made by the UNFCCC forum)

Goal 14: Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development

Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification and halt and reverse land degradation, and halt biodiversity loss

One of the major challenges facing the management of resources at the coast is sectoral governance system that does not recognize the interconnectedness of ecosystems in resource management. Consequently, the

sectoral approach to development planning and management, combined with population pressure and the intensity and complexity of human activities have resulted into resource use conflicts and adverse socio-economic and environmental effects. The Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) Action Plan for Kenya, 2019-2023 have identified various measures and strategies for implementation to reverse environmental degradation and promote sustainable utilization of coastal and marine resources. The GEF 7 project aligns to this policy and action plan as it will be implemented in mangrove areas in Shimoni-Vanga thus support implementation of the ICZM Policy and Action Plan.

Natural resources such as forests, wetlands and grasslands have increasingly been highlighted for their significant role in climate change mitigation. Forests, for example, play a major role in carbon cycling and serve as a major carbon sink that accounts for 60 percent of carbon storage on land. The National Climate Change Response Strategy (NCCRS) provides a framework for re-orienting national programmes towards a low carbon development pathway. The Strategy aims at a climate-proof socio-economic development anchored on a low-carbon path. The forestry sector has been highlighted as a major vehicle in addressing this goal. Mangrove forests store up to 5 times more carbon than many tropical terrestrial forests. Most carbon in mangroves is stored as large pools of soil carbon and within roots below-ground. Conservation of mangroves through this GEF 7 project can both reduce emissions and facilitate carbon sequestration with an added advantage of the development of the growing carbon markets.

The GEF project will contribute to the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) which has the vision of enhancing climate resilience towards the attainment of Vision 2030. The NAP has five objectives all of which will complement the objectives of the SGP-07 project:

- ? Highlight the importance of adaptation and resilience building actions in development
- ? Integrate climate change adaptation into national and county level development planning and budgeting processes
- ? Enhance the resilience of public and private sector investment in the national transformation, economic and social and pillars of Vision 2030 to climate shocks
- ? Enhance synergies between adaptation and mitigation actions in order to attain a low carbon climate resilient economy
- ? Enhance resilience of vulnerable populations to climate shocks through adaptation and disaster risk reduction strategies

The NAP focuses on developing mechanisms for enhanced resilience in agricultural and livestock value chains which are in line with GEF 7 project outputs of enhanced resilience for productive landscapes and seascapes. In the short-terms (during the life of the GEF 7 project), the NAP aims at increasing awareness on climate change impacts on agriculture and livestock value chains, support capacity building in indigenous knowledge and crops, support climate risk and vulnerability assessments, promote climate change adaptation and strengthen land use management systems. These are in line with aspirations of GEF 7 project.

Another national policy this project contributes to is the Policy on Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs). This policy was adopted in line with provision in the Constitution of Kenya. Adoption of the ASAL Policy marks an important milestone in the institutionalization of appropriate policy responses to the marginalization and underdevelopment of the ASALs. The ASAL Policy covers nearly 90% of Kenya's land mass and are home to nearly 30% of its population. In addition, they hold approximately 70% of the national livestock herd and are the location of most of the country's national parks, which support its thriving wildlife tourism. To improve the enabling environment for development in the ASALs, the policy proposes interventions in infrastructure, human capacity, and security and the rule of law. The goal of the policy is to facilitate and fast-track sustainable development in Northern Kenya and other arid lands by increasing investment in the region and ensuring that the use of those resources is fully reconciled with the realities of people's lives. This is to be realized through 4 objectives:

- ? To strengthen the integration of Northern Kenya and other arid lands with the rest of the country and mobilize the resources necessary to ensure equity and realize the region's potential.
- ? To improve the enabling environment for development in Northern Kenya and other arid lands by establishing the necessary foundations for development
- ? To develop alternative approaches to service delivery, governance and public administration which accommodate the specific realities of Northern Kenya and pastoral areas
- ? To strengthen the climate resilience of communities in the ASALs and ensure sustainable livelihoods

The goal and objectives align to the aspirations of this project as they focus on development in the SICA in northern Kenya rangelands and Lake Baringo in the rift valley lakes system through integration while addressing issues of governance, public administration and climate resilience of ASAL communities and their sustainable livelihoods.

[8] https://whatworks.co.ke/chc_projects/nawiri-consortium-development-food-security-activity-dfsa/

[9] <https://vision2030.go.ke/publication/kenya-vision-2030-popular-version>

[10] Government of Kenya (2019), Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) Action Plan for Kenya, 2019-2023. NEMA, Nairobi

8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, including a budget, key deliverables and a timeline, and explain how it will contribute to the project's overall impact.

Each SGP grant project is designed to produce: global environmental and local sustainable development benefits (impacts); organizational capacities (technical, analytical, administrative etc.) from learning by doing; and knowledge from evaluation of the innovation experience.

Knowledge Management is crucial to SGP as it supports wider adoption of the innovative solutions in its portfolio at national and global levels. The SGP project will incorporate training and capacity building components to improve the capacities and skills of CSOs and communities, and ensure that lessons learned and knowledge gleaned from activities are disseminated appropriately to relevant audiences.

All SGP-supported projects will integrate knowledge management as an important component. At the portfolio level, SGP provides support through strategic training on key areas for successful implementation through stakeholder workshops and knowledge dissemination means (such as knowledge fairs and network aggregation of grantee networks). This will be folded into the organizational accompaniment, and within the activities of the multi-stakeholder group.

The objective of the knowledge management portion of the project is to facilitate knowledge transfer, from one community to another, from one CSO to another and to upscale information to policymakers and development practitioners, as well as feed into other project development processes (the successes and best practices). One of the weakness of previous phases of the SGP is that lessons learned were not centralized or captured in ways that are easily accessible by other stakeholders. This phase of the project will ensure that the repository of lessons learned is collected in an accessible manner and fed back into local government structures. It is encouraged that cross-landscape relationships are fostered for peer learning opportunities and sharing of best practices. Collaboration with academic institutions will also be sought for technical expertise and puts.

There will be several levels of knowledge management under this project:

- ? Technical inputs for grantees
- ? Lessons learned from project-supported initiatives
- ? Data/research for policy development
- ? Case studies for future development initiatives
- ? Awareness-raising for broader audiences
- ? Public engagement strategy

The lessons learned and best practices will be disseminated through the SGP National Steering Committee, strategic partnerships and their networks, Learning Hubs and globally through the SGP global network of SGP Country Programs and UNDP's knowledge management system. At the global level, the SGP innovation library will continue to be updated with knowledge products from the experience of the SGP Upgrading Country Program.

SGP will use several strategies to ensure knowledge exchange and networking of its grantees and partners, such as:

- ? Strengthening grantee networks
- ? Connecting grantees with capacitated NGOs
- ? Promoting peer to peer exchanges

- ? Providing training on communication and audience identification
- ? Connecting NGOs and CSOs with government agencies, extension services, County Governments, academic institutions, cooperatives, private sector partners and other relevant partners
- ? Establishing a website with a list of grantees and their activities to promote exposure and partnerships
- ? Codifying guides, fact sheets, reports, in a usable way
- ? Promoting South-South partnerships, when relevant
- ? Identifying private sector champions that can play a key role in disseminating information in corporate circles; organizing marketplace sessions among grantees and identified private sector players
- ? Ensuring that information and knowledge shared for replication and upscaling is accessible to both women and men equally
- ? Using appropriate languages and technologies for selected audiences

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

Describe the budgeted M and E plan

The project results, corresponding indicators and mid-term and end-of-project targets in the project results framework will be monitored annually and evaluated periodically during project implementation. If baseline data for some of the results indicators is not yet available, it will be collected during the first year of project implementation. The Monitoring Plan included in Annex 3 details the roles, responsibilities, and frequency of monitoring project results.

Project-level monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken in compliance with UNDP requirements as outlined in the [UNDP POPP](#) and [UNDP Evaluation Policy](#). The UNDP Country Office is responsible for ensuring full compliance with all UNDP project monitoring, quality assurance, risk management, and evaluation requirements.

Additional mandatory GEF-specific M&E requirements will be undertaken in accordance with the [GEF Monitoring Policy](#) and the [GEF Evaluation Policy](#) and other [relevant GEF policies](#). The costed M&E plan included below, and the Monitoring plan in Annex 3, will guide the GEF-specific M&E activities to be undertaken by this project.

In addition to these mandatory UNDP and GEF M&E requirements, other M&E activities deemed necessary to support project-level adaptive management will be agreed during the Project Inception Workshop and will be detailed in the Inception Report.

Additional GEF monitoring and reporting requirements:

Inception Workshop and Report: A project inception workshop will be held within 60 days of project CEO endorsement, with the aim to:

- a. Familiarize key stakeholders with the detailed project strategy and discuss any changes that may have taken place in the overall context since the project idea was initially conceptualized that may influence its strategy and implementation.
- b. Discuss the roles and responsibilities of the project team, including reporting lines, stakeholder engagement strategies and conflict resolution mechanisms.
- c. Review the results framework and monitoring plan.
- d. Discuss reporting, monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities and finalize the M&E budget; identify national/regional institutes to be involved in project-level M&E; discuss the role of the GEF OFP and other stakeholders in project-level M&E.
- e. Update and review responsibilities for monitoring project strategies, including the risk log; SESP report, Social and Environmental Management Framework and other safeguard requirements; project grievance mechanisms; gender strategy; knowledge management strategy, and other relevant management strategies.
- f. Review financial reporting procedures and budget monitoring and other mandatory requirements and agree on the arrangements for the annual audit.
- g. Plan and schedule Project Board meetings and finalize the first-year annual work plan.
- h. Formally launch the Project.

GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR):

The annual GEF PIR covering the reporting period July (previous year) to June (current year) will be completed for each year of project implementation. Any environmental and social risks and related management plans will be monitored regularly, and progress will be reported in the PIR. The PIR submitted to the GEF will be shared with the Project Board. The quality rating of the previous year's PIR will be used to inform the preparation of the subsequent PIR.

GEF Core Indicators:

The GEF Core indicators included as Annex 13, will be used to monitor global environmental benefits and will be updated for reporting to the GEF prior to MTR and TE. Note that the project team is responsible for updating the indicator status. The updated monitoring data should be shared with MTR/TE consultants prior to required evaluation missions, so these can be used for subsequent groundtruthing. The methodologies to be used in data collection have been defined by the GEF and are available on the [GEF website](#).

Independent Mid-term Review (MTR):

The terms of reference, the review process and the final MTR report will follow the standard templates and guidance for GEF-financed projects available on the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Center](#) (ERC).

The evaluation will be 'independent, impartial and rigorous'. The evaluators that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing,

executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. Equally, the evaluators should not be in a position where there may be the possibility of future contracts regarding the project under review.

The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be actively involved and consulted during the evaluation process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the BPPS/GEF Directorate.

The final MTR report and MTR TOR will be publicly available in English and will be posted on the UNDP ERC by March 2023 management response to MTR recommendations will be posted in the ERC within six weeks of the MTR report's completion.

Terminal Evaluation (TE):

An independent terminal evaluation (TE) will take place upon completion of all major project outputs and activities. The terms of reference, the evaluation process and the final TE report will follow the standard templates and guidance for GEF-financed projects available on the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Center](#).

The evaluation will be independent, impartial and rigorous. The evaluators that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. Equally, the evaluators should not be in a position where there may be the possibility of future contracts regarding the project being evaluated.

The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be actively involved and consulted during the terminal evaluation process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the BPPS/GEF Directorate.

The final TE report and TE TOR will be publicly available in English and posted on the UNDP ERC by *(add date included on cover page of this project document)*. A management response to the TE recommendations will be posted to the ERC within six weeks of the TE report's completion.

Final Report:

The project's terminal GEF PIR along with the terminal evaluation (TE) report and corresponding management response will serve as the final project report package. The final project report package shall be discussed with the Project Board during an end-of-project review meeting to discuss lesson learned and opportunities for scaling up.

Agreement on intellectual property rights and use of logo on the project's deliverables and disclosure of information: To accord proper acknowledgement to the GEF for providing grant funding, the GEF logo will appear together with the UNDP logo on all promotional materials, other written materials like publications developed by the project, and project hardware. Any citation on publications regarding projects funded by the GEF will also accord proper acknowledgement to the GEF. Information will be disclosed in accordance with relevant policies notably the UNDP Disclosure Policy and the GEF policy on public involvement¹³.

GEF M&E requirements	Indicative costs (US\$)	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Terminal Workshop	5,000	Within 60 days of CEO endorsement of this project.
Inception Report	None	Within 90 days of CEO endorsement of this project.
M&E of GEF core indicators and project results framework	40,000	Reported annually and at mid-point and closure; on-going review.
GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	0	Annually typically between June-August
Social Safeguards	40,000	Conducted on onset of project and on-going review.
Supervision missions	0	Annually
Contract evaluator to conduct Independent Mid-term Review (MTR)	24,000	Mid-term
Contract evaluator to conduct Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE)	26,000	Three months before operational closure
<i>Total Indicative Cost:</i>	135,000	

[11] See https://www.thegef.org/gef/policies_guidelines

[12] See http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/transparency/information_disclosurepolicy/

[13] See https://www.thegef.org/gef/policies_guidelines

[14] Includes cost of travel for evaluators (USD 4,000 for travel)

[15] Includes cost of travel for evaluators (USD 4,000 for travel)

[16] M&E makes up 5% of total budget

10. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels, as appropriate. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

SGP Kenya will address the root causes of biodiversity loss in selected landscapes, and in so doing, anticipates several benefits to landscapes as well as the country at large. These include:

? ***Improved biodiversity values-*** Through biodiversity-friendly agriculture, conservation practices, restoration and improved use of biological resources, reforestation of native, climate-resilient species, there is the expectation that biodiversity values will improve in the landscape and seascapes identified by the project.

? ***Improved synergies and opportunities of joint learning between civil society, government and the private sector-*** during the PPG, it became apparent that there is great opportunity and interest in aligning some of the local government planning tools, with the execution and activities from CSOs and smaller community groups. This project anticipates increasing collaborations and leveraging government capacity with local level expertise to achieve impacts at a larger scale.

? ***Improved socioeconomic circumstances/strengthened livelihoods-*** Many small community groups do not often have the luxury of start-up capital to initiate sustainable enterprises into operation. The SGP approach will allow some of these groups to enhance their production, distribution of their biodiversity-friendly products and support their socioeconomic conditions. SGP funds will also strengthen civil society organizations that are working to enhance social conditions for the most poverty-stricken. The project will also test and pilot innovative technologies that could decrease labor, support more efficient production and improve peoples' quality of life.

? ***Resilient agriculture and food security-*** The focus on agroecology and sustainable agriculture is to have food production that makes best use of natural resources without destroying said resources, so that there can be long-term supply and sustainable use. The project will seek to support CSOs to have lower cost of inputs, and create a farm ecosystem that is more resilient to climate change and vacillations in rainfall. Additional project interventions that serve to improve the collection and use of water resources will also assist in ensuring successful production and a decrease in food insecurity.

? ***Strengthening civic culture-*** The project's landscape approach seeks to aggregate the actions of individual groups and communities, with the common objective of having a beneficial impact on the landscape as a whole. This will involve engagement, participation, the collaboration of many, and is anticipated to enhance civic culture and foster trust. Groups that have not worked together yet will have the opportunity to work together; people will learn about successful initiatives carried out, and it is expected

that the civil society community, as well as its collaboration with government, academia and the private sector, will be improved.

? **Upscaling women's achievements and creating opportunities for youth**- This SGP project was designed to support women to overcome the barriers that they face, and provide them opportunities for partnership and leadership. The project also will seek to increase youth participation and ownership in sustainability measures so as to make sure that knowledge is transmitted to the young.

? **Benefits for Indigenous Peoples (IP)**- The project seeks to support Indigenous communities that use a communal way of governing natural resources. Lessons learned from these communities will be upscaled, innovations that they wish to test will be supported. The project will also support advocacy and communications interventions to maintain the protection from these lands. In particular, indigenous knowledge on resilient food production will be upscaled, and opportunities for IP leadership in the multi-stakeholder platforms will be sought.

Accompaniment- Many civil society groups and organizations have specialized talents and expertise, but may not have the organizational or administrative capacities. SGP Kenya will support these entities to strengthen their organizational capacities so that they may be more financially resilient, more adept administratively and can leverage funds from other donors in the future.

11. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks

Provide information on the identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project/program based on your organization's ESS systems and procedures

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification *

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
Medium/Moderate			

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Elaborate on the types and risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and impacts (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and any measures undertaken as well as planned management measures to address these risks during implementation.

<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Impact and Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design.</i>
--------------------------------	--	--	------------------------	---

<p>Risk 1: Project may potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender</p>	<p>P = 2 I = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Women play a major role in family-based agriculture. However, they are under-represented in decision-making bodies, due to long-standing social and cultural norms.</p>	<p>The project conducted consultations with women in every target landscape and was able to identify avenues to increase women's participation in leadership activities. A Gender Action Plan has been designed to reflect these opportunities. Specifically, the project has established targets to include participation and representation.</p> <p>The project seeks to promote women's socially-based enterprises, which will support their economic opportunities and livelihoods. SGP allows them to test sustainable activities that they would ordinarily not be able to, providing the opportunity to see what is viable and establish the networks as needed.</p> <p>The small grants process will also require that all community proposals include gender considerations. These will be followed up with country project management team to ensure that gender-based support is provided to smaller CSOs which may not be capacitated in this regard.</p> <p>A gender-responsive approach was undertaken during project design to identify gender risks and design a gender action plan especially in times of Covid-19. These are supported by a comprehensive gender analysis to assess relevant gender dynamics and inequalities with attention to the differences across diverse groups of beneficiaries. The gender action plan and strategy takes into account representation of marginalized women, and is designed to mitigate risks of</p>
--	------------------------	------------------------	--	---

<p>Risk 2: Poor site selection within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, such as public protected areas and private reserves may enable harvesting of natural resources and forests, plantation development or reforestation.</p>	<p>P = 2 I = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Due to the fact that the target landscapes include areas of importance to biodiversity, some projects are likely to take place within or adjacent to critical habitats or sensitive areas such as parks, wetlands and other key biodiversity areas.</p>	<p>Part of the selection process for small grants involves screening out projects that have potential for negative environmental impacts. The projects proposed under this project are by design to mitigate and reverse the impacts of environmental degradation. The process of establishing multi-stakeholder platforms is to mainstream the need for landscape resilience with other stakeholders that may not otherwise be carrying out sustainable activities. The project is purposefully linked to sites that are vulnerable, so as to build their resilience. This includes vulnerable wetlands, mangroves forests, corridors for wildlife.</p>
				<p>Biodiversity conservation-related community grants will be primarily carried out in partnership with expert organizations, e.g., conservation agencies, protected area management administrations. Specific activities will be designed through collaborative arrangements with these organizations. Utilization of natural resources, e.g., within buffer zones, will be carried out sustainably and according to relevant regulations. Restoration/rehabilitation activities will be carried out in accordance with management plans developed through participatory processes. No invasive alien species will be used; as per GEF guidelines, preference will be given to native species. And project interventions will not entail logging of primary forests or other areas of high conservation value. Further, the project will only be supporting indigenous/resilient crops, restoration efforts as per GEF-biodiversity</p>

<p>Risk 3: Potential outcomes of the Project are sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change, including extreme climatic conditions, leading to increased vulnerability to subsidence, landslides, erosion, or flooding, which may affect community-based conservation and sustainable production initiatives and undermine efforts to arrest biodiversity loss and land degradation.</p>	<p>P = 3 I = 3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Coastal ecosystems and communities as well as the northern rangelands are highly vulnerable to the vagaries of the weather and human induced climate change.</p> <p>Extreme and frequent weather events associated with climate change such as floods, droughts are prevalent in the landscapes. These will exacerbate degradation, biodiversity loss as well as affect livelihoods and thus likely to affect community based conservation efforts under the project.</p>	<p>A climate assessment has been carried out during project design to account for current climate risks, adaptation and mitigation potential of the project, in all the landscapes/seascape. As part of the project design and implementation, climate change adaptation and resilience has been mainstreamed across key project intervention areas. The project is expected to yield direct and indirect climate change benefits across the landscapes. The risk of climate change is one of several reasons that the project has chosen to emphasize landscape-level management and coordination in productive landscapes. The project will promote a variety of adaptive biodiversity and land resource planning and management actions in forests, pastures and other agroecosystems. The project aims to foster a greater understanding and capacity building of the links between biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services and climate change to resilience socioeconomic development at a local level. The project team together with project partners will monitor closely climatic conditions in order to identify emerging threats. Small grant projects usually provide for contingencies within their budgets to better adapt to potential events.</p> <p>CBOs will be required to include an assessment in the project proposal documents on the risks of climate and geophysical hazards on proposed infrastructure and assets, and describe what measures are proposed to reduce and manage the risks. Moreover, the design and implementation of project interventions will be guided by the Programme</p>
--	------------------------	------------------------	--	---

<p>Risk 4: The Project may potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous communities present in the project area</p>	<p>P=2 I=3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>Moderate risk due to potential impacts on indigenous rights, lands, territories and traditional livelihoods</p>	<p>As part of project preparation, consistency of activities with indigenous peoples' standards were ensured as indigenous communities will design and carry out their own activities during project implementation.</p> <p>Consultations were carried out with indigenous community leaders during the PPG phase. Furthermore, prior to the selection of project proposals from Indigenous Peoples, a Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) assessment will be carried out to ensure that human, environmental, land and customary rights are respected and safeguarded within the potentially affected communities and that inclusive decision-making processes are upheld to guarantee the equal consideration of the various perspectives held within them. Recording or otherwise documenting traditional knowledge held by indigenous peoples populations will only be made upon free, prior and informed consent (FPIC).</p> <p>The National Steering Committee has demonstrated that indigenous people's rights, livelihood, culture and resources are fundamental concerns when assessing grant project proposals for approval for financing. Indigenous groups have benefited from SGP grants in the past, and the SGP process will continue to include indigenous groups in multi-stakeholder platforms, consultation groups and the NSC to give them a voice in the direction of SGP.</p> <p>The multi-stakeholder platforms that will be established in the landscapes</p>
--	--------------------	------------------------	--	---

<p>Risk 5: Possible extension of the COVID-19 pandemic, as a result of eventual uncontrolled outbreaks, that may delay project implementation, affect the health of the beneficiaries, limit the areas in which the project can be implemented, limit face-to-face consultations among stakeholders and further exacerbate conditions of marginalized people who have limited access to resources and technology.</p>	<p>P=3 I=3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>COVID threats are uncertain during the project design and can have long-lasting impacts on people's health, security, safety and economic conditions. While much of the pandemic is concentrated around the national capital and larger cities, there is always the chance that it could spread to more remote regions where there are less health facilities available.</p> <p>Given the characteristics of the pandemic both at a global and national level, it is not known yet when this disease will stop being a risk for humanity. It is likely that - at least in 2021 - some restrictions will still be applied to prevent pandemic outbreaks.</p>	<p>Due to the uncertain spread of the pandemic, risk mitigation procedures will be developed to address possible operational delays or pauses on an ongoing basis, to follow the latest guidance and advisories. Increased communication will be considered when consulting with local beneficiaries regarding possible impacts, and site-specific protocols will be followed. Changes in the scope or timing of planned activities may be necessary through workplan adjustments. The program, in close coordination with the local population, grantees and the SGP NSC, will consider the specific situation of each project in order to consider a flexible approach to the execution of some activities, such as established schedules? and workplans? deadlines.</p> <p>The UNDP office has established specific rules for participation and requires Project staff to have special permits for field visits. Due to the rapid spread of the pandemic, risk mitigation procedures will be developed to address potential operational delays or pauses on an ongoing basis, in order to follow the latest guidelines and warnings. The frequency of communication will be increased with local beneficiaries to ensure an ongoing presence and support; moreover, site-specific protocols related to potential impacts will be applied.</p> <p>To make up for possible delays due to the impossibility for SGP staff to visit the field, communication will be maintained through virtual means (WhatsApp, Skype, Zoom, etc.). The communication strategy</p>
---	--------------------	------------------------	--	--

<p>Risk 6: The project could potentially affect the cultural heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices.</p>	<p>P=3 I=3</p>	<p>Moderate</p>	<p>The SGP may support initiatives which seek to celebrate cultural handicrafts, cultural practices or attract eco-tourist activities, including those to cultural heritage sites.</p>	<p>All eco-tourism activities will have to demonstrate how they improve the status quo in terms of climate change adaption/mitigation, biodiversity protection and/or land degradation. Further, those activities will be assessed according to resilience indicators during the landscape assessments planned when the project starts the implementation phase. The Steering Committee will ensure that sustainability standards in eco-tourism (e.g. those produced by USAID) are adhered to. These considerations will have to be included in the grant proposals and will also go through a process of internal review, through landscape multi-stakeholder groups which include county representatives.</p> <p>The FPIC process will also ensure ongoing consideration of indigenous resources and ensuring that there is no appropriation of cultural practices and resources. Recording or otherwise documenting traditional knowledge held by indigenous peoples populations will only be made upon free, prior and informed consent (FPIC).</p>
---	--------------------	------------------------	--	--

Risk 7: The project involves support for employment or livelihoods that may fail to comply with national and international labor standards (i.e. principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions)	P=2 I=4	Moderate	There is the possibility that CSOs which manage their grants, may use funds to finance employment/livelihood activities that do not meet national and international labour standards (particularly for positions of watchmen, or security guards).	<p>The project does not finance any employment other than that of project staff or consultancies, and these will meet international labour standards.</p> <p>In order to ensure that proper livelihood standards are met, grant applications will have to detail what type of activities will be carried out, and provide clarity on the kind of compensation/costs associated with the tasks, to ensure that sub-standard pay or activities are not carried out. The grant review teams will diligently assess each application, and spot checks by the project management team will further reinforce standards and ensure that poor practices are not being carried out. These will be further reviewed during yearly PIRs and the midterm evaluation. The SGP team will also provide best practices and guidance when issuing calls for proposals.</p>
---	------------	-----------------	--	--

Supporting Documents

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title	Module	Submitted
PIMS 6448-Annex 5-SESP	CEO Endorsement ESS	

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Please see Section V. of the attached UNDP Project document

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

The following table provides responses to specific questions provided by GEF Council members at PIF stage.

Response to Comments

Comments Received	Comments Addressed
Germany asks that a section on the projects overall theory of change is included in the project that explicitly refers to lessons learned from the prior implementation phase. Given that after 2.5 years of project implementation under GEF-6, the capacity of local communities is not yet sufficiently enhanced, an improved sustainability strategy is required.	The point is well-noted and a detailed theory of change is included in the project document. The incremental cost reasoning table in the CEO Endorsement also further elaborates on how SGP-07 will build on SGP-06; what changes will be made, and what activities will be upscaled. As the Mid-Term Evaluation of SGP-06 notes, there have been numerous successes?the key is to upscale these, mainstream them further, and address the threats that have become more apparent during implementation, including that of COVID-19. Further, this phase will involve expansion into new sites that were not addressed by previous phases.
Germany would like to request to question and document the assumptions under barrier 1. Here, it is stated that local stakeholders may believe that sustainable practices are more expensive, generate lower yields and are inaccessible. This is described as a lack of know how. Further information on the source of this assumption, and potential mitigation measures is required. If possible, a participatory problem analysis should be undertaken.	This text has been removed as it was unsubstantiated during the PPG. The following text has been added to the description on the barrier: ?The project will thus invest in livelihoods to incentivize sustainable interventions and provide pilots and demonstrations on low-cost sustainable interventions.?

<p>Furthermore, it is described that Multi Stakeholder Platforms are not yet operational. Germany requests elaboration as to why this is the case and how this will be addressed in the project. Furthermore, Germany requests taking into account the context specificity of case studies under outcome 2.2 and would like to suggest revisiting the idea of simple replication.</p>	<p>The multi-stakeholder platforms have been initiated and are operational under SGP-06 in Shimoni-Vanga and Lake Bogoria sites. They have attracted effective participation from stakeholders. They require support to attract more stakeholders to upscale impact, and include a larger geographic area under SGP-07, as well as to further clarify roles and responsibilities. In this phase, the project will focus on formalizing some of these arrangements through MOUs, thematic based-sub-committees, and providing custody to key documents, case studies and findings, as well as the Baseline Assessment and Adaptive Landscape Strategy, so that these have ownership beyond the project duration and are housed institutionally without project support.</p> <p>This phase will also support multi-stakeholder networks to address the socio-economic and environmental challenges posed by COVID-19, and support community organizations to convene around shared sustainability agenda despite these challenges.</p> <p>As SICA is a new project site, it does not yet have such a multi-stakeholder platform. This will be piloted under SGP-07, while taking lessons drawn from SGP-06 and other sites.</p>
---	---

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG).
(Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 84,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Component A: Preparatory Technical Studies & Reviews	2,500	2,500	-
Component B: Formulation of the UNDP-GEF Project Document, CEO Endorsement Request, and Mandatory and Project Specific Annexes	42,500	53,290.45	-
Component C: Validation Workshop and Report	39,000	3,823.85	24,385.70
Total	84,000	59,614.30	24,385.70

ANNEX D: Project Map(s) and Coordinates

Please attach the geographical location of the project area, if possible.


Please see detailed maps of each landscape in Annex 1 of the Project Document.

Table: Central coordinates of the Target landscapes in Kenya

Region	County	Intervention Landscape Name	Midpoint geocoordinates	
			Latitude	Longitude
Marine ecosystem of Southern Kenya	Kwale	Shimoni-Vanga seascape	-3.529357	39.51384
Kenya Lakes System in the Great Rift Valley	Baringo	Lake Bogoria landscape	0.24054	36.24215
The arid rangelands of northern Kenya	Samburu and Isiolo	Samburu-Isiolo conservation areas (SICA)	0.631352	37.664723

Annex A

PROGRAM/PROJECT MAP



ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Annex 1: GEF budget

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)								Total (USD eq.)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1			Component 2		Sub-Total	M & E	PM C		(Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 1.2	Sub-component 1.3	Sub-component 2.1	Sub-component 2.2					
Equipment	A portion of the cost of computers, a printer, a scanner, and a photo-copier. It also includes office stationary, software, and bulk photocopying		500				500			500	UNOPS
Equipment	A portion of the cost of computers, a printer, a scanner, and a photo-copier. It also includes office stationary, software, and bulk photocopying			500			500			500	UNOPS

Equipm ent	A portion of the cost of computers, a printer, a scanner, and a photo- copier. It also includes office stationary, software, and bulk photocopyi ng.				500		500			500	UNOP S
Equipm ent	A portion of the cost of computers, a printer, a scanner, and a photo- copier. It also includes office stationary, software, and bulk photocopyi ng.					500	500			500	UNOP S

Equipment	Rental, operations and maintenance of equipment. This includes maintenance of computers, printer, scanner and photocopier, operations and maintenance of the office vehicle, insurance and fuel for the office vehicle, rental and maintenance of water dispenser and insurance for office furniture and equipment. It will also cater for communications, including internet, telephone, and courier.						-		14,292	14,292	UNOPS
------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--------	--------	-------

Grants	Approximately 44 grants (through a competitive process) to communities to implement biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management projects and strengthening of agricultural value chains. USD 569,519 allocated to projects which enhance ecosystem services and biodiversity within targeted landscapes and seascapes through multi-functional land-use systems. USD 455,085 allocated to projects which strengthen the sustainability of production systems in the target landscapes through integrated agro-ecological practices. USD 480,000 allocated to	569,519					569,519			569,519	UNOPS
--------	---	---------	--	--	--	--	---------	--	--	---------	-------

Grants	Approximately 44 grants (through a competitive process) to communities to implement biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management projects and strengthening of agricultural value chains. USD 569,519 allocated to projects which enhance ecosystem services and biodiversity within targeted landscapes and seascapes through multi-functional land-use systems. USD 455,085 allocated to projects which strengthen the sustainability of production systems in the target landscapes through integrated agro-ecological practices. USD 480,000 allocated to	455,085				455,085			455,085	UNOPS
--------	---	---------	--	--	--	---------	--	--	---------	-------

Grants	Approximately 44 grants (through a competitive process) to communities to implement biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management projects and strengthening of agricultural value chains. USD 569,519 allocated to projects which enhance ecosystem services and biodiversity within targeted landscapes and seascapes through multi-functional land-use systems. USD 455,085 allocated to projects which strengthen the sustainability of production systems in the target landscapes through integrated agro-ecological practices. USD 480,000 allocated to			480,000			480,000			480,000	UNOPS
--------	---	--	--	---------	--	--	---------	--	--	---------	-------

Grants	<p>Grants will be provided to CBOs/NGOs to support multi-stakeholder actions to build resilience. The total of USD 107,092 will be allocated to systematically assessing knowledge from community level engagement and innovative conservation practices and for replication and upscaling across the landscapes, across the county, and to the global SGP network. This will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) strategic grant through a competitive basis (with a maximum of USD 100,000) to be provided to (1) national and strong NGO who will implement knowledge management and communication strategies: 					107,092	107,092			UNOPS
--------	--	--	--	--	--	---------	---------	--	--	-------

<p>Contractual Services ? Individual</p>	<p>Personnel costs allocated to Component 1 are USD 311,640. These include: National Coordinator USD 135,000 (54% of total National Coordinator costs and tasks are allocated to Component 1. The total National Coordinator cost for the whole project are USD 250,000) Programme Assistant USD 80,640 (60% of total Programme Assistant tasks and costs are allocated to Component 1. The total Programme Assistant cost for the whole project are USD 134,400) Technical Assistant in Baringo (UNV) USD 48,000 (60% of total Technical Assistant in Baringo tasks and costs are allocated to Component</p>	<p>103,880</p>					<p>103,880</p>			<p>103,880</p>	<p>UNOPS</p>
---	---	----------------	--	--	--	--	----------------	--	--	----------------	--------------

<p>Contractual Services ? Individual</p>	<p>Personnel costs allocated to Component 1 are USD 311,640. These include: National Coordinator USD 135,000 (54% of total National Coordinator costs and tasks are allocated to Component 1. The total National Coordinator cost for the whole project are USD 250,000) Programme Assistant USD 80,640 (60% of total Programme Assistant tasks and costs are allocated to Component 1. The total Programme Assistant cost for the whole project are USD 134,400) Technical Assistant in Baringo (UNV) USD 48,000 (60% of total Technical Assistant in Baringo tasks and costs are allocated to Component</p>		<p>103,880</p>				<p>103,880</p>			<p>103,880</p>	<p>UNOPS</p>
---	---	--	----------------	--	--	--	----------------	--	--	----------------	--------------

<p>Contractual Services ? Individual</p>	<p>Personnel costs allocated to Component 1 are USD 311,640. These include: National Coordinator USD 135,000 (54% of total National Coordinator costs and tasks are allocated to Component 1. The total National Coordinator cost for the whole project are USD 250,000) Programme Assistant USD 80,640 (60% of total Programme Assistant tasks and costs are allocated to Component 1. The total Programme Assistant cost for the whole project are USD 134,400) Technical Assistant in Baringo (UNV) USD 48,000 (60% of total Technical Assistant in Baringo tasks and costs are allocated to Component</p>			<p>103,880</p>			<p>103,880</p>			<p>103,880</p>	<p>UNOPS</p>
---	---	--	--	----------------	--	--	----------------	--	--	----------------	--------------

<p>Contractual Services ? Individual</p>	<p>Personnel costs allocated to Component 2 are USD 207,760. These include: National Coordinator USD 90,000 (36% of total National Coordinator costs and tasks are allocated to Component 2. The total National Coordinator cost for the whole project are USD 250,000) Programme Assistant USD 53,760 (40% of total Programme Assistant tasks and costs are allocated to Component 2. The total Programme Assistant cost for the whole project are USD 134,400) Technical Assistant in Baringo (UNV) USD 32,000 (40% of total Technical Assistant in Baringo tasks and costs are allocated to Component</p>				<p>103,880</p>		<p>103,880</p>			<p>103,880</p>	<p>UNOPS</p>
---	--	--	--	--	----------------	--	----------------	--	--	----------------	--------------

<p>Contractual Services ? Individual</p>	<p>Personnel costs allocated to Component 2 are USD 207,760. These include: National Coordinator USD 90,000 (36% of total National Coordinator costs and tasks are allocated to Component 2. The total National Coordinator cost for the whole project are USD 250,000) Programme Assistant USD 53,760 (40% of total Programme Assistant tasks and costs are allocated to Component 2. The total Programme Assistant cost for the whole project are USD 134,400) Technical Assistant in Baringo (UNV) USD 32,000 (40% of total Technical Assistant in Baringo tasks and costs are allocated to Component</p>					<p>103,880</p>	<p>103,880</p>			<p>103,880</p>	<p>UNOPS</p>
---	--	--	--	--	--	----------------	----------------	--	--	----------------	--------------

Contractual Services ? Individual	Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist/ Gender Safeguards (UNV) USD 80,000						-	80,000		80,000	UNOPS
Contractual Services ? Individual	National Coordinator salary costs dedicated to PMC USD 25,000.						-		25,000	25,000	UNOPS
Contractual Services ? Company	Contracting independent firm to audit project						-		20,000	20,000	UNOPS
International Consultants	Cost of 2 international consultants for USD 42,000 USD 20,000 for mid-term evaluation USD 22,000 for terminal evaluation						-	42,000		42,000	UNOPS

Local Consultants	Under Component 1, USD 46,000 will be allocated to local consultant costs. This will be for the following consultancies: Consultancy 1 (USD 9,000- for a period of 3 months USD 3,000 per month) and 2 (USD 9,000 for a period of 3 months USD 3,000 per month)- to provide specialized technical support to the SGP secretariat, promoting the delivery of the biodiversity portfolio and generating appropriate indicators to assess progress in biodiversity conservation; development of community-monitoring tools; measuring socio-economic indicators, supporting biodiversity-related interventions and demonstrations	18,000					18,000			18,000	UNOPS
-------------------	--	--------	--	--	--	--	--------	--	--	--------	-------

Local Consultants	Under Component 1, USD 46,000 will be allocated to local consultant costs. This will be for the following consultancies: Consultancy 1 (USD 9,000- for a period of 3 months USD 3,000 per month) and 2 (USD 9,000 for a period of 3 months USD 3,000 per month)- to provide specialized technical support to the SGP secretariat, promoting the delivery of the biodiversity portfolio and generating appropriate indicators to assess progress in biodiversity conservation; development of community-monitoring tools; measuring socio-economic indicators, supporting biodiversity-related interventions and demonstrations	8,000				8,000			8,000	UNOPS
-------------------	--	-------	--	--	--	-------	--	--	-------	-------

Local Consultants	Under Component 1, USD 46,000 will be allocated to local consultant costs. This will be for the following consultancies: Consultancy 1 (USD 9,000- for a period of 3 months USD 3,000 per month) and 2 (USD 9,000 for a period of 3 months USD 3,000 per month)- to provide specialized technical support to the SGP secretariat, promoting the delivery of the biodiversity portfolio and generating appropriate indicators to assess progress in biodiversity conservation; development of community-monitoring tools; measuring socio-economic indicators, supporting biodiversity-related interventions and demonstrations			20,000			20,000			20,000 UNOPS
-------------------	--	--	--	--------	--	--	--------	--	--	--------------

Local Consultants	Under Component 2, USD 15,000 (for a period of 4 months, \$USD 3,750 per month) will be allocated to consultant costs (Consultancy 6) for developing Environmental and Social Management Framework and safeguards strategy.				15,000		15,000			15,000	UNOPS
--------------------------	---	--	--	--	--------	--	--------	--	--	--------	-------

Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Trainings, workshops and conferences to disseminate trainings, host experts, offer peer-training exercises in three landscapes on biodiversity conservation, sustainable agricultural production, sustainable land management and developing sustainable value chains. Costs include travel of small CBOs to demonstration and meeting sites.	8,667					8,667			8,667	UNOPS
---	---	-------	--	--	--	--	-------	--	--	-------	-------

Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Trainings, workshops and conferences to disseminate trainings, host experts, offer peer-training exercises in three landscapes on biodiversity conservation, sustainable agricultural production, sustainable land management and developing sustainable value chains. Costs include travel of small CBOs to demonstration and meeting sites.		10,000				10,000			10,000	UNOPS
---	---	--	--------	--	--	--	--------	--	--	--------	-------

Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Trainings, workshops and conferences to disseminate trainings, host experts, offer peer-training exercises in three landscapes on biodiversity conservation, sustainable agricultural production, sustainable land management and developing sustainable value chains. Costs include travel of small CBOs to demonstration and meeting sites.			21,000			21,000			21,000	UNOPS
---------------------------------------	---	--	--	--------	--	--	--------	--	--	--------	-------

Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Trainings, workshops and conferences to disseminate trainings, host experts, offer peer-training exercises in three landscapes to strengthen multi-stakeholder partnerships to build resilience. Costs include travel of small CBOs to demonstration and meeting sites.				14,500		14,500			14,500	UNOPS
---------------------------------------	---	--	--	--	--------	--	--------	--	--	--------	-------

Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Trainings, workshops and conferences to disseminate trainings, host experts, offer peer-training exercises in three landscapes to strengthen multi-stakeholder partnerships to build resilience. Costs include travel of small CBOs to demonstration and meeting sites.					19,000	19,000			19,000	UNOPS
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Costs for inception and terminal workshops						-	5,000		5,000	UNOPS

Travel	The travel budget related to the following activities: appraisal visits to biodiversity project sites; participation of personnel at workshops and meetings (linked to biodiversity conservation); meetings with potential/current partners to develop/strengthen synergies and to engage in resource mobilization efforts; costs include transport and accommodations.	16,000						16,000			16,000	UNOPS
---------------	---	--------	--	--	--	--	--	--------	--	--	--------	-------

Travel	<p>The travel budget related to the following activities: appraisal visits to biodiversity project sites; participation of personnel at workshops and meetings (linked to biodiversity conservation); meetings with potential/current partners to develop/strengthen synergies and to engage in resource mobilization efforts; costs include transport and accommodations.</p>		17,000				17,000			17,000	UNOPS
---------------	--	--	--------	--	--	--	--------	--	--	--------	-------

Travel	<p>The travel budget related to the following activities: appraisal visits to biodiversity project sites; participation of personnel at workshops and meetings (linked to biodiversity conservation); meetings with potential/current partners to develop/strengthen synergies and to engage in resource mobilization efforts; costs include transport and accommodations.</p>			17,000			17,000			17,000	UNOPS
---------------	--	--	--	--------	--	--	--------	--	--	--------	-------

Travel	<p>The travel budget related to the following activities: appraisal visits to biodiversity project sites; participation of personnel at workshops and meetings (linked to biodiversity conservation); meetings with potential/current partners to develop/strengthen synergies and to engage in resource mobilization efforts; costs include transport and accommodations.</p>				17,000		17,000			17,000	UNOPS
---------------	--	--	--	--	--------	--	--------	--	--	--------	-------

Travel	The travel budget related to the following activities: appraisal visits to biodiversity project sites; participation of personnel at workshops and meetings (linked to biodiversity conservation); meetings with potential/current partners to develop/strengthen synergies and to engage in resource mobilization efforts; costs include transport and accommodations.					11,000	11,000			11,000	UNOPS
Travel	Hire of 2 vehicles and accommodations for (i) for the MTR and the (ii) Terminal Evaluation for 10 days each						-	8,000		8,000	UNOPS

Other Operati ng Costs	Products for outreach, information and knowledge sharing: includes print costs, production of pamphlets and documentat ion, TV/radio shows, film clips, newsletters and fliers. The project will also produce knowledge managemen t products, which highlight best practices and lessons learnt in biodiversity conservatio n and sustainable land managemen t	7,000					7,000			7,000	UNOP S
---------------------------------	--	-------	--	--	--	--	-------	--	--	-------	-----------

Other Operati ng Costs	Products for outreach, information and knowledge sharing: includes print costs, production of pamphlets and documentat ion, TV/radio shows, film clips, newsletters and fliers. The project will also produce knowledge managemen t products, which highlight best practices and lessons learnt in biodiversity conservatio n and sustainable land managemen t		8,000				8,000			8,000	UNOP S
---------------------------------	--	--	-------	--	--	--	-------	--	--	-------	-----------

Other Operati ng Costs	Products for outreach, information and knowledge sharing: includes print costs, production of pamphlets and documentat ion, TV/radio shows, film clips, newsletters and fliers. The project will also produce knowledge managemen t products, which highlight best practices and lessons learnt in biodiversity conservatio n and sustainable land managemen t			7,000			7,000			7,000	UNOP S
---------------------------------	--	--	--	-------	--	--	-------	--	--	-------	-----------

Other Operati ng Costs	Products for outreach, information and knowledge sharing: includes print costs, production of pamphlets and documentat ion, TV/radio shows, film clips, newsletters and fliers. The project will also produce knowledge managemen t products, which highlight best practices and lessons learnt in biodiversity conservatio n and sustainable land managemen t				13,500		13,500			13,500	UNOPS
---------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--------	--	--------	--	--	--------	-------

Other Operating Costs	Products for outreach, information and knowledge sharing: includes print costs, production of pamphlets and documentation, TV/radio shows, film clips, newsletters and fliers. The project will also produce knowledge management products, which highlight best practices and lessons learnt in biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management					13,500	13,500			13,500	UNOPS
Other Operating Costs	Expenses related to rented office space currently occupied by the SGP secretariat.						-		67,171	67,171	UNOPS
Grand Total		723,066	602,465	649,380	164,380	254,972	2,394,263	135,000	126,463	2,655,726	

ANNEX F: (For NGI only) Termsheet

Instructions. Please submit an finalized termsheet in this section. The NGI Program Call for Proposals provided a template in Annex A of the Call for Proposals that can be used by the Agency. Agencies can use their own termsheets but must add sections on Currency Risk, Co-financing Ratio and Financial Additionality as defined in the template provided in Annex A of the Call for proposals. Termsheets submitted at CEO endorsement stage should include final terms and conditions of the financing.

ANNEX G: (For NGI only) Reflows

Instructions. Please submit a reflows table as provided in Annex B of the NGI Program Call for Proposals and the Trustee excel sheet for reflows (as provided by the Secretariat or the Trustee) in the Document Section of the CEO endorsement. The Agency is required to quantify any expected financial return/gains/interests earned on non-grant instruments that will be transferred to the GEF Trust Fund as noted in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy. Partner Agencies will be required to comply with the reflows procedures established in their respective Financial Procedures Agreement with the GEF Trustee. Agencies are welcomed to provide assumptions that explain expected financial reflow schedules.

ANNEX H: (For NGI only) Agency Capacity to generate reflows

Instructions. The GEF Agency submitting the CEO endorsement request is required to respond to any questions raised as part of the PIF review process that required clarifications on the Agency Capacity to manage reflows. This Annex seeks to demonstrate Agencies' capacity and eligibility to administer NGI resources as established in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy, GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01, June 9, 2017 (Annex 5).