Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1848	
GEF Agency project ID		4764	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	
Project name		Mount Kenya east Pilot Project for natural Resource Management	
Country/Countries		Republic of Kenya	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Multifocal	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP12: Integrated Ecosystem Management; OP3: Forest Ecosystems; OP4: Mountain Ecosystems; OP15: Land Degradation	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Water Resource Management and the Kenya Wildlife Service	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Water Resource User's Association (WRUAs) and Village Savings and Loan Associations - Beneficiaries	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		August 17 2004	
Effectiveness date / project start		March 2007	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		March 2012	
Actual date of project completion		September 2012.	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.35	0.35
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		4.7	4.7
Co-financing	IA own	16.74	U/A
	Government	1.81	0.81
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	2.51	0.34
Total GEF funding		5.05	5.05
Total Co-financing		21.07	U/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		26.12	U/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date			
TE submission date		December 11th 2012	
Author of TE		Harriet Matsaert and Rose M. Mayienda	
TER completion date		January 2015	
TER prepared by		Ritu Kanotra	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	N/R	MS	N/R	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	MS (Note that TE uses 6-point scale (Moderately Satisfactory)	N/R	ML
M&E Design	N/R	MS	N/R	S
M&E Implementation	N/R	MU	N/R	MU
Quality of Implementation	N/R	MS	N/R	MS
Quality of Execution	N/R	MS	N/R	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	N/R	N/A	N/R	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objectives of the project include 'improved conservation, management and sustainable and equitable use of biological resources of Mount Kenya ecosystem' (Project Document (PD) pg 19). The conservation of Mount Kenya ecosystem is of global and national interest due to its importance as a biodiversity reservoir, water catchment area and source of livelihoods for the surrounding communities. But this diversified and important ecosystem is under serious threat because of human pressure, institutional constraints and climate change that need to be addressed through supporting a sustainable and environment friendly use of natural resources, with the involvement of surrounding communities in its management.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Document, The Mount Kenya East Pilot Project for natural Resource Management (MKEPP) developmental goal was 'to contribute to poverty reduction through more productive, equitable and sustainable use of natural resources through integrated ecosystem management' (PD Pg 19). The objectives of the project were to be achieved through integration of the following outputs:

Output 1. Improved water regulatory systems and water use efficiency

- Develop sub-basin management plans; support community based water efficiency systems
- Equipment, training to technical staff for monitoring water abstractions and development of decision tools to enhance their participation in permit approval process

Output 2. Enhanced natural resource management and biodiversity conservation

- Promote on farm agro forestry and off farm reforestation/stabilization – 1000 Ha reforested; 100 kms of roadside plantations
- Protection of wetlands and assess feasibility of constructed wetlands
- Forest rehabilitation (2800 Ha), improve rehabilitation infrastructure
- Preparation of Forest operational management, implement an eco tourism plan and institutional strengthening of Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS)

- Research monitoring and information management, strengthen Mweiga Research station and set up research outposts in NP headquarters

Output 3. Increased sustainability of rural livelihood options

- Promote on farm soil and water conservation measures (500 farmers of 168 FFS involved); enhance agriculture technology dissemination (1320 farmers adopting technologies for increase in yield and acerage and change in cropping pattern)
- Support off farm income generating activities and enhance their marketing linkages
- Establishment of wildlife barriers (397 kms), train community for maintenance and development of long term strategy for elephant migratory corridors

Output 4. Strengthened local governance capacity and community empowerment.

- Mobilize communities, support formation of specific groups like water user associations and marketing groups**.**
- Conduct baseline survey and train district technical services and front line staff on participatory methodologies.

Output 5. Project Management

- Establish Project management Unit (PMU) and strengthen capacity of KWS for implementation of project activities.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

No, TE doesn't report any changes in Global Environmental Objectives and Development Objectives, although it does report that some of the activities were dropped due to budgeting problems.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

. Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: **Highly Satisfactory**

The Terminal evaluation assessed the relevance of the project as highly satisfactory as it was relevant to both GEF and national priorities. This evaluation assigns the same rating for relevance. Mount Kenya region is one of the highest potential agricultural regions in Kenya where only 17% of the land surface is classified as agriculturally useful. These agricultural lands encircle principal watersheds of the country, gazette as a Forest reserve while the upper altitudes areas designated as a National Park. Mt Kenya

mountains are recognized as one of 24 globally important 'hot spots' for forest biodiversity (PD- Annex 3A), hosting 11 strictly endemic species of higher plants and more than 150 species that are near endemic (PD, 2). The entire ecosystem of Mount Kenya is under threat due to interrelated factors like poverty, population pressure, institutional constraints and climate change. It was recognized that to address the complex and competing needs of the protected and agricultural areas of Mount Kenya, as integrated ecosystem approach was required, as has been adopted through this project. Thus, this project aims to relieve the pressure on forest and water resources by focusing on alternative livelihoods and improved management practices in adjacent agricultural lands, while also promoting management and conservation strategies in the adjoining protected areas. The Government of Kenya had shown its commitment to addressing inter related problems of destruction of protected areas and environmental conservation as a key to sustainable poverty reduction, through a number of initiatives in past, but was still constrained by limited resources, brought in through this project.

The project's objectives are inline with those of 4 GEF Operational Programs (OPS): OP12: Integrated Ecosystem Management; OP3: Forest Ecosystems; OP4: Mountain Ecosystems; and OP15: Land Degradation. The project is also consistent with Convention of Parties 3 and Article 8 of Convention on Biological Diversity. The benefits through the project are generated in terms of conservation of a globally significant ecosystem and species and generate multi focal benefits in land degradation, biodiversity and climate change (enhanced carbon sequestration in rehabilitated lands and ecosystems). Lastly, project also contributes to GEF Land and Water Initiative for Africa and is linked to the New Partnerships for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and its Environment Action Plans.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

According to terminal evaluation, project's effectiveness is rated as 'moderately satisfactory'. This review also finds the same rating for the project. Project succeeded in achieving many of the planned outputs such as rehabilitation of degraded forests and effective management of park through infrastructure development, training of government staff and community members to respond faster to crises (human-wildlife conflict, fire); training and support to community through income generating (off farm) activities allowing them to diversify their income and completion of Mt Kenya Ecosystem Management and tourism development plans at community level. However, critical outputs such as improving water resource management of Mount Kenya watershed couldn't be achieved due to lack of agreement and clarity on roles between key government actors; trainings related to on farm income generating activities were not undertaken due to transfer of budget to other activities and shortage of funds for completing the wildlife fence construction and make Mweiga Research station fully functional. Besides monitoring and evaluation systems (GIS and decision support tools) inbuilt in the project for adaptive management and tracking the overall progress of the project objectives were not used to their full potential, impacting effectiveness of the project.

Progress against four outputs defined in the project document is detailed below:

Water Resource Management: Except for supporting two (2, target of 13) Water User's Associations, collection of rainfall data, project failed in developing Water Resource Management Strategy and strengthening the capacity of concerned staff to actively participate in watershed and river basin management, for which GEF funds were allocated. TE notes 'limited institutional capacity and poor governance' and 'lack of clear understanding of roles or agreements between the different agencies involved' as main reasons for low achievement under this component. For instance, Water Resource Management Authority (WRMA) taking on the role formerly envisaged by KWA created confusion in terms of the roles of different stakeholders in water resource management. Despite recommendation in annual

report (2011-2012) to bring in an additional consultant to support this component, this issue remained largely unaddressed.

Environmental Conservation: About 70% of total GEF funding was allocated for activities related to natural resource conservation and management within protected areas (National Park and Reserve). According to the TE, 1,965 ha of degraded forest and additional 633 ha of plantations were rehabilitated, but the impact from this activity on improving forest diversity and rehabilitation cannot be assessed in absence of aerial surveys, expected to be conducted during the project. TE notes that provision of equipment and trainings to Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) has enhanced their capacity for park management and improved their response to crises like fire and human wild life conflict. According to TE, the project has contributed significantly in terms of improving the relationship between community members and KWS, through joint patrols, collaboration in preparation of plans, trainings and awareness generation camps for participatory management. Joint patrols are reported to have reduced number of illegal activities considerably through increased collaboration between Kenya Forest Service (KFS) and KWS and other stakeholders including Bill Woodley trust (Annual report 2011 – 2012 p 18 quoted in TE). But as per TE, this claim needs to be supported by analyzing available data.

Development of forest management plans (4) was an important achievement, but use of these plans for integrated management is limited, as these are yet not endorsed at the national level due to conflicting policies. Project had provisions to strengthen already existing Mweiga Research station and support KWS staff in getting information for eco system monitoring and management. But TE notes delays in setting up Mweiga research station meant that essential data and resources (maps) to support integrated planning, management, and monitoring were not available.

Sustainable rural livelihoods – According to TE, except for a few activities, on-farm soil and water management measures aimed at increasing the fertility and productivity of the agriculture land were not undertaken. TE reports most of the funds against this budget line were transferred to trainings to community members in off-farm income-generating activities (3,318 members) and community nursery management. The reasons for this shifting of funding are not clear from TE. This has enabled households to diversify income sources by adoption of new enterprises. But there is no data to quantify the scale and distribution of impact on household income.

An area of 87 kms of fence built with community involvement and their training on barrier maintenance helped reduce human wildlife conflict. This was less than the original target of 397 kms installed fence, reduced mainly due to change in the fence design and inflation. TE notes that additional funds are already mobilized for meeting target of fence construction, with community in agreement to provide funds for maintenance. But, evaluators based on their observation in field, also caution against the likelihood of negative environmental impact of fencing on elephant populations, if not properly monitored. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of fencing was conducted during project but its findings are not shared in the report. Project also envisaged development of long-term strategy for the elephant migratory corridors, looking at the impact of fencing on wildlife corridors. But, according to TE, this activity was not undertaken presumably due to reallocation of funds, as it was not a priority for KWS involved in mapping corridors at National level.

Community Empowerment – Community members were provided with extensive training and awareness generation activities focused around issues such as group dynamics, leadership, HIV/AIDS, proposal writing and gender mainstreaming. The management capacity of Community Forest Associations (CFAs) was enhanced through trainings. Forest management plans with 4 CFAs and 2 sub

management plans with two Water Users Associations were developed. Forty-three Community groups have adopted Village Loan and Savings Associations (VLSAs) to finance new enterprises. Again there is lack of data to quantify improvement in the status of income as a result of these interventions.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

TE rates the overall efficiency of the project as moderately satisfactory, and this TER concurs with that assessment. The project maximized its efficiency through utilization of existing institutions (KWS) for project execution, and worked with existing community groups and drew from their knowledge and experience. The project was co-financed by KWS (staff costs) and project beneficiaries (labour contribution), and also leveraged finance from local NGOs and donor organizations. Approaches like Training of Trainers (TOT) helped in up scaling benefits of trainings and reaching out to far wider group of community. Project suffered to some extent due to frequent transfers of key project staff, undermining training inputs, resulting in loss of institutional memory and delays in project output delivery. But the impact from these transfers was limited as key staff still remained within Kenya Forest Service (KFS) and Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), contributing to the broader capacity of the organization and enabling them to seek funds from other sources. At the same time, some existing KWS staff expertise in areas like GIS that would have helped in strengthening the GIS unit at Mweiga remained unused due to their non-involvement in the project. According to terminal evaluation, frequent reviews and evaluations, carried out within small time gaps, took some valuable time of staff while 'adding limited value' to the achievement of project outputs.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Likely**

The TE utilizes the same six-point scale for Sustainability as with Outcomes. TE finds Sustainability of Outcomes to be Moderately Satisfactory, which will be treated in this TER as Moderately Likely (moderate risks), based on the narrative of the TE. The TER concurs with the assessment in the TE, finding that while there are some uncertainties regarding sustainability, overall, these risks are moderate and likely to be addressed.

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes is further assessed along the following 4 dimensions:

Financial resources – Moderately Likely

A large part of the financial sustainability of the project's outcomes depends on the ongoing commitment of resources by GoK mainly through KWS and KFS, which according to terminal evaluation, is likely to occur as the 'government is committed to the conservation of the country's water towers' – referring to the Mount Kenya ecosystem (TE 13). Project is reported to be able to mobilize funds through linkages with NRM projects supported by government and other funding agencies, ensuring financial sustainability of some of the components of the project. For instance, provision in KWS budget to maintain infrastructure created through the project, support for additional fence building through Rhino trust, Government of Kenya (GOK); Upper Tana Catchment Natural Resource Management Project (UTaNRMP) supporting fence building, Water Resource User Associations (WRUAs) and Community User Associations (CFAs) formed during project. According to terminal evaluation, income generating activities will continue to get

support through sale of seedlings, savings and credit scheme – VSLA promoted through project and linkages with other NRM projects of World Bank and (UTaNRMP).

Areas where financial commitments are unclear or need to be monitored due to past experiences include the Mweiga research station and the community contribution for fence maintenance. Whether KWS will provide sufficient funds for Mt Kenya Monitoring unit at Mweiga research station and if these funds would be sufficient for it to play a role in coordinating data collection for all stakeholders, is still unclear. Financial sustainability of this research station is critical to track national and global impacts, and according to terminal evaluation, this should not only be the responsibility of KWS but also of other stakeholders present in the area. Regarding fence maintenance, even though community has committed to contribute, TE cautions that it has been a problem in past, and is important that the success of the maintenance strategy is carefully monitored.

b. Socio political – Moderately Likely

TE notes that joint planning mechanisms and improved relations between KWS, KFS and community members facilitated through the project, are likely to endure beyond project life, contributing to joint management and conservation of natural resources at local level. Project also had an overall political agreement, since project work remained largely unaffected despite political disruptions after 2007 elections in Kenya. However, Mt Kenya Ecosystem Management plans developed through involvement of local stakeholders are still not endorsed and legalized, due to conflicting policies that need to be resolved at national level.

c. Institutional framework and governance – Moderately Likely

According to terminal evaluation, the project was closely aligned to government institutional arrangements and forthcoming changes under the new constitution such as a proposed merging of ministries responsible for Environment and Natural resources and the formation of the Land Commission, should further strengthen the project's outcomes. In addition the training and resources provided by the project to KWS, KFS, communities and other stakeholders has increased their capacity to continue to support the activities initiated under the project.

However, evaluators note that certain project outcomes are undermined due to 'conflicting policies' and 'lack of agreement between key government actors'. For example, there is a need for MOUs to be signed between KWS and Water Resource Management Authority (WRMA) to agree on the sharing of water data for overall Ecosystem management. Also, Mt Kenya Ecosystem Management plans lack legal status, as they have not yet been endorsed at the national level. Principal reasons for this, as stated in the terminal evaluation and in past studies, are that overlapping Acts that address forestry (e.g. Water Act, the Wildlife Act, Agriculture Act) are not harmonized, and this can create uncertainty and confusion in responsibilities of law enforcement. Moreover, dual gazettement of protected forest areas to KWS and KFS can also create confusion in management of activities (fire fighting and patrolling) with the question of overall accountability in law enforcement.

As stated in the TE, the project lacked a method of feeding back these findings to the relevant Ministries and was not able to address these conflicting policies during the project life.

d. Environmental – Moderately Likely

Overall, terminal evaluation doesn't report any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of projects environmental benefits. However, as also cautioned in the PD and supported through terminal evaluation, construction of the fence may lead to negative environmental impacts in terms of enclosing elephant population impacting its gene pool. Careful monitoring of elephant populations and further development of corridors (at present there are two corridors on Meru and Lewa sides of the reserve) is needed to reduce environmental damage as fencing continues. Although evaluators were informed that a strategy for wildlife corridors is being developed at the national level with government funding, however, they didn't find any concrete progress for the Mt Kenya area. They observed that encroachment of the historical wildlife corridors is threatening to prevent the future movement of elephants from the park. Commercial poaching continues to be a major problem in Mt Kenya National Park as in other areas of Kenya. Without a fully functioning environmental monitoring unit, it will not be possible to monitor the park status and ensure environmental sustainability.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was expected to be financed with some $21M in co-financing. TE notes that actual government and beneficiary contribution was less than what was originally budgeted for in the project. According to the TE, this doesn't seem to have any impact on achievement of project outcomes, since lower than anticipated contributions may be due to underreporting of the government and beneficiary contribution in the project budget or due to overestimating costs in the initial budget. TE mentions that there was no indication in the field that the government didn't contribute pledged resources. According to TE, lower than expected contribution (labor) from community could be due to reduced length of wildlife barrier constructed during project. Also, project didn't account for and put value to community contribution through time spent in meetings, training and planning activities. Hence, according to the TE, activities that were not undertaken, or were partially achieved cannot be attributed to contributions realized from government and community.

Terminal evaluation doesn't provide any information on co financing from IFAD, which was a substantial proportion of the total co financing under the project.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

From the information in TE, it seems that project did not experience any delays.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Overall, project enjoyed 'satisfactory' country ownership since its goals and activities were closely aligned

to national development and environmental agenda reflected in various environmental acts passed recently (TE 19,20). Project made significant investments in building operational and technical capacity of staff of KWS and KFS and outputs of the Mt Kenya Ecosystem database (if effectively developed) will feed into the revised National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) to be developed under the new constitution. This shows that project was well received by the concerned departments of the government. However, few conflicting policies such as dual gazettement of protected forest areas and overlapping Acts touching on forestry, explained in detail above in section 4.4d, pose a risk to sustainability of outcomes related to management of protected areas and ecosystem plans developed under the project.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	**Rating: Satisfactory**

Terminal Evaluation rates M&E design at entry, as 'moderately satisfactory'. This review assigns the rating as satisfactory. According to TE, project management found logframes confusing, and was 'using several versions of logframes with different outputs and indicators'. The M&E log frame in the project document provided the overall framework, which was to be fine-tuned as per local conditions. TE notes 'lack of consistency in use of indicators across various planning documents' and 'baselines for impact monitoring' as some of the issues that affected the design of the proejct's M&E systems (TE, 35).

However, this TER found M&E design in the project document to be comprehensive as it included timeframes, specified indicators and assigned responsibilities, with provision for baselines, mid term, annual and final impact evaluations. M&E framework in the project document included a list of SMART indicators, both biophysical and socio economic, to assess progress of the project and also suggested tools for tracking these indicators, leaving no scope for confusion during project implementation. For instance, '*5000 farmers adopting improved soil management practices*' is a target based and measurable indicator that is also achievable within the project timeframe and can be monitored through suggested tool of farm and plot monitoring surveys.

M&E design in the project document also had budgetary provisions to train the technical staff of GOK, assigned with monitoring project progress at the district and local level using participatory approaches, while it also had provisions to involve external expertise for dealing with technical aspects, such as measuring carbon sequestration and diversity of forest ecosystems. Project design emphasizes the need to involve community in participatory monitoring and evaluation, with provision for training of community members on such issues. Project earmarked separate budget for baselines against each output in the logframe and external evaluations. The project also envisaged strengthening a Research Station Unit, expected to provide data and information to Project Management Unit (PMU) and other key stakeholders for long term ecosystem monitoring and management.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	**Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory**

Terminal review has rated M&E implementation as moderately unsatisfactory, and this TER concurs with the assessment. According to terminal evaluation, project employed various monitoring tools for collecting information on physical and financial progress of the project. Project was monitored through monitoring team missions, supervisions missions from IFAD and project steering committee meetings. During last two years of the project, external expertise was brought in to conduct impact studies, community members trained to conduct participatory monitoring and case studies collected and shared with the larger group.

However, TE reports that most of the information collected on regular basis in the project was not used to track and analyze progress, highlighting the problem of 'inadequate documentation, reflection and analysis' that would have otherwise enabled learning and adaptive management (TE, 35). The GIS center rehabilitated at Nweiga research station also had limited utility for monitoring as equipment was below specification and unit understaffed. The M&E log frame in the project document provided the overall framework, which was to be fine-tuned as per local conditions. It seems, changes were made in activities and indicators, but these were not documented at any stage of the project.

Most of the information on project implementation obtained by the evaluators was derived from project staff and discussions with stakeholders and not through any systematic documentation, except annual reports. According to TE, many achievements under the project, like increased forest cover, reduction of pressure on forests through tree plantation and livelihood diversification, cannot be substantiated with data. This is because many studies suggested in the M&E design, like aerial surveys, were either not undertaken, or were partially completed, like study on change in elephant population and behavior due to fencing. Annual reports that documented the progress of the project, included text mainly copied and pasted from last year and didn't explain reasons for diversions from the main activities and original budget.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

TE rates the quality of Project Implementation as Moderately Satisfactory, and this TER concurs.

According to TE, overall project managers found IFAD supervision, backstopping extremely useful. Project managers particularly expressed that capacity building facilitated by IFAD on various aspects (rural finance, monitoring and evaluation) and networking out of country with other IFAD projects, greatly helped them in project implementation. Few initiatives taken by IFAD like financial thematic and regional

workshops for project staff and decentralization of financial management system at the country level, were useful and improved financial management of the project. While project staff stated that IFAD supervisions were useful in keeping project on track, the TE finds that certain critical issues such as budget inadequacies and issues with the project's environmental monitoring were neither identified nor addressed by these missions. From the information in TE, it seems that IFAD supervisions had more focus on the financial disbursements and management of the project and should have devoted equal time in assessing progress against key project activities. There was also perhaps lack of coordination and convergence between supervisions from IFAD, GEF and GOK that took away valuable time of project team that they could have probably otherwise spend on project implementation.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

TE rates the quality of Project Execution as Moderately Satisfactory, and this TER concurs. Overall, TE finds that the project team was highly motivated, worked closely with the community members, used some innovative approaches, but was constrained by issues that impacted the progress of the project.

According to TE, project was carefully designed to complement and enhance the outcomes of the larger MKEPP loan project and was highly relevant to national, GEF and IFAD priorities. Choice of KWS as an implementing agency enabled rapid implementation and sustainability of project activities. The design of the project also ensured that it aligned with the priorities of KWS – the implementing agency. Although Forest Department is not mentioned in the project document, but according to TE, Kenya Forest Service (KFS) played a central role in project implementation. Project Implementation Team (PIT), with representations from various concerned departments, and responsible for annual budget and work plan preparation, played an important role in resolving some of the contentious issues, and building ownership amongst various stakeholders.

TE notes that project staff worked closely with community organizations with high participation of women and youth in the project. Use of some innovative approaches such as, development of VSLAs to provide seed money for community IGAs (as these were not budgeted in the project) and use of TOT approach to upscale community training activities, enhanced project outreach and impact. However, project progress was constrained due to reasons such as

- Conflicting policies and overlapping mandates of the concerned institutes.
- TE notes confusion in project implementation due to different versions of log frames and with different outputs and indicators available. In some cases, MKEPP and MKEPP and GEF log frames were merged that caused more confusion.
- Project didn't use the in house capacity of KWS landscape and ecosystem staff that reduced the quality of implementation on the scientific/data collection aspects of the project.
- Implementation was also constrained by 'inadequate documentation, reflection and analysis to enable learning and adaptive management' of the project
- Frequent transfers of key staff, which according to TE was unavoidable due to governmental practices.
- Delays in procurements, which according to TE, was again unavoidable as project had to follow standard government practices.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate below that this is indeed the case. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

Some of the environmental changes brought out as a result of the initiatives under the project and as highlighted in TE are listed below:

- Rehabilitation of 1965 ha of degraded forest and additional 633 ha of plantations through the project resulted in increase in forest cover (TE, 6).
- Provision of equipment and trainings to KWS through project has enhanced their capacity for park management and improved their response to crises like fire and human wild life conflict (TE, 6).
- Poaching and logging by local community members reduced. As per personal communication between evaluators and community members of Kangaita where wildlife fences were constructed through project, '*community members who were involved in illegal logging as a source of livelihood are involved in forest rehabilitation and able to earn a living from proceeds from seedlings, earnings from casual labor in site preparation, weeding and sale of farm produce'* (TE, 7).
- Joint patrols, and increased collaboration between the key stakeholders, KFS and KWS and other stakeholders including Bill Woodley trust, has reduced number of illegal activities considerably since the start of the project (Annual report 2011 – 2012 p 18 quoted in TE, 7).

However, such benefits are not quantified and are mainly based on the conversation of evaluators with local community members, project staff and senior warden of the protected area. TE mentions referring to data on fire and human/wildlife conflict analyzed by Kingongo research station, but actual data in not shared in the report. According to TE, '*many such benefits and project outcomes have not been quantified as adequate environmental monitoring is not yet in place'* (Pg 8).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

TE states that communities supported by the project are adopting new income generating activities, which allow them to diversify their income source; verified through personal communication between evaluators and community members, case study 'success story reports' and participatory impact

assessments carried out during evaluation (Pg, 6, 7). Around 43 community groups supported through the project have adopted Village Loan and Savings Associations (VLSAs) to finance new enterprises (Pg 7), verified during TE through data taken from monitoring reports on VSLA groups. TE makes reference to personal communications and participatory impact assessments carried out during evaluation, but there is no systematic data shared in the TE report to support these findings.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

According to TE, project led to significant improvement in relations between KFS, KWS and communities, as a result of involvement of the community members in the project, through trainings, awareness generation, exchange visits, joint management (Pg, 7), verified through personal communication between evaluators and community members, and reflected in improved joint management of the protected areas. Provision of training and equipment to KWS enhanced their core capacity to manage the protected areas and respond effectively and rapidly to fire and human wildlife conflict (Pg 7), verified through personal communication between evaluators and senior warden of the project. TE refers to data on reduced human wildlife conflict but doesn't share actual data. Community members in the project area are more aware of conservation issues and positive about conservation activities (Pg 7), verified through personal communications and participatory impact assessments carried out as part of terminal evaluation.

b) Governance

No such changes are identified in TE.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

TE cautions against the likelihood of negative environmental impacts of the construction of fence in the forest may enclose animal populations affecting their movement and gene pool (Pg 15). TE states that careful monitoring of elephant population and further development of corridors is needed to reduce environmental damage as fencing continues. Evaluators observed '*encroachment of the historical wildlife corridors is threatening to prevent the future movement of elephants from the park*' (Pg, 15). PD also cautions against the negative impact of fence construction and project had provision of conducting Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of fence, which as confirmed by TE, was completed. However, TE doesn't share whether their observation of possible negative impact was supported by findings of EIA.

Evaluators were also informed about a strategy for wild life barriers being developed at national level but they didn't see any such initiative being taken for the Mt Kenya area.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

According to terminal evaluation, KWS has broadened its mandate to extend to eco service provision (rather than just wildlife protection). KWS have now adopted the ecosystem approach to planning in other locations – Arabuko Sokoke Forest and Shima Hills (TE, 16). KWS also realized the importance and benefits of M&E; as a result they have decided to hire an in house M&E specialist.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE provides the following key lessons from the project:

- Inclusion of protected areas enabled MKEPP to adopt a holistic 'ecosystem' approach, which is likely to lead to more sustainable watershed management.

- Working with existing institutions and groups increased the sustainability of project achievements.

- Involving community is the key to successful conservation.

- Using a business model like, PELIS approach enhances conservation. But important to use value chain approach to ensure market linkages

- The VSLA scheme provided a sustainable funding mechanism for community livelihood development

- The ecosystem approach to planning is most appropriate for community based planning and reveals areas where harmonization of policies is needed.

- Gender mainstreaming increased effectiveness of the project in creating attitude change in the community

- GIS must be developed and sufficient resources allocated at the start of the project to maximize its usefulness. GIS Training for decision makers increases the chances of this activity being supported and resourced.

- Frequent transfers of government staff reduce project ability to deliver outputs.

- Lack of policy influencing strategy in project design and implementation meant that conflicts in certain policies and overlapping mandates are not addressed and continue to undermine progress of the project.

- Two projects in area having similar log frame create problems in allocating responsibility and attributing success.

- Delays in conducting baselines impacts development of monitoring indicators and future monitoring of the project

- Insufficient documentation and reflection during the project cycle meant that issues that prevented project maximizing positive outcomes were not addressed.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations from the project:

- KWS, KFS and IFAD should make efforts to disseminate valuable lessons learned out of the project and also raise awareness of the resources available at Mweiga Research Station.

- KWS, KFS and other stakeholders should work together to further develop capacity of GIS unit at Mweiga for ecosystem M&E and knowledge management for the Mt Kenya Ecosystem. This activity should be supported by future projects like Upper Tana Catchment Natural Resource Management Project (UTaNRMP).

- KWS and KFS should endorse the Mt Kenya Ecosystem Plan as soon as possible.

- UTaNRMP should formally align its activities to the Mt Kenya Ecosystem plan and expand its activities to include the protected areas.

- When working with government staff, UTaNRMP/future GEF projects in Kenya should strive to ensure minimum transfers of the staff, regular trainings to maintain staff capacity and inclusion of CBO representatives in the core team to improve continuity.

- IFAD/UTaNRMP should raise policy issues raised by project in the relevant policy forums.

- KWS should carefully monitor the impact of fencing on elephant behavior and prepare long-term strategy for wildlife corridors to ensure sustainability of the fencing strategy.

- KWS, KFS, WRMA and other stakeholders should review and clarify roles in water resource management.

- IFAD, GEF and GOK should attempt to combine and harmonize supervision and evaluation activities to conserve resources and reduce demands on the project team.

- IFAD M&E training and support should emphasize the importance of documentation of decisions and analysis of monitoring data during the project life to enable adaptive and accountable management.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	TE has done a good job of assessing relevant outcomes and impacts of project. But evaluation was constrained due to various versions of log frames used by project management.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Overall, report is consistent but sometimes argument presented to back up ratings is not complete due to excessive cross-referencing, more of report presentation issue. Evaluation was constrained by lack of complete baselines and monitoring data available with project. This aspect was highlighted upfront in the report, as one of the weaknesses of the project implementation. Most of the information was not supported by data and rather based on personal communication of evaluator with concerned officials or community members. Although evaluators seem to have conducted participatory impact assessments and collected case studies to validate findings at the community level.	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	TE provides ratings to sustainability and detailed account of how various activities are going to be adopted or financed by new projects and potential donors.	**S**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are supported by evidence and are comprehensive. It highlights important issues for consideration by KWS, KFS, IFAD and GEF for future projects and also policy level learning that need to be taken up at the national level.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Report doesn't provide actual vs project cost in the format in which original budget was prepared; hence it is difficult to determine deviations from main budget. But report does mention that budget was changed several times without adequate documentation and some of the budget anomalies remained unresolved during project. Report also doesn't provide any information on IFAD co financing - a major part of contribution.	**U**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The reasons for ratings of M&E at design are not clear but provides adequate analysis quality of M&E implementation	**MS**
Overall TE Rating – MS		**MS**

0.3x (5+4) +0.1X(5+5+2+4) = 4.3

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).