

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Kenya

Review PIF 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

Agenices

UNDP

Date received by PM

10/9/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 - Yes. Cleared. The Project is aligned with the SGP strategic directions approved for GEF-7.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019. Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 - Not entirely. Please provide the complete categorization for all sources of co-financing in Table C.

Please revise

11/7/2019 - Revised. Cleared

Agency Response Please see revised Table C with the complete categorization of all sources of co-financing.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 Yes. A PPG for \$91,980 inclusive of Agency fees is requested and it's within the allowable cap.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019. Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2019 Not entirely. See below under consistency with Focal Areas.

Please revise.

11/7/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

Please see response under Consistency with Focal Areas, below.

Normal

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 Please describe the contents of output 2.2.2 Strategic initiatives are supported to upscale successful SGP projects experience in practice - who will undertake it, what does it consist of?

Please revise

11/7/2019 - revised. Cleared

Agency Response

Please see revised description of Outputs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2. in the PIF on page 18.

Quote

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 Not entirely explained. Please elaborate more on the consistency of the projects with the Biodiversity and Land Degradation Focal Area strategies for GEF-7. Explain how the project is going to contribute to the objectives of the biodiversity focal area, and how it is consistent with the priorities of this focal area.

Regarding land degradation (LD):

The LD objective the Agency has selected is from GEF 6. The text is in line with GEF-7, but the number should be LD 1-4, which seems most suitable.

There is no mention of Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) and the LD Focal Area is supporting this agenda to a great extent. The SGP funding should indicate how it intends to assist Kenya to meet its national LDN targets or to set targets if they have not yet done so. There should be reference to this throughout the project description as well as in the section on national priorities.

The Agency has tagged 'Drylands' in the taxonomy, also Kenya is in the Drylands IP and if SGP is working in similar geographical areas, it would be good to explore collaboration with the Kenya child project. Even if SGP is not working in similar geographical areas, collaboration can be explored on knowledge component of the SGP and Drylands projects. Additional information on potential areas for collaboration should be included in the project description as well as under Section II- Project Justification, sub-section No. 4.

Please revise

11/7/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

Please see corrected Table A for more appropriate Programming Direction.

Please see amended text on pages 19-20 of the PIF.

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2019 Not sufficiently. Please explain the value added of the GEF. Please explain what the business as usual scenario is, that is what would the situation be without the GEF support, with only the ongoing and planned activities in the absence of the GEF and the expected/projected loss of GEBs if left unattended.

Please revise

11/7/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

Please see amended text under the section Incremental cost-reasoning on page 20-21 of the PIF.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2019 Is it possible to include an estimate for carbon sequestration benefits? The PIF mentions that the project will address climate mitigation strategies. Perhaps the Agency can provide a rough estimate based on the hectare estimates under indicators 3 and 4 or, alternatively, use a proxy from similar projects (1 tCO₂e /1\$). These estimates can be revised at CEO Endorsement.

Please revise

11/7/2019 Explanation provided. Cleared

Agency Response

Carbon benefits cannot be easily estimated, even crudely, at this stage of project identification given the scale of the landscapes, the different biomes involved, the possible grant project activities, and other factors. More time is needed to be able to calculate carbon sequestration benefits of these BD and LD activities; they will be calculated with greater precision during full project preparation.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 Not clear. Please describe what is innovative about the participatory, multi-stakeholder approach. The SGP has been in Kenya for many years, what's this Upgraded Country Program going to do differently and innovatively?

Please revise

11/7/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

Please see additional text under the section on *Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up* on page 22 of the PIF.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2019 Could the Agency please provide the exact geo-referenced information (coordinates) of the three landscapes/seascapes?

Please revise

11/7/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

Landscape coordinates have been provided in the revised PIF on page 24.

Normal

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2019 - Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2019 Not sufficiently. Please provide indicative information on Gender considerations relevant to the project (what are the issues to address in terms of gender equality) and any measures to address these.

Please revise

11/7/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

Please see revised text under the section on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment on pages 25-26 of the PIF.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Not sufficiently. The GEF recently approved an Updated Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards that came into effect on July 1, 2019. (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meetingdocuments/EN_GEF.C.55.07_ES_Safeguards.pdf). Please provide indicative information regarding any additional Environmental and Social Risks and potential Impacts associated with the proposed project and any measures to address such impacts as specified in the Policy requirements.

Please revise

11/7/2019 Explanation provided. Cleared

Agency Response

After reviewing the GEF Updated Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards, no additional Environmental and Social Risks are apparent at this stage.

The UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) is aligned with the GEF Updated Policy of July 1, 2019. The social and environmental safeguards pre-screening was prepared during the PIF design phase identifying environmental and/or social risks and potential impacts of the project at this stage of project development, as well as measures to address them. During the course of project preparation, potential risks will continue to be identified and analyzed and then added to the Risk table in the Project Document if they are found to be valid. The risk table in the PIF on pages 28-30 is in line with the social and environmental safeguards pre-screening conducted as part of PIF development.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2019 Partially. Please elaborate on how the monitoring and evaluation functions will be undertaken.

Please revise

11/7/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

Please see additional text under the section on Coordination on pages 27-29 of the PIF.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2019 Not entirely. The SGP funding should indicate how it intends to assist Kenya to meet its national LDN targets or to set targets if they have not yet done so. There should be reference to this throughout the project description as well as in the section on national priorities.

Please revise

11/7/2019 Revised. Cleared

Agency Response

Please see revised text on pages 29-30 and 19-20 of the PIF.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2019 Yes. The KM approach is explained under Outcome 2.2

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/20/2019 Please note that the current OFP is :

Ms. Betty Maina

Operational Focal Point since 2019-10-08

Principal Secretary

Ministry of Environment and Forestry

Please provide new letter of endorsement.

11/7/2019 Revised. Cleared - Note: The Portal registered October 11 as the submission date, since that was the date that the Agency noted. However, the Agency explained that the actual submission was done on October 7, one day before the OFP changed.

Agency Response

Please note that the, the SGP Kenya PIF, together with the LOE, was submitted through the GEF portal on 7 October 2019, the day before the change in the OFP, as indicated in the screenshot below.

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Kenya

	Updated By	Updated Date
PIF Clearance		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> PIF Submission	# SRV-GEF-EXUSR	Oct 7, 2019
CEO Endorsement		
<input type="radio"/> CEO Endorsement Request		
Implementation		
<input type="radio"/> Implementation Report		
<input type="radio"/> MidTerm Evaluation		
<input type="radio"/> Terminal Evaluation		

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019 Not at this stage. Please refer to the comments and questions above. In addition, please revise the PIF for several number of typographic errors (typos).

Please revise

11/7/2019 - Th e PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2019 . Please note that for CEO Endorsement, the Agency will be required to fill in a detailed budget template prepared by the GEF Secretariat. This budget template is as follows:

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		