

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Kenya

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10359

Countries

Kenya

Project Name

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Kenya

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

5/3/2021

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/27/2021

Please **highlight** changes made to the portal entry and ProDoc in the resubmission.

1-Table A FA elements and GEF amounts are identical to the PIF's, however a few activities mentioned in several places of the CEO endorsement request (see comments further down in this review sheet) are not eligible in the GEF-7 BD or LD focal area strategies. Please correct.

2- Please change the

Expected Completion Date

8/1/2025

to 7/31/2025 to match the 48-month duration and the 1/8/2021 start date, and adapt as needed to a realistic date depending on the date of resubmission.

Agency Response

Project description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/27/2021

Compared to the PIF, we note the addition of component 3 (M&E) and a strong decrease of the budget share allocated to component 1. The rest of table B is identical.

1- The GEF financed M&E budget represents 5.34 % of GEF project financing, which is slightly above the 5% observed average in the GEF portfolio. Please reduce to 5% (\$126,463) or justify the higher than average M&E costs for this project.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/27/2021

1- We note the overall \$500,000 increase in co-financing compared to PIF stage (\$3.6 mio compared to \$3.1 mio). However, co-financing in the form of grants has sharply declined from \$500,000 to \$271,000. Please justify and notably explain why the \$250,000 of grants from CSO grantees are not materializing at CEO endorsement stage. We note that "the emergence of COVID-19 and the financial stresses" led two previously anticipated partners, Northern Trust and The Nature Conservancy, to withdraw their co-financing.

2- While all the other co financing letters were provided in a single PDF file, the letter associated with the \$500,000 co-financing from UNDP has not been uploaded with this submission. Please provide the letter.

3- Please add the missing "Private sector" in front of Base Titanium in the portal entry:

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

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 5/27/2021 - Yes, identical to PIF. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 5/27/2021 - Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 5/27/2021 -

1- Please fill in core indicator 5 in the portal's table F.

2- The total area under improved management foreseen at CEO Endorsement is 38,000 hectares, which yields a cost efficiency of 66.5\$ of GEF grant per ha. By comparison, SGP OP6 targeted to have impact on 156,000 ha with just a 1.3 times larger GEF grant, that is 23\$ of GEF grant per ha. While the OP6 mid-term review (2020) states that the

156,000ha target is over-ambitious, it also reports that impact over 56,420 ha were achieved with, at the time, only 64% of the OP6 GEF grant disbursed, which is less than the total OP7 requested grant. While we note that all targets are already identical or increased compared to PIF stage, please revise the targets to reach an acceptable cost efficiency in the delivery of GEBs, especially as two of the three targeted landscapes have already benefited from OP6.

3- There is no target set under core indicator 6 when one could expect some mitigation benefits from the land-based interventions planned in the project. Please explain why this isn't the case or set a target based on a sound methodology for indicator 6.

4- Please explain the methodology / assumptions used for target setting under table F in the portal entry.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/27/2021 -

1- No. The portal entry corresponds to section 2.2 "Main threats and Barriers to Sustainable Development" of the ProDoC. While it presents adequately the barriers (but see comment 2 below), it does not provide an adequate description of the problem to be addressed and their root causes, and does not present the target landscapes at all (presented elsewhere in the ProDoc). Both were presented in the PIF. Please revise the portal entry.

2- Part of barrier 1 and especially the conclusion "The project will thus invest in livelihoods to incentivize sustainable interventions" seems to be an oversimplification of the drivers of behavior change (See e.g. STAP advisory document on behavior change <https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/why-behavior-change-matters-gef-and-what-do-about-it>). Please reformulate.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/27/2021

1 No, the baseline does not describe the lessons learnt from previous SGP phases and how the project will build on those, which was the case in the PIF. Please correct. Please notably elaborate on how the 12 recommendations of the SGP OP6 mid-term evaluation, which was published after this project's PIF approval, have been incorporated in the design of this project.

2- It seems contradictory that "The Northern Rangelands Trust (NRT) w[ould] contribute to the achievement of outcomes and outputs of this project" and, at the same time, NRT co-financing announced at PIF stage did not materialized at CEO endorsement stage. Please explain and revise as necessary.

3- Same question with the " two ongoing WWF Kenya initiatives, which will contribute to the achievement of the outcomes and outputs of this project". Why isn't the corresponding co-financing reported?

4- Several elements that are announced for support by this BD-LD project are not eligible under the BD and LD GEF-7 focal area strategies and were not mentioned in the PIF:

4a. The portal entry states that "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**). " Please note that this SGP project is funded as a BD-LD project so that energy efficiency and clean energy is not eligible. Please remove or clarify that this will be carried out through co-funding.

4b- Work envisaged in collaboration with the GEF Africa Environmental Health and Pollution Management Program 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 is not eligible for GEF funding under this project. Please remove or clarify that this will be carried out through co-funding.

4c - General "Renewable energy and energy efficiency partnerships" with the private sector are not eligible for support by GEF funding of this BD-LD project. Please remove or clarify that this will be carried out through co-funding.

4d - Plastic waste management. Please remove or clarify that this will be carried out through co-funding.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/28/2021:

1- Several elements that are announced for support by this BD-LD project are not eligible under the BD and LD GEF-7 focal area strategies:

- Disseminating best practices of terrestrial management of plastic waste

- 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

Please remove or clarify that these will funded through co-finance.

2- Output 1.1: Please clarify why the most relevant activities for biodiversity conservation that were mentioned in the PIF (poaching control; implementation of community conservancy land-use plans; management of fish spawning areas including mangrove and coral reef protection; control of illegal fishing gear and respect of no-take zones) are not listed in the CER.

3- output 2.1.1: Please clarify the baseline membership of the multi-stakeholder platforms that were created under OP6 and be more specific on the gaps in membership that OP7 will fill.

4- output 2.1.2 : Please be explicit on the "issues identified in the PPG and the Mid-term Review of SGP-6" and how they will be addressed. Please also clarify who are "the strategic partner organization in each landscape", how they are chosen and who they were for OP6 in the landscapes that are also in OP7.

5- According to the PIF, 2.2.1 was supposed to conduct case studies at two levels: individuals grantees and landscape/seascape level but it is not present in 2.2.1 and nowhere in the description of the alternative scenario of this CER. As case studies are clearly part of the project, please revise.

6- Output 2.2.1: Please clarify the pertinence of working through SGP, which is dedicated to CSOs, on social and environmental best practices in the development and implementation of large-scale investment projects, which are typically not planned, developed or implemented by CSOs. What would the SGP do in practice in relation to large-scale investment projects that would result in GEBs?

7- According to the PIF, 2.2.2 was supposed to support strategic initiatives upscale successful SGP project experience and practice but it is not present here under 2.2.2 and nowhere in the description of the alternative scenario of this CER. As strategic grants are mentioned in the scaling-up section of the CER, please revise.

8- Output 3.1.1 states "Activities under this output are designed to put in place enabling procedures and protocols to facilitate effective monitoring & evaluation" when it is our understand that this output is to actually deliver M&E and not just enabling procedures and protocols. Please correct and cross-reference the monitoring plan (Annex 14) here.

9. The ProDoc States "The underlying theory of change for the project is captured in the following diagram (please find larger version appended in **Annex 15**)", when it is Annex 16. Please correct and recheck all cross-references are many appear to be incorrect.

10. Please revise the Theory of change narrative and diagram to make it more readable and highlight more clearly causal pathways. Currently, the ToC diagram paraphrases each output to define so-called "strategies" that are not explicitly linked to barriers. The model of the ToC provided in some recent SGP submissions could be used (e.g. Egypt, Sri Lanka).

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/28/2021 - No, this section is missing from the portal entry. Please correct.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/28/2021 -

1- It does not seem to make sense to have distinct baseline and SGP OP6 columns in the table, especially as some of their content is somewhat contradictory. SGP OP6 is part of the baseline. Please merge the two columns while still making clear within the baseline what was achieved during OP6.

2- Please include the GEB summary figures per landscape in the table presenting the incremental reasoning.

3- Shimoni-Vanga Seascape in southern Kenya: "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 quite numerous in this seascape". Please explain to which output this corresponds. This activity is not described in the alternative scenario.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/28/2021 - The section is adequate but see comments on core indicator targets in comment box I.7 of this review sheet.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/28/2021 -

1) No, the text is identical to the PIF for the sustainability and scaling-up subsections (including the sentence "Identification of specific potential upscaling initiatives will take place during project preparation"). Please revise.

2) Sustainability: the MTE of OP6 rated sustainability as moderately likely only and provided some recommendations. Please clarify how these have been addressed in the design of this project:

Sustainability		
12.	Develop and implement a sustainability plan, including mainstreaming priority actions included in the landscape-seascape strategies and facilitating implementation of the seventh operational phase (OP7) of the SGP in Kenya. The sustainability plan should include updated landscape strategies, incorporating lessons learned from OP6, highlighting opportunities for upscaling successful interventions, identifying priority actions to mainstream into county development plans, and describing potential partnerships and funding sources.	CP

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/27/2021 - Yes, cleared. Noting that more detailed maps are provided in the ProDoc.

Agency Response

Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/2/2021

1- The portal entry states "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)", and "further details are provided in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (**Annex 4**) appended to the Project Document" when the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) is actually annex 8. Please correct.

2- The private sector is not reflected in the SEP, neither in the mapping, targets for future engagement or in the report on PPG consultations, when elsewhere the CEO endorsement states a private sector "consultation workshop [...] took place during project preparation". Please correct.

3- We note the list of stakeholders Consulted during PPG Process at the end of Annex 8. However, there is no information on consultations on OP-7 carried out through the

relevant multistakeholder platforms of OP-6 or the OP-6 NSC. Please clarify and revise as necessary.

4- As these documents will eventually be posted online, please consider removing the phone contacts of the listed stakeholders in Annex 8.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/2/2021 - A gender analysis and action plan is provided in annexes 9 and 10 of the ProDoc.

1- Measures to contribute to empowering women in the areas of intervention and to help address social and economic inequality are provided but remain rather generic and not linked to specific project outputs. They also do not include all that is reflected in the risk registry of Annex 6 (e.g. "The strategic partners in each n each landscape will be provided with specific gender training and tools to support smaller community organizations to include gender considerations in their proposals" in Annex 6 is not reflected in the gender analysis and action plan). Please elaborate a bit more on the planned activities (not just the desired outcome but also on the how), linking them to specific project outputs as described in the rest of the project.

2- Please clarify why the gender assessment planned to be carried out during project implementation were not carried out during PPG or even during OP-6, when the MTE of OP-6 stated "gender analysis should be made for each of the three landscapes-seascapes". What will be their added-value compared to the gender analysis and action plan provided here or carried out in OP-6 in response to the MTE.

3- Some of the targets of the gender action plan are not reflected in or not consistent with the Results Framework or the monitoring plan, e.g. "Number of women-led community organizations participating in multi-stakeholder platforms" is to reach at least 15 according to the RF vs 6 in the gender action plan. Please (i) ensure that the RF, monitoring plan and the gender action plan are aligned, (ii) confirm that all targets of the gender action plan, even if not reflected in the RF, will be monitored.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/2/2021 - Please make sure the Stakeholder Engagement Plan outlines past consultations with the private sector and describes plans to engage with it.

Agency Response
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/2/2021 -

1- The portal entry states "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.". However, Annex 5 is the SESP and Risk Register Annex 6. Please correct and please make also a cross reference to Annex 13 on climate and Annex 17 on COVID-19.

2- We note the information provided in the Climate Change report in Annex 13 and Risks 3 and 7 in Annex 6. Please, however, clarify how the project intends in practice to provide communities and the NSC selection committee with the tools and capacities to screen small grant proposal for climate change risk and design appropriate mitigation measures.

Agency Response

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/28/2021:

1- We note the cross-reference to Section VII Governance and Management Arrangements of the ProDoc, but please include in the portal entry the institutional arrangement for project implementation, using GEF's terminology (UNDP is the implementing agency and UNOPS the Executing Agency).

2- The time frame of several projects that are presented for coordination is not compatible with this project :

-?Scaling up sustainable land management and agro-biodiversity conservation to reduce environmental degradation in small-scale agriculture in Western Kenya? project (2017-2021).

-Kenya Resilient in Arid Lands Partnership for Integrated Development (Kenya RAPID) project (2015-2020)

- ?Climate Justice Resilience Fund project? (2018-2021)

Please move these projects to the baseline if relevant, and please confirm that the timelines of the other project, for which the time frame are not provided, allow for coordination with this project.

3- Please consider also coordinating with:

-the recently approved GEFID 10637, Restoration Challenge Grant Platform for Smallholders and Communities, with Blockchain-Enabled Crowdfunding, IUCN, in Kenya and Cameroon. This project is to facilitate, support, and mobilize investment in, smallholder and community-led restoration of critical landscapes to provide global environmental benefits and enhanced resilient economic development and livelihoods, in support of the Bonn Challenge, AFR100, the Trillion Tree Campaign, and other global and national restoration efforts.

4- Please explain why there is no co-funding reported from BMU when, through the Global Indigenous Peoples and Community-Conserved Areas and Territories

(ICCA) Support Initiative , "USD 300,000 will be provided to SGP project beneficiaries is to support civil society initiatives and actions by Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) to address the COVID-19 response and green recovery".

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/28/2021:

1- As a project partly funded through the LD focal area, please elaborate on its contribution to the implementation of the UNCCD, in particular its contribution to Kenya's LDN targets.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/28/2021:

1- No, a long list of possible "strategies" are provided and some deliverables are mentioned in a scattered manner, but their associated timeline is not provided when the workplan provided in the ProDoc is at the output level only. Please provide a clearer description of the deliverables and their associated timelines.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/2/2021 - Cleared. The Social and Environmental Screening is provided as Annex 5. The project is rated as moderate risks.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/28/2021

1- The GEF financed M&E budget represents 5.34 % of GEF project financing, which is slightly above the 5% observed average in the GEF portfolio. Please reduce to 5% (\$126,463) or justify the higher than average M&E costs for this project.

2- It is stated "The Monitoring Plan included in Annex 3" when it is Annex 4. Please correct.

3- Monitoring framework: indicator 11 states "The project aspires to establish four functioning multi-stakeholder platforms which includes a variety of stakeholders, that can develop coherent landscape strategies." when there are only 3 landscapes. Please correct.

Agency Response

Benefits

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/2/2021 - Cleared

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/28/2021:

1 Budget:

1a: The total amount allocated to small grants is \$1,611,696, which is less than 61% of GEF project financing and goes down to 57% when UNOPS 6% fee is taken into account. Please revise the budget to ensure that at least 70% of GEF project financing goes to small grants.

1b. 53% of the GEF funded PMC is to cover office rental. Please justify this high proportion and explain why it is not covered by co-finance.

1c. One of the project staff (Programme Assistant) is charged on components only. All staff performing project management duties should be charged on the PMC, and only when the PMC is exhausted can they be charged to both PMC and components by providing clear Terms of reference linking them to unique outputs under these components, which current "Annex 7- Overview of Technical Consultancies" fails to do. Please correct.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/2/2021 - It is stated "Please see Section V. of the attached UNDP Project document" when it is section VI. Please correct.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/27/2021

1- Please see comment on barrier 1 and especially "The project will thus invest in livelihoods to incentivize sustainable interventions" in comment box II.1 of this review sheet and revise accordingly in the response to Germany.

2- One of Germany's question is not addressed. Please address:

- "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"

as a separate question.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Cleared

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 5/27/2021 - Yes, cleared. Noting that more detailed maps are provided in the ProDoc.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/2/2021 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/2/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations