

Annex 5: ESMS Questionnaire & Screening Report - for field projects

Project Data

The fields below are completed by the project proponent

Project Title:	TWENDE Towards Ending Drought Emergencies: Ecosystem Based Adaptation in Kenya's Arid and Semi-Arid Rangelands		
Project proponent:	International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)		
Executing agency:	Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI) – State Department of Livestock, National Drought Management Authority (NDMA)		
Funding agency:	GCF		
Country:	Kenya	Contract value (add currency):	USD 38,111,975
Start date and duration:	15/12/18, 5 years	Amount in CHF:	CHF equivalent 38,000,000
Has a safeguard screening or ESIA been done before?	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no	Provide details, if yes:	

Step 1: ESMS Questionnaire

The fields below are completed by the project proponent; the questionnaire is presented in Annex A

	Name and function of individual representing project proponent	Date
ESMS Questionnaire completed by:	Dr Angela Mwenda – Environmental Lead Expert, Climate and Energy Advisory Kenya Ltd	18 th Oct 2017
	Robert Wild, Regional Technical Coordinator, Eastern and Southern African Regional Office. IUCN	19 th Nov. 2017
ESMS Screening is (tick one of the three options)	<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> required because the project budget is ≥ CHF 500,000</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> required – despite being a small project (< CHF 500,000) the project proponent has identified risks when completing the ESMS Questionnaire</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> not required because the project budget is < CHF 500,000 and the project proponent confirms that no environmental or social risks have been identified when completing the ESMS Questionnaire</p>	

Step 2: ESMS Screening

To be completed by IUCN ESMS reviewer(s); only needed when the options 1 or 2 above (marked in red) are ticked

	Name	IUCN unit and function	Date
IUCN ESMS Reviewer:	Gretchen Walters	Programme Officer GFCCP	8.2.2018
	Linda Klare	ESMS Coordinator, HQ	8.2.2018
	Mark Smith	Director Global Water Programme	8.2.2018
	Title		Date
	Project Proposal		30/01/2018

Documents submitted at Screening stage:	Feasibility Study	20/11/2018
	SESA Scoping Report	30/01/2018
	Gender and Youth Analysis	02/02/2018
ESMS Screening Report¹		
Risk category:	<input type="checkbox"/> low risk <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> moderate risk <input type="checkbox"/> high risk	
<p>Rationale: Summarize findings from the questionnaire and explain the rationale of risk categorization</p> <p><i>See the following sections of the questionnaire for details:</i></p> <p>Section A for findings about the stakeholder engagement process,</p> <p>Section B on the 4 Standards,</p> <p>Section C on other E&S impacts and</p> <p>Section D on risk issues related to Climate change</p>	<p>The project aims to improve resilience of communities and ecosystems in Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs) in Kenya to future climate shocks and stresses. In component 1 it focusses on adapting landscape planning through use of climate change information system, vulnerability assessments, strengthening of community institutions and establishing planning mechanism. Component 2 aims to promote ecosystem-based adaptation and includes concrete measure for rehabilitation and restoration of degraded river banks, wetlands, forests, degraded rangelands and agro pastoral systems and for improving water management. Under component 3 investments and incentives for climate change resilient ecosystem management will be promoted including support to climate smart value chains, restoration enterprises and community restoration plans.</p> <p>The target landscapes are dry season grazing areas which are critical resource zones that provide refuge during periods of drought. Their existence depends on availability of permanent water, which makes them hotspots for resource competition and land use change. They are used seasonally by large numbers of livestock keepers, often from multiple ethnic groups, following customary governance practices. Customary institutions have become weakened, leading to break down in natural resource governance, degradation of resources, and escalating conflict.</p> <p>Environmental and social impacts of the project are overall expected to be highly positive given that it is the aim of the project to address the above described challenges from climate change and increasing resource pressure and in light of the project's highly participatory and bottom-up approach. The planned vulnerability assessment is expected to appropriately capture and address specific risk experienced by vulnerable segments of the society.</p> <p>Because of the small-scale nature of the restoration and livelihood activities it is considered as very unlikely that project activities will have significant adverse environmental and/or social impacts that are divers, irreversible, or unprecedented (hence no high risk). However, land-use changes, physical restoration measures and value chain and enterprise development might trigger mild social or environmental impacts given the sensitivity of the dryland ecosystem, the complexity of the social fabric and an increasing pressure from resource competition. Social and environmental risks have been identified that are described in the questionnaire below, in the red circled boxes at the end of section B, C and D.</p> <p>Overall the identified impacts are expected to be few in number, generally be site-specific, largely reversible, and readily addressed either through project activities or mitigation measures. The project is therefore classified as moderate risk project. Because the specific on-the ground interventions and their sites will be defined in more detail only during project implementation, risk assessment at this stage can only be cursory focusing on generic types of activities. The development of an</p>	

¹ For projects below CHF 500,000 where no risks have been identified the screening report is completed by the project proponent - only the section on the rationale but the sections below that as low risk projects don't require assessments. The columns in the ESMS Questionnaire reserved for the IUCN ESMS reviewer will remain blank.

	<p>Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) is therefore required. The ESMF should delineate the procedure for the social and environmental assessment of the activities – once defined, provisions for mitigation measures and the development of an ESMP and describe the respective institutional arrangements for risk assessment and management. The ESMF will also explain the operational procedures of how investments funded by the Community Resilience Facilities (CRF's) will be screened on environmental and social risks as well as grants provided by the project to cooperatives and private sector actors.</p> <p>The Standard on Indigenous Peoples is triggered because of the presence of indigenous groups (see further detail in section B2 below). However, as these groups are considered the main beneficiaries of the project, there is no need for an Indigenous Peoples Plan. The project's participatory planning approach is generally expected to meet the Standard's requirement in terms of meaningful and effective consultation with these groups. The ESMF should nevertheless include explicit guidance in order to ensure full compliance with the Standard.</p> <p>The Cultural Heritage Standard is triggered but risks are considered minor. The Biodiversity Standard is triggered, some of the risk issues require further assessment and mitigation measures, minor issues are expected to be appropriately addressed by good practices guidance. The ESMF will need to delineate the respective guidance and provisions for both Standards.</p> <p>The ESMF should be disclosed on the IUCN website and in-country (government websites as well as appropriate local platforms).</p>	
Required assessments or tools	<input type="checkbox"/> Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Full ESIA) <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (Partial ESIA) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Impact Assessment (SIA) as part of the planned vulnerability assessment and in combination with the provisions from the Indigenous Peoples Standard (see below) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
Required actions for gender mainstreaming	<p>Decision-making in cultural institutions is traditionally dominated by older males, with women and youth partially excluded from the process. These institutions are now adapting to the new constitutional mandate of gender equity. The project will adopt a participatory approach and promote inclusive mechanisms to hear the voices of women and youth.</p>	
ESMS Standards	Trigger	Required tools or plans
Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions <i>(see section B1 for details)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Action Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Resettlement Policy Framework <input type="checkbox"/> Action Plan to Mitigate Impacts from Access Restriction <input type="checkbox"/> Access Restrictions Mitigation Process Framework
Indigenous Peoples <i>(see section B2 for details)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Peoples Process Framework
Cultural Heritage <i>(see section B3 for details)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Chance Find Procedures
Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use Natural Resources <i>(see section B4 for details)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> TBD	<input type="checkbox"/> Pest Management Plan

Annex A: ESMS Questionnaire

Project summary

The objective of the project is ***to reduce the cost of climate change induced drought on Kenya's national economy by increasing resilience of the livestock and other land use sectors in restored and effectively governed rangeland ecosystems***. The project will contribute to improved adaptation to climate change of Kenya's national policy of "Ending Drought Emergencies", as outlined in "Kenya Vision 2030".

The project will strengthen climate change adaptation in Kenya's arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs). ASALs occupy 89% of the country and are home to about 36% of the population and 70% of the national livestock herd. Livestock contributions account for 80% of household incomes in arid lands and 65% in semi-arid lands. Drought has been shown to reduce economic growth in Kenya by 2.8 percentage points per year for three years, with 72% of the losses concentrated in the livestock sector.

The project will be implemented in 2 landscapes encompassing 11 counties, which have devolved powers under Kenya's new constitution. The project will benefit 400,000 people in 68,000 households and will be implemented in 2.5 million hectares of rangelands.

The target landscapes are dry season grazing areas: critical resource zones that provide refuge during periods of drought. Their existence depends on availability of permanent water, which makes them hotspots for resource competition and land use change. They are used seasonally by large numbers of livestock keepers, often from multiple ethnic groups, following customary governance practices. Customary institutions have become weakened, leading to break down in natural resource governance, degradation of resources, and escalating conflict.

The target landscapes face challenges of weak capacities for landscape planning, poor access to climate data and analysis, and low access to markets and financial services. The project addresses this through three components:

- Component 1: Climate change adapted planning for drought resilience
- Component 2: Restoration of rangeland landscapes for ecosystem based adaptation
- Component 3: Investments and incentives for climate change resilient ecosystem management

Projects' Main Activities

Output 1: County and community landscape planning, management and practices are climate smart as well as monitored with learning captured

- 1.1: Establish information systems to inform climate change sensitive landscape planning and vulnerability/ risk management (AL1)
- 1.3 Develop county rangeland restoration plans that build on local community plans combined with enhanced climate change data
- 1.4 Establish functioning landscape management mechanisms in participating counties for climate change sensitive and accountable decision-making
- 1.5 Establish participatory monitoring, evaluation and learning systems to support adaptive management

Output 2: Resilient land production systems support expanded climate-smart pastoralism, and deliver climate adaptation benefits and risk reduction

- 2.1 Implement priority community-based rangeland restoration activities
- 2.2 Implement priority actions for integrated land/water management in catchments
- 2.3 Install community-validated strategic water sources for sustainable rangeland utilization
- 2.4 Assist communities to formulate bylaws and incorporate into county laws
- 2.5 Build capacity of local institutions to implement climate-sensitive landscape management

Output 3: Public, private and community investments in natural resources contribute to climate change resilient livelihoods for women and men

- 3.1: Invest in priority value chains that have been validated by local communities chains and marketing for multiple ecosystem services
- 3.2: Provide grants to establish for restoration enterprises by women's groups
- 3.3 Establish financial incentive mechanism for sustainable land management
- 3.4 Provide grants for private sector enterprises that support ecosystem based adaptation

A. Process of stakeholder engagement during project conceptualization	
1. Has a project stakeholder analysis been carried out and documented – identifying not only interests and influence of stakeholders but also whether there are any stakeholders that might be affected by the project? Does the stakeholder analysis disaggregate between women and men, where relevant and feasible?	
To be completed by project proponent	
Yes: Stakeholder consultation and analysis has been carried out. Stakeholder report is in the annex of the screening questionnaire.	
IUCN ESMS Reviewer	
Yes: Stakeholder consultation and analysis has been carried out. It does factor in gender considerations and appears to have been rather extensive at the county level. Certainly stakeholder views at the county level and interest in the project seem to be well represented.	
2. Has information about the project – and about potential risks or negative impacts – been shared with relevant groups? Have consultations been held with relevant groups to discuss the project concept? Did the consultations include stakeholders that were identified as potentially affected? Have women been consulted? Has this been done in a culturally appropriate way to allow a meaningful engagement of affected groups and women?	
To be completed by project proponent	
Yes; For each landscape, there were representatives from the regions of interest who identified challenges they face regarding drought and proposed interventions that they felt would address their issues.	
Using the bottom up approach; interventions proposed also focused on gender and youth issues, as evident from the stakeholder report and gender analysis report in the annex.	
IUCN ESMS Reviewer	
While the consultation process has been found very comprehensive at a higher level, there is a certain gap in terms of involvement of representatives from local communities. This is understandable given the large landscape covered by the project and the consideration to avoid raising expectations at a too early stage. Also, because certain elements will be defined in detail during project implementation and the consultative nature of this process is well demonstrated in the project document.	

B. Potential impacts related to ESMS standards

B1: Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions

	<i>To be completed by project proponent</i>		<i>IUCN ESMS Reviewer</i>
	<i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i>	<i>If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)</i>	<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1. Will / might the project involve relocation or resettlement of people? if yes, answer a-b below	NO		agreed
a. Describe the project activities that require resettlement?		n/a	
b. Have alternative project design options for avoiding resettlement been rigorously considered?		n/a	
2. Does the project include activities that involve restricting access to land or natural resources or changes in the use and management of natural resources? (e.g., establishing new restrictions, strengthening enforcement capacities through training, infrastructure, equipment or other means, promoting village patrolling etc.; if yes, answer a-g below	YES		
3. Does the project include activities that involve changes in the use and management regimes of natural resources? if yes, answer a-g below	YES		
4. Does the project create situations that make physical access more difficult to livelihood resources (e.g. to multiple use zones, to schools or medical services etc.)? if yes, answer a-g below	NO		No
Answer only if you answered yes to items 2, 3, or 4.			
a. Describe project activities that involve restrictions.		Overall the project aims to restore the productivity of land managed by communities and they will be the main actors in this restoration process. They will lead in developing restoration land-use plans for their communities. In each of these processes different land-user and stakeholder groups will be represented. Risks may emerge from specific stakeholders' groups that may suffer from short-term access restrictions while land productivity is being returned. For example, some areas need to have reduced livestock access during the restoration process.	Agreed. It is understood that potential access or use (harvest) restrictions might be needed /decided for rangelands, river banks, wetlands and forests. It seems also likely that the access to water resources might need to be regulated.

		<p>The following is the list of proposed interventions that might require restrictions. The final decision of actual restoration activities to be undertaken jointly with communities and potential access/use restrictions will be based on social and environmental assessment with inclusive participation of relevant stakeholders and community members, including indigenous or marginalized groups, women and youth. Temporary access restrictions might be needed as part of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Restoration and sustainable NRM for both watershed and rangeland management, and - Restoration of ecosystems, including degraded river banks, wetlands, forests and rangelands; 	
b. Explain the project's level of influence: will it define restrictions, put in place restrictions, strengthen enforcement capacities or promote restrictions indirectly (e.g., through awareness building measures or policy advice)?		<p>The role of the project will be to propose different restoration activities that the community can adopt. These will be based on good practice that is government endorsed. Any restrictions in land-use will be identified and managed by communities themselves. E.g. grass-seed banks will be established on land identified by communities. These will be fenced to control grazing and rehabilitated. The seed banks will be promoted as women's group income generating activity when they sell the seed.</p>	<p>If it is demonstrated that potential access restrictions are voluntary and collectively decided by the communities with a decision making process that deems adequate and reflects consensus among the community / users of the resources (with legitimate rights) based on solid information, the Standard would not be triggered.</p>
c. Has the existing legal framework regulating land tenure and access to natural resource (incl. traditional rights) been analysed, broken down by different groups including women, if applicable?	Yes	<p>Through the stakeholder workshop, existing legal frameworks were analysed, and gaps identified. Land tenure was also defined and linked to proposed interventions and which groups will be affected. Further information in the stakeholder consultation report.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>
d. Explain whether the country's existing laws recognise traditional rights for land and natural resources; are there any groups at the project site whose rights are not recognised?	YES NO	<p>The country's existing laws recognise traditional rights for land and resources. There are NO groups at the project site whose rights are not recognised.</p>	<p>Agreed. However, as precautionary measure, the rights situation on the ground should be confirmed during the vulnerability assessments. It is understood that activity 2.4 aims at strengthening customary land/resource use. Hence if there were any groups whose rights are not recognized, this should be tackled under this activity.</p>
e. Have the implications of the access restriction measures on people's livelihoods been analysed, by social group? If yes, describe the groups affected by restrictions. Distinguish social groups (incl. vulnerable groups, indigenous peoples) and men and women.	NO	<p>The general restoration methods proposed are not expected to have major implications for the adopting communities. As yet a social assessment has not been carried out of specific restoration interventions at specific sites, thus potential restriction have not been identified for specific interventions and sites and may not apply. Thus should any specific restrictions that may be applied in any community land-use plan will have a social assessment applied to it. The analysis of each intervention in each site will be disaggregated by social groups including women, youth and</p>	<p>Agreed. As explained under b. the Standard would not be triggered if it is demonstrated that restrictions are decided by the communities themselves as part of the community land-use planning. The project which is supporting the communities in this process, should ensure that social impacts from restrictions on specific vulnerable groups are well analyzed and this information is shared prior to the decision making.</p>

		marginalized groups. This will happen largely within the inception phase on a rolling basis per each activity.	
f. Will the project include measures to minimise adverse impacts or to compensate for loss of access? If yes, specify measures. Are they feasible, appropriate and gender inclusive?	NO	To mitigate potential impacts the community is encouraged to select the most degraded and least productive land for restoration. The work to carry out the restoration can be incentivized by offering this to more marginalized community members who can accrue the benefits, (sale of grass seed and hay) which can become substantial over a period of 3-5 years. Any possible restrictions will come under community owned land-use plans, with community identified by-laws. Women will be consulted separately to ensure that there will be no unintended restriction of use for female land users. The land-use and restoration plans will be validated by each community as a whole. The land-use plans will be supported by grants to communities to establish a community solidarity fund. Income generation options will be explored and offered where possible to marginalized groups.	Agreed. As stated above, while the Standard is not triggered by community-driven decisions, the project should nevertheless ensure that appropriate measures will be agreed between the community and potentially affected groups in order to mitigate adverse impacts, if any, on such groups. The planned Community Resilience Facilities are expected to serve as vehicle to serve as a vehicle to support such measures.
g. Has any process been started or implemented to obtain free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) from groups affected by restrictions?	YES	Specific sites in each landscape will be selected during the inception phase of the project. A site-based FPIC process will be followed in the inception phase. This will include a discussion of the potential risks or unintended consequences that might arise from each intervention.	Agreed. Please note that FPIC is mandatory only in case the Standard is triggered. However, consultations with potentially affected groups are certainly required – and given that indigenous peoples are the main project beneficiaries, FPIC on project activities affecting the respective groups is anyway required under the IP Standard.
Standard triggered? “Yes / No / TBD” Explain why	No	While the project may include activities that involve access and use restrictions of natural resources in order to ensure regeneration of ecosystems, it is understood that those restrictions will be collectively decided by the communities themselves as part of the development of the community land-use plans. Hence the Standard is not triggered. It will need to be demonstrated, though, that the decision making process is considered adequate and reflects voluntary, informed consensus among the community / all users of the resources who have legitimate rights. It will further need to be ensured that potential negative impacts from restrictions on specific groups, in particular vulnerable or marginalized groups, are well understood; and that if impacts are identified (including temporary impacts) that appropriate measures are available for their mitigation as agreed by affected groups. Management of such risks/impacts will not be guided by the Standard but will be addressed by the project as social impacts. Because the activities, restrictions and sites will be defined only during project implementation, relevant procedures and provisions will need to be established in form of an ESMF.	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?			

Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?		
B2: Standard on Indigenous Peoples²		
	To be completed by project proponent	
	<i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i>	<i>If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)</i>
	IUCN ESMS Reviewer	
	Comments, additional considerations	
1. Is the project located in an area inhabited by indigenous peoples, tribal peoples or other traditional peoples? If yes, answer questions a-j	YES	The project is inhabited by people that under international law are considered Indigenous People a term that is identified as 'marginalised communities' in the Kenya constitution, which further identifies many other 'non-Indigenous People' in the project area by the definition of 'marginalised group' (see below for constitutional definitions). Thus, pastoralist communities are considered 'marginalised communities' in Kenya and predominate in the project priority landscapes. However, all people in the project areas are potentially vulnerable or marginalised. Thus all groups in project will be treated through the measures of the IUCN IP standard. These groups will be as identified in Article 21. "All State organs and all public officers have the duty to address the needs of vulnerable groups within society, including women, older members of society, persons with disabilities, children, youth, members of minority or marginalised communities, and members of particular ethnic, religious or cultural communities".
2. If indigenous peoples do not occupy land within the project's geographical area, could the project still present risks that might affect their rights and livelihood? If yes, answer questions a-j	NO	agreed
Answer only if you answered yes to 1 or 2 above.		
a. How does the host country's Government refer to these groups (e.g., indigenous peoples, minorities, tribes etc.)?		In Kenya 'Indigenous People' are identified with marginalization. In this context, pastoralist and hunter-gatherer communities constitute Indigenous Peoples as outlined in Article 260 of the Constitution of Kenya, 2010. (see Annex 2)
b. How do these groups identify themselves?		The majority of Kenyans are indigenous to Kenya, and consider themselves 'indigenous'. Some groups, however, have adopted the term 'Indigenous People - IP', as defined by IUCN and under

²The coverage of indigenous peoples includes: (i) peoples who identify themselves as "indigenous" in strict sense; (ii) tribal peoples whose social, cultural, and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations; and (iii) traditional peoples not necessarily called indigenous or tribal but who share the same characteristics of social, cultural, and economic conditions that distinguish them from other sections of the national community, whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions, and whose livelihoods are closely connected to ecosystems and their goods and services

		international law. They present themselves as ‘pastoralists’ or ‘forest dependent’ groups.	
c. Name the groups; distinguish, if applicable, the geographical areas of their presence and influence (including the areas of resource use) and how these relate to the project site.		<p>The following is a list of all the main ethnic groups found in the project area - all of whom are considered ‘indigenous’. Of these only the pastoralist communities meet the international definition of IP. This might not be comprehensive as there are often little known groups of hunter-gatherers disparagingly called ‘Ndorobo’ located scattered amongst other agriculturalist and pastoralist peoples]. In this list the agriculturalists ethnic groups are denoted ‘indigenous i’, and pastoralists ‘Indigenous People - IP’.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;"> <p>a) Mid Tana Landscape</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meru (i) 2. Tharaka (i) 3. Somali (IP) 4. Kamba (i) 5. Boran (IP) 6. Orma (IP) 7. Wardei (i/IP) 8. Munyo yaya (i/IP) <p>b) Chyulu Landscape</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kamba (i) 2. Maasai (IP) 3. Taita (i) </div> <div style="width: 45%;"> <p>c) Moyale to Banisa Landscape</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Somali (IP) 5. Borana (IP) 6. Gabra (IP) <p>d) Sereolivi – Subarwawa-kom Landscape</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Samburu (IP) 8. Borana (IP) Somali (IP) </div> </div>	No comment
d. Is there a risk that the project affects indigenous peoples’ livelihood through access restrictions? While this is covered under the Standard on Involuntary Resettlement and Access Restrictions, if yes, please specify the indigenous groups affected.	YES	Nearly all the communities in the project landscapes can be considered as Indigenous People, thus all the above groups may be affected by access limitations.	The decision to consider nearly all communities as IP is an important information as this implies that the project needs to obtain FPIC from legitimate representatives of the different groups related to all activities that potentially affect them, negatively or positively.
e. Is there a risk that the project affects indigenous peoples’ material or non-material livelihoods in ways other than access restrictions (e.g., in terms of self-determination, cultural identity, values and practices)?	NO		Agreed with some reservation. It is acknowledged that the project provides for extensive consultation and that one of the expected impacts is to increase resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities and regions; however, there seems to be a low risk that the practices and activities implemented by the project might not be (fully) compatible with the economic/ cultural practices and values of specific groups

			and that these risks might be overlooked unless it is made explicit that such risks will be discussed during the consultations and the social analysis/ vulnerability assessments.
f. Is there a risk that the project affects specific vulnerable groups within indigenous communities (for example, women, girls, elders)?	YES	It is possible that vulnerable groups within IP communities could be at risk from access restrictions. This will be assessed for each project location during the inception and site selection phase. Vulnerability assessment by gender and age will be carried out.	Agreed – but to be assessed in more depth as part of the social analysis / vulnerability assessments.
g. Does the project involve the use or commercial development of natural resources on lands or territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	YES	The lands are communally owned and as the project involves activities for developing value chains and entrepreneurial activities a transparent decision-making process about the use of the resources will be developed to ensure that fair and transparent benefit sharing arrangements are agreed. This will be delivered by a community engagement process.	Agreed. This process needs to be explicitly described in the project documentation.
h. Does the project intend to use the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples?	YES	Knowledge on climate change, invasive species and how to address their eradication, will be sought and respected. If the benefits of this knowledge accrue to third parties a fair benefit arrangement will be developed.	Agreed. Same as above – explicit mentioning in the project documentation
i. Has any process been started or implemented to achieve the free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) of indigenous peoples to activities directly affecting their lands/territories/ resources?	YES	FPIC was discussed at the county level with government staff and civil society organizations. Participants were supportive of the project and it was agreed that FPIC will be implemented at the site level with participating communities during the inception phase when site selection process. FPIC will be part of the site selection and validation process.	Agreed. It is understood that this process will involve obtaining FPIC from legitimate representatives of the indigenous groups in each of the communities where the project intervenes.
j. Are opportunities considered to provide benefits for indigenous peoples? If yes, is it ensured that this is done in a culturally appropriate and gender inclusive way?	YES	The proposed interventions came from the indigenous people who identified those activities of most benefit to them.	Agreed. This will need to be further detailed with community representatives in each of the sites.
k. Are some of the indigenous groups living in voluntary isolation? If yes, how have they been consulted? How are their rights respected?	NO		no comment
Standard triggered? “Yes / No / TBD” Explain why	Yes	This standard is triggered because of the presence of indigenous peoples in the project area given the proponent’s decision to extend coverage of indigenous people to all “marginalized communities” – following provisions of the Kenyan legislation. This implies that all local communities / groups that are influenced/ affected (positively or negatively) by the project are covered by the Standard and by relevant instruments. There is a minor risk of designing and implementing restoration and land/water management practices that are not compatible with cultural practices of indigenous peoples and marginalized groups, including pastoralists and hunter-gatherer. However, the probability of this is considered low perceived minor as the	

		<p>project provides for extensive consultation when designing the concrete interventions for restoring rangelands and the actions for integrated land/water management.</p> <p>Because indigenous and marginalized communities are considered main project beneficiaries, there is no need to develop an Indigenous People Plan. However, the ESMF (which is needed because the concrete interventions for restoring natural resources and rehabilitating water infrastructure will be decided in detail only during the project) should entail a dedicated section specifying how provisions from the Indigenous Peoples Standard are addressed. As such this section will need to provide a detailed account of the participatory process related to the various components and activities of the project including specification that the process will involve legitimate representatives of the respective groups, follow FPIC, and include an in-depth analysis on potential social, cultural or economic impacts from project activities (disaggregated by sub-groups, where relevant). The ESMF should also establish that any use of traditional knowledge, where benefits accrue to third parties, will require fair benefit sharing arrangements.</p>
<p><i>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed? Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</i></p>		<p>See comment in the cell above about in-depth analysis on potential negative impacts. The ESMF should also specify that, if risk issues are identified that are not addressed yet through project activities, mitigation measures need to be developed together with the respective affected groups.</p>
B3: Standard on Cultural Heritage		
	<p><i>To be completed by project proponent</i></p> <p><i>IUCN ESMS Reviewer</i></p>	
	<p><i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i></p>	<p><i>If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)</i></p> <p><i>Comments, additional considerations</i></p>
<p>1. Is the project located in or near a site officially designated or proposed as a cultural heritage site (e.g., UNESCO World Cultural or Mixed Heritage Sites, or Cultural Landscapes) or a nationally designated site for cultural heritage protection?</p>	NO	<p>agreed</p>
<p>2. Does the project area harbour cultural resources such as tangible, movable or immovable cultural resources with archaeological, historical, cultural, artistic, religious, spiritual or symbolic value for a nation, people or community (e.g., burial sites, buildings, monuments or cultural landscapes)?</p>	NO	<p>The sites for the concrete restoration or rehabilitation interventions will only be identified during project implementation; hence it seems wise to revisit this question at that point (to be specified in the ESMF).</p>

3. Does the project area harbour a natural feature or resource with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance for a nation, people or community associated with that feature (e.g., sacred natural sites, ceremonial areas or sacred species)?	TBD	There is a high likelihood of cultural sites in nature being located in the project landscapes.	This should be assessed as part of the social analysis/vulnerability assessment (to be specified in the ESMF).
a. Will the project involve infrastructure development or small civil works such as roads, levees, dams, slope restoration, landslides stabilisation or buildings such as visitor centre, watch tower?	YES	Activities to increase water storage and restore the ecosystem. The activities are currently indicative and will focus on appropriate water harvesting infrastructure including small earth bunds, sub-surface and sand dams, shallow wells and water pans. Boreholes may be included if indicated as critical.	Agreed
b. Will the project involve excavation or movement of earth, flooding or physical environmental changes (e.g., as part of ecosystem restoration)?	NO	see question 3.a	Agreed
c. Is there a risk that physical interventions described in items 4–5 might affect known or unknown (e.g., buried) cultural resources?	TBD		At this stage no sufficient information is available about of infrastructure location and potential impacts on hidden /buried cultural resources cannot be ascertained. While the project only contains light infrastructure work with very little earth movement, the risk should nevertheless be assessed when selecting the sites. If considered relevant, Chance Find Procedures should be put in place to explain what should be done if objects are encountered during earth work. See Standard for the template.
d. Does the project plan to restrict local users' access to known cultural resources or natural features with cultural, spiritual or symbolic significance?	NO		Agreed. It is understood that access restrictions, when put in place for restoration purposes, would relate to livestock only and would not restrict the movement of people.
4. Will the project promote the use or development of economic benefits from cultural resources or natural features with cultural significance?	YES	Economic benefits will mostly accrue from the increased productivity of degraded land. It is unlikely that economic benefits from cultural resources or natural features with cultural significance will be promoted unless a community or other group requests for a grant to develop these. A grant operational manual will be develop which will include safeguards to address this situation should it arise.	
Standard triggered? "Yes / No / TBD" Explain why	Yes	The Standard is triggered as there is a low probability of encountering hidden cultural resources when carrying out civil work that includes movement of earth or of affecting natural resources with cultural significance.	

Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?		The ESMF should provide for revisiting this risk once the sites for the infrastructure work are known.	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?		For minimizing the risk of damaging hidden resources – where considered relevant by the above assessment - Chance Find Procedures should be included in the contract for companies executing civil work and the operational manual of the grant facility.	
B4: Standard on Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources			
	To be completed by project proponent		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
	Yes, no, n/a, TBD	<i>If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)</i>	<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1. Is the project located in or near areas legally protected or officially proposed for protection including reserves according to IUCN Protected Area Management Categories I - VI, UNESCO Natural World Heritage Sites, UNESCO Biosphere Reserves, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands? If yes, answer questions a-d	YES	The project landscapes include a number of National Parks, National Reserves and Forest Reserves	No comment
2. Is the project located in or near to areas recognised for their high biodiversity value and protected as such by indigenous peoples or other local users? If yes, answer questions a-d	YES	One of the proposed landscapes is managed under the ‘Community Conservancy Model’ which is analogous to community - run Cat V or VI, but may not meet the IUCN definition of a PA (e.g. biodiversity may be a secondary goal).	No comment
3. Is the project located in/near to areas which are not covered in existing protection systems but identified by authoritative sources for their high biodiversity value ³ ? If yes, answer questions a-d	TBD	This is unknown but possible.	No comment
Answer only if you answered yes to items 1, 2, or 3 above.			
a. If the project aims to establish or expand the protected area (PA), is there a risk of adverse impacts on natural resources on areas beyond the PA?	N/A	The project does on intend to expand any protected area	No comment
b. If the project aims at changing management of a PA, is there a risk of adverse direct and indirect	NO	No changes of PA management are proposed. In the target landscapes, however, a landscape stakeholder forum is envisaged to	Agreed.

³ Areas important to threatened species according to IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, important to endemic or restricted-range species or to migratory and congregatory species; areas representing key evolutionary processes, providing connectivity with other critical habitats or key ecosystem services; highly threatened and/or unique ecosystems (e.g. to be determined in future by the evolving IUCN Red List of Ecosystems); areas identified as Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) and subsets such as important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs), important Plant Areas (IPAs), important Sites for Freshwater Biodiversity or Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) sites.

impacts on other components of biodiversity?		bring stakeholders together. Relevant discussion topics are likely to emerge, namely – wildlife incursions into farmland, livestock incursions into protected areas (many protected areas have been established on pre-existing community dry-season grazing. The fora may propose remedies for these conflicts which may require PA management changes.	
c. If the project plans any infrastructure for PA management or visitor use (e.g., watch tower, tourism facilities, access roads), is there a risk of adverse impacts on biodiversity, (consider the construction and use phases)?	N/A		No comment
d. If the project promotes ecotourism, is there a risk of adverse impacts to biodiversity, e.g., due to water/waste disposal, disturbance of flora/fauna, overuse of sites, slope erosion etc.)?	N/A	There are currently not specific tourism plans for the project	no comment
4. Will the project introduce or translocate species as a strategy for species conservation or ecosystem restoration (e.g. erosion control, dune stabilisation or reforestation)? If yes, answer questions a-c	YES	An element of the restoration efforts will include the sowing of grass seed and the planting of trees or natural regeneration	No comment
5. Does the project involve plantation development or production of living natural resources (e.g., agriculture, animal husbandry or aquaculture)? If yes, answer questions a-c	YES	The project will be restoring land by the establishment of living natural resources	No comment
Answer only if you answered yes to items 4 or 5 above.			
a. Does this project involve non-native species or is there a risk of introducing non-native species inadvertently? If yes, is there a risk that these species might develop invasive behaviour?	YES	Non-native tree species are highly popular with farmers. The project will, however, promote indigenous tree species and only allow non-native trees that are proven to be non-invasive. The situation with grass establishment is not known and an assessment will need to be carried out that will identify the appropriate grass species that do not have negative impacts on biodiversity	While it is understood that the project intends to use only native tree species, in light of the widespread use of non-native there seems to be a need for an explicit protocol that will guide the selection of tree species used for restoration measures implemented as project activities. It is acknowledged that the project cannot be held accountable for decisions taken by farmers outside the project. The selection of grass

			species should be done following a risk assessment as described by IUCN guidelines ⁴
b. Is there a risk that the project might create other pathways for spreading invasive species (e.g. through creation of corridors, introduction of facilitatory species, import of commodities, tourism or movement of boats)?	YES	A number of invasive alien species already present in the landscapes. It is possible that some of these might be inadvertently promoted by techniques such as the establishment of soil bunds. An IAS assessment should be carried out in the landscapes during the inception phase and a mitigation plan adopted for IAS control.	Agreed. The assessment should take CBD recommendations into account ⁵
c. Have potential adverse impacts on local ecosystems and/or people's livelihood been analysed and precautions taken to avoid risks, including of species becoming invasive?	NO	No impact assessment on ecosystem or invasive species have been undertaken. The project aims to support livelihoods and thus adverse effects should not be there.	Socio-economic risks to be assessed following the IUCN guidelines referenced above.
6. If the project plans reforestation activities, how is it assured that biodiversity and ecosystem functionality will be maintained or enhanced? How has species selection been guided?	YES	Species selection for restoration has not been undertaken as yet. ESARO has a protocol for these situations which will be used to ensure that species selection is appropriate and focused mainly on indigenous species.	Agreed. The protocol should be made available in the project operational manual and communicated to all relevant stakeholders.
7. Will the project involve extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water (e.g., through dams, reservoirs, canals, levees, river basin developments, groundwater extraction) or other activities that affects water flows on-site or downstream (including increases or decreases in peak and flood flows and low flows)?	YES	A number of small scale water harvesting techniques are proposed for the project. It is not expected that these will have minimal impacts of flows.	The project includes infrastructure such as sand dams, rock catchment, water pans for retaining rainwater and erosion control. These infrastructures are small scale and quite local; impacts of rainwater retention measures are expected to be exclusively positive, however the ESMF should include a succinct procedure for assessing unintended impacts once these measures have been decided. It is further recommended to collect baseline data on groundwater in location with risk of over-exploitation and to monitor extraction induced by the project (subsurface and surface).
8. Will the project affect water dynamics, river connectivity or the hydrological cycle in ways other than direct changes of water flows (e.g., water infiltration and aquifer recharge, sedimentation)? Also	YES	The project is expected to slow, halt and eventual reverse degradation processes. This should slow down run off and allow greater infiltration and ground water recharge and have a positive on water balance, reduce flooding and help mitigate droughts.	Agreed.

⁴ IUCN/Species Survival Commission, 2013, *Guidelines for Reintroductions and Other Conservation Translocations*. Version 1.0, available at <https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/edocs/2013-009.pdf>

⁵ These pathways and relevant guidelines and tools are described in the CBD document *Pathways of Introduction of Invasive Species, their Prioritization and Management*, available at <http://tinyurl.com/CBD2014Invasive>

consider reforestation projects as originators of such impacts.			
9. Is there a risk that the project will affect water quality of waterways (e.g., through diffuse water pollution from agricultural run-off or other activities)?	NO	No negative effects of water quality are expected or the use of agricultural fertilizers. It is hoped that water quality will improved by the reduction of sediment load.	Agreed. It does not seem that the project will promote the use of fertilizer, but it is recommended to state this more clearly in the ESMF. The ESMF should also include provisions for avoiding risks for water quality from value chain activities.
10. Is there a risk that the project will affect ecosystem functions and services not covered above, in particular those on which local communities depend for their livelihoods?	NO	Land use planning will be undertaken by communities using the principle of self-determination. It is unlikely, unless there are unintended consequences.	Developing or rehabilitating water infrastructure might have small scale impacts on biodiversity during the construction phase due to disturbance of vegetation or inappropriate location of new water infrastructure, but these are expected to be minimal and temporary and are expected to be easily addressed through application of good practice. Additional impacts may arise during the use phase due to an influx of communities and livestock to newly established water points.
11. Does the project promote the use of living natural resources (e.g., by proposing production systems or harvest plans)? If yes, is there a risk that this will lead to unsustainable use of resources?	YES	Communities will develop their own land use plans that will include agricultural/livestock production and harvesting plan. Currently use is often times unsustainable therefor the plans will be aiming at sustainable use of natural resources.	In addition to specifying harvest rates for natural resources extracted from natural habitats the proponent should further ensure that the community land use plans will include requirements for monitoring these extractions. This is in in particular relevant for the harvest of gums and resins which frequently causes over-harvesting and drying up of tree in Kenya.
12. Does the project intend to use pesticides, fungicides or herbicides (biocides)? If yes, answer questions a-b	NO	Currently there are no plans for such use. There is a possibility that programmes may target the control of Prosopis jubiflora that may require herbicide use. If such a programme is planned it will follow IUCN guidelines for such work.	The ESMF will need to provide a clear process what steps need to be taken if pesticides are proposed and when the development of a succinct pest management plan is necessary
a. Have alternatives to the use of biocides been rigorously considered or tested?	NO		n/a yet – to be included in the description mentioned above
b. Has a pest management plan been established?	NO		see above
13. Does the project intend to use biological pest management techniques? If yes, has the potential of adversely affecting biodiversity been ruled out?	NO		to be included in the description mentioned above
14. Is there a risk that the project will cause adverse environmental impacts in a wider area of influence	NO		While the project is expected to lead to environmental impacts that are highly beneficial,

(landscape/ watershed, regional or global levels) including transboundary impacts?			there is a small risk that value chain support for the gum and resin sector might lead to over-harvesting in communities not covered by the project where harvest rates are controlled.
15. Is there a risk that consequential developments triggered by the project will have adverse impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services? Is there a risk of adverse cumulative impacts generated together with other known or planned projects in the sites?	NO	Not envisaged	No comments
Standard triggered? “Yes / No / TBD” Explain why	Yes	While the project’s impacts on biodiversity are expected to be overall very positive, caution needs to be taken with regards to the following topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Risks of introducing invasive species when implementing restoration measures (low risks for tree species, moderate risk for selection of grass species, unknown risks due to other pathways);• Impacts from construction of water infiltration measures are expected to be positive as they increase groundwater levels; however minor impacts from the construction of such measures but also from works related to the rehabilitation of water points are possible, e.g. due to disturbance of vegetation, inappropriate location of new water infrastructure and influx of communities and livestock to newly established water points;• Risk of lowering the water table due to increased water abstraction from boreholes and wells constructed by the project;• Minor to moderate risks for water quality from value chain activities;• Risk of over-harvesting resources from natural habitat (e.g. gum and resins).	
Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient? Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed?	To manage the risks related to invasive species a protocol is needed to guide selection of tree species and a risk assessment for guiding selection of non-native grass species, following IUCN guidelines referenced above; The ESMF should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• a procedure / good practices for avoiding potential minor impacts from the construction of small-scale water infrastructure (construction phase);• a provision that baseline water information on the conditions of groundwater need to be collected in location with risk of over-exploitation and that extraction induced by the project will be monitored;• a procedure to assess and avoid water quality issues from value chain activities;• a methodology for controlling risk of over-harvesting of gums and resin, including for villages not included as project sites,• a procedure to be followed if pesticides are proposed defining when a succinct pest management plan would need to be developed.		

C. Other social or environmental impacts

Other social impacts

	<i>To be completed by project proponent</i>		<i>IUCN ESMS Reviewer</i>
	<i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i>	<i>If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)</i>	<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1. Is there a risk that the project affects human rights (e.g., right to self-determination, to education, to health, or cultural rights) – other than those of indigenous peoples which are dealt with in the previous standard? Differentiate between women and men, where applicable.	NO	During the inception phase the wards and villages in the already identified priority landscapes will be selected. These will be selected based on agreed criteria and with the county government staff. Communities will be given opportunity to opt out of the project if they wish. The key project interventions will be based on the self-determination of specific communities which will develop their own land use and action plans and develop their own bylaws. The facilitators of these community processes will ensure that marginalized voices within the communities are heard. Action learning groups and monitoring methods will follow the feedback of community regarding the levels of participation of the project.	Agreed – the participatory processes proposed by the project and the intended vulnerability assessment undertaken in each project site (together with provisions from the Indigenous peoples standard) are expected to ensure that rights issues would be perceived and strategies for their avoidance put in place.
2. Is there a risk that the project creates or aggravates inequalities between women and men or adversely impacts the situation or livelihood conditions of women or girls?	NO		Agreed as the project adopts a gender sensitive approach, undertook a gender analysis and developed a gender action plan.
3. Does the project use opportunities to secure and, when appropriate, enhance the economic, social and environmental benefits to women?	YES	Component 3 (Investments and incentives for economic empowerment) targets in particular youth and women through activities in the following areas: 1. Development of livestock value chains 2. Production and marketing of fodder, pasture seeds, gums and resins 3. Community solidarity fund mechanism – Community Resilience Facility	agreed
4. Does the project provide, when appropriate and consistent with national policy, for measures that strengthen women's rights and access to land and resources?	YES	Women inclusion on land tenure of community land. Women's rights will be also promoted with their involvement in the stakeholder consultation.	agreed
5. Is there a risk that the project benefits women and men in unequal	NO		No comment

terms that cannot be justified as affirmative action? ⁶			
6. Is there a risk that the project might negatively affect vulnerable groups ⁷ in terms of material or non-material livelihood conditions or contribute to their discrimination or marginalisation (only issues not captured in any of the sections above)?	NO		Not agreed. There might be a risk of inadvertently affected vulnerable groups; the social analysis/vulnerability assessment and the proposed extensive consultative process are expected to shed light on such risks; the ToR should explicitly include a rapid social analysis of each intervention site, once selected, in order to identify vulnerable groups.
7. Is there a risk that the project would stir or exacerbate conflicts among communities, groups or individuals? Also consider dynamics of recent or expected migration including displaced people.	NO	Resource competition is an existing risk in the target landscapes and could be exacerbated.	The risk of conflicts is mentioned several times in the proposal document as an existing challenge, irrespective of the project. And restoration activities that involve restriction are likely to give rise to (further) conflicts when they relate to competing needs for natural resources. These issues are expected to be analyzed following the recommendations made in section B1 (Standard on Access Restrictions). Risks could also be exacerbated as economic opportunities increase (e.g. through the promotion of value chains). There is also a low risk of water infrastructure work leading to different impacts for different groups with the risk of being perceived as unfair benefit allocation. These risks will need to be appraised once the activities and sites are further concretized (to be specified in ESMF).
8. Is there a risk that the project affects community health and safety (incl. human-wildlife conflicts)?	NO	The project does not specifically address human-wildlife conflicts, however, these do exist in many of the landscapes. It is hoped the project will contribute some resolution of these conflicts. HWC will be included in the site assessment and selection criteria.	At this point, no risks are identified. Should be reviewed once the activities are further fleshed out (included in ESMF).
9. Is there a risk that a water resource management project could lead to an outbreak of water-related disease?	NO	The project aims to increase the surface infiltration of water and improve vegetation cover. This should improve the quality of surface water (less sediment load) and recharge ground water. There is a very low risk that water infrastructure may affect the quality of standing water and if considered a risk a water quality monitoring programme will be considered.	Agreed. The need for water quality monitoring will need to be reviewed once the sites for the restoration work and the water harvesting infrastructure have been selected. This should also include reviewing the risk of causing insect-borne diseases triggered by water infrastructure (standing water) as well as risks to surface water caused by contamination from cattle triggered by water harvesting infrastructure/ troughs.

⁶ Affirmative action is a measure designed to overcome prevailing inequalities by favouring members of a disadvantaged group who suffer from discrimination. However, if not designed appropriately these measures could aggravate the situation of a previously advantaged groups leading to conflicts and social unrest.

⁷ Depending on the context vulnerable groups could be landless, elderly, disabled or displaced people, children, ethnic minorities, people living in poverty, marginalised or discriminated individuals or groups.

10. Might the project be directly or indirectly involved in forced labour and/or child labour?	NO		agreed
11. Is the project likely to induce immigration or significant increases in population density which might trigger environmental or social problems (with special consideration to women)?	NO		agreed
12. Please specify any other risk that could negatively affect the livelihoods of local communities; also consider indirect, cumulative (due to interaction with other projects or activities, current or planned) or transboundary impacts.		Generally, the project landscape are secure but security issues do arise from time to time and the project will use police escorts when these are deemed necessary, based on security advice. IUCN has security protocols and follows government and NGO intelligence on this.	Agreed. In addition to the existing IUCN security protocol an operational health and safety handbook should be developed for the project addressing risks to communities, community workers, contracted workers and project staff; it should list preventive and protective measures, and emergency preparedness and response arrangements.
13. Is there a risk that the project affects the operation of dams or other built water infrastructure (reservoirs, irrigation systems, canals) e.g., by changing flows into those structures? If yes, has an inventory of existing water resources infrastructures in the project area been compiled and potential impacts analysed?	NO		agreed
14. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing legal social frameworks including traditional frameworks and norms?	NO		agreed
Other environmental impacts			
	<i>To be completed by project proponent</i>		<i>IUCN ESMS Reviewer</i>
	<i>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</i>	<i>If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)</i>	<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
1. Will the project lead to increased waste production, in particular hazardous waste?	NO		agreed
2. Is the project likely to cause pollution or degradation of soil, soil erosion or siltation?	NO	The project activities look to mitigate land degradation	agreed
3. Might the project cause pollution to air or create other nuisances such as dust, traffic, noise or odour?	NO		The intended infrastructure projects are all very small scale and it is not expected that these works will involve nuisances (e.g. in terms of dust, traffic or noise) that would be perceived by communities as problematic. However, as precautionary measure those potential

			impacts will need to be explained in the community meetings.
4. Will the project lead to significant increases of greenhouse gas emissions?	NO		Agreed
5. Is there a risk that the project triggers consequential development activities which could lead to adverse environmental impacts, cumulative impacts due to interaction with other projects (current or planned) or to transboundary impacts (consider only issues not captured under the Biodiversity Standard)?	NO		Agreed. But the project ESMS monitoring should provide for ongoing risk screening in order to capture unexpected risks dues to cumulative impacts.
6. Do any of the planned activities fall within specific legislation requiring environmental and/or social impact assessments? If yes, specify.	NO		agreed
7. Is there a risk that the project might conflict with existing environmental regulations or provisions of the host country?	NO	All environmental regulations are considered and adhered to	It needs to be ensured that the environmental licensing process is started ahead of time with the relevant authority (NEMA and district) and the potential need of a ESIA discussed
<i>Please summarise key issuse identified through the questions above. Aside from these issues, are there any other potential negative impacts?</i>		<p>While environmental risk - in addition to those identified under the Biodiversity Standard - have not been identified, there are a few social risks that will need to be reviewed once the activities and sites have been decided (as specified in the ESMF):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• risks for vulnerable groups caused by use restrictions (e.g. grazing);• risks of social conflicts due to competing needs for natural resources and/or related to economic opportunities promoted by the project (e.g. value chains);• health risks related to water quality (expected to be minimal though);• issues related to perceived unfair treatment when selecting the location of water infrastructure and• operational health and safety considerations due to the location of the project.	
<i>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</i>		<p>The project includes extensive and inclusive community-level planning which is expected to avoid or at least minimize the risk of social conflicts mentioned above. Implementing the provisions from the IP Standard is expected to address residual impacts.</p> <p>However, as precautionary measure, the ESMF should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provisions for assessing and potentially monitoring the quality of surface water;• Provisions for reviewing the risk of causing insect-borne diseases triggered by water infrastructure and of contaminations of surface water through cattle movements.	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational health and safety issues should be minimized through an operational health and safety handbook with preventive and protective measures and emergency preparedness and response arrangements.
<p>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures?</p> <p>What specific topics are to be assessed?</p>		It is assumed that the planned vulnerability assessment (together with provisions from the IP Standard) will be sufficient to provide an understanding of the social context, risks and vulnerabilities within the respective local communities.
D. Climate change risks (caused by a failure to adequately consider the effects of climate change)		
	To be completed by project proponent	
	<p>Yes, no, n/a, TBD</p>	<p><i>If yes, describe potential issues, specify activities causing this and measures for preventing or minimising adverse impacts (if applicable)</i></p>
		IUCN ESMS Reviewer
		<i>Comments, additional considerations</i>
8. Have historical, current, and future trends in climate variability and climate change in the project area been taken into consideration?	Yes	<p>Issues on Drought emergence and floods.</p> <p>Issues on disease outbreak due to climate change</p>
9. Is the project area prone to specific climate hazards (e.g., floods, droughts, wildfires, landslides, cyclones, storm surges, etc.)?	YES	<p>Floods</p> <p>Droughts</p>
10. Are changes in biophysical conditions in the project area triggered by climate change expected to impact people's livelihoods? Are some groups more susceptible than others (e.g., women or vulnerable groups)?	YES	<p>Activities proposed in component 2 on Land restoration and rehabilitation are expected to positively impact the livelihoods of the communities in the priority areas.</p> <p>1. This may be through increased security on food.</p> <p>2. Increased pasture for livestock.</p>
11. Is there a risk that current or projected climate variability and changes might affect the implementation of project activities or their effectiveness and the sustainability of the project (e.g., through risk and events such as landslides, erosion, flooding, or droughts)?	NO	
12. Could project activities potentially increase the vulnerability of local communities and the ecosystem to current or future climate variability and changes (e.g., through risks and events such as landslides, erosion, flooding or droughts)?	NO	
13. Does the project seek opportunities to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and ecosystem to climate change?	YES	<p>Component 1 on Drought management and Coordination; looks to build capacity on early warning systems to increase adaptive capability for affected communities in event of climate change extremes.</p>

<i>Please summarise key issue identified through the questions above.</i>	No risks identified that are not already addressed by the projects.
<i>Have measures for avoiding impacts already been considered? Are they sufficient?</i>	n/a
<i>Are assessments required to better understand the impacts and identify mitigation measures? What specific topics are to be assessed</i>	n/a

Annex 2

Indigenous people and Tribal communities [the constitution refers to indigenous people as marginalized]

In 2003, the African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights Working Group on Indigenous Populations provided criteria for the identification of Indigenous Peoples in Africa. Besides self-identification, identification by others as indigenous and cultures/livelihoods systems that are closely attached to particular lands and territories, marginalization from national process constitutes a key criteria. In this context, pastoralist and hunter-gatherer communities constitute Indigenous Peoples in Kenya. This is a view also supported by Article 260 of the Constitution of Kenya, 2010.

In addition to Article 260 (which defines ‘marginalised communities and groups’), Articles 56 (which set out procedures for affirmative action for marginalised communities and groups) and 21 (which sets out the responsibilities of government officers) are relevant to the concept of marginalization and IP. These articles are reproduced in full here.

Article 260 of the Kenya Constitution. “marginalised community” means—(a) a community that, because of its relatively small population or for any other reason, has been unable to fully participate in the integrated social and economic life of Kenya as a whole; (b) a traditional community that, out of a need or desire to preserve its unique culture and identity from assimilation, has remained outside the integrated social and economic life of Kenya as a whole; (c) an indigenous community that has retained and maintained a traditional lifestyle and livelihood based on a hunter or gatherer economy; or (d) pastoral persons and communities, whether they are—(i) nomadic; or (ii) a settled community that, because of its relative geographic isolation, has experienced only marginal participation in the integrated social and economic life of Kenya as a whole; “marginalised group” means a group of people who, because of laws or practices before, on, or after the effective date, were or are disadvantaged by discrimination on one or more of the grounds in Article 27 (4);

Article 56 of the Kenya Constitution. Minorities and marginalised groups. The State shall put in place affirmative action programmes designed to ensure that minorities and marginalised groups— (a) participate and are represented in governance and other spheres of life; (b) are provided special opportunities in educational and economic fields; (c) are provided special opportunities for access to employment; (d) develop their cultural values, languages and practices; and (e) have reasonable access to water, health services and infrastructure.

Article 21 of the Kenya Constitution. Implementation of rights and fundamental freedoms. (3) All State organs and all public officers have the duty to address the needs of vulnerable groups within society, including women, older members of society, persons with disabilities, children, youth, members of minority or marginalised communities, and members of particular ethnic, religious or cultural communities.