

## Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1999	
GEF Agency project ID		83172	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF - 4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Wildlife Conservation Leasing Demonstration Project	
Country/Countries		Kenya	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		1- Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		The Wildlife Foundation	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		The Wildlife Foundation [Lead Executing Agency]. Consultations & Partnerships with: Friends of Nairobi National Park, International Livestock Research Institute, African Wildlife Foundation, The Nature Conservancy.	
Private sector involvement		Kitengela Landowners Association [consultations]	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		07/14/2012	
Effectiveness date / project start		12/04/2008	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/31/2012	
Actual date of project completion		06/30/2013	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.02	0.02
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.72	0.72
Co-financing	IA/EA own		
	Government		0.22
	Other*		0.29
Total GEF funding		0.75	0.75
Total Co-financing		0.48	0.51
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.21	1.26
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		10/2013	
TE submission date		12/13/2013	
Author of TE		N/A	
TER completion date		01/22/ 2014	
TER prepared by		Dania Trespalacios	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

\*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	Not rated	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	ML	MU	Not rated	MU
M&E Design	Not rated	S	Not rated	S
M&E Implementation	MS	MU	Not rated	MS
Quality of Implementation	MS	MU	Not rated	MU
Quality of Execution	MS	MS	Not rated	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	--	--	Not rated	S

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The objective of the Project is to ensure long term ecological viability of Nairobi National Park by maintaining seasonal dispersal areas and migration corridors on adjacent privately owned lands, and demonstrating the use of wildlife conservation leases as a conservation tool outside the Protected Areas. The environmental project component listed in the Project Document for CEO Approval is “ Increasing conservation land through wildlife conservation leases”. Outputs include:

- 1- Increase in voluntarily enrolled Wildlife Conservation Leases (WCL) to 60,000 acres, with at least 20% of the leases being multi-year
- 2- No increase in the percentage of Kitengela rangeland within the 60,000 acre target area that is enclosed by fences
- 3- 20% increase in number of lions regularly using Kitengela
- 4- East Africa conservation practitioner community identifies at least 2 additional sites for trial implementation of WCL approach
- 5- Kitengela Sheep & Goat Ranch permanently secured for wildlife habitat
- 6- 25% increase in households adopting non-lethal measures for reducing wildlife predation on livestock in the project area

Nairobi National Park (NNP) is an important East African arid/semi-arid savannah ecosystem, containing great diversity of habitats and species in a small area. NNP contains the southern fringe of the remaining Langata Forest. The park’s fauna includes important mega fauna, endangered species and over 450 recorded species of birds. The traditional seasonal migration of large ungulates into and out of NNP is one of the largest remaining in East Africa. Its unusual close proximity to a major city makes NNP one of the most popular and accessible parks in East Africa, an important cultural, economic and educational resource.

And project start, the Park included only one quarter of the surrounding ecosystem, which includes the Ngong Hills, the Athi-Kapiti Plains, and the Kitengela Plains. The land in the area is being sold for use in urban centers and industries, large scale horticultural activities, quarrying, and expansion of permanent settlements with fencing, all of which disrupt movements of livestock and seasonal dispersal of wildlife. If these lands were not available for seasonal dispersal and migration, the populations of large mammals would be greatly reduced, altering the ecology of the park, and potentially reducing its importance as a biodiversity resource and as a tourism destination and economic resource. The NNP is

presently enclosed by fences on three sides and is open for wildlife dispersal only on the southern boundary.

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objectives of the project as listed in the Project Document for CEO Approval include Institutional strengthening and information dissemination, and enhancing the long term sustainability of this region. Development outputs include:

- 1- Wildlife leases used strategically to maximize conservation benefits achieved with available funds
- 2- Stakeholders are satisfied with effectiveness, transparency and management of Lease program
- 3- Land Use Master Plan (MLUP) implemented as the key planning framework for area
- 4- Increase in number of participating/benefiting households to 400
- 5- TFW develops and implements a professional fundraising strategy for WCL, and raises at least \$270,000 of additional funds (beyond baseline) for wildlife leases from non-GEF sources by end of project

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

There were **no** changes in environmental or development objectives between the start and end of the project.

## 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 <b>Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The project is consistent with the GEF Biodiversity focal area strategies and objectives. The project directly contributes to GEF-4 Strategic Priority 3, "Strengthening terrestrial PA networks", and Priority 5, "Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services". The project contributes to the sustainability of protected area (PA) systems (GEF-4 Biodiversity Objective 1), and mainstreams biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors (GEF-4 Biodiversity Objective 2).

The project is consistent with Kenya's national priorities. The Kitengela Area is one of the key areas that the Government of Kenya has identified to benefit from a national land use policy. A Land Use Master Plan is awaiting formal approval and adoption through the Ministry and the Olkejuado County Council. There is significant government commitment at both national and local level to maintain the natural savannah ecosystem with wildlife and extensive grazing in this area. The project is relevant to Kenya's National Biodiversity Action Plan, and to the 2010 Kenya Poverty Reduction Strategy.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-------------------	--

In general, many important on-the-ground project objectives were achieved. The project significantly contributed to the ultimate project objectives of maintaining season dispersal areas open and successfully demonstrating the utility of wildlife conservation leases. However, many project components were not achieved, or not assessed, and the project fell short of its expected outcomes.

The TE lists several project achievements that contribute to the expected project outcomes. A few are listed here:

- Adult lion population doubled from 18 to 35 individuals during the grant period.
- Project maintained seasonal dispersal areas and kept the migration corridor open.
- Loss of potential conservation land to sales was essentially halted.

The TE explicitly lists the expected outcomes of the project, and the achieved outcomes:

- 61,067 acres voluntarily enrolled in Wildlife Conservation Leases, from an expected 60,000 acres. However, none of these leases are multi-year.
- The number of participating households increased from 148 to 417, which is above the target of 400.
- Increase of 17 lions in the area, from a target of 3.
- 2 additional sites for trial implementation in East Africa were identified: Maasai Mara and Amboseli
- The Land Use Master Plan (LUMP) was adopted by the Government of Kenya and adopted by Kajiado County Council, but is not yet implemented.
- A target of \$270,000 in additional funds for wild life leases from non-GEF sources was surpassed, as the project raised \$294,000 in cash and \$210,000 in in-kind resources, from both NGOs and the Government of Kenya.

The following expected project outcomes were not assessed:

- Wildlife leases are used strategically, based on research and monitoring, to maximize conservation benefits achieved with available funds
- Stakeholders (local landowners, financiers) satisfied with effectiveness, transparency and responsiveness of management of scaled-up WCL program
- Kitengela Sheep & Goat Ranch permanently secured for wildlife habitat

- 25% increase in households adopting non-lethal measures for reducing wildlife predation on livestock in the project area
- % of Kitengela rangeland within the 60,000 acre target area that is enclosed by fences does not increase over baseline

The failure to assess the percent of rangeland in Kitengela that became enclosed or remained open is a significant shortfall, since this is a key component of the project stated directly in the environmental objective.

The Project did not report on the relevant indicators in the results framework that would have provided a more solid basis for assessing the degree to which institutions have been strengthened.

The TE also lists several project achievements that were not part of the original project plans, and likely benefited from other concurrent projects in the area. These include:

- Provision of cash income to poor families in the project area through the Wildlife Conservation Leasing program
- Investments in education, including school uniforms, school fees, books
- Keeping rangelands open to pasture
- Empowerment of women through conservation payments

The TE rates the overall project outcome as satisfactory despite project shortcomings, justifying this rating by praising the advancement of wildlife conservation lease payments achieved by the project. However, the project fell short of many of its expected outcomes, sometimes even key expected outcomes. For this reason, the rating given here is moderately satisfactory.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE reports that with an initial investment of \$700,000, the project leveraged \$500,000 in additional cash and in-kind donations.

The GRM rates project efficiency as satisfactory, and comments: “With an investment just over \$700,000, the project was able to leverage over \$500,000 in additional cash and in-kind resources to achieve impressive conservation objectives that also reduce poverty of indigenous pastoralists at the same time, while helping to safeguard one of Kenya's iconic tourist attractions that is so critical to Kenya's economic growth and unique contribution to the global environmental heritage.”

The GRM also notes that this project is one of the few successful PES schemes in Africa financed by the World Bank.

The failure to achieve all project outcomes does not seem to be due to inadequate funding or resources, but rather to poor M&E activities and inadequate project implementation. The project life was extended by 6 months, but this is not unusual. There is no evidence of bureaucratic, administrative, or political problems. Thus, with no other indicative information, the TE reviewer finds this project’s efficiency as satisfactory.

The likelihood of continuation of the main project objectives – (1) maintaining seasonal dispersal areas and migration corridors on adjacent privately owned lands, and (2) demonstrating the use of wildlife conservation leases as a conservation tool outside the Protected Areas – is moderately unlikely. There are substantial risks to the sustainability of this project's outcomes.

The TE describes this project as a successful demonstration of Payment for Ecosystem Services scheme: “wildlife conservation lease payments can and do work, there is demand for them, and they can slow unsustainable land conversions in the sensitive and economically critical open rangelands surrounding Nairobi National Park”.

However, the TE also describes significant challenges that have not been addressed by this project. The population growth and expansion of urbanization will continue as Nairobi Metropolis expands into Kajiado, as part of the implementation of the Kenya Vision 2030 economic blueprint. A proposed plan to build a US\$ 200 million road bypass that crosses the southern section of the Nairobi National Park may incentivize land fencing, hamper the land lease program and further accelerate the fragmentation of the landscape in Athi-Kaputie Plains. A high demand for land has raised land prices in the conservation area, particularly near Nairobi National Park. Finally, the post-project financial viability of the implementing NGO, The Wilderness Foundation is uncertain. Thus, the conservation payments themselves are uncertain.

## 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?

There was a significant amount of co-financing: half a million in co-financing, compared to a total GEF grant of \$727,000. The ability of the implementing agency to leverage co-financing for this project well above what was expected was celebrated by the TE and the GRM. It seems this project would not have been as successful without the co-financing raised by the implementing agency, although this is not stated explicitly in the TE.

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?

The project was originally intended to close at the end of June 2011, but was extended one-and-a-half years to close on December 30, 2012. The extension also provided an opportunity to slightly re-allocate grant proceeds to allow for more complete disbursement and fuller achievement of results.

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:

The TE does not discuss country ownership, except to describe how the project is in line with country priorities. A related activity to this project involves the adoption of the Land Use Master Plan, which indicates some local and national support for conservation activities in the target area. The TE describes several risks to the sustainability of this project, some of which are directly attributable to national policies in conflict with conservation, including urban expansion and road building plans. It seems the development of this project would have benefitted from an open, specific discussion with national authorities to address potential conflicting interests between conservation and development.

## 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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The Project Document for CEO Approval describes a simple M&E plan based on the expected outputs of the project. The Wilderness Foundation would be responsible for monitoring the increases in the total area under conservation. The World Bank would be responsible for management of the expanded Wildlife Conservation Leases program. A variety of data (wildlife numbers, status of fencing, incomes and expenditures of local households) was to be collected by several participating institutions, including The Wilderness Foundation, Kenya Wildlife Service, Friends of Nairobi National Park, International Livestock Research Institute, and the Center for Wildlife Management Studies. Approximately \$30,000 of project funds were allocated to support M&E activities throughout the life of the project.

The project would also benefit from the ongoing M&E activities of the participating institutions, and from the concurrent USAID-financed Kitengela Conservation Program.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Marginally Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------------------	--

The TE reports that M&E reporting during project implementation was marginally unsatisfactory. The project management did not fully track the indicators for the Project Development Objective described in the Project Document, and did not assess baselines and changes of key project components. Incomplete and inadequate M&E implementation could have foreshadowed the final project outcomes: many were not achieved, particularly those where baselines went unassessed.

Despite the serious shortcomings in M&E implementation during the course of the project, the TE rating is “satisfactory”, justified by the high quality of information in the final project evaluation report from the implementing agency, and new metrics that show evidence of the achievement of project results.

The TER reviewer finds that inadequate M&E implementation was not addressed during the course of the project, to the detriment of the final project performance.

## 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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
--	--

The TE rates the performance of the World Bank as moderately unsatisfactory: “Bank preparation of the project document included some PDO and indicator disconnects resulting in weak project reporting during implementation. Some indicators, outputs, and outcomes were not fully defined, lacked baselines that never materialized, or were misplaced in the results framework.” This is clearly visible when comparing the expected outcomes listed in the Project Document for CEO Approval and the actual project outcomes reported in the TE.

It seems that the executing agency, The Wildlife Foundation, received less than satisfactory ratings throughout the course of the project, and that M&E was particularly deficient. The TE does not describe what actions, if any, were taken by the implementing agency, The World Bank, to address these shortcomings and improve project performance. Thus the TER reviewer concurs with the performance rating given in the TE.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
---	--

The TE rates The Wildlife Foundation as moderately satisfactory, citing good achievement of the main intermediate results, total disbursement of funds, on-time reporting, and raising significant amounts of funds and co-financing. The TE states that “...because the on-ground results and indicators have been achieved, the implementing agency has demonstrated its capacity to carry out and expand complex conservation lease payments.”(TE pg. 8)

In general, many important on-the-ground project objectives were achieved. The project significantly contributed to the ultimate project objectives of maintaining season dispersal areas open and successfully demonstrating the utility of wildlife conservation leases.

However, M&E implementation was unsatisfactory. Many project components were not achieved, or not even assessed. This project definitely falls short of its expected outcomes, and the sustainability of project results is in question.

The GRM notes that “Implementation has been maintained at marginally satisfactory because of the good achievement of on-ground targets and disbursement at 100%, as well as on-time reporting. The rating would have been higher except for the fact of weak M&E reporting on some indicators.” (GRM pg. 3)

Considering the evidence presented in the GRM, the implementing agency’s performance may be rated as moderately satisfactory. TWF documented the project’s impact of increasing conservation land through wildlife conservation leases in a peer reviewed publication, and disseminated lessons learned and policy implications throughout the East Africa conservation community and to practitioners of PES. There was orderly close out of project activities, including consultations with local stakeholders and partners. TWF developed a fundraising strategy for project continuation and possible expansion

## **8. Lessons and recommendations**

8.1 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 describes the following lessons that may be applicable to other projects:

- Pastoral communities living near protected areas with wildlife should directly benefit from this close association for the benefit of both people and wildlife.
- The financial sustainability of payment for ecosystem services schemes is an important component of these activities.
- Pastoral landowners adjacent to Nairobi National Park are willing to keep their rangelands open if they are provided with financial incentives and if their livestock can continue to graze.
- PES schemes like the Wildlife Conservation Leases program can serve multiple purposes: conservation of private land for wildlife habitat; mitigation of human-wildlife conflicts; poverty reduction through cash income diversification; and, depending on how payment schemes are designed, the advancement of social causes such as gender empowerment and youth education.
- PES schemes may be combined with other conservation tools, such as conservation easements, predator compensation schemes, and land use regulations, to maximize the program’s success.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE makes the following observations on the Wildlife Conservation Leases program in Nairobi National Park:

- In Nairobi National Park, it is especially important that the wildlife dispersal area be kept un-fenced, un-subdivided and open for both livestock and wildlife.

- The WCL program alone is not sufficient to ensure the viability of the Nairobi National Park ecosystem, and must be complemented with other tools, including conservation easements, predator compensation schemes, and land use regulations.
- The WLC program is particularly essential for the protection of the wildlife rich area nearest to the open southern border of the Nairobi National Park in Triangle I, and the wildebeest calving zones located in Triangle 11 of the Athi Kaputie Plains.
- The WCL program has contributed to the education of Maasai Youth, and to the empowerment of Maasai women.

## 9. 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?	The TE specifically and clearly reports on the final status of expected outcomes of this project, both those achieved and those not achieved.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE is internally consistent. The ratings are well explained. There could have been more explanatory text on the project shortcomings.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE contains a thorough consideration of the potential for sustainability of project outcomes.	HS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by the evidence offered in the TE, and serve as a guide for future projects in this area.	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE does not contain any financial information. There is no breakdown of project costs by activities, or information on co-financing.	HU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE reports on the unsatisfactory implementation of M&E during this project, but does not seem to assign sufficient weight to the issue, particularly considering the importance of inadequate M&E implementation to final project results.	S
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>S</b>

$$0.3 \times (a + b) + 0.1 \times (c + d + e + f)$$

$$0.3(11) + 0.1(18) = 5.1$$

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

*This TER was completed using:*

- *World Bank Grant Reporting and Monitoring (GRM) Report, 11/11/2013*
- *Project Document for CEO Approval (2008)*