

## MID-TERM REVIEW

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| Project ID:          | 10359  |
| Project Name:        | Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Kenya |
| Countr(ies):         | Kenya  |
| Implementing Agency: | UNDP   |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. OVERVIEW .....3**

**A. Description .....3**

**B. Key Dates .....3**

**II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES .....3**

**A. Main MTR Findings .....3**

**B. Stakeholder Engagement .....5**

**C. Gender Equality .....6**

**D. Knowledge Management .....6**

**III. CORE INDICATORS .....7**

**IV: CO FINANCING .....10**

**V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS .....11**

**VI. ANNEX .....12**

## I. Overview

### A. Description

Project name

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Kenya

Country

Kenya

GEF ID

10359

Implementing Agency

UNDP

Executing Entity

UNOPS

Trust Fund

GET

Project Type

FSP

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.

### B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

12/2/2021

Agency Approval

6/14/2023

Implementation Start

6/14/2023

First Disbursement

12/31/2023

Expected MTR

2/28/2025

MTR Submission

3/2/2026

Actual MTR

5/31/2025

Expected Completion

6/14/2027

## II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

### A. Main MTR Findings

The findings pay close attention to the constraints associated with the brief period since funds started flowing to the grantees. About 75% of the beneficiaries interviewed exhibited a substantial push towards fast-tracking activities. The evidence shown for an inherent drive among them points to a positive trajectory and signifies

the high likelihood that the project will achieve its targets. The heightened pace creates hope that adequate progress can happen in a significantly shorter duration of activity. It stands a good chance to make up for some of the lost time.

The MTR finds that the defining element of strategy is well articulated, and aligned with the overarching objective of building socio-ecological resilience. The strategy provides an effective route towards expected/intended results. After the initial delays, disbursements took off to a good start and went smoothly.

All start-up activities have picked up at a fast pace and objectives/outcomes are evidently set to be achieved and attain most of the end-of project targets. Progress towards the project results framework/logframe was just emerging from the baseline, as were the mandatory GEF core indicators. Factoring in the brief duration of effective field presence and associated quick gains, progress towards results is rated 4 (Moderately Satisfactory - MS). The initial thrust has generated sufficient impetus for quick gains and attaining targets, and prospects for the end-of-project (EoP) are good. This rating could easily improve to “Satisfactory – S”, as nothing stands in the way of the project overcoming the envisioned significant shortcomings, or reducing them to only minor shortcomings. The accelerated implementation, adaptive management and support of relevant partners referenced elsewhere provides the confidence needed for this.

Under Component 1: Resilient rural landscapes for sustainable development and contribution to global environmental protection, achievement in outcome 1.1 is rated 4 (Moderately Satisfactory - MS). This is supported by the adequacy of proposals funded and the rapid approach to implementation adopted. A total of 43 CSOs have been awarded grants, and they are implementing projects across all 3 landscapes/seascapes that restore degraded lands, support biodiversity, and optimize ecosystem services.

Outcome 1.2 is rated 4 (Moderately Satisfactory - MS), given evident yet early steps towards targets with 20 CSOs enhancing sustainability and production systems. Outcome 1.3 is rated 3 (Moderately Unsatisfactory - MU) since the midterm target of 100 women benefitting is still constrained, and seven small-scale community enterprises are yet to show results.

Component 2: Landscape governance and adaptive management for upscaling shows strong prospects for EoP achievement. A multi-stakeholder platform has been established in Shimoni-Vanga and another revived in Lake Bogoria. With strategies developed for all three sites, Outcome 2.1 is rated 5 (Satisfactory – S).

Preparatory efforts for Outcome 2.2 include a Knowledge Management and Communications strategy with a full-year activity calendar. Prospects are positive, and progress is rated 4 (Moderately Satisfactory - MS).

Component 3: Monitoring and evaluation has begun smoothly. Tracking data collection has started for 15 grants in cohort 1, with plans underway for cohorts 2 and 3 and strategic partners. Progress is rated 4 (Moderately Satisfactory - MS).

Project implementation and adaptive management is rated 5 (Satisfactory – S), recognizing timely responsiveness, strengthened proposal review processes, technical support improvements, and expanded monitoring visits.

Sustainability is rated 4 “Likely (L)” based on projected incomes, market expansion, partner interest, and national/county government support. Prospects are strengthened by alignment with national strategies and a good fit with KWS/KFS priorities.

The attainment of project results and outcomes is contingent on overcoming the constraints and challenges identified during this MTR. The project has built momentum after a slow start and must maintain this

henceforth. As a desired long-term end, transformation is incremental and depends on strong feelings of inclusion and reciprocal respect. Gender and youth participation are well within the bounds of expectation. The MTR concludes that:

- The proposals and the respective grantees were carefully selected with consideration of their ability to contribute to the set project targets, and community representation within the landscape/seascape is adequate.
- It is important to maintain the gains after the initial lull, and avoid any possible future predicament. Now that the government officials newly appointed prior to project start - including the GEF operational focal point - have turned around the bend along the operational learning curve, it is now time for UNDP to deploy its diplomatic leverage to explain any remaining questions regarding the project. This is also crucial to calming down any lingering feelings of non-optimal engagement.
- Strategic partners are well placed to spearhead the push needed to consolidate current and future project gains. Given their comparative advantage based on recognition and familiarity in each respective landscape/seascape, they can speak loud and be heard promoting the SGP agenda in the multistakeholder platforms. They should specifically lobby for increased and timely government technical assistance to the grantees and assist them respond to demands for response to requirements from local and external stakeholders or compliance with regulations. This will help scale up grantee activities and impact.
- The multi-stakeholder platforms are engendering a long-term vision and bridging discrete initiatives to enhance social cohesion and environmental sustainability. Their leadership is inherently local and embraces both gender and youth dimensions. The knowledge-sharing being promoted by the project is vital for sustainable natural resource use and planning, and is equipping communities for responding to environmental shocks. These are a particularly good avenue to a viable future, as is knowledge-sharing, gender and youth participation.
- Building community capacity holds the greatest promise for maximizing benefits and engaging strategic partners was a wise move to determine returns. Growing community-level organizational and administrative structures amounts to a solid project investment in a viable future.
- The latency or general lack of detailed grant-specific, results-oriented and time-bound workplans signals a lapse in the requisite provisions for monitoring of efficiency. The strategic partners with the support of the SGP core team must address the grantees' need for continuous enhancement of skills in diverse areas, notably proposal writing for future calls and time-bound work planning. Appreciating the skills deficiency of even some accomplished actors, perceptions of a rushed proposal development process need to be countered.
- The selection and approval of grant proposals is weighed down by too much reliance on the NSC, and adds to costs and considerable delays.
- The imminent changes in GEF-SGP implementation arrangements are destined to impact the global and local levels. As a bridge into the future, the project must actively engage future stakeholders and encourage grantees about their continued eligibility for consideration.
- Most project interventions are geared towards women beneficiaries, largely because of the deliberate provision for inclusion and gender responsiveness. This must be safeguarded in all aspects project activities.

## **B. Stakeholder Engagement**

Regarding the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP), the project has engaged with the office of the GEF Operational Focal Point during the inception workshop and the induction workshop for new NSC members. It had also engaged with the KWS, KFS and the State Dept of Fisheries and Blue Economy, and reached out to the relevant ministries at the county level to seek their support and collaboration. The MTR considered these efforts as instrumental to minimizing risk. The MTR therefore finds that the project is undertaking stakeholder engagement appropriately and has developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships. The depth of these partnerships is admirable in some instances, and there was an incontrovertible sense of belonging among stakeholders. This heralded a feeling of meaningful engagement and appreciation of community inputs in the decision-making process. How collaboration has permeated implementation project-wide is, however, yet to become fully apparent. Inclusiveness, country-drivenness and both local and national government entities support to project objectives are clear. The two-tier levels of government are playing an active role in decision-making. At the landscape/seascape level, the MTR found relevant government agencies with hands-on-deck for resolving any conflicts. Involvement and public awareness are poised to contribute hugely to progress and likely to continue having the same positive effect. The MTR did not identify any significant legal, cultural, religious, gender or youth constraints on participation. Continuously building on the gains so far will enhance the benefits. Project implementation and adaptive management is rated 5 (Satisfactory - S), on a 6- point scale.

### C. Gender Equality

Gender-responsive tools and methodologies were used to ensure full, equitable, inclusive and effective representation and coverage of cross-cutting issues. These included a data collection survey that included questions specifically interrogating gender roles and responsibilities and constantly back-referencing the Gender Action Plan. The MTR also recognized that gender is universal and cross-cutting since socially constructed norms, behaviours and roles tend to be associated with differential value and resources use - the way different groups relate with the environment is both variable and contextual. This aspect therefore addressed the critical roles played not only by women and girls but also children, the youth and persons with disabilities as fundamental to meeting goals and targets of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, fostering meaningful participation, building synergies and achieving positive outcomes

Core Indicator 11 (number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment), was expected to be 6,000 and 15,000 at PIF and endorsement, respectively. The numbers of both females and males were 3,000 and 7,500 at each of the two stages.

While Kenya has made significant advances in fostering gender representation of women and girls, children and the youth, the ability to participate effectively in conservation and leadership is still limited by pockets of restrictive attitudes, social and cultural norms. None of this is unique to the project, and evidence clearly pointed to beneficiaries comprising mostly of well empowered community groups. The MTR found that explicit attempts have been made to bridge the gender gap and ensure full representation and participation of women, youth and persons living with disability. In all the project sites sampled, women were playing their crucial role in translating outcomes and outputs into tangible products that potentially impact households. They stand to benefit from increased awareness on biodiversity and sustainable resource management, and how to incorporate the knowledge gained in their enterprises, thereby protecting livelihoods and enhancing adaptive capacity.

### D. Knowledge Management

A Knowledge Management and Communications strategy is available, including a calendar of activities for the year. With the preparatory steps already in place, the EoP target of six case studies stand high chances of being successfully delivered.

Two consultants are developing communications and knowledge management products in collaboration with strategic partners. Out of this is expected to emerge a communications and knowledge management strategy - which will form a significant part, or lay the foundation for the development of the three communication strategies at landscape/seascape level. Among the other deliverables for the consultants will be a revamped website, a brochure, template for a newsletter, and guidance to the strategic partners on how enrich their communication concepts. Plans are under way to secure the services of a third consultant who will produce a bi-annual newsletter, and keep the website regularly updated using content provided by the strategic partners and contributions of the project management team. At least 2 peer-to-peer cross learnings and induction workshops are also in the plans at each landscape/seascape.

A total of 62 communications material and knowledge management products are targeted - including case studies, videos, photo stories; newsletters; project posters; eco-fairs. The target for Samburu is 6, 48 for Isiolo and 8 for FSK.

Adequate preparations are also in place for three communication strategies. A communication and knowledge management strategy, upgrading of the website, brochure for OP7, newsletter template and cross-landscape social media platforms are expected. The EoP target is therefore within reach.

Internal exchanges and sharing with stakeholders are an on-going process as part of communications and knowledge management. Mechanisms have been established for communicating progress and intended impact to the public. The documentation of lessons derived from adaptive management is however yet to commence in earnest, as is the sharing of these with key partners.

### III. Core Indicators

#### Indicator 3 Area of land and ecosystems under restoration

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 6000                 | 12000                            |                      |                     |

#### Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration

| Disaggregation Type | Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Cropland            | 6,000.00             | 6,000.00                         |                      |                     |

#### Indicator 3.2 Area of forest and forest land under restoration

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|                      | 2,000.00                         | 0.00                 |                     |

#### Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and woodland under restoration

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

#### Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) under restoration

| Ha (Expected at PIF) | Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|                      | 4,000.00                         | 0.00                 |                     |

#### 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                | 43000                            |                      |                     |

#### 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            | 35,000.00                        | 0.00                 |                     |

#### Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations

| 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             | 8,000.00                         | 0.00                 |                     |

#### Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided

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

#### Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported

| Name of the OECMs | WDPA-ID | Total Ha (Expected at PIF) | Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Total Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|-------------------|---------|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|
|                   |         |                            |  |                            |                           |

#### Documents (Document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

| Title |
|-------|
|       |

#### 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            | 16,000.00                        | 0.00                 |                     |

#### Indicator 5.1 Fisheries under third-party certification incorporating 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 Large Marine Ecosystems with reduced pollution and hypoxia

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

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

#### Indicator 5.3 Marine OECMs supported

| Name of the OECMs | WDPA-ID | Total Ha (Expected at PIF) | Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) | Total Ha (Achieved at TE) |
|-------------------|---------|----------------------------|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|
|                   |         |                            |  |                            |                           |

#### Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

|   |          |                      |                   |                  |
|---|----------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Total Target Benefit                                      | (At PIF) | (At CEO Endorsement) | (Achieved at MTR) | (Achieved at TE) |
| <b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)</b>   |          | 283797               |                   |                  |
| <b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)</b> |          |                      |                   |                  |

#### Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

|   |          |                      |                   |                  |
|---|----------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Total Target Benefit                                      | (At PIF) | (At CEO Endorsement) | (Achieved at MTR) | (Achieved at TE) |
| <b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)</b>   |          | 283,797              | 0                 |                  |
| <b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)</b> |          |                      |                   |                  |
| <b>Anticipated start year of accounting</b>               |          | 2022                 |                   |                  |
| <b>Duration of accounting</b>                             |          | 20                   |                   |                  |

#### Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

|   |          |                      |                   |                  |
|---|----------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Total Target Benefit                                      | (At PIF) | (At CEO Endorsement) | (Achieved at MTR) | (Achieved at TE) |
| <b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct)</b>   |          |                      |                   |                  |
| <b>Expected metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (indirect)</b> |          |                      |                   |                  |
| <b>Anticipated start year of accounting</b>               |          |                      |                   |                  |
| <b>Duration of accounting</b>                             |          |                      |                   |                  |

#### Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

| Total Target Benefit            | Energy (MJ) (At PIF) | Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement) | Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR) | Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE) |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Target Energy Saved (MJ)</b> |                      |                                  |                               |                              |

**Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)**

| Technology | Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF) | Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR) | Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE) |
|------------|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
|            |                                 |   |                                 |                                |

**Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments**

|               | Number (Expected at PIF) | Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement) | Number (Achieved at MTR) | Number (Achieved at TE) |
|---------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Female</b> | 3,000                    | 7,500                                | 0                        |                         |
| <b>Male</b>   | 3,000                    | 7,500                                | 0                        |                         |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>6,000</b>             | <b>15,000</b>                        | <b>0</b>                 | <b>0</b>                |

**IV: Co Financing**

| Sources of Co-financing      | Name of Co-financier         | Type of Co-financing | Investment Mobilized   | Anticipated at CEO(\$) | Materialized at MTR(\$) |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 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           |             |
| Private Sector               | Base Titanium                  | Grant   | Investment mobilized   | 21,000.00           |             |
| Donor Agency                 | Global ICCA Support Initiative | Grant   | Investment mobilized   | 350,000.00          |             |
| <b>Total Co-financing</b>    |                                |         |                        | <b>3,950,000.00</b> | <b>0.00</b> |

#### Comments

The project has managed to obtain substantial co-financing from county governments comprising investment mobilized as grants and in-kind recurrent expenditures, amounting to US\$ 1,350,000. Co-financing secured from the private sector, UNDP, CSO grantees and the global support initiative for Indigenous peoples' and Community Conserved Areas (ICCA) amounted to US\$ 2,600,000. Total co-financing secured at MTR was US\$ 3,950,000. UNDP co-financing goes to providing oversight, technical advice, supervision, monitoring results and performance. The amounts pledged by the four county governments was destined to supporting the developing and/or fulfilling landscape/seascape strategies, aligning policies and providing synergy. Others include hosting the multi-stakeholder platform meetings and providing inputs to CSOs as well as communications services to disseminate lessons learned and increase public awareness. Co-financing secured from the private sector in Kwale is supporting coastal clean-ups, plastic waste reduction, establishing of marketing linkages and provision of business development expertise. CSOs grantees are contributing to all implementation activities including monitoring results and participating in multi-stakeholder platforms, providing demonstrations and sharing of best practices. Insights into how well these funds are being tracked and managed can be hard to obtain due to the nature of contribution and applicable accounting and audit procedures. Given the elaborate financial and administration guidelines used by the project team, and the obligation for strict adherence to operational guidelines, manuals and systems, the MTR believes that funds are going into intended uses and subjected to necessary checks and balances. Moreover, the monitoring mechanisms in place are sufficient to ensure co-financing commitments are translated into actual contributions. We expect that a portion of the co-financing will be reported as materialized this year and will be reflected accordingly in the PIR.

## V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

## Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

| PIF | CEO Endorsement/Approval | MTR             | TE |
|-----|--------------------------|-----------------|----|
|     | Medium/Moderate          | Medium/Moderate |    |

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Turning to the social and environmental standards (safeguards), the risks identified in the project's most current SESP as listed in the prodoc and 2021 SESP have not changed since design. As part of SESP, CBOs submitting proposals were encouraged to include gender considerations in the grant preparatory stage, with the support strategic partners. Gender-sensitive CSOs were engaged to support women and girls in defining project objectives and designing activities. The Country Programme team also named a gender focal point on the NSC to, among others, ensure gender sensitivity in projects. These efforts are being actively followed up during implementation. The project team and partners are reporting to GEF according to laid down requirements. A back-to-office report (BTOR) is prepared for every mission undertaken by a member of the project team providing the names of persons in the mission, itinerary, purpose/objective, summary of mission findings and recommendations/actions to be taken. The annual PIR constitutes a mandatory requirement for reporting in each year of project implementation, together with SGP quarterly reports to the CO based on information gathered from the field. Equally important is the requirement for the project team to update periodically the status for GEF Core indicators to be used for monitoring global environmental benefits.

The multi-stakeholder platforms are engendering a long-term vision and bridging discrete initiatives to enhance social cohesion and environmental sustainability. Their leadership is inherently local and embraces both gender and youth dimensions. The knowledge-sharing being promoted by the project is vital for sustainable natural resource use and planning, and is equipping communities for responding to environmental shocks. These are a particularly good avenue to a viable future, as is knowledge-sharing, gender and youth participation.

## VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

| Document Category           | Prefix                  | Title  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| M and E Document            | Mid-term Review (MTR)   | GEF10359_UNDP6448_FY25_UNDP_K<br>enya_Biodiversity_FSP |
| Project Supporting Document | ESS Supporting Document | PIMS 6448-Annex 5-SESP                                 |