



CI-GEF PROJECT AGENCY SCREENING RESULTS AND SAFEGUARD ANALYSIS

(To be completed by CI-GEF Coordination Team)

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country: Kenya	GEF Project ID:	
Project Title : Strengthening National Institutions in Kenya to Meet the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement and Sharing Best Practices in the East Africa Region		
Executing Agency: Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, Kenya & Vital Signs		
GEF Focal Area: Climate Change Mitigation		
GEF Project Amount: US\$1,144,500		
Reviewer(s): Ian Kissoon		
Date of Review: January 31, 2017		
Comments: Analysis completed and approved		

B. Project Objective:

To enhance the System for Land-based Emissions Estimation in Kenya (SLEEK) system to ensure compliance with the Paris Climate Agreement's transparency requirements.

C. Project Description:

The new Paris Climate Agreement includes a number of requirements that countries have to meet to ensure "transparency of action and support" essentially to allow for ease in tracking how countries are progressing towards their commitments under the Paris Agreement.

The "transparency framework" requires countries to regularly provide: (i) A national inventory of greenhouse gas emissions (by sources) and removals (by sinks) (ii) Information necessary to track progress toward achieving their Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) (iii) Information related to climate change impacts and adaptation (iv) information on financial, technology transfer and capacity building support needed and received and (v) information on any support they provide to developing countries.

Kenya, like many other countries in East Africa, does not have the requisite capacity to meet these requirements. The project seeks to enhance existing MRV systems needed to meet these requirements and will be delivered under the following components:

- Component 1: Strengthening national institutions for transparency-related activities
- Component 2: System enhancements to assist with improvement of transparency over time
- Component 3: Regional capacity building





D. Project location and biophysical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis:

Kenya is located in the Greater Horn of Africa region, which is highly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. More than 80% of the country's landmass is Arid and Semi-Arid Land (ASAL) with poor infrastructure, and other developmental challenges. Kenya, like other countries in the region, is bearing the brunt of climate change impacts and the associated socio-economic losses. The situation is exacerbated by the high dependence on climate sensitive natural resources. Impacts include loss of biodiversity including threatening of species, change in vegetation composition and structure, decrease in forest coverage, rapid deterioration in land cover, and depletion of water quality and quantity through the destruction of catchments and underground aquifers.

The country's economy is also highly dependent on climate sensitive sectors such as agriculture that is mainly rain-fed, energy, tourism, water and health. Climate hazards such as droughts and floods have caused considerable losses across the country's different sectors over the years with economic losses estimated at 3% of the country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Kenya's economy is also highly dependent on climate sensitive sectors such as agriculture which contributes about 30% of the country's gross domestic product and contributes to 80% of the national employment. Seventy-five percent of Kenya's greenhouse gases are from the land use, land use change and forestry and agriculture sectors. This is due to the fact that a large proportion of the population is wood fuel dependent coupled with an increase on the demand for agricultural land and urban development.

E. Executing Agency's Institutional Capacity for Safeguard Policies:

The Executing Agency did not identify any staff as being knowledgeable/trained in managing safeguard matters nor demonstrated any experience in managing safeguard matters. The Executing Agency should consider hiring such personnel to prepare the required safeguard plans, and to ensure proper implementation of the plans and compliance with the CI-GEF safeguard policies throughout the project cycle.





II. SAFEGUARD AND POLICIES

Environmental and Social Safeguards:

Safeguard Triggered	Yes	No	TBD	Date Completed
1. Environmental & Social Impact		Х		
Assessment (ESIA)				
Justification: No significant adverse env	rironmental an	d social im	pacts that d	are sensitive, diverse,
or unprecedented is anticipated				
2. Natural Habitats		X		
Justification: The project is not proposir	ng to alter nati	ıral habitat	s	
3. Involuntary Resettlement		Х		
Justification: The project is not proposing involuntary resettlement or restriction of access/use of				
natural resources.				
4. Indigenous Peoples		Х		
Justification: The project is not planning	ı to work in laı	nds or territ	ories tradit	ionally owned,
customarily used, or occupied by indige	nous peoples.			
5. Pest Management		Х		
Justification: There are no proposed act	ivities related	to pest ma	nagement	
6. Physical & Cultural Resources		X		
Justification: There are no proposed activities related to physical and cultural resources				
7. Stakeholder Engagement	X			
Justification: The project is required to engage stakeholders				
8. Gender mainstreaming	X			
Justification: The project is required to mainstream gender at all levels				
9. Accountability and Grievance Mechanisms	Х			
Justification: As a publicly funded GEF project, a Grievance Mechanism is required.				

III. KEY SAFEGUARD POLICY ISSUES AND THEIR MANAGEMENT

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:

From information provided in the Safeguard Screening Form, this project has triggered three safeguard policies. These are:

- I. Stakeholder Engagement,
- II. Gender Mainstreaming, and
- III. Grievance Mechanism.
- 2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:

No indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities are foreseen at this time.





3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts:

The proposed approach of the project is expected to avoid or minimize adverse impacts. As such, no better alternative can be conceived at this time.

4. Describe measures to be taken by the Executing Agency to address safeguard policy issues.

I. Grievance Mechanism

To ensure that the project meets CI-GEF Project Agency's "Accountability and Grievance Mechanism Policy #7", the Executing Agency is required to develop an Accountability and Grievance Mechanism that will ensure people affected by the project are able to bring their grievances to the Executing Agency for consideration and redress. The mechanism must be in place before the start of project activities, and also disclosed to all stakeholders in a language, manner and means that best suits the local context. The Executing Agency must inform the CI-GEF Project Agency of any grievance received.

II. <u>Gender Mainstreaming</u>

To ensure that the project meets CI-GEF Project Agency's "Gender Mainstreaming Policy #8", the Executing Agency is required to develop a "Gender Mainstreaming Plan" that will ensure the mainstreaming of gender issues throughout the project. The CI-GEF Project Agency will provide a gender mainstreaming guideline, and will approve and oversee the implementation of the Gender Mainstreaming Plan throughout the duration of the project.

III. Stakeholder Engagement

To ensure that the project meets CI-GEF Project Agency's "Stakeholders' Engagement Policy #9", the Executing Agency is required to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan. The CI-GEF Project Agency will oversee the implementation of this plan throughout the duration of the project.

5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people:

The key stakeholders are the national institutions, academic institutions, regional governments, farmers, landowners, and civil society organizations.

The mechanisms for consultation and disclosure should be culturally appropriate, gender sensitive, effective, and in keeping with local customs. Engagement can take the form of village meetings, group meetings, workshops, interviews/surveys, etc. and done using local languages and methods. The Executing Agency should take these contexts into consideration when designing engagement activities.





IV. PROJECT CATEGORIZATION

PROJECT CATEGORY	Category A	Category B	Category C
PROJECT CATEGORY			х

Justification: The proposed project activities are likely to have minimal or no adverse environmental and social impacts.

V. EXPECTED DISCLOSURE DATES

Safeguard Plan	CI Disclosure Date	In-Country Disclosure Date
Environmental & Social Impact Assessment (ESIA)	NA	NA
Environmental Management Plan (EMP)	NA	NA
Voluntary Resettlement Action Plan (V- RAP)	NA	NA
Process Framework for Restriction of Access to Natural Resources	NA	NA
Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP)	NA	NA
Pest Management Plan (PMP)	NA	NA
Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)	Within 15 days of CI-GEF approval	Within 30 days of CI-GEF approval
Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP)	Within 15 days of CI-GEF approval	Within 30 days of CI-GEF approval
Accountability and Grievance Mechanism	Within 15 days of CI-GEF approval	No later than inception workshop/kick-off meeting

VI. APPROVALS

Signed and submitted by:			
Sr. Director Project Development & Implementation:	Name: Free De Koning	Date: 2017-01-31	
Approved by:			
Safeguard Manager:	Name: Ian Kissoon	Date: 2017-01-31	
Project Manager:	Name: Orissa Samaroo	Date: 2017-01-31	



