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OVERVIEW

Overall Assessments and Ratings

Grant Objectives:
The objective of the Project is to ensure long term ecological viability of Nairobi National Park by maintaining seasonal dispersal areas and migration corridors on adjacent privately owned lands and demonstrating the use of wildlife conservation leases as a conservation tool outside the Protected Areas.

Overall progress from 12/04/2008 to 06/30/2013 with regard to Achieving Grant Objectives:

Rating: Satisfactory (Previously Rated Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Comment:

Kenya Nairobi National Park Ecosystem Wildlife Conservation Lease Project (P083172), has achieved the project objectives. To achieve the grant objective described above, the implementing agency, The Wildlife Foundation, (TWF) entered into lease agreements with private land owners, who for a payment of Ksh 300 per acre per year, agreed to leave the portion of land under lease open for grazing and free movement of wildlife.

This US$727,270 "medium-sized project" financed by the GEF and implemented by The Wildlife Foundation (TWF), has been successful in helping to ensure the long term ecological viability of Nairobi National Park by maintaining seasonal dispersal areas and migration corridor on adjacent privately owned lands and demonstrating the use of wildlife conservation leases as a conservation tool outside Protected Areas. Apart from raising more than US$500,000 in additional cash and in-kind resources, project achievements exceeded the targets including: (i) the number of individual adult lions nearly doubled (target was a 20% increase); (ii) the area under voluntary enrollment of Wildlife Conservation Leasing has increased to 417 households (104% of the targeted 400 families) covering 61,067 acres (102% of the targeted 60,000 acres); (iii) negotiations between Ministry of Lands, Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) and the local Maasai Community are targeting the permanent designation for cattle and wildlife use of a 2,912 acre parcel of land adjacent to Nairobi National Park; (iv) research conducted in 2010 in the wildlife dispersal area indicates that 76% of household income in 2008 and 80% in 2009 generated from leasing is spent to pay school fees. The balance of leasing income was spent on human health and livestock production systems; (v) field observations of TWF staff indicate that increase in fencing of rangeland has slowed with 13% of the Kitengela rangeland area currently fenced compared to an estimated 10% at project inception; (vi) an aerial survey carried out in June 2011 by the department of Remote Sensing and Resource Surveys established that wildlife populations of Kitengela in the Athi-Kapiti Plains increased significantly over the wildlife census periods 2007 to 2011. In addition, TWF staff assisted in the development of a Land Use Master Plan for the District and is taking part in implementing and monitoring of the approved Land Use Master plan in the Wildlife Dispersal Area.

Having been extended to December 2012, the project has worked to consolidate these gains by: (i) implementing the final lease payments to families, (ii) finalizing of initiated field research documenting the project's impact and outputs of increasing conservation land through wildlife conservation leases (peer reviewed paper available in project files); (iii) documenting and disseminating of impacts/lessons learned and policy implications to the East African conservation community, and practitioners of payments for environmental services (PES); (iv) orderly closing out of project activities including consultations and planning with local stakeholders and strategic partners; (v) rolling-out of TWF's recently completed fundraising strategy for project continuation and possible geographic extension, including the proposals for the development of new products on sustainable leasing, easements and other payments for environmental services.

In parallel, a peer reviewed academic paper was prepared that assessed the impact of the project's payment for environmental services (PES) plan on household welfare, in particular poverty and inequality. It is worth quoting the abstract in its entirety here:

"The magnitude of the cash transfer is, on average, sufficient to close the poverty gap. Farm size and human capital significantly positively influence participation and intensity of participation, with the former also significantly influenced by asset endowments, wildlife depredation, and pasture conditions. In terms of participation, the scheme is not pro-poor, except for poor households occupying areas with low quality pasture. PES was found to have an income inequality reduction effect, and is also an invaluable source of income diversification during droughts." (Philip Osano et al., yet to be published manuscript,
2013: Poverty, Inequality and Participation of Pastoralists in a Payment for Ecosystem Service Scheme Adjacent to a Semi-Arid Protected Area in Southern Kenya.

**Overall progress from 12/04/2008 to 06/30/2013 with regard to Implementation of Grant Financed Activities:**
*Rating:* Moderately Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)
*Comment:*
Implementation has been maintained at marginally satisfactory because of the good achievement of on-ground targets and disbursement at 100%, as well as on-time reporting. The rating would have been higher except for the fact of weak M&E reporting on some indicators. Despite disbursement having reached 100% and significant results having been achieved from the expenditures, and most targets being met or being close to fully achieved, the ability of TWF to scale out or to advocate for scaling out is not secure, due largely to lack of post-project capacity at the implementing agency, TWF. TWF has been exploring follow-on schemes for payments for environmental services with additional entities such as KenGen, and this work could bear fruit in future.

**Grant follow-up and structure**

**Description and context of Grant:**

**Expected follow up (if any):** Expanded capacity

**Comment on follow up:**
At this stage follow on activities are in the form of proposed programs to expand or continue the lease program through with TWF funding or other development partner programs. The likelihood of this is dependent on the success of this pilot. However, post-project financial viability of the NGO remains a question, and they are seeking private sector support to continue activities after the GEF MSP closes. In fact, the TWF has been liaising with the Government of Kenya and the major utility KenGen on a proposal for payments for conservation services from land leases for wind turbines (the World Bank is not involved).

The last field visit was carried out by the previous TTL, Christian Peter.

**End Date of Last Site Visit:**

**Restructuring of Grant:**
The project was originally intended to close at the end of June 2011, but was extended six months on June 25, 2012, to close December 30, 2012. The extension also provided an opportunity to slightly re-allocate grant proceeds to allow for more complete disbursement and fuller achievement of results.

**Activity Risk**
*Rating:* Negligible or Low Risk
*Comment:*
There is a low risk to project implementation since the project closed on December 30, 2012 and is fully disbursed.

There are no conflicts of interest to the Bank.

**Critical Issues and Pending Actions for Management Attention**
There are currently no issues and actions for Management attention.
OUTCOME

Comments on outcome achieved from 12/04/2008 to 06/30/2013

As defined in the Project Document/GEF CEO Memo approved in 2008, there are two outcomes to achieve the PDO which is: to ensure long term ecological viability of Nairobi National Park by maintaining seasonal dispersal areas and migration corridors on adjacent privately owned lands and demonstrating the use of wildlife conservation leases as a conservation tool outside the Protected Areas.

These two outcomes and their indicators are:

Outcome 1. Maintain the seasonal dispersal areas and migration corridor open to ensure the viability of the Nairobi National Park ecosystem and its biodiversity.
Outcome 1 Indicator: By year 3 of the project, rainy season numbers of indicator species (lions, leopards, wildebeest, zebra) in the Kitengela area at least equal to the highest annual populations within the past 5 years.

Outcome 2. Enhance the economic security and quality of life of local landowner households.
Outcome 2 Indicator: Decrease in participating land owners who sell any portion of their land.

These two indicators do not by themselves sufficiently track the achievement of the outcomes. The project indeed has "maintained the seasonal dispersal areas and open migration corridor" (outcome 1), and has also helped "enhance the economic security and quality of life of local landowner households" (outcome 2).

The achievement of Outcome 1 was tracked in terms of its stated indicator. The adult lion population doubled from 18 to 35 individuals during the grant period. This is important because lions are the keystone species for the greater Nairobi National Park ecosystem. There is incomplete data for other species, but zebra numbers are thought to be maintained. Approximately 8000 zebras and 6000 wildebeests rely on the habitat in the general project area. In addition, the Project maintained seasonal dispersal areas and kept the migration corridor open, as stated as a PDO outcome. For more see the detailed project report in WB Docs (The GRM site attachments link is not functional).

The achievement of Outcome 2 was reflected by the fact that only 50 of the more than 50,000 acres of land in the WCL Program were sold. These 50 acres were then removed from the program. Although land sales did not decline (which was the indicator target at project close) the loss of potential conservation land to sales was essentially halted. To achieve this success, it was most important that the pattern in the project area of selling off pieces of land to pay for short term economic expenses was broken. By providing direct benefits in the form of Lease Payments to the pastoral land owners within the vital Nairobi National Park wildlife dispersal area, this detrimental pattern was indeed broken during the period of the grant.

Also for Outcome 2, in addition, there were four main positive socio-economic effects identified in the detailed project evaluation report, and these effects illustrate the contribution of the project to Outcome 2. These are as follows:

1. Provision of cash income and poverty reduction: Poverty in the AKP is very high, with an estimated 70% of the households living below the Kenyan poverty line. Cash income is therefore critical for these families that are mainly dependent on livestock. The Wildlife Conservation Leasing (WCL) program disbursed a total of US$ 837,120 (in US$ 2005 equivalent) to a total of 417 households for the 12 year between 2000 and 2012. The average income to the participating households ranged from US$ 248 in 2004 (7% of gross household income) in a period of normal rains to US$ 345 per year in 2009 (25% of gross household income in a period of severe drought).
2. Building human capital through education investments: More than three-quarters of the WLP income is spent on education (76% in 2008 and 80% in 2009), including payment of school fees, purchase of school uniforms, books. The WCL therefore enables pastoral families to invest in education of their children, and helps build the human capital that is critical for the future of the Maasai youth.
3. Reducing pastoral vulnerability to drought: The WCL program is invaluable in helping to reduce pastoral vulnerability to drought because it provides a regular and stable income that can serve as a safety-net, protecting families from the fluctuating livestock income during drought periods when pastoralists suffer drastic livestock losses. In addition, by helping to
keep the rangelands in the project area (AKP) open, the WCL benefits all pastoral families that are able to move with their livestock unhindered by fences in search of pasture and water during drought periods.

4. Gender empowerment: The WCL has however contributed greatly towards the empowerment of women through the distribution of income allocated to women recipients. The percentage of women that were provided by the lease payments between 2000 and 2010 ranged from a low of 18% in 2002 to a high of 39% in 2000 and 2003 respectively. Some of these women include the most economically vulnerable and poor members such as widows.

Grant Outcome Indicators

Grant outcome indicators are listed below.

1.1. By year 3 of the project, rainy season numbers of indicator species (lions, leopards, wildebeest, zebra) in the Kitengela area at least equal to the highest annual populations within the past 5 years.

Baseline Value: 18 individual lions (other species not reported)

Value: Date: 07/01/2008
Progress to Date: 35 individual lions; Incomplete data for other species, but zebra numbers are thought to be maintained.
Date: Approximately 8000 zebras and 6000 wildebeests rely on the habitat in the general project area. For more see the detailed project report in WB Docs.
Date: 06/30/2012
Target Value: Numbers of indicator species at least equal to the highest annual populations
Date: 06/30/2012

1.2. Decrease in participating land owners who sell any portion of their land.

Baseline Value: Not assessed

Value: Date: 07/01/2008
Progress to Date: Sales halted during the grant period (the target may have been achieved but without the baseline it is difficult to assess)
Date: 06/30/2012
Target Value: Decrease in sales
Date: 06/30/2012

COMPONENTS/OUTPUTS

Output and Implementation by Component

Increased land secured for conservation

Implementation Rating: Highly Satisfactory (Previously Rated Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)
Implementation Status: Completed
Planned Output: See "additional comment on outputs" below
Actual Output: See "additional comment on outputs" below
Institutional strengthening for implementation and dissemination

Implementation: Satisfactory (Previously Rated Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)
Rating: 
Status: Completed
Planned Output: See “additional comment on outputs” below
Actual Output: See “additional comment on outputs” below

Enhance longterm sustainability of the WCL program and NNP ecosystem

Implementation: Satisfactory (Previously Rated Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)
Rating: 
Status: Completed
Planned Output: See “additional comment on outputs” below
Actual Output: See “additional comment on outputs” below

Comment on planned and actual Output

Table 1. Summary of Achievements of the WCL Project Outputs

Project Component 1. Increasing conservation land through wildlife conservation leases
Outcome 1.1: Area under contractual commitment for wildlife use (WCL signed between TWF and private landowners) expanded, and commitments strengthened through introduction of multi-year leases

Output 1: Area voluntarily enrolled in Wildlife Conservation Leases increase to 60,000 acres, with at least 20% of the WCL being multi-year
Baseline: 10,000 acres (2008)
Target: 60,000 (2012)
Achievement: 61,067 acres (2012).
Note: none of the leases are multi-year

Output 2: Number of participating/ benefiting households increase to 400
Target: 400 (2012)
Achievement: 417 (2012)

Output 3: % of Kitengela rangeland within the 60,000 acre target area that is enclosed by fences does not increase over baseline
Baseline: Not assessed
Target: Not assessed
Achievement: Not assessed

Output 4: 20% increase in number of lions (indicator species) regularly using Kitengela
Baseline: 18 individuals** (2008)
Target: 20% increase (2012) (3 additional individuals or 21 total individuals)
Achievement: 35 total individuals (2011)

Project Component 2. Institutional strengthening and information dissemination
Outcome 2.1: TWF develops capacity to administer expanded WCL program efficiently and to the satisfaction of program participants and funding sources;
Outcome 2.2: Increased awareness of and interest in WCL and similar approaches in East Africa
Output 1: Wildlife leases are used strategically, based on research and monitoring, to maximize conservation benefits achieved with available funds
Baseline: Not assessed
Target: Not assessed
Achievement: Not assessed

Output 2: Stakeholders (local landowners, financiers) satisfied with effectiveness, transparency and responsiveness of management of scaled-up WCL program
Baseline: Not assessed
Target: Not assessed
Achievement: Not assessed

Output 3: East Africa conservation practitioner community identifies at least 2 additional sites for trial implementation of WCL approach
Baseline: No additional sites
Target: 2 additional sites
Achievement: Model tested in Maasai Mara and Amboseli

Project Component 3. Enhancing long term sustainability
Outcome 3.1: Positive action on key land-related policy and institutional measures supporting maintenance of wildlife and habitat (joint objective with USAID KCP)
Outcome 3.2: Reduction of human/wildlife conflict in project area
Outcome 3.3: Increase in amount and reliability of funding for WCL during and beyond project

Output 1: Land Use Master Plan (LUMP) implemented as the key planning framework for the project area (joint objective with USAID-funded project)
Baseline: LUMP not implemented (2008)
Target: LUMP implemented
Achievement: LUMP gazetted by GoK and adopted by Kajiado County Council. See note above in “comment on implementation progress by component.”

Output 2: Kitengela Sheep & Goat Ranch permanently secured for wildlife habitat
Baseline: Not assessed
Target: Secured
Achievement: Not assessed

Output 3: 25% increase in households adopting non-lethal measures for reducing wildlife predation on livestock in the project area
Baseline: Not assessed
Target: 25% increase
Achievement: Not assessed

Output 4: TWF develops and implements a professional fundraising strategy for WCL, and raises at least $270,000 of additional funds (beyond baseline) for wildlife leases from non-GEF sources by end of project
Baseline: 0 additional funding
Target: $270,000 additional funding
Achievement: The project has raised an additional US$294,000 in cash and 210,000 in in-kind resources total, from NGOs and the GoK.

*The available fence maps for the AKP produced with the support from International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) was not validated by TWF
** 18 individual lions were taken as the baseline for the GEF/World Bank project grant (Ed Loosli, Chair, TWF Board, personal
communication, January 20, 2013).

**Information provided by Ed Loosli**

**Comment on component implementation progress**

With regard to Component 3's Output 1, a Land Use Master Plan (LUMP) implemented as the key planning framework for the project area:

The Project achievement has resulted in the LUMP being gazetted by the GoK and adopted by Kajiado County Council.

The LUMP is Kenya's first ever land-use plan for a pastoral area that if implemented could help control unsustainable land uses in the area. The plan allows only land uses that are compatible with open livestock/wildlife grazing and sets a minimum parcel size of 60 acres in the open grazing lands. If enforced, this law should eliminate small sub-divisions of land to parcels that are not ecologically viable and prevent land uses that are incompatible with livestock and wildlife. Since the close of the project, the main author of the LUMP for Kajiado County (the project area) has been elected Governor of that county, helping secure strong implementation post-project of the Land Use Plan. This development arguably demonstrates the local buy-in and ownership of the land use planning exercise supported by the operation.

**EXECUTION**

**Bank project related to the grant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID / Name</th>
<th>WCL SIL (FY07)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>Lending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Focal Area</td>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Line</td>
<td>GM - GEF Medium Sized Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementing agency and contact details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>The Wildlife Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Ed Loslie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>TWF KWS HQ, Langata Rd P.O. Box 42076 Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>254-600324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation performance ratings from 12/04/2008 to 06/30/2013 with regard to:**

**Project Management:** Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Brief Comment:
Rating raised from MS to S for good achievement of the main intermediate results of the WCL program. HS is not given because of the weakness in reporting on one of the two PDO level indicators.

**Financial Management:** Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Brief Comment:
Rating raised from MS to S. Project fully disbursed and final unqualified audit provided that did not identify any significant problems. Additional funds were leveraged.
Counterpart Funding: Highly Satisfactory (Previously Rated Not Applicable on 06/30/2012)

Brief Comment:
Additional funds were raised by the Implementing Agency to complement Bank-GEF funds. This was an intermediate indicator that was fully achieved.

Procurement: Satisfactory (Previously Rated Moderately Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Brief Comment:
Rating raised from MS to S. No significant problems identified.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Satisfactory (Previously Rated Satisfactory on 06/30/2012)

Brief Comment:
See below in "additional comments on implementation performance."

Additional Comments on Implementation Performance:
M&E: Despite the marginally unsatisfactory M&E reporting during project implementation, the quality of information that was reported in the final project evaluation report by the implementing agency was generally high quality. The implementing agency did not fully not track the PDO level outcome indicators given in the Project Document (i.e., the GEF CEO Memo), and did not provide complete baselines. Some given intermediate indicators were also not tracked. Nevertheless, the final evaluation report provided a number of agreed and new metrics that show evidence of the achievement of project results. These are summarized elsewhere in this GRM.

PROGRAM

Program Specific Ratings

1. Please rate public involvement - Moderately Satisfactory
2. Please rate government commitment - Moderately Satisfactory
3. Please rate safeguard performance - Not Applicable
4. Please rate arrangements for sustainability - Moderately Satisfactory

Program Specific Questions

1. Please comment on additional resources leveraged
The project has raised an additional US$294,000 in cash and $210,000 in in-kind resources total, from NGOs and the GoK. However, this is not enough to sustain activities post-project as the TWF, a small NGO, faces financial and capacity constraints. TWF is in dialogue with the private sector, notably KenGen, on providing payments for environmental services in the project area, in order to continue the conservation incentives and possibly engage in or promote potential new PES schemes.

COMPLETION

Overall Assessments and Lessons Learned

Main lessons learned:
In general, it is important that the pastoral communities living near to wildlife Protected Areas directly benefit from this close association for the betterment of both the people and the wildlife. Specifically, in the case of Nairobi National Park, it is especially important that its vital wildlife dispersal area be kept un-fenced, un-subdivided and open for both livestock and wildlife. The financial sustainability of the WCL, along with the companion Consolation Program, is essential to the future well-being of the wildlife of the NNP ecosystem and the pastoral people that share their land with the wildlife. Some of the lessons learnt include the following:
Rangeland Management
1. The benefits of the open rangelands secured through the WCL PES initiative are critical for both wildlife and livestock because it ensures their mobility to access water and forage. The mobility of wildlife in AKP helps sustain the Nairobi National Park because wildlife can move freely between their dry season range inside the park and wet season range in the AKP.
2. Pastoral landowners are willing to keep open their rangelands within their individual privatized land parcels if they are provided with financial incentives under conditions that also allow grazing of their livestock herds.

Wildlife Conservation
1. The WCL PES initiative serves a dual function. First, it is an incentive for conserving private land providing habitat for wildlife use. Second, it is a tool for mitigating human-wildlife conflicts especially carnivore predation of the pastoral livestock.
2. The WCL is not sufficient on its own to ensure the viability of the Nairobi National Park (NNP) ecosystem, and it must be complemented with other tools, including conservation easements, predator compensation schemes, and land use regulations among other.
3. The WLC is particularly essential for the protection of the wildlife rich area nearest to the open southern border of the Nairobi National Park in Triangle I, and the wildebeest calving zones located in Triangle 11 of the Athi Kaputie Plains (AKP).

Social and Economic Benefits
1. The WCL is a source of cash income diversification that is critical for pastoralists especially during drought periods when it helps buffer pastoral families from increased poverty.
2. The WCL has contributed to financial supporting the education of the Maasai youth helping build critical human capital for the future.
3. The WCL has also contributed towards gender empowerment of the Maasai women within families that are benefiting directly from the initiative.

Partnership and Learning
1. Strong partnership is essential for the successful implementation of the WCL. The initiative benefited from the involvement and contribution of a range of local and international partners, including the Friends of Nairobi National Park (FoNNAP), the Kitengela Landowners Association (KILA), the Kenya government (through the Kenya Wildlife Service and the Ministry of Lands), the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), the Global Environment Facility (GEF)/World Bank among others.
2. The WCL has informed and catalyzed the implementation of payments for environmental services (PES) based on the land lease for wildlife model in other pastoral areas in southern Kenya on lands that serve as dispersal areas for protected areas.

Overall outcome (and its Sustainability): Rated Likely

Comment:
The overall outcome is highly satisfactory despite the uncertain sustainability of the conservation payments that are externally provided. The project demonstrated that wildlife conservation lease payments can and do work, there is demand for them, and they can slow unsustainable land conversions in the sensitive and economically critical open rangelands surrounding Nairobi National Park. In April 2000, the Wildlife Lease Conservation (WCL) Program was initiated to ensure that wildlife could move freely between the Nairobi National Park and Athi-Kaputie Plains. This PES program is currently managed by The Wildlife Foundation (TWF), a locally incorporated Non-Governmental Organization (NGO). In 2008, the TWF was awarded a medium-sized GEF grant to pilot the expansion of the WCL as a demonstration project for effective conservation of wildlife on private lands outside protected areas. This intervention addressed the following development and environmental challenge:

The Nairobi National Park (NNP) is located in South-western Kenya and encompasses an area of 117 km2. It is one of Kenya’s most visited parks, located at the boundary of Nairobi, Kenya’s capital city. The NNP is fenced on the northern boundary to separate it from the Nairobi metropolis as well as to the eastern and western boundaries. The southern boundary which lies along the Empakasi River is open and adjoins the Kitengela, an area of 390km2. Kitengela is one of the three triangles that comprise the larger wildlife dispersal area for NNP called the Athi-Kaputie Plains (AKP), an area of 2200km2. The rangelands of AKP are private land, majority of it owned by the pastoral Maasai, who have historically shared their land.
with wildlife (Reid et al., 2008).

The Nairobi National Park together with AKP comprise the Athi-Kaputiei Ecosystem (AKE) whose limits are bounded by the Rift Valley escarpment to the west, the Nairobi-Mombasa railway line to the east and the Konza-Magadi railway line to the south (Figure 1). The area is dry and the annual rainfall increases from 500 mm in the southeast to 800 mm in the northwest. The AKE ecosystem support 24 species of resident large mammals, but the park itself is too small to support viable populations of most of the large herbivores. Consequently, some herbivore species such as the wildebeest (Connochaetes taurinus Burchell), zebra (Equus Burchelli Gray) and eland (Taurotragus oryx) use the park as a dry season (June-November) refuge and disperse to the private land in the AKP in the wet season (March-May) for forage and calving.

The AKP is the traditional home to the Kaputiei Maasai pastoralists, whose main livelihood is livestock production, keeping cattle, sheep and goats in the vast plains. When NNP was established in 1946, the Kitengela plains were declared but never formally gazetted as a wildlife conservation area. In the mid-1970s, land in the AKP was privatized with the creation of the Kitengela Group Ranch covering an area of 18,292 ha (45,200 acres) and collectively owned by 215 members of the Maasai community. In 1988, the Kitengela Group Ranch was sub-divided into individual plots of roughly 215 acres allocated to each of the 250 members (Rutten, 1992). The process of land privatization and sub-division followed in the entire Kajiado County as the Maasai landowners passed on plots to several inheritors, and increased land sales mostly to non-Maasais interested in agriculture (Kimani & Pickard, 1998).

The land sales, alongside rapid increase in human population, has resulted in land uses such as expansion of urban centers (e.g. Kitengela and Athi River) and industries (e.g. the Export Processing Zones: EPZs), large scale irrigated horticultural schemes, quarrying and expansion of permanent settlements with fencing, which have restricted the movements of livestock and seasonal dispersal of wildlife between NNP and the AKPs (Reid et al., 2008). These changes in land use have contributed to large declines in the populations of wildebeest in the ecosystem from an estimated 38,000 in 1978 to about 10,000 in 2012 (Ogutu et al., Submitted).

While outside the Nairobi National Park in AKP, the wildlife occupy the private land of the Maasai pastoralists creating human-wildlife conflicts through competition for water and pasture with livestock, transmission of infectious diseases to livestock, and livestock predation by the large carnivores. The NNP is amongst the most visited parks in Kenya accounting for 23% of park visitors, and thus generating very high revenues from wildlife tourism (World Resources Institute, 2007). The absence of a revenue sharing mechanism with the Maasai landowners in AKP whose land is critical as a dispersal zone for wildlife that attracts tourists to the park means that landowners have very little or no incentives for having wildlife on their private lands. Consequently, the lack of direct monetary benefits from the wildlife coupled with the increase in human wildlife conflicts in AKP over the years made Maasai households intolerant to and excluded wildlife on their land through fencing and direct killing of predators.

Bank Performance: Rated Moderately Unsatisfactory

Comment:
Overall the project is considered a very successful project that has exceeded key targets including land area and number of families benefitting from the PES scheme. Nevertheless, Bank preparation of the project document included some PDO and indicator disconnects resulting in weak project reporting during implementation. Some indicators, outputs, and outcomes were not fully defined, lacked baselines, or were misplaced in the results framework (i.e., an outcome was actually an output). Nevertheless, the final project evaluation report from the implementing agency provides a good record of the project achievements (available in WB Docs), and these achievements are summarized in this GRM.

Additional Assessment

Development / strengthening of institutions: Rated Modest

Comment:
The Project did not report on the relevant indicators in the results framework that would have provided a more solid basis for assessing the degree to which institutions have been strengthened under Component 2. This component's outcome is in fact the following: "TWF develops capacity to administer expanded WCL program efficiently and to the satisfaction of program
participants and funding sources.” Although the agreed indicators meant to track the achievement of this outcome were not reported in the final evaluation report directly, it may be assumed that because the on-ground results and indicators have been achieved, the implementing agency has demonstrated its capacity to carry out and expand complex conservation lease payments.

**Mobilization of other resources: Rated Substantial**

**Comment:**
The implementing agency, TWF, was successful in raising over $500,000 in cash and in-kind resources ($270,000 cash was targeted in the results framework, which was exceeded) to complement project resources provided by the GEF through the World Bank. The project has raised an additional US$294,000 in cash and $210,000 in in-kind resources total, from NGOs and the GoK.

**Knowledge exchange : Rated Modest**

**Comment:**
See “main lessons learned” above.

**Client’s policy / program implementation : Rated Substantial**

**Comment:**
This project was implemented by an NGO, but the project activities are relevant for GoK priorities and programs. Wildlife tourism, rural livelihoods, land use and access, and the welfare of "vulnerable and marginalized groups" (i.e. indigenous people in the Bank’s terminology) are all important priorities of the GoK at project approval and of the current GoK at project close. This GEF grant has demonstrated how an innovative PES solution could be deployed by domestic parties to address all four of these priority issues. The PES scheme could be mainstreamed into GoK and private sector activities and therefore put on a more sustainable financial footing.

**Efficiency : Rated Satisfactory**

**Comment:**
The project demonstrated that PES can be an effective use of public financing to safeguard public goods and private livelihoods and poverty reduction. With an investment just over $700,000, the project was able to leverage over $500,000 in additional cash and in-kind resources to achieve impressive conservation objectives that also reduce poverty of indigenous pastoralists at the same time, while helping to safeguard one of Kenya’s iconic tourist attractions that is so critical to Kenya’s economic growth and unique contribution to the global environmental heritage.

**Replicability: Rated Uncertain**

**Comment:**
The project is itself a demonstration of expansion of a PES scheme, and could be replicated at larger scale. One key element to replicability and sustainability, however, is securing a permanent domestic buyer of the environmental service. The implementing agency, TWF is small and undercapacitated and depends on external finances to operate. Nevertheless, they have proven the capacity to implement an important PES scheme, and could continue to do so.

The PES scheme could be mainstreamed into GoK and private sector activities and therefore put on a more sustainable financial footing.

On the other hand, the Project achievement has resulted in the Land Use Master Plan (LUMP) being gazetted by the GoK and adopted by Kajiado County Council which should greatly contribute to sustainability of project impact. The LUMP is Kenya’s first ever land-use plan for a pastoral area that if implemented could help control unsustainable land uses in the area. The plan allows only land uses that are compatible with open livestock/wildlife grazing and sets a minimum parcel size of 60 acres in the open grazing lands. If enforced, this law should eliminate small sub-divisions of land to parcels that are not ecologically viable and prevent land uses that are incompatible with livestock and wildlife. Since the close of the project, the main author of the LUMP for Kajiado County (the project area) has been elected Governor of that county, helping secure strong implementation post-project of the Land Use Plan. This development arguably demonstrates the local buy-in and ownership of the land use planning exercise supported by the operation.
Main recommendations to stakeholders:

1. Wildlife tourism, rural livelihoods, land use and access, and the welfare of "vulnerable and marginalized groups" (i.e. indigenous people in the Bank's terminology) are all important priorities of the GoK at project approval and of the current GoK at project close. This GEF grant has demonstrated how an innovative PES solution could be deployed by domestic parties to address all four of these priority issues. The PES scheme could be mainstreamed into GoK and private sector activities and therefore put on a more sustainable financial footing.

2. Devolution of governance through the 2010 Constitution: The new constitution that was enacted in 2010 has devolved governance to sub-national County administrative units. This provides opportunity for greater participation of local land owners in managing their affairs and in greater say in the management of their resources. It can also open up opportunities to further seek for increased revenue sharing from Nairobi National Park through payments for habitat land used by wildlife and implementation of a surcharge to urban residents to pay for the land leases.

3. Sustain the implementation of the Land Use Master Plan (LUMP) gazetted by the GoK and adopted by Kajiado County Council.

4. Challenging constraints to conservation in the area abound, and require further attention by key stakeholders and government. These constraints include the following:
   - Rapid urbanization: the expansion of urbanization leads to conservation of rangelands to settlement areas as urban residents purchase land, further increasing land prices, leading to land sub-division, land sales and conversion of land use to non-pastoral uses such as crop cultivation. The expansion of urbanization is expected to continue as Nairobi Metropolis expands into Kajiado as part of the implementation of the Kenya Vision 2030 economic blueprint (Government of Kenya, 2008).
   - Road infrastructure: The fencing of land in AKP is directly associated with roads (Said et al., submitted). Therefore, a proposed plan to build a US$200 million road bypass that crosses the southern section of the Nairobi National Park may hamper the land lease program and further accelerate the fragmentation of the landscape in Athi-Kaputie Plains.
   - Population growth: The population in the AKP and in the Kajiado County is growing rapidly and this creates more pressure on the AKP ecosystem, including increase in human-wildlife conflicts in the area. Existing social protection and human development activities could be focused on this area to complement the conservation activities.
   - Rising land prices: the high demand for land has raised the land prices in AKP. The land prices are particularly high near the Nairobi National Park (currently around $10,700 per acre) and near the major roads, while far away from the tarmacked roads, land prices average merely about $530 per acre (ACC, 2005). In parts of AKP land value has appreciated at over 11% per annum over the last 10 years, which compares well with the average ten-year returns from Treasury bills. Alternative financial flows are critical to conserve valuable rangelands.

Main recommendations to Bank Management:

This project holds important lessons for the development of new investment lending in eastern Africa as well as elsewhere on the continent, as follows:

1. This project provides one of the few successful PES schemes in Africa financed by the World Bank.

2. The project demonstrates the interconnection between the interconnection between biodiversity, tourism, rural livelihoods, land use and access, and the welfare of indigenous people.

3. The Land Use Master Plan (LUMP) gazetted by the GoK and adopted by Kajiado County Council is the Kenya's first pastoral land use plan and could have interesting application in our new generation of investments in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel in particular on rangeland and livestock.
Manager's comments on this GRM report:
Date: 11/11/2013 User ID: WB18521 Name: Mr Jonathan S. Kamkwala
Operation performed: Approved by Manager
The project achieved its objectives of ensuring the ecological viability of Nairobi National Park by maintaining seasonal dispersal areas and migration corridors on privately owned land, thus demonstrating the use of wildlife conservation leases as a conservation tool. While the project was rated moderately satisfactory, weak monitoring and evaluation on some indicators may have affected overall progress and future sustainability.
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DISBURSEMENTS

Disbursements Summary in USD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>Date To</th>
<th>Planned Cumulative</th>
<th>Planned Period</th>
<th>Actual Cumulative</th>
<th>Actual Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2008</td>
<td>12/31/2008</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2009</td>
<td>06/30/2009</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2009</td>
<td>12/31/2009</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>300,000.00</td>
<td>300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2010</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>300,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>12/31/2010</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>300,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2011</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>464,344.00</td>
<td>164,344.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2011</td>
<td>12/31/2011</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>588,494.34</td>
<td>124,150.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2012</td>
<td>06/30/2012</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>727,270.00</td>
<td>138,775.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2012</td>
<td>12/31/2012</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>727,270.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2013</td>
<td>06/30/2013</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>727,270.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERNAL COMMENTS

Date: 11/11/2013 User ID: WB18521 Name: Mr Jonathan S. Kamkwalala
Operation performed: Approved by Manager
The project achieved its objectives of ensuring the ecological viability of Nairobi National Park by maintaining seasonal dispersal areas and migration corridors on privately owned land, thus demonstrating the use of wildlife conservation leases as a conservation tool. While the project was rated moderately satisfactory, weak monitoring and evaluation on some indicators may have affected overall progress and future sustainability.

Date: 10/24/2013 User ID: WB269425 Name: Mr Stephen Danyo Operation performed: Mail Sent to PM
Dear Jonathan and Paola

I am sending this GRM for approval. The GRM system will not let me "send for review" to Paola first. Paola has a PDF file.

Many thanks
Steve

Date: 09/25/2013 User ID: WB15479 Name: Ms Mary Y. Jackson Operation performed: Submitted to TTL
mjackson@worldbank.org