

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA					
GEF ID: 18		Review date:			
		at endorsement (Million US\$)		at completion (Million US\$)	
Project Name:	Lewa Wild life Conservancy	GEF financing:	0.725000	0.755	
Country:	Kenya	IA/EA own:	01460	?	
		Government:			
		Other*:	0.025	?	
		Total Cofinancing	3.139	?	
Operational Program:	1	Total Project Cost:	4.089	0.00	
IA	WB	<u>Dates</u>			
Partners involved:	Lewa Wildlife Conservancy	Work Program date			
		CEO Endorsement		07/19/1999	
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)			03/22/2000
		Closing Date	Proposed: 06/30/2004	Actual: 03/30/2004	
Prepared by: Lee Risby	Reviewed by: David Todd	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 4 years and three months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 4 years	Difference between original and actual closing: 3 months	
Author of TE: David Kamweti (Kamfor Ltd)		TE completion date: 10/2003	TE submission date to GEF EO: 09/21/2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 1 year and 11 months	

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (LBS)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes		N/A	HS	S
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	N/A	L	L
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation		N/A	MS	MS
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	U/A	U (for Bank report)

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? No Why? Although the report contains some useful information, it does not formally evaluate against the project objectives or changed outcomes (or even recognize that outcomes changed). In short, it is not a

formal evaluation and the TOR for the report consultants does not term the report as an evaluation. It contains no ratings of project performance. It is also poorly written and structured and does not do due justice to a very successful project. The Local Benefits Study case study provides a much more comprehensive evaluation of the project performance and underlying logic (it was conducted 1 month after the Banks report). Unfortunately, this TER is based primarily on GEF EO's own evaluation of the project conducted as part of the Local Benefits Study.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? No

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives?**

- To enable LWC to continue and expand its conservation of the endangered species.
- To enhance the sustainability of these conservation benefits, by enabling LWC to become more viable in the long term.
- To provide support to community-based wildlife conservation initiatives and to build capacity of these communities with the necessary skills which will lead to environmentally sustainable ecotourism business and other income generating activities.

- **Any changes during implementation?** Yes, an analysis of the log frame and retrospective review with Lewa staff based on their activities revealed the following (part of LBS report)

Outcome 1: Long-term capacity of LWC to provide global and local benefits from wildlife conservation strengthened

Outcome 2: Protection & management of endangered wildlife species in the wider ecosystem strengthened, in collaboration with local communities

Outcome 3: Economic benefits to local communities from sustainable use of wildlife and natural resources improved

Outcome 4: Pastoralist natural resources management and institutions sustainably enhanced

Outcome 5: Local and national policies supporting wildlife conservation and community livelihoods in semi-arid landscapes influenced and strengthened

- **What are the Development Objectives?**

Yes, See above

- **Any changes during implementation?** Yes, See above

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?**

The Bank report does not provide a coherent or consist review of project outcomes / impacts. Hence the summary below is drawn from the GEF EO LBS report.

Overall, the GEF Lewa project has been especially successful in increasing LWC's institutional capacity (Outcome 1), and in the protection and management of biodiversity (Result 2). These two results are at the heart of the project's overall goal. A strong foundation has also been laid with the project's work on improving community livelihoods (Outcome 3-5); however this is the area that will need additional attention in future if the project's initial gains in this area are to be consolidated.

Outcome 1 - LWC Institutional Capacity. The key achievements made in strengthening the long-term capacity of LWC to provide global and local benefits from wildlife conservation have been in the areas of increasing LWC's human resources capacity and consolidating and upgrading LWC's management systems. Another area of significant accomplishment has been in upgrading LWC equipment and infrastructure to enable LWC to more effectively conduct its wildlife protection and, to a lesser extent, its community conservation operations. However, as a result of all these improvements, LWC's operational costs have been increasing at a faster rate than revenues, which has made LWC more dependent on donor funding. The Community Development Department, which was established at the start of the project, requires a great deal more resources and personnel to support the existing and developing community conservation and development initiatives.

Outcome 2 - Biodiversity Protection & Management. Much has been achieved in the protection and

management of endangered wildlife species in the wider ecosystem and, as LWC's core strength, this result has been the main beneficiary of the institutional strengthening activities of Outcome 1. During the project, LWC has developed new capacity in reaching its goal of re-establishing the region's wildlife within its natural rangelands. In particular, LWC has developed a cost-effective capacity for the translocation of excess wildlife to restock other rangelands of northern Kenya, and has supported pastoralist communities to protect endangered species (e.g., three rhinos successfully introduced and protected at Il Ngwesi Group Ranch in 2002/3 and Grevy's zebra radio-collar monitoring programme within LWC and three pastoralist areas established in 2002). The major challenge faced relates to the high costs of wildlife security (e.g. US\$4,625 to protect one rhino), which currently relies on donor support. Also, although monitoring was a responsibility identified for LWC in the project proposal, there are still no biological (or socio-economic) baselines established for the target community areas.

Outcome 3 – Local Economic Benefits. The project has made significant progress in improving economic benefits to local communities from the sustainable use of wildlife and natural resources. This has mainly been achieved by strengthening the existing community tourism initiatives and wildlife operations, through capacity building in business, wildlife management and tourism, and by encouraging and supporting new initiatives such as the Kalama Community Wildlife Conservation Project and the Ngare Ndare Forest Trust. The challenges to the project have been in the management of heightened community expectations as to the level and nature of benefits from tourism, and the lack of progress in developing any income-generating activities outside of tourism.

Outcome 4 – Community NRM Capacity. Partial success has been achieved in enhancing pastoralist institutions through support and capacity building of the pastoralist group ranch governance and educational support through the Lewa Education Trust, which was established in 2001. However, the major missed opportunity during the project was the lack of attention and strategies aimed at improving community pastoralist NRM practices.

Outcome 5 – Policy Environment. LWC did not make strengthening local and national policies supporting wildlife conservation and community livelihoods a priority action during the implementation of the project. Rather, LWC has chosen to tackle these politically sensitive issues indirectly and informally, firstly at the district level through the Community Development Manager and area chiefs, and secondly at the national level by involving and working with senior government officials who endorse and personally support LWC's community conservation initiatives. However, national wildlife and land-use policies remain unaltered and continue to limit the potential sustainable benefits that wildlife could generate in the region, which in turn would strengthen long-term biodiversity conservation support. For example, the prohibition of carefully monitored consumptive wildlife utilization prevents income-generating activities such as wildlife cropping, processing and sale of wildlife products, and sport hunting. Although LWC disseminates information widely for fundraising and attracting tourists, it has yet to make a concerted effort to disseminate its experience and lessons learnt to local and national government and other communities in the region.

4. GEF EO ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes 16 / 3 = 5.3

A Relevance (5)	Rating: S
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain 	
<p>For an MSP this project had significant relevance for OP1 / SP1 and SP2 and also sustainable land management in Northern Kenya. The project went beyond its focus on LWC to develop strong partnerships with local communities and group ranches which have led to improved non-PA conservation activities in Northern Kenya. It has also attracted considerable financial support since project closure.</p>	
B Effectiveness	Rating: S (5)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? 	
<p>The TE gave a very poor and inconsistent account of effectiveness hence it is not possible to accurately assess effectiveness based on the report presented by the Bank, however based on the LBS project performance assessment against 5 outcomes (as provided by LWC and other stakeholders) the project was satisfactory overall. Although, there were some doubts concerning sustainability particularly on the financial</p>	

side. These issues have largely turned out to be unfounded as LWC has continued and expanded operations with a series of new partnerships with INGOs, private sector and philanthropic individuals (see www.lewa.org)

**C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)
(6)**

Rating: HS

- **Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?**

According to LBS report the project had a relatively small amount of GEF funding and achieved some significant outcomes in terms of safeguard key endangered species such as Grevy Zebra and Rhino on LWC and community lands. The approach taken by LWC to actively involve local communities in developing tourist and alternative livelihood opportunities through capacity development which was also a cost-effective (although human resource intensive). Lastly, on the local political front the project played a part in reducing conflict (such as cattle rustling and local inter-ethnic violence) to provide the basis for local communities to consider conservation. The project was firmly embedded in the local socio-political system with the owners of LWC being local white Kenyan's with a considerable understanding of the situation and strategies to augment the outcomes into the future. The environmental result of this has been near 2000 sq km of land being managed for conservation and community rangeland use in Northern Kenya for a relatively small amount of GEF resources.

Impacts

- **Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?**

According to the LBS report the project achieved key outcomes such as improving the capacity of LWC to manage its own estate and reach out to the communities surrounding it. In doing so, this has resulted in more effective conservation. External information gathered from the LWC website now shows that it has moved forward to work with the communities through a new umbrella organization – The Northern Rangelands Trust and it is also managing another conservancy OI Pejeta. The fears that LWC may not be financial sustainable have been reduced through intensive fund raising and partnerships with FFI and various American zoos (St Louis and San Diego) as well as contributions from individuals and companies.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE.

A Financial resources

Rating: ML

According to the LBS case study, the risk to sustainability in the medium – to – long-term is moderate likely, this is mainly because of fluctuations in revenue generation through tourism. For example, LWC's revenue generation from tourism was hard hit by Sept 11th thru 2002 – 03 and the East African tourism market remains somewhat volatile and competitive. On the fundraising side a significant amount of the efforts rest on shoulders of Ian Craig the CEO of LWC. However, Lewa has set up charities in UK, USA, Switzerland, Austria and Asia (Hong Kong) to receive philanthropic donations and are functioning institutions independent of Mr. Craig's own actions. On the community side the LWC capacity building efforts were directed at training communities to run their own tourist lodges. The lodges were constructed with the assistance of the Bank and USAID from all local materials. This means they can be easily maintained but also blend into the landscape and ecologically appropriate. The training has included accounting, cooking and management and tourist guiding. This has enabling local employment opportunities to be retained within Maasai and Samburu communities and not exploited by ex-pats and also meant that revenues go back into the community. The GEF grant paid for communities to develop their own business planning models with the help of LWC. Since the grant ended LWC has linked up with INSEAD (leading MBA school in France) and to assist the communities with marketing and business planning advice. At the time of the GEF EO LBS evaluation the community run tourism operations were at break-even due to global terrorism threats reducing visitors to Kenya, but encouragingly communities were not substantively impacted and took a longer term view that the enterprise needed nurturing and that there would be good years and bad years (similar to their main activity of pastoralism).

B Socio political

Rating: ML

According to the LBS case study, the socio-political sustainability depends on the network of individual contact set up by LWC staff and particularly the CEO. LWC have taken strategic steps to ensuring the longer-term sustainability by involving local politicians including the Speaker of the Kenyan Parliament on their board. The establishment of the Northern Rangelands Trust provides a further way in which LWC can broaden the wider socio-political commitment to conservation in Northern Kenya, although this is still

ongoing.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
According to the LBS case study the GEF grant was primarily aimed at securing LWC institutional and physical capital and it achieved that, since the end of the project nearly two years ago, LWC has sustained its institutional capacity and extend operations to cover neighbouring ranches and communities activities such as Northern Rangeland Trust. The LWC has also established institutional relationships with several zoological institutes to support research function and conservation operations as well as FFI to support the community aspects. On the policy side LWC has informally influenced Kenyan MPs such as the influential Speaker of Parliament to support private conservancy and for their contribution to be recognized in government policy and legislation this is still ongoing. Although LWC has a established a legally binding conservation easement over its core land (16,500 hectares).	
D Environmental	Rating: L
The projects successful elements, most notably building capacity for enforcement over a wider area outside of LWC (as well as reducing social-unrest in terms of cattle rustling) and the research component on Grevy's zebra have greatly reduced the medium – long term risks to endangered wildlife – notably black rhino and zebra. Both populations have increased over the course of the project and have continued to increase as over 2006 (see www.lewa.org) . LWC has also secured further technical assistance and funding for research and monitoring of the wider ecology of the conservancy and the community conserved areas of the Northern Rangelands Trust. The project resulted in nearly 2000 sqkm of community and LWC land coming under active conservation management.	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE (not possible – ratings are derived from the LBS report and lewa.org): **16 / 4 = 4**

A Financial resources (4)	Rating: L
B Socio political (4)	Rating: L
C Institutional framework and governance (4)	Rating: L
D Environmental (4)	Rating: L

4.3 Catalytic role

1. Production of a public good - LWC represents a public (community) – private partnership of an innovative kind, in that the potential for further partnerships has been demonstrated since the project ended (e.g., with Sera community conservancy – resulting in a further 200,000 hectares of land coming under conservation management), which was directly catalyzed by the GEF grant for institutional and physical capital development of LWC.
2. Demonstration - The project has demonstrated the socio-economic and environmental value of conservation in Northern Kenya and many other white owned and native Kenyan ranches are now undertaking mixed farming and / or exclusive conservation practices. This has been further augmented through the work of the Laikipia Wildlife Forum and umbrella community group that brings together ranchers and conservancies across Northern Kenya
3. Replication – Replication is happening in Sera – with the ongoing construction of a community owned and run lodge, furthermore, existing community conservancies at Il'Ngwesi, Tassia and Namunyak are still functioning and making contributions to community development which serve to demonstrate links between local and global benefits and serve as incentives for others to follow their example.
4. Scaling up – This is one area that remains to be fully exploited by LWC and community partners (although the land issue is very sensitive politically in Kenya), Kenya conservation and wildlife law needs to be amended to allow communities and others to own wildlife on their land, and also to allow private conservancies to operate with greater legal certitude.

4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE: **12 / 3 = 4**

A. In retrospect, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&E activities)
--

Rating: MS (4)
The project established a good environmental monitoring system for zebra and rhino and other species (regular aerial counts and ground-based truthing). The research officer for LWC managed all ecological monitoring with the assistance of other institutions and this has continued ex-post. However, monitoring of important community incentives (tourism and revenues), impacts on poor and women was less systematic and there was no baseline assessment. There is evidence from www.lewa.org that community conservation and development monitoring has improved and FFI have now seconded a staff member to LWC to assist with the Northern Rangelands Trust.
B. Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure? Rating: MS (4)
Yes the ecological monitoring was carried out before, during and after the project. This did allow tracking of environmental aspects. However, detailed monitoring of capacity building was more ad-hoc. Data collection has improved since the project ended.
C. Was M&E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation? Rating: MS (4)
Yes, the project had a separate budget for research and ecological monitoring.
Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? On the ecological monitoring yes, on the socio-economic and capacity building side no, however, during the LBS evaluation it was clear that the local perceptions of progress on capacity building and the physical evidence of progress was clear.

4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?
The lessons in the Bank report are not coherent or easily understandable. The LBS lessons are clearer and are stated below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A high degree of community ownership over project design and implementation is vital to success 2. Effective and sustainable local institutions are crucial for project success and sustainability 3. Locally-base project implementers with a long-term commitment to the area are more likely to succeed 4. Monitoring systems incorporating baseline data collection are needed 5. Long-term external financing may be essential 6. Win-win scenarios between conservation and development are most easily attained where populations are homogenous, conservation-compatible land uses are attractive, and population pressure is low 7. Non-cash benefits may be more important to communities than cash benefits 8. Successful conservation – development projects need to be tailor-made to local needs, involve multiple strategies, and adopt a wider ecosystem approach.

4.6 Quality of the evaluation report Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to the "Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports" in the document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings
In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.
The TE was not an evaluation the ratings given in the TER are derived almost exclusively from the GEF EO's LBS case study.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report: overall score 1.9	Ratings
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	2
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?	1
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	2
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	2
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	3
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	2

4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

Yes: X

No:

Explain: The project could be considered for further evaluation of the catalytic effect of the GEF and / or capacity development.

4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)

Malpas, R., Craig, R et al (2003) Kenya : Lewa Wildlife Conservancy. Role of Local Benefits in Global Environmental Programs. GEF Evaluation Office. Washington DC.
www.lewa.org

Reviewer's Comments

The Local Benefits Study of Lewa was encyclopedic in its scope and has therefore enabled ratings for most aspects of the project to be derived. The document received from the Bank is not a final evaluation of any sort, but, as its title states, an Output to Purpose Review. It does not therefore tell us much about outcomes or achievement of the project's GEOs. As a TE it should actually be unacceptable to the Bank and the GEF. I therefore support both the project ratings, derived from the LBS Case Study and the ratings given to the Bank's document, which does not conform to the requirements of a GEF TE.