United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Terminal Evaluation of UNEP/GEF Project " Development and Implementation of a Sustainable Resource Management Plan for Marsabit Mountain and its associated Watersheds in Kenya. Otherwise known as Mount Marsabit Ecosystem Project (MESP) Project Number: GFL/4779

Harriet Matsaert

Songa Village with Marsabit Forest in the background

Evaluation and Oversight Unit

October 2009

Table of Contents

Annexes

Executive Summary

1. This terminal evaluation was carried out between May and June 2009. The consultant met with, or corresponded with key stakeholders involved in the project including representatives of government bodies, civil society and community groups.

Background to the Project

2. Marsabit Mountain is a unique and fragile ecosystem consisting of extensive upland mist forest on an extinct volcano within an arid setting. The forest provides the only source of water for the surrounding desert region and is one of the critical 'water towers' in North Eastern Kenya. It also provides a home to many wildlife species. The mountain contains both gazetted forest and wildlife reserves.
3. The survival of the forest has been threatened by forest clearance for farming and urban development, firewood collection, and the increase in water extraction through boreholes. In 2001 the Kenya Forest Working group carried out an appraisal of the forest status and recommended the urgent development of a forest management plan[1].
4. The project under review was designed by AGREF in 2003, and addressed KFWG's concerns. Its overall goal was to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of the unique mountain ecosystem in Marsabit by developing a management plan that could be replicated in similar environments in the Horn of Africa.
5. The key project outcomes were:
   - Land use management plan for Mt. Marsabit developed.
   - Enhanced knowledge base and information for long term monitoring and management of the Marsabit mountain ecological system.
   - Enhanced natural resource management of the Mt Marsabit ecosystem through demonstration activities on sustainable land and water management at pilot sites.
   - Enhanced capacity of local and national stakeholders including communities and institutions to sustainably manage natural resources and to resolve land-use conflicts.
6. The project design complemented other national initiatives for forest conservation and with new legislation on forest and environmental management[2]. It addressed a number of GEF priorities (Operational programme 15 on Sustainable land management and Operational Programme 4 on Mountain ecosystems). The project had strong complementarity with the two other GEF projects in Marsabit area (Desert Margins and Indigenous Vegetation project).
7. UNEP subcontracted project execution to UNOPS, who in turn subcontracted AGREF to carry out fieldwork. AGREF submitted expenditure accounts and technical reports directly to UNOPS, who were responsible for disbursement of funds. The UNEP task manager attended steering committees and gave technical input and other support to project staff.
8. In the first year the project team facilitated and coordinated 15 MSc studies carried out by students at Nairobi and Kenyatta University. These provided baseline information on the status of the mountain ecosystem, investigated the causes of forest degradation and generated management recommendations. The theses formed the basis for advocacy, management planning and demonstration activities in the remaining years of the project. They also provided baseline information and indicators for monitoring the forest status over time.

[1] Kenya Forest Working Group Rapid Appraisal of Marsabit Forest (2001)
[2] Environmental and Coordination Act. 1999, Kenya Forest Act (200%)

9. It should be noted that Marsabit is a difficult environment to work in due to poor infrastructure and ongoing ethnic conflict. The project experience many constraints due to local conflict, drought and as a result of the political upheaval following the 2007 elections.

Project Achievements, Strengths and Weaknesses

Achievements

10. **Outcome 1:** ***Land use management plan for Mt. Marsabit developed.*** **The project came close to** achieving this outcome. Key stakeholders accepted the recommendations generated by the project and a planning process was initiated, led by KWS. However, after the December 2007 elections, the process was abandoned. Both KWS and KFS appear committed to complete the process, though there are no definite dates or funds allocated as yet.

11. **Outcome 2:** ***Enhanced knowledge base and information for long term monitoring and management of the Marsabit mountain ecological system***. MSc studies generated innovative and practical recommendations, which have been widely accepted by the key stakeholders involved in the conservation of Marsabit Mountain. The key recommendations were to develop woodlots and dams outside the forest in order to protect and allow regeneration of the forest trees. The project piloted a water-harvesting machine suitable for mist mountains (based on recommendations from an MSc study). Baseline studies also provided valuable indicators of the forest status. However, for this outcome to be fully achieved, the information collected needs to be synthesised and archived to ensure it is accessible to key stakeholders (government, community and civil society groups) for future use.

12. **Outcome 3:** ***Enhanced natural resource management of the Mt Marsabit ecosystem through demonstration activities on sustainable land and water management at pilot sites.***

The key achievements of the project are summarised in the table below.

Changes in Natural Resource management	**By who**	**Notes**
Fenced and irrigated woodlots for afforestation.	Schools Some Marsabit entrepreneurs.	These plots demonstrated which trees could be successfully grown for commercial purposes in the area. Trees which have done well include Acacia seyal, Kigelia Africana, Terminalia spinosa and Acacia nilotica. The plots also highlighted the importance of fencing and water as preconditions of successful afforestation (many former projects failed because these two elements were not in place). Demonstration woodlots were set up in schoolyards and private individuals also established a number of commercial woodlots.
Dam construction for	Planned by community in	Though this activity is at an early stage

watering livestock outside the forest.	Gotu Gardi and several other sites. Implemented in other areas with EU funding.	only, the project's studies have raised awareness of the benefits of grazing and watering livestock outside the forest in order to allow regeneration of indigenous forest trees.
Water harvesting from mist forest	Kenya forestry service in Marsabit	One of the students designed a 'water machine' which can be used to harvest the water vapour generated by the moss in mist forests. A water machine is now in use in the KFS nursery in Marsabit. Elders in Hurri Hills have requested that one should be used to harvest moisture for reforestation in their area.

The activities under this outcome were revised during the project life (see annex 10 and description in 3.1.4 below). This was in response to the realisation that other projects were already doing these activities, and to allow the project to focus on the recommendations generated by the MSc studies. The emphasis moved from a range of income generating activities, agro forestry and livestock marketing to a focus on water (constructing dams) and woodlots. This outcome has not been fully achieved. While considerable achievements were made in forestation (including raising awareness of the importance of water and protection), the woodlot demonstrations did not reach maturity in the project life. The project team were successful in finding funding for dams (which couldn't be achieved within the project budget), but these were not built by the end of the project life. As a result management plans linked to the dam construction (fodder banks, tree planting, water charging etc) were not implemented. While there appears to be a growth in local awareness of forest conservation issues, changes in practices have not yet occurred.

13. **Outcome 4:** ***Enhanced capacity of local and national stakeholders including communities and institutions to sustainably manage natural resources and to resolve land-use conflicts.*** The project has succeeded in increasing capacity of local and national stakeholders in a number of ways.

Capacity Development	**Of Who**	**Notes**
Research skills and field experience for working in indigenous forests.	Mc students, Academic staff.	Several of the students trained have gone on to work in this field.
Ability of local people to advocate for forest conservation	Local NEMA office. Macoco KFS KWS	Student's MSc theses have given material to support advocacy work.
Know how for tree planting in semi arid areas.	KFS staff NGO staff	The importance of irrigation and fencing is now clearly understood.
Afforestation skills	School staff (children/parents)	Some skills developed through participating in school woodlot activities.
Knowledge on water harvesting	KFS staff Visitors to nursery	Unfortunately the size of the 'water machine' is such that individuals cannot easily replicate this technology. However

		elders in Hurri hills are planning to replicate the idea for afforestation of Hurri hills.
Conflict management and joint planning	Community members (Gotu Gardi)	Community members have struggled with and overcome ethnic conflicts in order to generate a joint resource management plan. The possibility of water development has acted as a powerful incentive for peace building.

The project's has been successful in building awareness, capacity and catalysing action at the district level. It has less impact on increased awareness at the national level. Many of those interviewed recommended that more be done to share project findings with key national actors.

At the community level, there is more work to be done in capacity building (both for woodlot management and forest management.

14. The project had a significant catalytic role at the Marsabit level. This included support and implementation of recommendations by key stakeholders, demand for further studies for science led development, requests for woodlots etc. The opportunities for wider replication have been limited due to the fact that the project outcomes were not fully achieved.

Key Strengths

15. The project benefited from the local knowledge and experience of the project manager. The project's implementation approach was characterised by flexibility, opportunism and a focus on identifying with and working with individuals who were effective and passionate about forest conservation. This approach has allowed the project to cope and respond to the extreme constraints it has encountered, and has contributed to its considerable success and to the sustainability of its work.
16. The project's monitoring and evaluation processes were comprehensive and effective. The project 'learned' and adapted accordingly during its life. Despite problems with high turnover of members, the project was able to work successfully with the steering committee to change key project outputs when necessary. The mid term review provided useful recommendations for the final year of the project.
17. The project made efficient use of funds. Considerable co-financing was made in kind by the government of Kenya. The project was also successful in leveraging $1.5 million from the Kenyan Ministry of Northern Kenya and other Arid lands to construct the dams recommended by the project.

Constraints

18. The project time frame was too short to meet the aim of changing attitudes and management practices. Trees grow slowly and more time is needed for people to see the benefits of woodlots.
19. The double layer of project management: UNEP and UNOPS also created some unnecessary bureaucracy. At one point provision of funds were delayed by 5 months as UNOPS management structures were reorganised (see section 3.10 on implementation approach). Some key stakeholders who will be critical to the sustainability of the project (e.g. KEFRI, KARI) were not involved in the project and appear to have little knowledge of its outcomes.

The project would have benefited from an extensive analysis of key stakeholders in Marsabit mountain conservation at the project planning stage and the development of strategies to engage key stakeholders.

20. The project could have done more to synthesise, document and share baseline information and lessons learned so that they are accessible to key national stakeholders and community forest management groups.
21. While the relevance of the project goal to GEF is high, replicable lessons (and public goods) will only be generated if the process of finalising and implementing the forest management plan is followed through and documented (see recommendations).

Sustainability of Project Outcomes

22. The project team succeeded in negotiating funding to build the dams. Further funding may be forthcoming from the French Development Agency and Ministry of Livestock. It is not clear whether KWS/KFS have funding allocated to implement the forest management plan. School woodlot projects are struggling to find funds to continue their work. Socio political sustainability is a concern as Marsabit is currently experiencing considerable ethnic conflict. However, the dam projects have been found to have a positive impact in bringing together different ethnic groups. The formation of local environmental alliance and strong support by local stakeholders promises well for the sustainability of the institutional framework and governance structure. The sustainability of monitoring the forest status is also a concern as none of the organisations interviewed indicated that they would take on responsibility for this activity.

Conclusion

23. The project's achievements have been considerable (particularly given the constraints experienced), but there is still more work to be done to meet the project goal, both for Marsabit level outcomes and to create 'public goods' for GEF.

Lessons and Recommendations.

24. Key Lessons which can be drawn from this project include (see section 5 for full discussion): -

    General lessons for GEF projects:

    - Value of MSc studies for Science led Development
    - Importance of Stakeholder Analysis when there are many actors involved.
    - Need to keep Management Structure Simple for Medium Sized Projects.
    - Forestry Projects need time to mature
    - Advantages of using an Opportunistic and Actor Oriented Approach to Project Management.
    - The Dissemination Strategy is a critical element of project design.

    Lessons specific to pastoralist and mist mountain ecosystems:

    - Water Projects can act as instruments of conflict resolution
    - Water and Protection are key factors for afforestation in Pastoralist areas.
    - Development of water harvesting technology for Mist Mountains.

25. As this is a terminal review, recommendations are restricted to essential action which is needed to enhance the project's impact. The consultant recommends
    - Wider Dissemination of Project Lessons
    - Synthesis and archiving of project findings so that they can be used for future monitoring activities.
    - Follow up project to consolidate work done already.

Acknowledgements
Many thanks to all of those who gave me their time and shared their thoughts on this project. I would also like to express my appreciation to Dr Chema for accompanying me to Marsabit and showing me round the project sites. Thanks also to Mohammed Sessay and the UNEP Evaluation and Oversight team for facilitating this evaluation.

Acronyms and Abbreviations.

AGREF	Agriculture Research Foundation
ALRMP	Arid Lands Resource Management Programme
CBOs	Community Based Organisation
EMCA	Environmental Management and Co-ordination Act
FHI	Food For the Hungry International
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
IPAL	Integrated Project in Arid lands
KARI	Kenya Agricultural Research Institute
KEFRI	Kenya Forest Research Institute
KFS	Kenya Forest Services
KFWG	Kenya Forests Working Group.
KMD	Kenya Meteorological Department.
KWS	Kenya Wildlife Service
KWS	Kenya Wildlife Service
M &E	Monitoring and Evaluation
Macoco	Marsabit Conservation Consortium
MENR	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
MOARD	Ministry Agriculture and Rural Development
MSP	Medium Size Project
NEMA	National Environment Management Authority
NGO	Non Governmental Organisations
NR	Natural Resource
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NRMP	Natural Resource Management Plan
OP	Operational Programme
UK	United Kingdom
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
UNOPS	United Nations Office Project Services

1. Introduction

1.1 Context

Marsabit Mountain is a unique and fragile ecosystem consisting of extensive upland forest on an extinct volcano within an arid setting. It is one of a number of 'mist forests' which exist in this region. Over thousands of years these forests have developed a distinct plant association endemic to this area. Much of the recharge of the water sources in the forest come from mist condensate on species of saprophytic moss plants living on indigenous forest trees. Marsabit forest provides the only source of water for the surrounding desert region and as such is one of the critical 'water towers' in North Eastern Kenya. It also provides a home to many wildlife species including greater kudu, buffalo, oryx, genet cat, klipspringer, caracal, common duiker, grant gazelle, bushbuck, grevys zebra, lion, monkeys and a species of dryland elephant only found in this area. There are two crater lakes; Lake Paradise and Elephant pool lake. The mountain contains a gazetted forest reserve, and the wider area is also a gazetted wildlife reserve and has considerable potential for tourism revenue, particularly when the Marsabit road is completed.

Despite its critical importance to the region and its double 'gazetting', the survival of the forest has been threatened by forest clearance (particularly around Marsabit town) and the increase in water extraction through boreholes which is thought to be contributing to the drying up of both the forest lakes. Over 18,000 people living in the town and adjacent environs use water and wood from the forest (KWS training report). In 2001, in response to local concerns, the Kenya Forest Working group sent a team to carry out a 'rapid appraisal' of the forest's status. The team recommended that a management plan be developed for the mountain. This should consider, among other things, land use planning for the whole mountain, forest zoning for utilisation and preservation, additional/alternative sources of fodder during dry periods, firewood (woodlots, agro forestry), the provision of water outside the forest and monitoring and correction of sustainable utilisation levels[3].

These recommendations have been addressed both by this project and by sister GEF funded projects, the Indigenous Vegetation project which looked at zoning of grazing around the forest and the Desert Margins Project which has a wider regional mandate.[4] The project qualified for GEF funding because its activities related directly to GEF strategic priority SLM 2 on Implementation of Innovative and Indigenous Sustainable Land Management Practices the priority areas under the GEF Operational Programme 15 on Sustainable Land Management. It would contribute to SLM2 through the implementation of sustainable land management practices with a focus on management of the interface between a unique highland forest and its surrounding lowland pastures.

The activities of the project would have wider relevance to other 'mist mountains' ecosystems in Kenya, Uganda, Ethiopia, Sudan and Somalia.

[3] Kenya Forest Working Group Rapid Appraisal of Marsabit Forest (2001)
[4] Pers comm. Esau Omollo, KFS

Cattle in Marsabit forest (estimated 50,000 in May 2009[5])

Traditional well dug for livestock watering in forest gorge (May 2009)

[5] Pers comm. Meshak Cheto, KFS

Wood collectors leaving forest (May 2009)

Elephants come to drink in the last remaining water in Lake Paradise (May 2009)

1.2 Project Background

Project design was led by Dr Chema of AGREF (Agricultural Research Foundation) who had long experience of working in the Marsabit area under the IPAL programme. The project was initially designed to address land management in the lowland as well as the highland areas, and was later adapted to focus on the mountain only, as the Indigenous vegetation programme and desert margins programme (both GEF funded) were working in the lowland areas.

The project was designed together with, and aimed to work closely with key actors in forest conservation. These included the Kenya Forestry Service, Kenya Wildlife Service Ministry of Water, County Council, Arid Lands Resource Management Programme, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MENR) and Kenya Meteorological Department (KMD). The Universities of Nairobi and Kenyatta were key partners in providing students to carry out research activities in the forest. Local schools became important partners in hosting wood lots as the projects developed[6]. While the project was funded and task managed by the UNEP/GEF, UNOPS was given responsibility for project execution. In turn UNOPS subcontracted project implementation to AGREF. The AGREF project manager sent financial and technical reports to UNOPS who in turn were responsible for disbursement of funds. The UNEP task manager also provided technical and other support to the project but was not involved in reporting procedures.

1.3 Project goals and objectives

The overall goal of this project was to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of the unique mountain ecosystem in Marsabit by developing and implementing a management plan that could be replicated in similar environments in the Horn of Africa.

The project planned to use a 'science-led model[7]' to achieve the following outcomes (see annex 5).

- Land use management plan for Mt. Marsabit developed.
- Enhanced knowledge base and information for long term monitoring and management of the Marsabit mountain ecological system.
- Enhanced natural resource management of the Mt Marsabit ecosystem through demonstration activities on sustainable land and water management at pilot sites.
- Enhanced capacity of local and national stakeholders including communities and institutions to sustainably manage natural resources and to resolve land-use conflicts.

1.4 Project Activities

2004

Project activities began in 2004. Fifteen MSc students carried out baseline studies in the forest (see annex 8). Three forest transects were marked and documented. Studies were able to quantify the extent of forest loss (estimated at 100 ha per year from 1973 – 2005), and predict a

[6] Initially the number of partners was much larger. Partners who were identified at the beginning of the project but did not end up getting involved in project activities were: Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI), Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI), Ministry of Livestock Development (MALD), Ministry of Agriculture.

[7] By 'science led model' we mean that major recommendations are driven by and defendable by scientific data. (pers comm. Project Manager).

deficit in water for human and livestock use of 44,000m3/year under current conditions[8]. The studies showed that key contributing factors were the entry of livestock into the forest in search of water (trampling by livestock prevent regeneration of indigenous trees), and the use of forest wood by most of the population of Marsabit for cooking. Sinking of boreholes outside the forest is also believed to contribute to the drying up of mountain lakes due to lowering of the water tables in aquifers, (however this needs to be confirmed by further studies of forest aquifers[9]). Studies also provided a baseline inventory of plants, animals and provided information on current carbon storage in the forest. This together with the transect information provides a baseline for ongoing forest monitoring.

Based on the findings of the studies, the project prioritised the development of water supplies outside forest (by damming gorges) and the planting of woodlots (for firewood and commercial purposes). This was the focus of the next four years of project activities.

Together with Kenya Forest Service (KFS) and a local NGO, Food for the Hungry International (FHI) the project initiated planting activities, planting 6000 tree seedlings in the March/April rainy season.

2005

As the studies were completed the project began to share the results, raise awareness of the current status of the forest and meet with others to discuss implementing the recommended forest management plans. Extensive meetings were held with local stakeholders and villagers living around the mountain. In October 2005 the project was officially launched.

High levels of local insecurity and drought inhibited the project's activities this year. However by the end of 2005 the six focus communities for testing and validating project management recommendations were selected. These were: Logo Logo, Parkishon, Girib Dombo, Kubi Bagassa, Badassa and Gotu Gardi.

2006

This year work began on developing woodlots and sustainable water management practices in the selected focus sites. At this stage the project made the decision to drop several of the planned activities (in the initial log frame) relating to the development of sustainable livelihoods e.g. market development, rearing of dairy groups. Project staff realised that not only were these activities being developed by other local agencies. They also decided that it would be most useful for them to focus specifically on the key priorities raised by the forest studies (water and woodlots). Reallocations in the budget were made up to the allowed 30%.

[8] "This refers to the slope (gradient) in a water availability regression line – not the total amount of water available. This is despite the extremely low average water consumption by pastoralists in the mountain area. Surveys (65 manyattas or villages, 2,041 households, 11,941 people both adults and children) showed that for an average Marsabit family (1.89 adults and 3.98 children) the volume of water consumed per day is a very low 166 litres. " Pers comm. Project Manager

[9] Use of a tracer in the crater lake water using a safe and easily quantifiable isotope and long term sampling from boreholes has been considered. The seepage of such a tracer might take months to years before it emerges in boreholes. AGREF are looking for funding and have a PhD student ready to do a hydro-geological study that will clarify this and many other crucial hydrological issues in the greater Marsabit area. The candidate is an engineer from the Kenya Ministry of Water and Irrigation. Pers comm. Project Manager

This year the project activities were further hampered by local insecurity. A plan to build a dam in a gorge at Gotu Gardi had to be temporarily abandoned as the communities who used this gorge refused to work together.

Another constraint this year was caused by a change in management structure in UNOPS which resulted in a five-month delay in cash transfers to the project (PIR 2008 page 29).

The first project steering committee was held in March 2006.

2007

This year the project extended its community activities to five sites. They were approached with requests to set up woodlots in several additional schools and responded to these requests. However activities in Logo had to be abandoned due to the distance from the project office and lack of telecommunications. A central nursery was established and a water-harvesting machine developed, based on plans developed by one of the MSc student. This machine provided water to irrigate the tree seedlings.

A brochure and video of the study findings were produced and presented at the GEF conference in South Africa.

A major achievement this year was the agreement of the key stakeholders: KWS, KFS and the Ministry of Water to work together to create a joint management plan for Marsabit Mountain.

The Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries committed funds for the construction of 8 dams in gorges around the mountain.

2008

This year began with the post election violence which cause enormous disturbance to the workings of government. As a result the joint management process for Mount Marsabit was abandoned. The Ministry of Livestock reduced the quantity of cash pledged for dam construction.

The mid term project review, initiated in 2007 was completed in March 2008. It recommended that the project should lobby for continued support for the activities it had initiated. Intensive lobbying by the project manager and UNEP resulted in the newly formed Ministry of Northern Kenya pledging 100 million shillings for the construction of dams in the mountain gorges. The project received an extension to continue its activities until funds ran out. In the final year it continued its work with school woodlots as well as moving increasingly into supporting individual woodlots.

The mid term review also recommended that the project put some effort into dissemination of project results. A website and book sharing project results were recommended. Neither of these was achieved.

A significant activity this year was the formation of a local coalition to support afforestation. Macoco (Marsabit conservation coalition) is committed to planting 100,000 trees a year on the

mountain. This dynamic group has also been instrumental in obtaining funding for the EU Community Trust Development Fund, to continue building on the activities of the project.[10]

1.5 Terminal Evaluation

This evaluation was carried out in May 2009 by Harriet Matsaert. The objective of this evaluation was to establish whether the project met its objectives (see annex 1 for terms of reference). The consultant assessed the project's performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. She reviewed the recommendations of the mid term Evaluation and their implementation. She was asked to focus on the following main questions:

A. Have the land-use planners and implementers adopted and enforced an agreed comprehensive plan for Marsabit Mountain and have the villages in the project are embraced this plan?
B. Are the village and district levels using the enhanced information system for decision making on land use?
C. Are sustainable crop livestock production systems and income generating activities being implemented in the project area?
D. Is there local capacity to sustainably manage natural resources and resolve land use conflicts in the project area?

2. Evaluation Scope, Objective and Methods

The evaluation was carried out in May 2009. During this time the consultant reviewed project documents, held meetings with key individuals involved in the project and visited project sites. Interviews were held in Marsabit and Nairobi with some communication also by email (see annex 2 and 3 for list of documents consulted, interviews carried out and itinerary of field visit). A checklist (see Annex 9) was used to ask key informants about their vision for the development of Mt Marsabit and how they felt the project had contributed this. Project partners were also asked to comment on the technical validity and sustainability of the project's activities.

3. Performance and Impact: Findings

The following section provides a review of the project performance and impact based on eleven evaluation aspects (A-K) as provided by the UNEP. The evaluation is generally performed based on a 6 point constructed scale whereby:

HS = Highly Satisfactory
S = Satisfactory
MS = Moderately Satisfactory
MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory
U = Unsatisfactory
HU = Highly Unsatisfactory

[10] Pers comm. Macoco.

3.1 Attainment of Objectives and Planned results (see Annex 5 for detailed description of goals, outcomes, indicators and verification).

3.1.1 Attainment of Project Goal (A) (See Annex 5 for detailed description).

The project goal was "*to promote long-term conservation and sustainable use of the unique mountain ecosystems in Marsabit District, in other arid districts and, through collaborative arrangements elsewhere in the Horn of Africa including Uganda, Ethiopia, Sudan and eventually, Somalia, by developing and implementing a science-led management plan*". (Revised Log Frame, Mid Term Review Annex 7.1).

All stakeholders' interviewed[11] agreed that the information collected by the project has been enormously valuable in quantifying the extent of forest degradation, analysing its causes and providing concrete and practical science led management recommendations. The science led approach was particularly appreciated because local stakeholders felt the need for 'hard facts' to substantiate their arguments for forest conservation, and to generate intervention options that were realistic because they were grounded in a real understanding of local conditions. It was also noted that "*for the first time in the history of the Mount Marsabit ecosystem, the GEF project brought together key stakeholders to develop a natural resource management plan that is owned by key institutions and local communities*" (Richard Mugacha, UNOP).

What has not been achieved is the full validation of the project recommendations. The recommended dams were not built during the project life, and because these were not completed, the planned water management structures were also not finalised. Most stakeholders interviewed[12] felt that this was due to the short time frame of the project. Three years is very short for a project that involves tree planting and which has the aim of building awareness and changing natural resource management practices.

The full attainment of the project goal was also constrained by the nature of the recommendations generated by the initial studies. The initial project plan had not envisaged that dams would be a recommendation of the studies. Though there were alterations in the project budget, this did not stretch to the construction of dams. So the project was dependent on finding external funding to implement this recommendation. The project team, and UNEP had considerable success in doing this. They obtained pledges of funding for the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries, and later from the Ministry of Northern Kenya for dam construction. However the dams were not completed by the end of the project.

In order to meet the project's wider aim of developing a model which could be validated elsewhere it would be useful to continue to engage with forest user communities as dams are built and to document the effectiveness of the dams and water user associations (see recommendations).

The project's findings and recommendations have been shared with others more widely through presentations at two conferences and the production of a brochure. Elders from Hurri Hills visited the project sites and have requested a similar project in the Hurri Hills. However, to

[11] Pers comm.NEMA, KFS, KWS, Md Sessay, WNWDA, KARI, ALRMP.
[12] KWS, KFS, School principals, NEMA. WNWDA.

maximise the impact of the project's considerable insights and achievements it would be useful to disseminate the findings more widely (see recommendations). Government partners stressed the importance of disseminating findings and building awareness at central government level so that the importance of Marsabit Mountain is understood and funds can be made available to continue the work the project has started.[13] While all those interviewed were aware of the student theses produced by the project, several did not have copies of these theses and were not clear where they could be obtained[14]. The consultant was concerned that the findings of the student theses should be synthesised and archived in such a way that they are accessible for further monitoring activities[15].

3.1.2 Attainment of Outcome 1

Land Use Management Plan for Mt. Marsabit developed.

The project did considerable work in lobbying for the development of a land use management plan for Mount Marsabit. In 2006 the KWS, KFS and the Ministry of Water agreed to develop a plan. The process was to be led and funded by KWS. An initial meeting was held in Nanyuki to launch the process. However everything was put on hold after the post election crisis. There is now a new KWS area director in Marsabit. He did not seem aware of the past plans, but did say that KWS would be favourable to taking this forward. The KFS Deputy Director of Forest Conservation and Management also indicated that the management plan is still on KFS's agenda. However neither was able to confirm dates or resources allocated to this activity.[16]

In 2007 the project supported the development of a local civil society body: Macoco (Marsabit Conservation Consortium). This organisation has representation from NEMA, local environmental management committees and sits on the District Natural Resource forum. It is taking a lead at the local level in developing management strategies for the area. For example Macoco has committed itself to maintaining the tree nurseries set up by the project, and to fulfilling the goal of planting 100,000 trees a year around the forest. Members of Macoco have also been successful in obtaining funding from the EU Community Development Trust fund for activities which follow the project's recommendations (e.g. small dams, fuel conserving technologies, water user groups).[17]

In conclusion we can say that this outcome has been partially met.

3.1.3 Outcome 2

Enhanced knowledge base and information for long term monitoring and management of the Marsabit Mountain ecological system.

The information produced by the student theses (see appendix 8) fills a real gap in knowledge about the mountain and has been greatly appreciated. It provides the 'ammunition' for advocacy

[13] Pers comm.ALRMP staff

[14] KFS, KWS, ENWDA, ALRMP, FHI did not have copies of the thesis. The NEMA representative in Marsabit does have soft copies. The Marsabit ALRMP representative was aware of these copies and felt happy to access information via NEMA

[15] A staff member at KARI is currently synthesising project findings for use by the Kenya Arid and Semi Arid Lands project (KASAL) (Pers comm. Dr Ngutu), but the consultant was unable to see a copy of this.

[16] Pers comm. Esau Omollo, KFS, John Kagwi, Area Director KWS Marsabit.

[17] Pers Comm. NEMA

work by groups such as NEMA, but also allows realistic, science led management options to be developed.

This information will be invaluable for future monitoring of forest health and trends in its use.

As mentioned above, it is important that the information is synthesised and stored in such a way that it can be accessed and used by others in the future (see recommendations).

3.1.4 Outcome 3

Enhanced NRM in the Mt. Marsabit ecosystem through demonstration activities on sustainable land and water management at pilot sites

It should be noted this outcome was changed during the project life as a result of the findings of the initial studies. The initial outcome (from PIR 2007) was stated to be

Agreed aspects of the land-use plan, in particular formulation of appropriate environmental conservation and sustainable land use policies on Mt. Marsabit, introduction of integrated and sustainable crop-livestock production systems and establishment of alternative income generating activities approved and implemented.

The key change was drop the initial wide range of planned activities, which included livestock marketing, introduction of dairy goats, agro forestry and alternative income generation activities, to focus closely on water development and tree planting outside the forest. See annex 10 for a full breakdown of activities under Outcome 3 before and after it was changed.

The project initiated two key demonstration activities: tree planting and water harvesting.
There were a number of innovations in these activities which have been appreciated by local stakeholders. The emphasis for tree planting was on providing water and protection to the seedlings. Trees were planted only in fenced areas with permanent water sources. Surprisingly, this has not been done in the past (in the highlands of Kenya its sufficient to give out trees as livestock are restrained). NGOs and KFS have tended to focus on planting large numbers of trees unprotected only to find that most did not survive the dry season due to destruction by livestock. Staff from KFS, KWS and ALRMP were struck by the success of the project's approach and feel that this has generated important lessons for future afforestation projects in pastoral areas[18].

A second demonstration activity was the construction of the 'water machine' at the project's central nursery. This water harvesting structure was based on the findings of one of the MSc students. Its large roof surface harvests considerable water from mist condensation, which is collected in a large tank and used to irrigate the tree seedlings. Elders from Hurri Hills, who visited the nursery, would like to replicate this in their own area.

[18] Pers comm.. John Kagwi KWS, Meshak Cheto KFS, Doyo Godana ALRMP.

Water Machine

A key recommendation based on the studies was to build dams in gorges around the forest to provide water outside the forest and thereby keep livestock, a major cause of forest degradation, from the forest. Together with the focus communities, the project discussed the development of water committees around these dams. These would be responsible for maintaining the dams, conserving the area around the dams and setting up tree nurseries in the vicinity. Charging for water would pay for maintenance of the dams. As no dam was completed in the project life, this model could not be tested. However, a key project success is that it has persuaded others of the validity of this recommendation. The Ministry of Northern Kenya has agreed to follow up this recommendation and construction of the first dam at Gotu Gardi is already taking place.[19] An important benefit of keeping livestock and herders outside the forest would be to allow natural regeneration of indigenous trees most of whose seeds resist artificial propagation.

Though the project was completed before the demonstration woodlots could be harvested (a minimum of 5 years), and before the dams were built, local stakeholders still felt that the studies and initial work had resulted in a significant increase in local awareness of forest conservation issues[20].

3.1.5 Outcome 4

Enhanced capacity of local and national stakeholders, including communities and institutions, to sustainably manage natural resources and to resolve land-use conflicts.

[19] Consultant visited the dam site on May 27th 2009.

[20] Pers comm. Mamo (NEMA), John Wako (community member) " *the project has led the process [of forest conservation] by creating awareness and showing through the woodlots, what can be done*"

Through providing information on the forest, the project has enhanced the capacity of stakeholders to lobby to protect the forest, as well as the basis to plan management strategies.

The project staff experienced many constraints in developing activities because of the high level of conflicts in the area. However, a positive finding was that water issues can actually bring opposing groups together. An example of this occurred in Gotu Gardi, where after initial conflicts which brought project activities to a halt in 2006, members of different groups came together to agree plans to develop a dam in the gorge. In Dirib Gombo, members of different ethnic groups are also working together in managing their water resource. Project members have found that water can act as 'glue' to bring communities together.[21] "*The project has united warring communities through join endeavours and exchange visits. This work is becoming a peace forum*" (pers comm. John Wako, community member of Marsabit Forest Conservation Committee).

Stakeholders interviewed reported that people around the forest now have a better awareness of the importance of the forest and that the commitment to protect the forest has increased.[22]

As mentioned above, a concern is that the data collected should be made accessible for future use. The project manager feels strongly that action rather than academic papers are the right outputs from the studies. The consultant agrees with this point of view. However, there is a 'middle way' with action combined with 'smart' dissemination targeted strategically at reaching the various key users of the information generated (see recommendations).

While there is some enthusiasm by school staff about the woodlots situated at school sites, the consultant found that the school staff were experiencing problems in maintaining and developing the woodlots without external assistance. The school staff had depended on project staff to come and prune the trees, they did not appear to know how to do this independently. Although the primary purpose of fencing had been to protect seedlings for the first 1-2 years from browsers, we saw signs that, in the absence of the project, fences had been allowed to fall into disrepair, damage by pupils had taken place and weeding had not been carried out. Trees grow slowly and it can take some time for the school community to see the benefits of the planting. A longer project life would have helped the tree plots to have become more firmly established. The schools we visited have very minimal resources and unfortunately none have been able to obtain funds for continued support to the wood lots.

On the national, the project has enhanced the capacity of Universities though enhancing the training of graduate students and supporting field research supervision by their professors[23].

[21] Pers comm. Dr Chema.
[22] KWS, KFS, NEMA, Macoco
[23] Pers comm.. Richard Mugacha, UNOPS

Woodlot at Songa Primary School

Headmaster at Hekima Primary School woodlot

Overall Rating: Moderately Satisfactory.

3.1.6 Project Effectiveness

Given the limitations of time frame, external disruptions and change of focus, the project can be said to have been effective in meeting its planned goals and outcomes.

Limitations have been in full validation of the water harvesting model, synthesis and dissemination of study findings and full handover of woodlots.

Effectiveness: Moderately Satisfactory.

3.1.7 Relevance

This project addresses one of the eligible activities within the GEF Operational Programme No. 4 on the Mountain Ecosystem, GEF OP No 13 on conservation of Agro-ecosystems and GEF OP No. 15 on "Sustainable Land Management". The project addressed *local and global benefits specifically mentioned in GEF OP 15* (contribution to biodiversity protection and planning, sustainable land management options, contribution to peace through cross tribal agreements for water management). It was extremely relevant to the concerns of this OP, and had strong complementarity with the two other GEF projects in Marsabit area (Desert Margins and Indigenous Vegetation project). The comment of the UNEP task manager is that this project has been particularly relevant to GEF because it has catalysed action in the form of development of local action and national level funding for dams.[24]

The potential for replication and wider global lessons would be enhanced if the implementation of the dams was recorded and outcomes monitored. Impact would also be improved by increased dissemination of the project findings and outcomes (see recommendations).

Relevance: Highly Satisfactory.

3.1.8 Efficiency

The project budget was $924,000 US. There was an additional commitment of 2,260,391 US $ made by the Kenyan government. The cash co-financing did not materialise, however the project received considerable in kind funding through provision of staff housing, office space and staff support from GOK. The project can be considered to be efficient in that it resulted in a commitment by GOK (Ministry of Northern Kenya) of 100 million shillings ($1.5 million) for the construction of the dams recommended by the project. In addition project activities have formed the basis for project proposals by Macoco which have been funded by the EU community trust development fund.

Project costs were also reduced through partnership with Nairobi and Kenyatta Universities. These universities provided free tuition to the MSc students who carried out their thesis research with the project.

[24] Pers comm. Mohammed Sessay.

The project's activities have high complementarity with, and relevance to, current developments in government practice (restructuring of KFS and KWS, Water Act, Forest Act etc), and this has increased the efficiency of its work in terms of creating impact with limited funds.

UNEP and UNOP staff interviewed by the consultant were satisfied with the efficiency of the project[25].

Efficiency: Highly Satisfactory.

3.2 Sustainability

3.2.1 Financial Sustainability

Financial sustainability is the greatest concern of the stakeholders consulted.[26] Many expressed concern that finances would not be forthcoming to follow through activities that the project has started. This was identified as a key concern during the project's mid term review. As a result the project and UNEP staff worked hard to obtain funding for the next stage. They were successful in getting support and a financial commitment from the Ministry of Northern Kenya to continue work on the dam construction projects. Tenders have been put out and this work has begun. The Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries have also shown some interest in funding dams for livestock watering but this appears to have faded[27]. KWS and KFS are committed to the development of the forest plan but are unable to set a firm date and have not indicated that finances are available[28]. It remains to be seen whether these finances will materialise.

Financial Sustainability: Moderately unlikely

3.2.2 Socio-political Sustainability

The socio-political stability is a major threat to the development of sustainable management plans for the forest. Conflict between different tribal groups around the forest has led to instability, displacement of groups and has slowed down longer-term development activities. However, project staff are optimistic that water development can provide a way of bringing disparate groups together.

A historical view of deforestation shows that large tracts of forest are lost before each election, as land is given away to curry favours by local politicians. The growth of public awareness and civil society interest groups such as Macoco should help reduce this risk. Greater awareness of the importance of the forest at the national level would also prevent this occurring.

Rating: Moderately Likely

[25] Pers comm. Md Sessay, Martin Okun, Richard Mugacha
[26] Pers comm. ALRMP, KFS, NEMA, school principals.
[27] Pers comm. Dr Chema
[28] Pers comm. Esau Omollo, KFS, John Kagwi, KWS

3.2.3 Sustainability of Institutional framework/governance

The sustainability of the institutional framework and governance structures for forest management appear to be good as the project activities complement and have provided support to ongoing restructuring of KFS forest management structures which give more control and decision making powers to communities living around forests. The Ministry of Water's strategy for water development in Marsabit area also complements (and draws on) the projects findings and recommendations.

The formation of Macoco has increased the sustainability of the project's works. Association members are active in education, lobbying and have succeeded in obtaining funding from the EU's Community Development Trust Fund for project's which build on this project's recommendations[29]. (pers comm. John Wako, community member of Marsabit Forest Conservation Committee, pers comm. Mamo, NEMA). Macoco are committed to maintaining the nurseries formed by the project and to following through the recommendation to plant 100,000 seedlings per year.

Following the mid term review, the project manager and the UNEP task manager made considerable efforts to ensure that the project's recommendations for dam construction were continued after the end of the project life. As a result of this lobbying, the Ministry of Northern Kenyan and Arid Lands agreed to take on this work and allocated funding for it.

However, there are a number of areas of concern. The first is for the sustainability of the forest monitoring system. The project has collected extremely valuable baseline data and has created the basis for an effective monitoring system. However, it is not clear who will take responsibility for this. KWS appears mainly concerned with monitoring wildlife species and poaching, KFS does not have the resources to carry out monitoring activities. KARI and KEFRI were suggested as possibilities[30]. Neither was closely involved in the project's activities. In order to maximise the positive impact of the project's work it is important to ensure that the data collected is shared with the potential monitoring agents. The development of the management plan would be a good time to decide on monitoring responsibilities (see recommendation).

The project has generated a demand for further studies e.g. study of mountain aquifers (pers comm. John Kagwi, KWS), study of clone eucalyptus (pers comm. Chema), propagation of indigenous tree species (Chema). A question the project raises is how we can institutionalise the production of science to guide decision-making.

A final concern is for the sustainability of the school woodlot projects. The local schools appear extremely under resourced and have lack of resources and skills to carry out maintenance of the woodlots.

Institutional/Governance sustainability: Moderately Likely.

[29] These include advocacy, construction of small dams, improved charcoal production, brick making machines, fuel efficient jiko, tanks for rain water harvesting and 14 tree nurseries.
[30] Pers comm. KFS and KWS staff.

3.2.3 Environmental sustainability

All the activities developed by the project promote environmental sustainability in the management of Marsabit Mountain.

A key threat to the sustainability of project outcomes is the increased incidence of drought due to climate change. When livestock numbers within the forest are controlled, indigenous trees can regenerate. However, the mountain is a traditional drought refuge for livestock owners and in times of drought (as the consultant observed in her visit in May 2009) it is difficult to deny access into the forest.

Increased settlement in the forest margins, clearance of land by farmers, or for urban development also threatens the viability of the forest. The project's activities have raised awareness and local concern about this issue, and new forest management structures[31] should help protect the forest from further clearance.

Environmental Sustainability: Moderately Likely.

3.3 Achievement of outputs and activities

For detailed description of achievements under each output and activity, and for completion of recommended action suggested by mid term review (see annexes 6 and 7).

It should be noted that these did change considerably from the initial design as a result of information collected by the studies, and as project team became aware of the work of others in the area. Consequently a number of the planned activities under Outcome 3 (for example work on forage production, agro forestry and dairy goats) were dropped as the project team made the decision to focus on woodlots and water (see discussion of this in 3.1.4, and annex 10 for details of change of outputs and activities).

Successfully delivered outputs were:

- Mapping of forest transects
- Status and trends in changes in mountain flora and fauna biodiversity, abiotic resources established.
- MSc Theses completed (see Annex 8 for details)
- Baseline information on transects
- Incorporation of study findings into natural resource management plan.
- Development of water harvesting techniques
- Development of tree nurseries and woodlots (one central nursery and four satellite woodlots surviving, in addition four schools have independently established woodlots).
- Woodlots established
- Process of boundary mapping initiated.

[31] Grass root Environmental management committees are being assisted by an environmental lawyer to merge local land use regulations with the Environmental Management coordination act and the forest act. These groups then have representation on the newly formed regional forest conservation committees. This is Ewaso North Conservancy (has one appointed chair, and reps from Moyale, Marsabit, Samburu and Isiolo). The TORs for this committee are just being developed, but they should have considerable impact on the forest management plans.. Pers comm. John Wako, Marsabit representative, Forest conservation committee.

- Brochure produced to share project findings.
- Seminars held to share findings.
- Consultations with communities.
- School staff carried out exchange visits to other sites. Elders from Hurri Hills visited the sites to look at the feasibility of replicating this in their areas.
- Communities collaborating on water management.

The following outputs were not achieved: -
- community agreement on NRM plan in 40% of communities
- wide scale change in community NRM practices (though shoots of change can been seen in the pilot sites and in subsequent projects initiated by Mecoco using EU Community Development Trust Funding).
- information/data system in place (data available but not synthesised for accessibility).
- Strong socioeconomic baseline[32]
- Journal articles, video, book, website.
- Participation of women wood collectors in afforestation activities[33]
- Funding proposals by schools.
- Water associations legalised[34].

The mid term review recommended a number of areas that needed to be strengthened before the end of the project: strengthening local institutions, identifying alternative livelihood strategies (to take pressure off the forest), mobilising additional resources for financial sustainability, continued lobbying to put a forest management plan in place, and dissemination of project findings.

The project team did well, and achieved positive results in the last year, in looking for finances for dam construction (agreement with Ministry of Northern Kenya), strengthening local institutions (support to Macoco). The team also continued lobbying for the forest management plan though this remained uncompleted at the end of the project life, this can be said to be outside he project team's control (Outcome 1).

Community action plans and water management structures (Outcome 3) were not completed as planned by the end of the project life. This was due to the fact that the dams had not yet been built, and was outside the project team's control.

A key area that was not addressed in the last year was the dissemination of the project findings (activities related to Outcome 2). The planned website and book did not materialise.

Overall Rating: Moderately Satisfactory.

[32] (There were two students)This was due to problems with one of the thesis and follow up by the thesis superviser. In addition, one of the two students got a well paying job in an NGO and has been able to complete the write-up despite pleas from his supervisor and the project to surrender his raw data for compilation by other scholars.

[33] Women wood collectors were once made to plant seedlings as a condition to obtaining permits, and were very unhappy to do this. This was the only project activity involving this group.

[34] "Unfortunately there was no *de facto* legal Association but Gotu Gardi has been assessed by a District Cooperatives Officer for legal registration. There are Water User Associations at all boreholes but these are not recognised legal entities (can not sue or be sued). The only recognised legal entities would be Cooperatives registered under the Cooperatives Act or Societies, under the Societies Act." Pers comm. Dr Chema

3.4 Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation systems.

The project team produced technical and financial technical reports at six monthly intervals. The consultant reviewed the following reports.

Project document (2004)
Technical and financial reports:
Progress report June – Dec 2004 – June 2005 (?)
Progress report July – December 2005
Progress report April – June 2006
Progress report July – September 2006 and annex
Progress report Oct – Dec 2006
FA Monitoring tool.
Progress rep Jan – March 2007
Progress rep April – June 2007 and annex
Progress report Oct – Dec 2007
Annual PIR reports: July 2005 – 2006, July 2006 – June 2007, July 2007 – June 2008
Midterm review - March 2008

Steering committee minutes – March 2006, March 2007

There was no terminal report completed for the project.[35]

M&E Design

Design of the M&E followed standard GEF/UNEP processes. A shortcoming in the design was in considering the impact of imposing a double layer of accountability through involvement of AGREF, UNOPS and UNEP (see discussion below under implementation). There appears to have been a failure to budget sufficiently for M&E activities such as the terminal report (see budgeting below).

Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory.

M&E plan Implementation

Focal points for monitoring were the project manager, the UNOPS desk officer and the UNEP task manager. Steering committee meetings were critical events where changes in the project outcomes were agreed. While the MSc students were working in the forest, the project manager held daily 'debriefing' sessions where the students shared information and discussed ideas.

The regular monitoring reports are extremely detailed and comprehensive. The project shows a good level of self-reflection and ability to adapt to new information opportunities and constraints that arose during the project life. Richard Mugacha, of UNOPS, observed that the M&E framework was highly satisfactory and aligned the project towards the realization of its output targets and overall implementation outcomes[36].

[35] According to the project manager, computers were taken by the Ministry of Northern Lands at the end of the project on the understanding that they would be made available to the Agref team for further use. This has not happened and reports which were on the computer and which would have been used to create the terminal report are not accessible.
[36] Pers comm. Richard Mugacha, UNOPS

The project team showed some dissatisfaction with the steering committee, due to the high turnover of steering committee representatives over the project life and resulting lack of continuity. However the 2006 steering committee meeting was used successfully to change the project outcomes to respond to new priorities coming from the forest studies (see 3.1.4).

The mid term review was very successful in allowing the team to take stock of achievements and areas that needed more attention. The review resulted in a number of important recommendations. Some of these were followed up in the last year, resulting in improved project outcomes (See Annex 7 for details).

UNEP subcontracted project management to UNOPS, who in turn subcontracted implementation to AGREF. It is not clear that the additional 'monitoring' layer of UNOPS added any value to the monitoring and evaluation process. The UNOPS staff member consulted indicated that the double layer: UNOPS/UNEP, had value in giving UNEP an added quality in reporting, attaining agreed deliverables and compliance with audit requirements. However this may not be really essential in a medium sized project. On the negative side the double layer appeared to increase bureaucracy in project management and at one point created a serious problem when funds were held up for 5 months.[37]

The Focal Area Portfolio Monitoring Tool monitors how project relates to GEF targets. This should make it a useful tool for GEF coordinators to assess how far the project contributes to GEF's wider aims. The consultant found only one completed report for 2006.

Rating: Moderately Satisfactory.

Budgeting and funding for M&E

There was no budget for project monitoring and evaluation activities, though a small sum ($251 US) was spent on internal monitoring review meetings. The budget for steering committee meetings ($12,423) was only partially used ($3660 spent).

Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory.

Overall Rating: Moderately Satisfactory.

3.5 Replicability/Catalytic role.

Evidence of the project's catalytic role can be seen in the following:

[37] The project mid term report notes that "Frequent problems arising from the inconsistency between accounts reported by AGREF and those reported by UNOPS to UNEP were caused by the use of different templates for reporting purpose at UNOPS and UNEP., MOUs between UNOPS and AGREF requiring different templates and timeframe for budgeting and reporting as well as high turn-over of staff in charge of Marsabit project at UNOPS and FMOs at UNEP. Whereas UNOPS on one hand has a restricted role of overall supervision of project implementation focusing mainly on following up on administrative and financial issues, UNEP on the other hand is contributing to technical aspects of project implementation and direct AGREF support. These technical and administrative bureaucratic layers (AGREF → UNOPS → UNEP) led sometimes to delays in disbursement of funds from UNOPS to AGREF." Mid Term Review page 22.

- formation of a local conservation consortium (Macoco) and use of data for lobbying and advocacy.
- Data has been used by NEMA for education and advocacy work (NEMA state of the environment report and training PowerPoint presentations for environmental management committees)
- Project findings and recommendations have formed the basis of new projects which have been funded (CDTF and Min of NK).
- French Development Organisation are considering funding follow up activities in Marsabit (Dr Chema pers comm.).
- Ministry of Livestock Development/ADB are considering supporting the construction of a weir (Progress report July – September 2006)
- Ministry of Northern Kenya have agreed to build dams at sites identified by the project.
- School woodlot projects resulted in requests from many other schools.
- Demand for further studies e.g. aquifer study[38], study of eucalyptus clone.
- AGREF planning to replicate the ideas in the Hurri hills, Mt Kulal and Kaya forests in the coast.
- Interest by Equity bank in providing banking to water users associations
- Opportunities for replication: -
- There is potential to replicate management plans in other mist forests in Marsabit. Visiting elders from nearby Hurri Hills have requested a similar project in their area
- Science led advocacy and development also a replicable model (though need to find appropriate institutional setting for this).
- Approach to tree planting is relevant to other pastoral areas[39].

The opportunities for replication are very good BUT the impact would be greater if findings were well documented and shared with others particularly at the national and international level.

Overall Rating: Satisfactory.

3.6 Preparation and Readiness

The project's strength was that it responded to a definite need and built on recommendations by the Kenya Forest Working Group (Rapid Forest Appraisal 2001) and the long experience of the IPAL project in Marsabit area. The project manager had extensive experience of working in Marsabit and of the key institutions and organisations involved.

Having said this, a constraint was that the project team had little experience of the mountain area itself. The initial project document reflects the lack of awareness of the true nature of the issues to be addressed in conserving Mt Marsabit (see particularly activities in outcome 3). Happily the strong monitoring and evaluation system was able to identify and change these planned activities as the project progressed.

[38] Pers comm. J Kagwi, KWS
[39] "Lessons from this project (on protecting tree seedlings) are relevant to all pastoral areas" (pers comm. Mechak Cheto, KFS).

The goals of the initial project document were also, in the opinion of the consultant, over ambitious given the fact that the changes required involved extensive changes in attitudes and practices and management actions involving more than one government agency (KWS, KFS, Ministry of Water and the County council). Any project involving tree planting also needs a longer time frame than three years to convince people of its utility (woodlots need a minimum of 5 years before you can begin to harvest). Nearly all the stakeholders consulted regretted the short length of the project, given its ambitious goals.

An additional shortcoming in planning was in the consideration of how key stakeholders would be involved. Key stakeholders such as KARI and KEFRI never really got involved in the project[40]. University supervisors were reluctant to put time into the development of a book to summarise study findings. The project manager puts this down to lack of motivation in terms of funding to do these activities.

Overall Rating: Unsatisfactory.

3.7 Country ownership/driveness

The project's complementarity with recent policy developments (Forest Act 2005, Water Act 2002) and restructuring of key ministries (Kenya Forest Services and Ministry of Water) shows that it is extremely relevant to Kenya's national environmental and development agenda[41].

Country ownership of the project process was not as strong as it could have been due to the funding being largely channelled to AGREF, a non-profit company (Company Limited by Guarantee). Lack of significant funding, or 'buy in' limited the day-to-day involvement of important government stakeholders: KARI, KEFRI, KFS and KWS. The project was criticised by some stakeholders for not making enough efforts to influence the national agenda[42]. The project manager's response to this is that the nature, cause and extent of the problem were not recognised until the project was coming to an end. Indeed it could be argued that the pilot activities need to be followed through for some more time to draw lessons before national level lobbying is carried out (see recommendations).

Project and UNEP staff did make good efforts to lobby at the national level during the last year of the project. Ultimately and despite the criticisms, there is evidence of good 'buy in' of the results and of drive to follow through the project's recommendations demonstrated by the following:

- All stakeholders interviewed appreciative of data collected and in agreement with recommendations of the project[43].
- The Ministry of Northern Kenya has agreed to fund the construction of the dams recommended by the project.

[40] Initially it was planned that they should provide 4 students to the project, but this didn't happen.
[41] *" the timing was very good in that the project started working here just as KFS was restructuring and provided the information to motivate people to take action*" John Wako (community member).
[42] Pers comm. ALRMP, KWS.
[43] Pers comm.KWS, KFS, ALRMP, Water Development Authority

- Strong support of project activities by NEMA and incorporation of project findings into District Environmental plans.[44]
- KFS committed to develop forest management plan in near future.[45]
- Water development authority staff say the project has provided a model for interaction with communities in Marsabit.[46]

Overall Rating: Moderately Satisfactory.

3.8 Stakeholder participation/public awareness

There are a large number of stakeholders involved in the activities and planned outcomes of this project. They include: -

National organisations: Kenya Forestry Services, Kenya Wildlife Services, Ministry of Water, Ministry of Northern Kenya and other Arid lands, Kenya Meteorological Department, Tree Biotech Project, Universities, Kenya Forest, Working Group, Forest Action Network. Kenya Association of Forest Users, Ministry of Cooperative Development and Marketing.

Local: Marsabit District Natural resource Forum, District Environmental Committee, District Steering Group, Macoco, Country Council, local administration (chiefs), traditional elders, NGOs (FHi), NEMA, Schools, seed collectors, Catholic church, Environmental management committees, forest management committees, District Youth Programme.

International: International Remote Sensing Centre, Belgium, UNU, Canada, OUCE (Oxford), New Mexico State University). Other GEF projects (including desert margins project and indigenous vegetation project in Marsabit).

The project team engaged with stakeholders in the following ways: -

National

- initial consultations in project design (particularly KARI, KWS and KFS)
- Production of leaflet to share project findings.
- Steering committee meetings.
- Meetings with key stakeholders in last year of the project.

Marsabit

- briefings to District Steering group and District Environmental committee during project life.
- Briefings and provision of information to NEMA and Macoco.[47]
- Meetings with leaders in communities around the mountain.
- Response to requests by local groups and schools to get involved in project activities.
- Joint projects (with KFS, ALRMP, FHi, Catholic church)
- Video? (not seen by consultant, not sure how much this was used).

[44] Pers comm. NEMA
[45] Pers comm. Esau Omollo, KFS
[46] Pers comm. Mr Maitima, Ewaso Nyiro Water Development Authority
[47] The project team avoided holding too many workshops as government staff demand sitting allowances for these. Instead they preferred the strategy of giving information to key information providers such as NEMA.

International

- Presentation (using Posters, Brochure and the project Video) at GEF conference in Cape Town
- Presentation at a conference in Iceland.

A particular strength of the project was its opportunistic approach whereby it responded to requests and good ideas coming from stakeholders who were particularly enthusiastic and motivated. This has resulted in a core groups of extremely motivated forest advocates (ex employees and project partners) who are continuing the project's work even today[48].

There was criticism by some local stakeholders that the project did not participate regularly in District Planning forums, or harmonise its activities with NGOs[49]. These criticisms are not borne out by the evidence of project activities. The issue here may be due to the high turnover of staff amongst some of the key agencies (KWS, NGOs etc) and the fact that the project has not been active since December 2008.

The consultant's impression is that the level of awareness of project findings and forest management issues is high amongst Marsabit stakeholders. The formation of Macoco is evidence of the high level of local buy-in. However, national level awareness could be increased through increased dissemination of project findings (see recommendations).

Overall Rating: Satisfactory.

3.9 Financial planning (see Annex 4 for breakdown of budgets and co-financing).

The GEF funding provided to the project was $924,000 and and in-kind co-funding from Kenya (Ministries, Research Institutes, and Universities) for US$ 1,504,099.

The final analysis of co-financing and leveraged resources provided by Martin Okun, Financial Management officer at UNEP, shows a total sum of $2,260,391. This can be broken down into the following

1. The AGREF (Agricultural Research Foundation) contribution was in the form of foregone income by a decision to stay in the project area continuously for 39 months and contribution of equipment and assets to the project.
2. Two public universities shared the cost for the more than a dozen post-graduate students through partial waiving of tuition and supervisory fees.
3. It took several years, but ultimately, NGOs and CBOs and individual community members have been contributing financially (largely fuel for vehicles) and labour to the project.
4. Although poorly endowed itself, the local district forest services office seconded 5 staff members and casual workers midway through the project whom they pay.
5. Kenya Wild Service provided staff time as well as subsidies in housing and office space.

[48] Pers comm. John Wako, Mamo, Katelo.
[49] Pers comm. FHi, KWS.

6. The largest input has been agreement to the project's main request of constructing 6 rock-catchment dams on the periphery of the forest largely to keep livestock out of the forest but also provide domestic water for villagers. The new Ministry of Development of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands has put in process the construction process in collaboration with the Ministry of Water and Irrigation. A joint team of administrators, surveyors and engineers is already in the field for this work. A total of Kshs 100million (about $1.5million) is in the budget for this.

There was some variation in the initial budget with significantly more money than expected being used for community support activities (see annex 4). Changes in the budget were agreed at the project's steering committee meetings. All budget variance fell within the 30% limitation and was deemed acceptable by the UNEP FMO.[50]

AGREF submitted quarterly financial reports to UNOPS and UNEP. As mentioned above, the value of this 'double layer' of management is questionable. There were problems faced at the beginning of the project due to an inconsistency between UNEP and UNOPS templates for financial reporting. At another point, dispersal of funds was delayed due to a change in UNOPS management (see Mid Term review p 22). Apart from these hitches, financial planning and management appears satisfactory.

Overall Rating: Satisfactory.

3.10 Implementation approach.

The project management structure was extremely simple at the field level. While the plan had been to have a project manager based in Nairobi with field coordinator in Marsabit, the project manager ended up spending much of the project life in Marsabit. In the first year, the project manager was joined by 15 MSc students. Once their theses were completed, the project team in Marsabit consisted simply of the project manager, IT specialist and a driver. Two steering committee meetings were held during the project life (should have been three).

Reporting, as mentioned earlier was from Agref to UNOPS.

The project was effective in using the results of the MSc studies to redefine and improve project performance indicators and targets[51]. The project implementation, at field level, can be described as highly flexible and opportunistic. This approach was extremely well suited to the difficult environment and circumstances faced by the project and allowed them to adapt rapidly and to maximise the positive outcomes of the project.

Constraints experienced by the project included:

- drought

[50] Pers comm. Martin Okun
[51] Pers com. Richard Mugacha , UNOPS

- security problems at project sites[52]
- effect of post election violence on government partners
- high turnover of staff in key Ministries.
- Financial constraints caused by excessive layers of project implementation and execution between AGREF, UNOPS and UNEP[53]
- adaptation of log framework to respond to findings of student studies and to avoid duplication by activities being carried out by other stakeholders (outcome 3 largely changed)
- high responsiveness to recommendations coming from student theses (e.g. construction of water harvesting machine, development of plans for dams).
- Project team identified and made efforts to work in partnerships with individuals with real enthusiasm and motivation for forest conservation issues (e.g. Mamo at NEMA, key nursery workers, community members, members of the Catholic mission in Marsabit).
- Project team responded to requests by schools and groups with real enthusiasm and proven commitment to tree planting.
- Project team responded to constraints in government ministries after the post election violence, by increasing its efforts to build a local civil society consortium for forest conservation.
- UNEP/project team extended project life to compensate for constraints experienced.
- Team learnt from mistakes and adapted its approach accordingly e.g. experimentation with individual woodlots to address constraints in community management of school lots.

On the whole the project implementation approach was extremely effective and has maximised the positive outcomes in what was an extremely difficult working environment and political environment. The project team did not find the steering committee meetings useful[54] largely due to the high turnover of Ministry representatives. However, from her review of the minutes of the two steering committees, the consultant feels that they played an important role in informing key stakeholders of project activities, authorising change and maintaining accountability. Its unfortunate that only two steering committee meetings were held and that none were held in Marsabit itself.

One constraint in implementation was the failure to obtain full reports from all of the students who did studies in the forest (thirteen reports were obtained, socioeconomic report was of poor

[52] Local conflict mentioned as a problem in 2005 (lost four months) (PIR 2006). Progress reports Dec 2204 – June 2005, July – Dec 2005. This is often due to disputes over scarce resources particularly water. Conflicts halted work in Gotu Gardi in 2006 (Progress report April – June 2006). Security problems Badassa school (Progress report Jan – March 2007).

[53] Pers comm.. project manager. In addition the mid term review notes that "Since UNOPS has not been able to monitor project implementation at ground level to assess the factors affecting the implementation process, there are cases where the release of the funds is not matching the needs on the ground as far as the implementation timeliness is concerned. Although these have not been significant problems, delayed disbursement of funds by UNOPS has sometimes forced AGREF to pre finance some expenses like diesel to keep the field operations going" p 31 The reviewer also notes that "Another challenge faced by the UNOPS in terms of discharging its project executing role appears to have been linked to some human capacity problem, where UNOPS was some-how overstretched in managing several projects from the same coordination desk and also at a time when there was a high turnover of the focal persons charged with overseeing the implementation of this project. Unfamiliarity with the ground situation also seems to have been a course of delay in approving the field request in good time and for the appropriate amount of funding: p 33

[54] The project cannot recall an instance where key inputs have been made at the steering committee nor its success can be linked directly to it. (PIR 2008)

quality). The project team have reflected on this and have identified that the best students to involve are scholarship students (highest calibre) who are working for an MSc degree (high motivation). (see project lessons).

Overall Rating: Satisfactory.

3.12 UNEP supervision and backstopping.

This appears to have been satisfactory. The only issue is that of the double layer of management with UNOPS.

Overall Rating: Satisfactory.

4. OVERALL RATINGS TABLE

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
A. Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating) **Sub criteria (below)**	The project has worked under significant constraints (environmental and political). Project goals were ambitious and timing short to achieve these. Given this context its achievements in working towards the project's goal have been considerable.	**Moderately satisfactory**
A. 1. Effectiveness	Project achievements have been considerable given the constraints faced.	**Moderately satisfactory**
A. 2. Relevance	Project highly relevant to GEF priorities with good potential for replication and wider global lessons.	**Highly satisfactory.**
A. 3. Efficiency	Good use of funds and succeeded in leveraging significant sums for continuation of work started.	**Highly satisfactory.**
B. Sustainability of Project outcomes **(Overall rating)** **Sub criteria (below)**	Completion of management plan and recommended interventions requires considerable funding and government support. Verbal commitment has been given.	**Moderately unlikely.**
B. 1. Financial	Key GOK departments are under resourced and Marsabit has low profile at the national level.	**Moderately unlikely.**
B. 2. Socio Political	Increase in awareness by civil society, and peace building through joint water initiatives look promising for socio political sustainability.	**Moderately likely.**
B. 3. Institutional framework and governance	Many positive developments but concerns over continuity of activities initiated by the project (forest monitoring, maintenance of tree lots).	**Moderately likely.**
B. 4. Environmental	Project recommendations and ongoing initiatives are beneficial to the local environment.	**Moderately likely.**
C. Achievement of outputs and activities	Much achieved. Community management plans and water management structures not completed because dams not yet built. Dissemination not adequate.	**Moderately satisfactory.**

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
D. Monitoring and Evaluation	Project M&E regular and resulted in adaptive and accountable project management. Problems with UNOPS management layer.	**Moderately Satisfactory**
D1 M&E Design	Double layer of accountability was cumbersome. Failure to plan and budget for some activities.	**Moderately unsatisfactory.**
D2 M&E plan implementation	Regular monitoring occurred and monitoring instruments enabled the project to respond and change as appropriate. Some problems with steering committees and some monitoring activities not carried out.	**Moderately satisfactory.**
D3 Budgeting and funding for M&E	There was no budget for M&E activities apart from steering committee meetings	**Moderately unsatisfactory**
E. Replicability/Catalytic Role	Very good. But need to disseminate findings more widely.	**Satisfactory**
F. Preparation and readiness	Unrealistic goals. Not enough consideration of how to involve key stakeholders.	**Unsatisfactory**
G. Country ownership / driveness	High level of appreciation by local GOK stakeholders, but some key actors, particularly national level, not involved as much as they might have been in project implementation.	**Moderately Satisfactory**
H. Stakeholders involvement	Very good. More dissemination of project findings would help.	**Satisfactory**
I. Financial planning	All appears to be in order here. Some problem with delay in disbursement by UNOPS.	**Satisfactory**
J. Implementation approach	Flexible, opportunistic management style well suited to the project context.	**Satisfactory**
K. UNEP Supervision and backstopping	No problems identified except with UNOPS/UNEP discontinuities.	**Satisfactory**

5. Lessons

5.1 MSc Studies are a useful tool for Science led Development

Applicable Contexts
All GEF projects.

Project Context
The use of MSc studies for investigations on key forest issues and characteristics was extremely effective (see section 3.1). The studies were focused, of high quality and provided results and practical recommendations in a short period of time. The results were highly appreciated by key stakeholders and there is a demand for further similar studies to guide development decisions (e.g. study of clone eucalyptus, aquifer mapping).

The project experience was that the best results were achieved when working with MSc students rather than students who were not working towards an academic qualification, as the latter were less motivated to complete their work and write up (for example if offered alternative employment). The payment arrangement could also be used to motivate students to complete writing up and dissemination e.g. lump sum payment on successful provision of report.

In addition to providing useful and practical information, using national students for MSc studies enhances university programmes and builds up local knowledge and capacity of key environmental issues. Using students from the area in question is particularly valuable for providing local expertise, capacity and awareness.

Prescriptive Action
Project designers should consider using MSc students to support science led development projects. Ensure that payment is structured in such a way to motivate students to fully complete and disseminate their work.

5.2 Water Projects can act as instruments of conflict resolution

Applicable contexts
Pastoralist areas (Kenya and elsewhere?)

Project Context
The project team found that water projects are of such high priority that even groups who are in conflict can be persuaded to meet together and cooperate to bring these about (see section 3.2.2).

Prescriptive Action
Water projects could be an entry point for organisations focusing on peace building in Northern Kenya.

5.3 Water and Protection are key factors for afforestation in Pastoralist areas.

Applicable contexts
Forestry projects in pastoral areas.

Project Context
Recent afforestation efforts in Marsabit have been largely unsuccessful as livestock destroy the seedlings during the dry period. Forestry staff told us that in other areas of Kenya, staff simply give out seedlings, or plant seedlings and survival rate is good. The project studies looked at the constraints in planting in Marsabit and realised that water and livestock damage in the dry season were key issues. As a result all the project's tree planting initiatives emphasised water availability and protection. Tree lots were set up only at sites of permanent water and fences were built around the planted areas. These fences could then be moved to extend the planted area as the trees matured.

Though this lesson may appear to be 'obvious' it represents an important innovation in practice in Marsabit area. The lesson was mentioned with appreciation by KFS and KWS staff[55].

Prescriptive Action
Projects planning afforestation in pastoral areas should plan and budget for adequate water and fencing.

6.4 The Dissemination Strategy is a critical element of project design.

Applicable Context
All GEF projects

Project Context
In order for the project's goals to be achieved it is essential that a wide number of stakeholders are involved and informed of the key forest issues, mechanisms involved and management options. Disseminating project findings and management recommendations is therefore critical to the project's success.

Despite this fact, dissemination was not giving much consideration in the project design. For example there was no budget for a book summarising the MSc findings, for production of a web site, nor was there a plan to synthesise findings in such a way that they could be used by key stakeholders for further monitoring of the forest health.

Prescriptive Action
A dissemination strategy must be central to project design. No project should be passed unless the team are satisfied that dissemination has been adequately considered. This does not necessarily have to be in the form of academic papers. Project teams should consider who needs the knowledge generated (e.g. for application, advocacy, awareness raising) and in what form it should be best generated. (see also recommendations below).

5.5 Stakeholder Analysis is critical when there are many actors involved.

Applicable Context

---

55 Older woodlots in Marsabit show that tree planting has been carried out successfully in the past. However, there is a high turnover of staff in key ministries and most forestry staff come from non pastoral areas. It seems that the institutional memory of these institutions has been poor.

Projects with many actors involved.

Project Context
Weaknesses in the project's sustainability (see section 3.2.1 and 3.2.3 and 3.6) derive in some part to the failure to identify and sufficiently involve the actors who would play a key role in implementing project recommendations and continuing action begun by the project. Examples of this include the lack of financial incentives to draw KARI staff into the project, lack of involvement of KEFRI, who in practice should have a key role in science led forestry innovation and lack of financial incentives for academic staff to work on a scientific publication of the results.

Prescriptive Action
To increase project effectiveness and sustainability, project planning must include a clear analysis of key actors in the focus sector and a realistic strategy for involving them in the project.

5.6 Keep Management Structure Simple for Medium Sized Projects.

Applicable Context
GEF medium sized projects.

Project Context
The management of this medium sized project was delegated to UNOPS who in turn delegated management to the AGREF team who were the initiators and designers of the project. In practice this resulted in a double layer of management which does not appear to have added any benefits to the project, but rather created additional bureaucracy and delays in funding. See sections 3.4 and 3.10. [56]

Prescriptive Action
This situation may be a 'one off' due to the particular circumstances of the project. However, a more general lesson is to minimise the layers of management in medium sized projects.

5.7 Forestry Projects need time to mature

Applicable Context
GEF medium sized forestry projects involving tree planting.

Project Context
Tree planting activities began in 2005 and the project came to an end in 2008. The aim of the tree planting plots was to demonstrate the potential to create sources of firewood and income outside the forest. The hoped for outcome was a change in local attitudes and management practices. However the demonstration could not be completed because it takes at least five years from planting to harvesting timber trees. Communities around the wood plot sites have not yet been able to see the full benefits of the wood plots. This may explain why in some cases wood

[56] This lesson was also noted in the mid term review: "One lesson that UNEP/GEF may want to address for similar future projects is the reduction of the bureaucracies from three levels (UNEP-UNOPS –AGREF) to only two levels (AGREF- UNEP) provided the implementing institution is well known for transparency and accountability like AGREF has been so far". P 33

plots are not being adequately cared for. The consultant also found that local managers of wood plots did not feel fully qualified to manage the plots (see 3.15 and 3.6)

The majority of the stakeholders interviewed[57] felt strongly that the project had ended too soon, and emphasised the need for a longer time frame for projects involving tree planting.

Prescriptive Action
Projects involving tree planting need to be given a longer time frame and/or be more realistic in terms of what they can achieve in the project period.

5.8 Advantages of using an Opportunistic and Actor Oriented Approach to Project Management.

Applicable Context
All GEF projects, but particularly applicable in difficult situations which require a flexible and pragmatic approach.

Project Context
This project faced an exceptionally difficult working environment (see 1.4 and 3.10). Constraints addressed included drought, local conflict and political upheaval. The fact that the project was able to achieve considerable success despite the enormous constraints faced is due, to a large extent, to the opportunistic, flexible and actor oriented approach used (see 3.10) for examples. In particular the project managers identification and focus on working with individuals who were particularly motivated and passionate about the forest means that the work developed by the project (particularly advocacy work) is still being continued today, in some cases without funding.

This success can be attributed to the project manager's considerable local knowledge and experience. In a case where a team does not have this kind of experience, tools such as stakeholder analysis, innovation systems and positive deviance analysis can be used to identify key actors, opportunities and to promote a responsive management style.

Prescriptive Action
Use of tools such as stakeholder, innovation systems and positive deviance analysis can help identify key actors and opportunities at the project planning stage and as part of project monitoring.

6. Recommendations

As this is a terminal review, recommendations are restricted to essential action which is needed to enhance the project's impact.

6.1 Dissemination of Baseline data and Project Lessons

Issue/Problem

[57] Pers comm. Mr Maitima, Ewaso North Water Development Authority, KWS, KFS, ALRMP, Headmaster, Songa Primary School

The project has generated valuable baseline data on Marsabit forest which can be used for further monitoring of the forest status. The project's experience, as discussed in section 5, has also generated lessons which have applications more widely to other GEF projects or afforestation projects in other pastoral areas.

However the current dissemination of this information has been limited (see 3.15 and 3.8). MSc reports are not easily accessible (soft copies were found with the project manager and NEMA Marsabit office only), and a web search does not locate any information whatsoever on the project or, perhaps more importantly, the status of Marsabit forest. Many of the stakeholders interviewed indicated that they would like copies of the MSc reports[58]

While the MSc findings are enormously valuable they are not readily accessible to those who will be involved in ongoing monitoring (KARI, KEFRI, Forest Action Group, KFS, local community environmental management groups). The MSc theses are large and very academic documents and information from these is not in a form which can be easily used by some of the above groups. It would be useful to synthesise the key findings of the project and to develop indicators which could be used by these groups for ongoing monitoring of the forest status.

In addition a number of those interviewed stressed the importance of sharing the project findings for information and advocacy at the national level[59]. Without this Marsabit based offices may not receive the funds they need to carry through the planned activities.

Dissemination of broader lessons has also been very limited (GEF presentation and presentation at conference in Iceland). This is regrettable as the project has much to share.

Doing this will increase the impact of the projects work and should increase the chances of the project's goal and outcomes being achieved.

Recommended action (feasible, specific (who, what), performance target included)
The development of the following dissemination material is of high priority. It is recommended that GEF funding be provided to assist UNEP in producing this material. This activity should be undertaken as soon as possible in order to keep up the momentum created by the project, and to prevent duplication of studies by others.

Material to be produced and target audience/users.

What	Who to produce	Target audience/users
Baseline findings and key indicators documented in a form to make them accessible for forest monitoring.	KARI Marsabit staff are already synthesising the MSc studies. These reports could form the basis of this output. Consultant to review and complete in consultation target groups to ensure information is usable and relevant..	Agencies responsible for monitoring forest status (KFS, KWS, KEFRI, Forest Action group). Community environmental management groups.

[58] Mr Maitama, Ewaso North Water Development Authority, Esau Omollo, KFS, Cheto KFS (Marsabit), Fatuma Abdikar (ALRMP), John Kagwi KWS. Tuke Guyo, FHi.
[59] Pers comm.. John Kagwi, KFS, Fatuma Abdikar ALRMP.

Hard copies of MSc (compiled into a book, or bound together).[60]	AGREF UNEP Representatives of other related GEF projects in Marsabit.	Field based government and NGO staffs (with poor access to internet) and key archives (bureau of statistics, NEMA office etc).
Soft copies of MSc on DVD	AGREF	As above: key government offices, NGOs and civil society groups.
Share lessons on developing forest conservation in Mist Mountains. Short article or film to be posted on relevant website (UNEP, Kenya Forest Action Network, KFS etc)	UNEP communications team/ media consultant[61]. It may be sufficient to create and distribute copies of the existing video.[62]	National and international stakeholders with an interest in forest conservation issues. Copies/presentation to national government organisations and donors.

It would also be useful to print additional copies of the leaflet produced by the project which summarises the project's findings. This could also be posted on a relevant website.

6.2 Follow up project to consolidate work done already.

Issue/Problem

The project has achieved a lot, but due to the enormous constraints experienced, an unrealistic time frame for forestry trials, and unforeseen recommendations (see 3.10) has not been able to fully achieve its goal, particularly with regard to wider lessons contributing to the GEF OP s it addresses (see 1.4, 3.1.1, 3.10). The project team believe that what is missing from the GEF design is "*a mechanism of follow-up of proven beneficial practices developed by GEF projects to ensure that painstakingly derived breakthroughs do not go to waste through inaction or by overstretched or disinterested ministries especially since the project areas are not inhabited by politically powerful constituents*" (PIR FY08).

Nearly all of the stakeholders interviewed (and all local stakeholders) requested an extension to allow the project to follow through what it has started.

Recommended action (feasible, specific (who, what), performance target included)

What should be done: -

A follow up activity is recommended to allow satisfactory completion and lesson learning from the project. Lessons and follow on activities could also draw from associated GEF projects in Marsabit: The Desert Margins project and Indigenous Vegetation project.

Who could implement this?

Ideally, GEF should provide additional funds to allow the AGREF team to follow through the work it has started. Key activities for further action are: -

- additional studies to support ongoing forest conservation plans (aquifer study, clone eucalyptus trials).

[60] This book could include findings from other GEF projects in Marsabit: the Indigenous Vegetation and Desert Margins Projects.
[61] This work could be combined with the ongoing production of materials for the Drylands Livestock Wildlife Environment interaction project (DLWEIP).
[62] The consultant has not been able to locate a copy of this so cannot judge which target group its aimed at.

- Further advocacy work, particularly at the national level.
- Documentation of the process of developing dams and water committees to manage these.
- Follow through woodlots to first harvest.
- Dissemination and syntheses work (6.1 and 6.2)[63]

Failing this, it is recommended that the process of dam development be monitored and documented so that lessons can be learnt from the process. This might be done by AGREF or through one of the University partners, perhaps as one or more MSc studies.

Timing
This activity should be initiated as quickly as possible to build on the activities and momentum developed by the project.

[63] Some dissemination work is already planned by UNEP and will be combined with dissemination of the Indigenous vegetation and Desert margins project. Costs of this activity should be reimbursed by GEF as this is an essential part of project completion.