

GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		796	
GEF Agency project ID		4277	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Lake Baringo Community-Based Integrated Land and Water Management Project	
Country/Countries		Kenya	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP1 (Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems) & OP2 (Coastal, Marine and Fresh Water Ecosystems)	
Executing agencies involved		UNOPS	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Project beneficiaries through capacity building project components	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		February 17, 2000	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 1, 2000	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		January 2, 2003	
Actual date of project completion		February 28, 2004	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.75	0.75
Co-financing	IA/EA own		
	Government	0.23	0.23
	Other*		
Total GEF funding		0.75	0.75
Total Co-financing		0.23	0.20
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		0.98	0.95
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		March 2004	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Asenath Omwega and Segbedzi Norgbey	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Siham Mahamedahmed	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Lee Risby	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		June 2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Joshua Schneck	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Neeraj Negi	

*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	Good (3 on 1-5 scale w/ 1 being highest)	N/R	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	Good (3 on 1-5 scale w/ 1 being highest)	N/R	MU
M&E Design	N/R	N/R	N/R	U
M&E Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	MU
Quality of Implementation	N/R	Very Good (2 on 1-5 scale w/ 1 being highest)	N/R	MU
Quality of Execution	HS	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Document (PD), the Global Environmental Objective (GEO) of the project is to contribute to the protection of globally significant biodiversity through improved land and water management in the Baringo Catchment area. Lake Bringo and the nearby watershed areas are part of the Rift Valley Lake System of Eastern Africa, which is known to harbor globally significant biodiversity (PD, pg 12). Furthermore, the project's target area is under severe threat of environmental degradation from high grazing, deforestation for fuel use, and unsustainable farming practices that are degrading water quality (PG, pg 14).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objectives of the project, as originally stated in the PD, are to develop the capacity of local stakeholders to adopt sustainable and integrated and water management approaches within the Great Rift Valley that would otherwise undergo irreversible degradation. Local communities are expected to benefit from environmental services capitalized on with the help of the project, including lake-based tourism, bee keeping, and small scale farm-based industries. It is hoped that experience gained through the project will impact surrounding districts experiencing similar processes of land degradation (PD, pg 20).

The following five results were expected to be attained by the project:

1. Local populations adopt sustainable land and water use management plans and apply them;
2. The capacity of communities to undertake wildlife conservation activities on their lands will be greatly enhanced, and protection of endangered species will be assured;

3. The viability of community enterprises will be improved through training in business management and finance;
4. Broader income generating activities for local communities will provide employment and reduce pressure on land and water resources;
5. Improved production systems developed in pilot activities will be validated by the project, and community groups will adopt these systems for application in other key areas.

These results were to be achieved by the following four activity areas:

1. *Core Natural Resources Management activities.* Associated activities include identifying viable techniques and setting up demonstration sites; upgrading of land management plans; rehabilitation of range and degraded lands; promotion of soil and water conservation techniques; capacity building among stakeholders in management and technical abilities.
2. *Protection of Wildlife Habitats on Land and Water.* Associated activities include establishment of community-based wildlife management and demonstrations; improved sustainable use of the lakes; management and technical training.
3. *Support of Community Conservation Initiatives.* Associated activities include participatory rural appraisal and socio-economic survey; establishment of alternative sources of livelihood; upgrading of resource management extension programs; strengthening capacity of policy group, local authorities, NGOs, and local communities to undertake integrated resource management.
4. *Improve the Long-Term Viability of Pilot Activities and Information Dissemination.* Associated activities include adoption of efficient and sustainable financial management by NGOs and local community groups; increased returns from tourism and non-tourism wildlife utilization activities; establishment of a financial scheme to support natural resource based rural enterprises; and development of information packages to support project activities.

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

Yes. A stakeholder workshop organized at the outset of the project refined the objectives of the project as follows:

- To assist existing government agencies and non-governmental organizations in rehabilitating degraded lands in the catchment area of lake Baringo;
- To facilitate development of participatory management and conservation of biodiversity in the Lake Baringo ecosystem;
- To build the capacity of local communities to generate social and economic benefits from the sustainable use of the natural resources in and around Lake Baringo; and
- To create awareness about natural resources and support the development of appropriate policies for the conservation of natural resources in the catchment area of Lake Baringo.

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

As stated in the PD, the project is consistent with GEF OPs 1 (Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems) and OP2 (Coastal, Marine and Fresh Water Ecosystems. Lake Baringo and the nearby watershed areas are part of the Rift Valley Lake System of Easter Africa, which is a known area of globally significant biodiversity (PD, pg 12). Furthermore, the project’s target area is under sever threat of environmental degradation from high grazing, deforestation for fuel use, and unsustainable farming practices that are degrading the water quality (PD, pg 14). Kenya also ratified the Convention on Biodiversity in 1994, making it eligible to receive GEF BD funding. The project is also consistent with Kenya’s National Environmental Action Plan which emphasizes community-based conservation of globally significant wildlife resources. Moreover, the project addresses sustainable utilization of aquatic resources and the sustainable use of arid and semi-arid ecosystems that are directly referenced in the 1999 National Biodiversity Action Plan. The project aims to contribute to poverty alleviation for the local population of Lake Baringo, which is further in-line with Kenya’s overall development goals.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
--------------------------	--

The project experienced significant shortcomings in terms of achieving its overall objectives, but did make important progress in establishing the basis for further conservation efforts - through awareness raising, establishment of Lake Baringo as a Ramsar site, and demonstration of sustainable land-use technique - and is rated as moderately unsatisfactory for effectiveness on balance. None of the primary project objectives that were defined in the year 2000 stakeholder workshop have been fully realized, and the overarching objective of reversing the degradation of Lake Baringo and its catchment area and securing the conservation of the area’s globally significant biodiversity is far from being achieved. At the same time, the project was largely successful at implementing the numerous project activities defined in the project logframe (54 activities under four components), and in achieving or achieving most of the activity/output targets. That this level of output achievement did not result in the achievement of overall project objectives speaks to the overall incoherence and lack of focus in the project’s design (see sections 6.1 and 7.1 below). The project’s achievements can best be seen as part of a larger and long-term effort at achieving the objectives of long-term biodiversity conservation in the area – one that will likely require more time and resources than a single MSP.

Project achievements are further detailed below under the four objectives, as defined in the year 2000 revised logical framework:

1. *Rehabilitation of degraded lands* – project helped facilitate the construction of terraces in upper catchment areas to limit degradation. While the target for terrace construction was met, it's unclear from the TE how sustainable this effort will be, or what lasting effect it will have on the larger area. Project achievements under this objective are best characterized as having “successfully demonstrated the **potential** (emphasis added) of selected technologies in rehabilitating degraded lands if they were to be adopted throughout the affected areas beyond the demonstration sites” (TE, pg 11). The project made little headway in implementing a plan for communal grazing, which would have addressed one of the principle causes of environmental degradation in the area. This project activity was held up largely due to issues of land tenure (TE, pg 15).
2. *Facilitate the development of participatory management and conservation of biodiversity* – the project facilitated the registration of Lake Baringo as a Ramsar site (# 1159) on January 2, 2002, thereby raising the profile of this globally-significant wetland habitat. According to the TE, the project also facilitated the establishment of protected areas for the conservation of breeding sites for fish and birds that are linked to the Lake Baringo ecosystem (TE, pg 26). However, it is unclear from the TE what the area covered by the newly established PAs is, how effective protection efforts are, how the PAs are to be managed, the degree of threat they faced or continue to face, and so on. The project also helped facilitate a two-year fishing ban on Lake Baringo, which apparently helped the local fish stocks replenish (TE, pg 33). It's unclear however how much of a lasting effect this will have, and TE notes that the community is concerned that the fishing ban has allowed the crocodile population to bloom, with an increasing number of associated conflicts as a result.
3. *Capacity-building and sustainable livelihood security* – Fourteen activities were implemented under this project component grouping, which accounted for some 35% of project funds (~\$370k). Activities ranged from and included support to micro-enterprise management, distribution of improved bucks, a 1-day seminar on livelihood risk management, short courses in sustainable agroforestry for some government ministry workers, construction of several energy-efficient stoves, and training on gender. The TE provides no assessment as to whether the activities under this project component made any significant contribution to the project's overall biodiversity conservation objective, nor what the quality of the trainings and support provided was. The TE does note that discussions with beneficiaries of the improved cook stoves showed that they were not aware of the link with environmental conservation nor did they appreciate the consequences of deforestation. The main perceived benefit of the stoves was a reduction in the time spent collecting fuel wood (TE, pg 19).
4. *Awareness creation and support of appropriate policies* – Fifteen activities were implemented under this project grouping (expenditures not clear from TE). Activities ranged from study tours for participants (who sometimes included local officials, and community members) to nearby areas demonstrating alternative land-use practices, showing of videos in villages; public meetings; and meetings between the district environmental committees. As with the capacity-

building component, there is little information on the quality of these activities, or whether they have had any significant effect on the project’s overall objectives.

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

The project was executed by UNOPS under the supervision of UNEP. While the project was successful at implementing most of the activities called for in the project log-frame, and meeting a majority of the activity targets, the project suffered from unclear institutional arrangements between the project steering committee and the project management, and lack of effective project management in the final year of the project. As discussed in the TE, the project steering committee was substantially expanded at project start up to include members from the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Livestock, Ministry of Water, and the district development officer. While the expanded steering committee seems to have helped in terms of stakeholder ownership of the project (TE, pg 28), the committee also had three chairpersons over the three-year life of the project and *seven* rotations of district officers on and off the committee, all of which limited the effectiveness of the committee in reviewing implementation progress and suggesting any modifications (none were put forward). In addition, steering committee meetings were held at the same time and concurrently with planning workshops, blurring the lines between project management and steering committee functions. Lastly, in April of 2003 the field project coordinator left the project for reasons not discussed in the TE. A replacement was not brought in, as at the time the project was expected to close later that year. However, the project was extended for another 9 months, leaving only the project extension officer to bring the project to a close. TE notes that this reduction in project management capacity was likely responsible in part for the inability of the project to meet the planned targets of several project activities (TE, pg 28). Despite this, because the project was successful at implementing most of the activities called for in the project logframe, meeting most of the activity targets, and staying within budget, efficiency is rated as moderately satisfactory.

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

The project was successful in establishing a basis for biodiversity conservation in the Lake Baringo watershed area, notably through the registration of Lake Baringo as a Ramsar site, establishment of some community-run protected areas, and marginal increases in the awareness of stakeholders about the area’s biological significance. However, the principle threats to, and ongoing environmental degradation of, the Lake Baringo watershed area have not gone away, and sustainability of the project’s limited achievements remains very much in question. Project sustainability is further assessed along the following dimensions:

- *Environmental sustainability (MU)* – While some progress has been made in advancing sustainable environmental management approaches, the principle threats to the Lake Baring watershed from unregulated grazing, forest degradation, and unsustainable farming practices, have not gone away to any significant degree. The project was successful at helping to facilitate

the establishment of new fishing regulations on Lake Baringo, including controlling the size of fishing nets so that only mature fish stocks are harvested, and imposing a 2-year fishing moratorium to facilitate the replenishment of fish stocks.

- *Financial sustainability (MU)* - Lake Baringo was designated as a Ramsar site containing globally significant biodiversity, thus raising the profile of this area, and possibly increasing the chance that funds for the preservation of this area can be secured. However, to date, no funding has been secured. TE states that a vacuum is likely to be created after project closure unless additional resources are provided (TE, pg 6).
- *Socio-Political sustainability (MU)* – As assessed by the TE, lack of immediate benefits to the communities from conservation activities promoted by the projects and failure of the project to incorporate any scaling-up strategies for best land-use practices beyond the demonstration sites will likely limit the sustainability of the project going forward. TE states that the project did help to raise the awareness of community members of the importance of the area’s biodiversity and the need to sustainably manage resources. However, it is unclear to what extent this awareness will contribute to changing farming, grazing, fishing, and other related activities to more sustainable practices.
- *Institutional sustainability (MU)* – The TE notes that the project was successful at implementing a number of capacity building activities focused on local community organizations and district ministry workers. However, it seems that the resources expended and the activities conducted (1-day workshops, study tours), were of too small a scale to make a significant impact.

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?

According to the TE, co-financing pledged by the GOK was realized in full as an in kind contribution. The co-financing included provision of office space used by the project management team. No further information is given in the TE about co-financing or its contribution to project outcomes and sustainability, but it can be assumed that what was provided was integral to project achievements given the limited project funds and ambitious objectives.

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?

TE reports that the project was extended by nine months to allow completion of some project activities. While the extension was likely helpful in this regard, TE also notes that the project was without the services of a project field coordinator for the last year of the project, and thus it is unclear how effective the final nine months of the project were in delivering additional project results. TE notes that the

reduction in project management capacity was likely responsible in part for the inability of the project to meet the planned targets of several project activities (TE, pg 28).

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:

Project appears to have benefitted from strong country ownership in terms of involvement from local and national government workers, the local community, and in the realized co-financing from the GOK. However, it appears that this 3-year MSP project had too much involvement by government Ministries, whose participation in the project steering committee was less about evaluating and steering the project implementation, and more about simply having a voice in the project. TE notes that the frequent changes in the makeup of steering committee members limited its effectiveness.

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 project’s M&E design at entry was weak. The project lacked a coherent overall objective, which had to be developed after project commencement, and which should have guided the design of the project’s M&E system (TE, pg 8). Most of the logframe indicators lacking targets or were difficult to measure (ex.: Outcome 1 indicator, “effective and sustainable functioning of community land management initiatives; Outcome 2 indicator, “return of critical herbivorous species and migratory fowl to the lake and surrounding area, etc.). When targets were provided, there is no time frame stating when results are expected to manifest. The budget allocation of US \$ 10,000 for M&E activities appears to be low (i.e. it is only 1.4% of the GEF grant). The M&E design does not establish who is to be responsible for many M&E components, except to say “the ongoing process of monitoring and evaluation at the informal level will be provided by the various groups and committees established to co-ordinate and oversee project activities (PD, pg 32).

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

TE states that monitoring of project activities by implementing partners was weak. Moreover, the project steering committee, which could have utilized M&E findings, did not appear to be effectual in this or

indeed any oversight role. While the TE provides a listing of the output of all project activities there is no information provided in the TE or PIRs on the quality of project outputs (quality of trainings provided for example; quality of land rehabilitation efforts, efficacy of awareness raising activities, etc.). M&E implementation is rated as moderately unsatisfactory rather than unsatisfactory, as the project appears to have kept track of project expenditures, activities, and did conduct a mid-term review as called for in the PD.

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 Unsatisfactory
--	--

Quality of project implementation is rated as moderately unsatisfactory, largely due to weaknesses in project design. The PD failed to provide a coherent overall objective for the project, which had to be subsequently developed at a stakeholder workshop in the early stages of project implementation. The M&E design, as discussed above, did not facilitate adaptive management, and instead functioned mostly as a check list of activities to be undertaken. The TE’s overall finding that the project attempted far too many activities with far too limited resources and time should have been apparent from the project’s design, which called for 54 ambitious project activities (ex., “train all councilors and senior county council officials in environmental management; promote commercial agroforestry production;” etc.) to be completed in three years using MSP-sized funding. The overall impression of the project, considering the project evaluations (PIRs and TE) as well as the PD, is that of “leave no activity or group behind,” with little strategic thought into what activities presented the best opportunity for success. Indeed, the limited success of project livelihood components, and the large expectations raised by the project’s design and consultation period, may have done some damage to future efforts at conserving the area’s BD resources, as community members may be less likely to expect any benefits from conservation efforts (TE, pg 38). Project design also made little to no provision for scaling up of successful technologies beyond the project demonstration sites (TE, pg 26). Perhaps more of a concern is that TE finds that many of the activities funded by the project are “not entirely new,” and have been implemented by project partners and organizations in the Lake Baringo watershed area for many years – raising questions as to the additionally of the project (TE, pg 10). Finally, UNEP should have ensured that a replacement field project coordinator was found after the coordinator left with a year to go on the project (which subsequently stretched into over a year and a half after project extension was granted).

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

Project execution, while largely successful in completing the extensive list of project activities called for in the project’s design, was weak in a number of key areas that ultimately limited the extent of project achievement. Project management failed to establish effective M&E systems, and did not take the project’s mid-term review findings into account (2004 GEF EO TER assessment). TE notes that quality of financial reporting was weak, with reporting only listing budget codes and amounts while failing to provide any indication of what expenditures were for (TE, pg 32). As noted above, project was without a project field coordinator for over a year during the end of the project, which limited the achievement in some project outputs (TE, pg 28, although which outputs were affected by this is not discussed). TE also notes that the quality of some project outputs, in particular the terracing constructed in the project’s first year, was of poor quality and had to be reconstructed following some heavy rainfalls.

Because the project team was largely successful in completing project activities, and because project failings, in the assessment of this reviewer and the TE, were largely due to weaknesses in project design and inadequate project supervision, quality of project execution is rated as moderately satisfactory.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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.

TE states that project helped facilitate the designation of Lake Baringo as a Ramsar site, thereby raising its profile and possibly increasing the likelihood of attracting follow-on efforts and resources to conserve the area’s biodiversity. TE also notes that the project helped establish several community protected areas for the conservation of breeding sites for fish and birds that are linked to the Lake Baringo ecosystem (TE, pg 26). However, it is unclear from the TE what of the total area of the newly established PAs is, how effective are the protection efforts, how they’re to be managed, the degree of threat they faced or continue to face, and so on. The project also helped facilitate a two-year fishing ban on Lake Baringo, which apparently helped the local fish stocks replenish (TE, pg 33). It’s unclear however how much of a lasting effect this will have, and TE notes that the community is concerned that the fishing ban has allowed the crocodile population to bloom, with an increasing number of associated conflicts as a result. No evidence is provided on any changes in the principal threats to degradation of the area’s biodiversity, or any change in the trend of environmental degradation – most of which stems from practices that were unchanged by the project (unsustainable grazing and farming practices, deforestation from fuel gathering, etc.).

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.

The project included a number of activities focused on sustainable livelihoods that may have made a small contribution towards increasing the well-being of community members and communities that participated. These include training in micro-enterprise management; support for the procurement and distribution of mango and macadamia seedlings on a cost-sharing basis to individual farmers (~2000 seedlings – number of farmers involved is not clear from TE); training in bee-keeping to four community groups; 1-day training on risk management to sixty pastoralists; and distribution of some drought-resistant seed varieties (number unclear). In all cases, the effect on well-being is not quantified and is unclear, although TE gives the overall assessment that the projects efforts were too small and spread out to make much of a difference.

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 – Project activities included capacity-building initiatives on several levels, including training of community members in various sustainable farming practices; training for the Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (NGO) in monitoring of water quality and fish populations; training of councilors in environmental management (effectiveness and extent of training not discussed). In all cases, the effect of these activities in bringing about environmental change is not quantified or discussed, and the assessment of this reviewer is that there is little to indicate any increased propensity for large-scale action as a result.

b) Governance – No changes in governance are identified in the TE as having occurred as a result of the project.

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.

As noted in the TE, the extensive consultation process that was part of the project’s design and launching, and the fact that this process became highly politicized “with local politicians promising huge employment opportunities and relief supplies to the local communities as had been the case with past interventions” created some problems for the project, and much time was spent in the early stages of the project on changing this perception. (TE, pg 35) However, these expectations appear to have not gone away entirely, and the TE notes that “lack of immediate benefits to the communities from

conservation and the project's failure to build scaling-up strategies for best land-use practices beyond the demonstration sites into the project's design is likely to affect the long-term impact of the project on biodiversity conservation and restoration of degraded land...most beneficiaries had expected a lot in terms of income given the initial publicity given to the project and its promises (TE, pg 38). Thus, an unintended consequence of the project and its limited achievements may have been to lessen the prospect that similar initiatives will be embraced in the future by community members.

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.

None of the activities promoted by the project have been taken to scale. Indeed, the TE notes that the project design stretched the small amount of project resources far too thin to have much of an impact, and moreover, no provisions were made – either in the design stage or implementation – for how to take any of the project's demonstration activities and bring them to scale.

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.

TE identifies the following key lessons:

- Spreading limited financial resources over numerous activities in a short-lived project reduces the impact of a project. If resources are concentrated on fewer activities strategically selected to create impact and demonstrate effectiveness, they are more effective - in demonstrating practices for scaling up for example.
- Achieving equity in multi-stakeholder projects is difficult. Representation is difficult to achieve as interest groups expand.
- Broad-based and extensive consultations during project design and development contribute to project ownership...however, such consultations can lead to high expectations that may not be met by the project.
- Well-designed and implemented study tours are effective in raising awareness and influencing action on environmental issues. Best practices on environmental management observed in situ are easily replicated by either direct adoption or innovative adaptations with follow-up technical support from extension service providers.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE offers the following recommendations:

- Success at Lake Baringo will require long-term interventions with extensive resources, particularly for scaling up of lessons learned.

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?	The TE does not use a consistent framework for evaluating project outcomes, grouping for example the assessment of project outcomes by activity groupings that overlap with outcome groupings provided in the PD. This makes assessing the extent to which relevant outcomes were achieved difficult. Moreover, while TE does a good job of providing information on the extent to which project activities met their expected targets, it does not provide an assessment on the extent to which indicators for overall project objectives have been achieved, which would have been far more useful.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	TE is inconsistent on a number of occasions and this makes evaluating the project's achievements difficult. For example, on pg 40, TE states that of the 54 activities, expected targets were reached in most cases, and surpassed in a number of others. On pg 28 however, TE provides a more negative assessment of output achievement, stating that loss of project coordinator is responsible for the many cases where project activities failed to meet their targets. Moreover, there is no assessment on the quality of trainings and most other activities, and ratings provided on pg 40 do not appear to match the generally negative assessment of the projects overall impact.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Project sustainability is not discussed in detail. For example, there is no assessment on whether the trainings provided to the ministry workers are likely to have a lasting effect, or whether communal PAs established by the project are to be managed in a sustainable way, and so on. More information should have been provided on	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons are fairly straightforward but should have extended to a discussion on M&E; a discussion on the additionally of the project given that many of the project activities had been done in the area for many years prior; and in particular a discussion of the demonstration activities, and which ones appeared the most promising.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	No. Total project costs and co-financing are provided, but expenditures are not broken down by activity groupings. In addition, no information is provided on some additional co-financing not mentioned in the PD, but stated in the TE and not materializing.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE only mentions the project's M&E systems in brief, saying that "monitoring of project activities by implementing partners was weak." There is no discussion of how findings from MTR were or were not taken up. Considering the overall weakness of the M&E design and the project's	U

complexity, the report should have explored further how the project may or may not have benefitted from a more robust M&E framework and implementation	
Overall TE Rating	MU

Overall TE rating = $(0.3 * (3+3)) + (0.1 * (3+3+3+2)) = 1.8 + 1.1 = 2.9 = \text{MU}$

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