



Kenya



**UNDP/GEF Developing Incentives for Community Participation in
Forest Conservation Through the Use of Commercial Insects in Kenya
(CIP)**

PIMS NUMBER: 85 UNDP

PROJECT NUMBER: KEN 04 G35

Final Evaluation (FE)

FINAL REPORT

Report Prepared By

Oliver Chapeyama

June 2008

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms	4
Executive Summary	5
1.0 Introduction	10
1.1. Methodology of the evaluation	11
1.2 Structure of the report	11
2.0 The project and its development context	12
2.1. Immediate and development objectives of the project	14
2.2. Main stakeholders	14
2.3. Outcomes/ Results expected	14
3.0 Findings and Conclusions	17
3.1. Project formulation	17
3.2. Implementation approach	18
3.3. Country Ownership/Driveness	19
3.4. Stakeholder participation	20
3.5. Sustainability	21
3.6. Replication	23
3.7. 3.7Linkages between project and other interventions within the country	24
4.0 Project Implementation	24
4.1. Financial Planning	24
4.2 Incremental Cost Analysis	24
4.3 Project Budget	26
4.4 Cost Effectiveness	27
4.5 Monitoring and evaluation	28
4.6 Management by the UNDP country office in Kenya	29
5.0 Project Results	29

5.1.	Attainment of objectives, outcomes and outputs	29
5.2.	Sustainability beyond the Project Life Cycle	38
6.0	Recommendations	39
7.0	Lessons Learned	40
8.0	Annexes	44

List of Tables

- 1 Project Budget
- 2 Co-financing Committed
- 3 Expenditure Against GEF Increment per Activity
- 4 Progress towards project Objectives, Outcomes and Outputs
- 5 Project Performance Rating

List of Acronyms

CBD	UN Convention to Combat Dessertification
CBO	Community-Based Organisation
CFA	Community Forest Association
CIP	Commercial Insects Project
CIPC	Commercial Insects Programme Coordinator
EU	European Union
FA	Forestry Association
FE	Final Evaluation
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GoK	Government of Kenya
IBA	Important Bird Area
ICIPE	International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology
ICD	Integrated Conservation and Development
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
KOAN	Kenya Organic Agriculture Network
KFS	Kenya Forest Service
KWS	Kenya Wildlife Service
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NEX	National Execution
NEMA	National Environment Management Authority
PCU	Project Coordination Unit
PFM	Participatory Forestry Management
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy and Plan
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Executive Summary

The Developing Incentives for Community Participation in Forest Conservation Through the use of Commercial Insects in Kenya (CIP) is a UNDP-GEF funded project that was intended to reverse the problem of loss of forest resources in three ecologically representative regions of Kenya through the provision of poverty alleviation incentives, alternative income sources and institutional capacity building services to forest adjacent communities. The project was developed to demonstrate that there was greater economic value in biodiversity conservation than in the direct exploitation of the resource which was almost always done in unsustainable ways.

The project is premised on the understanding that management of the national system of forest reserve will be strengthened through improved incentives for real collaborative forest management with communities. Through this project, on-farm and in-forest livelihood support systems involving the use of commercial insects in the production of honey and wild silk and harvesting of butterflies have been introduced in forest buffer zones aimed at protecting the target forest areas from further degradation. The system of participatory forest management (PFM) that has been introduced includes the establishment of Village Forest Associations for Participatory Forest Management. In addition, marketing centres for silk and honey products from the three project sites have been established and linkages to the wider national and international markets have been established. The success of this project will depend upon the capacity of communities and institutions to manage and utilize insects for both livelihood and forest conservation benefits. It is in response to this that a comprehensive capacity development component has been incorporated as an important component of the project.

The Project was intended to achieve the following Outputs:

1. A forest management framework that facilitates community participation in buffer zone enterprises and conservation is in place at all project sites;
2. Forest adjacent communities, through integrated forest associations are actively engaged in forest conservation through buffer zone management and enterprises;
3. The capacity of communities and institutions to manage and utilize both wild and mulberry silk-moth and honey bee biodiversity for income generation is increased;
4. Improved management methodologies and insect resources are available at sites to allow efficient resource use for improved livelihoods and conservation practices

5. Effective project administration, monitoring and coordination to enable timely and efficient implementation of project activities.

The evaluation was conducted to analyze and assess the achievements and progress made so far towards achieving the original objectives of the CIP Project. It was also intended to identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives. Finally, the evaluation considered the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability of the CIP Project and provided recommendations and lessons learned to assist in defining future direction of similar projects.

The main findings of the evaluation are that the CIP was designed in response to major problems that were affecting the conservation of forest resources in Kenya. These ranged from poverty among forest adjacent communities, limited technical and institutional capacities in both government and civil society organizations to address the problems as well as policy and legislative deficits that facilitated the unsustainable exploitation of the resources. The project adopted the provision of income generating incentives for communities as well as the development of value chains linking community level production systems to the market as a way of reversing resource degradation. The approach to achieving this included the recruitment of all relevant institutions include private sector entities. To ensure sustainability of the effort into the future ICIPE promoted local ownership of the programme through the introduction of simple technological interventions that could easily be adopted by community groups. The project has now been replicated at both local and regional levels and presents huge potential for upscaling. This momentum will need to be sustained into the future. Recommendations on how to ensure continued funding of programmes and provision of support services have been made in the report.

The project has contributed to the improvement of the management and conservation of critical ecosystems in the three focus areas in Kenya. This process has resulted in increased realization of both national and global environmental benefits. Considerable progress has been made towards the achievement of project objectives. Overall the project is rated Successful.

The success achieved by ICIPE in implementing this project places an obligation on the organization to ensure that the gains that have been realized are not lost after the end of the project. GEF funding has clearly achieved the intended objective of creating new knowledge and technologies for the generation of incentives for communities to reduce their dependence on biodiversity resources of the forests at the three project sites. Further, the link between the provision of incentives and improved biodiversity conservation has been demonstrated through this project. New methods of beekeeping and the production of silkworm cocoons have been adopted by community groups over the four years the project has been implemented. What is not guaranteed though is whether these gains will be sustained if ICIPE were to withdraw from the activity at the end of the project in December 2008 without putting in place contingency measures to ensure continued community support. It is recommended therefore that ICIPE should

start developing an exit strategy which will allow organizations that are better placed to work with community groups to finalize the process of product certification as well as develop markets for the products. The initial efforts that have been made in these two areas need to be followed up with the introduction of community groups to institutions that will help them grow these activities into rural businesses where producer communities hold controlling interests. There are a number of regional and international NGOs that can be enlisted to assist with this. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) has a Regional Headquarters for East and Southern Africa in Nairobi. This, regional office runs a Natural Futures Programme that aims to promote the certification and marketing of organic products from rural communities.

Project financing is another area that requires attention as the project nears completion. GEF does not fund follow-on activities so as part of its exit strategy ICIPE and its collaborative partners needs to identify funding sources that can continue providing the support it has been rendering the project until it is sustainable. There are a number of financial mechanisms that can provide such support. The International Finance Corporation is one such institution while there are numerous national facilities that communities can access. The private sector could also be encouraged to participate through such activities as the construction of beehives. Where financial streams from the silk and honey production activities are showing sustainable increasing trends, such communities could be encouraged to access soft loans to capitalize their activities. ICIPE would maintain their research and technical support services to these activities in the areas of product quality development and market development. An immediate area for research that ICIPE could embark upon is the investigation of policy and institutional barriers to product certification

The causal link between forest conservation and provision of incentives for livelihood improvement among forest adjacent communities has been proven through the implementation of the CIP. Over the four years the project has been under implementation, the Project Steering Committee has conducted constant monitoring of progress and has not had to change any of the project design aspects. Consideration now needs to be given to the implementation of measures that will guarantee the sustainability of this initiative in the future. The following recommendations are made as a way of informing the design and implementation of similar projects in future.

- Future biodiversity management projects include a component of establishing baseline data at least in the first year of their implementation to ensure their sustainability. CIP can only point to anecdotal improvements in the quality of biodiversity after four years of implementation.
- Biodiversity management projects should include elements of resource valuation to enable programme managers to adequately establish the levels of benefits that can be provided to community groups. This will help avoid situations where community expectations are raised beyond the levels that can be met by the projects;
- Natural resources management policies should include provisions for community benefits to make them sustainable over time;

- The Lessons learnt from the implementation of CIP in the three project sites need to be documented for replication and up-scaling. The interest shown by community groups that are not currently involved with project implementation is an opportunity that should not be missed. Further, opportunities to influence similar programme developments in other parts of the region should be identified and built upon.
- CIP experiences should be disseminated to other parts of Africa so they can influence similar programmes that also promote community participation in natural resource conservation and development planning.
- High expectations have been raised among community groups participating in the project. Care should be taken to avoid frustrating these communities through failure to ensure that they continue realizing the benefits that they are realizing today. The elements that ensure sustainability of such initiatives that are discussed in this report should be followed up as the project reaches closure to ensure continuity into the future.
- ICIPE should design an exit strategy for themselves and identify institutions that could take over the growth of this initiative. ICIPE would retain their role as technical advisors.

CIP has also yielded a number of lessons that will be useful in the design and implementation of similar projects in future. These are summarized below.

- The CIP has demonstrated that there is a direct link between conservation and livelihoods. Future projects should ensure that there is provision for local people to benefit from resources conservation programmes as this guarantees sustainability of such initiatives.
- Biodiversity conservation programmes are inherently expensive. These costs increase if a control and command process is adopted to implement such programmes. These costs are reduced considerably with the adoption of participatory methods of project management.
- The provision of benefits from conservation to community groups presupposes the presence of such values in the resources to be shared. There is need for the implementation of comprehensive resource valuation processes that will help quantify the extent of benefits to be shared with community groups. This also calls for the incorporation of resource valuation processes into formulation.
- Conservation programmes that include the extension of benefits to community groups and the development of natural products provide a viable vehicle for the entry of local communities into the mainstream economies of African countries. There is need to ensure that product quality is enhanced and efficient market linkages are developed to avoid frustrating participating communities.
- The CIP has demonstrated that natural resources conservation cannot be conducted outside of the context of overall national development planning

processes. There is therefore a need to ensure that conservation programmes are integrated into these processes.

- The CIP has demonstrated that global environmental benefits can be realized from the implementation of local conservation initiatives. The identification of bird species of global significance in Mwingi District as a result of this local initiative is a clear case in point.
- Projects like CIP that are implemented over short time periods run the risk of being unsustainable over the long term as funding usually comes to an end before results are institutionalized. There is therefore a need for original project proposals for such projects to build in provisions for support beyond projected project lives to ensure sustainability.

1.0 Introduction

This report presents the findings of a Final Evaluation of the UNDP funded project: “Developing Incentives for Community Participation in Forest Conservation through the use of Commercial Insects in Kenya (CIP)” (Project ID-KEN/04/G35). Final Evaluations are a mandatory requirement of UNDP/GEF Midsize Projects.

The evaluation analyzed and assessed the achievements and progress made towards achieving the objectives of the CIP Project. The evaluation was also conducted to identify factors that influenced the achievement of the project objectives.

Finally, the evaluation provides recommendations and lessons learned from the implementation of the project that could be of use in designing similar projects in future.

The Terms of Reference for the evaluation required that particular attention be paid to the following aspects of the project:

- (1) Project Design – review the original project intervention strategy including objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities and assess quality of the design and delivery of planned outcomes. The review should also assess the conceptualization, design, effectiveness, relevance and implementability of the project. The review should also include the updated logical framework matrix which was designed during Project Inception. This evaluation shall cross-reference the results, and report, including recommendations of the Project Steering Committees which have been carried out yearly since the project start.
- (2) Project Impact – assess the achievements of the CIP Project to date against the original objectives, outcomes and activities using the indicators as defined in the project document as well as any valid amendments made thereafter. Of particular relevance are the indicators that have been identified during Project Inception. Achievements should be measured against the indicators as described in the log frame.
- (3) Project Implementation – assess:
 - a. Project management arrangements, i.e., effectiveness of UNDP/GEF, UNDP Country Office, the Project Coordination Unit (CIP PCU),
 - b. Quality and timeliness of delivering outputs and activities;
 - c. Financial situation (i.e., budget and expenditure status). In this regard, this evaluation is not a financial audit, which is a separate process carried out by UNDP. If a financial audit was done the consultants should have access to the audit reports under the auspices of UNDP;
 - d. Cooperation among partners including but not limited to: GEF, UNDP, Governments counterpart Ministries, PCU, KFS and private companies;
 - e. Responsiveness of project management to adapt and implement changes in project execution, based on partner and stakeholder feedback;

1.1 Methodology of the evaluation

The Final Evaluation of the CIP was conducted over the period May 19, 2008 to June 20, 2008 and covered the followed aspects:

A briefing session by representatives of principal project stakeholders was held on the first day of the evaluation to provide the reviewer with a broad overview of the project and each agency's mandate on the project. Presentations were made by representatives of UNDP-GEF, UNDP Kenya, Nature Kenya, Kenya Organic Agriculture Network (KOAN), Ministry of Finance (Treasury), National Environmental management Authority (NEMA), Kenya Forest Service (KFS), and icipe.

The reviewer then conducted field visits to the three project sites in Mwingi, Arabuko Sokoke and Kakamega where site visits and interviews with project stakeholders were conducted to establish progress that has been achieved to date with project implementation. Only a few of the project sites could be visited during field visits mainly due to the long distances between these sites and the limited time within which the review was conducted.

The review of project documents was also conducted concurrently with field visits and follow-up interviews with stakeholders in Nairobi. Despite the limited number of sites visited, the reviewer is confident that the sites visited and the interviews conducted provided a strong enough basis for the formulation of conclusions about project implementation since its inception.

1.2 Structure of the Report

This report is made up of an Executive Summary and seven chapters as follows:

Chapter 1 is an Introduction that provides an overview of the purpose of the evaluation, key issues addressed and the methodology used in conducting the evaluation.

The CIP project is briefly described in Chapter 2. This chapter also provides an analysis of the context within which the project was developed. This includes the problems that the project was designed to address, its immediate and development objectives, the main stakeholders involved in the implementation of the project as well as the outcomes and or results expected from the process.

Chapter 3 analyses the main findings of the evaluation focusing on issues of project design, its responsiveness to national and global environmental priorities and the extent to which national stakeholders were involved in the implementation of the project. This chapter is followed by Chapter 4 which provides an analysis of financial planning and management and assesses whether project resources were used in an effective manner.

Chapter 5 discusses the extent to which the project has met its intended objectives and provides a rating of specific project elements against targets set at project inception.

Finally the recommendations from the evaluation and lessons learnt from the implementation of the CIP that could be useful in the design of similar projects in future are given in Chapters 6 and 7 respectively.

2.0 The project and its development context

The Developing Incentives for Community Participation in Forest Conservation Through the use of Commercial Insects in Kenya (CIP) is a UNDP-GEF funded project that was intended to reverse the problem of loss of forest resources in three ecologically representative regions of Kenya through the provision of poverty alleviation incentives, alternative income sources and institutional capacity building services to forest adjacent communities. The project was developed to demonstrate that there was greater economic value in biodiversity conservation than in the direct exploitation of the resource which was almost always done in unsustainable ways. The project aims and objectives as well as the expected outcomes are detailed in the sections below.

Although the Project Document for the UNDP/GEF supported “was signed in June 2005 funding of activities had commenced earlier (with) a first disbursement having been made in December of 2003. The project was to be implemented over a four year period with a project completion date of July/August 2008. A no cost extension for the project to December 2008 was approved in March 2008.

Kenya has instituted a comprehensive system of protected areas for the conservation of its rich biodiversity endowment. Up to 12 % of the country’s land area is reserved as protected areas that include forest, marine and wildlife management areas. These areas are represented across the country’s ecological zones from the coastal zones through the dry lands of the north east, the central rift valley to the well watered western regions that are the country’s “bread basket”. The three project sites under the CIP (Arabuko Sekoko, Mwingi and Kakamega) were selected to represent these unique ecological systems. These sites were also chosen because they hold biodiversity of regional and global significance. Arabuko Sekoko is one of 19 Important Bird Areas that have been prioritised as critical sites for intensive and immediate conservation action in Kenya (Bennun & Njoroge 1999). It is part of the East African Coastal Forest / Eastern Arc Mountain forest complex that ranks among the top 25 biodiversity hotspots on earth (Myers *et al.* 2000). Arabuko-Sokoke is home to 6 globally threatened bird species and 5 globally threatened mammals, an additional 5 bird species are strict coastal forest

Mwingi district represents the tropical and sub-tropical dry forests and woodlands which are important sources of livelihood for large sections of the population in east and southern Africa. The district is also home to the globally threatened Hinde’s Babbler, which has a very restricted range in Central Kenya and the pancake tortoise, *Malacochersus tornieri*, which is found now only in Kitui-Mwingi on scattered rocky hilltops. It is threatened by habitat destruction and over collection for trade.

Kakamega Forest is the only mid-altitude tropical rainforest left in Kenya. It is the easternmost outlier of the Congo Basin forests. Kakamega hosts 2 globally threatened and 15 regionally threatened bird species while its mammalian fauna is diverse and shows clear affinities to the West African rainforest.

The country’s protected areas have traditionally been managed using a command and control approach which has generally excluded poor community groups living adjacent to these areas from management decision making processes. All three forest areas are surrounded by large and growing human population which reaches densities of over 1,000

people per square kilometer in Vihiga District. The forests has suffered from subsistence and commercial logging and clear felling of indigenous forest to make way for agriculture and plantations of exotic trees. Increased human populations and food insecurity in the areas surrounding protected areas has resulted in encroachment as community groups seek to meet their survival needs, with the consequent loss of biodiversity. This phenomenon is worsened by the limited economic opportunities and livelihood options as well as limited individual and institutional capacities for biodiversity management among these communities.

The core forest estates in the three project site areas were experiencing extensive resource degradation due to unsustainable use of forest resources for firewood, illegal logging for commercial timber especially in Kakamega and Arabuko-Sokoke and excisions of forest land for settlement or other uses that detracted from sustainable forestry management practices. Up until recently, there were no comprehensive forest management plans that were being implemented, resulting in uncoordinated approaches to management. While there was some form of management practice in the core forests, the areas around these, the buffer zones and the settlement zones, suffered extensive deforestation with no motivation to replant degraded areas.

In response to the problems described above, the Government of Kenya (GoK) developed the CIP project aimed at poverty reduction and improved food security and incomes of farmers and rural women by promoting equitable and effective use of forest resources and biodiversity in the three protected areas of Kakamega, Mwingi and Arabuko Sekoke through which it is intended to introduce income generating activities using commercial insects (honeybees and silkworms) as an incentive for improving conservation practices.

The project is premised on the understanding that management of the national system of forest reserve will be strengthened through improved incentives for real collaborative forest management with communities. Through this project, on-farm and in-forest livelihood support systems involving the use of commercial insects in the production of honey and wild silk and harvesting of butterflies have been introduced in forest buffer zones aimed at protecting the target forest areas from further degradation. The system of participatory forest management (PFM) that has been introduced includes the establishment of Village Forest Associations for Participatory Forest Management. In addition, marketing centres for silk and honey products from the three project sites have been established and linkages to the wider national and international markets have been established. The success of this project will depend upon the capacity of communities and institutions to manage and utilize insects for both livelihood and forest conservation benefits. It is in response to this that a comprehensive capacity development component has been incorporated as an important component of the project.

The Project has the following intended Outputs:

6. A forest management framework that facilitates community participation in buffer zone enterprises and conservation is in place at all project sites;

7. Forest adjacent communities, through integrated forest associations are actively engaged in forest conservation through buffer zone management and enterprises;
8. The capacity of communities and institutions to manage and utilize both wild and mulberry silk-moth and honey bee biodiversity for income generation is increased;
9. Improved management methodologies and insect resources are available at sites to allow efficient resource use for improved livelihoods and conservation practices
10. Effective project administration, monitoring and coordination to enable timely and efficient implementation of project activities.

2.1 Main stakeholders

The CIP has been implemented through the active participation of a number of main stakeholders. The Government of Kenya is a major stakeholder and has been involved in the project through various institutions. The principal institution has been the Department of Forestry (now Kenya Forest Service) which is charged with the responsibility to manage the forest reserves at the three project sites. The National Environmental Management Authority, as the National GEF Focal Point participates as a member of the Project Steering Committee. The Ministry of Finance is the signatory to all agreements with development partners. Other government agencies that are important stakeholders include the Ministries of Agriculture and Local Government through which advisory, administrative and technical services have been provided to the project.

Perhaps the most important stakeholders in the project are the local communities that are organized in a variety of structures at the three project sites.

The project has been supported by a number of international agencies and non-governmental organizations that have provided both financial and technical support. The original support provided by USAID through Nature Kenya built the foundation for the present project. The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) have provided substantial resources to the project. The support to the project has been channeled through the International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE).

2.2 Outcomes/ Results expected

Expected project outputs have been discussed above. The impacts or results that were expected at project inception were as follows:

1. That the conservation of forest-protected areas would be promoted and supported through improved buffer zone management with the involvement of local communities.

2. Methodologies and capacities to improve the livelihoods of forest adjacent communities that are based on commercial use of insect resources, are developed, linked to forest habitats and scaled-up.

These two outcomes were to be achieved through the implementation of the indicative activities detailed below:

Output 1 A forest management framework in place that facilitates community participation in buffer zone enterprise and conservation in all project sites.

Key Indicative Activities: (to be implemented through the Kenya Forest Department):

- Awareness raising and capacity building within District Partners (Forestry and District Environment Committees) for community partnership.
- Specific Participatory Forestry Management-Integrated Conservation and Development (PFM-CD) training for partner staff.
- Buffer Zone management planning stressed within Forest Management Plan processes, and buffer zone pilot intervention areas identified.
- Kakamega – detailed aerial resource assessment carried out (KFD/KWS).
- Networking district partners (and between districts for Kakamega)
- CBO survey and link to District PRSP processes (livelihood/poverty mapping).
- Reserve boundary demarcation in Mwingi, Buffer demarcation elsewhere.
- Biodiversity assessment in Buffer Zones (contrast core) focus on tree regeneration and use, and useful commercial insect indicators.

Output 2 Forest adjacent communities, through registered Forest Associations are actively engaged in forest conservation through buffer-zone management and enterprise.

Key Indicative Activities (to be implemented Forest Department and ICIPE):

- Creation of Village Forest Committees (model from Cross Borders/Arabuko)
- Scale up Committees to registered Forest Associations (as per Forest Bill).
- Scale up to overall Site Based Association, linked to DFO / Dist. Environment Committee.
- Buffer zones patrolled and protected, sustainable resource strategies in place.
- Fire breaks installed and village jurisdictions agreed and in management plan.
- Degraded areas restored (buffer planting, regeneration tending, gully plugging).
- Tree Nursery support for restoration.
- Training for Forest Associations {FA} - study tours, cross visits, site-training workshops.
- FAs involved in buffer zone M&E processes, targeting insects and tree growth.
- FAs promote on farm tree use, fuel wood surveys, pole use surveys
- FAs promote improved energy stoves etc on farm.

Output 3 The capacity of communities and institutions to manage and utilize both wild and mulberry silk-moth and honeybee biodiversity for income generation is increased.

Key Indicative Activities (to be implemented by ICIPE):

- Selection of villages, sub-villages and household clusters (link to buffer zone areas).
- Household livelihood and income mapping in pilot areas.
- Training of participating groups on site and in ICIPE for apiculture and sericulture ventures.
- Training for apiaries providing honey and hive products, and for processing and packaging facilities.
- Training community members in wild-silk moth recognition, farming of useful races, and monitoring.
- Training and support for mulberry planting on field borders, for domestic silk moth, fuel and fodder.
- Training and support for silk preparation including reeling and weaving in village marketplaces.
- Upgrade these household activities to village processes.
- User Groups are formed, registered, trained and capacity to manage enterprise is built
- Communities are linked to and working with private sector markets (Link to Output 4).

Output 4 Improved methodologies and insect resources are available at sites to allow efficient resource use for improved livelihoods and conservation practices.

Key Indicative Activities (to be implemented by ICIPE and partners):

- Apiaries established and operational in all three sites.
- Queen rearing and royal jelly production system established.
- Silk moth rearing houses and wild silk moth farming sites established and operational.
- Marketplaces (including processing/packaging facilities) established for silk/honey products at all three sites.
- Marketing linkages established through Viking Ltd.

Output 5. Effective project administration, monitoring and coordination have enabled timely and efficient implementation of project activities.

Key Indicative Activities will be:

- Forest facilitators in place and functioning at all three sites
- Overall supervision from FD is functioning and supported.
- Project Management Unit in ICIPE is staffed, functioning and providing leadership and oversight.
- Project partnership between co-finance and baseline is functioning, supported by NEMA at national level and Environment Committees at District level.
- National and Site Level Steering Committees are held as planned.

- Funds disbursed and accounted for satisfactorily (UNDP NEX Audit Procedures)
- Project Independent Evaluations held on schedule (midterm and terminal).
- Monitoring and Evaluation processes are coordinated at site and national levels, from baseline to impact assessments on both biodiversity and livelihoods.
- Project documented and results lessons disseminated. Training brochures are in place and used.
- Outreach mechanisms in place addressing both livelihood (PRSP) and conservation policy processes.

Project achievements will be assessed against the extent to which these outputs have been achieved since project inception.

3.0 Findings and Conclusions

3.1 Project Formulation

The Commercial Insects Project focuses on building capacities of forest adjacent local communities and support institutions to enable them to manage and effectively utilize forests and linked resources for their own benefit and, in the process, guarantee the conservation of these resources. The CIP project conceptualisation correctly identifies the causes of the problem of the loss of forest resources as being due to poverty, poor institutional coordination, limited capacity for resource management which resulted in the command and control approaches used by forest managers. This approach kept local communities out of the benefit loop resulting in them exploiting forest resources in unsustainable ways.

The CIP Logframe identified objectives and outputs that would result in better conserved forests. The plan of implementation also clearly identified project beneficiaries who were to benefit from capacity building activities that were intended to improve community capacities for conservation thereby enhancing their abilities to earn incomes from resources other than the forests that they have depended upon in the past. These results were to be facilitated through the suite of activities that are highlighted in Chapter 2 of this evaluation report. All the activities implemented under this project were therefore appropriate for addressing the contextual issues that the project was developed to deal with.

The design of the project also addressed pertinent national conservation priorities as identified in the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan which points to the need for the conservation of the various forest types in the country. The conservation of these forests will enable Kenya to address conservation priorities of the Global Environment Facility (GEF Strategic Priority BD 1 which relates to sustained protected area systems) and the provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) relating to the conservation of critical ecosystems and threatened species. The CBD also promotes the active involvement of local communities in the management systems and benefit sharing schemes around natural resources. Through these linkages with international environmental agreements the CIP would contribute to the conservation of globally significant biological resources.

The CIP was designed to be implemented over a four year period. This is in line with all GEF funded projects which are design to be implemented within a specific timeframe. This

timeframe was however not adequate considering that the project was addressing issues of biodiversity conservation and providing alternative livelihood options for rural communities, aspects of development which require longer term interventions than four years. Even with this limitation, it is instructive to note that the CIP Project Document did not include a clear strategy as to what would need to be done to ensure that results achieved would not be lost. ICIPE should have included an exit strategy that clearly indicated what would happen with the project when funding ended. The evaluation proposes a number of actions that can be taken to move the community level process forward at the end of the project in December 2008.

3.2 Implementation approach

CIP is a complex project which involves a range of activities from operations at local community levels where community groups are involved in silk and honey production through the research activities of ICIPE, the policy formulation processes of government up to the establishment of national and international market linkages being developed by Viking Limited. This spread of focus areas and the variety of stakeholders involved in the project have necessitated the development of effective coordination mechanisms to make all these elements work together effectively.

Overall project coordination rests with ICIPE which is the beneficiary institution for all programme funds. ICIPE disburses these funds to participating institutions against approved workplans. At national level ICIPE work in collaboration with primary stakeholders such as the KFS, NEMA, IFAD and UNDP-GEF. A Project Steering Committee is responsible for overall project management and supervision including approval of annual workplans. At local level, this project has a focus on the conservation of biodiversity in three forest areas in Kenya. To achieve intended results, the project has established strong operational ties with an ongoing IFAD project for product development. The project links with the expertise and commitment of existing Forest Department and other Government services, local NGO's and local groups to implement activities for which they have comparative advantage. By selecting the District Community Development Plan as the basis of all planning, activities and investments, the project avoided possible duplication resulting in it establishing transparent relationships with other development partners, as well as leveraging additional commitment from other donors. ICIPE is in contact with several organisations involved in biodiversity conservation, and linkages with these institutions have been established through collaborative MOUs. These organisations and institutions are:

- National Museums Kenya for bio-indicator studies.
- Nairobi University Kenya for pollinator bee race selection, and support to production systems for Royal Jelly.
- Kenya Agricultural Research Institute, Kenya for information on agricultural development at project sites.

For effective technical and administrative management of the project ICIPE established a Project Management Unit at their Nairobi Headquarters that is headed by the

Commercial Insects Programme Coordinator. The original plan was for the Coordinator to be assisted by a team of four professional staff, namely:

- Silk Moth Technical Officer (to be based in Kakamega)
- Honey Technical Officer (to be based in Arabuko-Sokoke)
- Training Coordinator (to be based at ICIPE)
- A Post Harvest Coordinator (to be based at ICIPE)

In addition, five technical assistants were to provide village based support in developing community-based organizations. This management structure was however not evident at the time of the Final Evaluation. Instead, the Programme Coordinator was assisted by a Silk Scientist and two Post Doctoral Consultants working in the areas of honey and silk moth production at Headquarters in Nairobi. In addition, three Doctoral students, one at each project site, were working with communities on promoting silk production while one pre-doctoral student is working on meliponiculture (promoting honey production from stingless bees).

The communities are engaging staff (members of their groups) to manage the market places with executive committees that coordinate purchases, processing and sales of honey produced by community groups and also to purchase and process silk cocoons sourced from producer communities. Three staff in this category were interviewed at Mwingi, six at Kakamega and two at Arabuko Sekoko.

A unique implementation modality for the project that has been adopted by ICIPE is through support to value chain development for the various products. The central goals of this approach are poverty alleviation and employment creation which result in biodiversity conservation. ICIPE supports these value chains through investment in improved production infrastructure and human capital development through training and capacity building. Producer communities such as butterfly pupae producers in Arabuko Sekoko and beekeepers in Mwingi and Kakamega have been provided with improved equipment and linked to national and international markets from which direct benefits are being realized. All project sites visited demonstrated the impact of this approach with participating communities acknowledging that the increased benefits they are realizing from biodiversity have motivated them to promote sustainable exploitation of the resources at their disposal. Previously conflictual relationships between community groups and park and forest managers have been replaced by collaborative management systems with some communities engaged in buffer zone reforestation projects.

3.3 Country Ownership/Drivenness

Kenya ratified the CBD on July 26th, 1994 and is a member state of the Global Environmental Facility; and is therefore eligible for technical assistance through the United Nations System.

The country has established a network of protected areas (wildlife, forest and marine and freshwater ecosystems) covering some 12% of the land surface as the basis for conserving its country's biological diversity. Closed forests cover some 1.6% of the land

surface, and most forests are in the PA system. This PA system helps meet Kenya's global and national commitment to biodiversity conservation, as expressed within Kenya's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NEMA 2000). This commitment also entails the allocation of substantial financial resources for the management of these protected areas. It is in this context that the GoK has committed resources to the CIP thereby ensuring that the programme is owned and driven by national considerations.

Of all the protected areas in Kenya, the forest reserves have always been most vulnerable to encroachment, overuse and degazettement due to growing demand for agricultural land and fuel-wood resources, which override perceived benefits from the forest. CIP seeks to reverse this trend through ensuring that benefit streams flow from resource use systems other than agriculture. The introduction of production systems based on the use of commercial insects provides this alternative and results in increased conservation of the forests as communities reduce their dependence on this resource. In other words, it is expected that the project will be able to demonstrate that the returns from commercial insects are higher than those from the harvesting of timber. The results and experiences from the implementation of this project will be useful in the process of mainstreaming participatory methodologies in national development planning processes in future.

The CIP has also contributed to the review and modification of forest management policies and allowed for communities to realize direct benefits which in turn encourage them to participate in conservation initiatives.

ICIPE has established an effective project management institutional infrastructure that includes a variety of stakeholders including representatives of government at all levels as well as community members. The National Environment Management Authority is the national focal point for GEF projects in the country and therefore plays an important role in the implementation of the project. This participation by country representatives is clear evidence of country ownership

3.4 Stakeholder participation

The project concept and design was developed through active consultation of involved communities. Forest adjacent communities were identified through these processes and their views gathered to input into project design. .

The project is also structured to provide incentives to community groups to encourage them to reduce their dependence on forest resources. This focus on incentives and income generation required the participation of private sector entities that could help identify markets for the alternative products that are now being realized from project implementation. This is the process through which Viking Limited, a company that is now providing market intelligence to producer community groups was identified.

Non-governmental organizations have also been enlisted to provide scientific inputs such as bio-surveys that have been used to inform project design. While it is difficult to say when consultation and stakeholder participation can be considered to be enough, it

is the view of the evaluation that the CIP planning phase was extensive and covered most of the institutions that had a contribution to make to the project formulation.

3.5 Sustainability

The link between biodiversity conservation and economic benefits is fraught with a lot of problems. First and foremost, it takes a long time for biodiversity improvements to be realized from project interventions. The four year timeframe that the CIP has been implemented over is hardly adequate for the determination of direct and quantifiable benefits on the ground. Secondly, there are numerous variables that impinge upon the realization of biodiversity benefits from project implementation. These range from the impacts of climate variability, management and policy deficits, policy changes and the general lack of baseline data. Sustainability of projects such as CIP is influenced by these variables to a great extent. It is important that these variables are taken into account at the design stages of such projects.

The developing world is replete with projects that have folded as soon as external financial support stops. It is important therefore that projects and programmes implemented in rural areas include elements that will ensure that projects continue beyond their end dates. The Government of Kenya continues to commit resources to the CIP through the participation of staff from various extension departments that are organized into project implementation teams. UNDP funding has also been complemented by financing from a number of additional sources. Project design needs to ensure that the policy and legal frameworks within which projects such as the CIP are developed allow for effective participation and ownership of the projects by local communities. The CIP has adopted a participatory approach to the formulation of new and revised policies and legal instruments for forestry management. The Forest Act of 2007 provides for community participation in the management of forestry resources that were previously considered to be state resources. This should guarantee that the project can continue beyond the period of support by GEF.

The provision for communities realizing economic and social benefits that enable them to reduce their dependence on forest goods and services will also contribute to the sustainability of this initiative. Already, CIP is contributing upwards of US\$ 53, 000.00 in revenue from non-extractive forest products such as wild silk and honey. These new products are proving to be valuable additions, if not alternatives, to traditional economic activities such as livestock rearing which has its limitations in dry areas like Mwingi District. This broadening of livelihood options for community groups will increase potential for sustainability of this project. Reduced exploitation of forest resources will ensure their continued productivity thereby ensuring availability of the resource over time. All community groups that have started receiving benefits from project activities have confirmed that they will be willing to continue with their project activities without support from outside.

Closely related to the income generation incentive discussed above as a source of project sustainability is the need for on-going projects to identify new and innovative project financing alternatives to ensure the continued flow of resources. Kenya has a number of financial mechanisms that are available to various sectors of the community in the form of loans and grants that CIP initiated projects can source support from at the end of the GEF sponsorship thereby ensuring sustainability. Government has set up community

development funding sources that are accessible in each constituency. Special funding sources are also available for women and youth groups through mechanisms such as the Kenya Agricultural Development Programme implementation entities also need to take advantage of parallel projects and programmes that are being funded by other donors and or government that could be used to pick up from where GEF will leave CIP. Examples include the World Bank supported Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Programme that includes a component focusing on natural resources management and also promotes community driven development initiatives and the Green Zones Development Support Project (2007-2015) that is funded by the African Development Bank and covers twenty-four districts in the country. Some CIP implementing communities such as the Isiekuti Organic Farming Youth Group in Vihiga District are already benefitting from this programme. What is needed is to ensure that there is a seamless transition from CIP to new programme phases so as to avoid disruption of working programmes.

A potential threat to the CIP is the fact that not all community members are participants in the project activities that are currently under implementation. Both participating communities and those that are not members have equal rights to the resources being exploited through the projects. There is therefore a very real socio-political threat to the sustainability of these projects that emanates from the potential for non-participating community members claiming their rights over the common resources. It is important therefore that benefit sharing mechanisms that adequately compensate all community members are designed and implemented in the project areas. This threat is being mitigated through the deployment of trainers to work with non-participating communities. Already numerous informal groups have been established in areas adjacent to project sites and requests have been received for assistance with initiating project activities among these groups

Institutional deficits and capacity limitations are a usual cause for the collapse of projects when outside support ends. It is instructive to note that CIP has established local level project management institutions that are run by community groups themselves to manage project activities. All the project sites visited demonstrated local ownership of processes with a number of communities displaying capabilities for the design and management of meetings, visitor tours and projects in general. A major feature that cut across all projects visited was the predominance of women as members and office bearers of groups. This has resulted in the empowerment of women who are now recognized for their contributions to project activities. The net effect of this is that these projects are contributing directly to the poverty reduction strategy at local level. Working with and through women also guarantees impact at household level as women are responsible for the welfare of the household. The income that is flowing to the women was reported to be having direct household impact through increased abilities of households to fund important needs such as children's education and health delivery needs.

Training in project management and organizational development prepare community groups to take over the management of programmes into the future. CIP has deliberately incorporated these aspects into programme management in places such as MUSHAs in Kakamega where community groups have assumed management of reforestation programmes from the Forestry Department and are developing plans for the establishment of planted forestry buffer zones involving 20 villages around the core protected forest. This

institutional strengthening will lay a strong foundation for programme management after project termination. From the above analysis it is likely that the CIP will be sustainable from an institutional and governance perspective.

Project sustainability is also assessed through an environmental prism. There is clear evidence that the incentives that CIP is providing to participating communities and the benefits they are realizing have engendered increased concern for conservation of biodiversity among these communities. This concern has increased to a level where the majority of community groups assessed are actively collaborating with conservation agencies such as Forestry Department to replant degraded areas. Most communities also indicated that they would continue with the programme even if support from outside stopped. Environmental sustainability is therefore likely as a result of the implementation of CIP.

Local initiatives need to be managed by local champions for the rest of the community members to relate to them and decide to take part. The majority of projects evaluated during the evaluation are driven by local champions who serve as chairpersons, community trainers and facilitators who are demonstrating the power of local leadership. At the overall project management level, the staff at ICIPE has shown unparalleled commitment to the CIP with many of them spending a lot of time on field-based research and community mobilization. The efforts of these champions are yielding huge benefits to the project with numerous groups visited reporting that more community members are requesting support with the establishment of new projects under CIP.

Most community projects collapse when they fail to identify and maintain markets for their products. In addition, most projects have failed to maintain markets due to the poor quality of their products. CIP has addressed both these constraints through linking producer communities with the market through Viking Limited and also working towards certification of the silk and honey products. Quality assurance is an on-going process with CIP especially given the demand for organic products worldwide. These two initiatives should ensure that the products from community groups are of a standard high enough to pass the stringent non-formal trade barriers that are in place internationally.

3.6 Replication

The CIP is yielding important lessons that can be considered for use in designing other initiatives. The first and most important lessons that CIP has yielded is that success in promoting the conservation and ecological integrity of protected areas, such as forests, is more readily assured where community groups that live in areas adjacent to these areas are involved in the management of such areas and also realize direct benefits from them. This experience should be up scaled and replicated to other parts of the country and beyond.

Community groups in the three project sites have adopted project elements to different levels. Communities in Mwingi are enjoying higher benefits than those in Kakamega and Arabuko Sekoko as evidenced by the volumes of products and the amounts of money that are flowing back to project participants. It is important that the knowledge and

experience generated in this area are shared with the other participating communities around the country. Already, there is evidence that community members that have not participated in projects before are making enquiries as to how they can join successful projects or form their own. Project management needs to follow up on these and incorporate them into the larger initiative. The reviewer identified communities in Mwingi, Kakamega and Arabuko that could be included in the larger initiative,

The CIP has trained a lot of trainers that are operating in the various project locations. These trainers, who handle both honey and wild silk production, need to be used strategically to up-scale and replicate the experience with CIP. Mr. Aggery Mambiri of the Farm and Forest Conservation Group at Shirere Village in Kakamega is demonstrating the utility of these trainers as he works with two groups to promote silk production. There are numerous other trainers that are working with communities with impressive results being recorded. This training approach could be used to spread the CIP to other regions of the African continent and beyond. In addition, CIP has also promoted exchange visits among projects in the three sites. These could be extended to other regions of Africa and further afield so that experiences from these other regions could be used to inform CIP processes.

The project is also replicable at a regional level where lessons learned are adopted in other countries. Already, ICIPE has started implementing similar projects in Uganda and southern Sudan. There is need to explore potential for replication into regions such as Southern Africa where there have been previous programmes based on community participation in environmental resource conservation.

3.7 Linkages between project and other interventions within the country

The CIP is one of a few GEF projects currently under implementation in the forest sector in Kenya. Associated projects include the Green Zones Development Support Project funded by the African Development Bank and the Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Programme which have already been discussed in this report.

4.0 Project Implementation

4.1 Financial Planning

The overall GEF alternative is US\$3,450,000 plus a total baseline across the four years of US\$2,140,000 giving a total of US\$ 5,520,000. The GEF increment is US\$ 1.0 million, and co-financing is \$2.450 million.

4.2 Incremental cost assessment

Without the support of the GEF and leveraged co-finance the project objectives would not have been met. Experience at Arabuko-Sokoke and Kakamega has demonstrated that external support for forest-based community livelihoods can help drive local communities to conserve forest resources and participate in PFM initiatives. Ongoing income generation activities that are based on the sustainable use of forest resources build confidence in the PFM process, alleviate the poverty that drives forest degradation, and motivate communities towards advocacy on behalf of forest

conservation. Despite these benefits, there are no funds available within the Kenyan Forest Service budget to support community income-generating activities and there is little capacity among the KFS staff to initiate and sustain non-timber based enterprises. GEF and other financing agencies were therefore required to access the necessary skills and expertise for the establishment and sustainability of community “Income Generation Associations” (that also act as Forest Associations) based on income from commercial insects.

Co- financing was also provided by the following organizations:

ICIPE are the project management entity with special research and development input into the project. Through these efforts, ICIPE has identified new races of both bees and moths which have been used to augment levels of production of both honey and silk. The training they provided throughout the life of the project has resulted in the upgrading of skills among project beneficiaries. ICIPE’s in-kind contribution to the project is estimated at US\$ 200,000.

Viking Ltd Kenya is a registered company (Kenya and United Kingdom) in the field of Material and Natural Resources – Market Access and Development. Viking has worked with ICIPE / IFAD before on the piloting of product marketing, and has developed linkages at Kakamega and Mwingi. Viking invests time, vehicle support and expertise in this MSP process, costed at US\$ 100,000.

IFAD provided US\$ 1,400,000 co-finance, towards the survey, documentation and testing of bee and silk-moth races, quality selection and testing, inputs to product quality and market development. This is based on their successful partnership with ICIPE in the prior pilot project.

Nature Kenya (with funding via USAID) provided support to the community of the Arabuko-Sokoke Forests in nature-based enterprise (US\$ 150,000) and support to Participatory Forest Management and Management Plan implementation in Arabuko-Sokoke (US\$350,000). Nature Kenya also supported the conduct of assessments involving threatened species in Mwingi which has resulted in the area being identified as an Important Bird Area.

Government of Kenya provides in kind support through the forest, agriculture and environmental sectors of government, at both central and district levels. This is estimated at US \$ 200,000 over the four years.

The overall assessment of the evaluation is that all pledged co-financing was committed to the project. This assessment is based on the results that have been achieved to date. ICIPE has provided training and research which has benefitted the project beneficiaries through positioning them to effectively manage project interventions.

Viking Limited Kenya has developed both local and international market linkages that have resulted in increased orders for honey. Through the “Best of Kenya” marketing

initiative, Viking has identified a market for 10,000 bottles of Mwingi honey through the Farmers Choice chain of stores.

IFAD provided initial support to ICIPE that was used for conducting surveys, documentation and testing of bee and silk-moth races. This support formed the basis of an earlier phase of support to and collaboration with ICIPE which laid the foundation to the phase of the programme that is under review.

Co-financing from Nature Kenya through USAID focused on the management of biodiversity through the formulation and implementation of forest management plans in Arabuko Sekoko and Kakamega. Nature Kenya also supported the assessment of threatened bird species in Mwingi district which has resulted in the area being declared an Important Bird Area. Birds are an important indicator species for the status of biodiversity in any area

The in-kind contributions of the Government of Kenya have resulted in the involvement of staff from the various government entities that are assisting communities with project implementation. . .

4.3 Project Budget

Table 1: The GEF Budget by Input

COMPONENT	GEF Cost US\$
PDF A The project development was financed by ICIPE.	None
MEDIUM SIZED PROJECT	
Personnel	200,000
Subcontracts in Forestry	150,000
Training	170,000
Equipment	262,000
Travel	70,000
Monitoring Evaluation, Documentation, Lessons Learned	60,000
Miscellaneous	23,000
Institutional Overhead (ICIPE) and Audit	65,000
MS PROJECT GEF TOTAL IN \$US	1,000,000

Table 2: Co-Financing Committed

Institution	Amount (US\$)	Type
ICIPE	200,000.00	In-kind
Viking	100,000.00	In-kind
IFAD	1,400,000.00	Cash
Nature Kenya (USAID)	5000,000.00	Cash
Government of Kenya	250,000.00	
TOTAL	2,450,000.00	

4.4 Cost Effectiveness

The CIP has been under implementation for the past four years within which period it has yielded very impressive results as shown in the evaluation table in Chapter 5. The Table below shows the distribution of the GEF Increment across the five project output areas.

Table 3: Expenditure against GEF Increment per Activity as at March 31, 2008

Project Activity	GEF Amount (US\$)	Expenditure	Balance
Output 1: Forest Management Framework in Place	150,000.00	145,621.00	4,379.00
Output 2: CFAs Engaged in Conservation			
Output 3: Capacity of Community Institutions Increased	322,000.00	278,636.00	43,364.00
Output 4: Improved Methodologies and Insect Resources	268,000.00	265,490.00	2,510.00
Output 5: Effective Project Management	210,000.00	201,000.00	9,000.00
Output 6: Monitoring and Evaluation (UNDP)	50,000.00	1,000.00	49,000.00
Total	1000,000.00	891,747.00	108,253.00

As stated in the Financial Planning section above, the GEF Increment was used to finance aspects of the project that would otherwise not have been funded. GEF funded the creation of Forest Associations and capacity building activities resulting in the creation of strong institutions that are now contributing to the improved conservation of forest reserves thereby contributing to the achievement of global environmental benefits.

The project has overall met all the intended objectives and activities as shown in Table 4 which rates the project as having been Successful. In addition to achieving global environmental objectives, the project also achieved general development goals identified at project inception. The expenditure profile shown in Table 3 above shows that all components have been achieved within budget which indicates cost-effectiveness in project implementation.

The success achieved by the project also attracted additional funding during the course of implementation. The Toyota Environmental Activities Grant Programme contributed a total of US\$ 149,424.00 towards Capacity Building for Organic Certification in Mwingi District over the period January 2007 to December 2008. This money is being used to advance the certification process for honey products in Kenya with a consultant having already visited the Mwingi District in 2007 to evaluate production processes. Mwingi honey is certified as a true organic process. Further training is ongoing with collaboration from the Kenya Organic Agriculture Network (KOAN). A second external inspection is due later in the year.

4.5 Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation is a process through which project implementers track project management and implementation to ensure the project is on course to achieve intended objectives and outcomes. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is also used to monitor the use of financial and other resources over the course of a project life to ensure effective deployment of these resources. M&E uses measurable and quantifiable indicators to track these processes of project management. These are spelt out in the project Logical Frameworks that are developed at project formulation. In the case of GEF funded projects, comprehensive M&E guidelines have been developed to guide project implementers in the performance of the process.

The CIP Project Document included a Logical Framework with indicators that were developed on the basis of information drawn from relevant and authoritative institutions. Biodiversity indicators were drawn from information held by the forestry and wildlife management authorities including the surveys that were conducted by institutions such as Nature Kenya. These indicators have provided the basis upon which changes in biodiversity trends as a result of the implementation of the project have been tracked. A major weakness that is evident in the project was the lack of biodiversity baseline data particularly with reference to forestry cover change and threatened species at project inception, which made it difficult for the assessment of progress that has been made in achieving biodiversity targets. An additional project shortcoming was that no mid-term evaluation was conducted to track progress towards objectives. At best the project can only make reference to anecdotal evidence of biodiversity improvements on the ground. This situation is now being addressed through the work of PhD students attached to ICIPE through which baselines will now be established for monitoring the abundance

and distribution of honeybees and silkworm moths in Kakamega, Mwingi and Arabuko-Sokoke. Trends are showing increases in numbers of bee colonies and wild silk moths as indicated by increases in harvests of honey and silk cocoons.

ICIPE has conducted M&E throughout the life of the project in collaboration with principal institutions such as the Project Steering Committee, the Forest Department, the participating Districts and the GEF Operational Focal Point at NEMA. M&E has also been conducted at local levels by communities, albeit in an informal manner, as they tracked the revenues they are accruing from project implementation. The results of this exercise have been included in the Technical Progress Reports that ICIPE has produced on a bi-annual basis since the beginning of the project. A potential weak point at the beginning of the project was the slow uptake of M&E responsibilities by organizations such as the forestry department which needed training to bring them to the same level of understanding of the process. The department's staff also lacked an overall appreciation of biodiversity issues beyond the silvicultural training that they had. This weakness is being resolved through training that has been provided during project implementation. The review noted that the project was not subjected to a mid-term review. This is an opportunity to correct aspects of project management that are not going right that was missed.

Despite the limitations highlighted above, the overall assessment of this evaluation is that the M&E procedures and processes that have been put in place under this project are effective and have allowed for continuous monitoring of progress with project implementation and administration.

4.6 Management by the UNDP Country Office in Kenya

The UNDP Kenya office is the implementing agency of the GEF projects in the country. The Resident Representative of UNDP is represented on the Steering Committee by a Senior Programme Manager who provides guidance on both programme implementation and financial management to project management. UNDP also conduct periodic monitoring visits to project sites to apprise themselves of progress with implementation.

The review established that there was a very close working relationship between UNDP and ICIPE through which they share information and guidance freely. As a result, project management has been smooth with reporting schedules being adhered to and financial management being streamlined.

5.0 Results

5.1 Attainment of objectives, outcomes and outputs

Table 4 below details the progress that has been made by the project to date towards achieving intended objectives, outcomes and outputs that were set at project inception. The project sought to achieve the two interrelated outcomes of improved biodiversity management at three forest sites and the use of commercial insects to improve livelihood standards among community groups that previously depended upon these forestry resources. The improvement of livelihood standards among these communities

was expected to work as an incentive to participating communities to reduce their dependence on the forests thereby promoting conservation.

The Table below shows that these objectives have been met and in many cases exceeded through the implementation of the CIP. Only anecdotal evidence can be used to point to biodiversity benefits that have been accrued from the implementation of this project since there was no real baseline established at project inception. Despite this shortcoming however, there is evidence in all three project sites that community groups are reducing their dependence on forestry resources resulting in improvements in selected biodiversity indicators. Incomes from the use of commercial insects such as wild silk moth and African honeybees have also increased and are providing a major incentive to community groups encouraging them to desist from unsustainably exploiting the forest resources. Instead, communities have committed themselves to working with forestry management authorities to rehabilitate degraded forests through tree planting activities. On-farm tree planting programmes have also been embarked upon resulting in the creation of effective buffer zones around protected forests. The overall assessment of the evaluation is that the project has achieved its intended objective and is rated **Satisfactory**.

Table 4

Progress towards meeting project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs

Project Objective:	Indicator(s)	Baseline	Target at End of Project	Progress at Evaluation (May/June 2008)	Rating
To demonstrate in the three different forest sites that the biodiversity of Kenya's forest protected area system can be maintained through collaborative management systems using incentives based on income from commercial insects	a) Abundance ratings of wild silk-moth and pollinator bees are stable or increase	Nil (No data)	Positive changes in number and distribution	Baseline on wild silk moth and stingless bees conducted and populations being monitored through work being done by students.	S
	b) Forest dependent bird species show no loss of species/population abundance in core and buffer areas	IBA Data sets are in place	Increase in distribution of threatened species in all three sites	Bird survey conducted through Nature Kenya established five threatened species in the area. Although fewer bird species were recorded in 2007 than in 2006 (86 against 93) area still considered important bird area. Mwingi and Kitui valleys have been recognized by National Liaison Committee as an IBA in Kenya.	S

	c) 12000 hectares of forest and woodland under improved multi-stakeholder management	Nil	12,000 hectares	Losses of forest land have been arrested. Encroached forests recovered and replanted. At least 364 h recovered in Muumoni in Mwingi and 637 h recovered and being replanted in Kakamega forest. MUSHA Forest Association demonstrating commitment to the effort and have formed MUILESH CFA..	S
	d) Habitat monitoring shows no loss of forest area	Nil	No additional losses	No additional losses recorded to date with communities around Kakamega establishing nurseries for replanting. All communities visited establishing on-farm plantations of multiple use forests.	S
Overall Rating-Project Objective					S
Outcome 1					
The conservation of forest –protected areas is supported through improved buffer zone management with the involvement of local communities	a) Forest Management Plans for buffer zones stipulate role of communities	Nil	At least four management plans in place by end of project	Forest resource surveys conducted in Kilifi with 20 VDFCCs in place. Dida draft management plan (Arabuko) in place. Mabuwani Group in Arabuko has raised more than 38,000 seedlings for planting. Mapping also done in Mwingi and planting of up to 10 hectares of forest land in Nnu and Muthaitho areas	S

	b). Buffer zone resource assessments conducted and used in M&E	Nil		Wild silk moth and bee surveys have been conducted in all three forest areas and data has been published in technical reports and international journals (see list of publications)	S
Output 1					
A forest management framework in place that facilitates community participation in buffer zone enterprise and conservation in all project sites.	Forestry Policy that includes community participation developed	No Forestry Policy with community participation	Forestry Policy providing for participatory approaches developed and passed	Forestry Policy of 2005 now in place and PFM institutionalized as a way of managing forestry resources in all three areas. This has resulted in improved forestry management.	S
Output 2					
Forest adjacent communities, through registered Forest Associations are actively engaged in forest conservation through buffer-zone management and enterprise.	At least six CFAs registered/approved as PFM partners at three sites	No CFAs at project inception	6 CFAs in place	New Forest Act only gazette in 2007. Up to 12 CFAs have been formed but not yet registered (3 in Arabuko, 3 in Mwingi 6 in Kakamega). Number will be reduced due to requirement in Act for one CFA per Forest Station	HS
	Six CFAs involved in managing at least 12,000 hectares of forest across all three sites	No CFAs active	6 CFAs	Communities have attended training workshops on new Forest Bill. Draft management plans in place in all three forest areas.	MS
	At least six CFA plans for buffer zones management in place	None in place	6 CFA plans for buffer zones	These are still to be established although planting on-farm is going on in most communities especially around Arabuko and Kakamega forests.	MS

	At least six community CFAs empowered to run silk and honey businesses supported by Viking Ltd and other traders	None in place	6 CFAs	Viking Ltd supporting community groups in Mwingi district and have established a market for honey in Dubai through Farmers Choice. At least 100,000 bottles of Eco-honey required to satisfy this market demand. Silk products also finding growing markets.	S
Overall Rating Outcome 1					S
Outcome 2					
Methodologies and capacities to improve the livelihoods of forest adjacent communities that are based on commercial use of insect resources, are developed, linked to forest habitats and scaled-up.	Forest Associations formed in all target villages	None	6 CFAs in all three forest sites	FCAs formed and awaiting registration	S
	Income Generation Groups formed and increase in number, capacity and financial turnover	None	Local level groups formed in project sites	Most community groups visited are beginning to realize income from commercial insects and realizing the value of protected forests (See income streams under Output 4 below)	S
Output 3					
The capacity of communities and institutions to manage and utilize both wild and mulberry silk-moth and honeybee biodiversity for income generation is increased.	At least 900 community members trained in management and utilization of wild and mulberry silk and African Honeybees for income generation at end of project	None	At least 900 community members trained in apiculture and sericulture by end of project	Training has involved more than 3,000 community members. In all three districts training has been extended to staff from most government departments particularly KFS and DLPO. Mwingi and Arabuko have recorded more than 1000 farmers trained in each district.	HS
Output 4					

Improved methodologies and insect resources are available at sites to allow efficient resource use for improved livelihoods and conservation practices.	30 Apiaries (average 20 hives each) 20 silk moth rearing houses and 10 wild silk moth farming sites established and operational	None in Place	30 apiaries with 600 hives, 20 silkworm rearing houses, 10 wild silk moth farm sites	32 apiaries established with 1150 Langstroth hives (Mwingi 600, Arabuko Sokoke 300, Kakamega 150 hives)	HS
	5 market places (including processing and packaging facilities) are established for silk and honey products at all three sites.	1 in Mwingi established with British High Commission and IFAD funding	6 market places established in the three sites	6 market places operational in project areas. A total of US \$53 276.00 has been raised from 28,566 kgs of honey, 414.6 kgs of wild silk, 100 kg of B. mori cocoons and 25 kg of stingless bee honey. 921.98 grams of Royal Jelly has been produced in Arabuko Sokoke.	
Output 5					
Effective project administration, monitoring and coordination has enabled timely and efficient implementation of project activities	Steering Committee meetings held and minutes recorded	None	Meetings held annually	Three meetings held	S
	Project Management reports produced	None	Financial and technical reports produced every half year	Financial and technical reports, research findings produced	
	Socio-economic and biodiversity baselines produced in year 1	None	Baselines established. Baselines tracking tools developed	Socio-economic and biodiversity surveys completed in 2006 through work of PhD and MSc students	
Rating Outcome 2					S
Overall Project Rating					S

Source of data: ProDoc, Technical Reports, Interviews in the Field

Table 5: Project Performance Rating

RATING OF PROJECT ASPECTS AS PER GEF GUIDELINES		
Project Aspect	Evaluation Criteria	Rating
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits continue beyond project life; • Organisational Development and management; • Policy and Regulatory Frameworks; • Institutional Capacity Development; • Involvement of Champions; • Project Ownership • Environmental sustainability • Streamlining into development planning processes. • Financial Sustainability 	S
Achievement of Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information Dissemination; • Public Awareness; • Consultation Processes; • NGO Involvement 	HS
Implementation Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool • Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region • Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation • Feedback from M&E activities used for 	HS

	adaptive management.	
Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information Dissemination • Institutional Frameworks in place • Legal Frameworks 	S
Monitoring and Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is appropriate M&E system in place; • Clear practical indicators in place; • Data Analysis used for project management 	S
Overall Rating		S

Key: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)

5.2 Conclusions

The success achieved by ICIPE in implementing this project places an obligation on the organization to ensure that the gains that have been realized are not lost after the end of the project. GEF funding has clearly achieved the intended objective of creating new knowledge and technologies for the generation of incentives for communities to reduce their dependence on biodiversity resources of the forests at the three project sites. Further, the link between the provision of incentives and improved biodiversity conservation has been demonstrated through this project. New methods of beekeeping and the production of silkworm cocoons have been adopted by community groups over the four years the project has been implemented. What is not guaranteed though is whether these gains will be sustained if ICIPE were to withdraw from the activity at the end of the project in December 2008 without putting in place contingency measures to ensure continued community support. It is recommended therefore that ICIPE should start developing an exit strategy which will allow organizations that are better placed to work with community groups to finalize the process of product certification as well as develop markets for the products. The initial efforts that have been made in these two areas need to be followed up with the introduction of community groups to institutions that will help them grow these activities into rural businesses where producer communities hold controlling interests. There are a number of regional and international NGOs that can be enlisted to assist with this. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) has a Regional Headquarters for East and Southern Africa in Nairobi. This, regional office runs a Natural Futures Programme that aims to promote the certification and marketing of organic products from rural communities.

Project financing is another area that requires attention as the project nears completion. GEF does not fund follow-on activities so as part of its exit strategy ICIPE and its collaborative partners needs to identify funding sources that can continue providing the support it has been rendering the project until it is sustainable. There are a number of

financial mechanisms that can provide such support. The International Finance Corporation is one such institution while there are numerous national facilities that communities can access. The private sector could also be encouraged to participate through such activities as the construction of beehives. Where financial streams from the silk and honey production activities are showing sustainable increasing trends, such communities could be encouraged to access soft loans to capitalize their activities. ICIPE would maintain their research and technical support services to these activities in the areas of product quality development and market development. An immediate area for research that ICIPE could embark upon is the investigation of policy and institutional barriers to product certification.

6.0 Recommendations

The causal link between forest conservation and provision of incentives for livelihood improvement among forest adjacent communities has been proven through the implementation of the CIP. Over the four years the project has been under implementation, the Project Steering Committee has conducted constant monitoring of progress and has not had to change any of the project design aspects. Consideration now needs to be given to the implementation of measures that will guarantee the sustainability of this initiative in the future. The following recommendations are made as a way of informing the design and implementation of similar projects in future.

- Future biodiversity management projects include a component of establishing baseline data at least in the first year of their implementation to ensure their sustainability. CIP can only point to anecdotal improvements in the quality of biodiversity after four years of implementation.
- Biodiversity management projects should include elements of resource valuation to enable programme managers to adequately establish the levels of benefits that can be provided to community groups. This will help avoid situations where community expectations are raised beyond the levels that can be met by the projects;
- Natural resources management policies should include provisions for community benefits to make them sustainable over time;
- The Lessons learnt from the implementation of CIP in the three project sites need to be documented for replication and up-scaling. The interest shown by community groups that are not currently involved with project implementation is an opportunity that should not be missed. Further, opportunities to influence similar programme developments in other parts of the region should be identified and built upon.
- CIP experiences should be disseminated to other parts of Africa so they can influence similar programmes that also promote community participation in natural resource conservation and development planning.
- High expectations have been raised among community groups participating in the project. Care should be taken to avoid frustrating these communities through failure to ensure that they continue realizing the benefits that they are realizing today. The elements that ensure sustainability of such initiatives that are discussed in this

report should be followed up as the project reaches closure to ensure continuity into the future.

- ICIPE should design an exit strategy for themselves and identify institutions that could take over the growth of this initiative. ICIPE would retain their role as technical advisors.

7.0 Lessons Learned

The following lessons have been identified from the implementation of the CIP.

- The CIP has demonstrated that there is a direct link between conservation and livelihoods. Future projects should ensure that there is provision for local people to benefit from resources conservation programmes as this guarantees sustainability of such initiatives.
- Biodiversity conservation programmes are inherently expensive. These costs increase if a control and command process is adopted to implement such programmes. These costs are reduced considerably with the adoption of participatory methods of project management.
- The provision of benefits from conservation to community groups pre-supposes the presence of such values in the resources to be shared. There is need for the implementation of comprehensive resource valuation processes that will help quantify the extent of benefits to be shared with community groups. This also calls for the incorporation of resource valuation processes into formulation.
- Conservation programmes that include the extension of benefits to community groups and the development of natural products provide a viable vehicle for the entry of local communities into the mainstream economies of African countries. There is need to ensure that product quality is enhanced and efficient market linkages are developed to avoid frustrating participating communities.
- The CIP has demonstrated that natural resources conservation cannot be conducted outside of the context of overall national development planning processes. There is therefore a need to ensure that conservation programmes are integrated into these processes.
- The CIP has demonstrated that global environmental benefits can be realized from the implementation of local conservation initiatives. The identification of bird species of global significance in Mwingi District as a result of this local initiative is a clear case in point.
- Projects like CIP that are implemented over short time periods run the risk of being unsustainable over the long term as funding usually comes to an end before results are institutionalized. There is therefore a need for original project proposals for such projects to build in provisions for support beyond projected project lives to ensure sustainability.

8.0 Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation



Terms of Reference - Final Evaluation (FE)

UNDP/GEF Developing Incentives for Community Participation in Forest Conservation Through the Use of Commercial Insects in Kenya (CIP)

1. INTRODUCTION:

The Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (M&E Policy) at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives to:

- a) monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- b) provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- c) promote accountability for resource use;
- d) document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective Project monitoring and evaluation. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators through the annual Project Implementation Reports (PIR), Project Steering Committee meetings – or as specific and time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews (MTR), audit reports and final evaluations (FE). In accordance with UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon or nearing completion of implementation. A final evaluation of a GEF-funded project (or previous phase) is also required before a concept proposal for additional funding (or subsequent phases of the same project) can be considered for inclusion in a GEF work program. However, a final evaluation is not an appraisal of the follow-up phase.

Final evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the projects. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals and objectives. It will also identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve the design and implementation of other UNPD/GEF projects.

2. BACKGROUND:

Improving forest resource management, that includes a strong biodiversity conservation component, requires a strategic mix of planned law enforcement and local capacity building that includes community participation based on incentives. These incentives should be based on the diversification of local livelihood options. All of this needs to operate within a supportive enabling environment at Local, District and Central level requiring an investment into policy support and institutional strengthening and awareness raising so to allow informed decision-making.

Kenya, with a new environmentally conscious political party in power has just overhauled her forest sector, with improved management capacity, and a new Forest Bill and Forest Policy are before Parliament. Both the policy and law stress the need for collaborative forest management. Many important forests are prioritized for support to conservation; and renewed donor support to a sector that has been greatly under-funded in the past years looks increasingly possible¹. Despite the small area of closed forest in Kenya (>2% of land area), these forests are of great biodiversity value (high localized endemism) as well as providers of ecological services. The last decade has seen a decline in forest conservation capacity. However the political will is now renewed to rebuild capacity, embracing community- government – private sector partnership. This project provides a mechanism to do so.

In the past three years, ICIPE, the main project proponent for this MSP, has pioneered a set of rural community livelihood support mechanisms that are based on the sustainable use of natural forest products. This has been done on a pilot basis (including some Mwingi and Kakamega sub-villages) using “commercial insects” (honey and wild silk-moths) and medicinal plant products. This input, funded from IFAD, MacArthur Foundation and the GEF Small Grants Project has been extremely successful. Insects are the basis of the two most important income earners (honey and wild silk), and whilst insects are one of the critical natural resources of forest ecosystems, our understanding of their biodiversity, including distribution and function is poor. Besides serving as efficient pollinators and crop protection elements, insects are good indicators of beneficial resource management of an ecosystem. This project will help to make communities and national institutions more aware of the ecological and economic importance of insects and their forest habitats. The project will focus on insects’ usefulness in supporting community-based efforts for minimizing forest and associated biodiversity loss.

One of the barriers to forest conservation is the lack of linkage between the forest managers and the rural development sector – including civil society and the private sector. There is a need for strong collaboration and linkage between the conservationists and the developers to achieve synergies of purpose around important forest resources. In particular this requires introducing proven development initiatives to act as the incentive for forest conservation by local communities. This present project, based around three different globally significant biodiversity rich forest areas, is to scale up the livelihood support mechanism in forest adjacent villages, to a critical mass that has the ability to protect the neighbouring forest, particularly the buffer forest, as the source of sustainable income. IFAD would co-finance the income support, and GEF support is requested to build linkages to the forest conservation institutions to work with the developing community forest conservation – user groups.

¹ The Kenya Government Donor Coordination Committee on Environment has a Forest Sector Sub-Committee that met in February 2004, and agreed that sectoral reforms in the past year warranted restored and increased donor support.

Improved buffer-zone conservation would ensure greater protection of the core areas of the two major forest blocks (Kakamega and Arabuko). These core areas are supported through other initiatives, which serve as baseline and co-financing to this GEF MSP intervention02.

The Project is funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) which has contributed \$1.0 million through the United Nations Development Project (UNDP) for the initiative. The GEF's funding complements an investment of \$1.1 million by IFAD, and over \$ 1.15 million from other sources such as the ICIPE, USAID, Viking Ltd, EU BCP and Government of Kenya. The Government of Kenya and United Nations Development Project signed the project document in 2004

The Project Development Goal:

The overall goal of the project is that the national protected area system of forest reserve is strengthened through improved incentives for real collaborative forest management with communities.

The Project Purpose:

This project developed on farm and in forest livelihood support leading to buffer zone management involving Village Forest Association for Participatory Forest Management. The project developed marketplaces for silk/honey products at all three sites to establish marketing linkages for the sale of commodities. The capacity of communities and institutions to manage and utilize insects for both livelihood and forest conservation benefits.

The Project has six principal Outputs:

11. A forest management framework in place that facilitate community participation in buffer zone enterprise and conservation in all project sites
12. Forest adjacent communities, through integrated forest association are actively engaged in forest conservation through buffer zone management and enterprises
13. .
14. The capacity of communities and institutions to manage and utilize both wild and mulberry silk-moth and honey bee biodiversity for income generation is increased
15. Improved methodologies and insect resources are available at sites to allow efficient resource use for improved livelihoods and conservation practices
16. Effective project administration, monitoring and coordination enabled timely and efficient implementation of project activities.

3. GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION:

The final evaluation of the UNDP/GEF project "CIP" is initiated by the UNDP Kenya and it is being undertaken in accordance with the UNDP/GEF Project Monitoring and Evaluation Policy see

(<http://thegef.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/mepoliciesprocedures.html>).

The principal purpose of the Final Evaluation is to assess the project results and impacts as required by the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. It is also mandatory to evaluate and review any UNDP project of the magnitude of USD 1 million or more, at mid-term and when the assistance is about to phase out. The mid-term evaluation of the CIP was however not conducted as planned due to a number of factors which included differential start of the initiatives in 3 sites due to Government clearance on Environmental Impact Assessment and lastly in 2007, this did not take place because of electioneering process that charged the whole country resulting in huge post election conducted in 2005. Therefore, a very thorough and comprehensive evaluation shall be undertaken during the final review.

4. PROJECT PERFORMANCE:

4.1 OBJECTIVES OF THE FINAL EVALUATION:

A final evaluation is a mandatory requirement of UNDP/GEF Projects and Projects of this magnitude. The evaluation will analyze and assess the achievements and progress made so far towards achieving the original objectives of the CIP Project. It will also identify factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievement of the objectives. The evaluation will consider the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability of the CIP Project. While a thorough assessment of the implementation to date is important, the evaluation is expected to also result in recommendations and lessons learned to assist in defining future direction of similar projects.

The evaluation will in particular assess:

- (4) Project Design – review the original project intervention strategy including objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities and assess quality of the design and delivery of planned outcomes. The review should also assess the conceptualization, design, effectiveness, relevance and implementability of the project. The review should also include the updated logical framework matrix which was designed during Project Inception. This evaluation shall cross-reference the results, and report, including recommendations of the Project Steering Committees which have been carried out yearly since the project start.
- (5) Project Impact – assess the achievements of the CIP Project to date against the original objectives, outcomes and activities using the indicators as defined in the project document as well as any valid amendments made thereafter. Of particular relevance are the indicators that have been identified during Project Inception. Achievements should be measured against the indicators as described in the log frame.
- (6) Project Implementation – assess:

- a. Project management arrangements, i.e., effectiveness of UNDP/GEF, UNDP Country Office, the Project Coordination Unit (CIP PCU),
- b. Quality and timeliness of delivering outputs and activities;
- c. Financial situation (i.e., budget and expenditure status). In this regard, this evaluation is not a financial audit, which is a separate process carried out by UNDP. If a financial audit was done the consultants should have access to the audit reports under the auspices of UNDP;
- d. Cooperation among partners including but not limited to: GEF, UNDP, Governments counterpart Ministries, PCU, KFS and private companies;
- e. Responsiveness of project management to adapt and implement changes in project execution, based on partner and stakeholder feedback;

Based on the above points, the evaluation should provide a document of approximately 30 pages indicating what project and project activities, outputs/outcomes and impacts have been achieved to date, and specifically:

- (1) Assess the extent of the progress which the CIP Project has made to achieve its objectives and where gaps are evident;
- (2) Draw lessons from the experiences of the CIP Project, in particular those elements that have worked well and those that have not, requiring adjustments and;
- (3) Provide recommendations to strengthen the effectiveness, efficiency, impact, implementation, execution and sustainability of the CIP Project.

4.2 SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION:

While the specific issues of concern are listed in the following paragraphs, a reference to the UNDP programming manual and UNDP/GEF guidelines to conduct terminal or end-of-cycle evaluations should be made for addressing the issues not covered below.

The evaluation will include ratings on the following two aspects: (1) Sustainability and (2) Outcome/Achievement of objectives (the extent to which the project's immediate and development objectives were achieved). The review team should provide ratings for three of the criteria included in the Final Evaluations: (3) Implementation Approach; (4) Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement; and (5) Monitoring and Evaluation. The ratings will be: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, and N/A.

4.2a) Project Conceptualization/Design:

1. whether the problem the project addressed is clearly identified and the approach soundly conceived.
2. whether the target beneficiaries and end-users of the results of the project are clearly identified.
3. whether the objectives and outputs of the project were stated explicitly and precisely in verifiable terms with observable success indicators.

4. whether the relationship between objectives, outputs, activities and inputs of the project are logically articulated.
5. whether the project started with a well-prepared work-plan and reasons, if any, for deviations.

4.2b) Project Relevance:

1. whether the project is relevant to the development priorities of the country.
2. given the objectives of the project, whether appropriate institutions have been assisted.

4.2c) Project Implementation:

The evaluation team will examine the quality and timeliness in regard to:

1. the delivery of inputs specified in the project document, including selection of sub-projects/projects, institutional arrangements, interest of beneficiaries, the scheduling and actual implementation.
2. the fulfilling of the success criteria as outlined in the project document.
3. the responsiveness of the project management to significant changes in the environment in which the project functions (both facilitating and impeding project implementation).
4. lessons from other relevant projects if incorporated in the project implementation.
5. the monitoring and backstopping of the project as expected by the Government and UNDP.
6. the delivery of Government counterpart inputs in terms of personnel, premises and indigenous equipment.
7. Project's collaboration with industry associations, private sector and civil society, if relevant.

4.2d) Project Performance:

1. whether the management arrangements of the project were appropriate.
2. whether the project resources (financial, physical and manpower) were adequate in terms of both quantity and quality.
3. whether the project resources are used effectively to produce planned results.
4. whether the project is cost-effective compared to similar interventions.
5. whether the technologies selected (any innovations adopted, if any) were suitable.
6. the role of UNDP CO and its impact (positive and negative) on the functioning of the project.

4.2e) Results/Success of the project applied to each Specific Project sites (3 sites):

The overall outputs and their meaning are as defined in the project support documents and project documents that should form the main basis for this evaluation. The details of the specific project impact to be provided, in addition to general outputs, are as under:

1. what are the major achievements of the project vis-à-vis its objectives.
2. what are the potential areas for project's success? Please explain in detail in terms of impact, sustainability of results and contribution to capacity development.

3. what major issues and problems affected the implementation of the project and what factors could have resolved them.
4. given an opportunity, what actions the evaluation team members would have recommended to ensure that this potential for success translated into actual success.
5. level of institutional networking achieved and capacity development of key partners, if done in a structured manner at different stages – from inception to all project operations.
6. environmental impact (positive and negative) and remedial action taken at each project site.
7. social impacts, including impact on the lives of women at each sub-project site.
8. any underlying factors, beyond control, that influenced the outcome of each project outputs.

4.3 METHODOLOGY/EVALUATION APPROACH:

The team should provide details in respect of:

1. Documentation review (desk study);
2. Interviews and/or consultations;
3. Field visits if any;
4. Questionnaires, if used; and
5. Participation of stakeholders and/or partners.

5. TIME TABLE:

The duration of the evaluation will be a total of 30 working days and will commence towards early May 2008 with the following tentative schedule for the critical milestones:

- Acceptance and commencement of duties by Monday 14th April 2008.
- Inception meeting with the principal parties (UNDP and CIP PCU) by end of April, 2008 with a schedule and definite timetable for the overall evaluation.
- Draft Evaluation Report by 31st. May 2008.
- Presentation of the draft to the key stakeholders and incorporation of comments if deemed necessary, including submission of five copies of the final evaluation report by mid –June 2008.
- Final Evaluation report by end of June 2008, in five copies, 5 CD ROMs.

6. CONSULTATIONS:

The consultant and team members are open to consult all reports, files, manuals, guidelines and resource people they feel essential, to make the most effective findings, conclusions and recommendations. The mission will maintain close liaison with the UNDP Resident Representative and Deputy Resident Representative in Kenya, as well as other concerned officials and agencies in UNDP; the Governments of Kenya through the KFS, Nature Kenya, and the national focal point staff assigned to the project and the CIP PCU.

7. REPORTING:

The evaluation team will report directly to the Senior Management of UNDP Kenya, UNDP/GEF RCU, but mostly to the UNDP Resident Representative and/or his designated officials to act on his behalf. The consultant shall work in close collaboration with the CIP PCU. The consultant will prepare and submit the draft report of the evaluation to UNDP. A presentation and debriefing of the report to UNDP, the project beneficiaries (executing and implementing agencies), Special PSC will be made in June as part of the combined wrap-up workshop for the CIP. The reporting schedule will be finalized during the inception meeting between the evaluation team and key stakeholders prior to commencement of the consultancy.

DISCLOSURE

Although the team is free to discuss with the authorities and any partners in the country on anything relevant to the assignment, under the terms of reference, the team is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of UNDP or the Governments of Kenya.

Annex 1: Evaluation Report: Sample Outline

Executive Summary

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

Introduction

- 4 Purpose of the evaluation
- 5 Key issues addressed
- 6 Methodology of the evaluation
- 7 Structure of the evaluation

The project and its development context

- 8 Project start and its duration
- 9 Problems that the project seeks to address
- 10 Immediate and development objectives of the project
- 11 Main stakeholders
- 12 Outcomes/ Results expected

Findings and Conclusions

- 13 Project formulation
- 14 Implementation approach

- 15 Country Ownership/Driveness
- 16 Stakeholder participation
- 17 UNDP comparative advantage
- 18 Linkages between project and other interventions within the country
- 19 Management arrangements

Implementation

- 20 Financial Planning
- 21 Monitoring and evaluation
- 22 Execution and implementation modalities
- 23 Management by the UNDP country office in Kenya
- 24 Coordination and operational issues

Results

- 25 Attainment of objectives, outcomes and outputs
- 26 Sustainability beyond the Project Life Cycle
- 27 Contribution to capacity building, regional and national development

Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the next project.
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project and relevance for inclusion in future initiatives
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives.

Lessons Learned

- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success of the project.

Annex 2:

- TOR for the CIP
- CIP Final Evaluation Schedule
- List of Persons and Organizations interviewed
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used, if any, and summary of results.

Application procedure

Interested and qualified persons are kindly requested to forward their application letters and an updated CV - giving details of education and professional experience, as well as names, addresses and telephone numbers of two referees, to the following address below not later than **Wednesday, 5 March 2008**. Please include a two page expression of interest, a short work plan and expected fees for the consultancy.

Resident Representative
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
UN Complex, Gigiri, Block Q, Room 305B,
P O Box 30218, 00100 Nairobi, Kenya
Email: Charles.nyandiga@undp.org

Annex 2:

Evaluation Itinerary **Draft Programme for the Consultant 19th May– 12th June 2008.**

Project Title: Developing Incentives for Community Participation in Forest Conservation Through the Use of Commercial Insects in Kenya.

Project No.: KEN/04/G35

Consultant: **Oliver Chapeyama**

Programme Leader & National Project Coordinator: **Suresh Raina**

Implementing partners: ***icipe*, Kenya Forest Service and Nature Kenya**

Monday, 19 th May 2008	-	Consultant arrives and checks in at the <i>icipe</i> guest house
Tuesday, 20 th May 2008	-	Briefing meeting at <i>icipe</i> / Interviews (NEMA, KFS, NK, Ministry of Finance, KOAN, Viking, UNDP-GEF representatives)
Wednesday, 21 st May 2008	-	Travel to Mwingi Project site
Thursday, 22 nd May 2008	-	Travel back to Nairobi
Friday, 23 rd May 2008 to Saturday, 24 th May 2008	-	Report Writing in Nairobi
Sunday, 25 th May 2008 to Tuesday 27 th May 2008	-	Trip to Arabuko Sokoke
Wednesday 28 th May 2008-	-	Travel back to Nairobi
Thursday 29 th & 30 th May 2008 Sunday 1 st June 2008	-	Visit to KFS, NEMA, Ministry of Finance & Viking Ltd.
Monday 2 nd June 2008 to Wednesday 4 th June 2008	-	PUBLIC HOLIDAY (Trip to Kakamega)
Thursday, 5 th June 2008	-	Travel back to Nairobi
Friday, 6 th June 2008 to Sunday, 8 th June 2008	-	Report Writing continues

Monday, 9th June 2008 - Briefing to Project Partners and Stakeholders
Tuesday, 10th June 2008 - Courtesy Call on DG, *icipe*
Wednesday 11th June 2008 - Visit to UNDP, Gigiri
Thursday 12th June 2008 - Departure

End of Programme

Annex 3: List of Documents Reviewed

GEF Secretariat (2005): Guidelines for Implementing Agencies to conduct Terminal Evaluations

ICIPE (2007). Development of Sericulture and Apiculture Products for the Poor in Fragile Ecosystems Using the Value Chain Approach: Proceedings of the Trainers Course and IV International Workshop on the Conservation and Utilization of Commercial Insects

ICIPE (2008). Training Manual: Commercial Insects Farming for Income Generation and Biodiversity Conservation through Value Chain Approach.

ICIPE: CIP Financial, Technical and Progress Reports (2004-2007)

ICIPE (2007) External Research and Development Review 2002-2007

Nature Kenya (2006). Arabuko –Sokoke Forest: Conservation Successes, Challenges and Lessons Learnt.

Republic of Kenya (2008) Arid Lands Resource management Project: Kilifi District Early warning Drought Monitoring Bulletin

Republic of Kenya (1997) Mwingi District Development Plan: 1997-2001

UNDP-GEF (2004): Commercial Insects Programme Document

:

Annex 4: List of People and Institutions Contacted

Meetings in Nairobi

Ms Jeniffer Ngige-KFS
Mr. Washington Ayiemba-Nature Kenya
Mr. Eustace Kiarii-KOAN
Mr. Busienei-NEMA
Mr. N. Mate- Treasury
Ms. Esther Wangombe-KFS
Mr. Emilio Mugo-KFS
Mr. Samson Njrhia-KFS
Mr. J. Siele-Nature Kenya
Mr. Naftali Ndugire-NEMA
Dr. Paul Matiku –Nature Kenya
Mr. Anil Mandevia-Viking Limited
Dr. Chris G. Gakahu-Assistant Resident Representative UNDP Kenya
Dr. Charles Nyandiga-UNDP Kenya
Dr. Alan Rogers-UNDP-GEF
Ms. Foulata T. Kwena-UNDP Kenya
Prof. Christian Borgemeister-Director General, ICIPE
Prof. Suresh Raina-ICIPE
Dr, Ian Gordon-ICIPE
Dr, Esther Kioko-ICIPE
Dr E Muli-ICIPE
Ms. E Nguku-ICIPE
Mr. Macharia-ICIPE

Mwingi District

Officers and Service Providers

Mr. Elijah Muteto-District Forest Officer
Ms. Patricia wambua-NEMA
Mr. W. Wanderi-Livestock
Fening Okwae Ken-PhD Student, ICIPE
Mr. Andrew Muthama-Forest Officer, Nnu and Mutthaitho

Project Participants

Mwingi District Beekeepers Joint Self-help Group

Mr. Titus M Kingangi-Chairman
Mrs. Mwalale Musunza- C/Chairperson
Sabina Mutambuki- Machine Operator (honey)
Roseline Mbuti-Machine Operator

Pauline Kyavoa-Group member
Esther Musili-Sales
Mr. Wamayio- Forest Officer
Mr. Newton Ngui-ICIPE (Nguni Commercial Insects Field Training Site-Honey)
Mr. Daniel Muia –ICIPE (Nguni Commercial Insects Field Training Site-Wild Silk)

Mikumi Self-help Group (8 women and 2 men)

Mr. Robert Maluki
Mrs. Alice Munyambo
Mrs. Mueni Mwendu
Mrs. Mangangi Kitheka
Mrs. Mukola Munyiithya
Mrs. Tabitha Mutuku
Mrs. Martha Kyalo
Mrs. Kithumbi Kitheka
Mrs. Mwende Muteti

Syembeni Wild Silk Group-Kiembeni (10 women)

Mrs. Naome Kalekye
Mrs. Loice Maithya
Mrs. Kalonda Masai
Mrs. Mwikali Muimi
Mrs. Rhoda Karobwe

Kathiani Group (Sixty Members-25 women, 35 women)

Mr. David Mukinya-Trainer
Mr. William Masila-Chairman
Mrs. Angelena Kilonzi-V/Chair
Mr. Wilson Musya-Secretary
Mrs. Joyce Kaleke-V/Secreatry
Mrs. Eunice Mwanda-Treasurer
Mr. James Nguli-Organising Secretary

Nnu Group

Mrs. Roselyn Kilonzi Kanza-Secretatry

Mutanu Group (Twenty members-all women)

Mrs. Lena Nzuki-Chair
Mrs. Kasiogi Kyalo
Mrs. Walima Kula
Mrs. Mary Kisee

Mrs. Kalunda Mulwa
Mrs. Beth Masawa
Mrs. Mwendu Kasivi- Secretary
Mrs. Mulekye Musee-V/Secretary

Arabuko-Sekoko Forest

Officers and Service Providers

Mr. Anthony Githitho-Manager, Kepepeo Project
Mr. Ignatius Kagema
Mr. B.O. Orinda-DFO
Mr. Christopher Maina-DFO, Kilifi
Mr. Mulu-Forest Officer, Gede
Ms. Evelyn Wangari N'gan'ga- Arid lands Natural Resources Management Programme
Mr. Boniface Ngoka-ICIPE (PhD student)

Project Participants

Kipepeo Project

Mr. Charo Ngumbau- Chairman
Mr. Khamisi Juma-V/Secretary
Mr. Jame Thoya- Chair-Beekeepers Association
Mr. Samuel Katoi-Chair, Marketplace
Mr. Ben Tsuma-Trainer

Matsanjeni Group, Swalehe

Mr. Musosa-Chair
Mr. Eric Katana-Secretary
Mr. Litsao Karimiko-Treasurer
Mr. Kaviha Muhambi
Mrs Sarah kahindi
Mrs. Kabibi Kahathi
Mrs. Jumwa Charo
Mrs. Sidi Mwathi
Mrs. Kadzo Karisa

Mabuwani Group

Mr. Bosco Karisa-Chair
Ms. Esther Mwambire
Ms. Fransisca Chai
Ms. Beatrice Kahindi
Mr. Kahindi Simba

Musitu Women's Group (15 members)

Chambuko Mangrove Men and Women Asali Group

Rachael Salama Lugo-member and Trainer

Kadzandani DIDA Group

Mr. Edward Mwakombe Biry-Chair and six members

Model Farmers

Mrs. Benedeta Wambua Representing Sokeko Forest Herbal and Environmental Forum
Mrs Alice Kasisk (Mama Nyuki)

Kakamega/Vihiga Districts

Officers and Service Providers

Mr. Peter Mukira-DFO Kakamega
Mbahin Obert-ICIPE PhD Candidate
Mr. Jacob Ligeve-Gender and Social Services
Mr. Godwin Sakwa-NEMA
Mr. John Sirinyu-Water Affairs
Mr. Gordon Olondo-Livestock Production, Kakamega
Mr. Henry Odanga-Livestock Production, Vihiga District
Mr. Okachi Achuodhi- Social Services-Hihiga District
Mr. Wellington K. Matielo-As. District Forest Officer-Vihiga District

Groups Visited

Lubao Zone: Bushi CFA Nursery

No members met

Farm and Forest Conservation Group (12 members)

Aggrey Mambiri-Trainer
James Ditali
Aggripinah
Alida Ibala
Margaret Mulembe

Mulberry Silk Worm Group

Clement Indulu-Chair

Julius Mkaisi
Violet Burache
Elmina Lihavi
John Lugonzo
Mary Undangasi
Sarah Mudi
Elphas Mukabwa
Esau Andalo
Vincent Chimwany
Eddah Shirezi

Isiekuti Organic Youth Group/Makuchi Plar Farmers Group (25 members)

Mr. Charles Llavu Mwoshi

SHAMU CFA Nursery

Mr. Sylvester Seth Mambili-Chair and forty members

Kakamega Stingless Bees Group

Mark-Trainer

Annex 5: Site Level Management Effectiveness Tracking Tools