# GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*
## THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| GEF ID: | **4827** | | |
| Country/Region: | **Kenya** | | |
| Project Title: | **Enhancing Wildlife Conservation in the Productive Southern Kenya Rangelands through a landscape approach Kenya** | | |
| GEF Agency: | **UNDP** | GEF Agency Project ID: | |
| Type of Trust Fund: | **GEF Trust Fund** | GEF Focal Area (s): | **Biodiversity** |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | | **BD-2; BD-2; BD-1; Project Mana;** | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | **$0** | Project Grant: | **$3,990,909** |
| Co-financing: | **$28,000,000** | Total Project Cost: | **$31,990,909** |
| PIF Approval: | **March 28, 2012** | Council Approval/Expected: | **June 01, 2012** |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | **Jaime Cavelier** | Agency Contact Person: | **Veronica Muthui** |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Eligibility | 1. Is the participating country eligible? | 3-15-12<br>Yes.<br>Cleared | |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | 3-15-12<br>Yes. There is a LoE from the OPF dated February 13, 2012 for a total of $4.5M.<br>Cleared | |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? | 3-15-12<br>Yes.<br>Cleared | |
| | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? | NA | |
| | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? | 3-15-12<br>Yes. Details provided on pages 13-14 of PIF.<br>Cleared | |
| | 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Resource Availability | available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | • the STAR allocation? | 3-15-12<br>Yes. Kenya has a balance of BD $7,006,000 as of today.<br>Cleared | |
| | • the focal area allocation? | 3-15-12<br>Yes. Kenya has a balance of BD $7,006,000 as of today.<br>Cleared | |
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | NA | |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | NA | |
| | • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | NA | |
| | • focal area set-aside? | NA | |
| Project Consistency | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework? | 3-15-12<br>Yes.<br>Cleared | |
| | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified? | 3-15-12<br>Yes. BD-1 and BD-2.<br>Cleared | |
| | 9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP? | 3-15-12<br>Yes. This project was prioritized by the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE) exercise following a detailed in-country consultation, led by the OFP. GEF SEC reviewed this NPFE and provided comments in two occasions.<br>Cleared | |
| | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes? | 3-15-12<br>Yes.<br>Cleared | |
| | 11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), | 3-15-12 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Project Design | sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions? | Cleared | |
| | 12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits? | | |
| | 13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning? | 3-15-12<br>Yes. But not clear if sufficient to change the status quo. See other points of the review.<br><br>3-27-12<br>Issues properly addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF.<br>Cleared | |
| | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear? | 3-15-12<br><br>1) Component 1:<br><br>1.1.) Are the 5,583 Km2 of the 6 Group Ranches (around Amboseli) the only target for this component?<br><br>1.2) What are the legal bases for the co-management framework involving private sector, communities and NGOs and other relevant stakeholders? Same for "Management Commission", and "Kenya Wildlife Conservation Forum". Do these institutions have enough | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | hand?<br><br>2) Component 2:<br><br>2.1) The geographic scope of the project is difficult to visualize. The target appears to be the 1000 Km2 of the National Parks. When referring to Tsavo, does it include Tsavao West as well as Tsavo East??<br><br>2.2) Where are the 500 Km2 of the proposed conservancies in the group ranches in relation to Tsavo and Chyulu? A map similar to that provided for Amboseli would facilitate understanding of the geographic scope of the project.<br><br>2.3) Please be more specific about the following output: "Integration of biodiversity considerations into the operations of key economic sectors through: a) incentivizing sustainable resource use through product branding and other market mechanisms (e.g. premium sale of organic products)". What economic sectors, goods and services are you refereeing to? This is massive if the project intents to cover them all.<br><br>2.4) Please clarify the geographic scope and the level of engagement in the following output: "Implementation support to critical activities identified in a landscape land use plan (e.g. zoning for agriculture, core protection, sanctuaries, ecotourism lodges, camping sites, settlement areas, infrastructure | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Considering the other outputs, these are far too many fronts unlikely to be properly covered with the budget allocated to this component.<br><br>3) Component 3. This is the hardest to visualize.<br><br>3.1) What is the geographic scope for this component? There is reference to the greater Amboseli (including Chyulu and Tsavo), but also 5 conservancies. No financial resources would be sufficient to get the proposed outputs in these vast areas. Need to narrow down the area and communities targeted for interventions.<br><br>3.2.) What is the legal status of the "conservancies" in Kenya?<br><br>3.2) What do you mean by "Safeguards for financial, technical and business management support to avoid promoting practices with negative impacts on BD"? This is very vague. How does this look on the ground?<br><br>3.3) What production practices are you refereeing to in "Production practices on group ranches and private lands for >50% of Greater Amboseli landholders are compatible with best practices in biodiversity management objectives while providing livelihoods to stakeholders". As above, this is too broad.<br><br>3.4) What does the following output mean on the ground? "Ongoing | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | sustainable natural resource use (tourism, improved livestock, revenue diversification) sustained". What activities would lead to this change?<br><br>3.5) Target for providing microcredit. This is a huge undertaking in itself.<br><br>3-27-12<br>Issues properly addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared | |
| | 15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate? | 3-15-12<br><br>The financial viability of the incremental reasoning is in question. Not clear how the proposed activities will enable those on the ground to depart from the status quo of land subdivision, accompanied by fencing, overgrazing, extension of agriculture and unplanned human settlements.<br><br>3-27-12<br>Issue properly addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared | |
| | 16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits? | 3-15-12<br>The economic benefits for land owners of not fencing, not subdividing and not selling increasingly smaller pieces of land is not clear. Are the stakeholders in open opposition to this historic trend?<br><br>3-27-12<br>Issues properly addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared | |
| | 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken | 3-15-12<br>It is not clear if the Massai and owners | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | identified and addressed properly? | and willing to participate in this project. Why are they Tier 3 in the stakeholder table (p.13). Should not they be Tier 1 (assuming the order matters)?<br><br>3-27-12<br>Issues properly addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF. Cleared | |
| | 18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience) | 3-15-12<br>The greatest threat to the integrity of the Southern Rangelands is the subdivision of the Group Ranches which is, as stated in the PIF, "often accompanied by fencing, overgrazing, extension of agriculture and unplanned human settlements. The process continues today, with group ranch committees voting to subdivide entire ranches into small parcels of 24 to 40 hectares to be dispersed among ranch members and the trend is towards increasing fragmentation of the ecosystem".<br><br>This historical trend, with the formation of group ranches in the 1960's, that allowed members to gain collective group title to their land, is not recognized as a threat in the PIF. This threat is compound with increased population growth.<br><br>Please address the issue, considering the opportunity cost for the owners of the Group Ranches of not subdividing and fencing their lands. What is that this project offers them Not to continue the historic trend? This needs to be fully clarified not only in the Table of Threats (B.4) but in other core sessions of the | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 3-27-12<br>Issues properly addressed in Responses to GEF Comments and revised PIF.<br>Cleared | |
| | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | 3-15-12<br>Yes.<br>Cleared | |
| | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate? | 3-15-12<br>Yes. The project will be implemented through the Kenya Wildlife Service, in close collaboration with the Maasai Wilderness Conservation Trust and other partners (such as the African Conservation Center).<br>Cleared | |
| | 21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | | |
| | 22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | | |
| Project Financing | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate? | 3-15-12<br>It is 4.5% of the GEF request and 7% from co-management.<br>Cleared | |
| | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | 3-15-12<br>Yes. Investments are significant. Nevertheless, the geographic scope of the project needs to be clarified to evaluate if the investments are likely to have an impact on the ground, or get diluted all together.<br><br>3-27-12 | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | to GEF Comments and revised PIF.<br>Cleared | |
| | 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;<br>At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided. | 3-15-12<br>Co-financing ratio is 1:7.<br>Cleared | |
| | 26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? | 3-15-12<br>The co-financing for this project ($28M) is significant (but see item 24), especially considering that it is all in cash. UNDP is brining $1M.<br>Cleared | |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | |
| | 28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | |
| Agency Responses | 29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from: | | |
| | • STAP? | | |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | | |
| | • Council comments? | | |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | **30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?** | 3-15-12<br>No. Please address issues under items 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 24. Thanks.<br><br>3-27-12<br>Yes. This PIF is recommended. | |
| | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | | |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ | 32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?** | | |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | March 15, 2012 | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | March 27, 2012 | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

## REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

| Review Criteria | Decision Points | Program Manager Comments |
|---|---|---|
| PPG Budget | 1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate? | 5-15-12<br>Yes. The PPG has the following components:<br>1. Baseline data collection<br>2. Assessment of institutional arrangements and capacity of different agencies<br>3. Feasibility analysis, budgeting.<br>Cleared |
| | 2.Is itemized budget justified? | 5-15-12<br>Yes.<br>GEF is contributing $1,600/week for local consultants and $2,500/week for international consultants. Travel expenses are $120K of which #30K are from GEF. Justification for Travel Expenses will be made over email.<br><br>In an email dated 5-15-12, the GEF Responsed: "The US$ 30,000 from GEF will support travel required to ensure full consultation of a broad range of relevant stakeholders during the project formulation process. Public transport system is poorly developed in Kenya in general and very limited in the Amboseli ecosystem, making it expensive to traverse the breadth of the expansive ecosystem. This is necessary because the Amboseli ecosystem is very large (over 50,000 square kilometers) and although the project initiatives will be piloted in a smaller part of the ecosystem, it is necessary to ensure adequate representation of the various production systems within the ecosystem".<br>Cleared |
| Secretariat | **3.Is PPG approval being** | 5-15-12 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Agency responded. See item 2.<br>Cleared |
| | 4. Other comments | |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | May 15, 2012 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | |

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.