

Basic Project Data

Project GEF ID:

<i>Staff</i>		<i>Processing Status</i>	<i>Date</i>
Program Manager	Acquay	Processing Stage	
Implementing Agency	UNEP	Concept Pipeline Discussion	
Regional Coordinator	Mark Griffith	PDF A - Agency Approval	
Executing Agency	National Government	PDF B - CEO Approval	
		Bilateral Project Review Meeting	
		Work Program Submission and Approva	
		CEO Endorsement	
		Agency Approval	
		Project Completion	

Cost Summary

Cost Item	Years	Amount (USD'000)
<u>Preparation</u>		
- PDF A		
- PDF B		
- PDF C		
<u>Project Allocation</u>		
- Executing Agency Fees and Costs		\$0.00
- Project Management Costs		\$0.00
- Other Incremental Costs		\$0.00

Completeness of Documentation

Focal Point.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Budget.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Logical Framework.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
STAP Review.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	Increment Cost.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Length.....	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disclosure of Administration Cost.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			Complete Cover Sheet....	<input type="checkbox"/>

1. Country Ownership

Country Eligibility

Kenya is eligible for GEF funds because it is a party to the CBD; it ratified the convention on July 26, 1994.

Evidence of Country Ownership/Country-Drivenness

The project was endorsed by the GEF Operational focal point on August 10, 1999.

The Government and community groups would provide \$290,000 in co-financing, 28% of the total project costs.

2. Program and Policy Conformity

Portfolio Balance

This project contributes to the balance of the biodiversity portfolio because it addresses arid and semi-arid and land degradation issues that are "under-represented in the portfolio.

Program Conformity

The project is consistent with the objectives of the operational program of OP#1, OP#2, and the cross-cutting issue of land degradation.

Replicability

As a demonstration project, the project is expected to develop models and lessons in community-based resource management that can be replicated.

Potential Global Environmental Benefits of Project

The potential global environmental benefits are:

- (a) Protection of the habitat of globally significant biodiversity because of improved land and water management;
- (b) Increased awareness and understanding of conservation of biodiversity through sustainable natural resource management;
- (c) Development of replicable models for community-based conservation of biodiversity of global importance.

Sustainability

The project is likely to succeed because of:

- (a) high political commitment;
- (b) major local government and community involvement in project development and implementation; and
- (c) establishment of conservation-based enterprise as an incentive to raise awareness among the intended beneficiaries about the ecological and financial benefits associated with improved conservation of natural resources.

Baseline Course of Action

The baseline actions focus on achieving sustainable land management in the following ways:

- (a) demonstration projects on high-yielding pasture and fodder production;
- (b) afforestation;
- (c) establishment of a nature reserve;
- (d) limited awareness environmental education for local communities; and
- (e) limited alternative livelihood for local people, especially women.

Alternative Action Supported by project

The alternative actions are:

- (a) promotion and adoption of integrated approaches to land and water management;
- (b) wildlife conservation activities;
- (c) Provision of environmentally sensitive economic activities for the local people as a means to reduce pressure on biodiversity/natural resources.

Conformity with GEF Public Involvement Policy

The project was conceived after a series of consultations and site visits (p. 26). The proposal does not provide a listing of the consultations and participants, but the description in para. 43, p. 26 covers a wide range of stakeholders, including community groups and farmers, as well as local government officials. This was followed by a stakeholder workshop which resulted in the identification of project activities (p. 27).

Except for project management costs, it can be presumed that the total GEF funding going to non-governmental groups for co-execution of this project would be in the range of \$0.50 to \$0.52 million. A breakdown of counterpart contributions by community group or co-executing partner, and a breakdown of GEF allocations by group, would be useful for tracking purposes.

The project has a special focus on women's groups, and allocates some \$0.05 m towards small enterprises that are mostly run by women. Additionally, women are identified as key members in the proposed Catchment Committees to be formed in the demonstration sites (it is not clear how many of such sites will be formed) that the project will fund to pilot technological and community based approaches to conservation (p. 21). Overall, the project anticipates that there would be about 20,000 beneficiaries from the project (p. 26).

Aside from specified activities at the community level (through the demonstration sites), the project will establish a Natural Resources Rural Enterprise Revolving Fund which will be focused specifically on women, and women's groups' needs (p. 24). The fund will receive some \$0.03 m from GEF as a start-up for livelihood related activities. It may be helpful if the project adopts transparent selection criteria for recipients of the fund.

It is noted that the project proposal contains a separate annex on stakeholders and their expected involvement in the project, which is good practice. A separate GEF allocation of \$0.015 m is dedicated to information dissemination, which may be an important activity that could highlight good practices as well as lessons.

Private Sector Involvement

There is no private sector involvement in the project.

3. Appropriateness of GEF Financing

Incremental Cost

The incremental cost of the project is \$750,000. The calculation of this cost is consistent with GEF principles.

Appropriateness of Financial Modality Proposed

The proposed financial modality is appropriate. The GEF is requested to provide a grant which would be 72% of total project cost of \$1.04 million and the Government and community groups would provide the remaining funds.

Financial Sustainability of the GEF-Funded Activity

As an MSP, it is expected that the recurrent cost after implementation completion would be low enough for the Government and the "financially" empowered" beneficiaries to sustain project activities.

Absorptive Capability

Cost Effectiveness

4. Coordination with Other Institutions

Collaboration

The project was reportedly prepared collaboratively by Government agencies, NGOs, and local community groups.

Complementarity with Ongoing Activities

A Task Force has been established to ensure complementarity between the project and others in the area, include the "Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Eastern Rift Valley Lakes Project" which is being prepared with a PDF B from the GEF and the GEF-funded "Management of Indigenous Vegetation in the Rehabilitation of Degraded Rangeland in the Arid Zone of Africa".

5. Responsiveness to Comments and Evaluations

Core Commitments

The Government and local stakeholders would provide about \$290,000 in co-financing, about 28% of total project cost.

Linkages

Consultation and Coordination

A variety of stakeholders were consulted during project preparation (see "Conformity with GEF Public Involvement Policy" section above for details).

Consistency w/previous upstream consultations, project preparation work, and processing conditions

Monitoring & evaluation: Minimum GEF Standards, ME plan, proposed indicators, lessons from PIRs and Project Lessons Study

The proposal outlines a M&E plan and indicators have been developed to monitor implementation progress and impacts.

Indicators

Implementing Agencies' Comments

Comments from UNDP

(a) Project needs to establish linkages with a Japanese-funded project that has a major land degradation component. This project is expected to start in late 1999.

(b) There are policy issues such as land tenure that needs to be addressed, but can an MSP tackle such policy issues?;

(c) proposed GEF activity seems to be an extension of the baseline; it is not easy to pick out the innovativeness or "value added";

(d) Insufficient detail to determine what the project is aiming for, including project site/coverage; and

(e) Some activities appear to be under-costed and it is not clear from the modest amount allocated, if the expected outcomes would be achieved.

STAP Review

n/a

Council members' Comments

n/a

Technical Assurances

Convention Secretariat

Other Technical Comments

(a) Since this is not a full project, it is unrealistic to expect that the project would help to build the (central) Government's capacity to support community-based conservation initiatives (as noted e.g. on page 3 "c"). We, therefore, recommend that references to the above project outcome/objective be deleted from the document; and

(b) We recommend that references to "financial viability of NGOs" (page 3, (d)) as an expected project objective or outcome should be deleted because this is one of the objectives of the Small Grants Program not the MSPs.

Further Processing

The MSP proposal is not recommended for CEO approval at this time because UNEP's comparative advantage in the GEF is regional/sub-regional initiatives, among others, but not in-country projects.

Accordingly, we suggest that the project proponents explore opportunities with an executing agency such as IFAD; UNEP would remain as the Implementing Agency.