

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3693	
GEF Agency project ID		4178	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Strengthening the Protected Area Network of the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya	
Country/Countries		Kenya	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SP3 – Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area	
Executing agencies involved		Nature Kenya Kenya Wildlife Service, Kenya Forest Service, Kenya Forest Research Institute, and Ministry of Environment and Forest Resources	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Nature Kenya – Lead Executing Agency	
Private sector involvement		None involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		1/19/2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		09/24/2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/31/2015	
Actual date of project completion		01/30/2016	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.15	-
	Co-financing	.10	-
GEF Project Grant		4.5	4.5
Co-financing	IA own	.50	.50
	Government	10.47	12.40
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	-	-
	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CSOs	1.5	1.5

Total GEF funding	4.65	4.5
Total Co-financing	12.57	14.4
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)	17.22	18.9
Terminal evaluation/review information		
TE completion date	04/28/2016	
Author of TE	Sean White	
TER completion date	12/1/2016	
TER prepared by	Spandana Battula	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	NR	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	NR	MU
M&E Design		S	NR	U
M&E Implementation		U	NR	U
Quality of Implementation		S	NR	S
Quality of Execution		S	NR	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	NR	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's Global Environmental Objective is "To conserve the Montane Forest Biodiversity and Ecosystem Values and provide sustainable benefit flows at local, national and global levels" (PD pg 45).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's Development Objective was "to expand and strengthen the spatial coverage and management effectiveness of the Montane Forest Protected Area sub-system" (PD pg 45). The project planned to achieve its objective through three outcomes, termed as components in project document (PD pg 45):

Component 1: Systemic and institutional capacities for managing an expanded and rationalized protected area estate;

Component 2: Community management of protected areas; and

Component 3: Operational capacities of protected area site management.

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

There were no changes to the objectives or activities during implementation.

4. GEF IEO 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: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

The project's objective to conserve biodiversity of Montane Forest Area is consistent with GEF's Biodiversity focal area. The project's aim to strengthen the spatial coverage of Montane Forest is aligned to GEF's Strategic Programme 3: strengthening terrestrial protected area network (PD pg 44).

The project outcomes are in line with Kenyan policies and programmes such as the Forest Act of 2005, Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan of 2000, Kenya Wildlife Service Strategic Plan of 2005-2010, and Forest Master Plan (PD pg 25).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE gives a Satisfactory rating for project effectiveness, however while assessing the overall project results at the outcome level, it gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating. The project contained three outcomes with ten outputs and it was able to deliver eight of its outputs. Although there were many shortcomings in attaining the results, the project had significant achievements. Due to the moderate achievements, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to the project effectiveness. Achievements under the planned outcomes are listed below:

Component 1: Systemic and institutional capacities for managing an expanded and rationalized protected area estate -

As per the project document this component had four expected outputs but because of modifications of the targets, one output was dropped from the project design. The TE rates achievement of two outputs as Moderately Unsatisfactory and reports that one was not achieved. Originally, the first output consisted of establishing new protected areas in 20,000 ha, reclassifying 20,000 ha of threatened forest reserves to National Reserves, and reclassifying 25,000 ha of threatened forest reserve lands to Nature Reserves (PD pg 46). However, the TE states that it was soon realized that the targets were too ambitious and a compromise was made to categorize the forest reserves as conservation areas in forest management plans (TE pg 11). In terms of achievement, biodiversity conservation areas were designated in Forest Station plans but there was no establishment of new protected areas as was intended. The project also expected to provide for the effective administration of the protected area system as part of the regional development agenda by mainstreaming into local planning. This was only partially achieved as State of Environmental Reports were produced but they were not integrated into County Development plans. For its last output, the project failed to increase its protected area budget of 50% over baseline of \$5,000,000 in order cover the recurrent costs of forest protected area system (TE pg 22).

Component 2: Community management of forest protected areas (JFM/CBNRM) -

The project delivered on all four of its outputs under this component and was able to achieve its objective of engaging with communities and establishing Joint Forest Management zones (TE pg 22). The project established Community Conserved Area (CCA) covering 18,000 ha, exceeding its intended target of covering 10,000 ha. It also had an 80% reduction of forest degradation incidences in buffer zone from community scouts and KFS rangers (Kenya Forest Service) protection routines. For its third output, the project intended to reduce the costs for protected areas by garnering community support and acceptance of protected areas which would lead to decrease in incursions. This was accomplished as the project was able to involve 16 Community Forest Associations in forest protection, development of management plan and implementation of initiatives. Lastly, to effectively integrate conservation needs and local livelihoods into protected area management system, the project developed 17 Participatory Forest Management plans. The plans included enterprise and value chain positioning, and the community-based organizations provided trainings and manuals. However, the project was unable to meet its target of developing business plans on income generation opportunities (TE pg 23).

Component 3: Operational capacities for protected area site management -

Under this component, the project achieved both its planned outputs. The main expected result was to generate effective global, national and local environmental benefits that was to be measured by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) across three selected landscapes. The project had modest achievements as the METT score increased from 2013 to 2015 in the three sites (TE pgs 24-25). However, the TE notes that the “METT scores (are) unreliable due to inexperience in using the tool” (TE pg 24). The project also expected to reduce forest loss and degradation in an area covering 175,000 ha. Forest land covering 549 ha was rehabilitated, but there was an assumption made that there was no forest loss occurring because there was no record of forest loss. The TE notes that the monitoring systems were weak, and the TER finds that there were no targets and indicators set for this output (TE pg 23-24). Due to lack of reliable data and sources, the TER finds the achievements as moderately unsatisfactory for this component.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	---------------------------------

The TE gives a Satisfactory rating to the efficiency of the project. The TE states that as the financial reports were not in the budget format “it has not been possible to compare planned and actual expenditures to assess overall financial efficiency in implementing the project” (TE pg 26). However, the quarterly work plans and field observations “indicate detailed financial planning and a high degree of financial efficiency in utilization of funds” (TE PG 26). In regard to infrastructure expenditures, the amounts spent on developments, such as Forest Stations, represented good value for money. Although in the case of one development, the Cheptongei Forest Station office block, the quality was sub-standard (TE pg 27).

The TE notes that due to late funding disbursement by UNDP, the project was delayed for one year. Nature Kenya asked for one-year no-cost extension, which was granted, however, a previously planned construction of a watch tower could not be done because of lack of time (TE pg 15 and 51). Due to moderate achievements of outcomes but delays and lack of financial reports indicating accurate progress, this TER gives a rating of Moderately Satisfactory to the project’s efficiency.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
--------------------	-----------------------------

The TE gives a Moderately Likely rating to the overall sustainability of the project. The likelihood of sustainability is assessed below on the basis of financial risks, socio-economic risks, institutional and governance risks, and environmental risks –

Financial resources: The TE reports that there are negligible financial risks to sustainability and explains that “as the activities being undertaken were central to the institutional mandates of the partners (KFS, KWS, NEMA, KEFRI) and as those institutions will remain on the ground, they will continue to implement the project activities using their own core institutional funding” (TE pg 29). The TER gives a Moderately Likely rating to financial sustainability.

Socio-political: Due to the high country and local ownership and support by government as well as community-based organizations, the socio-political risks seem very low. Additionally, the “advocacy and awareness activities during implementation have built public support for the project activities” (TE pg 30). The TE gives a Likely rating to socio-political sustainability which seems appropriate.

Institutional framework and governance: The TE gives a Moderately Likely rating to this aspect and the TER gives the same. The TE reports that the legal and policy framework within which the project was being implemented was strongly supported by the relevant government institutions. However, in terms of governance, the power balance is tilted towards Kenya Forest Service (KFS) as compared to Community Forest Associations (CFA) which could lead to conflicts over claims of benefits. Also the management of funds by KFS and CFA had weak transparency and accountability systems which could also be a cause of friction. But the TE suggests that “this risk can be mitigated by minimizing cash elements in the user agreements until standards and systems can cope” (TE pg 30).

Environmental: The project does not have any explicit environmental risks that could affect the sustainability of the project.

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 expected co-financing was \$12,470,000 while the actual co-financing was \$14,400,000. The TE states that "co-financing contribution mainly consisted of staff time, use of the institutions vehicles and other resources. The levels of co-financing were not monetized and reported by the partners or audited" (TE pg 15).

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 TE notes that due to delay of funding from UNDP, the project was deferred for one year and got one-year extension. There was also a delay by the Kenya Wildlife Service as the environmental impact assessment was slow to develop (TE pg 49). The TE reports that a previously planned watch tower could not be constructed because of the delay (TE pg 49 and 51).

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 notes that the country ownership of project implementation was very high due to strong participation of key stakeholders and government institutions. For instance, Kenya Forest Service, part of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, was one of the implementing partners and had co-financed the project. Other parastatal organizations such as Kenya Forest Research Institute, Kenya Wildlife Service and National Environment Management Authority were involved in planning the project and were part of the steering committee. The TE notes that the level of ownership and engagement was high due to direct relevance of project objectives to Kenya's forest policies. The project activities of biodiversity conservation assisted in fulfilling the objectives under the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (TE pg 27).

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: Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	------------------------

The TE gives a Satisfactory rating to M&E design at entry but also states that it was “rudimentary” (TE pg 19). It explains that although there was insufficient data on baseline and indicators at entry level, the project document “made provision for developing and implementing a detailed M&E plan as one of the initial implementation activities” (TE pg 19). The inception workshop set-up a sub-group to develop the plan, identify indicators and baseline, however as there was no follow-up from the meeting, the project continued to use the initial M&E outline for the duration of the project (TE pg 17). On biodiversity monitoring, the TE reports that there was some baseline information available on bird populations but even then there was a need for additional baseline data to assess changes in results from project activities (TE pg 17). The mid-term evaluation also recommended to develop a results framework but it was not produced (TE pg 19). Considering the failure to develop an M&E plan, this TER gives an Unsatisfactory rating to the M&E design.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	------------------------

The TE gives Unsatisfactory rating to the M&E plan implementation and this TER gives the same rating. The M&E system was not in place, and the quarterly and annual progress reports showed results per outcomes but assessing results against targets proved to be difficult (TE pg 13). This was due to lack of baseline data and indicators at the entry level. The TE also notes that there was no M&E staff person on the project to oversee the plan implementation and so, “this function was absorbed by Nature Kenya staff who had other functions to perform” (TE pg 18). The mid-term evaluation gave a recommendation to report progress in the format of results framework as the Steering Committee required it. But this was not done and that seemed to be a limiting factor for adaptive management (TE pg 13).

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: Satisfactory
--	----------------------

The main implementing agency of the project was UNDP and the TE gives a Satisfactory rating to the quality of implementation. According to the TE, UNDP was involved in project oversight and gave back-up support. It also co-chaired the Steering Committee and provided a technical advisor to design the project (TE pg 20). It disbursed funds to Nature Kenya based on quarterly budgets, however, the TE notes that the project implementation started late because of delays in getting funds from UNDP. To compensate the delay, UNDP gave one-year extension to the executing agency and partners for completion of the project (TE pg 49). Considering the assistance provided by UNDP, the TER also gives a Satisfactory rating.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory
---	----------------------

The main executing agency was Nature Kenya. The TE gives a Satisfactory rating to the quality of project execution and the TER gives the same rating. The TE notes that Nature Kenya provided quarterly budgets, reports and work plans as well as Project Implementation Review reports and annual Management Effectiveness Tracking Tools reports (TE pg 20). It also coordinated and built relationships with other executing partners such as Kenya Wildlife Services and Kenya Forest Service at national and field levels (TE pg 15).

Nature Kenya also took over the M&E duties as there was no staff to implement the M&E plan. Although this overburdened Nature Kenya with additional work, it managed to perform its project coordination duties in a satisfactory manner (TE pg 20).

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 in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. 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.

The impact of ecological status cannot be seen until the plans are implemented. Although ecological monitoring has been done, the data is not yet available to assess the changes. Nature Kenya had monitored three landscape sites from 2004 to 2014, but the TE states that the information is not sufficient to report whether the project reduced environmental stress (TE pg 32).

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.

No changes in socio-economic aspects have been reported.

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: The TE notes that advocacy for biodiversity conservation has impacted change in attitudes towards conservation of forests. It is reported that due to work executed by Kenya Forest Service and Community Forest Association “threats had reduced since the project started because of project interventions resulting in improved attitudes to forest conservation and protection, joint patrols and protection activities” (TE pg31).

Capacity building of executing agencies was done through various means such as exchange visits to other community conservation sites, meetings with Site Advisory Committees, trainings and study tours (TE pgs 10, 14 and 49).

b) Governance: No elements of changes in governance are reported.

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.

No unintended impacts are reported affecting ecological or social aspects.

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.

The TE reports that County formations and devolution of powers provided institutional environment for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into development planning, However, due to lack of time, mainstreaming and capacity building was not possible (TE pg 13).

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 key lessons for project design, implementation, and M&E are (TE pgs 33-34):

- a) The project design process was good especially as it involved all key stakeholders. That helped in catering towards the needs and priorities of the stakeholders while also developing collaboration between partners. However, there were weaknesses in the design as the assumptions and risks were not sufficiently considered and there were overlaps between the components. Also, the targets for creating new protected areas was overambitious.
- b) The decision to execute the project through an independent NGO, instead of main government partners, was strategic as it avoided the institutional rivalries and

bureaucracies. However, there was inadequate staff for M&E and Nature Kenya was overburdened with work.

- c) The Steering Committee held only three meetings throughout the project and thus, there was a need for the Committee to meet more often as it would have assisted in “creating linkages, increasing country ownership and extending lessons from project implementation”. Also, the Steering Committee delegated its functions to Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) but the TAC meetings did not have sufficient information to perform their functions of overseeing project implementation.
- d) The Site Advisory Committees did an effective job at field level and ensured local ownership of project interventions.
- e) The M&E plan required a better baseline information, indicators, reporting requirements, financial monitoring system, a budget and other M&E components.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The recommendations given for better project process and implementation are (TE pgs 34-37):

- a) Plan a reasonable breakdown of cash and in-kind funding and include the co-financing amount in project document;
- b) Develop more robust assumptions and risks so that mitigating measures can be included in the project design;
- c) Document revised targets and project implementation arrangements, and get formal approval by the Steering Committee and UNDP. After approval, the project should be assessed on the basis of revised targets;
- d) Provide comprehensive progress and financial reports for informed decision making, project steering, adaptive management and developing lessons learned;
- e) Develop comprehensive M&E plan with specific baseline data, data analysis systems and reporting requirements;
- f) Include cash component of co-financing in budget and work plans and produce financial reports in the format of the budget;
- g) Standardize biodiversity monitoring framework, which is compatible with international system, so that all stakeholders involved can use;
- h) Identify areas that have high biodiversity value and areas deserving additional protection, and gazette them as National Monuments; and
- i) Use biodiversity data collected during the project to develop new baselines for three ecosystems.
- j) Compile and document biodiversity survey data, and provide additional funding to Nature Kenya to complete this task.

- k) Document the low-cost methodology that was developed for community involvement in biodiversity monitoring focusing on threatened species. Also provide funding for the documentation.
 - l) Document lessons learned and project successes to assist in replication of the model.
- 4 The TE also provided recommendations for each component and they are (TE pgs 35-36):
 - a) Component 1: Identify and map biodiversity hotspots to ensure adequate protection and reclassify them to higher conservation categories. Implement Forest Station Plans, Participatory Forest Management Plans, and Ecosystem Strategic Plans. Also, integrate Landscape and Forest Station Plans into County Development Plans.
 - b) Component 2: Provide capacity building support to Community Forest Association (CFA) in the form of funding and mediation. To provide funding for CFAs, explore alternative funding mechanisms such as providing proportion of revenues from plantations to Counties. Complete the resource user agreements as an urgent priority in order to provide clarity to CFA members. In addition, Kenya Forest Service should take up coordinating and capacity building role so as to include coordinating Counties at the ecosystem level. Lastly, reform the Site Advisory Committees at the County level so that they could act as mediators in case of conflict between CFAs and Forest Stations.
 - c) Component 3: review and update State of Environment Reports annually by including it as an annex to the existing reports showing any relevant changes during the previous year. Revise and integrate associate action plans into County Development Plans.

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 IEO 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 presents a thorough and critical analysis of relevant and effective outcomes, impacts and achievements of the objectives.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Although explanation for each aspect of the TE are present, the ratings in the TE seem inflated and sometimes are not supported by relevant evidence.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report properly assesses the project's sustainability but does not provide for an exit strategy.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are supported by evidence and comprehensive.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes the costs and expenditures of the project but does not monetize the actual co-financing used	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report gave appropriate ratings for M&E design and implementation but it needed more details and evidence to support the rating.	MS
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

No additional sources were used in the preparation of this TER.