

# 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**

10/18/2021

**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 10/22/2021 - All cleared.

JS 10/21/2021 -

Given current date and that the project will be circulated for 4-weeks to GEF Council prior to CEO Endorsement, it is unlikely that the project will be able to start implementation on December 1, 2021. Please adjust the Expected Implementation Start and completion dates to more realistic dates (see screenshot below).

Submission Date 9/13/2021	Expected Implementation Start 12/1/2021	Expected Completion Date 11/30/2025
Duration ⓘ 48 In Months		Agency Fee(\$) 252,294.00

JS 9/19/2021 - Thank you for the responses and revisions throughout the review sheet and project documentation.

1- Cleared.

2- Thank you, but with a start date on 12/1/2021 the end date should be revised to 11/30/2025.

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  
22 October 2021

The expected implementation start and completion dates have been revised accordingly

15 September 2021

1-Noted.

2- The end date has been revised to 11/30/2025.

13 September 2021

1. The activities that do not fall under BD or LD focal areas have been removed from the project document.
2. The start date has been adjusted to December 1, 2021, taking into account the resubmission date and review period.

**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 9/13/2021 - Cleared. We note that the OP6 MTR indeed identified the need to strengthen support to M&E.

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

13 September 2021

1. One of the lessons learned from SGP-06 (MTR and staff interviews) is that more has to be done on the M&E front to capture project results and impacts from disparate initiatives. During SGP-07, the project will collaborate with a number of new CSOs in the new landscape site, which do not have the administrative and organizational experiences in monitoring/reporting that SGP-07 will require. The project will invest in fostering skills and capacity development for CSOs, to generate the kind of data and information that will support feedback loops into project activities, measure project results, assess impacts on women and vulnerable groups, and drive data-based information for future programming in the landscapes. The new landscape is heavily impoverished and has received little foreign assistance on sustainability measures. As a result, the CSOs in this site are typically not experienced in providing reporting for international donors, which is why they have been identified as a target area for capacity building.

Capacity building in M&E will not only be for new project partners; during the implementation of SGP-06, it was noted that local CSOs require significant accompaniment on M&E and this has been a lesson learned. Even strategic partners, which will provide assistance to smaller CSOs, require accompaniment, training, and support through earlier phases of project implementation, to ensure that they are collectively generating data that can be appropriately aggregated. The additional M&E support requested is of USD 8,537?will significantly assist in the project team's ability to liaise more directly and regularly with CSOs to support them in beefing up their own reporting capacities on M&E. Higher than average investments on M&E, will result in higher impact on the ground, as monitoring and reporting data will feedback into the project management approach, CSOs own activities, decision-making by the multi-stakeholder platforms and allow grantees to have a much higher impact with lower individual M&E costs.

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 10/22/2021 - All cleared.

JS 10/21/2021 -

Please change the label of the co-financing from the Global ICCA from ?GEF Agency? to ?Donor agency?.

GEF Agency	Global ICCA Support Initiative	Grant	Investment mobilized	350,000.00	
				<b>Total Co-Financing(\$)</b>	<b>3,950,000.00</b>

JS 9/13/2021- All cleared, thank you.

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

22 October 2021

The label of the co-financing for the Global ICCA was revised from "GEF Agency" to "Donor agency"

13 Sep 2021

1. The amount of co-financing has been increased to reflect ICCA's contribution to the project, which amounts to USD 350,000. In terms of The Nature Conservancy, the following text has been added to the CEO Endorsement: "The emergence of COVID-19 and the financial stresses the pandemic has imposed has affected the availability of confirmed resources for organizations. In terms of the TNC, there have been staff and organizational changes given the mobility restrictions imposed by COVID-19 protocols, the new TNC staff has not yet been able to liaise with the SGP team or with the multi-stakeholder platforms and take part in landscape discussions. While it is fully expected that by the time the project commences, TNC will be fully briefed and will have identified opportunities for synergistic activities, at this time, formal co-financing is not confirmed. In terms of the Northern Trust, while a significant player on issues related to environmental protection, there are political and security issues, and differing perceptions among the CSO community and the county governments on the agenda of Northern Trust programming. To maintain trust among all CSOs and for purposes of transparency, the SGP will not be taking funds/resources in the form of co-financing. There will be opportunities for joint activities, consultations, but SGP will not be taking direct resources in the form of co-financing." It is also essential to note that co-financing has increased. All four county governments increased their commitments. There are two new co-financiers that were not anticipated during the PIF - Base Titanium and ICCA.
2. The UNDP co-financing letter has been submitted through the portal.
3. "Private Sector" has been added to the portal entry.

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 9/13/2021 - All cleared, thank you.

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

13 September 2021

- 1- 1- Core indicator 5 is filled out in the portal entry
- 2- 2- The targets have been revised following an analysis of the results achieved under SGP-06. The following changes have been made:

		<b>Endorsement (proposed) (ha)</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
<b>Indicator 3.1</b>	<b>Area of degraded agricultural land restored</b>	<b>6,000</b>	The Lk. Bogoria and SICA landscapes are in semi-arid areas where livestock keeping has been the main livelihood activity. However, communities are increasingly engaging in mixed farming (livestock and crops) and irrigation schemes have been established. Poor agricultural practices combined with fragile soils have resulted in degraded farmlands. The successful agro-ecological pilot projects in the Lk. Bogoria landscape will be up-scaled and replicated in both Lk. Bogoria and SICA landscapes to restore degraded farmland. In Shimoni Vanga seascape, poor coastal zone land based agricultural activities that impacts on health of marine ecosystems will be addressed.
<b>Indicator 3.2</b>	<b>Area of forest and forest land restored</b>	<b>2,000</b>	Forests are under threat in all the landscapes. SGP will contribute towards the national 10% tree cover initiative, launched by the President of the country, to promote forest restoration. Attention will be given to farm forests; dryland forests and mangrove forests.
<b>Indicator 3.4</b>	<b>Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) restored</b>	<b>4,000</b>	Riverine rehabilitation activities of SGP-06 will be upscaled in the Lk. Bogoria landscape. Similar activities will be replicated along the Ewaso Nyiro river, the key source of water and the lifeline of the SICA landscape. Furthermore, the county government of Kwale has expressed interest in supporting community-based mangrove rehabilitation initiatives.
<b>Core Indicator 3 TOTAL</b>		<b>12,000</b>	



Indicator 4.1	Area of landscape under improved management to benefit biodiversity	35,000	The governing committees of the community wildlife conservancies in the SICA landscape, have large tracts of land under their leadership and custody. These conservancy landscapes host endangered and endemic wildlife. With the support of county governments, SGP will support the governing committees to promote improved management of an increased hectareage.
Indicator 4.3	Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems	8,000	The successful pilots of pasture farming, grazing management; water resource management, as sustainable SLM practices in GEF 6 will be replicated in the SICA landscape.
<b>Core Indicator 4 TOTAL</b>		<b>43,000</b>	The significant increase in hectareage is due to a higher target of land under community conservancies
Indicator 5		16,000	SGP will support Beach Management Units and other local community groups that neighbour the Shimoni-Vanga seascape, and whose activities have an influence on the Shimoni-Vanga seascape
<b>Core Indicator 5 TOTAL</b>		<b>16,000</b>	
Indicator 6.1	Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector (metric tons)  Expected Co2e direct	283,797 tCO <sub>2</sub> -e	Estimated mitigation co-benefits are based on restoration activities to be achieved under core indicator 3.1 (6,000 hectares), 3.2 (2,000 hectares), and 3.4 (4,000 hectares).
<b>Core Indicator 6 TOTAL</b>		<b>283,797 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e</b> Expected Co2e direct avoided	

Estimated mitigation co-benefits from the land-based interventions have been identified using the FAO Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool (EX-ACT), please see Annex 18 to the

Project Document. Using the FAO Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool (EX-ACT), roughly 283,797 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e over a 20-year lifetime are approximated to be avoided through the 12,000 ha of restoration interventions under Core Indicator 3. The estimations are preliminary; updated estimations will be made as the actual project interventions are designed, approved, and implemented under the SGP modality. Reference to mitigation has been added to the following sections:

- Results Framework (prodoc)
- Core Indicators Annex (CEO ER and prodoc)
- Project Target Contribution to GEF 7 (CEO ER)
- Incremental Cost Reasoning (CEO ER)
- Contribution to Global Environmental Benefits (CEO ER and prodoc)
- Changes from original PIF (CEO ER)

4- Part of the rationale for increasing target areas are provided in the last column in the aforementioned table; in addition the following justification is also provided in the CEO Endorsement:

There are several factors that favour the increase of targets to be achieved by SGP-07, since the development of the PIF. These include:

1. 1) Demonstrated commitment of the county governments at all the landscapes/seascapes to support SGP and the local communities. The county governments have pledged both cash and in-kind co-financing. With strong institutional backing, and mandates to support this work, there is far greater likelihood of success and coordination of various interventions at the landscape level.
2. 2) There has been greater devolution of governance. County governments have had 2 terms to establish policies and legislation and relevant structures. The third term will begin in August 2022. With each term, the county governments are getting better at providing services and serving their constituents, and responding to more local needs and initiatives. It is anticipated that this devolution will allow greater upscaling, collaborations and activity with local-level CSOs.
3. 3) Implementation of GEF 6 projects is almost complete. Key stakeholders and potential partners can see positive results, and they have a better understanding on the way SGP operates, the possible accomplishments, landscape approaches and what can be achieved through consolidated work. There is greater likelihood for participation and engagement now that SGP is known and has achieved results.
1. 4) There is a large area under conservancies in SICA targeted by the project, plus strong commitments to project support shown during PPG.

## 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 10/18/2021 - Cleared.

JS 9/13/2021

1- Thank you for the additions. However, the elaboration includes "However, after only 2.5 years of technical and financial support" when SGP OP6 started implementation in September 2017, i.e. 4 years ago. Please correct or explain.

2- Thank you for the additions. However, the elaboration states "The project will thus lean on the following three levers of behavioural change" but only mentions two (Material incentives, Information). It would be expected that SGP would also use at least "social influences" as a lever (see [https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/2021-03/54640%20STAP%20Behavior%20Change\\_WEB.pdf](https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/2021-03/54640%20STAP%20Behavior%20Change_WEB.pdf)). Please correct.

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

15 September 2021

1- The CEO ER has been revised accordingly.

2- Thank you. The third lever of behavioural change has now been added. The text now reads: "Social influences: to leverage social relationships, dynamics, and leadership to support changes in peoples' behaviour and render them more sustainable. By investing in community-based groups and local actors, the project anticipates that instead of top-down social influences, community leaders will be able to mobilize their communities and promote changes of behaviour. The project will also work specifically with indigenous groups and women's groups, so that they may be better able to communicate the benefits of sustainable actions within their own communities. The underlying notion

is that locally-rooted groups and organizations have more recognition, familiarity and trust within their communities, and will thus be agents and channels for information and change. The project will also leverage larger NGOs/CBOs to support smaller entities, and to help shape the landscape sustainability agenda.?

13 September 2021

1) As requested, the problem to be addressed, root causes and the shorter description of the sites to be targeted have been added to the CEO ER (pages 9-16). In the prodoc the problem to be addressed and root causes have been added in Section 2.2 (the briefer recap of the sites have not been added to the prodoc as there are already sections which provide lengthy descriptions of these and we wanted to avoid being redundant).

2) Additional information has been added. The text now reads the following :  
The project will invest in livelihoods to incentivize sustainable interventions, and provide pilots and demonstrations on low-cost sustainable interventions, as it recognizes that unsustainable behaviours and practices are fundamental drivers of global environmental change, and responding to those behaviours can lead to transformative impacts. Behavioral change will require the project to address how environmental practices are influenced by stakeholders? values, cultural norms, power dynamics and other social structures?livelihoods offer an entry point to address the intersection of some of these factors. The project recognizes that practices need to change, but the ?how? can often be left out. By investing in livelihoods that are relevant to stakeholders and communities, and degrading in nature, the project will explicitly address what behaviours need to change with accompanying strategies and benefits to communities. The project will thus lean on the following three levers of behavioural change:

- Material incentives: to make behavior more convenient and accessible by giving rewards and providing substitutes for desired, or undesired, behaviours. In this case, the project will support sustainable livelihoods by providing technical capacity and inputs, facilitating markets and exchanges, business plan development, and linkages with private sector, government and other partners that can support activities.

- Information: about what the desired behavior is, why it matters and how to achieve it. The multi-stakeholder platforms, and knowledge sharing by CSO partners will be key to, in tandem to material incentives, to enhance information, knowledge and public awareness on why behavioural change will be beneficial, and the positive outcomes that will be associated with sustainable practices.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 10/18/2021 - Cleared.

JS 9/13/2021

1- Thank you for the additions. However, the table includes reference to a CCM consultant (*TORs were drafted for a part-time consultancy to establish guidance for standardizing how results of CCM are reported...*) when this GEF-7 project is a BD-LD MFA. Our understanding is that the CCM consultant is to be hired for the OP6. For clarity, please only include in this CEO endorsement request what concerns directly the GEF-7 project. We thus suggest removing the reference to the hiring of a CCM consultant and replace it by a statement clarifying that this recommendation is not relevant for OP7.

2 to 4: Cleared, thank you.

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 materialize 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

15 September 2021

1- Reference to hiring a CCM consultant has been removed and replaced by a statement clarifying that the recommendation is not relevant to OP-7.

13 September 2021

1)Text has been added to the CEO ER to reflect how the project has incorporated the recommendations from the MTR. Kindly note the new following text and table:  
?In addition this project will build on the specific recommendations of the Mid-term Review of SGP-06 to ensure that it is incorporating the analysis from that exercise:

Since its inception, the SGP has supported diverse initiatives intended to address local-level environmental concerns, while contributing to global benefits in the GEF focal areas of biodiversity conservation, climate change, international waters, and land degradation. During various phases, the the circumstances surrounding the SGP have evolved and SGP has responded accordingly taking into account the changing local, national, and global circumstances. While the table below showcases the recommendations from SGP-06 and how they have been incorporated into this design, there are also broader learnings from previous phases that are included in this design. These include the following:

- ? The role of intermediaries. The SGP has learned that NGOs/CSOs can play an important role in building the capacities of communities to implement environmental projects. However, it is also necessary to monitor the extent to which the NGOs remain an empowering force for local communities. In some cases, the NGOs may be a disempowering element, especially when they retain critical information that results in limited ownership of the project process and results at the community level. It is therefore important to invest in selecting suitable NGOs to play strategic roles of supporting community groups.
- ? The role of government officials. The Kenyan government has been espousing an environmental agenda to support livelihoods and in particular the tourism industry. Synergizing some of the activities, or piloting innovative practices in the area of biodiversity conservation, SLM, sustainable livelihoods, provides opportunities for

government to upscale initiatives and foster stronger relations with local-level organizations. Experiences have also highlighted to the SGP the importance of tapping into existing technical resources within government by providing communities with linkages to relevant offices. This process also enhances the sustainability of SGP results, because communities are empowered to seek services from government offices.

? ? Use of the clustering approach. Many benefits result from using a landscape approach and clustering complementary projects, geographically and thematically. Experiences from the COMPACT have provided the SGP with lessons on how the clustering approach can enhance impacts and also promote greater collaboration among partners.

? ? Support for strengthening partnerships. The SGP has piloted the approach of forming donor and partner roundtables at the site level, to enhance the level of collaboration and sharing that occurs among institutions supporting respective communities. In SGP-07, the project can link CSOs/CBOs with donors to ensure long-term sustainability.

? ? Use of innovative mechanisms to enhance participation. To enhance the participation of a range of stakeholders, including those who are illiterate or marginalized, the SGP has piloted and implemented innovative approaches, such as use of video by communities to present their project proposals, use of murals, and participatory monitoring and evaluation workshops. The SGP has therefore learned about the need to innovate constantly to ensure effectiveness in meeting its mandate.?

<b>Recommendation from SGP-06</b>	<b>How Recommendations have been incorporated in the design of SGP-07</b>
<b>Prepare an adaptive management plan in response to the current COVID-19 pandemic.</b>	The COVID-19 pandemic was in full swing during this project design and the entire PPG process was adapted to ensure security, health and consultation for communities. A COVID-19 framework was designed (see Annex 17) to ensure that COVID considerations are considered in activities to avoid delays and other challenges.
<b>Update the terms of reference for the strategic partners to better define roles and responsibilities.</b>	The terms of reference and the expectations of the Strategic Partners will be updated by the NSC by inception. This will ensure no delays and that there are clear mandates for strategic partners before they respond to calls for proposal.
<b>Include the role of a project coordinator in the budget for each small grant in order to strengthen effectiveness and efficiency of the interventions.</b>	This issue will be considered by the NSC, to ensure that the grants are utilized for maximum results, and will differ based on the type of proposals submitted (some organizations may have better suited staff already in place for these activities); in addition the project team will provide greater accompaniment in monitoring and reporting. To contribute towards sustainability, the project coordinator will be a member of the local community and not an ?outsider?. S/he will continue to provide guidance to community affairs even after project funds are exhausted.
	<b>Governance and management arrangements</b>

<p><b>Bolster the SGP country team</b></p>	<p>The terms of reference of the SGP country team have been revised, roles and tasks have been clarified in response to this recommendation. In addition, 3 UNVs were recruited as per the guidance of the MTR; 2 of the positions support the SGP secretariat and all the grantees (knowledge management officer and M&amp;E officer), while a 3rd position is based at the landscape with the largest number of grantees.</p>
<p><b>Reconcile the role of technical assistance on the project.</b> Targeted technical assistance and advisory support should be considered, including, but not limited to matters associated with the climate change mitigation (CCM) focal area. CCM technical assistance could be delivered through a part-time consultancy arrangement, for example, sharing information on industry level best practice, identifying potential private sector partnerships, and establishing guidance for standardizing how results of CCM projects are reported. Part-time technical assistance support should also be considered at the landscape-seascape level, firstly to provide oversight and monitoring &amp; evaluation of the performance of the strategic partners. Having part-time technical assistance support at the landscape-seascape level, with knowledge of local sociopolitical dynamics, would also contribute towards enhancing the durability of the landscape-seascape strategies and governance mechanisms. It is recommended that a short-term CCM consultancy be recruited to support the implementation, reporting, and private sector coordination.</p>	<p>TORs were drafted for a part-time consultancy to establish guidance for standardizing how results of CCM are reported. The TORs were shared widely via email among SGP networks. The SGP secretariat is in the process of hiring a consultant from the pool or respondents.</p> <p>A UNV is stationed full-time as a project officer at the landscape that has the highest number of grantees. The project officer provides technical support to the grantees, and conducts regular monitoring. The officer also liaises with the county government</p>
<p> </p>	<p><b>Communications and knowledge management</b></p>



**Enhance knowledge management and communications to facilitate upscaling and expand awareness of SGP in Kenya.**

The country team is currently completing two strategy documents, one on communications and one on knowledge management. Regarding communications, it is important to describe the key messages that SGP would like to convey, what are the most effective methods for delivering these messages, who are the target stakeholders, and what metrics can be used to assess effectiveness. With respect to knowledge management, it would be useful to describe the objectives of the knowledge management activities, including development of case studies. And it would be advisable to rethink the overall knowledge management approach. For instance, it might be more effective for the grantees to be responsible for collecting inputs (e.g., photographs, video clips, audio recordings, results of the interventions, etc.) for knowledge products and having a knowledge management expert organization develop the actual products ? in coordination with the UCP Global Coordinator and the CPMT KM focal point. There are also opportunities to document/record traditional knowledge (e.g., the way in which wildlife is an integral part of livestock rearing of some pastoralists) with free, prior, and informed consent from local communities.

Objectives of knowledge management approach (outcomes, outputs and indicators) are now included in the results framework. Budget resources have also been allocated for communications products, along with communications consultant to support the dissemination of key messages. Traditional knowledge will be part of case studies intended by project.

It is expected that the UNV who was hired in GEF 6 as a Knowledge Management and Communications officer will continue to provide technical guidance to the secretariat and the grantees in development of KM material.

**Capacity development**

**Arrange cross-learning exchanges among the landscapes-seascapes, integrate capacity development needs and plans into the landscape-seascape strategies, and develop a programme-wide capacity development strategy for SGP in Kenya.**

This is already planned, provided that COVID protocols do not advise against this. This was taken into consideration when drafting the travel and meetings/consultation elements of the budget. Exchanges are vital for the success of SGP, as are witnessing pilots and sharing knowledge across landscapes and seascapes. The lessons learned and capacity development approaches at the landscape-seascape levels will be consolidated into a programme-wide capacity development strategy for the SGP in Kenya that will be regularly updated and made available to grantees, strategic partners, and NSC members.

<p><b>Incorporate the use of planning grants into the SGP capacity development strategy.</b></p>	<p>Planning grants will be utilized as one of the mechanisms to deliver capacity building to project proponents, particularly those with limited experience in preparing grant proposals and delivering community development interventions. Strategic grants will be used to as a tool by which smaller CSOs can benefit from organizational and administrative support.</p>
<p><b>Monitoring &amp; evaluation and social and environmental safeguards</b></p>	
<p><b>Establish standard approaches for reporting on project indicators.</b> <b>Strengthen capacity building and monitoring &amp; evaluation associated with social and environmental safeguards, including those associated with indigenous peoples.</b></p>	<p>The project design for SGP-07 has revised its results framework in line with GEF-07 requirements, and reporting needs identified through SGP-07. The indicators are more consistent with one another and gender responsive. In order to support M&amp;E gaps, additional funding is requested to support CBOs in improved reporting. The project team will also provide training on UNDP social and environmental standards to ensure that indigenous, women and marginalized peoples' rights are protected.</p>
<p><b>Complete the gender analysis and action plan for the project, and monitor and evaluate progress towards achievement of the gender mainstreaming objective.</b></p>	<p>A gender action plan has been completed and the mandatory SGP indicators are included in the gender action plan. Grants will be evaluated for progress towards the indicators; the gender mainstreaming section of the grant proposals will be strengthened including the mandatory SGP gender indicator, and will be supported by M&amp;E resources to do this. Gender disaggregation will be reported across the project results framework.</p>
<p><b>Sustainability</b></p>	
<p><b>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</b></p>	<p>This exercise will be a part of the landscape strategies development so that CSOs are part of the exercise and can see themselves carrying out the initiatives needed to sustain results in their landscapes. The sustainability plan will incorporate lessons learned from OP6, highlight opportunities for upscaling successful interventions, identifying priority actions to mainstream into county development plans, and describing potential partnerships and funding sources. Kindly refer to the Section on Innovation, Sustainability and Scaling Up in the project document (page 46) for further information.</p>

2) Please see the remark as a response on co-financing on Northern Trust. There has been a lack of trust exhibited by some county governments and CSOs on the agenda of the Northern Trust, and some concerns around land ownerships and interests. SGP will liaise with the Northern Trust through multi-stakeholder mediums and use data and such produced by them, but will not accept financial resources (co-financing from them) in order to maintain trust and transparency.

3) In SGP-06, WWF Kenya was both a co-financier and a grantee. Based on that experience and a deeper understanding of some of the administrative/organizational structures and challenges of WWF Kenya, it is considered more efficient to collaborate with them than to seek co-financing. It is more useful for SGP to coordinate activities with WWF Kenya, rather than depend on execution, approvals, or go through financial arrangements with them.

4.a) Reference to energy efficiency, and clean energy projects have been removed in the prodoc and CEO ER. Other initiatives that are working on clean energy are mentioned as contextual information.

4.b) Reference to PoPs have been removed.

4.c) Text has been clarified to indicate that private sector may supply renewable energy for sustainable agricultural activities, biodiversity conservation and SLM.

4.d) It has been clarified that any work on plastic waste will be conducted through co-financing from Base Titanium.

**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 10/18/2021 - Cleared.

JS 9/13/2021

9- Thank you but there is no reference to the Theory of change anymore in the portal entry/CER template. Please add a cross-reference to Annex 16 of the ProDoc.

All the rest is cleared, thank you.

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 be 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 to 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 understanding 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 as 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

15 September 2021

9- References to the Theory of change have been added in the CEO ER and in the portal.

13 September 2021

1. 1) Please note that references to activities managing plastic waste have been revised? for the ones that remain it is clarified that these will be funded exclusively through co-financing.
1. 2) Thank you for highlighting any gaps in activities under Output 1.1. Activities on coral-reef protection are present under the following activity: ?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?; land-use plans are covered under the activity: ?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?, and has been added as a standalone activity. References to management of fish spawning areas including mangrove and coral reef protection; control of illegal fishing gear and respect of no-take zones have been added under descriptions of Output 1.1.
1. 3) The following text has been added to the description of Output 2.1.1: The baseline membership of the multi-stakeholder platforms varies in the different land/seascapes, depending on the stakeholders active at the landscape/seascape. For instance, the Shimoni-Vanga platform has a relatively high number of international NGOs because they are active there. The Lk. Bogoria has several county depts represented (environment and tourism; water; agriculture) because

all are engaged in supporting grantees to some extent. But generally includes county government, national government, national and international NGOs, and local registered groups. In OP 7, effort will be made to strengthen the participation and involvement of the following: women groups; youth groups; research/tertiary institutions and private sector.

1. 4) The text has been amended here as the Incremental Reasoning section now includes the recommendations of the MTR and how they will be addressed. The strategic partners will be selected through a competitive process (open call to proposals), so they cannot be identified at this point. The strategic partners under SGP-06 were: WWF Kenya for the Sacred Kaya forest landscape; Coastal Marine and Resource Development (COMRED) for the Shimoni-Vanga seascape and Kenya Organic Agricultural Network (KOAN) for the Lake Bogoria landscape.
1. 5) The following text has been added to Output 2.2.1: ?Case studies will be conducted at two levels: First, individual grantees will be supported to reflect on their grant implementation experience and distill lessons. An Second, NGOs implementing land/seascape strategic grants will prepare case studies summarizing the land/seascape planning and implementation efforts, including the contribution of individual grant activities to achieving the land/seascape objectives. These case studies will also apply a participatory approach involving all members of the multi-stakeholder platforms, grantees and their support organizations. Best practices will be identified and documented as part of the process. Understanding the extent to which community and environmental resilience has been enhanced will be an important aspect of case study preparation. Dissemination will be done at various levels including local, county, watershed, land/seascape and national levels within available resources. The means of dissemination will be identified as project implementation progresses, with the objective of reaching a large audience, but also through means adapted to specific target groups, in particular women and the youth.?
1. 6) The following text has been added under the description of Outcome 2: ?Activities under this outcome, also allow for CSOs as a sector, to distill their learning, and potentially leverage knowledge for policy recommendations, advocacy, and support to other development initiatives. Case studies, pilots and lessons learned can help inform other initiatives with field-level experiences and expertise.
- 7) The following text has been added to Output 2.2.2 ?Criteria for identification of *strategic initiatives* for upscaling will be developed jointly by both the National Steering Committee (NSC) of the SGP and strategic partners. Criteria will include, but not be limited to the following: (i) relevance and priority for the county government, (ii) applicability at county-wide level; (iii) involvement of large numbers of the community and beneficiaries; (iv) goodwill and support by relevant national institutions. Some of the initiatives implemented in GEF 6 as possible candidates for replication and upscaling in GEF 7 (depending on proposals) include; (i) strengthening the governance and managerial capabilities of community wildlife conservancies; (ii) developing and strengthening a honey value chain, and (iii) expansion and protection of locally-managed-marine areas (LMMAs) through monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS)?

1. 8) The text has been revised to now read: "Activities under this output will implement enabling procedures and protocols for effective monitoring & evaluation; please refer to Annex 4- Monitoring Plan for more information."

9) & 10) The Theory of Change has been revised.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 9/13/2021- Cleared, thank you.

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

Agency Response

13 September 2021

4) The following text has been added to the CEO ER :

The Kenya SGP is aligned with the Biodiversity and the Land Degradation Focal Area Strategies as it engages communities in landscape strategies that "mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes" and "Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape.". The SGP Country Programme will also work with community organizations to "enhance on-the-ground Implementation of SLM" for the protection of biodiversity.

The strategy for the Kenya SGP UCP in GEF-7 is fully aligned with the spirit of the *GEF Impact Program on Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration* in that its core approach promotes "a sustainably integrated landscape that simultaneously meets a full range of local needs, including water availability, nutritious and profitable crops for families and local markets, and enhanced human health; while also contributing to national economic development and policy commitments; and delivering globally to the maintenance of biodiversity, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and provision of food, fiber, and commercial commodities to international supply chains."

The project is expected to deliver significant global environmental benefits: 12,000 hectares of land restored; 43,000 hectares of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas); 16,000 hectares of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity. These investments will support the conservation of globally significant biodiversity, support healthy ecosystems, promote sustainable use of natural resources, and arrest land degradation.

Co-benefits from the project will also contribute to GHG emissions avoided (283,797 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e) through restoration, management, land use change and sustainable agricultural activities.

In terms of concrete activities that the project will undertake to support the conservation of globally significant biodiversity, and contribute in arresting and reversing current global trends in land degradation, specifically desertification and deforestation, these include:

Contribution to Global Environmental Benefit (GEB)	Examples of Activities Conducted to Contribute to GEB
12,000 hectares of land restored;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conservation and restoration of mangrove ecosystems</li> <li>- Restoration and rehabilitation of native vegetation, including riparian forests in middle and upper catchments /woodlands, coastal areas</li> </ul>



43,000 area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected 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 to avoid risks to marine biodiversity and environment
- 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 practises, water resources management and utilisation, traditional crops
- Establishing community conservancy land use management plans
- Public awareness campaigns and educational programmes to promote behavioural change particularly in the areas of poaching 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
- Support land management practices which promote diversification, and agroforestry, as well as intercropping, mulching, and composting and erosion control
- Improvement of mariculture practices to avoid depleting natural resources and supporting sustainability
- 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

<p>16,000 area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> <li>- Replicating successful Sea Grass Ecosystem Restoration programs in areas where it has not been piloted</li> <li>- management of fish spawning areas including mangrove and coral reef protection; control of illegal fishing gear and respect of no-take zones</li> <li>- Supporting turtle conservation activities</li> </ul>
<p>283,797 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e Expected CO<sub>2</sub>e (direct) (metric tons) ?</p> <p>Greenhouse gas emission mitigated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- restoration of mangrove ecosystems</li> <li>- restoration and rehabilitation of native vegetation, including riparian forests in middle and upper catchments /woodlands, coastal areas</li> <li>- implementing coral reef restoration programme</li> </ul>

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 10/18/2021 - Cleared

JS 9/13/2021

2- Please correct the typo on the number of hectares of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity in the Shimoni-Vanga Seascape . The table shows 71,000 ha instead of 16,000.

The rest is cleared, thank you.

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

15 September 2021

2- The typo has been corrected.

13 September 2021

1. The baseline and OP-6 columns have been merged, while making clear what was achieved during OP-6. Please see table below:

Landscape	Baseline (Business-as-usual)	SGP-07	Global Environmental I be contributed to
-----------	------------------------------	--------	---

Shimoni-Vanga Seascape in southern Kenya

Local community (BMUs, CFAs) institutions exist but are weak, with minimal capacity to influence NRM governance. To address this, under SGP-06 there has been considerable attention on capacitating 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, and those that did not have market linkages existed until SGP-06 invested in this area. Market linkages for various enterprises including plastic waste value chains, tourism ventures, boat operators and value addition were initiated.

Limited capacities of local governance bodies and communities to access suitable solutions and financial resources. As a response, under SGP-06 multi-stakeholder governance platforms were established for improved governance of the seascape for effective participatory decision making to enhance socio-ecological landscape resilience.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Establish/strengthen linkages with tertiary institutions and research organizations to facilitate exchange and

4,000 hectares of land rest

10,000 hectares of landsca  
improved practices

71,000 hectares of marine  
under improved practices  
biodiversity

283,797 tcO2-e CO2e (dir  
sequestered or emissions a

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 generally weak, with minimal capacity to influence NRM governance. As a result, SGP-06 invested in local institution strengthening focusing on community wildlife conservancies and mid and downstream Water Users Associations for improved governance of the ecosystem

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. However, participation of women's groups has remained weak and requires more support for engagement.

Absence of experience sharing platforms to disseminate lessons and experiences of good practices, led to SGP-06 investing in structures that allow so. 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 for productive use e.g. Village Solar Energy Access and Sustainable Mobility Project and Promoting adoption and scaling up of

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.

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.

Renewable energy piloted in SGP-06 is now used to fuel sustainable interventions in SGP-07.

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.

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, lead to greater ownership and coordination

4,000 hectares of land rest

16,500 area of landscapes improved practices

283,797 tcO2-e - carbon saved or emissions avoided

<p>The Samburu-Isiolo (SICA) Conservation Areas in the arid rangelands of Northern Kenya</p>	<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>	<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>	<p>4,000 hectares of land restored</p> <p>16,500 area of landscapes improved practices</p> <p>283,797 tcO2-e - carbon sequestered or emissions avoided</p>
--	---	---	--

2. The GEB summary figures have been added to the table on incremental reasoning (please see table above).

3. This has been added as an activity under Output 2.2.2. ("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")

**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 10/18/2021- Cleared.

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 9/13/21- All cleared, thank you.

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.	<b>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.</b> 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

13 September 2021

1) 1) The following text has been added to the sustainability sub-section: **There are several factors and considerations built into the project that will promote sustainability:**

? Multi-stakeholders platforms will design sustainability plans as part of their landscape strategies. This will promote a more long-term vision for results achieved, and help identify the roles that CSOs, county governments and the private sector will play in the long run

? County governments will play a key role in supporting CSOs to realize landscape strategies. This is crucial as it bridges the policy gaps that exist, and ensures that those institutions with mandates, can coordinate with the civil society sector. It also ensures that there is a coordinated approach to the landscape rather than disparate initiatives at play. The co-financing provided by the local counties reflects their interest and support of the project.

? The multi-stakeholder platforms also promote social cohesion, mechanisms for planning and coordination which support social sustainability. Giving CSOs a platform

through which to communicate plan, and include marginalized communities, is likely to support the social cohesion needed for sustainability.

? Counties such as Kwale and Isiolo are in the final stages of setting up climate change funds for access by local communities and have begun discussions on how these can build on successes of SGP. This indicates that there are opportunities for financial sustainability. CSOs that have demonstrated success under the SGP grants, will be able to apply for other resources.

? Financial sustainability will be sought by strengthening communities' livelihoods, support for marketing, and increasing linkages with private sector partners. The project will also invest in CSOs organizational and administrative structures to help them better manage their resources for sustainable interventions. Support in M&E will further help CSOs to understand results achieved and how their resources were utilized, this will support more long-term planning.

Under the upscaling sub-section, the following text has been added: The interventions identified thus far for upscaling from SGP-06 include:

? coral rehabilitation in the Shimoni-Vanga seascape

? pasture growing and management in Lake Bogoria landscape

? Sustainable agricultural practices across the three landscapes

? Mangrove restoration in coastal zones.

2) In response to the point made by the MTR, it is recommended that a sustainability plan be developed as part of the landscape strategies. This is so that specific objectives under the strategies are associated with longer-term, concrete interventions meant to ensure sustainability. This has been added as an activity under Output 2.1.2 ?Design a sustainability plan for each landscape strategy?.

#### **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 (see Annex D). 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 9/13/2021 - All cleared, thank you.

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

13 September 2021

- 1- The Annex numbers have been corrected.

1. 2- The Stakeholder Engagement Plan now includes reference to the role of private sector. Please refer to Annex 8. Consultations with the private sector did take place during the PPG, however these were not exclusively private sector workshops. These are identified in the list of consultations
1. 3- The list of stakeholder consultations now also include reference to which of these members were also part of multi-stakeholder platforms under SGP-06. There were two specific consultations held for the Shimoni Vanga and Lake Bogoria multi-stakeholder platforms. The individuals that were part of the platform and met with individually are highlighted. During the months of consultations, the multistakeholder platforms did not meet physically because of the COVID-19 restrictions. It was a challenge to hold virtual meetings because in many areas internet connectivity was poor or non-existent, or local communities do not possess smart phones or ability to purchase bundles for virtual meetings. But many of the members of the multi-stakeholder platforms were consulted because the consultations brought together groups of people such as national government and local government personnel; members of local organizations; international and national NGOs. The NSC was consulted on several occasions, especially when the PIF and the prodoc were part of the NSC agenda meeting.

4- The phone numbers have been removed.

#### **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 10/18/2021 - Cleared.

JS 9/13/21

1-2: Cleared.

3- Thank you but targets are still not consistent between the results framework (RF) and the gender action plan (GAP). For instance, the GAP has 11 women-led community organizations participating in multi-stakeholder platforms as a target, when the end of project target is 15 in the RF:

<b>Outcome 1.3</b>	conversion of waste; beekeeping; green value-added <del>agro</del> -businesses integrated into value chains, micro-processing.			
<b>Project Component 2</b>	Landscape governance and adaptive management for upscaling and replication			
Outcome 2.1- Multistakeholder governance platforms strengthened/in place for improved governance of target landscapes and seascapes for effective participatory decision making to enhance socio-	<i>Number of landscape-based multi-stakeholder platforms established and operational</i>	2 multi-stakeholder platforms established in <del>Shimoni</del> – Vanga, and Lake <del>Bogoria</del> National Reserve (in their nascent <del>stage</del> , <del>more</del> capacity building is needed)	3	3-functional multi-stakeholder platforms with at least 30% women representation in <del>Shimoni</del> Vanga sea scape, Kenya Lake <del>Bogoria</del> National Reserve and the arid rangelands of northern Kenya around Samburu- <del>Isiolo</del> conservation area and production sacred Mijikenda Kaya forests of Kilifi county
	<i>Number of women-led community organizations participating in multi-stakeholder platforms</i>	11 women-led community organizations participating in multi-stakeholder platforms	At least 10	At least 15 in all 3 land/seascapes

Please double check all targets and align.

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

15 September 2021

3. Thank you. The Results Framework and the Gender Action Plan have been double-checked to align targets. 15 women-led community organizations will be participating in multi-stakeholder platforms and there will be at least 30% women representation in the 3-functional multi-stakeholder platforms. The Gender Action Plan has been updated accordingly.

13 September 2021

1. The Gender Action Plan has been redrafted to reflect which activity falls under each outcome, and the activities have been specified. The activities are now consistent with the risk register. There is now a new column titled "project level gender related activity" that outlines the specific activities to be undertaken.

2. The consultants that SGP engaged (during PPG) for SGP-06 did not deliver on the gender assessment. However, during the PPG, the gender consultant conducted a gender analysis and gender action plan and identified specific interventions required to achieve strong gender results. In particular, it was noted that there was a need to increase the participation of women's groups in the multi-stakeholder platforms as a result an indicator exists for this consideration in the results framework. Findings have also revealed that the SGP office together with the Strategic partners for each of the landscapes-seascapes need to encourage women groups and women-led groups to develop and submit proposals. As a result the proposal template and the progress report template have been improved by revising the section on gender; to guide the local groups in thinking through and reporting on gender dimensions. The baseline studies preceding the development of the landscape/seascape strategies will now include gender as a main priority.

3. The targets in the results framework and gender action plan are harmonized (e.g. both include the following target: 11 women-led community organizations participating in multi-stakeholder platforms). Text has been added before the gender action plan confirming that all targets of the gender action plan, even if not reflected in the RF, will be monitored.

1.

## 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 9/13/2021 - Cleared, thank you.

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

13 September 2021

The stakeholder engagement plan includes reference to consultations with the private sector.

**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 9/13/2021 All cleared, thank you.

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 proposals for climate change risk and design appropriate mitigation measures.

Agency Response

13 September 2021

1. The text has been amended to read: "The complete list of risks is in the Risk Register Annex 6; the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) is in Annex 5; risk considerations are also included in Annex 13 in the Climate Change Report as well Annex 17 on COVID-19 Analysis and Action Framework."
2. The following clarification has been added to the risk register: "Grant proposals will require CSOs to identify how they plan to address climate change risks in their proposals. If and when this is a challenge for CSOs to identify in their proposals, strategic partners will provide the technical guidance that can support identification of climate change risks and tools for mitigation of said risks. At the NSC level, the climate change expertise will be employed to vet and follow up on project proposals to skill up through the proposal process."

### 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 10/18/2021 - Cleared.**

JS 9/13/2021 -

A- The project budget plans for 4 staff (National Coordinator, Programme Assistant, Technical Assistant in Baringo, Communications and Knowledge sharing UNV) when this section of the portal entry only mentions the National Coordinator and the Programme Assistant as part of the Project Management Unit.

A1 - Please clarify and ensure that the description of the PMU is consistent with the budget.

A2- Please clarify why there is a technical assistant for one (Baringo) of the three targeted landscapes and not the others. Please especially explain why the technical assistant would be devoted to Baringo where OP6 was already operating, when it seems there would be stronger staffing needs for the new landscape (Samburu and Isiolo counties) that was not included in OP6.

All the rest is cleared, thank you.

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 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

15 September 2021

A- Noted. The ToRs for the Technical Assistant in Baringo and for the Communications and Knowledge-Sharing have been added to Annex 7- Overview of Technical Consultancies. Reference to the Technical Assistant in Baringo and the Communications and Knowledge-Sharing Personnel have also been added to the CEO Endorsement and ProdDoc with the following text: The project team will also include two UN Volunteers

(UNVs); one will be a technical assistant to support implementation of the project in Baringo, and the second will support knowledge-sharing and communications. Details of these roles are outlined in Annex 7.

A-1 The descriptions in the budget are aligned and integrated into Annex 7, which outline the ToRs for the consultancy.

A-2 Due to budget limitations and based on observations from the MTR which noted the relevance/need of technical assistance, it was determined that there can only be one Technical Assistant during this SGP cycle. Baringo was selected because (i) it has the largest number of grantees and thus greater coordination is needed to ensure cohesion at coordination at the local level; (ii) it is the only site where there likely will not be a strategic partner to support the capacity development (there were no qualified applicants for strategic grants during the last cycle, which required significant support from the project team); (iii) the present technical assistant has established a very positive working relationship with stakeholders that the project does not want to disrupt, and wants to build momentum on. The Strategic partner in SICA will collaborate closely with this Technical Assistant so that there are opportunities for cross-learning.

13 September 2021

- 1- The GEF terminology has been incorporated in the GEF Portal in the section on Governance and Management Arrangements. UNDP is identified as the implementing agency while UNOPs is identified as the executing agency.
- 2- The projects that will be ending soon have been identified as baseline initiatives. The following text has been added under descriptions of the baseline: ?Several projects have also contributed to the baseline of the project. SGP-07 will explore the lessons learned from the initiatives, and build on some of the successes so that there is not a duplication or undermining of previous investments. These include:

**?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), partnered 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.

**?Kenya Resilient in Arid Lands Partnership for Integrated Development (Kenya RAPID)?** USAID 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 guided the program were (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.

**?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.?

1. 3- The Restoration Challenge Grant Platform for Smallholders and Communities, with Blockchain-Enabled Crowdfunding, IUCN, in Kenya and Cameroon (2020-2023) has now been added. Two additional projects have also been added.
1. 4- There is now co-financing provided from the ICCA initiative in the amount of USD 350,000; please see co-financing figures.

#### **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 9/13/2021 - Cleared.

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

13 September 2021

1- The following text has been added: The project also supports Kenya's Land Degradation Neutrality Target. Kenya's work on LDN seeks to protect, restore, and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification and halt/reverse land degradation and biodiversity loss?all of which will be target by the project. SGP-07 will target erosive activities and provide alternatives, challenge deforestation and support reforestation/rehabilitation activities, address overgrazing of grasslands/pastures to prevent the loss of vegetation and ecosystem services. The project will contribute to LDN targets by restoring 12,000 hectares of land and achieving 43,000 hectares of landscapes under improved practices.

**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 9/13/21 - Cleared, thank you.

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**

13 September 2021

1. A specific Knowledge Management workplan is provided with timelines:

Activities	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Objective	Audience
Peer to Peer exchanges					-Sharing best practices and lessons learned - building social cohesion -opportunities for capacity building and synergies	CSOs/CBOs, government

Participation in Knowledge Fairs					-showcasing achievements/results - connecting with other CSOs/CBOs, networking - Sharing best practices and lessons learned	CSOs/CBOs, private sector, Government
Annual presentations at multi-stakeholder platforms on innovations and pilots					-showcasing achievements/results - connecting with other CSOs/CBOs, networking - Sharing best practices and lessons learned -Networking	CSOs/CBOs, private sector, government
Development of case studies					-Documenting initiatives and results - Providing analysis for purposes of replication and/or learning lessons, and promoting sustainability of interventions - Upscaling initiatives	CSOs/CBOs, government
Training workshops					-Increasing knowledge, capacity building, skills development	CSOs/CBOs
Policy recommendations presented at county level					-Upscaling knowledge, promoting replication of successful activities and practices - Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and SLM	Government
South/South exchanges through SGP global network					-Sharing lessons learned, best practices - Capacity development - Strengthening global movement and actions for biodiversity conservation and SLM	CSOs/CBOs

Participatory videos/photo series					-Increasing public awareness -Documenting interventions and results achieved - Showcasing leaders in conservation and SLM for greater exposure and recognition	Broader public, CSOs/CBOs, government, private sector
Radio programmes					-Public awareness on biodiversity protection and SLM -highlighting work that is being conducted by grantees	Broader public

**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 9/13/2020 - Cleared. We note that the GEF financed M&E budget is just slightly above the 5% observed average but that the OP6 MTR identified the need to strengthen support to M&E.

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

13 September 2021

1. 1- Kindly see the response under question 1 of Project Summary on why the M&E is slightly higher.
2. 2- Thank you; correction has been made.
3. 3- Thank you; correction has been made

#### 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 10/18/2021 - Cleared.

JS 9/13/2021

#### A-Budget

A1- The budget is difficult to read in the portal entry because of very large rows. Please simplify the presentation in the portal entry by reducing the `detailed description` to the strict minimum, and merging together rows that share the same `detailed description`. For example the first four rows should be merged for a total of \$2000. Details can be kept in the other documents.

A2 - Please attach the GEF budget template as a separate xls file in the next submission. We failed to find it with this submission.

1a- Cleared.

1b - Cleared.

1c - Out of the 4 project's staff (National Coordinator, Programme Assistant, Technical Assistant in Baringo, Communications and Knowledge sharing), only one is currently charged on the PMC (10% of the total cost of the national coordinator) so that only \$25,000 out of a total staff cost of \$544,400 is charged on the PMC. Terms of reference are provided only for two of them (National Coordinator, Programme Assistant) in annex 7 of the ProDoc and they still fail to describe unique outputs linked to the respective components on which they are charged. Please provide, for all project staff, Terms of reference that link them to unique outputs under the components on which they are charged.

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

15 September 2021

A1. Changes have been made to the portal entry, as suggested.

A2. The xls budget spreadsheet has been uploaded in the Portal (see ?Annex1 GEF Budget Template- Sept 2021?).

I-C Noted. The ToRs for the Technical Assistant in Baringo and for the Communications and Knowledge-Sharing who will be part of the project management team, have been added to Annex 7- Overview of Technical Consultancies. The tasks listed under these, refer to responsibilities to be carried out under each Component, and will support the implementation of several outputs. All the ToRs have been updated to have responsibilities correspond to specific components.

13 September 2021

1.a. SGP-07's budget is USD 905,918 lower than the budget for SGP-06. Despite this, the project seeks to achieve high level of results resulting in global environmental benefits. Under SGP-07, the project is venturing into a new landscape where the baseline of activity is very low. To ensure that high level of programming is delivered the project has been reduced to the extent possible, without increasing risks to the project. Budget decreases have been made in the following areas:

- Audiovisual/Publications decreased from USD 49,000 to USD 20,000
- Trainings reduced from USD 78,167 to USD 63,667
- Service contracts have decreased from USD 624,400 to USD 544,400

The total amount allocated to small grants has **increased** from USD 1,611,696 to USD 1,679,196; now 63.3% of the budget.

While most of the SGP is implemented through grants, one of the key learnings from SGP-06 (MTR and staff interviews) is that CSOs require substantial capacity building and training in the areas of policy influence, upscaling of activities, monitoring, and knowledge management. This support cannot be provided solely through grants; the projects must provide this capacity development so that grantees optimize their grants.

A strong central coordinating mechanism through the project team and multi-stakeholder platforms, will support activities, particularly on knowledge management, communications, upscaling and replication, policy recommendations, organizing peer-to-peer trainings and pilots, and monitoring and evaluation. These activities can be implemented by the project team outside of grant proposal cycles. Similarly, some capacity building (ecosystem development, biodiversity conservation, livelihoods M&E, financial administration), may need to be carried out before call to proposals to optimize CSOs abilities to implement grants, and should not be beholden to grant submission/approval schedules.

1.b. County governments have offered office space through co-financing, however due to risks posed by violence, security threats and terrorism, these spaces have not been

approved by the United Nations Department for Safety and Security (UNDSS). Rent costs for offices that meet UNDSS requirements are higher due to their location in more secure zones. The UNDP Country Office does provide a small amount of co-financing for space e.g. their meetings rooms.

1.c. The annex on Overview of Technical Consultancies has been amended to reflect the tasks of the programme assistant related to the realization of specific outputs. The following text has been added to the ToRs: "Support and liaison among CSOs and small grant recipients that are working to restore degraded lands, restore connectivity, support innovation in biodiversity conservation (output 1.1.1) and those enhancing sustainability and resilience of production systems (output 1.21) and promoting sustainable livelihoods (output 1.3.1) to help organize pilots, meet deadlines, access technical support as needed; maintain minutes and document success rates and gender participation in pilots and demonstrations"

#### **Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 9/13/2021 - Cleared.

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

13 September 2021

Duly noted; correction has been made.

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 10/18/2021 - Cleared.

JS 9/13/2021

1- Thank you but note that the response mentions three levers of behavioural change and only elaborates on two (material incentives; information). Please correct.

2- This comment was 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" in a separate row of the response matrix.

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

15 September 2021

1-The third lever of behavioural change has now been added with the following text:  
?Social influences: to leverage social relationships, dynamics, and leadership to support changes in peoples? behaviour and render them more sustainable. By investing in community-based groups and local actors, the project anticipates that instead of top-down social influences, community leaders will be able to mobilize their communities and promote changes of behaviour. The project will also work specifically with indigenous groups and women?s groups, so that they may be better able to communicate the benefits of sustainable actions within their own communities. The underlying notion is that locally-rooted groups and organizations have more recognition, familiarity and trust within their communities, and will thus be agents and channels for information and change. The project will also leverage larger NGOs/CBOs to support smaller entities, and to help shape the landscape sustainability agenda.?

2- The comment by Germany regarding case studies has been separated into a separate row in the response matrix. The following text has been added to respond to this: ?Case studies will be conducted at two levels: First, individual grantees will be supported to reflect on their grant implementation experience and distill lessons learned. Second, NGOs implementing land/seascape strategic grants will prepare case studies summarizing the land/seascape planning and implementation efforts, including the contribution of individual grant activities to achieving the land/seascape objectives. These case studies will also apply a participatory approach involving all members of the multi-stakeholder platforms, grantees and their support organizations. Best practices will be identified and documented as part of the process. Understanding the extent to which community and environmental resilience has been enhanced will be an important aspect of case study preparation. Dissemination will be done at various levels including local,

county, watershed, land/seascape and national levels within available resources. The means of dissemination will be identified as project implementation progresses, with the objective of reaching a large audience, but also through means adapted to specific target groups, in particular women and youth. Case studies will take into account context specificity. When applicable, elements will be drawn out to feed policy development, upscaling opportunities, and other projects. These will be discussed and highlighted in multi-stakeholder platforms, so that actors can discuss and question particular elements, to integrate them in their own programming. Outcome 2.2 thus goes beyond simple replication; analysis of lessons learned and case studies will inform policy development, upscaling opportunities, the development of other projects and initiatives, as applicable. This text has also been added to the CEO ER and the prodoc in the 'Section 3- The proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project' and 'Section 4.2-Expected Results', respectively.

13 September 2021

1 & 2. Please see amended text as a response to Germany:

The project will invest in livelihoods to incentivize sustainable interventions, and provide pilots and demonstrations on low-cost sustainable interventions, as it recognizes that unsustainable behaviours and practices are fundamental drivers of global environmental change, and responding to those behaviours can lead to transformative impacts. Behavioral change will require the project to address how environmental practices are influenced by stakeholders' values, cultural norms, power dynamics and other social structures?livelihoods offer an entry point to address the intersection of some of these factors. The project recognizes that practices need to change, but the 'how' can often be left out. By investing in livelihoods that are relevant to stakeholders and communities, and degrading in nature, the project will explicitly address what behaviours need to change with accompanying strategies and benefits to communities. The project will thus lean on the following three levers of behavioural change:

- Material incentives: to make behavior more convenient and accessible by giving rewards and providing substitutes for desired, or undesired, behaviours. In this case, the project will support sustainable livelihoods by providing technical capacity and inputs, facilitating markets and exchanges, business plan development, and linkages with private sector, government and other partners that can support activities.

- Information: about what the desired behavior is, why it matters and how to achieve it. The multi-stakeholder platforms, and knowledge sharing by CSO partners will be key to, in tandem to material incentives, to enhance information, knowledge and public awareness on why behavioural change will be beneficial, and the positive outcomes that will be associated with sustainable practices.

The importance of a participatory problem analysis is recognized, especially given that the project will be piloted in a new site, and that COVID-19 may have led to unidentified problems for sustainable interventions/capacities of CSOs. As a result, a participatory problem analysis has been added as an activity under Outcome 2.1, and will be critical in designing responsive landscape strategies.

**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 10/22/2021. Yes, CEO endorsement is recommended.

JS 10/21/2021. Not at this stage. Please address the two remaining comments (Start and completion date; co-financing labelling) and resubmit.

JS 9/14/2021 - Not at this stage. Please address the few remaining comments above and resubmit.

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**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>9/14/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/21/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/22/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**