United Nations Environment Programme

Lake Baringo community-based land and water management project

Evaluation report on project GF/3010-00-03

Asenath Omwega and Segbedzi Norgbey

March 2004

Evaluation and Oversight Unit

Contents

Acronyms and abbreviations

AIC	–	Agriculture Information Centre
CBO	–	Community-based organization
EOU	–	Evaluation and Oversight Unit
FAO	–	Food and Agriculture Organization
GEF	–	Global Environment Facility
GTZ	–	German Agency for Technical Cooperation
HIV/AIDS	–	Human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immune deficiency syndrome
IIN	–	Indigenous Information Network
JICA	–	Japanese International Cooperation Agency
KARI	–	Kenya Agricultural Research Institute
KEMFRI	–	Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute
KWS	–	Kenya Wildlife Service
LEAP	–	Local environmental action plan
NEMA	–	National Environment Management Authority
NES	–	National Environmental Secretariat
NGO	–	Non-governmental organization
PIR	–	Project implementation review
PPR	–	Project performance reports
PRA	–	Participatory rural appraisal
RAE	–	Rehabilitation of Arid Environments Trust
TOR	–	Terms of reference
UNDP	–	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	–	United Nations Environmental Programme
UNOPS	–	United Nations Office for Project Services

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge and express their profound gratitude to the staff of the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS and the project management office for their assistance in preparing this report. We extend special thanks to Philip Kisoyan, who carefully planned our field visit and provided all the documentation requested by the evaluation team. We also thank Anna Tengberg for her readiness to answer our numerous questions

We would like to express a very special gratitude to Dr. Zadok Ogutu, whose long-standing interest, involvement and knowledge of the Lake Baringo area drove him to participate in this evaluation almost as a third evaluator. We thank the staff of the Evaluation and Oversight Unit for their general support for this evaluation and for preparing the final draft of the report.

We express sincere thanks to the numerous stakeholders and individuals we interviewed both in their offices and in the field. They gave us a much better insight into the project.

Executive summary

Introduction

1. The Lake Baringo community-based land and water management project was designed to strengthen the lake catchment communities' capacity in sustainable resource management. This process was to be achieved by demonstrating improved land and water management techniques which preserve biodiversity. In addition, the project aimed to improve the livelihoods of populations in the lake catchment area through the promotion of alternative income-generating activities designed to provide employment and reduce pressure on land and water resources. As was intended, the project successfully engaged the local communities in most aspects of the project cycle. The project recognized the ethnic composition in the Lake Baringo catchment area and the social, cultural and economic contexts of their interactions with the natural resource base. The interventions aimed at building their capacities for reversing the severe degradation and rapid loss in biodiversity.

Evaluation results

2. The project initiated local capacity development for best land-use practices through on-farm demonstrations, training workshops and study tours as well as by establishing revolving credit systems and developing information packages. Partner institutions were supported with training to upgrade skills and with the purchase of materials and equipment to participate in the project and ensure its continuity. For example, a radio communication system was purchased for Baringo County Council for future monitoring of security and equipment was bought for the Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KEMFRI) for future research on Lake Baringo. Different government departments and para-extensionists gained important skills for resources management and were given on-farm demonstrations. However, very little was done to scale up cases of successful practices and to manage the risks threatening the achievement of project results.

3. Reversing the negative impact of human activity on the environment of Lake Baringo basin requires action by a wide range of stakeholders, including farmers, policy-makers and the general public, as demonstrated by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) project. The GEF project used various strategies such as study tours, on-farm demonstrations of technologies, environmental education and training to enhance knowledge of best land-use practices.

4. The project used several channels (radio, workshops, videos and drama) to disseminate information to different interest groups at the community level (churches, *barazas*, villages and schools). Also, the opportunity was used to highlight other important community issues such as HIV/AIDS. The project worked with Egerton University and the Indigenous Information Network to streamline gender in resource management. However, some of the respondents indicated that most of the information, which was in English or posted on the project website, was not accessed by stakeholders at community level.

5. The overall assessment of the project is that, as a pilot project, it was successful in demonstrating effective strategies and approaches to rehabilitating degraded lands and conserving biodiversity. Some of the project components achieved only moderate results, especially in demonstrating alternative livelihoods. The most impressive accomplishment of this project is the general level of environmental awareness created in the lake catchment area and the residents' recognition that their livelihoods are inextricably linked to the health of the natural resources in the area. As evidenced by the support for a moratorium on fish harvests in the lake, which was achieved through an impressive stakeholder consultation process, there is a demonstrable willingness to protect livelihoods through environmental conservation.

Lessons learned

6. The main lessons learned from this project are as follows:

- Broad -based consultations during project design and development contribute to project ownership by the implementing teams as well as the beneficiaries. However, such extensive consultations can create high expectations that may not be met by the project. Community-based projects are more successful when designed with adequate representation from the communities taking into consideration social, economic and ethnic differences where necessary;
- Projects designed for implementation with government departments of poor countries playing lead roles without sufficient financial and logistical support are less likely to continue beyond the funded phase of the project even if other sustainability measures are built into the project activities;
- Multi-stakeholder processes are time-consuming because consensus building is required at all stages because of different expectations. However, these processes facilitate easy implementation of integrated community-based environmental projects as stakeholders use their expertise where they have the best advantage;
- Spreading limited financial resources over numerous activities over a short project lifespan reduces the project's impact. If resources are concentrated on fewer activities strategically selected to create impact and demonstrate effectiveness, they are more effective as models for scaling up.

Conclusions

7. The project succeeded in raising environmental awareness and promoting action by various stakeholders, including local communities and institutions. The threat of environmental degradation to people's livelihoods is more appreciated. The project was built mainly on existing initiatives; to a large extent, local institutions, existing techniques and current land-use practices, were used to promote support for activities being implemented by government departments and strategic partners. Consequently, the project promoted local communities' ownership of the natural resources.

8. The project demonstrated that through training and the provision of basic tools, local communities could implement conservation activities to protect their livelihoods. However, success in Lake Baringo requires long-term interventions with extensive resources especially set aside for building upon the lessons learned and promoting best practices.

9. This review determined that the limited financial resources of the project were spread too thinly across the many activities over the short duration of the project. This effectively reduced the impact the project would otherwise have had if the resources had been concentrated on fewer, strategically-selected activities. Furthermore, though designed as a medium-sized project, the project was implemented as a pilot project with no strong mechanism for scaling-up the lessons. A vacuum is likely to be created after project disengagement unless additional resources and a coordination mechanism are provided.

Overall assessment of the Lake Baringo project

10. The following are the ratings for the Lake Baringo project:

Table 1. Rating of Lake Baringo project activities

	Category	Rating
(a)	Achievement of objectives and planned results	3
(b)	Attainment of outputs and activities	1
(c)	Cost effectiveness	2
(d)	Impact	3
(e)	Sustainability	3
(f)	Stakeholder participation	1
(g)	Country ownership	2
(h)	Implementation approach	2
(i)	Financial planning	3
(j)	Replicability	3
(k)	Monitoring and evaluation	2
	All categories (overall average)	2

Note: The UNEP rating system used is as follows:

1	=	excellent	(90-100 per cent achievement)
2	=	very good	(75-89 per cent)
3	=	good	(60-74 per cent)
4	=	satisfactory	(50-59 per cent)
5	=	unsatisfactory	(less than 49 per cent)

I. Project identifiers

11. The following are the project identifiers:

Project title:	Lake Baringo community-based land and water management project
Project number:	UNEP project no. GF/3010-00-03
Duration:	39 months Commencing: November 2000 Completion: February 2004
Location:	Kenya
Implementing agency: Partner:	United Nations Environment Programme P.O.Box 30552, Gigiri, Nairobi, Kenya
Project cost:	$ 980,000

II. Introduction

A. Background

12. The Lake Baringo community-based land and water management project was developed by UNEP and funded as a UNEP/GEF medium-sized project. The project was designed to strengthen the capacity of communities in the lake catchment area in sustainable resource management, through the demonstration of improved land and water management techniques, and to preserve biodiversity. In addition, the project aimed to improve livelihoods of populations in the lake catchment area by promoting alternative income-generation activities designed to provide employment and reduce pressure on land and water resources. Following an elaborate stakeholder consultation process during project development, the project was approved for implementation in 2000.

13. To initiate project activities, a stakeholder workshop was conducted at Lake Bogoria in Baringo district in December 2000. The primary objective of the workshop was to review the project document, examine the outputs and activities and develop an annual work plan for the first year of project implementation. The stakeholder workshop was also designed to address the high expectations of the project that resulted from promises made by local politicians and administrators during initial stakeholder consultations at the project development phase. It became apparent, following review of the approved project document, that the document lacked a clearly stated goal and vision. The workshop, therefore, defined a goal and vision for the project, which had been a serious omission in the approved project document.

14. It further refined the objectives of the project as follows:

- To assist existing government agencies and non-governmental organizations in rehabilitating degraded lands in the catchment area of lake Baringo;
- To facilitate development of participatory management and conservation of biodiversity in the Lake Baringo ecosystem;

- To build the capacity of local communities to generate social and economic benefits from the sustainable use of the natural resources in and around Lake Baringo; and
- To create awareness about natural resources and support the development of appropriate policies for the conservation of natural resources in the catchment area of Lake Baringo.

15. The workshop also refined the logical framework for the project and defined strategic partnerships and other approaches required for effective project implementation. The plan of operation which resulted from the stakeholder workshop gave clarity to the approved project document.

16. The project was to be funded from the GEF trust fund in the amount of $750,000 with contributions from the Government of Kenya and non-governmental organizations in the amount of $200,000. Local communities were to provide a $30,000 contribution in kind. The total budget of the project was $980,000. The project covered the catchment area of Lake Baringo, including Sandai, an area shared by Lake Baringo and Lake Bogoria. The duration of the project was initially 30 months but was extended for an additional nine months to allow time to complete the project activities. The project was implemented by UNEP and executed by UNOPS through a memorandum of agreement.

B. Evaluation objectives and scope

17. Originally, no formal evaluation was included in the project document. However, during a project steering committee meeting on 30 July 2002 a technical review was recommended. This technical review was subsequently executed in October and November 2002. An in-depth terminal evaluation, the subject of this report and a requirement of both GEF and UNEP, had been inserted into the project earlier during the December 2000 planning workshop.

18. This evaluation was conducted jointly by the Evaluation and Oversight Unit of UNEP and an independent, external evaluator, under the guidance of the chief of the UNEP Evaluation and Oversight Unit and in close cooperation with the Director of the UNEP Division for Global Environment Facility Coordination.

19. The primary objective of this evaluation is to assess the extent to which the project succeeded in fulfilling its objectives and achieving expected results in a cost-effective manner. This has been accomplished by reviewing project results, the implementation of planned project activities, outputs and outcomes. As far as possible, project impacts have been determined. Lessons from project implementation have been identified and documented and recommendations made. This evaluation covers all key activities undertaken as described in the project document GEF 3010-00-03 (31 May 2000) and the subsequent amendments made at the stakeholder workshop organized in December 2000.

C. Methodology

20. The evaluation was carried out during the period 15 January 2004–15 March 2004.

21. The findings of the evaluation are based on the following:

(a) A desk review of the project document and work programme outputs such as project implementation review reports, self evaluation fact sheets, quarterly progress reports, reports of training workshops, minutes of meetings, technical project reports, websites, video materials, expenditure reports and other correspondence. Of particular interest was the technical review of the project by two external consultants between 28 October and 1 November 2002;

(b) Personal interviews were conducted with 27 key individuals and stakeholders associated with the project. These include, among others, the project managers both in UNEP and UNOPS, the site project manager, representatives of various stakeholders including the Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI), the Kenya Forestry Research Institute, government extension staff, non-governmental organizations, KEMFRI, the Association of Fishermen in the Lake Baringo Area, the Kenyan Fisheries Department, women's groups, councillors, clerks of councils, government district officers, pastoralists, agro-pastoralists and the Beekeepers Association.

(c) Numerous field visits were undertaken to observe ongoing and completed activities such as conservation structures and demonstration plots which were established as part of this project and discussions were conducted with groups participating in activities implemented as part of the alternative livelihoods programme.

D. Limitations of the evaluation

22. Although the evaluation of this project benefited from various sources of information including field visits, the evaluation team noted the following limitations.

(a) Some key personnel, for example, the District Commissioner (the chair of the project steering committee), some members of the steering committee and key stakeholders such as World Vision were not available for interviews;

(b) The field project coordinator left the project almost a year before the end of the project. This effectively ensures that the viewpoint from the field project team is limited to that of the project extension officer, who served in acting capacity as project coordinator prior to the end of the project;

(c) The project activities are not entirely new; the partners and organizations that are being enabled through the implementation of the GEF project have implemented some of the key activities in the Lake Baringo catchment area for many years. It is therefore extremely difficult to determine the extent to which the project's accomplishments can be attributed to GEF funding. Further, as a result of the short duration of the project (three years), the impacts related to control of land degradation, stabilization and reversal of ecological damage are difficult, if not impossible, to determine at the closure of the project.

II. Evaluation of the project

A. Aims of the project

23. The basic goal of the project, as refined by the project implementation workshop that preceded the start of project activities, was "to contribute to the Lake Baringo ecosystem that maintains its natural functions and biodiversity while sustaining human development and welfare". Four main outcomes were expected from the project activities. These were:

- Enhanced collaboration between local authorities, non-governmental organizations and communities to create awareness of environmental problems among local stakeholders and to empower local communities to deal directly with integrated land and water management issues;
- A well-managed community protecting endangered habitats of both grazing herbivores and migratory waterfowls;
- Enhanced government capacity to support community-based conservation initiatives and the development of local capacity to support community-based enterprises; and

- Enhanced capacity of community groups and non-governmental organizations to provide a sustained conservation benefit.

24. The outcomes expected from the project seem consistent with the objectives defined above but are of a long-term nature requiring substantial capacity development.

25. As implemented, the project defined 54 activities under four components as follows:

- Rehabilitation of degraded land – 14 activities;
- Participatory management and conservation of biodiversity – 11 activities;
- Capacity-building for sustainable livelihoods – 14 activities;
- Awareness creation and support to policy implementation – 15 activities.

26. The activities were designed to contribute to the attainment of the outcomes expected giving the project, as implemented, some internal coherence. This internal coherence was not evident in the original project design.

B. Implementation of the project activities

1. Rehabilitation of degraded land

27. The project adopted a multiple-strategy approach in promoting the rehabilitation of degraded land. Proven techniques and land-use practices were used that are effective in controlling soil and water losses, increasing soil water retention and promoting regeneration of vegetation cover, thus contributing to the rehabilitation of degraded land. The project successfully demonstrated the potential of selected technologies in rehabilitating degraded lands if they were to be adopted throughout the affected areas beyond the demonstration sites.

28. The project provided direct support for the rehabilitation of degraded sites by purchasing basic tools, including mattocks and line and spirit levels for laying terraces. In addition, the project facilitated training of 60 para-extensionists and selected farmers on soil and water conservation through field demonstrations and study tours. The project provided logistical support to government staff and para-extensionists for community mobilization, training and follow-up activities. The direct technical and logistical support helped ensure that the project activities were implemented as planned.

(a) Soil and water conservation

(i) Terracing

29. Terracing was one of the key strategies selected to rehabilitate the degraded areas, especially in the upper catchments where steep slopes are under cultivation. The project supported construction and rehabilitation of terraces to control soil erosion as planned. The evaluation team visited different farms to observe and interview beneficiaries. Both old and new structures were observed, mainly as on-farm demonstrations. Complementary structures included cutoff drains, *tumbikisa* (water retention ditches), and planting of napier grass and agro-forestry trees on contours.

30. A total of 30,000 metres of terraces were constructed in various sub-catchments compared to the planned target of 20,000 metres. This is an achievement given that floods damaged a significant proportion of the terraces constructed during the first year of the project. The severe damage to the terracing work was attributed to the failure to design the structures in line with the hydrological dynamics of the area. The steep slopes which have been deforested experience intense

rain causing flash floods. Such conditions require physical structures that can cope with the intensity of the floodwaters generated.

31. The project team attributes the success in achieving the planned target in this activity partly to their collaboration with World Vision who agreed to use their food-for-work programme in terrace construction. If World Vision continues to use this approach, the terracing work will expand to cover critical areas. However, it should also be noted that terraces require regular maintenance and must be accompanied by other physical and biological structures for effective soil erosion control and land rehabilitation.

(ii) Water harvesting techniques

32. The project promoted on-farm water harvesting techniques, including micro-catchments and water retention trenches and ditches as part of the soil and water conservation demonstrations. Twenty-four farms constructed different water harvesting structures, integrating them mainly in on-farm soil conservation demonstrations. Schools were used for demonstrations at the community level.

(iii) Increasing vegetation cover

33. The project promoted strategies to increase vegetative cover on degraded areas which had little groundcover. Drought-resistant grass and multi-purpose agroforestry species were used alongside soil and water conservation technologies in selected farms and sub-catchments that were severely eroded and degraded. In addition to improving groundcover, grass and trees provide alternative fodder for livestock, the mainstay of the local economy.

(iv) Grass reseeding and alternative fodder production

34. The evaluation team observed on-farm demonstrations of reseeded crop and grazing sites which had varying degrees of success. The project provided seeds, technical support, exposure to successful cases through study tours and contact with the Ministry of Agriculture. Of the 100 demonstration plots targeted, only 32 fields were reseeded. Discussion with the project coordinator and the partners indicated that the reseeding programme was affected by lack of seeds. KARI, the organization tasked with providing seeds, could not provide enough for the project work as planned and hence the limited number of demonstration farms undertaken.

35. The evaluation team visited two successful demonstrations of on-farm grass reseeding using dryland grass species. Farmers reported harvesting seeds for sale, for replanting and as fodder for dry season feeding. Discussions with the farmers and the Ministry of Agriculture indicated that the reseeding work was successful at the farmer level where the demonstration was undertaken. The main constraint was the lack of seed. The demonstration had also been done for only one year. The participating farmers had harvested seed for planting the following season. However, they did not have enough to distribute to other farmers, although there was demand for the grass seeds from other farmers. This could be an indication of the potential for replication, which is yet to be realized.

36. The project also supported the expansion of a demonstration farm growing indigenous cacti for fodder. The team was informed of limited success in the adoption of cacti fodder because of difficulties in maintaining effective enclosures to protect the plants from grazing animals. As this was an ongoing activity, the project support was limited to logistical support for expanding the area under cacti in the demonstration sites. The project's inputs included seeds and technical support through KARI and the Ministry of Agriculture.

(b) Agroforestry

37. Agroforestry was integrated with other land rehabilitation techniques with a bias towards promoting fruit and fodder trees. This activity benefited from ongoing community initiatives such as tree nurseries under the management of local administration, chiefs and women's groups. Seven schools were targeted for agroforestry demonstrations but only four demonstrations were actually implemented and with only limited success.

38. Integration of this activity with the environmental committees launched at the district and sub-location level appears to have strengthened the agroforestry work. Through these committees, some farmers have procured fruit trees from KARI.

39. The project provided transport, technical and logistical support, and seedlings on a cost-share basis working closely with ministry staff and the Rehabilitation of Arid Environments Trust. Six (four community and two individual farmer) tree nurseries out of a target of four were established with varying levels of success before the end of the project.

40. Discussions with farmers and government personnel indicated that one of the long-term benefits of the project is that farmers are now aware of where they can source appropriate tree seedlings in the future. The evaluation team was informed that the forestry department had contacted community nurseries about supplying seedlings for planned reforestation programmes which seem to be well supported by the district officers at the divisional levels, as indicated by the Sacho division office. Some groups were also trained to prepare tree nurseries and graft fruit trees, and although this was not a new activity, there has been revitalization and scaling up of reforestation work through the GEF project support.

(c) Protection of water sources

41. Water sources are particularly vulnerable to soil erosion because of the impact of human activity. Springs and riverbanks were selected to demonstrate how communities could be responsible for protection against further degradation and loss of valuable water sources.

(i) Spring protection

42. The project supported the protection of six out of the ten planned springs, facilitated the communities mobilizing locally available resources and provided technical support and some basic inputs – mainly cement. Protection work involved construction of cut-off drains to reduce runoff, tree planting on the spring banks and restricted harvesting of trees in the watershed. The evaluation team was informed that the protected springs were to be managed by local environmental committees.

(ii) River bank protection

43. The project supported one out of the three planned sites demonstrating riverbank protection. An interview with the officer at Sacho division indicated that as a result of the awareness raised by the project, steps are being taken to protect riverbanks in the upper catchment area. The administration in this division has asked the local communities to stop cultivation near riverbanks. The divisional officer has requested that the Ministry of Lands demarcates land along riverbanks in the upper catchment that require protection. Enforcement of legislation protecting riverbanks against cultivation is expected to help reduce soil erosion and siltation at Lake Baringo.

2. Participatory management and conservation of biodiversity

44. Through this objective, using eco-tourism and support to livelihoods, the GEF project sought to strengthen the systems, community institutions and research institutions to promote conservation of biodiversity in the Lake Baringo ecosystem. Through the project support, participation of various stakeholders in the conservation of Lake Baringo's ecosystem was further strengthened .

(a) Support to Baringo County Council

45. Baringo County Council is a key player in the conservation of natural resources in the district. It also derives revenue from eco-tourism through the levies collected from tourism-related activities. The town clerk informed the evaluation team that the GEF project was the first directly to involve the Baringo County Council in conservation work and to recognize its role as an important partner. The GEF project helped raise awareness among the Baringo County Council staff and strengthened their technical and logistical capacity to better manage natural resources and biodiversity.

46. The project facilitated a training workshop for 32 members of the Lake Baringo management committee, including the council members, on the significance of Lake Baringo's ecosystem biodiversity and the potential for eco-tourism. Council staff also participated in a study tour to Lake Naivaisha which is experiencing similar environmental management challenges to Lake Baringo.

47. The council received radio communication equipment from the project which is being used to monitor the security situation in the Samburu-Baringo tourist circuit. The project also facilitated the training of council staff in the operation and maintenance of the equipment.

48. Interviews with Baringo District County Council personnel indicated that GEF project support has contributed to the improvement in the security of the Samburu-Pokot-Baringo sector of the mid-rift tourist circuit. This has resulted in the opening up of the circuit for tourist movement to the region. This change is expected to contribute positively towards local community involvement in biodiversity conservation. The local communities and the local administration now appreciate the direct economic benefits that can be derived from eco-tourism.

49. The council is currently investing more resources in developing eco-tourism and in community development programmes, using funds generated from tourism. A water project worth one million shillings for Kampi ya Samaki town is being funded by the council. The council is also raising funds for conservation work and establishing tree nurseries for reforestation. The evaluation team was informed that the GEF project has helped catalyze the council into making environmental conservation a priority area of its work in partnership with the local communities. The project has also helped the council appreciate the need to share the benefits accruing from eco-tourism with the local communities as a motivation for biodiversity conservation.

(b) Environmental committees

50. GEF facilitated the formation of eight out of a target of twelve locational environmental committees in the upper catchment area within the framework of the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA). The project also facilitated the launching and training of the district environmental committee on the Environmental Management Coordination Act of 1999. Despite the limited logistical and technical support the government has provided for these committees, there is some indication that they could be instrumental in the management of tree nurseries for the reforestation of deforested catchments and in promoting agroforestry in the communities they represent.

51. The local chief and district officer at Sacho division informed the evaluation team that the local environmental committees played a key role in the activities marking World Environment Day in 2002. The committees were also involved in protecting some of the water sources the GEF project implemented.

(c) Plan for communal grazing

52. The project made little progress in implementing this activity largely owing to issues of land tenure. Land adjudication is yet to be undertaken in the district. Most of the rural areas are communally owned and the project views land privatization as a necessary condition for the realization of this objective. A meeting held on the establishment of a grazing system for Lake Baringo failed to reach a consensus.

53. The project staff indicated that the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) had expressed interest in supporting a pilot project on the problem of land tenure in the Lake Baringo area in an effort to address one of the underlying causes of land degradation. However, the evaluation team could not verify this expressed interest by UNDP.

(d) Support to research institutions

54. Capacity-building of strategic partners for the immediate and long-term implementation and sustainability of project activities was a major approach adopted in the GEF project. Three key research institutions were supported by this project; these were KEMFRI, KARI and the fisheries department. The institutions were involved in project planning and implementation on a cost-share basis within their areas of expertise. GEF built the capacity of KEMFRI in monitoring water quality and fisheries through the purchase of laboratory equipment and a boat, and through other logistical support. Data generated by KEMFRI was instrumental in stakeholders' resolution for a moratorium on fishing in Lake Baringo for two years. Stakeholders also supported the adoption and use of four-inch fishing nets (*Nation* newspaper, 4 February 2004). Using the database created, KEMFRI produced four quarterly reports on the status of Lake Baringo.

55. GEF sponsored KARI staff to attend a short course on production of macadamia nuts in Thika. The request made by KARI for a complete agro-meteorological station and laboratory equipment was not fulfilled during the project period owing to delays in quotations from overseas suppliers. KARI was a key player in the implementation of a wide range of project activities. In the promotion of agroforestry, KARI provided and distributed fruit trees to farmers and schools. A direct linkage has been developed with the farmers in the supply of grafted fruit trees and there was indication that farmers are now able to purchase fruit trees directly from KARI nurseries. A similar trend was shown in improved livestock breeds.

56. Delays were reported in the procurement of a boat engine requested by the fisheries department. However, GEF provided technical and material support to the fisheries department for surveillance along the lake. In addition, the project facilitated community consultations which led to the fishing moratorium in the lake. This collective decision led to an increase in fish stocks in the lake. The evaluation team perceives this as the strongest success achieved by GEF in mobilizing community action in the protection of critical natural resources and biodiversity conservation. The local community also seemed to have a strong sense of ownership of the lake and there is every indication that it will continue to play a key role in the conservation of the lake biodiversity.

(e) Community conservancies

57. Three community conservancies (Kaptuya, Kichirtit and Mochongoi) out of a target of five have been registered with the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS). Awareness-raising and other activities have been conducted among the Pokot community to enhance their involvement in wildlife use and conservation. Following study tours to Laikipia district to learn about community participation in eco-tourism, the Pokot community has set aside land for the Kaptuya conservancy.

A committee has been formed to oversee development of by-laws on the community management of the conservancy and to introduce eco-tourism initiatives in the area. GEF has also linked the conservancy with the Laikipia Wildlife Forum for capacity-building and to tap into the tourist market already developed in Samburu and Laikipia districts. The evaluation team was informed of a firm from Laikipia which has expressed interest in promoting tent camping at Kaptuya so that the conservancy can be operational before the end of 2004.

58. GEF facilitated study tours for members of Lake Kichirtir to the Giraffe Centre in Nairobi that led to the development of a proposal to create a Baringo giraffe conservancy. A potential site for this development has been identified. The local community, jointly with Baringo County Council, has identified potential sites for bird and reptile sanctuaries. This site will be developed and protected for eco-tourism to support their livelihoods.

(f) Management of alien species

59. As part of the land rehabilitation work, the GEF project attempted to address the problem of *prosopis,* a tree species introduced earlier into the Lake Baringo region for land degradation control and for fodder. The project also facilitated a workshop on various ways of using this invasive species. During the workshop, participants expressed concern about the disadvantages of *prosopis*, particularly its invasive nature which has resulted in significant reduction in pasture. The need to control its spread was expressed even though some effort was made to demonstrate its potential for multiple uses through an exhibition of products made from this tree.

60. This workshop helped bring the problem of this invasive species to government attention at the national level. Local communities and civil society organizations operating in the area have increased pressure on the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the research institutions responsible for introducing the tree into the area to take responsibility for its eradication. Consequently, the Nairobi-based organization Community Museums of Kenya and the Ichamus community threatened to take legal action against FAO and the Kenya Government. The case was taken to the public complaints committee of NEMA. Although FAO initially admitted partial responsibility, they insisted that they were facilitating a government project upon request as per the signed agreement. However, the position of FAO seems to be changing as recent information in the local media indicates that it is committing some $2.4 million to eradicate *prosopis* from the Lake Baringo basin.

61. The project managed to facilitate the development of three out of the planned five sectoral plans involving fisheries, tourism and wildlife sectors. Little was done on agriculture and livestock, which remain the backbone of the local economy, because of urgently needed land reform. However, the frameworks developed provide a strong basis for future community-based integrated programmes for the Lake Baringo ecosystem.

(g) Integrating local environmental action plans and sectoral plans with the Lake Baringo ecosystem

62. The evaluation team learned of some attempts to implement local environmental action plans based on information generated from nine participatory rural appraisals conducted during the project period. The short project life span, however, did not allow for follow up in the implementation of these action plans.

3. Capacity-building and sustainable livelihoods

(a) Sustainable livelihood building activities

63. The project activities supporting this objective were aimed at assisting local communities to engage in environmentally sound, sustainable livelihood-building activities. The project initiated a wide range of income-generating activities with varying levels of success.

(i) Micro-enterprises

64. Guided by the livelihood strategies report, the project supported eight out of ten community groups in micro-enterprises. The project support consisted of:

- Basic skills training in micro-enterprise management such as group dynamics and book keeping;
- Facilitation of exposure tours to selected projects;
- Seed money for revolving loans amounting to between Ksh 100,000 and 200,000.

65. The evaluation team visited three groups that were involved in different micro-enterprises. However, the selection criteria for awarding grants to groups was not clearly defined and some needy community groups, such as the Guatemala Women's Group (named in honour of a Guatemalan women's group that visited them before they were officially registered), did not benefit from the seed funds which could have helped their worthwhile enterprises. While it was pointed out that the project funding was limited and therefore only a few of the trained groups could receive grants, two of the funded groups visited by the evaluation team indicated that as much as half of the grants they had received was being kept as savings in their group accounts.

66. Thus, given the limited capacity of these groups to absorb large grants, the project funds available for micro-enterprises could have been spread out to cover all the groups that were trained. Nevertheless, this activity demonstrates a deliberate attempt by the project team to spread the support out equitably across the different ethnic communities, men and women's groups as well as the different sections of the Lake Baringo catchments.

(ii) Baringo Fishermen Society

67. Very little was done to support this group, especially considering that fishing activities were closed for two years. The project had only initiated dialogue with Lake Baringo Club to have fishing boats participating in tourism activities. However, this initiative was hampered by the problem of the safety of the boats managed by the communities. Only one of the private hoteliers has allowed local communities to do boat rides for tourists at the hotel.

68. The recent lifting of the fishing moratorium indicates that there is an increase in fish stocks and the fishing community can once again start benefiting. Discussions with beneficiaries indicated enhanced awareness about threats to the productivity of the lake as well as to sustainable livelihoods in the absence of lack of collective resource management. The lakeshore community, however, expressed serious concern over increasing loss of fishing nets and livestock due to the rapidly growing population of crocodiles.

(iii) Commercial agroforestry

69. The project focus in this component was the promotion of improved varieties of fruit trees for local consumption and for income generation. GEF supported the procurement and distribution of 1,546 mango and 867 macadamia seedlings on a cost-sharing basis to individual farmers, groups and schools. The mango seedlings exceeded the project target of 1,000 trees. Members' contributions were used to purchase more seedlings to satisfy the unexpectedly high demand.

70. The project established links with Honey Care Company and Africa Now for honey production and marketing. A demonstration of a model apiary was established at KARI with ten Langstroth hives to help integrate bee-keeping into agroforestry practices. Four community groups (Maoi, Sabor, Kimalel and Kibingor) received training in modern bee-keeping. The impact of this training and introduction of new technologies is yet to be realized.

71. Plans for growing non-consumptive trees or shrubs seem to have been overambitious. The main accomplishment was the setting up of a multiplication centre for aloe vera at KEFRI nursery. It is hoped that KEFRI will follow through with the production and marketing of the products as envisaged.

(iv) Improved crops and livestock varieties and risk management

72. The GEF project acquired and distributed different seeds of drought-resistant pulses (green grams, cowpeas, pigeon peas, *mwezi moja* beans, and so on) to model farmers. There has been only one harvest and therefore it is difficult to determine adoption rates by target communities. However, the model farmers appreciate the potential these pulses have in improving food security and incomes if adequate seed is made available to farmers.

73. Although the project supported acquisition of improved varieties of bucks and bulls, the evaluation team found little evidence linking this activity with natural resources management. The team was informed that sixty out of a target of forty bucks purchased from Isiolo were distributed to farmers on a cost-sharing basis. This activity requires more time and adequate follow-up to ensure effective reproduction.

74. Sixty pastoralists, out of the planned target of one hundred, received a day's training in livelihood risk management, covering various aspects such as early warning, diversification and market outlets. The project visited two demonstrations where farmers were promoting pasture supplements for income and use during drought.

75. The introduction of drought-resistant pulses and improved livestock varieties also aimed at reducing vulnerability to drought and improving livelihoods.

(b) Capacity-building

(i) Training of government officers

76. Partner government ministries, such as Agriculture, Forestry and Social Services, gained new skills and knowledge following short courses and study tours facilitated by the project. The training and study tours covered a wide range of skills related to the project work in natural resources management, participatory approaches in project implementation, soil and water conservation, crop and livestock production, and marketing, among others. Twenty government ministries' staff received training in gender and extension. A training manual on this course was prepared and could be used in future.

(ii) Community workers – para- extensionists

77. Forty out of a target of sixty farmers were trained in participatory extension methodologies as well as on various land rehabilitation technologies such as terracing, re-forestation, basic livestock and crop husbandry. The beneficiaries were to be involved in soil conservation, dryland farming and livestock production. The trainees also participated in the various study tours which were designed to expose them to best practices in the skills they had been trained in. The impact of the work of these para-extensionists is yet to be realized as they have not had time to share their expertise. A few of them have supported their neighbours in laying terraces for land rehabilitation. These resource people will be valuable in any future programmes in the area as well as in supporting government extension staff in the Ministry of Agriculture and in the forestry department.

(iii) Energy-saving stoves

78. Promoting energy-saving stoves in the Lake Baringo catchment area aimed to control the rate of deforestation which is a contributing factor to land degradation in the project area. A total of 45 such stoves, known locally as *enzaro jikos*, against a target of 50 were constructed. The

evaluation team visited members of Guatamala Women's Group who received training in the construction of *enzaro jikos*. All 15 members who had constructed the devices for their own use reporting savings in the time spent collecting wood. The group had received only one request to construct a stove for a neighbour at a cost of KSh 200. This group of beneficiaries reported limited adoption of the technology because of high construction cost and difficulty in maintenance; the stoves easily collapse since they are made of clay.

79. Discussions with a group of beneficiaries of this activity clearly showed that they were not aware of the link with environmental conservation nor did they appreciate the consequences of deforestation. The main perceived benefit of the stoves is saving the time spent in collecting firewood. Perhaps awareness raising could include this aspect and link it to the promotion of agroforestry to encourage planting of tree varieties that can be used for firewood.

(v) Training of administrative officers

80. The project trained administrative officers from Baringo and neighbouring districts of Koibatek and Nakuru on the significance of the Environmental Management Coordination Act and their role in its implementation. These officers, who included 12 chiefs and 245 assistant chiefs, are expected to work in collaboration with the divisional and locational environmental committees.

81. The project's plan to train councillors and senior council officials was delayed after Action Aid offered to implement the activity.

(vi) Training in agriculture and environment

82. Twenty-three teachers received training in agriculture and the environment as part of community action plans for this topic to be incorporated into regular school teaching curricula. The GEF project facilitated training of religious leaders in environmental conservation. Twenty members drawn from Christian and Muslim sectors participated. Four churches have initiated conservation practices on their compounds while one has started a tree nursery.

(vii) Training on gender

83. The project sponsored a workshop on gender equity and environmental extension that was jointly facilitated by Egerton University and the Indigenous Information Network (IIN) in 2003. Although the target was ten community-based organization leaders, 26 other participants drawn from partner government ministries also attended this one-day workshop. The evaluation team observed two weaknesses: a shift in target groups and the fact that the training was conducted too late in the project to have any meaningful impact. However, it is expected that the course helped raise the consciousness of extension staff on gender equity. The training manual prepared for this training could be used by other agencies to reach other groups.

(viii) Linkages and networks

84. The project hosted ten local and nine international graduate students during their internships. Consequently, linkages were established with local institutions such as Egerton, Kenyatta, Moi and Nairobi universities and international institutions such as Minnesota University, University of California Berkeley and Gothenburg University. Through these linkages, the project benefited from the research and baseline studies conducted by the students. This was particularly beneficial as it helped supplement limited resources and project staff.

4. Awareness creation and support of appropriate policies

(a) Study tours

85. This was a key strategy used by the project to raise awareness and build capacity. Beneficiaries were exposed to different parts of the country, including Machakos, West Pokot, Naivasha, Laikipia and Samburu. Participants gained from demonstrations of best land-use practices. The project also sponsored exchange visits to improve linkages between upland and lowland communities of Baringo district. Beneficiaries included locational environmental committees.

(b) Environmental education

86. The project purchased a car, a television set and a generator for showing videos in the villages and schools as part of environmental education. There were lectures or presentations followed by film shows in Sacho, Tenges and Karbanet covering the subject areas of water and soil conservation and HIV/AIDS awareness. A total of 3,347 pupils, 228 teachers and 860 community members benefited from these shows. The videos on agriculture and HIV/AIDS and other materials are in Kiswahili and were obtained from the Agriculture Information Centre (AIC).

87. The project team also used two videos developed by GEF on the project focusing on two themes, *Securing Livelihoods* and *Healing the Rift.* Although the project team believed that the two project videos were useful in raising environmental awareness, the evaluation team questioned their effectiveness given that both videos are in English. It is doubtful that primary school children and the rural folk were able to understand the messages. It is clear, too, that these videos were not designed for the local audience. The evaluation team learned of a controversy between the Rehabilitation of Arid Environments Trust (RAE) and the project over content and claims made in the video. The video makes little mention of the conservation work of other agencies who have worked in the area for many years.

(c) Public meetings

88. Fourteen public meetings were held at the community level to sensitize target beneficiaries to various aspects of the project. One of the highlights of such meetings was the 2002 World Day to Combat Desertification gathering which was held in Baringo and helped to emphasize the significance of the GEF project. The World Day to Combat Desertification is organized annually by UNDP country office focusing on specific sites in collaboration with relevant projects. In 2002, the GEF project was a key collaborator in the organization of the event in Baringo. In addition to the UNDP Resident Representative and other officials, the event was attended by top government officers and dignitaries from GEF and UNEP. The event was also used to launch the National Action Plan to Combat Desertification.

(d) Joint district environmental meetings

89. GEF supported one of two planned joint meetings between the district environmental committees of Baringo and Koibatek to lobby for integrating environmental management into various aspects of Lake Baringo basin.

(e) Designation of Lake Baringo as a Ramsar site

90. The project facilitated registration of Lake Baringo as a Ramsar site (No. 1159) on 2 January 2002. The lake is now a recognized wetland of international significance. This was perhaps the most important policy achievement of the project although it was recognized that policy changes require long periods of time to achieve meaningful impacts. By designating Lake Baringo as a Ramsar site, its national, regional and global significance has been established. Through this

recognition, the potential for its conservation has been improved as it is more likely to receive funding which will help sustain the project activities initiated by the GEF project.

(f) Resource mobilization

91. Resource mobilization was an important activity of this project as it was intended to help scale up and sustain the initiated activities. The project established partnerships with the following institutions for funding of various activities:

- UNDP Kendelevu, which supported Marti Community Water Dam with $ 2,000;
- World Vision, which supported Lomuga Community Water Dam with $3,000; and
- Africa Now, which supported the bee-keeping work with KARI by providing ten hives as samples and equipment worth $1,000.

92. The GEF project has also initiated contacts with the following institutions:

- UNDP has pledged to donate $68,000 for pilot land adjudication work in the project area;
- FAO has expressed interest in funding pilot activities on use of prosopis;
- Kenya Tourist Trust Fund has pledged $40, 000 to revitalize tourism activities in the district;
- Laikipia Wildlife Forum has pledged $80,000 towards technical and logistical support for the development of the Kaptuya Conservancy as a viable tourist site.

93. Following the review of activities in this project and discussions with staff of the project management offices and stakeholders the evaluation team came to the conclusion that, for the resources available, the project attempted to implement too many activities. This to a very large extent reduced the impact this project could otherwise have created on the ground.

94. Table 2 below provides a summary of the activities implemented and the level of achievement of each activity.

Table 2: Project activity implementation summary

Objectives / activities	Targets planned	Actual achievements
1. Rehabilitation of degraded lands		
1. Produce resource maps for lake Baringo ecosystem	Five resource maps	Four maps produced: Agro-climatic zones, Landcover, Drainage and Erosion hazard
2. Compile baseline studies done and identify information gaps	Comprehensive information gathered on Lake Baringo ecosystem	Detailed information gathered from GTZ, JICA and World Vision studies
3. Establish demonstration sites for land rehabilitation	Six sites	Five sites established for gully control, reseeding, water harvesting, terracing and agroforestry
4. Facilitate construction of soil and water conservation structures in the upper catchment	20,000 metres of terraces	Over 30,000 metres done in various sub-catchments
5. Facilitate grass reseeding of individual plots	100 individual plots	32 individual fields reseeded
6. Promote agroforestry practices in schools	Seven schools	Four schools facilitated

7. Facilitate protection of water springs in the upper catchment	Ten water springs	Six springs facilitated
8. Support demonstration of riverbank protection	Three sites on the main rivers (Perkerra, Molo, Endao)	One site protected on river Perkerra canal intake
9. Promote water harvesting techniques for dryland farming	20 farms	24 farms with water harvesting structures
10. Support strengthening of community / individual agroforestry nurseries	Four nurseries	Four community and two individual nurseries supported
11. Support the establishment of three demonstration sites for alternative livestock fodder (*caliandra, sesbania*, *cacti*)	Three sites	Four sites established
12. Promotion of energy-saving stoves (*enzaro jikos*)	Construction of 50 *enzaro* stoves	45 *enzaro jikos* constructed
13. Conduct surveys in cost-benefit analysis of land rehabilitation and adoption rates	Research report	Report produced
14. Support scientific workshop on management and use of the invasive *Prosopis* spp.	Workshop	National workshop held
2. Participatory management and conservation of biodiversity		
1. Conduct inventory of both terrestrial and aquatic biodiversity and identify major threats	Report	Report produced. Survey undertaken by National Museums of Kenya and KEMFRI
2. Conduct survey on eco-tourism potential within Lake Baringo ecosystem	Report	Report produced
3. Support County Council of Baringo in tourism promotion	Procurement of radio equipment	Radio equipment procured
4. Support research institutions acquire scientific equipment	Two institutions (KARI, KEMFRI)	One institution facilitated (KEMFRI) with multi-parameter meter, turbidity meter, stereo-microscope and a boat
5. Facilitate sectoral stakeholders forums for management planning	Management plans for five sectors	Three sectoral management plans facilitated: fisheries, tourism and wildlife
6. Support establishment of locational environmental committees	12 environmental committees	8 committees established with defined TOR. Facilitated the launching and training of the district environmental committee on EMC Act of 1999.
7. Facilitate management plan for communal grazing lands	Establishment of a grazing system for Lake Baringo wetlands	Meeting held but no consensus reached
8. Integration of local environmental action plans (LEAPs) and sectoral plans into a management plan for the entire catchment	Management plan	Implementation of LEAPs ongoing
9. Conduct PRA in various sub-catchments	12 PRAs	9 PRAs
10. Support KEMFRI and fisheries department in monitoring of Lake Baringo	Quarterly reports on Lake Baringo status	Information generated used in decision making on placing and lifting of the fish moratorium

11. Train Lake Baringo management committee	One workshop and study tour	32 members trained and taken for a study tour to Lake Naivasha
12. Support registration of five community conservancies and develop project proposals for funding	Five conservancies to be registered	Four community conservancies registered (Kaptuya, Kichirtit, Mochongoi)
3. Capacity-building for sustainable livelihoods		
1. Undertake assessment of diverse livelihood strategies in Lake Baringo basin.	Assessment report	Report produced and used to identify opportunities for micro-enterprise development
2. Support groups to diversify their livelihoods trough micro-enterprises	10 groups	8 groups supported and trained in group dynamics and accounting
3. Train government officers in specialized short courses	Twenty	Twenty trained in gender and agro-methodology
4. Train community extension workers in participatory extension methodologies	40 farmers	60 farmers trained
5. Train groups in modern bee-keeping	Three groups	Four groups trained (Maoi, Sabor, Kimalel, Kibingor)
6. Promote commercial agroforestry of high value fruits	Planting of 1000 mango and 1000 macadamia seedlings	1546 mango and 867 macadamia seedlings planted
7. Promote non-consumptive tree and shrubs products (gums and resins, aloe sap, herbal medicine)	Commercial extraction of aloe sap, herbs, gums and resins	Multiplication centre for aloe vera set up in KEFRI nursery
8. Support Baringo fishermen society diversify income-generating activities	Alternative sources of income established	Lobbying for fishing boats to participate in tourism activities ongoing
9. Support establishment of Ilchamus and Pokot cultural centres for eco-tourism	Establishment of two cultural centres	Two centres registered and land allocated by the county council
10. Promote crop diversification of four drought-resistant pulses in the lowlands	Establishment of five drought-resistant seed varieties	Seed varieties for green grams, cowpeas, pigeon peas, beans and sorghum worth Ksh. 300,000/= procured and distributed
11. Continue with implementation and monitoring of community action plans	Quarterly monitoring reports	Monitoring reports submitted
12. Support pastoralists acquire improved bucks	40 pastoralists	60 pastoralists
13. Train 100 pastoralists in livelihood risk management	100 pastoralists trained	Sixty trained on: early warning, herd diversification, pasture supplements, disease control and market outlets
4. Awareness creation and support of appropriate policies		
1. Conduct study tours to other districts of similar agro-climatic zone and with better land-use practices	10 visits	10 visits undertaken to West Pokot, Machakos Kitui, Mwingi, Samburu Nakuru
2. Conduct exchange visits between upstream and downstream communities in Lake Baringo basin	10 visits	12 visits undertaken linking with environmental committees

3. Develop educational material for Lake Baringo ecosystem	Video Posters	Video and posters produced and used to disseminate the state of environment in Lake Baringo basin.
4. Conduct environmental education and video shows in schools and villages	100 shows	Video on AIDS incorporated through request from the District Aids Committee
5. Conduct public meetings to gather communities' views	10 meetings	14 meetings held. The project facilitated the commemoration of the World Day to Combat Desertification in 2002 in which the National Action Plan to combat desertification was launched
6. Training of administrative officers in the new EMCA	120 officers	12 District officers 245 chiefs / assistant chiefs trained
7. Training of agricultural/ environmental teachers	20	23 teachers trained. Action plan developed with incorporation of environmental issues into the curricula
8. Training of religious leaders in environmental conservation	40	20 religious leaders trained. Four churches have initiated environmental conservation in their plots while one has started a tree nursery.
9. Train CBOs in gender equity and environmental advocacy	10 CBO leaders	10 CBO leaders. Exercise undertaken in collaboration with Egerton University and Indigenous Information Network (IIN
10. Train all councillors and senior county council officials in environmental management	Councillors trained by June 2003	Not accomplished
11. Establish linkages with other research institutions and universities	Research reports	10 local and 9 international graduate students hosted by the project
12. Facilitate enlisting of Lake Baringo as a Ramsar site	Registration certificate	Registered as site No. 1159. Dated 2 January 2002
13. Support two joint meetings of district environmental committees from Lake Baringo catchment (Nakuru, Laikipia, Koibatek and Baringo).	Two joint meetings	One meeting held with Koibatek district environmental committee
14. Linkage of Lake Baringo project to ongoing government economic policies and strategies	Incorporation of Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper into project activities	Support of livelihood diversification through micro-enterprises and eco-tourism activities
15. Resource mobilization from potential donors to sustain activities initiated by the project	Linkages established and accessibility of resources	Linkages established: • UNDP Kendelevu – supported Marti community water dam with $2,000 • World Vision – supported Lomuge community water dam with $3000 • Africa Now – supported KARI with 10 hives and equipment worth $1,000

95. During the life of the project, a wide range of documents were produced through commissioned studies, surveys and assessments or inventories, case studies, training manuals and workshop reports (see annex II for a complete list of outputs). These project outputs present a rich body of information, which is yet to be fully exploited. The current project did not have time to make full use of these reports but they could be useful tools for future projects.

C. Achievement of project objectives and results

96. The overall design of the Lake Baringo community-based land and water management GEF project reflects the broad-based approach used which involved multiple stakeholders and a wide range of activities covering several sectors seeking to achieve both short-term and long-term results. The level of achievement of project results must be viewed in the context of the project timeframe, available resources and the complexity of the problems being addressed.

1. Enhanced collaboration for natural resource management

97. The project strategy of multi-sector participation was largely effective in enhancing collaboration between stakeholders and involved different government ministries and departments, national research institutions, hoteliers, local community-based organizations, and the three ethnic communities of the project area. Meetings and workshops provided forums for partners and participants to discuss opportunities, barriers and risks associated with land rehabilitation and conservation of biodiversity in Lake Baringo catchment area.

98. The stakeholder consultations during project planning helped to strengthen collaboration among the key actors. Roles were assigned for each activity with lead agencies identified for implementation with financial and coordination support from the GEF project team. New partnerships emerged and collective responsibility in natural resource management was strengthened through GEF support.

99. Information collected by KEMFRI was instrumental in collective decision-making to place a fishing moratorium on Lake Baringo. The collective responsibility for its enforcement by all stakeholders including the local fishing community, the fisheries department, Kenya Wildlife Service and the Baringo County Council, among others, is a good example of the level of collaboration which was forged by this project. The evaluation team perceives this as one of the project's major impacts – community action has been mobilized in protecting a critical natural resource and conserving biodiversity. There also seems to be a strong sense of ownership of the lake and its resources by the local community and enhanced awareness of threats to the productivity of the lake as well as to sustainable livelihoods in the absence of collective resource management.

100. Close collaboration was forged between research institutions, government ministries, local farmers and community groups with each playing complementary roles within their areas of expertise in the land rehabilitation work. For example, KARI and KEFRI provided the technical support and improved varieties of livestock, trees, pulses and cereals that were used in the demonstration work aimed at rehabilitating degraded lands. Linkages with other institutions such as Honey Care and micro-credit institutions were instrumental in the livelihood improvement activities.

2. Enhanced government support to community-based conservation initiatives

101. Through this project, relationships between government departments and the local community improved. The information generated has helped to increase the project's profile in environmental issues, and in facilitating registration of community sanctuaries and Lake Baringo as a Ramsar site. The lake is now a recognized wetland of international importance. However, a major weakness is the lack of a framework to translate the created awareness into solid policy actions.

102. Involvement of other actors, such as universities and the national museums, assisted by providing additional expertise in preparing baseline surveys, case studies and inventories on natural, social and economic aspects of Lake Baringo basin. Some of the information collected was used to guide the project activities, for example, in the selection of demonstration sites, micro-enterprise activities and the identification of the eco-tourism sites. Most of the information collected is yet to be fully exploited but is expected to guide other projects in future.

103. Project evaluation findings further indicate that the project was effective in building synergy for on-farm demonstrations in land rehabilitation among the various actors – the farmers, environmental committees, extension staff from the Ministry of Agriculture and the forestry department. Different resource maps generated provided the basis for an integrated or catchment approach, which was used in Lake Baringo basin for the first time. This means that the project had to create awareness not only within the government but also among the communities before they could participate in the planned activities.

104. There was substantial development of the technical and logistical capacity of individual farmers as a result of training conducted by government extension agents. An important achievement was the creation of a mechanism to involve the local community in land rehabilitation and biodiversity management for the first time. All activities involved stakeholder workshops that helped raise the level of knowledge and understanding of important natural resources management issues. The established capacity could be useful for future partnership interventions.

105. Interviews and review of project reports suggest that the project met the needs and expectations of partners. After the initial stakeholder workshops, training workshops and exposure tours were conducted on land rehabilitation and biodiversity conservation. Informal consultations were also undertaken with partner institutions. The different forums and networks for consultation were instrumental in getting planned activities off the ground. In the absence of this project, however, the lack of organized coordinating structures on the ground and the absence of an exit strategy will make it difficult for the partners to continue supporting and enhancing project activities.

106. Of particular interest is the issue of scaling up successful technologies beyond the demonstration sites. Development of strategic linkages with other ongoing programmes and local institutions for some of the GEF project initiatives is expected to help sustain the collaborative capacities developed. However, it will not be possible to sustain the momentum created by the GEF project without substantial injection of external resources.

3. Well-managed, community-protected, endangered habitats for livestock and wildlife

107. The project initiated a number of activities towards this outcome which is one of the GEF overarching goals of biodiversity conservation. However, because of the limited project duration, this outcome is yet to be fully realized although the basis for its achievement has been laid. Attention on conservation of indigenous species was limited to establishing community-managed conservancies and promoting cultural centres for eco-tourism that depend on local biodiversity. The project lobbied for registration and allocation of land for the conservancies. Efforts were made to raise awareness on exotic invasive plant species such as *senna siemea, opuntia leucotricha* and *prosopis*, which are further degrading grazing lands.

108. The project also facilitated the establishment of protected areas for the conservation of breeding sites for fish and birds that are linked to the Lake Baringo ecosystem. Plans to reintroduce the giraffe, which was indigenous to the area, and other wildlife is a positive indication of the progress the GEF project has made in the conservation of endangered wildlife species. Good management of habitats for livestock raising in the project area is yet to be realized although the project recorded positive results from the demonstration sites on land rehabilitation. It is anticipated that with increased environmental awareness, local communities will support protection of habitats for endangered wildlife species due to the economic benefits that accrue to them.

109. The project generated information that is important for justifying and strengthening biodiversity conservation in Lake Baringo and its catchment area. However, most of the information is on avifauna. Such information could form the basis for objective decision-making if it is complemented by data on flora and fauna. Relevant settings included appointment and training of locational environmental management committees whose presence could enhance community ownership of wildlife resources.

110. As a result of enhanced consultations and information generated, various management committees have been formed to mobilize local communities for effective participation in biodiversity conservation. Through networking, the Laikipia Wildlife Forum has pledged to support Kaptuya Conservancy activities and the African Fund for Endangered Wildlife has pledged to support the Kichirtit Community Giraffe Sanctuary. Through increased awareness the project has changed the attitudes of the local communities resulting in positive action to protect and rehabilitate the environment.

4. Enhanced capacity of community groups and non-governmental organizations to provide conservation benefits on a sustainable basis

111. Through study tours, training workshops and facilitating the formation of local environmental management groups, the GEF project established a basis for further participation of community-based organizations in natural resource management. There is evidence of increased awareness and appreciation of the benefits of sustainable management of the local resources. However, the communities are yet to benefit fully from their conservation efforts. The project helped identify potential sites and lobby for their registration, initiating security measures that are fundamental to reopening a tourist circuit involving the project area.

112. The GEF project facilitated the establishment and capacity-building of local institutions and networks for natural resources management. These include the formation and launching of environmental management committees, Lake Baringo Fishing Cooperative, boat owners and beach boys. These groups are now more involved in eco-tourism related activities with some already starting to benefit directly from conservation efforts.

D. Project management

1. Institutional arrangements

113. As designed, the project was executed by the United Nations Office of Project Services (UNOPS) under the supervision of UNEP. UNEP, as the implementing agency, was responsible for overall supervision and guidance. UNEP was also tasked with reviewing and approving substantive project reports and was responsible for authorizing the release of funds to implement project activities.

114. The responsible institution in the field was the project management office located at Marigat in the Lake Baringo district. This office was responsible for the day-to-day management and coordination of project activities and reported directly to UNOPS. The relationship between UNOPS and the Government of Kenya in the project was to be governed by the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of Kenya. Several organizations, including RAE, women's groups, the district planning unit of the district council, KEMFRI, KWS and World Vision were mentioned as institutions that would implement specific project activities.

(a) Steering committee

115. A ten-member multi-stakeholder project steering committee was to provide overall guidance and advice to the project on field project implementation and policy issues, review implementation progress and assess results. The committee which was to meet twice a year was made up of the Baringo District Commissioner or his representative, a representative from the National Environmental Secretariat in his capacity as the GEF focal point, and a representative each from RAE, World Vision, KEMFRI and KWS. Others included two representatives from community groups and one each from UNOPS and UNEP. The District Commissioner was chair, assisted by the representative from the national environmental secretariat.

116. During the project start-up workshop, the composition of the steering committee was expanded substantially to include the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Livestock, the Ministry of Water and the district development officer. Others include a women's representative and one representative from the local community. Expansion of the membership of the project steering committee was designed to increase stakeholder representation. This was necessary because key functions of the steering committee – allocation of responsibilities for project activities, hiring of local staff and distribution of assets following project disengagement – were sensitive enough to have affected project implementation if it was not perceived as representative. In fact wide representation on the steering committee may have contributed to the promotion of strong stakeholder ownership of the project.

117. Discussions with the project management office and some members of the steering committee revealed that the steering committee meetings were organized concurrently with planning workshops. Although cost-effective, this approach may have blurred the lines between the workshops and steering committee meetings. Consequently, several members of the committee were unaware that they were members of the steering committee. Altogether, five meetings were convened over the life of the project. As a result of transfers and frequent travel, over the three-year life of the project, the committee has had three chairpersons and seven rotations of district officers on and off the committee. This did not provide for continuity in the review of implementation progress and assessment of results suggesting that the project management office perhaps assumed a larger role in the review of implementation progress and policy matters than anticipated.

(b) Project management office

118. The project management office was essentially the secretariat, which supported the work of the project steering committee. It was made up of two technical staff and six support staff as follows: a project coordinator, a project extension officer, an accounts assistant, a copy typist, three drivers and a night watchman. In April 2003, the field project coordinator left the project. However, his post was not filled since the project was expected to come to an end later that year. The project extension officer was retained to coordinate the project and to fill the void, two extension staff were seconded to the office from the Ministry of Agriculture for a four-month duration. The project was later extended for another nine months to complete outstanding project activities leaving only the project extension officer to bring the project to a close. It would seem that the reduction of capacity within the project management office was partly responsible for the inability of the project to meet the planned targets of many proposed activities.

2. Gender considerations in project implementation

119. Gender representation seemed to have been taken into consideration in project design and implementation. Consultation with youth and women's groups was evident during project development. For the most part, activities related to sustainable livelihoods, for example, diversification of livelihoods through micro-enterprises, training in modern bee-keeping and the promotion of energy-saving stoves, were largely focused on women. Capacity-building activities, including study tours and other training activities, also had fair representation of women and men. In addition, the project facilitated a training workshop on gender for government extension staff as one of the specialized courses deemed necessary in capacity-building. In awarding consultancies for research and training, care was taken to involve women even though there was no conscious effort to create any form of gender balance.

3. Public involvement, partnerships and stakeholder participation

120. As a participatory community-based project, strong stakeholder participation was evident from the outset during project preparation. A stakeholder workshop, which included local community groups, non-governmental organizations, farmers, government officials and youth groups, was organized to give them the opportunity to identify the activities to be undertaken as part of the project. As noted, a stakeholder consultation workshop was organized to refine the project

objectives and the approach to implementation as well as to develop a work plan for implementing activities in the first year.

121. Strong stakeholder representation and participation characterized the activities of the project steering committee that provided policy guidance and direction to project implementation. More importantly, project implementation involved community groups, women's and youth groups as well as non-governmental organizations and government departments and agencies. For example, conservation committees were formed to oversee water catchment protection activities, the Laikipia Wildlife Forum pledged to support Kaptuya Conservancy activities and the African Fund for Endangered Wildlife pledged to support the Kirtchit Community Giraffe Sanctuary. Indeed, the Association of Fishermen was instrumental in the decision to close fishing in Lake Baringo.

122. Partnerships with institutions including universities, government departments, and research institutions were instrumental in implementing project activities. For example, data collected by KEMFRI helped convince the fishing community of the wisdom in closing the Baringo lake for fisheries for two years. The universities were instrumental in conducting most of the required baseline studies. The project succeeded in taking advantage of the key strengths of partner institutions and these strategic partnerships were effective within the context of integrated conservation and development.

123. The project's approach was to facilitate already well-established key stakeholders, which obviated the need to create parallel institutional structures to implement project activities. Strong public participation and the strategic use of partners reduced the cost of implementing project activities and enhanced efficiency in the allocation and use of the limited resources of the project.

4. Financial management

124. As indicated, the total budget of the project was $980,000. This included a GEF contribution of $750,000 of which $60,000 was earmarked for executing agency fees.

(a) Co-financing

125. A Government of Kenya contribution of $230,000 was pledged during project preparation. At the time of this evaluation, the project estimated that the government contributed the total pledge as in kind contribution. The estimated contribution expected from non-governmental organizations was never realized. As part of its contribution to the project, the government provided spacious office space, which was formerly used by KARI. This space was renovated with project funds and used as the project management office.

126. The financial rules of UNOPS were applied in managing the financial resources of the project. The salary levels of project staff were within rates paid for national level employees within the United Nations system. All subcontract documents contained details such as specific assignments, cost breakdown and time schedules. Subcontracts were duly signed and final payments were made after the products were delivered. Procurement, travel and costs of meetings were all handled according to the procurement practices of UNOPS in all its field projects and are consistent with United Nations financial rules.

127. An imprest account with monthly deposits of $5,000 was opened for the field office for day-to-day running of the project management office. Staff salaries were paid directly by UNOPS. A review of the expenditure records showed clearly that the project expenditures were carefully recorded and no anomalies were found. Some delays in fund disbursement were reported resulting in delays in purchasing and procurement of project equipment. For example, a motorboat for the district fisheries department was never purchased because of the inability of UNOPS to find the particular engine size stipulated in the purchase order.

128. Discussions with staff of the project management office show that no major delays were experienced in the disbursement of funds for implementation of project activities. Overall, the use of resources in the project was consistent with the planned expenditures with approximately 60 per cent of the reported expenditures made directly to project activities.

(b) Overall spending

129. The final report of expenditures of the project provides the following expenditure pattern.

Project expenditure accounts for supporting organizations

Project statement expenditure (expressed in US$) covering 2000 –2003

Object of expenditure by UNEP budget code	Project expenditure for the year 2000		Project expenditure for the year 2001		Project expenditure for the year 2002		Project expenditure for the year 2003		Project total
	m/m 1	Amount 2	m/m 1	amount 2	m/m 1	amount 2	m/m 1	Amount 2	Amount (US$)
1100 Project personnel				72,340					**72,340**
1200 Consultants				42,000		19,187		20,213	**81,400**
1300 Administrative support				38,000		23,071		29,260	**90,331**
1600 Travel		2,061		6,204		11,967		9,470	**29,703**
2100 Sub-contracts				88,000		29,718		29,067	**146,785**
3200 Group training		1,266				31,343		27,001	**59,610**
3300 Meetings				28,700		1,074.43		630	**30,404**
4100 Expendable equipment		4,095		11,300		2,959		6,022	**24,376**
4200 Non-expendable equipment		14,103		53,262		715			**68,080**
4300 Premises				8,190		1,575		1,473	**11,238**
5100 Operation		404		11,426		13,899		12,706	**38,436**
5200 Reporting costs				800		309.25		324.4	**1,434**
5300 Sundry		533		4,500		7,332		9,611	**21,976**
5400 Hospitality									
99 Grand total		**22,463**		**364,722**		**143,150**		**145,778**	**676,112**

(c) Procurement

130. The evaluation team attempted to determine if procurement of both non-expendable equipment and consulting services were done in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

131. UNOPS, through the project management office, contracted 22 consultants to prepare scientific baseline studies and conduct training. Non-expendable equipment such as vehicles, office equipment, laboratory equipment, boats and agricultural inputs such as seeds and seedlings were procured by the project. The UNOPS procurement processes were strictly followed and interviews with UNEP and a number of other stakeholders did not point to any anomalies in the procurement practices under this project. Instead, as a result of the stringent implementation of the procurement requirements, it became quite difficult, for example, to purchase a boat, which was required by the district department of fisheries for monitoring purposes. The original purchase had to be cancelled because the specific engine size stipulated could not be found even though the district would have been satisfied with a slightly different specification which was available on the local market. Even at the time of this evaluation, the engine for the boat had not been purchased.

5. Relationship with UNEP

132. As part of the reporting requirements for the project, UNOPS was required to submit to UNEP/GEF quarterly progress reports as well as reports of project expenditures in a specific format. These reports were to be submitted 30 days from the end of each quarter. The quarterly reporting and expenditure reports were done regularly over the duration of the project. While the quarterly progress reports were adequate, the project team was disappointed with the quality of the financial reports which listed only budget codes and amounts without any indication of what these expenditures were.

133. As the implementing agency for the project, UNEP had overall supervisory responsibility. The task managers were instrumental in ensuring that wide stakeholder consultations took place during project development and ensured consistency of the project with GEF policies and procedures. The UNEP task manager and fund management officer received, reviewed and transmitted relevant, substantive and technical project reports to GEF. The task manager participated effectively in the project steering committee and conducted field visits. She participated in workshops organized to refine the approach to project implementation, worked with the project management office in monitoring and evaluating the project, and assisted in preparing required project reports such as the project implementation reviews and project performance reports. Research interns sent by UNEP/GEF provided invaluable support to the project in terms of the preparation of substantive reports. Upon the initiative of UNEP/GEF, two videos were produced documenting problems in the lake catchment area and results of the project. These videos were used as training and public awareness tools.

III. Impact and sustainability

134. Reversing the trend of degradation in Lake Baringo and its catchment area is a major challenge requiring a long-term sustained rehabilitation programme throughout the catchment area. The project under review could not achieve this goal given its scope and the short duration of implementation. Despite its many limitations, an evaluation of the project activities and outputs indicate that the project has had some positive impact on the current and future management of Lake Baringo and its environs.

A. Increased environmental awareness

135. Discussions with representatives of local communities and institutions involved in the implementation of the project revealed increased awareness of the problem of land degradation and its impacts in the Lake Baringo catchment. This has been achieved through awareness campaigns where information from baseline studies on the extent of land degradation and biodiversity was shared, study tours by the communities from the different sections of the catchment conducted and training workshops for different groups organized.

B. Communities and local institutions taking action

136. Although some of the activities were in progress prior to the start of this project, it is evident that this project helped increase the tempo and intensity of actions taken by more institutions and the community at large in the conservation of the environment and its biodiversity. Examples of this include the following:

(a) The fishing community around Lake Baringo is now actively involved in the promotion of sustainable use and management of the fish from Lake Baringo. They work in collaboration with the fisheries department in enforcing the regulations governing fishing in the lake;

(b) The two-year fishing ban imposed on Lake Baringo, which had the support of the local community, has helped the lake to recover from overfishing and hence increased overall biodiversity. This experience seems to have served as a successful experiment that could be adopted in the future at this lake or in other areas. The ongoing monitoring of the status of the lake by KEMFRI in collaboration with the fisheries department and the fishing community will help to prevent overfishing in the future;

(c) There is greater appreciation of the importance of the environment and biodiversity conservation by local communities. For example, the Pokot community, which used to hunt and kill wildlife, is campaigning for its protection as a source of income through tourism. The initiatives in eco-tourism promoted by this project include the establishment of cultural centres and conservancies;

(d) The Baringo District Council has increased its support for and work in the conservation of natural resources under their mandate as a result of the project. According to the town clerk, the council sees itself as a key player in environmental conservation in the district. Through support from this project, the council is now better equipped to effectively contribute to management of the Lake Baringo catchment. To encourage conservation the council, using funds from tourism, has increased its support to the local communities by funding community development projects such as improved access to water. In this way, the council hopes to assist local communities appreciate the value of conserving natural resources that attract tourists;

(e) Discussions with the district officer at Sacho division indicate that the project has contributed to increased government action. As a result of the environmental committees set up at the division level together with staff from the Ministries of Agriculture and Forestry, there is renewed effort to reforest some of the most affected upper catchments of Lake Baringo. For example this district officer informed the evaluation team that tree nurseries have been established by the local chiefs and the divisional environmental committees are already supplying seedlings for the reforestation work.

C. Establishment of a supportive environmental policy and legislation

137. The project facilitated the designation of Lake Baringo as a Ramsar site – the fourth in Kenya. This has helped elevate the status of the lake and its environs nationally and globally as an important site for biodiversity protection. The World Bank, UNDP and FAO have already expressed interest in supporting environmental programmes in the project area. In particular, UNDP has pledged $68,000 for a pilot land adjudication programme. FAO plans to fund a pilot prosopis management project. Whether this will materialise considering legal threats by the Kenyan Government against the FAO for introducing prosopis to the region in the first place, is yet to be seen. A land degradation and natural resources management project of over $50 million is currently under development for World Bank funding.

138. The project facilitated the training and launching of eight environmental committees at the divisional level within the Lake Baringo catchment area aimed at strengthening capacity at community-level in conservation. This was part of the project's support to government departments in the implementation of the new Environmental Management Co-ordination Act.

139. Regulations governing sustainable fishing practices in Lake Baringo has been adopted and is being enforced. This includes controlling the size of the fishing nets so that only mature fish stocks are harvested. This is being undertaken jointly by the fisheries department, the local fishing communities and KEMFRI.

140. The Baringo District Council has facilitated local communities' access to land for conservation activities such as cultural sites. The proposed plans to designate the cliffs overlooking Lake Baringo as protected areas for bird breeding would provide legal protection for the rich bird life of this Ramsar site.

D. Strengthened capacity for sustaining project activities

141. The project enhanced the capacity of participating institutions through training workshops, study tours, materials and equipment, promotion of alternative livelihoods, increased infrastructure facilities, on-farm demonstrations, and establishment of natural resource management forums. Through this support, it is anticipated that these institutions will use the strengthened capacity to continue implementing project activities in future. However, in all cases, more financial resources are required for logistical and administrative support.

142. KEMFRI is relatively better equipped to monitor the status of the lake and its resources and provide advice to the fisheries department using the monitoring equipment purchased through the project. In this way, the threat to marine biodiversity has been reduced. The project has facilitated close collaboration with relevant institutions in sharing information from monitoring, conservation and better management of the lake.

143. The Baringo town council is now playing a more active role in the management and conservation of Lake Baringo and other environmental resources of Baringo district. The project supported the purchase of communication equipment which is used by the district council to enhance security within the mid-rift tourist circuit. Although no specific figures were available, the town clerk confirmed that on the whole security has improved and more tourists are visiting the area. The project has also provided training to senior civic leaders on biodiversity conservation and its economic and ecological significance as well as the role the council can play in conservation activities in the district.

144. The logistical support to government extension staff has helped to increase the ministry's presence on the ground for capacity-building. However, sustaining delivery of these essential services by the government is a major constraint to the sustainability of project activities.

145. Through training workshops many skills were acquired that are likely to continue to be applied even beyond the life of the project. However, there is no mechanism in place to monitor such activities.

146. The planned distribution of the project assets among strategic partners will be based on the role they will play in sustaining project activities. This approach is partly aimed at increasing project ownership and commitment to its goal and objectives.

E. Development of strategic linkages

147. To ensure sustainability, the project established linkages through different initiatives with ongoing activities. The following are among such initiatives:

- Tourism development was linked with Laikipia Wildlife Forum and the Kenya Tourism Policy Review;
- Rehabilitation of degraded sites has been linked with Danida environmental mitigation projects;
- Collaboration with World Vision has led to the adoption of food-for-work in relief food distribution and has also contributed towards increased terracing of degraded areas.
- Harnessing of honey has been linked with Honey Care Africa working in close collaboration with KARI.

F. Training workshops and study tours

148. Study tours were extensively used in all components of the project although the level of adoption and application was varied. From discussions with various beneficiaries of the study tours, the evaluation team concluded that the tours were instrumental in changing attitudes towards conservation. Attitudinal changes have resulted in positive action to protect and rehabilitate the environment. Through the many training workshops facilitated by the project, the stakeholders gained knowledge and skills necessary in environmental management.

149. The project has laid a strong foundation for future work by other programmes.

150. Baseline studies have been conducted in all key areas of biodiversity and environmental management of the Lake Baringo catchment area.

151. Local institutions and the communities in the project area are mobilized and better informed about the threats to their livelihoods caused by environmental degradation and the role they can play in addressing the problem.

IV. Constraints and lessons learned

A. Constraints

1. High expectations

152. The high expectations created during project design and launching posed problems during the early stages of its implementation. The project had been highly politicised with local politicians promising huge employment opportunities and relief supplies to the local communities as had been the case with past interventions. The project had to spend considerable time correcting this perception and redirecting the stakeholders to the project focus and its implementation strategy.

2. Budgetary limitations

The performance of the project in the implementation of planned activities was dependent on the capacity of the stakeholders. While the project had built the capacity of the local people and some institutions, it had limited resources to support the operations of all the relevant government departments, which were key partners in project implementation. The government departments have very limited financial and human resources for supporting even their own plans. The project was forced to work with weak partners which constrained the achievements of some targets. It is unlikely that implementation of the large number of project activities could be sustained beyond the life of the project due to budgetary limitations.

3. Procurement problems

154. The project experienced problems in the procurement of some inputs. A boat engine which was to be provided to KEMFRI was not purchased. The problem was attributed to procurement procedures and non-availability of the required engine size locally. Also, land rehabilitation work was partly affected by unavailability of grass seed, which was to be supplied by KARI. Only a small amount was available and hence the failure to reach the target number of demonstration farms for grass reseeding.

4. Control of crocodile population

155. The two-year fishing ban on Lake Baringo is believed by local communities to have led to a rapid increase in the crocodile population in the lake. This is attributed to increased fish stock as well as failure of Kenya Wildlife Service to control its numbers. Attacks on livestock and people have increased. Since the fishing ban has been lifted, fishermen have experienced high losses through damage to their fishing nets by the crocodiles. Resolution of this conflict between the Kenya Wildlife Service and the fishing communities is critical to the conservation of biodiversity in Lake Baringo.

5. Travel ban

156. The travel ban imposed on Kenya after 11 September 2001 has negatively impacted on the success of this project in demonstrating the importance of eco-tourism in environmental management and biodiversity conservation. The expected growth in tourism to the various tourist destinations was not fully realized. The eco-tourism sites planned by the local communities are yet to take off thus the conservancies are not yet fully operational.

6. Short duration of the project

157. The short duration of the project and the limited resources available to implement a large number of diverse activities were a major constraint to project performance. Environmental hazards such as floods constituted a major risk factor in the successful implementation of the project. The 2003 floods forced the project to divert some of its resources to support emergency services. Associated surface runoff led to damage of infrastructure facilities reversing the impact of the project on the ground. An estimated 50 per cent of the constructed terraces were damaged at one of the sites. However, this problem was addressed through improved designs after hydrological studies were conducted. Also, the use of a food-for-work programme in terrace construction through collaboration with World Vision assisted in mitigating the impact of the floods on project activities.

B. Lessons learned

1. Project design

158. The following lessons were learned about project design:

- Project baseline surveys are beneficial to projects when designed for implementation prior to full implementation of project activities. Information generated helps to inform project design;
- Broad-based and extensive consultations during project design and development contribute to project ownership by implementing teams as well as the beneficiaries. However, such extensive consultations can lead to high expectations that may not be met by the project;
- Community-based projects are more successful when designed with adequate representation from the communities, taking into consideration social, economic and ethnic differences where applicable;
- Integrated projects designed to use strategic partners ensure that the diverse expertise required is available for project implementation;
- Projects designed for implementation with government departments of poor countries playing lead roles without sufficient financial and logistical support are less likely to continue beyond the funded phase of the project, even if other sustainability measures are built into project activities.

2. Project implementation and management

159. The following valuable lessons emerged from the implementation phase of the project:

- Well-designed and implemented study tours are effective in raising awareness and influencing action on environmental issues. Best practices on environmental management observed in situ are easily replicated by either direct adoption or innovative adaptations with follow-up technical support form extension service providers. This was the case in the project under review as farmers adopted various land rehabilitation technologies and practices from areas with similar conditions.
- Adoption of joint planning approaches in projects involving many stakeholders is effective in ensuring that the roles played by each partner are clearly defined. However, failure to accompany this with the control and management of the required resources affects the efficiency of implementation.
- Careful or strategic location of the project field office and team within the project area facilitates effective implementation and management of the project.

3. Multi-stakeholder processes

160. The following lessons were learned from this multi-stakeholder project:

- Multi-stakeholder processes take time, as consensus building is required at all stages due to different expectations.
- Multi-stakeholder processes facilitate easy implementation of integrated community-based environmental projects as stakeholders use their expertise where they have the best advantage.
- Projects with multiple stakeholders often require more resources to be effective as otherwise the resources are spread too thinly over the many actors.

- Achieving equity in multi-stakeholder projects is difficult. Representation is difficult to achieve as interest groups expand.

4. Other lessons

161. Spreading limited financial resources over numerous activities over the short lifespan of the project reduces the impact of a project. If the resources are concentrated on fewer activities strategically selected to create impact and demonstrate effectiveness then they are more effective as demonstration practices for scaling up.

V. Conclusions and recommendations

A. Conclusions

1. Increased awareness

162. The project has been successful in raising environmental awareness and promoting action by the various stakeholders including local communities and institutions. The threat of environmental degradation on people's livelihoods is more appreciated.

2. Ownership promotion

163. Most of the activities implemented under this GEF project were not new but were built mainly on existing initiatives. To a large extent, local institutions, and existing techniques and land-use practices were used to promote support for activities being implemented by government departments and strategic partners. Consequently, the project promoted ownership of natural resources by the local communities.

3. Capacity-building

164. The predominantly, need-driven capacity-building initiatives at different levels (including target farmers and partner institutions) facilitated by the project was fundamental in accomplishing the objectives of the project. Diverse strategies were used to empower project beneficiaries to support stakeholder participation in on-farm demonstrations and then implement other project activities that contributed to improved biodiversity and the health of Lake Baringo.

4. Long-term results and interventions

165. The project demonstrated that through training and the provision of basic tools, local communities are willing to implement conservation activities to protect their livelihoods. Success in Lake Baringo, however, requires long-term interventions with extensive resources, especially for scaling up of lessons learned.

166. Lack of immediate benefits to the communities from conservation and the project's failure to build scaling-up strategies for best land-use practices beyond the demonstration sites into the project design is likely to affect the long-term impact of the project on biodiversity conservation and restoration of degraded land. Most beneficiaries had expected a lot in terms of income given the initial publicity given to the project and its promises.

5. Limited financial resources

167. This review has determined that the limited financial resources in the project which were spread over implementing so many activities during the short-term project effectively reduced the impact the project would have created if the resources had been concentrated on fewer, strategically-selected activities.

Table 3: Rating of Lake Baringo project activities

	Category	Rating	Comments
(a)	Achievement of objectives and planned results	3	• The project was quite successful in demonstrating approaches to the rehabilitation of degraded lands. However, the objective is of a long-term nature and could not reasonably have been expected to be achieved within the project duration. • The project was successful in facilitating participatory management and conservation of biodiversity in the lake basin ecosystem. • The objective of building capacity of local communities to generate social and economic benefits for the sustainable use of natural resources was partly accomplished through workshops, field visits, and so on. The activities implemented demonstrated that capacity-building for sustainable livelihoods is feasible. • More than anything the project has been extremely successful in raising awareness among all stakeholders of the environmental and natural resources problems and the actions they could take to mitigate the problems
(b)	Attainment of outputs and activities	1	• Fifty-four activities were planned and all of them were implemented to varying degrees. Indeed, expected output targets were reached in most cases and surpassed in a number of activities. • Unanticipated risks and lack of inputs affected implementation of some activities and the delivery of some outputs.
(c)	Cost effectiveness	2	• There was strong control of financial resources with clear linkages to the activities. • Use of existing initiatives and partnerships further reduced the cost of implementation. • Use of strategic partners facilitated project implementation and reduced costs. • The limited project resources were spread too thinly over too many activities. This compromised the impact the project could otherwise have achieved. • Strict use of central procurement and financial control procedures, while cost effective, were cumbersome and less transparent to stakeholders.
(d)	Impact	3	• Capacity of strategic partners has been strengthened. • Pilot activities have been successfully demonstrated and can be replicated. • More time is required for full realization of project impact. • Resources were spread too thinly over too many activities.
(e)	Sustainability	3	• Even though the project built on existing activities and partnerships, disengagement of the project will create a vacuum in terms of resources and a coordinating mechanism to sustain the activities initiated.
(f)	Stakeholder participation	1	• Representatives of all key stakeholders (local communities, government, research institutions, NGOs and the private sector) participated in project design, planning and implementation.
(g)	Country ownership	2	• Strong participation by government ministries and institutions from project design through implementation. • Although the government did not meet the financial obligations in cash; in-kind contributions were made through the government institutions. • There was also strong support through the creation of the enabling policy and legal framework for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of natural resources – conservancies, environmental committees support for designation as Ramsar site. • Local community project ownership was very strong.
(h)	Implementation approach	2	• Strategic partnerships, multi-stakeholder and integrated community-based approaches built on existing initiatives and institutions. The approach used was effective and responsive to the complex nature of the issues in the basin. • Longer-term technical and logistical support are required to address the environmental issues. • Though designed as a medium-sized project, the project was implemented as a pilot project with no strong mechanism for scaling-up of lessons. • A vacuum is likely to be created after project disengagement.
(i)	Financial planning	3	• A centralized system was used by UNOPS. • Even though the steering committee was involved in discussions relating to the use of resources for activities, the partner agencies did not have any role in planning for the use of resources on the ground. Therefore no capacity was developed in financial planning and management in the partner agencies.
(j)	Replicability	3	• Demonstrations at farm level were successful and can be replicated. • Stakeholders are ready to replicate with limited logistical and technical support. • Some initiatives require more time to be refined before replication – for example, eco-tourism and livelihoods building. • There was lack of a clear replication strategy in the project.

(k)	Monitoring and evaluation	2	• UNOPS set up a comprehensive project monitoring and internal evaluation system. • A mid-term technical review was done but its recommendations were not implemented. •Internal monitoring and evaluation, including PIRs, PPRs and self-evaluations, were carried out over the life of the project. • A final evaluation was planned and being executed. • Monitoring of project activities by implementing partners was weak.
	All categories (overall average)	2	

Note: The UNEP rating system used is as follows:

1	=	excellent	(90-100 per cent achievement)
2	=	very good	(75-89 per cent)
3	=	good	(60-74 per cent)
4	=	satisfactory	(50-59 per cent)
5	=	unsatisfactory	(less than 49 per cent)

B. Key recommendations

1. Sustaining momentum

168. There is need to sustain the momentum that the GEF project has built for rehabilitation of degraded land and biodiversity conservation in the project area. The main constraint is financial but a coordination mechanism would ensure that the gains made by the GEF project are not lost. Future external support should aim at capacity-building of selected local agencies and community institutions in resource mobilization and the institutionalization of interventions for long-term commitments. This requires collaboration and commitment as follows:

- The Government needs to increase budgetary allocations to the relevant ministries and government departments, especially the Ministries of Agriculture and Forestry and the fisheries department;
- The Baringo County Council and hoteliers should increase the benefits shared with local communities from biodiversity conservation and scale up investment and support to eco-tourism development programmes;
- National research institutions need to institutionalize support to local communities and government ministries in the project initiatives that require their expertise;
- There is a need to increase mobilization and capacity-building of local farmers and community groups for land rehabilitation and biodiversity conservation work to improve their livelihoods;
- The international agencies should provide funding and technical support for the development and sustainable management of the Lake Baringo ecosystem as a Ramsar site in collaboration with the Kenya Government.

2. Building on the goodwill

169. Given the lessons learned from the successful implementation of some of the project activities, especially in the use of the community-based integrated approach in the conservation of biodiversity, GEF should invest in follow-up work to ensure sustainable impacts are realized. This will provide tangible examples beyond the pilot phase for replicable lessons in similar cases. As a Ramsar site, Lake Baringo is in a good position to build on the goodwill created and the highly mobilized community groups and local institutions.

3. Maintaining databases

170. The rich databases generated by the project on the physical, social and economic aspects of the Lake Baringo ecosystem are critical for any future land rehabilitation and biodiversity conservation work. There is need to package and disseminate the information for easy access and use by local and international actors interested in the project area. The national research institutions should be encouraged to maintain the monitoring and updating of the databases.

4. Exploring partnerships

171. The designation of Lake Baringo as a Ramsar site and the successful demonstration of a participatory approach to sustainable management of natural resources at the site provide a unique opportunity to demonstrate that a partnership approach to the implementation of a global convention at the local level is feasible. To that end, GEF and UNEP should explore the feasibility of an involvement with the proposed World Bank project where they can effectively share experiences and lessons learned from this project.

5. Early warning system

172. The Kenya Government, through its national research institutions working in the Lake Baringo area, should take advantage of the existing monitoring capacity and baseline data already generated within the lake basin to set up an early warning system on changes in the lake and the biodiversity. The website, which was created originally as part of this project, should be reactivated and used as an information tool for stakeholders within the lake basin.

6. Distributing assets

173. In distributing the assets of the project, the strategic role of partner institutions in sustaining activities initiated as part of this project should be considered as criteria. The asset distribution process should be transparent and involve all key stakeholders. This would avoid suspicion and ensure that the goodwill created by the project remains to sustain the implementation of project activities.

Annex I

Terms of reference of the evaluation

Lake Baringo community-based integrated land and water management project, GF/3010-00-03

Under the guidance of the Chief of Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) and in close cooperation with the programme officer, Land Degradation in the Division GEF Coordination (DGEF) and in consultation with the programme officer for medium-sized projects (MSP) in (DGEF), the evaluator shall undertake a detailed review and evaluation of the project "Lake Baringo community-based integrated land and water management project", GF/3010-00-03. The evaluation shall be conducted by a consultant and EOU during the period between 19 January 2004 and 29 February 2004.

1. Background

Lake Baringo is a brackish water lake in Kenya's East Rift Valley that harbours aquatic and terrestrial biodiversity of global significance in its catchment area. The lake is particularly well known for its rich bird life and more than 500 different bird species have been observed in the catchment. The overall goal of the project is that "Lake Baringo *remains an* ecosystem *which* maintains its natural functions and biodiversity while sustaining human development and welfare". The project is being implemented in the catchment area of Lake Baringo including Sandai area that it shares with Lake Bogoria – a soda lake to the south. A catchment approach is taken as the human activities conducted in the catchment have direct impacts on the lake ecosystem and it is also the source of the seven rivers feeding the lake. Out of seven rivers that flowed to Lake Baringo in mid last century only two seasonal rivers currently flow to the lake due to unsustainable land-use systems and subsequent environmental degradation in the catchment. The project takes an integrated conservation and development approach. It supports sustainable pastoralism, agriculture and other livelihood activities that result in better conservation of the resource base (land and water). Thus while it attempts to undertake development work, the focus will be on livelihood improvement initiatives that are feasible, that contribute to and result from natural resource conservation, and that are sustainable in the long term by the people themselves after the closure of the project.

Objectives

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

With limited human and material resources the approach used in implementing the project was to build strategic partnerships. Thus the project facilitates the operations of other stakeholders already working in the area rather than establishing temporary parallel structures to those already existing. The project supports government agencies (extension, natural resource management and research institutions), non-governmental organizations already implementing projects in the area, and local communities to implement appropriate components of the project where they have a comparative advantage. The project provides necessary resources to these organisations and helps to build appropriate capacity at all levels to ensure effective delivery of planned outputs.

Project duration was initially 30 months (July 2000 to December 2002), which was extended for another 6 months for completion in October 2003 and yet another 4 months for completion in February 2004. The budget was $ 980,000 funded by the GEF Trust Fund ($ 750,000) with co-financing from the Government of Kenya ($200,000) and non-governmental organizations and local communities ($30,000).

1.1 Legislative mandate

The project refers to UNEP's programme of work 2000-2001, and its sub-programme on sustainable management and use of natural resources. The project also supports the GEF operational strategy in which "GEF activities will be designed to support capacity-building, human resource development and skills that are necessary to achieve global environmental objectives" and the GEF Operational Programme Number 1 on arid and semi-arid zone ecosystems and its emphasis on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

1.2 Scope of the evaluation

In accordance with the UNEP/GEF policy, the evaluation shall be conducted as an in-depth evaluation. The objective of the evaluation is to establish project impact, and review and evaluate the implementation of planned project activities, outputs and outcomes against actual results. The performance indicators provided in the logframe/project matrix (see table below) should be used together with the evaluation parameters of appropriateness, effectiveness and efficiency, impact and sustainability. Guidelines on performance indicators are provided in the UNEP project manual pp. 13/89-13/99 and also available on http://www.unep.org/Project_Manual/

The original logical framework of the project was amended and revised at the project's first multi-stakeholder workshop in November 2000 held immediately after the project manager and project extension specialist had been recruited, which marked the actual start of the project. The logical framework presented below is the version agreed upon in November 2000, which should be used as the basis for this evaluation. However, as the logical framework has been used as an adaptive management tool, the timeframes to achieve the indicators have been reviewed at each annual stakeholder workshop.

Project objectives	**Indicator(s) including target value and time frame**
Objective 1 Rehabilitation of degraded lands	♦ Increased number of community conservation initiatives ♦ Increased area of community land being managed sustainably
Objective 2 Participatory management and conservation of biodiversity	♦ An integrated management regime developed for conservation of biodiversity in the Lake Baringo ecosystem by the end of project.
Objective 3 Capacity-building and sustainable livelihood security	♦ Improved livelihoods of community groups through diversification of income-generating ventures
Objective 4 Awareness creation and support of appropriate policies	♦ Increased awareness and empowerment of the local people in management of their resources
Activities and results	**Indicators** **Target value / Timeframe**
1.0 Rehabilitation of degraded lands	
1.1 Facilitate construction of 20,000 metres of terraces in upper catchment (Tinamoi, Ngetmoi, Kibonjos Chebinyiny, and Sogon sub-catchments)	20,000 metres of terraces constructed by December 2003
Facilitate grass reseeding of 100 individual plots in the lowlands (Meisori, Rugus Endao, Kapkuikui, Koriema)	100 individual plots reseeded by June 2003
Promote agroforestry practices in seven schools (Marigat, Kiserian, Tenges, Kapropita, Ngetmoi, Talai, Ngambo, Baringo Teachers College)	Seven schools practising agroforestry by August June 2003
Facilitate protection of ten water springs in Kabartonjo, Kabarnet, Sacho and Tenges, Mukutani)	Ten water springs registered and protected by August 2003

1.2 Support riverbank protection in three sites (Endao, Perkerra and Molo)	Riverbank protection demonstrated in three sites by June 2003
1.6 Promote water harvesting techniques for dryland farming in 20 farms (Meisori, Kaptombes, Lomuge, Tangulbei, Loruk)	Water harvesting techniques practised in 20 farms by May 2003
1.7 Support the establishment of three demonstration sites for alternative livestock fodder (*cactus*, *caliandra* and *sesbania* spp)	Three demonstration sites for fodder established by November 2003
1.8 Promotion of energy-saving stoves (*enzaro*) in 50 homesteads (Ngambo, Marigat,Koriema, Kipkaech, Eldume, Salabani, Sogon)	Construction of 50 *enzaro* stoves by November 2003
1.9 Support scientific workshop on management and use of the invasive *Prosopis spp*.	Workshop report by August 2003
2.0 Participatory management and conservation of biodiversity	
2.1 Support establishment of twelve locational environmental committees in Marigat, Kabarnet, Sacho, Tenges and Kabartonjo, Kipsaraman, Mochongoi divisions	Twelve environmental committees established by September 2003
2.2 Facilitate management plan for communal grazing lands in Marigat and Mukutani Tangulbei, Kipsaraman, Kabartonjo divisions	Grazing system established and practised by June 2003
2.3 Support KMFRI and fisheries department in monitoring and patrol of Lake Baringo	Quarterly reports on Lake Baringo status
2.4 Support registration of five community conservancies in Kaptuya, Kichirtit, Rugus, Kampi ya Samaki and Mochongoi and develop project proposals for funding	Five conservancies registered by August 2003
2.5 Train five government officers in specialized short courses	Five government officers trained by August 2003
2.6 Train 40 community workers in participatory agricultural extension methodologies	40 farmers trained by April 2003
2.7 Integrate various LEAPS and sectoral plans into a management for the entire Lake Baringo ecosystem	Integrated and harmonized action plan established by end of project
3.0 Capacity-building and sustainable livelihood security	
3.1 Support five groups with micro-enterprise development	Five groups supported on micro-enterprises established by September 2003
3.2 Promote commercial agroforestry (fruits and fodder) production	1000 mango and 1000 macadamia seedlings planted by May 2003
3.3 Promote non-consumptive tree and shrubs products (gums and resins, aloe sap, herbal medicine)	Commercial extraction of aloe sap, herbs, gums and resins established by September 2003
3.4 Support Baringo fishermen society diversify income-generating activities	Alternative sources of income established by August 2003
3.5 Support establishment of Ilchamus and Pokot cultural centres for eco-tourism	Construction of two cultural centres by September 2003
3.6 Promote crop diversification of four drought resistant pulses (green grams, cowpeas, pigeon peas, beans) and sorghum in the lowlands	Procurement and distribution of five seed varieties by June 2003

3.7 Continue with implementation and monitoring of community action plans	Quarterly monitoring reports
3.8 Support 40 livestock keepers acquire improved bucks and bulls	40 farmers assisted to acquire improved bucks by September 2003
3.9 Train 100 pastoralists in livelihood risk management	100 pastoralists trained by September 2003
4.0 Awareness creation and support of appropriate policies	
4.1 Conduct environmental education and video shows in 40 schools (20 for each district Baringo/Koibatek)	Environmental lectures and video shows conducted in 20 schools by August 2003
4.2 Conduct ten exchange visits between communities and opinion leaders in the catchment (all divisions involved)	Ten exchange visits undertaken by September 2003
4.3 Train all councillors and senior county council officials in environmental management.	Councillors trained by June 2003
4.4 Training ten CBOs in gender equity and environmental advocacy	Ten CBOs trained by October 2003
4.5 Support two joint meetings of district environmental committees from Lake Baringo catchment (Nakuru, Laikipia, Koibatek and Baringo).	Two joint meetings held by September 2003

The findings of the evaluation will be based on:

(a) Desk review of the project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as the quarterly reports to UNEP and the GEF annual project implementation review reports), and relevant correspondence;

(b) Field visits to project pilot sites to assess impact on the ground, especially in terms of biodiversity conservation and rehabilitation of degraded land;

(c) Interviews with project management at the project office in Marigat and at UNOPS;

(d) Interviews with stakeholders from participating communities and governmental and non-governmental organizations, which were involved with this project. This will also involve field visits to participating communities.

The evaluator should develop a participatory evaluation methodology to carry out this exercise.

2. Terms of reference

The evaluator shall:

(a) Establish to what extent the project's objectives were met and planned results obtained, taking into account the indicators listed in the project logical framework, and the extent to which project activities are completed and outcomes are attained, particularly focusing on:

At the objective level:

- To what extent the project has contributed to participatory rehabilitation of degraded lands, sustainable management of biodiversity, improvement of local livelihoods and strengthening of the environmental policy framework for Lake Baringo.

At the outcome (results in UNEP terminology) level:

- Area rehabilitated and under improved environmental management;
- The appropriateness and effectiveness of alternative income generating activities promoted by the project;
- Determine the quality and usefulness of other project outputs, such as training courses and material and publications distributed.

At activity level:

- Examine the impact of the project activities to assist the participating communities in rehabilitating degraded land and conserving biodiversity in terms of the level of improvement in capacity; establishment of policies; and level of awareness raised at local and national levels. Particular attention should be paid to evaluating the role of the project office in facilitating these activities.

- Assess the cost-effectiveness of the project taking into account the achievement of the project objectives detailed above.

- Identify and establish the various aspects of the project as follows:

  – Impact achieved through the project including the sustenance of capacity-built in participating communities, and their sustainability;
  – Level of stakeholders' participation. Particular attention should be paid to the level of participation of target groups and communities, the private sector and civil society non-governmental organizations;
  – Country ownership of the project during project design and implementation. Attention should be paid to the relevance of project for national development and environmental agendas, regional and international agreements, and recipient country commitment;
  – Effectiveness of the institutional structure, financial planning including the level of co-financing both cash and in-kind, the staffing, administrative arrangements and operational mechanisms at the project level from the point of the flexible implementation approach;
  – Replicability of the project, taking into account arrangements and steps taken in this respect;
  – Effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation system as an effective management tool of the project. Attention should be paid to the identification of baselines and indicators, quality of backstopping, quality assurance, and control of deliverables;

- Identify problems encountered and lessons learned during project implementation.

- Provide recommendations to UNEP and its executing partners regarding future actions to follow up this project.

3. Evaluation report format and procedures

The evaluation report shall be a detailed report, written in English, of no more than 20 pages exclusive of the executive summary, the lessons learned, and the findings and recommendations and include:

(i) Executive summary (no more than 3 pages)
(ii) Separate section on lessons learned
(iii) Separate section on findings and recommendations
(iv) All annexes should be typed.

The success of project implementation will be rated on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the highest rating and 5 being the lowest. The following items should be considered for rating purposes:

– Attainment of objectives and planned results
– Attainment of activities
– Cost-effectiveness
– Impact
– Sustainability
– Stakeholders' participation
– Country ownership
– Implementation approach
– Financial planning
– Replicability
– Monitoring and evaluation

Each of the items should be rated separately and then given an overall rating. The following rating system is to be applied:

1 = Excellent	(90 - 100 per cent achievement)
2 = Very good	(75 per cent - 89 per cent)
3 = Good	(60 per cent - 74 per cent)
4 = Satisfactory	(50 per cent - 59 per cent)
5 = Unsatisfactory	(49 per cent and below)

In accordance with UNEP/GEF policy, all GEF projects are evaluated by an independent evaluator contracted by the EOU, and not associated with the implementation of the project. The evaluator should have the following qualifications: (i) Basic expertise on the subject matter, (ii) Experience with projects in developing countries, and (iii) project evaluation.

4. Outputs of evaluation

The final report shall be written in English and submitted in electronic form in MS Word Format by 29 February 2004, and should be addressed as follows:

Mr. Segbedzi Norgbey,
Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit
UNEP, P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: (254-20) 623387
Fax: (254-20) 623158
Email: segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org

With copies to:

Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaf, Director
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: + 254-20-624166
Fax: + 254-20-624041/4042
Email: ahmed.djoghlaf@unep.org

Ms. Anna Tengberg
Programme Officer Land Degradation
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination
Tel: (254-20) 624147
Fax: (254-20) 624041
Email: Anna.Tengberg@unep.org

The evaluation report will be printed in hard copy and published on the Evaluation and Oversight Unit's website www.unep.org/eou. Subsequently the report will be sent to the GEF Secretariat for their review and inclusion in the GEF website.

5. Schedule of evaluation

The contract will begin on 19 January 2004 and end 29 February 2004 (3 weeks spread over 6 weeks). The consultant will travel to Lake Baringo to visit selected field sites and, to interview participating stakeholders and project staff. The consultant will submit a first draft to EOU on 16th February 2004. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant after a maximum of 2 weeks. After incorporating the comments, the consultant will submit the final report by 20th February 2004.

6. Schedule of payment

The evaluator will receive a payment of 50 per cent of the total amount upon assessment of satisfactory progress of the evaluation. Final payment of 50 per cent will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual SSA of the evaluator and is not inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses. The travel to the project site will be covered separately under a travel request.

In case, the evaluator cannot provide the products in accordance with the terms of references, the timeframe agreed, or his products are substandard, the payment to the evaluator could be withheld, until such a time the products are modified to meet UNEP's standard. In case the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the evaluator may not constitute the evaluation report.

7 January 2004

Annex II

List of reports produced by the project

1. Land cover/use analysis of Lake Baringo basin (1976-2001)
2. Assessment of social and economic factors that affect environmental status of Lake Baringo
3. Checklist of birds of Lake Baringo watershed
4. Effects of habitat degradation and fragmentation on the *Ichthyofaunal* composition of Lake Baringo
5. Assessment of diverse livelihood strategies in Lake Baringo catchment
6. Gender and extension training manual
7. Food security in Baringo workshop
8. Preliminary hydrological study of Lake Baringo drainage basin
9. Environmental education workshop
10. Agro-metrology training for extension workers workshop
11. Business management training for micro-enterprises
12. Lake Baringo tourism stakeholders' workshop
13. Monitoring of birds in Lake Baringo wetlands
14. Biodiversity conservation in arid and semi-arid lands: A case study from GEF funded Lake Baringo project, Kenya.
15. Assessment of Kaptuya community wildlife conservancy
16. Mid-rift wildlife and tourism forum proposal
17. Assessment report on micro-enterprise groups
18. Assessment of alternative livestock feed resources in Lake Baringo basin.
19. Soil erosion hazard assessment of river Perkerra catchment
20. The economics of soil conservation measures and adoption rates in Lake Baringo catchment.
21. Experiences and lessons learned in Lake Basin Management. A case study of Lake Baringo GEF project
22. Participatory rural appraisal reports for:
    - Korossi
    - Kipcherere
    - Sogon
    - Kimondis
    - Kaptuya
    - Tangulbei
    - Tinamoi
    - Tebei
    - Ngetmoi

Annex III

List of project assets

Item: Motor vehicles

	Model/serial no.	Office/place found	Cost
1.	Toyota double cab (4WD) Chass No. 0047147 Engine No. 4978909 40UN 325K	Project Office Marigat (Very good condition)	Procured by UNOPS Outpost Nairobi
2.	Nissan Pick up 40 UN 99K	Project Office Marigat (Very good condition)	"
3.	Nissan Terrano (4 WD) 40 UN 97K	Project Office Marigat (Very good condition)	"

Furniture

No	Item description	Serial no.	Qty	Location	Cost
	Secretary's desk Secretary's chair Visitor chair	Non " " " "	1 1 1	Reception " " " "	22,500 8,500 35,800
	Desk Executive chair File cabinet Office shelve Visitors chair	Non " " " " " " " "	1 1 1 1 1	Coordinator office " " " " " " " "	37,500 14,500 15,000
	Desk Office Executive Chair File cabinet	Non " " " "	1 1 1	Extentionist office " " " "	37,500 14,500
	Desk	Non	1	Administration office	36,000

Office supplies

No	Item description	Serial no.	Qty	Location	Cost
1.	Fax machine	M.KXFP105BX	1	Coordination office	Procured UNOPS Nairobi
2.	Computer Compaq Deskpro ex series	8031 DW 440505	1	Secretary's office	" "
3.	Canon printer LBP	Non	1	Secretary office	" "
4.	Photocopier Ricoh	FT381H420680 1104 11	1	Administration Office	" "
5.	Daytek computer	DV0028V	1	Extensionist office	" "
6.	BJC – 3000 Printer	FDP23952	1	" "	" "
7.	Computer speakers	Non	2	" "	" "
8.	UPS – 0023100146BA12 0023100202BA712		2	" "	" "
9.	Air fan	Non	4	One for each office	1 stand Sanyo – 5,000/-
10.	Telephone Head ETA	857	1	Secretary's office	2,900
11.	Coolant large coolbox	-			5,841
12.	Meko Gas Cooker (6 kg)	-	1		4,250
13.	Fridge Sanyo	-	1		32,000
14.	Electric/Gas cooker	-			28,000
15.	Hema – camping tent Camping beds Mattresses Camp chairs – metal Kettle	- - - - -	1 2 2 2 1		36,500 7,000 1,598 5,200 2,649

Office supplies

No	Item description	Serial no.	Qty	Location	Cost
1.	Projector Video ELKILC 3610 Generator	G8x 02222	1 1		Procured by UNOPS Nairobi Outpost " "
2.	Loud speaker Coomber Big screen with stands	R09597	1 1		" " " "
3.	2 beds 4 x 6		2		1 @ 4,000 1 @ 2,300

	Mattress vitafoam High density 2 Pieces pillow cases 2 Bedsheet @ 550		 1 2 2		 4,600 1,600 1,100
4.	Compaq computer S 720 CPU Monitor	8142FR4ZODB71	1		Procured at UNOPS Nairobi Outpost
5.	HP Printer Laserjet	1260L23LA158	1		" "
6.	Computer laptop – Toshiba satellite	1200 4300	1		" "

Office supplies – consumables

No	Item description	Serial no.	Qty	Location	Cost
1.	Data tray	-	1	Secretary Office	
2.	Paper Bunch	-	1	Secretary Office	
3.	Staplers	-	4	" "	
4.	Wall Clock	-	1	" "	699
5.	Waste papers	-	4	Each office with 1	360
6.	Trays – Desk tray	-	2	Coordinator office	
7.	Diskette file	-	1	" "	
8.	Stapler remover	-	1	Adm. Office	
9.	Water container	-	1	Kitchen	
10.	Mobile Phones – Nokia 8210			Project Coordinator	
11.	Mobile phone – Erickson T10			Project Extensionist	

Annex IV

List of key informants and institutions

1.	Ag. Project Manager	GEF Marigat Office
2.	Mr. P.K Keitany	Town Clerk, Baringo County Council District
3.	Mr. K. Cheboi	Ministry of Agriculture
4.	Mr. Moi Timon	KARI
5.	Mr. S. Tanui	Livestock Department
6.	Mr. Stephen Nyakundi	D.O Marigat
7.	Mr. Eddyson Nyale	D.O Sacho
8.	Mrs. Esther Ngotie	DAO Sacho
9.	Mr. Luke Tingos	Assistant Chief, Sacho
10.	Mr. Daniel Kipkwarkwar	Farmer /para-extensionist, Sacho
11.	6 members	Guatamala Women group
12.	Mr. P. Kimei	Agricultural Extension Officer
13.	Mrs. B Chelimo	Farmer,
14.	Mrs. Wafula	Head teacher, Kaptombes Primary School
15.	8 members	Stage Women Group, Marigat
16.	Mr. Samuel Chemase	Farmer,
17.	Mr. Mohammed	Council Warden
18.	Mr. Wambua	Fisheries Dept, Kampi Samaki
19.	Mr. Samuel Cheboi	Councillor, Kampi Samaki
20.	Mr. John Kajos	Fish monger, Kampi Samaki
21.	Mr. Raymond	Kenya Baringo Management Committee
22.	Mrs. Jennifer	Fish Trader, Kampi Samaki
23.	Mr. Ollilo	KEMFRI, Kampi Samaki
24.	Mr. Samuel Chirchir	Livestock Drought Revival
25.	Mr. Philipp Von Waechter	UNOPS
26.	Ms. Anna Tengberg	UNEP-GEF
27.	Mr. John Mukoza	UNEP-DGEF

19 May 2004