

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review – Project ID 2396

1. PROJECT DATA				
Review date:				12/21/2009
GEF Project ID:	2396		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	UA	GEF financing:	1	1
Project Name:	Dryland Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project (DLWEIP)	IA/EA own:	1	1.2
Country:	Kenya and Burkina Faso	Government:	0.47	0.48
		Other*:	0.88	0.98
		Total Cofinancing	2.35	2.66
Operational Program:	OP 13 and OP 15	Total Project Cost:	3.35	3.66
IA	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	World Conservation Union (IUCN), African Wildlife Foundation (AWF), the African Conservation Centre (ACC), and both the Governments of Kenya and Burkina Faso	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		August 2005
		Closing Date	Proposed: July 2008	Actual: January 2009
Prepared by: Rajesh Koirala	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months):35	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months):41	Difference between original and actual closing (in months):6
Author of TE: Winston Mathu		TE completion date: June 2008	TE submission date to GEF EO: UA	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): UA

* 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 AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	S	S	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	HS	S	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	MS	S	S	S
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	HS	S

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why? It is a good practice. The terminal evaluation reports the extent to which the global environmental objective was achieved and important lessons learned in terms of limitations and success of the project.
2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.? No. It is not required to do follow-up as there are not any cases of fund reallocation, mismanagement, corruption and other malpractices; however, it would be good to do so after few years to know the extent of activities that have been continued even after the project has been over.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?
The Global Environmental Objective of the DLWEIP, as mentioned in the project proposal submitted to the GEF for approval by the CEO, is to “mainstream biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas in Africa through the promotion and support to sustainable land use management systems for livestock and wildlife at the interface to improve community livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and reduce land degradation.”

No, there was no change in the global environmental objectives during implementation.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)
As described in the project proposal and the terminal evaluation report, DLWEIP has following three development objectives or project outcomes:

1. “Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized or reversed around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites”
2. “Community livelihoods improved and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso”
3. “Enhanced awareness of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the interface, leading to scaling up of best practices in other African Drylands rich in wildlife.”

According to the terminal evaluation report, there was no change in the development objectives of the project during implementation.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)

c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)

Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance	Rating: S
Based on the information provided in the project appraisal document, the outcomes of the project are relevant to the different level of policy frameworks:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At global level (GEF): The project is consistent with the GEF OP 13 (Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity) and OP 15 (Combating Land Degradation). DLWEIP contributed to achieve these operational programs mainly through the preparation and implementation of sustainable land-use plans and community based enforcement of regulations relating to transhumance routes for pastoralists in Burkina Faso. 	

2. At regional level (Africa): The DLWEIP objectives and activities are compatible with the Action Plan for the Environment Initiative of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). As mentioned in the terminal evaluation, it was also expected to contribute to the implementation of the Regional Action Program (RAP) for Africa in context of the UNCCD and its Thematic Programme Networks on rational use of rangelands and development of fodder crops (TPN 6) and on agriculture (TPN 6).
3. At National level (Kenya and Burkina Faso): The DLWEIP outcomes are relevant to the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and other national strategies for poverty reduction and environmental sustainability (Consistent with the Millennium Development Goals 1 and 7).

b. Effectiveness

Rating: S

According to the terminal evaluation, the project assisted pilot areas to adopt sustainable land use practices that support wildlife and livestock management, and minimize biodiversity loss and land degradation. Three conservation areas in Kenya are equipped with sustainable management plan and eight Zovics in Burkina Faso with land-use plans. Similarly transhumance routes (in 358,000 ha) have been fixed which reduce uncontrolled grazing by livestock. To assist to maintain ecological health, many trainings were provided, which included community based environmental monitoring, reseeded programs for the rehabilitation of seriously degraded arid environments especially within Namunyak and Naibunga conservancies, scout based monitoring system, livestock breeding, fodder conservation, pasture and grazing management, range rehabilitation, and land-use planning and management for group ranch and disease surveillance.

The project documented baseline information on natural resource use. As stated in the terminal evaluation, the project compiled baseline information on natural resource use. Examples of reports prepared in both countries include: Status and trends on NR, Trends on wildlife population, Analysis of land-use policies, Capacity building needs assessment, Analysis on conflict resolution, and Assessment of woodlands utilization. These can be used for sustainable management of natural resources. For dissemination of lessons learned, the project organized workshops and seminars, and published best practices, while some documents were yet to be completed, when the time terminal evaluation was done.

It also promoted activities aimed at improving community livelihoods. According to the terminal evaluation, the project supplied sixty improved beehives to various community groups, grass seed for reseeded to Ttiemamut, Kijabe and Koiya Group ranches, and chicken to Kijabe Women Group in Naibunga Conservancy. In Burkina Faso, a women group was trained in business management and in milk processing and was in the process of setting up the enterprise. Trainings were provided to impart skills in continuing the business. An example quoted in the terminal evaluation shows that the income of Koiya Group Ranch of Naibunga Conservancy in Kenya had grown six times (from 1 million to 6 million between 2006 and 2008), mainly from ecotourism activities. Eight Other Group ranches reported improved income from their investments in tourism activities. However, the terminal evaluation also admits "some of the interventions initiated under this project are vulnerable due to lack of proper consideration of marketing opportunities. Such is the case for the market for honey and eggs."

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: MS

The terminal evaluation considers the project as a highly efficient. However, there is little evidence to support these highly optimistic conclusion. In contrast, there are some areas where performance has not been superior. For example, as the terminal evaluation also reports, there was a 21 month delay in project commencement, and as asserted in the terminal evaluation "the delay clearly meant activities being implemented in a hurry, aimed at completing the targets on time." In the end, the project was extended for six months to complete the activities. Even after extending the project, publication of best practices and lesson learnt was not completed.

4.1.2 Impacts: summarize the achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project.

According to the terminal evaluation, the livestock/wildlife interface concept has been discussed at the regional meetings, and the approaches of the project are being replicated in other countries in Africa. The project has contributed to bring the interface concept into national agenda. Through the capacity development activities of the project, the communities have been able to debate at the national level on a wide range of issues including resource ownership and revenue sharing.

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. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources

Rating: ML

According to the terminal evaluation, sustainable management of livestock/wildlife interface is integrated into the group ranch work programmes and budgets. The terminal evaluation reports some income generating activities such as tourism enterprises and bee keepings are promising, but some activities such as chicken farming are vulnerable due to lack of market. Overall financial risk appears to be moderate.

b. Socio political

Rating: ML

According to the terminal evaluation although local communities, CBOs and local NGOs were involved and played an active role both at project formulation and implementation stage, and showed interest in continuation of some of the practices promoted by the project, there is a risk that inter-community conflicts might increase in the future. According to the terminal evaluation, “the experiences in Kenya suggest that conflicts are likely to increase with intensive management of rangelands that involve giving up part of the grazing areas to conservation for wildlife land-use system.” This said the expected overall effect of the eventuality that this risk materializes on continuation of project benefits seem to be moderate.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
According to the terminal evaluation, both Kenya and Burkina Faso have national level detailed, high quality policy and legislative frameworks relating to land-use and land tenure systems. At local level, the project assisted to prepare management plans for the three conservancies. As described in the terminal evaluation, the project supported to Naibunga conservancy in the development of group ranch constitution, rules, by-laws and regulations governing the membership in the group ranches. The conservancy established local mechanisms for law enforcement (local rangers/scout based monitoring units).	
d. Environmental	Rating: L
There seem to be no environmental risk.	

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good
Based on the information provided in the terminal evaluation, it can be said that the project produced public goods such as increased awareness of significance of natural resource management through training on pasture and grazing management; range rehabilitation; increase in abilities of women groups, youth groups, and Zovic committees to collaborate on common property resource management by minimizing the conflicts; enhanced technical know-how through training on livestock breeding, disease surveillance; and skills acquired to generate income resulting in enhanced livelihood security.
b. Demonstration
The terminal evaluation notes that during the last interactive learning session on Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) country roundtable processes in Midrand, South Africa, AU/ IBAR organized a side meeting where it presented the best practices and lessons from DLWEIP, and proposed continental action plan for livestock development in Africa that would help to feed the livestock sub sector of CAADP. The project had also planned to organize regional seminar to share and disseminate the lessons learned, but due to delay in implementing the project, it was not achieved.
c. Replication
The lesson learned and experience gained in this project is being widely replicated in Africa. The terminal evaluation discloses that AU/IBAR has received Euro 5 million grant for a 3-year project in 4 other regions in Africa: the Arly Park Complex (Benin, Niger, Burkina Faso and the Panjari park and Togo); in West Africa (Senegal, Mali, Guinea); in West/Central Africa (Chad, Cameroon, Nigeria); and in East Africa (Kenya, Uganda and South Sudan). Similarly, building on the experience of this project, as revealed in the terminal evaluation, IUCN has already developed a GEF funded regional project covering Burkina Faso, Benin and Niger.
d. Scaling up
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At regional level: According to the terminal evaluation, “the concept of livestock/wildlife interface has entered the African Ministers of Environment (AMCEN) dialogue. The review of the AU/NEPAD (Action Plan for the Environment Initiative of the New Partnerships for Africa’s Development) CAADP initiative indicate several references to the issues of under Pillar #1 on Land and Water- introduced by AU/ IBAR borrowing from DLWEIP experiences.” 2. National level: As stated in the terminal evaluation, an inter-ministerial taskforce has been formed in Burkina Faso to oversee the integrated management of natural resources of the livestock/wildlife environment interface sites. Similarly the DLPO, Ministry of Livestock in Kenya, has integrated range rehabilitation activities in 2009-2010 annual work plans. These demonstrate that the concept has received acceptance at policy and planning level in both countries. 3. At provincial level: Influenced by the DLWEIP’s training on conflict resolution, the provincial administration in Kenya has scaled up the training of peace committees at district and divisional level.

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing (or proposed co-financing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project? 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
According to the terminal evaluation, the total co-financing for the project was 2,502,403, higher than the proposed co-financing US\$ 2,356, 000. The co-financing contributions included: a bilateral contribution of US\$ 1,000,000 by AU-

<p>IBAR, in-kind contributions of US\$ 47,300 from the government, US\$ 200,000 from NGOs and US\$ 683,000 from institutions. In cash contributions were provided by RECOPA (US\$ 39,200) and AWF (US\$ 134,690). The terminal evaluation states “the extent of materialization of co-financing positively affected on project outcomes and sustainability.” But it does not provide any further explanation on how essential it was to achieve the project objectives.</p>
<p>b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?</p>
<p>There was a 21 months delay in commencing the project. The terminal evaluation reports that principal reasons of the delays were institutional issues (implementation and coordination arrangements). According to the terminal evaluation, “there were other delays precipitated by weather and political factors. These delays clearly meant activities being implemented in a hurry, aimed at completing the targets on time”. But there is no further discussion on which activities at what stages were implemented in a hurry. The project was extended for six more months to execute the activities previously planned.</p>
<p>c. 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.</p>
<p>The ownership of the project had been well perceived both at the national and local level. According to the terminal evaluation, such considerations directly influenced the level of project outcome and sustainability.</p> <p>At national level, both Kenya and Burkina Faso, signatories to the UNCCD and the CBD, have considered the DLWEIP activities and outcomes consistent with and strongly linked to their national priorities expressed through National Biodiversity Strategic Action Programmes (NBSAP) and the National Action Programme to Combat Desertification (NAPCD). In Burkina Faso, the Ministry of Environment of Quality of Life – the focal ministry for the UNCCD and CBD – coordinated the DLWEIP. Also, a National Steering Committee formed for the project involving all key government ministries, CBOs and NGOs is an indication of government’s ownership to DLWEIP. In Kenya, National Environment Management Authority – the focal agency for the conventions – signed the project document on behalf of the Kenya Government, and was involved in all key M&E activities. The terminal evaluation, however, does not provide information on to what extent the government and other national actors facilitated in implementation of the project like assisting the project team in addressing operational problems.</p> <p>At local level, as acknowledged by terminal evaluation, communities have willingness to continue the implementation of good practices, using their own resources and seeking support from other organizations. In Burkina Faso, the collaborative/inter-ministerial approach has been institutionalized in implementing projects and programs on wildlife/livestock interface.</p>

4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

<p>a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): MS</p>
<p>The project document incorporated an M&E plan to enhance accountability and experimental learning through participatory processes. The plan identified the indicators to evaluate the effectiveness of project implementation unit and steering committee, and the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders to implement it. However, the plan didn’t include ‘Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI).’ Instead, it has specified rather general indicators such as ‘vegetation recovery’ and ‘biodiversity of wildlife coexisting with livestock’.</p>
<p>b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): S</p>
<p>The terminal evaluation acknowledges that an M&E plan was satisfactorily implemented. Most of the key stakeholders participated for its implementation. Inputs given by communities’ representatives and other concerned institutions were incorporated during project implementation. The plan required internal monitoring and evaluation at every six months. But “because of the cost involved”, a six monthly evaluation requirement was not followed. Most of the recommendations by a mid-term external review, which was conducted six months behind the schedule, were also implemented.</p>
<p>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?</p>
<p>Based on the information that initially the money allocated to M&E was US \$ 75000, and later it was revised down to US \$ 64,135. The terminal evaluation concludes sufficient funding was provided for M&E.</p>
<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?</p>
<p>The terminal evaluation nowhere mentions that insufficient and untimely funding was provided.</p>
<p>b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system?</p>
<p>The MTR provided mainly six recommendations: no cost extension of the project up to the end of January 2009, adoption of AWF M&E framework, more emphasis on livestock production and marketing issues, conduction of comparative studies and dissemination of the findings on wildlife utilization strategies and land use policies, and formulation of participatory natural resources management plan. All these recommendations, other than the one on conduction of comparative studies on wildlife utilization strategies and land use policies, were implemented.</p>
<p>b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.</p>

Yes, the project M&E system can be considered a good practice. According to the terminal evaluation, “mid-term review provided genuine feedback to the DLWEIP on its performance and future steps to be taken to achieve the overarching goal of the project”. The implementation of such prescriptions ensured the project to be on the right track throughout the operational period. The terminal evaluation documented the best practices and lessons learned which could be applied to similar other projects.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale):	S
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale):	S
Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.	
The terminal evaluation reports that the implementing agency constructively engaged and played the supervisory responsibilities effectively. Both a task manager and a fund manager were always available to provide guidance and direction, and were responsive to proposals and suggestions from the executing agency. All resources were timely and sufficiently provided to an executing agency.	
c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale)	S
Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.	
The terminal evaluation acknowledges that the executing agency effectively facilitated the sharing of best practices within and between communities in both countries. It conducted seminars, workshops and field visits to exchange information and experience at the project level. However due to lack of sufficient preparedness, in terms of arranging coordination and deciding responsibility, project implementation was delayed; as a result publication of some documents was not completed on time. The terminal evaluation cites that “according to the UNEP Fund Manager and a public auditor, financial record keeping and fund management in general were done in consistence with accepted non-profit accounting principles.” Quarterly technical and financial reports were expected to regularly submit to UNEP. Due to institutional factor, there were occasional delays, which however did not have adverse effect on the project implementation.	
According to the terminal evaluation, the risks were very well managed. Due to delay in initiating project activities, according to the PIR, the risks in FY 06 were rated substantial, but as the project was capable to compensate the loss by expediting activities, risks were rated medium in FY 07 and low in FY08. Also to address the risk caused by post election violence in Kenya and delay in Burkina Faso, the project was extended for six more months.	

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects
The terminal evaluation describes the following four key lessons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wildlife and livestock are two compatible land uses, and proper management of both promotes biodiversity conservation and better livelihood. However, due to the complexity of resource use and possible conflicts, through analysis and careful planning are necessary. 2. Land use planning and zoning to allocate conservation areas is considered a threat to nomadic land use system. For this, empowerment and capacity building of local communities, national and local level policies to regulate ownership and access to grazing resources are some of the prescriptive actions. 3. To avoid unnecessary delay in implementing the project, detailed stakeholder analysis and identification of roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder should be done during the project formulation stage. 4. Since wildlife and transhumance involve trans-boundary resource use and conflict, the project would have better effect had it included the countries of immediate vicinity, rather than a country from the East and the other from the West of the continent.
b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation
The terminal evaluation suggests the publication of the best practices and lessons learned for wider dissemination. Five documents, which have been drafted but not finalized, are enlisted and considered that their completion of publication as the most significant output of the project. It also suggests all project information and documents, including the terminal evaluation, be made available in two languages: English and French.

¹ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criterion based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The report presents a detail, good assessment of outcomes of the project against the objectives.</p>	S
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? There is an issue of consistency. In the terminal evaluation, it is said that “the selection of the two pilot sites, one in Kenya and the other in Burkina Faso allowed for comparison and contrasting in terms of lessons learned.” It is also stated that “there was no linkage at operational level between activities in Kenya and Burkina Faso”</p>	S
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The terminal evaluation reports only description of some unsuccessful initiatives. Had the appropriate sampling methodology been used, success and failure could have been quantified and project sustainability would have been clearer.</p>	MS
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Lessons learned are well supported by the evidence and are comprehensive.</p>	S
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? It includes actual project costs both in terms of total and per activity. But it does not include the extent to which reported cofinancing was essential to achievement of GEF objectives and the extent to which components supported by cofinancing were integrated into the project.</p>	S
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The report assesses both M&E design and implementation with wide consultation of different stakeholders. But it does not address the extent to which M&E contributed to the project in achieving its outcomes.</p>	S

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.
