

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME**

**TERMINAL EVALUATION OF UNEP/GEF PROJECT GF/3010-05-10 (4857) – DRY  
LAND LIVESTOCK WILD LIFE ENVIRONMENT INTERFACE PROJECT  
(DLWEIP)**

**Winston Mathu**

**Evaluation and Oversight Unit**

**July 2009**

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge the excellent support received to complete this evaluation. First of all a word of thanks to project country teams for facilitation of field missions to Laikipia and Samburu project sites in Kenya and to Arly Park in Burkina Faso. In particular, I wish to acknowledge Philip Lenayaisa (AWF- Nanyuki- Kenya) and Joseph Youma (Project Coordinator- Burkina Faso) for facilitating interviews with local community groups and entertaining questions and review of documents at country level. The cooperation received in that process is highly appreciated.

In a similar way, I wish to acknowledge the warm welcome received from the beneficiaries and the many valuable discussions with project staff and stakeholders in the field. Without those contacts this evaluation would have been half baked.

A special word of appreciation is directed to the UNEP Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) staff in Nairobi for the professional way they prepared me for this exercise and put me on track to ensure I completed it successfully. In particular, I mention Segbedzi Norgbey and Jessica Kitakule-Mukungu for the detailed briefing and guidance, and Mela Shah for the administrative and logistic support provided.

I wish also to express appreciation to the UNEP project Task Manager (Mohamed Sessay) and the Fund Manager (Paul Vrontamitis) for the briefings and information provided.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the role played by the Project Coordinator, Dr. Simplicie Nouala of AU/ IBAR for his briefings, documents and contributions to the evaluation report through comments and corrections received. Thank you for allowing me to delve into project administrative and management processes and giving comments on the very draft findings of the evaluation.

Thank you all for your availability, for the many in-depth discussions and your valuable reflections.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	i
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	v
1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND.....	1
A. Context.....	1
B. Project background .....	4
C. Evaluation Background .....	7
2. EVALUATION SCOPE, OBJECTIVE AND METHODS. ....	9
A. Scope .....	9
B. Objective of the evaluation.....	9
C. Methods .....	9
3. DLWEIP- PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND IMPACTS .....	12
A. Attainment of objectives and planned results.....	12
B. Sustainability .....	19
C. Achievement of outputs and activities.....	21
D. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems .....	26
E. Replicability/Catalytic role.....	29
F. Preparation and Readiness.....	30
G. Country ownership/drivenness .....	31
H. Stakeholder participation and public awareness.....	32
I. Financial planning and Reporting.....	34
J. Implementation Approach .....	39
K. UNEP Supervision and Backstopping .....	40
L. Conclusions and Ratings .....	41
4. LESSONS LEARNED .....	45
5. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	47
6. ANNEXES .....	48
Annex 1: Documents Reviewed and Personal Communications .....	48
1a: List of relevant documents produced by the project.....	48
1b: List of assorted documents stored on CD available at AU/ IBAR.....	50
1c: Key documents reviewed and personal communications .....	52

Annex 2:	Consultations and Interviews.....	54
2a:	Meeting with zovic committee- Diapaga, BF. ....	54
2b:	Briefing with animal disease control committee- Diapaga, BF. ....	54
2c:	Briefing with livestock owners committee members – Matiacoali, BF.....	55
2d:	Briefing with National Steering Committee (NSC).....	56
2e:	Interviews with key persons/groups involved in project management in BF. ....	57
2f:	Interviews with key persons involved in project management in Kenya .....	59
2g:	Debriefing with DLWEIP stakeholders in Nanyuki, Kenya.....	63
2h:	Debriefing with implementing and executing agencies- 28 April 2009 .....	64
Annex 3:	Evaluation Benchmarks and Indicators (Questionnaire) .....	65
Annex 4:	Review of implementation of MTR recommendations .....	73
Annex 5:	Monitoring And Evaluation Plan.....	74
5a:	Indicators that ISC and NSC units are operating efficiently.....	75
5b:	Monitoring, reporting and evaluation responsibilities .....	76
5c:	Monitoring project impacts .....	77
5d:	Review of activities undertaken by the project in line with the M&E plan.....	78
5e:	Examples of events where community/ stakeholders were engaged .....	80
Annex 6:	Log Frame matrix analysis showing actual achievements .....	81
Annex 7:	Expenditure Report as of December 2008.....	86
Annex 8:	Co-Financing and Leveraged Resources (as provided by AU/ IBAR).....	92
Annex 9:	Terms of Reference for Evaluation .....	95
Annex 10:	Qualifications of the Evaluator.....	115
Annexe 11:	List of Intended Additional Recipients for the Terminal Evaluation .....	119

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<b>ACC</b>	African Conservation Centre
<b>ADELE</b>	Programme d'Appui au Développement Local dans l'Est
<b>ALRMP</b>	Arid Land Resources Management Programme (Kenya)
<b>ARECOPA</b>	The Pastoral Communication Network (Burkina Faso)
<b>AU-IBAR</b>	African Union- Inter Bureau of Animal Resources
<b>AWF</b>	African Wildlife Foundation
<b>CBO</b>	Community-Based Organisation
<b>COP</b>	Conference of the Parties
<b>CRIC</b>	Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention
<b>DGEF</b>	UNEP Division of GEF
<b>DLPO</b>	District Livestock Production Officer
<b>DLWEIP</b>	Dryland Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project
<b>DVO</b>	District Veterinary Officer
<b>EOU</b>	UNEP- Evaluation and Oversight Unit
<b>GEF</b>	Global Environment Facility
<b>IGA</b>	Income Generating Activities
<b>ILRI</b>	International Livestock Research Institute
<b>IUCN</b>	International Union for Conservation of Nature (The World Conservation Union)
<b>KFS</b>	Kenya Forest Service
<b>MEA</b>	Multi-lateral Environmental Agreement
<b>MECV</b>	Ministry of Environment and Quality of Life (Burkina Faso)
<b>MOA</b>	Ministry of Agriculture
<b>MOE</b>	Ministry of Environment
<b>MOU</b>	Memorandum of Understanding
<b>MOW</b>	Ministry of Water
<b>MTR</b>	Mid-Term Report
<b>NAP</b>	National Action Plan
<b>NBSAP</b>	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
<b>NEMA</b>	National Environment Management Authority (Kenya)
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organisation
<b>OOP</b>	Office of the President (Kenya)
<b>PDF- A</b>	Development Facility A (First Phase)
<b>RECOPA</b>	The Pastoral Communication Association (Burkina Faso)
<b>RAP</b>	Regional Action Programme of the UNCCD
<b>TE</b>	Terminal Evaluation
<b>TOR</b>	Terms of Reference
<b>TPN</b>	Thematic Programme Network (UNCCD)
<b>UNCBD</b>	United Nations Convention on Biodiversity
<b>UNCCD</b>	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
<b>UNEP</b>	United Nations Environment Programme

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. UNEP implemented the regional Dry Land Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project (DLWEIP) with the overall objective of mainstreaming biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas in Africa. The project commenced in August 2005 and completed in January 2009. It was implemented in two representative countries, Kenya and Burkina Faso.
2. The immediate objective of the project was to promote and support sustainable land use management systems for livestock and wildlife at the interface in order to improve community livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and reduce land degradation. The project aimed at achieving three major outcomes by capitalizing on the sustainable management of the livestock and wildlife mix:
  - (i) Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized or reversed around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites;
  - (ii) Community livelihoods improved and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso; and
  - (iii) Enhanced awareness of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the interface, leading to scaling up of best practices in other African Drylands rich in wildlife.
3. AU-IBAR was the executing agent in charge of the overall technical backstopping of the project with the support of country project coordinators. AU-IBAR worked in collaboration with other key partners including Government Departments, IUCN, AWF, ACC, ILRI and local NGOs and CBOs. National project steering committees were established in Kenya and Burkina Faso to provide general oversight and guidance and facilitate interagency coordination. An international project steering committee was also constituted at the regional level.
4. Samburu and Laikipia districts in Kenya were selected as role models on community participation and support for the establishment of conservancies where controlled management of livestock is practiced in order to allow the coexistence of wildlife and pastoral production systems. Arly National Park in Burkina Faso provided a good example on how wildlife conservation areas continue to provide corridors and migratory routes for transhumance pastoralists from neighbouring countries of Niger and Benin.
5. The project planned to document good practices and opportunities for improving the management of resources at the interface. Indicators for progress towards the realization of the project goal included expansion of greater constituency of supporters for mixed production systems, improvement of ecological health under a mixed production system, a policy framework to govern the operations of local management of resources at the interface, and locally based conflict resolution institutions minimizing the conflicts between sedentary farmers and transhumance pastoralists along the migratory corridors in Burkina Faso. Documented good practices were to be shared with other countries facing similar challenges.
6. The total project budget was US\$ 3,477,403, with US\$ 975,000 (in addition to the US\$ 25,000 for PDF-A) funded by the GEF Trust Fund, and total co-funding of 2,502,403. Co-funding included a bilateral contribution of US\$ 1,000,000 by AU-IBAR, in-kind contributions of US\$ 47,300 from government, US\$ 200,000 from NGOs and US\$ 683,000 from institutions. In cash contributions were provided by RECOPA (US\$ 39,200) and AWF (US\$ 134,690).

7. **Evaluation:** The purpose of the present terminal evaluation was to establish whether the project achieved its objective of integrating biodiversity conservation at the wildlife/livestock interface production pastoral landscapes in Kenya and Burkina Faso and the future impacts. The evaluation was also to assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results.
8. The evaluation was undertaken between March and May, 2009 and is based on project-related information produced over the project implementation period; site visits to and stakeholder consultations in Laikipia and Samburu Districts in Kenya and Arly Park in Burkina Faso; consultations with the implementing agency units (UNEP-DGEF and UNEP Fund Manager); and with the executing agency (AU-IBAR) in Nairobi.

**Main Conclusions:** The evaluation concludes as follows concerning project achievements:

9. **Project assisted pilot areas to adopt sustainable land use practices that support wildlife and livestock management.** The project facilitated the assessment and collection of data and information on the dynamics of the drylands livestock/wildlife interface zone that was utilized in the planning and implementation of project activities, and is available to facilitate future planning and management of local resources in similar environments; and to inform policy. Major gaps however remain, particularly regarding the socio-economic aspects of livestock/wildlife production mix (cost/benefit assessment) and socio-economic status of communities at household level.
10. **DLWEIP contributed to the development and implementation of conflict resolution mechanisms and strategies for resolving and mitigating natural resources based-conflict and human/wildlife/livestock conflicts within project sites.** The project effectively focused on capacity building for negotiations relating to natural resources and conflict resolution and these are already paying dividends in Burkina Faso (see Section 2A). The experiences in Kenya suggest that conflicts are likely to increase with intensive management of rangelands that involve giving up part of the grazing areas to conservation for wildlife land-use system (particularly as nomadic system is part of the overall land-use pattern in the project site, expected to persist in the foreseeable future) . Training of community leaders and management in conflict resolution and support to local mechanisms for monitoring and enforcement of local by-laws (local scout-based units) has contributed towards empowering of the communities for this challenge.
11. **Project contributed to enhancing the community capacity to utilize available natural resources in a sustainable way.** The project focused on capacity building for improved livestock based livelihoods arising from community-based natural resources management (CBNRM) interventions (planning and sustainable management of rangelands, setting aside conservation areas, reseeded of grasslands) and improved livestock/veterinary services. The impacts of these interventions will however take time to be realized. The Impacts from alternative livelihoods interventions (bee keeping, chicken farming, and livestock products processing) is limited in scope and of questionable sustainability, particularly concerning marketing. Capacity building for conflict resolution/negotiations will also impact on livelihoods, particularly in Burkina Faso through reduced conflicts between pastoralists and farmers, as well as securing access routes for transhumance.
12. **Contribution to policy and good governance for the management of natural resources.** Project contributed to policy and good governance for the management of natural resources in the interface through capacity building of local institutions (ARECOPA, Disease Control Committee, Women Groups) which empowered them to advocate and push for the interests of the respective groups during local and national debates on crucial issues, for example access to watering points, access routes for transhumance, ownership of resources, fair share of

revenues from concessions, etc. In Burkina Faso, pastoralists are able to go to Togo and Niger to negotiate agreements to facilitate access to grazing of their animals there.

13. **DLWEIP effectively facilitated the sharing of best practices within and between communities in both countries.** Project facilitated intra and interstate exchange of information and experiences at project level through seminars and workshops and exchange visits. However, documentation and dissemination of information was not completed in time, largely due to delay in starting implementation of field activities arising from institutional constraints, particularly in Burkina Faso.

14. **Overall conclusion:** The project performance is rated satisfactory based largely on the assessment of effectiveness, relevance and efficiency in attaining the project objectives and planned results: Major strengths are in capacity building for land-use planning and biodiversity conservation in the wildlife/livestock interface zone through training and strengthening of local institutions for governance of Natural resources, conflict resolution and enhanced livestock livelihoods. Weakest link is in sharing of adaptable best practices on land use management with other countries facing similar challenges.

**Key lessons:** The evaluation notes four key lessons:

15. That wildlife/livestock co-existence is possible and can contribute to reduce conflicts in land-use planning and management, but could also increase human wildlife conflicts as the contact between people and wildlife increase due to increase in wildlife abundance and the human population. Economic feasible is yet to be established.

16. That Land-use planning and zoning to set aside conservation areas can be a threat to nomadic land-use system as it creates potential for conflicts, particularly from out of area herders. There is therefore need to put in place by-laws, rules, regulations and mechanisms at local level to facilitate governance of wildlife conservation areas, to be reinforced by national land-use/land tenure policies.

17. That in Burkina Faso, pastoralists would have benefited more if the project interventions had taken a regional (involving Togo, Niger and Benin) rather than a national perspective- since pastoralists migrate to and from these countries within the region, in search of grazing and water.

18. That institutional issue (decision on implementation/coordination arrangements) was the most significant cause of delay in launching project activities leading to delay in completing documentation of adaptable practices and the sharing of the same with other countries facing similar challenges in Africa. Future projects should address this issue as early as possible, and preferably at project inception stage to avoid frustration as occurred in this project.

**Recommendations:**

19. The evaluation finds that the documentation and publication of the best practices and lessons learned<sup>1</sup> is yet to be completed for wider dissemination. Therefore recommends:

- (i) That the UNEP-DGEF facilitates the finalization of the draft documents and their publication as appropriate before the project is finally closed.
- (ii) Ensure that as a minimum, all information and documents, including the final evaluation report are made available in both French and English.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 1a- List of relevant documents produced by the project

# 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

## A. Context

1.1 Drylands constitute the largest proportion of most of the countries in Africa, including Kenya (constitute 80% of the country)<sup>2</sup> and Burkina Faso (98%)<sup>3</sup>. The most significant land-use systems are livestock and wildlife, both of which remain major drivers of economic development for both countries. The management of these resources to date has been one or the other, with little consideration of the possibility of mixed/integrated management. The conceptual underpinning of the Drylands Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project (DLWEIP) is that a mixed production system that integrates wildlife and livestock is a win/win option in terms of both economic benefits to the local communities and to the sustainability of environmental goods and services derived from the ecosystems, particularly biodiversity conservation. However, balancing the economic development and conservation of biodiversity remain a major challenge in managing the livestock/wildlife mix at the interface. UNEP and AU/ IBAR therefore conceived the DLWEIP to address this challenge.

1.2 The goal of the project was to document good practices on mainstreaming biodiversity in mixed production landscapes through the sustainable management of livestock and wildlife at the interface in Kenya and Burkina Faso for dissemination to other relevant member states through TPN3 (Rational use of rangelands and development of fodder crop) and TPN6 (Development of sustainable agriculture) of the UNCCD. Samburu<sup>4</sup> and Laikipia<sup>5</sup> districts in Kenya were role models on community participation and support for the establishment of conservancies where controlled management of livestock is practiced in order to allow the coexistence of wildlife and pastoral production systems. Arly National Park in Burkina Faso provided a good example on how wildlife conservation areas continue to provide corridors and migratory routes for transhumance pastoralists from neighboring countries of Niger and Benin.

1.3 Kenya ratified the UNCBD on 26<sup>th</sup> July 1994<sup>6</sup>, and UNCCD on 24<sup>th</sup> June 1997<sup>7</sup>. Similarly, Burkina Faso ratified the UNCBD on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 1993 and the UNCCD on 6<sup>th</sup> January 1996. The two countries are therefore eligible for GEF support to the biodiversity and land degradation focal areas.

1.4 The project is consistent with the GEF Operational Programme no. 13 on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity important to Agriculture. The project is also relevant to GEF Operational Programme no. 15 on Sustainable Land Management

1.5 The project was to be implemented in the context of the National Action Programmes (NAPs) to Combat Desertification and the National Biodiversity Strategic Action Programmes (NBSAP) in the two countries.

---

<sup>2</sup> World Atlas of Desertification, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1997- UNEP

<sup>3</sup> Dryland areas in Sub-Saharan Africa- UNDP-DDC internal document 1998


<sup>4</sup> Samburu has a land areas of approximately 21,000km<sup>2</sup>. The district has a population of about 169,474 people, out of which 80% are pastoralists who keep cattle, sheep goats and camels.

<sup>5</sup> Laikipia district covers an area of 9,693kmsq and has a population of 281, 097, 82% are pastoralists


<sup>6</sup> CBD Web site at <http://www.cbd.int/countries/?country=bf>

<sup>7</sup> UNCCD web site at <http://www.unccd.int/convention/ratif/doiif.php>

Fig. 1a: Project sites in Burkina Faso



**Fig. 1b: Project sites in Kenya**



## ***B. Project background***

1.6 The DLWEIP project commenced in August 2005 and completed in July 2008, when it was extended cost-free to January 2009<sup>8</sup>. The aim of the project was to mainstream biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas in Africa through promotion and support to sustainable land management systems for livestock and wildlife to improve community livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and reduce land degradation.

1.7 The project was to develop and test good practices at two pilot sites in representative agro-ecological systems, one representing typical West African conditions in Burkina Faso and the other one in Kenya representing the wildlife rich savannah ecosystems in East Africa. The project was to document the good practices and share them with other countries facing similar challenges. African Union's Inter Africa Bureau for Animal Resources (AU/ IBAR) was to facilitate the sharing process because of its mandate under Thematic Programme Network (TPN) 3 and the internal collaboration with other TPNs of United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) under the guidance of the African Union.

1.8 Indicators of progress towards the realization of the project goal included expansion of greater constituency of supporters for mixed production systems as exemplified by their willingness to set more land for livestock and wildlife land use. The improvement of ecological health of the fauna and flora under a mixed production system would be indicative of community support and institutional sustainability of the management system. By the end of the project, the policy framework to govern the operations of local institutions that manage resources at the interface would have been initiated. Locally based conflict resolution institutions would minimize the conflicts between sedentary farmers and transhumance pastoralists in Burkina Faso by building consensus around contested resources along the migratory corridors.

1.9 The project was to demonstrate that the mixed wildlife livestock based livelihood system is more sustainable than wildlife or livestock alone, and provides the basis for more sustainable livelihoods than more settled agro-pastoral systems in African Drylands<sup>9</sup>. The project aimed at achieving three major outcomes by capitalizing on the sustainable management of the livestock and wildlife mix:

- 1) Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized or reversed around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites;
- 2) Community livelihoods improved and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso; and
- 3) Enhanced awareness of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the interface, leading to scaling up of best practices in other African Drylands rich in wildlife.

### Linkages with other projects and UNEP regular work programme

1.10 The project is consistent with the GEF Operational Programme no. 13 on Conservation and Sustainable use of Biological Diversity. The project also has linkages with GEF Operational Programme no.15 on Sustainable Land Management, as land degradation in Drylands is increasingly threatening good management practices in the conservation of biodiversity, in particular wildlife under sustainable and indigenous agricultural production systems.

---

<sup>8</sup> UNEP-GEF Project Document Revision of July 2008- see Annex 1C.

<sup>9</sup> Original Project Document- see Annex 1C- List of relevant documents produced by the project

1.11 The Project was expected to contribute to the above goal and achieve its purpose by delivering on activities within the three components:

**Component 1:** *Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites*

**Component 2:** *Community livelihoods improved and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso*

**Component 3:** *Enhanced awareness of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the livestock-wildlife interface.*

### **Implementation and Execution Arrangements**

1.12 The implementing Agency was UNEP. AU/ IBAR was designated as the executing agent in charge of the overall technical backstopping of the project with the support of full time country project coordinator (in Burkina Faso only). AU/ IBAR worked in collaboration with other key partners including Government Departments (OOP), IUCN, AWF and ACC in Kenya; MECV and IUCN (as well as local NGOs- RECOPA and ADELE in Burkina Faso. The financing of the project activities by the collaborating institutions was through sub-contracts administered through MOUs.

1.13 There were two national project steering committees (NSC) to be established, one for Kenya and one for Burkina Faso- comprising of the national agencies, ministerial departments, institutes, NGOs and CBOs- to provided general oversight and guidance to the project and facilitate interagency coordination. Only the one for Burkina Faso was established as such. AU-IBAR facilitated the coordination role at national level while AWF served as lead agency at field level (by default, due to its field presence and already implementing activities closely relevant to those of DLWEIP).

1.14 An international project steering committee (ISC) was put in place comprised of one representative each from UNEP, AU/IBAR, the Office of the President-Arid Lands Resource Management Programme (ALRMP) in Kenya and la Direction Générale des Eaux et Forêts of Burkina Faso and representatives from two key organizations based in Burkina Faso and Kenya, designated by AU/IBAR.

### **Programme Activities**

**Component 1:** *Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites*

#### **Activities:**

- 1.1 Assessment of the status and trends of natural resources e.g. water, livestock, wildlife and fodder resources) as well as the impacts of changes, incentive and capacity building measures on the market shares of the derived products.
- 1.2 Assessment of land use policy frameworks in Kenya, and land tenure systems “gestion des terroirs” in Burkina Faso, at both national and local levels, including customary laws and local bylaws, and strengthening of local-level land-use planning and management.
- 1.3. Assessment conflict status on natural resources and identification and implementation of conflict resolution mechanisms.

- 1.4 Assessment of the status of non-sustainable wildlife and natural resources utilization and identification and implementation of sustainable alternatives.

**Component 2: *Community livelihoods improved and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso***

**Activities:**

- 2.1 Identification and promotion of sustainable management and rehabilitation of indigenous woodlands (in charcoal burning areas in Kenya; agriculture expansion zones in Burkina Faso).
- 2.2 Capacity building for local community and institutions- (user associations, stakeholders meetings, inter-sectoral forums and platforms for feedback mechanisms).
- 2.3 Establishment and support to community conservation initiatives.
- 2.4. Establishment of community disease control committees and initiatives on local slaughter and marketing of livestock and wildlife products by examining the dynamics of diseases among livestock and wildlife at pilot sites.

**Component 3: *Enhanced awareness of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the livestock-wildlife interface.***

**Activities:**

- 3.1 Documentation of the success stories and lessons learnt and sharing of information (experiences in land management and land use and indigenous methodology of collecting and analyzing information).
- 3.2. Identification of the target groups and facilitation of exchange visits for the dissemination of success stories and lessons learnt.
- 3.3. Identification and training of facilitators and organization of dissemination workshops and seminars at local, national and Africa regional level.

## ***C. Evaluation Background***

1.15 According to the UNEP Evaluation Manual<sup>10</sup>, the evaluation process should be seen in three stages: planning, executing and using the evaluation outcomes. This section looks at the planning phase.

1.16 The planning for the DLWEIP terminal evaluation started in January 2009 with the preparation of the draft TOR<sup>11</sup> by the EOU in consultation with the DGEF project Task Manager. This was preceded by discussions on the evaluation approach/format and procedures, resources required and timing/schedule. It was agreed that this be a participatory evaluation to be carried out by one independent international evaluator (minimum qualifications as per the TOR) in 30 days spread between March and May 2009.

1.17 The UNEP-EOU initiated the search for a qualified candidate in January 2009 and contracted the project evaluator to carry out the Terminal Evaluation. The evaluation was conducted between March and May 2009 and included site visits to Laikipia and Samburu Districts in Kenya (15-20 March 2009), and to Arly Park in Burkina Faso (28 March to 7 April 2009). The process also involved a review of relevant project documents and consultations and interviews with various stakeholders during the visits to the project sites/concerned institutions or through telecommunications<sup>12</sup>.


---

<sup>10</sup> Evaluation Manual, UNEP 2008

<sup>11</sup> See TE TOR- Annex 9

<sup>12</sup> See Annexes 1 & 2

**DLLWEIP ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**  
**(Reconstructed from consultations with AU/IBAR)**



## **2. EVALUATION SCOPE, OBJECTIVE AND METHODS.**

### ***A. Scope***

2.1 This evaluation focused on the activities, outputs and outcomes of the project from its inception in August 2005 until its termination on 31 January 2009. The evaluation also assessed project performance and the implementation of project activities and outputs against actual results. In addition, the evaluation reviewed the recommendations of the mid term Review (MTR) and their implementation.

### ***B. Objective of the evaluation***<sup>13</sup>

2.2 The objective of this terminal evaluation was to establish whether the project achieved its objective of integration of biodiversity conservation at the wildlife/livestock interface production pastoral landscapes in Kenya and Burkina Faso and the future impacts. In particular, the evaluation was conducted to assess the extent to which the project was able to:

- a. Assist the pilot areas to adopt sustainable land use practices that support wildlife and livestock management at the interface while conserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation
- b. Develop and implement conflict resolution mechanisms and strategies for resolving and mitigating natural resource based-conflict and human/wildlife/livestock conflicts within project sites in Kenya and for cross-border areas adjacent to Arly National Park in Burkina Faso.
- c. Enhance the community capacity to utilize available natural resources in a sustainable way
- d. Facilitate the sharing of best practices within communities in both countries and other African member states through the UNCCD TPN3

### ***C. Methods***

2.3 The evaluation reviewed the status of the project implementation in light of the original project objectives, targets and expected end results (as per project logical frame work). This involved, among other things:

- A desk review of project documents<sup>14</sup> including:
  - a. The project documents, monitoring reports (such as quarterly and annual progress and financial reports; UNEP and GEF annual Project Implementation Review reports) and relevant correspondence.
  - b. The Project Mid-Term Review Report
  - c. Other project-related material produced by the project staff or partners.
  - d. Relevant material published by GEF and the project team.
- Interviews with project management and technical support staff<sup>15</sup> including the Project Implementation Agency staff (UNON-EOU, UNEP-DGEF), Project Executing Agency (AU/IBAR), other key partners including Government Departments, IUCN, AWF, ACC, ILRI and local NGOs and CBOs. In Kenya the key partners were IUCN, AWF, ACC, and OOP, while in Burkina Faso they were IUCN, DAPF, DGEF, DSV and AT, ADELE, ARECOPA, and ZOVICs..

---

<sup>13</sup> As per TOR- Annex 9

<sup>14</sup> See Annex 1a

<sup>15</sup> See Annex 2a-h

- Briefing/debriefings with the UNEP/DGEF project Task Manager and Fund Management Officer, and other relevant staff in UNEP dealing with biodiversity related activities as necessary<sup>16</sup>.
- Field visits to project sites in Kenya, and Burkina Faso- opportunity to interview with key beneficiaries<sup>17</sup>.
- Review of the final Tracking Tool for Reporting Progress at Protected Area Sites: Data Sheet completed in context of the Exit Strategy Workshop- February 2009<sup>18</sup>.
- Review/discussion of the evaluation results with the evaluation team and main stakeholders (UNEP-DGEF/AU/ IBAR) to agree on the main lessons and experiences of the project to date (at a half-day stakeholder meeting in Nairobi- 28 April 2009)<sup>19</sup>. This meeting aimed at identifying
  - Main activities/achievements under each intervention
  - Main factors affecting progress of each activity
  - Main benefits (positive and negative) and beneficiaries of each intervention
  - Role/responsibility of each stakeholder and factors affecting partnerships/participation
  - Main conclusions and recommendations

*Subsequently, an analysis of the results from the above assessment and preparation of the final evaluation report was undertaken by the consultant, with inputs from core team members.*

#### **D. The Evaluation Team**

##### *Core Team*

- Dr. Winston Mathu – consultant and team leader
- Mohamed Sessay -- DGEF, Project Task Manager
- Simplicie Nouala - AU/ IBAR Project Manager
- Philip Lenayiasa- AWF and field team leader, Kenya
- Joseph Youma- MECV and National Coordinator, Burkina Faso

##### *Other participants*

- Country Project Lead Agency/ Coordinators (AWF in Kenya, MECV in Burkina Faso)
- Representatives of key partners (IUCN, ACC, ARECOPA, ADELE)

2.4 The **Participatory evaluation approach** was the main method applied for this assignment. This was ensured through the involvement of all key stakeholders in the discussions at the end of the field work at which representatives of grassroots community stakeholders, relevant government departments and NGOs/private sector institutions were invited. The objective of these meetings was to give, in particular, the local community groups, relevant NGOs and concerned private sector organizations an opportunity to input their views into the evaluation process in terms of the project performance, usefulness of the interventions, and to make recommendations and suggestions as to how the project could have been more responsive to their needs. This was also an opportunity for the evaluator to brief the stakeholders on the preliminary findings and solicit feedback.

---

<sup>16</sup> See Annex 2f

<sup>17</sup> See Annex 2g

<sup>18</sup> See Annex 1c- Key document reviewed

<sup>19</sup> See Annex 2h

**TABLE 2a. WORK PLAN/SCHEDULE**

<b>Task/ Activity and/or deliverables</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Duration/deadline</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Review of background documents and consultations	Nairobi	Continuous 1 March to 15 June	See Annex 1a-c For key documents reviewed
Field work	Laikipia and Samburu in Kenya	15-20 March	See Annexes 2f&g on key persons/ groups interviewed
<i>Interviews with project staff and with key stakeholders; Visits to the main project activity sites/locations</i>	ARLY Park, Burkina Faso	28 March to 7 April	See Annexes 2a-e on key persons/ groups interviewed
Stakeholder workshop	Nairobi	28 April	See Annex 2h for details.
1 <sup>st</sup> draft report	Nairobi	15 May	
Final report	Nairobi	15 June	

### 3. DLWEIP- PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND IMPACTS

3.1 The following section provides a review of the project performance and impact under all the eleven evaluation aspects (A-K) as provided in the TOR. Each of the aspects is rated on a 6 point constructed scale as follows:

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

In addition, an overall rating for the project is given, weighted heavily on project achievement in attaining the project objectives and planned results.

#### A. *Attainment of objectives and planned results*

3.2 The overall project objective was to improve community livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and reduce land degradation at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas in Africa, through mainstreaming, promotion and support to conservation and sustainable land management systems for livestock and wildlife. The project aimed at achieving three major results by capitalizing on the sustainable management of livestock and wildlife mix:

- 1) Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized or reversed around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites;
- 2) Community livelihoods improved and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso; and
- 3) Enhanced awareness of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the interface, leading to scaling up of best practices in other African Drylands rich in wildlife.

#### **Effectiveness**

3.3 This section looks at the effectiveness with which the project attained the objectives and planned results by answering four main questions:

#### ***Did DLWEIP assist pilot areas to adopt sustainable land use practices that support wildlife and livestock management?***

3.4 Yes, the project assisted the pilot areas to put in place land-use systems and practices that if effectively implemented will, in the medium to long term, contribute to minimizing and/or reversing biodiversity loss and land degradation at pilot sites. These include:

- Support to group ranches/ conservancies (Kenya) and Zovics (Burkina Faso) in the preparation and implementation of sustainable land-use plans, including rehabilitation of grazing areas and indigenous woodlands and setting aside conservation areas. Key results include:
  - 3- Community-based natural resource management plans for Naibung'a, Kalama and Namunyak conservancies in Kenya. Each of these management plans (contained in one consolidated report<sup>20</sup>) provide guidelines and direction for sustainable utilization and management of natural resources within the conservancies for the next five years

---

<sup>20</sup> See Annex 1c- Key documents reviewed, Doc. No. 16

for improved community livelihoods, protection of biodiversity, sustainable livestock production and environmental conservation. They have a total of over 200,000 ha set aside as environmental conservation areas for wildlife and dry season grazing, and rehabilitation of indigenous woodlands through seeding<sup>21</sup>;

- 38- Village Development Committees trained in the management of village game reserves and hunting zones (ZOVIC); 3 village committees<sup>22</sup> received support for preparation and implementation of land-use plans in the transition zone to Arly Park.
- Support to conservancies for **decentralized governance of natural resources**: DLWEIP supported Naibunga conservancy in the development of group ranch constitution, rules, by-laws and regulations governing the membership in group ranches; and the establishment of local mechanisms for enforcement (local rangers/scout based monitoring units)
- **Generated baseline data and information** to be used for future planning for sustainable management of natural resources. Assessment reports (covering Kenya and Burkina Faso) on following themes<sup>23</sup>: Status and trends on NR; Trends on Wildlife population; Analysis of land-use policies; Capacity building needs assessment; Analysis on conflict resolution; and Assessment of woodlands utilization.

3.5 The potential for effectiveness of these interventions was further reinforced through training of communities and local institutions (grazing committees, women and youth groups in Kenya, ARECOPA and Zovic committees in Burkina Faso) in land-use planning and in the governance and management of land resources focusing on conflict resolution and resource conservation and management (scout based monitoring system; livestock breeding; fodder conservation; pasture and grazing management; rrange rehabilitation).

3.6 Except for the AU/ IBAR Project Coordinator, no one has a comprehensive knowledge of what data and information<sup>24</sup> is available, where it is, in what format, and who can access it/ how it can be accessed. *There is therefore an urgent need to synthesize this information/data base and make it publicly available as appropriate.*

***Did DLWEIP promote activities aimed at improving Community livelihoods and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface in the project sites?***

3.7 The project initiated and supported several initiatives towards achievement of this Objective:

- Training in financial and enterprise management (bee keeping and poultry keeping for women and youth groups in Kenya; milk processing for women groups in Burkina Faso)<sup>25</sup>
- Provided initial capital to initiate community livelihood enterprises in Kenya (60 improved beehives<sup>26</sup>, grass seed for reseeding and chicken to Kijabe and Nkiroti Women Groups (80 chicks supplied) in Naibunga Conservancy
- Establishment of Disease Control Committee in Burkina Faso<sup>27</sup> and the training of veterinary scouts for disease surveillance in Kenya expected to improve livestock health.
- Improved information access and marketing of the tourist enterprises of Group Ranches in Kenya (e.g. Koiya)

---

<sup>21</sup> Management plans (2008-2012) for namunyak wildlife conservancy, kalama community wildlife conservancy (samburu district) & naibung'a conservancy trust (laikipia district), Kenya reviewed by consultant

<sup>22</sup> Burkina Faso presentation to Exit Strategy Workshop- See Annex 1b- Doc No.2.

<sup>23</sup> See Annex 1a: List of relevant documents produced by the project

<sup>24</sup> See Annex 1b: List of assorted documents stored on CD available at AU/ IBAR

<sup>25</sup> See Annex 6: Log Frame matrix analysis showing actual achievements- Outcome2- activities for component 2

<sup>26</sup> Each langstrom beehive costs about KSh. 4000 each, about US\$ 50.00- Personal communication with AWF.

<sup>27</sup> See Annex2b- meeting with the Disease Control Committee in Diapaga

- Enhanced the range of cultural activities at the cultural villages through training and exposure (exchange visits).

3.8 In Kenya, the livelihood of local communities/livestock owners will be impacted on by improvement in livestock grazing practices, and the improved market access of livestock and livestock products arising from improved market information.

3.9 The improvement of community livelihood and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock at the interface will take effect only in the long term.

3.10 Based on the interviews and consultations during the field visits, the evaluator concludes that the main thrust for this project was capacity building with focus on training of local institutions (group ranch management board members, pastoral community leaders, community leaders, women/ youth and consumer group leaders); and on support to community conservation initiatives (development of management plans, land-use plans and management of livestock resources (disease surveillance, marketing of livestock products)). On the other hand, the project invested little money in support to community livelihood enterprises. For example in Burkina Faso, the women group (28 members) trained in milk processing enterprise expressed frustration at the lack of basic equipment to start the enterprises<sup>28</sup>, while the NGO ADELE complained of lack of follow-up to the training in livelihood initiatives<sup>29</sup>. This takes away on the effectiveness of these efforts.

***Did DLWEIP support the establishment and implementation of conflict resolution mechanisms and strategies for resolving and mitigating natural resource-based conflict and human/wildlife/livestock conflicts within project sites in Kenya and Burkina Faso?***

3.11 Yes. In Kenya, two assessments were carried out (one case study for Naibunga Conservancy<sup>30</sup> and one for Kalama, westgate and Namunyak<sup>31</sup>) identifying key sources of conflicts and proposals on conflict resolution mechanisms and approaches. This was used as background for follow-up training workshops on governance, at which conflict resolution plans and mechanisms for conservancies were developed. This is expected to result to reduced conflicts between and within group ranches in Kenya, but the potential exists for increased conflicts arising from increased conservation areas which pastoralists from outside the conservancies resist.

3.12 In Burkina Faso, four thematic workshops were organized for pastoralists, farmers, breeders and forest producers respectively. These served as platform for inter-agency and inter communal conflict resolution. This effort has helped bring down the number of conflicts from 196 in 2004 to 15 in 2008<sup>32</sup>. Conflict resolution and training in negotiating skills has also led to secure access to transhumance routes, with the effect of ensuring access to grazing areas in neighboring countries (Togo and Niger) and increased income of pastoralists from sale the of animals, which takes place mainly during the transhumance period<sup>33</sup>.

***Did the project facilitate the sharing of best practices within communities in both countries and at Africa regional level?***

3.13 This was the ultimate and most important objective of DLWEIP. The project was to achieve this through, inter alia, documentation and dissemination of good practices and lessons learned, and the dissemination of these to other relevant member states by organizing dissemination workshops and

---

<sup>28</sup> Annex 2a: Meeting with zovic committee- Diapaga, BF.

<sup>29</sup> Annex 2e: Interviews with key persons/groups involved in project management in BF

<sup>30</sup> See Annex 1b: Document No.3.

<sup>31</sup> See Annex 1b: Doc. No. 4

<sup>32</sup> See Annex 2a: Meeting with Zovics Committee, Diapaga BFI

<sup>33</sup> See Annex 2c: Briefing with livestock owners committee members – Maticoali, BF

seminars at local, national and Africa regional level. The project did accomplish part of this objective through several interventions:

- **Documentation of the success stories and lessons learnt and sharing of information on best practices.** Two Policy Briefs are already posted on the web:
  - Status and Trends of Natural Resources at the Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface:- DLWEIP Working Policy Brief #1 at [www.au.ibar.org/dlweip](http://www.au.ibar.org/dlweip);
  - Status and Trends of Natural Resources Conflicts at the Livestock Wildlife environment Interface:- DLWEIP Working Policy Brief #2 at [www.au.ibar.org/dlweip](http://www.au.ibar.org/dlweip).

➤ *Other policy briefs and documents on lessons learned are in draft form*<sup>34</sup>. *Finalization of these and publications for wide dissemination are proposed before project is finally closed.*
- **Facilitation of exchange visits** (to and within Kenya and Burkina Faso; and to neighbouring countries, Niger and Togo and Benin) for project staff and community leaders: for learning and and for the dissemination of success stories and lessons<sup>35</sup>.
- **Organisation of dissemination workshops and seminars at local and national level.** *The Project implementation review workshops*<sup>36</sup>, *The Exit Strategy Workshop*<sup>37</sup> and various workshops at Zovic/ community level were undertaken.
- Integrating best practices and lessons learned into the 'Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) development process'. During the last interactive learning session on CAADP country roundtable processes in Midrand, South Africa (May 2008), AU/ IBAR organized a side meeting where it presented the proposed continental action plan for livestock development in Africa that will help to feed the livestock sub sector of CAADP. This presentation<sup>i</sup> was informed largely by the best practices and lessons from DLWEIP.

3.14 The documentation of lessons learned was not fully achieved partly due to the delay in launching field activities particularly in Burkina Faso<sup>38</sup>. Secondly, it is the evaluator's view that the project was overambitious to expect to be able to organize workshops and seminars particularly at Africa regional level, given its timeframe (3 years) and budget (dissemination workshops and seminars were not budgeted for)<sup>39</sup>. Overall, the project achievement of this objective is satisfactory, considering the above constraints.

---

<sup>34</sup>See Annex 1a: List of relevant documents produced by the project – available draft documents

<sup>35</sup> See Annex 6: Log Frame matrix analysis - under Outcome 3, activities for component 3

<sup>36</sup> See Annex 1c: Progress Reports- implementation.

<sup>37</sup> See Annex 1b: Doc. No. 2

<sup>38</sup> Interview with AU-IBAR Project coordinator: Also discussed in the UNEP Project Document Revision- July 2008.

<sup>39</sup> See Annex 7: copy of original Budget

**Table 3a: Summary: Level of Achievement of Project objectives<sup>40</sup>.**

Indicators	Level of Achievement
<p><i>Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized or reversed around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites:</i></p> <p><b>Land-use planning processes in place:</b> Group Ranches/ Conservancies (Kenya) and Zovics (Burkina Faso) involved in the preparation and implementation of sustainable management plans and/or land-use plans, including rehabilitation of grazing areas and indigenous woodlands through setting aside conservation areas.</p> <p><b>Mechanisms for decentralized governance of Natural resources in place:</b> Constitutions, rules, by-laws and regulations for promoting sustainable management of the environment (governance and enforcement through peace committees, grazing committees, scout-based monitoring units).</p> <p><b>Baseline data and information in place:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Status and trends on NR;</li> <li>- Trends on Wildlife population;</li> <li>- Analysis of land-use policies;</li> <li>- Capacity building needs assessment;</li> <li>- Analysis on conflict resolution;</li> <li>- Assessment of woodlands utilization.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conflict resolution strategies and mechanisms in place and being implemented</b></p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> Land-use plans have been prepared for target group ranches/Zovics in both Kenya and Burkina Faso<sup>41</sup>. Mechanisms to ensure implementation are also in place.</p> <p><b>Yes.</b> Mechanisms are in place but there are questions on sustainability</p> <p><b>Yes</b> but one key issue not addressed: household socio-economic status and trends,</p> <p><b>Yes.</b> This has been effectively achieved and already bearing fruits in Burkina Faso. In Kenya the project contributed to a wider process being managed under OOP</p>
<p><i>Community livelihoods improved and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso;</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improved range management practices introduced and being applied</li> <li>2. Mechanisms for livestock/wildlife disease surveillance in place</li> <li>3. Alternative livelihood opportunities introduced and being applied by Resources user and CBOs</li> </ol>	<p>Livestock livelihood adequately addressed, including disease surveillance</p> <p>Alternative livelihoods only partly addressed- no discernable strategy, not enough resources set aside for follow-up to training.</p>
<p><i>Enhanced awareness of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the interface, leading to scaling up of best practices in other African Drylands rich in wildlife.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information available on best practices for sustainable land use and management</li> <li>2. Workshops, seminars/conferences and exchange visits organized for exchange of knowledge at local, national and between the two countries.</li> <li>3. Best practices and lessons made available at Africa level (CAADP process)</li> </ol>	<p>Only partially achieved. A lot of information has been generated, some documentation has been done (two policy briefs) and some dissemination has been done. Organization of DLWEIP specific workshops and seminars at Africa regional level was not feasible in the first place. Documentation and dissemination of lessons learned is yet to be completed.</p>

**The effectiveness of the project in achieving main project objectives: Satisfactory**

<sup>40</sup> See also Annex 6: Log frame analysis for details

<sup>41</sup> See Annex 6: Outcome 1- Activities for component 1&2 for details

- **Relevance**

**3.15 To local community priority needs:** One of the key challenges for communities living in the wildlife/livestock interface areas is ensuring sustainable livelihoods which are predominantly dependent on livestock. Some of the constraining factors to the livestock livelihood system are water and pasture, whose availability is often threatened by bad resource management practices (overgrazing, deforestation and limited access to disease control services) and conflicts arising from the competition for these resources among different interest groups. DLWEIP focused on the livestock livelihood issue by promoting sustainable management of natural resources to conserve and/ or improve grazing resources (rehabilitation of grazing areas through reseeding, setting aside dry season grazing zones, and the establishment of disease control committees); training on conflict resolution<sup>42</sup>; and the establishment of conflict resolution committees.

**3.16 To national priorities:** DLWEIP offered Kenya and Burkina Faso an opportunity to promote poverty eradication and environmental sustainability in the target sites, consistent with the MDGs 1 (Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger) and MDG7 (Ensure environmental sustainability); also to PRSPs and other national strategies for poverty eradication (e.g. Vision 2030 in Kenya)<sup>43</sup>.

3.17 With regard to policy, results from the DLWEIP conflict resolution assessments and consultative workshop at Naibunga Conservancy in Kenya served as an important input to the drafting of the “National Policy on Peace Building and Conflict Management”- 19 July 2006 by the OOP<sup>44</sup>.

**3.18 At Africa level,** DLWEIP was particularly relevant to the Action Plan for the Environment Initiative of the New Partnerships for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) spearheaded by AMCEN<sup>45</sup>. It was also expected to contribute to the implementation of the Regional Action Programme (RAP) for Africa in context of the UNCCD and its Thematic Programme Networks (TPN) on Rational use of rangelands and development of fodder crops (TPN3) and on Agriculture (TPN6). Unfortunately, the implementation of the UNCCD RAP for Africa has not been very active, and there is no evidence of DLWEIP interaction with the UNCCD process<sup>46</sup>.

**3.19 At global level:** The project is consistent with the GEF Operational Programme no. 13 on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity; and to OP 15 on Combating land degradation. DLWEIP delivered on these objectives through various interventions: the preparation and implementation of sustainable land-use plans which include the setting up of protected areas with limited/controlled grazing to ensure protection and conservation of the biodiversity (Kenya); and the definition and community-based enforcement of regulations relating to transhumance routes for pastoralists in Burkina Faso.

The Relevance of the project to GEF priorities: Highly Satisfactory

## Efficiency

---

<sup>42</sup> Proceedings of a “Conflict Resolution and Management Training, Naibunga Conservancy Board of Trust, Nanyuki, 29-30 May 2006.

<sup>43</sup> Vision 30 document- July 2007

<sup>44</sup> “National Policy on Peace Building and Conflict Management”- 19 July 2006 by the OOP-draft

<sup>45</sup> “Action Plan for the Environment Initiative of the New Partnerships for Africa’s Development (NEPAD)”- UNEP/AMCEN/GEF- October 2003

<sup>46</sup> Evaluator’s personal communication with UNCCD Secretariat

**3.20 Financial management:** the overall project budget supported by GEF was US\$ 975,000 and as of 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008, the total expenditure was US\$ 817,439 or 84%<sup>47</sup>. The unspent balance of US\$ 157,561 was expected to be spent by January 2009 and on documentation and publication of best practices and lessons learnt (if proposed expenditure on these activities is allowed beyond 31<sup>st</sup> January 2009). This makes for a highly efficient project in terms of utilization of allocated resources.

**3.21 Technology** is a key factor in improving productivity and efficiency in the utilization of environmental resources and for improving human well-being. DLWEIP promoted specific technologies- techniques and practices in reseeded of grazing areas with improved grass varieties; techniques in data collection, analysis and decision-making for management planning (group ranches/Zovics) zoning; training in alternative livelihood enterprises (milk processing, bee keeping and chicken farming), training in techniques and practices in animal disease surveillance and control- all contributing to more efficient utilization of local resources particularly land, nature reserves, wildlife and livestock. The project had a very clear strategy on the need for improved livestock productivity, but did not have a specific strategy for alternative livelihood technologies or approaches. At the debriefing session with the implanting/executing agencies, it was clarified by the UNEP-DGEF Task Manager that in deed GEF only considered alternative livelihoods only to the extent they serve to focus local communities on the bigger picture of global environmental issues<sup>48</sup>.

**3.22 Timing:** This was supposed to be a 36 month project- starting in August 2005 and closing in July 2008. Full implementation in Burkina Faso did not start until April 2007 when the current National Coordinator was appointed<sup>49</sup>. According to Urbain Belemsobgo, Director of Wildlife in the MECV<sup>50</sup>, this 21 month delay in initiating field activities was caused by the time it took to get all the relevant Government ministries to sign on to the national steering Committee. A similar delay was experienced in Kenya but not as long. For example as of February 2006, the National Taskforce meeting held at AWF offices in Nairobi (Including AU/ IBAR, IUCN, ACC, OOP-Arid Lands Natural Resource Management Programme and AWF) was still discussing signing of the MOUs, the TOR for the taskforce and the launching of the taskforce<sup>51</sup>. It took several months to agree on the coordination arrangements.

3.23 In addition to these, the evaluation established that there were other delays precipitated by weather and political factors<sup>52</sup>. These delays clearly meant activities being implemented in a hurry, aimed at completing the targets on time. In the end, the project had to request for a 6 month cost-free extension (to 31 January 2009) to complete the project activities.

**3.24 Synergy:** In Kenya, AWF was selected as the lead agency for implementing DLWEIP activities in the field. AWF has a USAID funded “CBNRM” project that cover the target sites<sup>53</sup>. This provided an excellent opportunity to ensure synergy and value-adding to DLWEIP project activities. In Burkina Faso, the two local NGOs involved in community support activities (RECOPA and ADELE) are implementing activities similar to those of DLWEIP in the field with funding from IUCN and Government of Switzerland respectively<sup>54</sup>. These provided a good opportunity for synergy and cost effectiveness in delivery of support to the communities. Use of the local institutions already on the ground allowed for sharing of costs relating to facilities (office space, transport, communication), thereby making for efficiency and cost saving.

---

<sup>47</sup> See Annex 7: Expenditure Report as of December 2008- Annex 1- Annual expenditures

<sup>48</sup> See Annex 2h- Debriefing with implementing and executing agencies- 28 April 2009

<sup>49</sup> Briefing with Urbain Belemsodgo- Annex 2e.

<sup>50</sup> Briefing with Urbain Belemsodgo on Annex 2e

<sup>51</sup> Minutes of meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> February 2006 at AWF Office, Nairobi

<sup>52</sup> See section on “Financial Planning and Reporting”

<sup>53</sup> Interview with AWF representative in Nanyuki- See Annex 2f

<sup>54</sup> Interview with IUCN representative in Ouagadougou- See Annex 2e

**3.25 Information gathering:** In both Kenya and Burkina Faso, the project relied heavily on data and information maintained by the government ministries and other executing organizations both international and regional such as AU/ IBAR, IUCN, AWF, ACC, RECOPA and ADELE). Use of existing local institutions also allowed for more timely and cost effective implementation of activities.

**3.26 Sharing of experiences:** The selection of the two pilot sites, one in Kenya and the other in Burkina Faso allowed for comparison and contrasting in terms of lessons learned- the former being predominantly an agripastoral landscape and the later offering experiences on the interface adjacent to conservation areas. The sharing of information between the two was on the other hand rendered costly due to differences in the working language between the two countries. Meetings and documents for sharing between the two had to be in both French and English to be useful.

Taking into account the delays in initiating project activities in both Kenya and Burkina Faso, and constraints in sharing of information, the Efficiency of the project to meet objectives: Moderately Satisfactory

## ***B. Sustainability***

**3.27 Indicators:** Adoption of conservation activities as a standard activity in group ranch work plans, ecotourism enterprises incorporated as part of the group ranch business plans; environmental by-laws developed and being enforced; capacity building activities are part of the work plan of government ministries (e.g. DVOs/ DLPOs); local community institutions established and/or strengthened for the management of NR, including resolution of conflicts.

This section looks at the probability of long-term continuation of project impacts and outcomes when the DLWEIP project comes to an end.

### ***Financial resources:***

3.28 A major consideration in financial resources availability is the degree to which sustainable management of natural resources being supported by the project are integrated into the group ranch work programmes and budgets. Evidence in this regard was provided by group ranch managers in Kojia and Westgate Conservancies who indicated they have ordered grass seed (from group ranch resources) for reseeding when rain comes<sup>55</sup>.

3.29 Most community group IGAs (chicken farming, bee keeping, sale of artifacts) are expected to be self-sustaining. The evaluation however notes that some of the interventions initiated under this project are vulnerable due to lack of proper consideration of marketing opportunities. Such is the case for the market for honey and eggs<sup>56</sup>. The policy constraining the harvesting of wild game needs review as it limits the potential benefits from conservation efforts by local communities in Kenya<sup>57</sup>. This is not the case in Burkina Faso as controlled hunting is permitted.

Financial Sustainability: Satisfactory

<sup>55</sup> See Annex 2f: Interview with key persons involved in ect management in Kenya- Group Ranch Manager Kojia

<sup>56</sup> See Annex 2f: Interview with key persons involved in project management in Kenya- Interview with Kijabe Women Chicken project

<sup>57</sup> See Annex 2g: Debriefing meeting with stakeholders in Nanyuki, Kenya

### *Socio-political sustainability:*

3.30 All indications are that both Kenya and Burkina Faso are keen on DLWEIP, given its relevance to national policy for poverty alleviation and sustainable development. For example the Kenyan policy for drylands development is already in place. There is therefore political goodwill for continued support to programmes that address the wildlife/livestock environment interface issues in the drylands. An important consideration in this regard is the pending land-use policy in Kenya. It is not clear at this stage what the outcome of that debate may have on the management of group ranches.

3.31 The social dimension remains a challenge in Kenya. There are pastoralists who will want to use the conservation areas as dry-season grazing areas; and the concept of conservation can be considered limiting by some to the nomadic lifestyle. Project interventions in these areas will perpetuate conflicts, create unsustainable/conflict situations particularly with pastoralists coming from outside the project sites. Mitigating factors could include environmental management by-laws being enforced by local peace committees and grazing committees of the group ranch management boards and Zovic Committees.

Socio- political Sustainability: Highly satisfactory

### *Institutional sustainability:*

The overall strategy for this project was to work within the existing local and national institutions in both Kenya and Burkina Faso.

3.32 In Kenya, project activities were implemented through the group ranch management boards which are legal entities established under the laws of Kenya<sup>58</sup>. The project promoted and supported the establishment of grazing committees with membership from board members, thus ensuring sustainability of these mechanisms when the project funding is over. The grazing committees also serve as the conflict resolution mechanism on issues relating to implementation of conservancy management plans.

3.33 In Burkina Faso, project activities were implemented through ARECOPA which is an association of local pastoralist groups registered with the government; and the ADELE, a local NGO working with Zovics<sup>59</sup> which are legal entities. The project supported the establishment of an Animal Disease Control Committee which is still in the process of identifying its roles, responsibilities and operational modalities. Interview with the group did not provide indication of prospects for the sustainability of this mechanism now that the project is over.

3.34 The involvement of Government ministries in Kenya and MECV in Burkina Faso was important in ensuring the sustainability of project impacts. In particular, the engagement of DVOs and DLPOs in Kenya<sup>60</sup> was critical in promoting rangelands rehabilitation activities and the delivery of veterinary services to ensure livestock health. The integration of these activities in their work plans was a clear signal of sustainability.

3.35 Finally, the Evaluation notes the effective capacity building (targeting in particular the group ranch/ Zovic leadership, women/ youth groups and individuals and the local authorities) is a strong sign that the project impacts arising from awareness raising, skills training and management of land resources will outlive the project.

---

<sup>58</sup> Land (Group Representatives) Act, Cap 287 Laws of Kenya

<sup>59</sup> See Annex 2a: Meeting with zovic committee- Diapaga, BF

<sup>60</sup> See Annex 2g: Debriefing with DLWEIP stakeholders in Nanyuki, Kenya

Institutional Framework Sustainability: Highly satisfactory

*Environmental sustainability:*

3.36 DLWEIP is basically about sustainable management of natural resources and in particular the wildlife and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas. In the long run, this is expected to lead to better environmental stewardship and conservation of natural resources. However, at project output level, the main impact will come from awareness, skills training and community involvement in decision making concerning land and natural resource management through change in peoples attitude and appreciation of the role that they can play on their own (without external support) to protect and improve the basic resources (animal resources, rangelands and biodiversity) on which their livelihoods depend. This will ensure the sustainability of the project interventions long after external support is gone.

3.37 Environmental sustainability could be undermined by, among others, governance and conflict issues. For example the successful implementation of grazing management plans and natural resource management plans for the conservancies and Zovics will depend on legalizing and enforcing community by-laws which for the most part are only binding to the members of the concerned socio-economic groups. Inter-tribal and intra-tribal conflicts can affect the sustainability of the benefits accruing from the project, particularly because improved grazing resources are likely to attract the attention of neighboring communities, thereby triggering conflicts, particularly during drought periods.

Environmental Sustainability: Satisfactory

***C. Achievement of outputs and activities***

3.38 The project Log Frame was revised during the MTR<sup>61</sup> and outlines the project outputs and activities, the objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification. Annex 6 (Log Frame Matrix Analysis) uses the same outputs and activities (as revised in the MTR) but adopts revised indicators and the means of verification used in this evaluation. The following are the achievements as verified through this process:

**Programme Activities**

**Component 1: *Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites***

**Project strategy:** Focus on baseline studies/ assessments and capacity building for follow-up.

**Activities in component 1:**

1.1 Assessment of the status and trends of natural resources (e.g. water, livestock, wildlife and fodder resources) and the baseline socio-economic status of communities in pilot sites.

---

<sup>61</sup> MTR Report- see Annex 1c

**Means of verification:** Baseline assessments on natural resources and socio-economic status in place and being used to inform project activities.

*The assessment of natural resources use (livestock and wildlife) status and trends was undertaken in Kenya and Burkina Faso<sup>62</sup>. Review indicates well-researched desk studies covering all key issues (status and trends) including water, livestock, wildlife and fodder, as well as the impacts of current usage levels- with proposals on follow-up programme activities to address natural resource conservation. Project follow-up to these assessments include:*

- *Training on land-use planning and management for Group Ranch and Zovic managers undertaken*
- *Support to preparation of 3 Conservancy Management plans<sup>63</sup> in Kenya and land-use plans for 8 Zovics in Burkina Faso (these relate to activities 1.4 and 2.3).*

*The assessment of socio- economic status of communities in pilot sites on the other hand was not done.*

*In Burkina Faso, the study was spearheaded by IUCN (Dr. Moumini). In Kenya, the assessment was undertaken by a team of scientists lead by Prof. Nicholas Otienoh Oguge of Earthwatch Institute, Samburu Conservation Research Initiative.*

1.2 Assessment of land use policy frameworks in Kenya, and land tenure systems “gestion des terroirs” in Burkina Faso, at both national and local levels, including customary laws and local bylaws, and strengthening of local-level land-use planning and management.

**Means of verification:** Land-use policy assessment reports in place and being used to guide development of subsidiary legislation for local community land management purposes.

*The assessment of land-use policy frameworks and land tenure systems were undertaken in Kenya (by IUCN)<sup>64</sup> and Burkina Faso (by MECV/IUCN)). Review of assessment reports indicate high quality, detailed review of policy and legislative frameworks relating to land-use and land tenure systems in both countries with an analysis of impacts of these on land use practices and resources use. The documents also included identification of gaps and recommendations for follow-up. These assessments guided the project follow-up activities:*

- *Supported Naibunga conservancy in the development of group ranch constitution, rules, by-laws and regulations governing the membership in group ranches;*
- *The establishment of local mechanisms for enforcement (local rangers/ scout based monitoring units)*

1.3 Assessment of conflict status on natural resources and identification and implementation of conflict resolution mechanisms. The following key outputs were realized:

**Means of verification:** Conflict resolution assessment reports in place, mechanisms for conflict resolution established, and training undertaken to ensure capacity for conflict resolution.

- *Two assessment reports in Kenya and one in Burkina Faso were prepared<sup>65</sup> using Participatory Rapid Rural Appraisal (PRRA) methodology. The community focus groups (during workshops) were used for the identification of main categories of conflicts, the underlying causes and to make recommendations on possible mechanisms to address the issues.*

---

<sup>62</sup> See Annex 1a for details

<sup>63</sup> For Naibunga, Kalama and Namunyak, See Annex 1b, also Annex 6 (Log Frame Matrix Analysis) for details

<sup>64</sup> See under Annex 1a for details.

<sup>65</sup> See Annex 1a for details

- *The ensuing reports served as background documents at workshops organized for training, awareness raising and development of strategies for conflict resolution in the project sites-two in Kenya (Naibunga and Kalama/ Namunyak conservancies) and four thematic workshops as a platform for inter-agency and inter communal conflict resolution in Burkina Faso.*

1.4 Assessment of the status of non-sustainable wildlife and natural resources utilization and identification and implementation of sustainable alternatives.

**Means of verification:** Reports on Assessment of NR utilization-status and trend; Game scout monitoring reports on the consumption of bush-meat; monitoring report on poaching and illegal hunting; proposals/recommendations on alternatives.

*Several assessments were undertaken in Kenya and one in Burkina Faso<sup>66</sup>. Review of these assessment reports indicates high caliber studies using several tools and methodologies including desk studies, remote sensing and GIS, and field interviews/ measurements using PRRA along selected transects. The output is a report indicating main issues and constraints to current resource use systems in the target areas (overstocking/grazing, land degradation and resources conflicts) and giving recommendations focusing on strategies to address these issues. The main project response to these recommendations are:*

- *Development of management plans for the three conservancies- Naibunga, Kalama and Namunyak (Relate to Activity 1.1 and 2.3)*
- *A training program for community based environmental monitoring in the three conservancies*
- *Reseeding programs for the rehabilitation of seriously degraded arid environments especially within Namunyak and Naibunga conservancies.*

Annex 1c provides the list of specific documents reviewed, and the institutions and experts involved in the assessments. Overall, the quality of assessments is highly satisfactory, based on the methodologies applied and caliber of experts involved. *It should be noted however that these assessments relied heavily on existing data and information and therefore their veracity is as good as the data they are based on. There is also a degree of overlap in coverage of issues between the various assessments (e.g. 1.1 and 1.4) but this is as expected.*

**Component 2: Community livelihoods improved and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso**

**Project strategy:** Capacity building with focus on training.

**Means of verification:** Interviews with project staff, resource user/women groups and Group Ranch officials; AU/ IBAR project progress technical reports; Stakeholder meetings during evaluation mission

### **Activities in Component 2**

2.1 Identification and promotion of sustainable management and rehabilitation of indigenous woodlands (in charcoal burning areas in Kenya; agriculture expansion zones in Burkina Faso).

*The management plans and grazing codes are covered under activity 1.1 and 1.2. In addition, several training workshops were undertaken relating to sustainable management of natural resources<sup>67</sup>, including training of communities and group ranch officials on reseeded of grasslands in Kenya and training Zovic leadership on sustainable management of game reserve areas in Burkina Faso.*

<sup>66</sup> See under Annex 1a for details

<sup>67</sup> See under Annex 1b- Training reports.

## 2.2 Capacity building for local community and institutions- (user associations, stakeholders meetings, inter-sectoral forums and platforms for feedback mechanisms).

Following are some of the key outputs<sup>68</sup>:

- *Training in financial and enterprise management (bee keeping and poultry keeping for women and youth groups in Kenya; milk processing for women groups in Burkina Faso)*
- *Provision of catalytic support to community groups to initiate livelihood enterprises in Kenya (60 improved beehives to various community groups, grass seed for reseeding to Ttiemamut, Kijabe and Koiya Group ranches, and 80 chicken to Kijabe Women Group in Naibunga Conservancy)*
- *Training for Improved information access and marketing of the tourist enterprises of Group Ranches in Kenya (e.g. Koiya)*
- *Enhanced the range of cultural activities at the cultural villages through training and exposure (exchange visits to Baringo and Magadi in Kenya).*
- *In Burkina Faso, one Women group (28 members) was trained in business management and in milk processing and are in the process of setting up the enterprise.*

## 2.3 Establishment of, and support to community conservation initiatives.

*Project contributed to sustainable management of the following conservation areas, particularly through training of community leaders/managers:*

- *In Kenya, West Gate-34,000 ha, Kalama 16,000 ha, Naibunga 43,000ha, Namunyak-78,000ha)<sup>69</sup>*
- *In Burkina Faso, Arly National Park-120,000ha; Koakrana concession-27,000ha; Pagou Tandougou-34,000ha and 8village Zovics-about 8,000ha)- also transhumance routes (in an area totaling 358,000 ha)<sup>70</sup>. The later translates into security of the biodiversity in the national park from reduced incidences of grazing.*

## 2.4. Establishment of community disease control committees and initiatives on local slaughter and marketing of livestock and wildlife products by examining the dynamics of diseases among livestock and wildlife at pilot sites. Following key outputs were realized<sup>71</sup>:

- *Establishment of Disease Control Committee in Burkina Faso*
- *Training of veterinary scouts for disease surveillance in Kenya*
- *Training on Scout Based Monitoring system; Livestock Breeding; Fodder Conservation; Pasture and Grazing management; Range rehabilitation*

## **Component 3: Enhanced awareness of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the livestock-wildlife interface.**

**Project strategy:** Documentation and dissemination of good practices and lessons learnt through workshops and seminars at local, national and Africa level

---

<sup>68</sup> See under Annex 1b for details

<sup>69</sup> See under Annex 6- Log Frame Matrix Analysis- Outcome 2, activities under component 2

<sup>70</sup> See under Annex 6- Log Frame Matrix Analysis- Outcome 2, activities under component 2

<sup>71</sup> See under Annex 6- Log Frame Matrix Analysis- Outcome 2, activities under component 2

**Means of verification:** Workshop reports; review of finalized or draft policy briefs and other documents; review of the various technical and assessment reports in the custody of AU/ IBAR

### Activities in Component 3

3.1 Documentation of the success stories and lessons learnt and sharing of information (experiences in land management and land use and indigenous methodology of collecting and analyzing information).

*Project has finalised documentation of two Policy Briefs<sup>72</sup> ready for dissemination that are already posted on the web-*

- *Status and Trends of Natural Resources at the Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface:- DLWEIP Working Policy Brief #1 at [www.au.ibar.org/dlweip](http://www.au.ibar.org/dlweip);*
- *Status and Trends of Natural Resources Conflicts at the Livestock Wildlife environment Interface:- DLWEIP Working Policy Brief #2 at [www.au.ibar.org/dlweip](http://www.au.ibar.org/dlweip).*

*Other policy briefs and documents are in draft form<sup>73</sup>.*

*Synthesis, documentation and dissemination of other experiences and lessons learned is proposed before final project closure.*

3.2. Identification of the target groups and facilitation of exchange visits for the dissemination of success stories and lessons learnt.

- *Project facilitated exchange visits for project staff (e.g. project coordinators, executing agencies staff and CBO/ resource user group leaders to Kenya or Burkina Faso as appropriate for the dissemination of success stories and lessons- mainly in context of M&E events (e.g. Exit Strategy meeting or ISC meetings<sup>74</sup>).*

3.3. Identification and training of facilitators and organization of dissemination workshops and seminars at local, national and Africa regional level.

- *Project organised workshops and seminars at Zovic/ community level for dissemination of best practices and experiences. The thematic workshops in Burkina Faso and the exit strategy workshop are examples of efforts to disseminate/ exchange knowledge and experiences on DLWEIP between the two countries, but the project could have done more, e.g. taking opportunity of MEAs (CBD, UNCCD) COP/CRIC processes and technical conferences and seminars.*
- *Project also disseminated best practices and experiences at Africa level through contribution to the Africa-wide CAADP process.*

3.39 Most of the quantitative information on outputs given in this section is obtained from documents and interviews with stakeholders, but there was no opportunity for physical verification of quantitative values. One weakness is also that the original Log Frame<sup>75</sup> (and the one revised at MTR) did not give a quantitative measure of expected output for most activities (or are in %- not useful without baseline data) so that it is difficult to hold the project accountable for failure to achieve.

---

<sup>72</sup> See Annex6- Outcome 3, also Annex 1a for details

<sup>73</sup> See Annex6- Outcome 3, also Annex 1a –draft documents

<sup>74</sup> Verified from list of participants for ISC meeting and Exit Strategy meeting.

<sup>75</sup> In the original project document

3.40 Another important consideration in the achievement of outputs in this project is the divergence of expectations between DLWEIP implementing/executing partners and other Stakeholders. According to the original project document, DLWEIP was expected to deliver the larger proportion of its support to activities involving the community stakeholders directly at the grass root level<sup>76</sup>. DLWEIP implementing/executing partners interpreted this to refer strictly to community activities to do with livestock livelihoods or biodiversity conservation, and this was the rationale for the revision of the logical framework<sup>77</sup>. Other stakeholders interpreted it to refer to livelihoods in the broader sense – to include transformation of livelihoods through value addition and alternative livelihood options. The former interpretation prevailed, leading to the perception expressed by other stakeholders<sup>78</sup> that this project was all research and studies and less on support to local communities. This divergence of expectations was also noted in the MTR<sup>79</sup> as quoted below:

*“Nearly all the implementing partners and even some collaborating institutions were expecting more support from DLWEIP than what is allowable within the GEF MSP policy guidelines. Consequently, some institutions were not satisfied that the co-financing component of the DLWEIP included meeting of most overheads and staff time costs from their own institutional funds. Some stakeholders and particularly the communities expected more of tangible material benefits from the project which have not been forthcoming, thus creating some degree of frustration. So far there are only a few tangible benefits realized by the Burkina Faso communities, and therefore there is an element of community frustration that the project is not meeting their expectations as raised in the DLWEIP supported training workshops. Some of these expectations include provision of small scale dairy equipment and the establishment of community managed tree nurseries. In Kenya, the communities are benefiting from reseeded, bee-keeping, poultry, training of security game rangers for community conservancies but some of the DLWEIP target communities have complained that they not enjoying similar tangible benefits and yet they are within DLWEIP pilot area”.*

3.41 The assessments/studies are completed (except for socio-economic status of households), capacity building for sustainable land management and support to planning and preparation of management plans are key achievements. Documentation of good practices and lessons learned partially achieved but substantial progress, ready for completion. Overall, the outputs of the project are acceptable, given the delay in launching activities in Burkina Faso, particularly under component 2.

Achievement of outputs: Satisfactory

## ***D. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems***

### **Monitoring and reporting on progress of the project implementation process**

**3.42 Key Sources of information:** Original DLWEIP Project document; Quarterly technical and financial reports; Rapport de Synthese Projet Interface Faune Betail Environment, Burkina Faso (Sep 2008); Exit Strategy Report (January 2009), Minutes of ISC and NSC meetings (various dates).

### ***Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Design***

3.43 A monitoring and evaluation plan was included in the Project Document, designed to facilitate:

<sup>76</sup> See Original document, section on budget

<sup>77</sup> Refer to debriefing meeting with implementing/executing agencies- 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009- Annex 2h

<sup>78</sup> See interviews with DVO- Kenya- Annex 2f and with ADELE in Burkina Faso- Annex 2e

<sup>79</sup> MTR Report- section 4.12- *Problems encountered so far in DLWEIP implementation*

- 1) “Participatory” Assessment of performance (e.g. extent to which the project is being implemented as planned in terms of objectives, time and financial constraints, and organizational policy and procedures);
- 2) Learning: ensuring that project knowledge is fed back into project planning processes to allow for improvement;
- 3) Measurement: ensuring that proper processes keep developing relevant project indicators to allow for internal and independent results evaluations;
- 4) Accountability: ensuring quality through systemized processes that allow for transparency.

3.44 The plan identified Indicators for evaluating whether project implementation unit and steering committee are operating effectively<sup>80</sup>, as well as a clear indication of the roles and responsibilities for the various stakeholders in the implementation of M&E activities<sup>81</sup>.

3.45 The revised project Log Frame (see Annex 6) identified specific objectively identifiable indicators and means of verification. A review of those proposed for use at objective and outcome level indicate that these are not useful to this evaluation, either because they are too general, or because of lack of the baseline data for reference. Example:

- Communities make decisions to set aside conservation and drought refuge areas at the interface in Kenya (Kina, Namunyak) and Arly in Burkina Faso by the end of the project in an area totaling 182,000 ha- (too general)
- Number of households with increased income increase by 20% at pilot sites (*no baseline established on socio-economic status of households*)
- Ecosystem health (animals, land and people) in the pilot sites improves by 20% by the end of the project (*no baseline established on ecosystem health*)

3.46 The M&E plan identified in general (and largely unquantifiable) terms the *Impact indicators* which specifically measure institutional, socio-economic and environmental impacts (vertical and horizontal impacts). These included:

- Land set aside for conservation and drought refuge areas at the interface in Kenya and Burkina Faso by the end of the project.
- Vegetation recovery and biodiversity of wildlife coexisting with livestock.
- Level of support for conservation of wildlife under livestock production systems.

3.47 These were to be objectively verified by the amount of land put under community owned management plan for sustainable management of natural resources under their jurisdiction. It is however not reasonable to attribute these impacts to DLWEIP interventions alone since other programmes and activities are operating in the project site.

M&E Design: Moderately Satisfactory

**M&E Plan Implementation**

3.48 The evaluator reviewed the various activities undertaken by the project in line with the M&E plan, summarized in Annex 5d. This review indicated that monitoring and control was duly exercised according to the M&E plan. AU/ IBAR took the opportunity of progress meetings (International Steering Committee meetings, National Taskforce/Steering Committee meetings, MTR and special

---

<sup>80</sup> See Annex 5a

<sup>81</sup> See Annex 5b

meetings as necessary, e.g. the Exit Strategy workshops and field coordination meetings involving communities and executing institutions)<sup>82</sup> to review project implementation and recommend adjustments as appropriate. There were also <sup>83</sup>missions to project sites by UNEP Task Manager and AU/ IBAR Project Coordinator for supervision, to assess the realization of project objectives and outcomes and to provide technical backstopping.

3.49 Review of the various implementation progress reports and minutes of the ISC and NSC<sup>84</sup> indicates that most of the outputs and indicators shown in the logical framework were largely adhered to. Where this was not the case (e.g. delay in initiating implementation in Burkina Faso, the MTR recommendations), project management took appropriate action to correct the situation<sup>85</sup>.

3.50 Review of ISC and NSC workshop reports<sup>86</sup> provide evidence that most of the key stakeholders participated effectively in the implementation of the M&E Plan, including feedback from communities' representatives and other participating institutions, and that their inputs were incorporated in project implementation and management wherever possible. For example during NSC meetings in Burkina Faso, ADELE<sup>87</sup>, an NGO working with local communities (Zovics) regularly suggested the need for more resources for community-based livelihood activities as a follow-up to the training they provided. This request could not be accommodated under the resources allocated under MOU with the Government. The M&E activities provided opportunities for learning and coordination of activities among executing partners. The MTR<sup>88</sup>, synergy workshops<sup>89</sup> and exit strategies<sup>90</sup> are good examples.

3.51 Quarterly technical<sup>91</sup> and financial reports were expected to be regularly prepared and submitted to UNEP by AU/ IBAR as a requirement for release of funds. Consultations with the UNEP Task Manager indicated that this was adhered to except for occasional delays arising from institutional factors. The UNEP Fund Manager concurred with this and confirmed these delays had no adverse effect on the project implementation.

3.52 The M&E plan required that internal monitoring and evaluation of project implementation be carried out by AU/ IBAR at the end of every six months, in collaboration with other stakeholders including the community itself. This was not adhered to. Instead, the project opted for two main reviews, one in April 2007 (in readiness for the MTR) and one in September/October (in readiness for the Exit Strategy Workshop). It is the evaluator's opinion that the six-monthly monitoring and evaluation requirement was overly ambitious and costly, and that the adjustment by the project did not affect the project outcomes.

3.53 A mid-term external review (MTR) was expected to take place 18 months from beginning of the project, in addition to a final end-of-project external evaluation commissioned by UNEP-GEF<sup>92</sup>. The MTR took place in June 2007, six months behind schedule. Annex 4 gives the detailed review of the recommendations from this MTR and actions taken by the project in response, as summarized in the following Table:

---

<sup>82</sup> See also Annex...Examples of events involving local communities

<sup>83</sup> For example in connection with delay in project implementation in Burkina Faso

<sup>84</sup> See Annex 1c- Key documents reviewed

<sup>85</sup> AU-IBAR/UNEP missions to BF to jump-start the project activities in March/April 2007

<sup>86</sup> See Annex 2b for details

<sup>87</sup> See interview with ADELE, Annex 2e.

<sup>88</sup> See Annex1a - Key documents reviewed

<sup>89</sup> See Annex 1a - Key documents reviewed

<sup>90</sup> See Annex 1a - Key documents reviewed

<sup>91</sup> AWF- Quarterly Technical Report of 30<sup>th</sup> January 2007 reviewed by evaluator.

<sup>92</sup> As per the M&E Plan- see original project document

**Table 3b: Summary of actions taken in response to the MTR recommendations**

MTR - Recommendation	Action taken
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for project extension to January 2009</li> <li>• Introduce an adapted AWF M &amp; E system to monitor wildlife numbers in protected areas in DLWEIP sites</li> <li>• emphasis on livestock production and marketing issues</li> <li>• Conduct comparative studies on wildlife utilization strategies and disseminate lessons learnt</li> <li>• Strengthen the national steering committee in Burkina Faso</li> <li>• Prepare and implement a participatory project exit strategy</li> </ul>	<p>Effected (see Project budget Revision- July 2008) AWF M&amp;E system adopted in the field in Kenya (see Exit Strategy report)</p> <p>Establishment of the Animal Disease Control Committee in Burkina Faso</p> <p>–</p> <p>Effected (see draft Exit Strategy report)</p> <p>Effected (See draft Exit Strategy Workshop report)</p>

3.54 The evaluation concludes that the M&E of progress in the implementation of the project activities had significant results in keeping the project on course and ensuring focus on project objectives and expected results.

M&E Implementation: Satisfactory

***M&E Budget and Financing***

3.55 The DLWEIP project budget had a provision for supporting monitoring and evaluation of activities at US\$ 75,000 to cover external evaluation costs, both mid-term and final evaluation. This figure was revised downwards to US\$64,135<sup>93</sup>.

M&E Budgeting: Highly Satisfactory

***E. Replicability/Catalytic role***

**Indicators:** Project design, Lessons and experiences picked up by other institutions/projects for replication; components of DLWEIP up scaled.

3.56 Several attributes of DLWEIP interventions rendered the activities readily replicable and serve as a catalyst: Technologies and approaches promoted by the project for sustainable livelihoods and land-use practices are cost effective and home-grown (e.g. bee keeping, chicken farming); they demonstrate benefits and profitability (reseedling, protecting conservation areas through local scouts); and they require low-capital inputs. Four examples of catalytic value of DLWEIP are outlined below:

- The early results of good practices emanating from DLWEIP served as a catalyst to get the

<sup>93</sup> See Budget Revision, July 2008- Annex 7

Westgate conservancy in Kenya to request to be part of the project to benefit from training and capacity building in rehabilitation of grazing areas and management of conservation areas<sup>94</sup>.

- In Kenya, training of Peace Committees at district, divisional and locational level has been stepped up by the provincial administration/(ALRMP), catalyzed by the DLWEIP intervention/ training on conflict resolution<sup>95</sup>.
- Borrowing from lessons learned and experiences from the DLWEIP, AU/ IBAR proposed to the EU to replicate/ up-scale the best practices from DLWEIP in 4 other regions in Africa: The Arly Park Complex (covering Benin, Niger and Burkina Faso and the Panjari park and Togo), in West Africa (Senegal, Mali, Guinea), in West/Central Africa (Chad, Cameroon, Nigeria), and in East Africa- Karamojong area (covering Kenya, Uganda and South Sudan). This Euro 5 million 3-year project has already been approved<sup>96</sup>.
- IUCN already developed a GEF funded regional project covering Burkina Faso, Benin and Niger- for the biodiversity protection in the entire ecosystem – Park W, Arly and Panjari (WAP) which has been approved, awaiting implementation<sup>97</sup>. This project already integrates the concept and activities to address the wildlife/livestock interface issues- building on DLWEIP experiences.

Catalytic role: Highly satisfactory

## ***F. Preparation and Readiness***

**Indicators:** Concept paper, availability of baseline data/information, participation of CBOs/private sector in project formulation, timely availability of resources (human and financial)

3.57 The review of the project document<sup>98</sup> indicated that a detailed analysis of the main issues and underlying causes/threats to sustainable management of the wildlife/livestock interface had been undertaken, providing a basis for the identification of the project objectives, outputs and appropriate intervention measures, as well as the project design to address these (see logical framework in particular)<sup>99</sup>. The project design provided for collection and assessment of baseline data and other information as the first component of activities, necessary to facilitate planning and implementation of the next two components: support to community initiatives and documentation and dissemination of information.

3.58 The timeframe for the realization of most of the project outputs was appropriate and achievable. However, the work planning process did not anticipate the delay in initiating project activities due to institutional issues, particularly in Burkina Faso. It is also the evaluator's view that some outputs from component 3- organization of national and regional seminars and workshops for sharing of lessons from DLWEIP was not achievable in total within the timeframe of three years.

---

<sup>94</sup> Steering Committee minutes reviewed by consultant

<sup>95</sup> Exit Strategy report, see Annex 1c.

<sup>96</sup> Personal communication- AU-IBAR, Dr. Nouala

<sup>97</sup> Personal communication- IUCN; GEF Pipeline (on Website).

<sup>98</sup> Original Project Document signed with AU-IBAR

<sup>99</sup> See original project document- Annex 1c.

3.59 Interviews with stakeholders in both Kenya and Burkina Faso gave the impression that local communities were not involved at project formulation stage<sup>100</sup>. Available information<sup>101</sup> however suggest otherwise:

*BURKINA FASO*

- a. Environmental consultation workshop (Field workshop) held in Arly National Park on 8<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> March 2004- in context of PDF-A.
- b. National workshop held in Kossodo/Ouagadougou on 11 and 12 March 2004.

*KENYA*

- a. Workshop on proposed UNEP-GEF funded project on 29th January 2004 in Bomen Hotel Isiolo- In context of PDF A.
- b. National Stakeholders workshop on 12th February 2004 in Nairobi

*REGIONAL*

Regional workshop in Nairobi- 21st-and 22nd April 2004, where key stakeholders from Kenya and Burkina Faso met to discuss the proposed the DLWEIP.

The gap between formulation (2003/4) and launching of implementation (November 2005- Nanyuki-Kenya) is partly responsible for this disconnect.

3.60 As mentioned elsewhere, the launching of field activities in Burkina Faso did not start in earnest until March 2007. Interview with the then National Coordinator<sup>102</sup> (Urbain Belemsobgo- Director of Wildlife Department) indicated institutional issues as the critical factor:

- Decision on coordination arrangement and deciding on responsibility among the many concerned ministries/NGOs (Ministry of Animal resources, Lands, Agriculture, Research, Environment, IUCN) took too long as this was a new experience/concept in Burkina Faso.
- Operationalizing the project was also constrained by the need to clarify roles and responsibilities between the local authorities and the central government

Similarly, some delays were experienced in Kenya due to institutional issues, e.g. the delay in signing the MOU with the OOP caused by delay in clearance from the Attorney's General's Office<sup>103</sup>.

3.61 From interviews with AU/ IBAR Project coordinator and the UNEP Managers, there was no intimation or evidence that timely availability of resources was an issue.

Preparation and readiness: Moderately Satisfactory

## ***G. Country ownership/driveness***

**Indicators:** Level of engagement of government institutions in project implementation; Government institutions integrating lessons from project into annual work planning and budget processes; CBOs/communities investing own resources on project related activities.

3.62 Both Kenya and Burkina Faso are signatories to the UNCCD and the CBD<sup>104</sup>. Both countries have in place the National Biodiversity Strategic Action Programmes (NBSAP) and the National

<sup>100</sup> See Interview with stakeholders in Nanyuki, Kenya- Annex 2g.

<sup>101</sup> See Original Project Document signed with AU-IBAR

<sup>102</sup> See Annex 2e -Interview with key persons/groups BF

<sup>103</sup> Minutes of meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> February 2006 at AWF Office, Nairobi- made available to evaluator

Action Programme to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) processes which are on-going. DLWEIP activities and outputs complement these processes, and a strong linkage was expected between the two at implementation stage. This linkage exists in Burkina Faso where MECV- the focal ministry for UNCCD and CBD is also coordinating DLWEIP. In Kenya, this linkage is not apparent since NEMA, the focal agency for the conventions is not directly involved in DLWEIP activities in the field. NEMA was however involved in all key M&E events (Synergy workshops, Exit strategy workshop)<sup>105</sup> and actually signed the project document on behalf of the Kenya Government<sup>106</sup>. Other indicators of country ownership/driveness include:

- ◆ During the Exit Strategy workshop, the communities expressed readiness to proceed with the implementation of good practices, using their own resources as well as by leveraging financial and non-financial resources from willing partners and the government<sup>107</sup>.
- ◆ The institutionalization of the collaborative/inter-ministerial approach in implementing projects and programmes relating to wildlife/ livestock interface in Burkina Faso<sup>108</sup>
- ◆ The integration of project activities into the work planning processes of government ministries, institutions and local NGOs (e.g. DVOs, DLPOs, ALRMP in Kenya, MECV, EDELE, and RECOPA in Burkina Faso).

Country Ownership/driveness: Highly Satisfactory

## ***H. Stakeholder participation and public awareness***

**Indicators:** Clear identification of stakeholders and their roles (verified through review of the original Project Document; the MoU signed with executing partners; and reports of the various meetings held during the life of the project); Prompt start up and rapid implementation;

### ***Stakeholder engagement:***

The project document clearly identified the key stakeholders and their role in the project at the various levels: community/local; national and regional/international.

**3.63 At community level:** Interviews with actors in the field and reviewed documents (thematic workshop reports, NSC reports) indicate that local communities, CBOs (local transhumance herders, hunters, farmer and communities in Burkina Faso; group ranches, private sector actors and women/ youth groups in Kenya) and local NGOs (RECOPA, ADELE in Burkina Faso) were effectively involved and played an active role, both at project formulation stage and during implementation<sup>109</sup>. Also at this level, some concerned government ministries and institutions played a very active role, supporting local communities in the implementation of project initiatives. Examples include the District Veterinary Officers, District Livestock Production Officers and OOP (ALRMP) in Kenya; and the Ministry of Environment in Burkina Faso. However, some key government ministries were conspicuously absent at field level in Kenya- KFS, NEMA, MoW, and MoA.

---

<sup>104</sup> UNCCD and CBD web sites:

<sup>105</sup> See list of participants to these meetings- verified by Evaluator.

<sup>106</sup> See Original Project Document signed with AU-IBAR

<sup>107</sup> See Annex 1c- Documents reviewed- Exit Strategy Report

<sup>108</sup> Legal notice setting up the NSC in Burkina Faso- copy made available to evaluator

<sup>109</sup> See Annex 5e- Examples of events where community/ stakeholders were engaged - also under "Preparation and readiness"- involving local communities at formulation stage.

**3.64 At national level**, relevant Government ministries and international NGOs had been identified as executing partners:

- ◆ Office of the President (OOP)- Arid Lands Resource Management Programme (ALRMP) (Kenya) – National Executing Agency responsible for overall coordination, with African Wildlife Foundation (AWF), World Conservation Union (IUCN) and African Conservation Centre (ACC) as assisting agencies
- ◆ Ministry of Environment (Burkina Faso) – National executing Agency responsible for overall coordination with the World Conservation Union (IUCN) as assisting agencies

3.65 MECV (Ministry of Environment) in Burkina Faso played its role as expected although there was the long delay while the institutional arrangements were being sorted out. The eventual establishment of the National Steering Committee<sup>110</sup> involving all key government ministries, CBOs and NGOs is an indication of government commitment to DLWEIP.

3.66 The Office of the President (OOP) did not take up the role of coordinating activities in Kenya as expected. Consultations indicate this had to do with the small size of the budget allocated. Consequently AU/ IBAR subtly facilitated stakeholder coordination to ensure project implementation went on as planned. Other institutions active at project formulation stage (ILRI, WWF and NEMA) did not participate in DLWEIP implementation. Indications (based on interviews with stakeholders) are that NEMA lacked implementation capacity at field level, while the other two considered their engagement in DLWEIP too expensive relative to available funding. Some other partners (OOP/ALRMP, IUCN and ACC) started out very active but were less active after completing their assignment under the respective MOUs.

**3.67 International and Regional level:** All indications are that the stakeholders were constructively engaged and played their role effectively:

- ◆ UNEP- DGEF unit as implementing agency with overall supervisory responsibility
- ◆ African Union-Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU/IBAR)- Lead executing agency. AU/ IBAR is mandated by AMCEN to be the lead institution in elaborating and facilitating the implementation of UNCCD Thematic Programme 3 on the Rational Use of Rangelands and Development of Fodder Crops. This was the main criteria/rationale for selection of this institution to spearhead DLWEIP.

3.68 Collaboration with other partners and institutions/programmes: a Synergy Workshop was held in April, 2007<sup>111</sup> involving Kenya GEF supported projects (WISP, Marsabit ecosystem, Indigenous Vegetation Project and Desert Margin Programme). Similarly, these programmes were invited to the Exit Workshop.

3.69 Public awareness activities: The project undertook only two activities that are of public awareness interest:

- ◆ Posting of the two policy briefs on its web site: [www.au.ibar.org/dlweip](http://www.au.ibar.org/dlweip)
- ◆ Preparation of a DLWEIP brochure and poster<sup>112</sup>

3.70 The evaluator notes that the delay in sorting out the implementation arrangements in Burkina Faso should have received the attention of UNEP and AU/ IBAR much earlier to at least mitigate the effects. The evaluator also takes note that AU/ IBAR's intervention in Kenya (facilitating stakeholder coordination) was timely and critical to getting the project implementation going.

Stakeholder participation: Satisfactory

<sup>110</sup> Legal notice : « Arrete No. 2006/MECV portant creation, composition, attributions et fonctionnement du Comite Technique de Suivi du Projet Interface Betail-Faune-Environnement en Zone Aride (CTSP)- May 2007 »-availed to Evaluator

<sup>111</sup> See Annex1c. -Documents reviewed

<sup>112</sup> See Annex 1b. - List of assorted documents stored on CD available at AU/ IBAR

## ***I. Financial planning and Reporting***

3.71 The main source of funding for this project is from GEF. Major findings of financial status as provided by Paul Vrontamitis-the UNEP Fund Manager (up to 31 December 2008) include the following:

- The project received in total \$US 975,000 from the GEF. This is in addition to the PDF A of 25,000
- The project has undergone two budget revisions, the most recent in July 2008 for two purposes<sup>113</sup>:
  - To reflect actual expenditure of US\$ 239,513 for the year 2007, and rephrase the unspent balances of US\$254,099, thereby increasing the total budget for 2008 to US\$448,499
  - To extend the project to January 2009 (at no cost) following the mid-term review of the project and the recommendation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Steering Committee meeting held in Burkina Faso in April 2008.

The following Table<sup>114</sup> reflects the financial status of the project following the rephrasing.

**Table 3c Project Financial Status and annual expenditure**

<b>Budget GEF contribution</b>	<b>-Year 1 (2005)</b>	<b>Year 2 (2006)</b>	<b>Year 3 (2007)</b>	<b>Year 4 (2008)</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Allocation (original)	308,400	253,400	218,800	194,400	975,000
Expenditure	252,450 (actual)	34,538 (actual)	239,513 (actual)	290,938 (actual) 448,499 (projected)	975,000
Variance	55,950	218,862	-20,713		
<b>Delivery rate</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>110%</b>	<b>150%</b>	

### **Utilization of Input**

3.72 As of 31<sup>st</sup> December 2008, a balance of US\$ 157,561 remained unspent, to be accounted for during the final budget revision.

3.73 The above table indicates a project that started slowly (suggesting inadequate preparedness) but picked up momentum over time. The most critical year was 2006. Consultations with stakeholders indicated several factors that contributed to this state of affairs<sup>115</sup>:

- Delay in launching community-based activities in the field due to Institutional constraints in both Kenya and Burkina Faso
- Flooding of rivers and roads, rendering the project sites inaccessible between June and October 2006 in Burkina Faso

<sup>113</sup> Project document revision- July 08, reviewed by Consultant

<sup>114</sup> Project Document Revision- July 08 obtained from Paul Vrontamitis

<sup>115</sup> Personal communication- Paul Vrontamitis

- Implementation in Burkina Faso further delayed by the general elections of July 2007, and the rainy season of June- September 2007
- Post election violence in Kenya from December 2007 completely stopped implementation for three months<sup>116</sup>.

### Project expenditure by activity:

3.74 The largest portion of the finances was expected to finance activities involving the community stakeholders directly at the grassroot level<sup>117</sup>. The latter was to be done in collaboration with NGOs, CBOs and government agencies. The following was the proposed budget allocation per activity (GEF component)<sup>118</sup>:

**Table 3 d: GEF Budget allocation per activity**

PROGRAMME ACTIVITY - COMPONENT	GEF FUNDING
Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites <i>(mainly assessments and studies)</i>	190,000 (19.5%)
Community livelihoods improved and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso <i>(Mainly support to community activities)</i>	350,000 (36%)
Awareness of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the livestock-wildlife interface Enhanced. <i>(Mainly documentation and dissemination of information)</i>	160,000 (16%)
Coordination Units (Kenya and Burkina Faso)- AU/ IBAR	200,000 (20.5%)
Monitoring and evaluation	75,000 (8%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>975,000</b>

3.75 Following consultations with stakeholders, AU/ IBAR entered subcontracting arrangements with collaborating institutions to undertake specific activities based on respective institutions' expertise and comparative advantages. The following is the status of allocation of finances through MOUs as of 31 December 2008<sup>119</sup>:

**Table 3e: Estimated expenditure by activity for different executing agencies**

Executing agency	Activity 1	Activity 2	Activity 3	Total allocation as per original MOU	Final allocation as per latest budget 2008) <sup>120</sup>	Activities assigned <sup>121</sup>
GoK (OOP)	15,000			15,000	23,000	1.3
IUCN	120,000			120,000	100,000	1.1, 1.2 & 2.1
AWF		140,000		140,000	140,000	2.2 & 2.3
ACC	55,000			55,000	55,000	1.4
GoBF (MoEnv.)	20,000	100,000	30,000	150,000	150,000	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 2.1, 2.3, 2.4 3.1, 3.2
IUCN BF		20,000	20,000	40,000	50,000	2.3 & 3.3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>210,000</b>	<b>260,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>520,000</b>	<b>518,000</b>	

<sup>116</sup> Ref. letter of 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2008 from AU/ IBAR requesting for a no-cost extension to 31 January 2009)

<sup>117</sup> As per original project document

<sup>118</sup> As per original project document

<sup>119</sup> According to the MoUs signed between AU-IBAR and the respective executing agencies.

<sup>120</sup> Budget Revision signed July 2008

<sup>121</sup> As per MOUs- see also Log Frame Matrix Analysis- Annex 6.

AU/ IBAR					457,000	Coordination at Regional level
----------	--	--	--	--	---------	--------------------------------

### 3.76 Key observations:

- The table suggests that the project did not live up to expectation in terms of allocating the largest portion of the finances to activities involving the community stakeholders directly at the grassroots (activity 2) (allocated 350,000 (36%), actual utilization 260,000 (27%)). This figure is even lower when you consider the expenditure under sub-contracts includes an element of overhead costs of the concerned implementing institutions.
- 47% of the project budget is managed by AU/ IBAR in implementing activities under component 3<sup>122</sup> - information sharing/ documentation and dissemination. This was not factored in original document. Only coordination costs (20.5%) and evaluation (8%) were factored in for implementation by AU-IBAR.
- The coordination costs<sup>123</sup> comprised such items as salaries of country coordinator (Burkina Faso), four field assistants (3 in Kenya- up to April 2007 when this was discontinued) and 1 in Burkina Faso, travel to Burkina Faso by Project coordinator at AU/ IBAR, local travel to project sites, communication (telephone, faxes, etc), purchase of computers (one laptop and 2 desktops), conference and workshops by project coordinator (local and international), stationery and supplies, translation (English-French and vice versa), etc.
- Monitoring and evaluation was coordinated by AU/ IBAR in conjunction with UNEP/EOU (terminal evaluation) from the budget set aside for that purpose.

3.77 During the debriefing session involving UNEP-DGEF, AU/ IBAR and UNEP-EOU, it was clarified that AU/ IBAR undertaking implementation of activities under component 3 was an adaptive strategy to correct an oversight in the original project document.

### **Influence of financial reporting on project management**

3.78 The project document stipulated quarterly technical and financial reporting. These constitute the most significant source of information on the progress in project implementation. These provided the main pointer that there were constraints in launching activities in the project sites in both Kenya and Burkina Faso. In response, the AU/ IBAR Coordinator (Simplice Nouala) and the then UNEP-GEF Task Manager for DLWEIP (Daya Brigante) made missions to both Kenya and Burkina Faso (2 missions in 2007)<sup>124</sup> to meet with high level government officials to resolve the institutional constraints (agreements on coordination arrangements, implementation roles and responsibilities for the various stakeholders). Clearly the financial reporting had a positive influence on project management.

### **Due diligence in financial reporting**

3.79 GEF requires that annual audits be carried out on all GEF funded projects with a budget of over US\$500,000. Only one audit has taken place covering 24 months (01 August 2005-31 July 2007), and it had been mutually agreed between UNEP and AU/ IBAR to make only one other audit covering 1<sup>st</sup> August 2007 to 31 January 2009.

<sup>122</sup> See DLWEIP WORKPLAN 2008- Annex....

<sup>123</sup> Budget Revision July 2008

<sup>124</sup> Interview with AU/IBAR Project Coordinator- see Annex 2g.

3.80 A review of the Audited Financial Statements (01 August, 2005 to 31 July, 2007) (24 Months) prepared by Erastus & Co. Certified Public Accountants opined that the basic financial management controls and due diligence in reporting were observed, and that proper books of account were kept, in accordance with generally accepted non-profit accounting principles. Interviews with Paul Vrontamitis- UNEP Fund Management Officer, DGEF confirmed this to be so, and that there were no adverse audit queries.

3.81 As per the signed project document, it is expected that a final statement of account, certified by a duly authorized official of AU/ IBAR, containing a signed audit opinion by a recognized firm of public accounts, should be dispatched to UNEP within 180 days from 31 January 2009, indicating whether, in their opinion:

- Proper books of account and records have been maintained ;
- All project expenditures are supported by vouchers and adequate documentation;
- Expenditure have been incurred in accordance with the objectives outlined in the project document.
- The expenditure reports provide a true and fair view of the financial condition and performance of the project.

### **Cash Advance Requirements**

3.82 The Fund Manager (Paul Vrontamitis) and the Project Coordinator (Simplice Nouala)<sup>125</sup> confirmed cash advances were timely, made quarterly or very close to that, subject to the terms as stipulated in the Project document, and in particular, the satisfactory financial report showing expenditures incurred for the past quarter, and satisfactory progress reports on project implementation.

### **Sources of co- financing and leveraged financing**

3.83 The main sources of co-financing anticipated for the project<sup>126</sup> were:

<b>Entity</b>	<b>US\$</b>
Cost to the GEF Trust Fund	975,000
PDF –A	25,000
 <b>Co-funding-</b>	
<b><u>In-kind:</u></b>	
Government of Kenya	193,000
Government of BF	280,000
AU/ IBAR	1,000,000
NGO's	200,000
Other institutions	683,000
<b><i>Sub-total</i></b>	<b>2,356,000</b>
<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>3,356,000</b>

3.84 Final accounting for co-financing is given in Annexe 8. Total in-kind contribution estimated at US\$2,502,403<sup>127</sup> is derived from the project document but adjusted to accommodate increase in co-financing from AU/ IBAR; and confirmed with representatives from the respective governments and institutions. In cash contributions as reported by AU/ IBAR came from:

RECOPA:	39,200 USD;
AWF:	134,690 USD
 <b>TOTAL:</b>	 <b>173,890USD</b>

<sup>125</sup> See interviews with these officials- Annex 2g.

<sup>126</sup> As per original project document

<sup>127</sup> Communication from AU-IBAR

## Verification of co-financing

3.85 Efforts to verify the co-financing through interviews and assessing the actions undertaken by the various organizations and governments involved in carrying out the project elicited the following:

- **The government of Kenya co-financing<sup>128</sup>** was in several forms: Project planning and coordination at national level (OOP); and project implementation: data collection and training on conflict resolution through peace committees (ALRMP); and data collection on livestock marketing, livestock population trends and status, disease control and training of communities on reseeded of rangelands (DVOs and DLOPs Laikipia and Samburu). These were verified through interviews with DVOs and DLPOs in the field<sup>129</sup>. Main contribution from the Government was in form of staff time, office space and reporting/communication costs.
- **In kind contribution from the Government of Burkina Faso (US\$280,000)<sup>130</sup>** is arrived at as follows:
  - Salary of Coordinator and one field assistant based at Arly Park \$32,760
  - Salary of 10 Rangers \$42,868
  - Salary of patrols \$19,656
  - Project Office space at Arly Park \$184,716
- **IUCN Burkina Faso estimates its In kind co-financing to be US\$ 150,000<sup>131</sup>**, more than originally estimated. This is in view of activities undertaken on site for Biodiversity conservation in Arly Park:
  - Alternative livelihood to communities- Training communities to access domesticated wildlife and training on management
  - Facilitating negotiations between farmers, pastoralists and Park management
  - Training and facilitating community participation and negotiations on shared water resources under the Global Water Initiative project funded by the Buffet Foundation
- **AWF contribution estimates US\$144,690<sup>132</sup>** grant as matching fund, mainly to community-based activities. For example DLWEIP funds training of women groups on keeping chicken or honey harvesting, AWF funds purchase of the chicken and the beehives
- ACC contribution calculated at US\$ 13, 750<sup>133</sup> per year for a total of US\$41,250. Cost elements include Project Officer's time, Accountants time, Motor vehicle mileage and administrative costs.

Financial Planning and Reporting: Satisfactory

<sup>128</sup> Interview with ALRMP manager-Mr. Halakhe

<sup>129</sup> See Interview with DVO and DLPO Laikipia, Annex

<sup>130</sup> Personal communication from Youma- project Coordinator, BF.

<sup>131</sup> Interview with Head of Programme- Moumini Savadogo, IUCN Burkina Faso.

<sup>132</sup> Interview with Philip, AWF (see Annex 2f.)

<sup>133</sup> Report on co-financing provided by ACC to evaluator.

## ***J. Implementation Approach***

### **Project Implementation Mechanisms**

3.86 The review of minutes of the ISC and NSC (Burkina Faso) and Task Force (Kenya) meetings<sup>134</sup> and confirmation during interviews indicate that the project implementation mechanisms worked effectively to inform the project on organizational and management issues. Table 6 below outlines the landmark issues, decisions made and actions taken following decisions from some of the meetings during the life of the project.

3.87 The following are examples of key results:

**Table 3f: Landmark issues and key results**

<b>Event/date</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
March/April 2007 Field missions to Burkina Faso- AU/ IBAR and UNEP Task Manager	Institutional issues blocking launching of activities.	National Steering Committee established and a National Coordinator in MECV identified
2006-April 2007: Several Task- force meetings in Kenya involving AU/ IBAR and UNEP Task Manager	Coordination arrangement for project implementation in Kenya	Resulted in agreement to stick to Taskforce arrangement, with a lead agency to coordinate activities in the field.  AWF identified as lead agency in view of their presence in the project site.
<b>1<sup>st</sup> ISC Meeting</b> Nanyuki, Kenya, 12 <sup>th</sup> -13 <sup>th</sup> April 2007	Review of project activities and overall direction.  Delay in project implementation of field activities	Project focus redirected towards field activities. Insisted on appointment of a full- time project coordinator for Burkina Faso to jump-start the project implementation
June 2007: Mid-term review	Review of project implementation	Six key recommendations, most of which have been implemented
2 <sup>nd</sup> ISC meeting: Ouagadougou 26-28 April 2008	Review of the Mid-term review recommendations  Assessed progress in the implementation of project in Burkina Faso	Endorsed recommendation to extend the project by six months-cost free  Agreement on way forward to implementing MTR recommendations

### **Adaptability**

3.88 The Project Coordinator position experienced a change in personnel in January 2007. This change coincided with the turn-around in the direction and speed in project implementation for the better (1<sup>st</sup> ISC meeting- see Table above). There were similar changes in personnel at the project Task Manager

<sup>134</sup> Annex 1c -.Documents reviewed

and Fund Manager positions at UNEP but no indication that these had any adverse effect in project implementation. Both the project coordinator in AU/ IBAR and the managers in UNEP displayed a good degree of flexibility and creativity in their dealings with government and NGO counterparts, particularly with respect to delays relating to institutional arrangements. At issue however was why it took so long to start addressing the delay in Burkina Faso.

3.89 The assignment of responsibility for implementing specific activities to respective executing partners put the burden for ensuring timely delivery of inputs on those agencies. The challenge therefore was on those agencies in terms of day-to-day management styles and procedures, including efficiency in decision making. In this respect, the NGOs are known to be more flexible, and less bureaucratic in decision making than governments, thus more adaptable to changes and circumstances. This is why IUCN, ACC and other NGOs were able to immediately start implementation while government counterparts (OOP, MECV) in Kenya and Burkina Faso consulted on coordination arrangements thereby causing delays.

Implementation Approach: Satisfactory

### ***K. UNEP Supervision and Backstopping***

3.90 Consultations with AU/ IBAR Project Coordinator<sup>135</sup> indicated that both the UNEP Task Manager and Fund Manager were always supportive and responsive to proposals and suggestions from the ISC and the executing agencies. Examples include the effective role the Task Manager played in jump-starting the implementation process in Burkina Faso, and the guidance the Fund Manager provided in the preparation of budget revision proposals. The ISC minutes indicate UNEP Task manager played the supervisory role effectively, providing guidance and direction as appropriate.

UNEP Supervision and Backstopping: Satisfactory

---

<sup>135</sup> See Annex 2f- Interviews with key persons involved in project management in Kenya

## L. Conclusions and Ratings

3.91 The assessment of the performance of this project was hampered to a large extent by the lack of a clear understanding on the baseline condition and trends in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. By design also, the DLWEIP project activities were integrated into on-going activities of the implementing agencies (AWF, DVOs, DLPOs in Kenya, MECV, RECOPA, ADELE in Burkina Faso) so that it is difficult to assign any observed outcome or impact to the interventions by the project alone. The following is a summary of the main conclusions concerning outcomes and impacts that the project has achieved.

- a) **Project assisted pilot areas to adopt sustainable land use practices that support wildlife and livestock management.** Data and information on the dynamics of the drylands livestock/wildlife Environment Interface made available to facilitate future planning and management of local resources in the livestock/wildlife interface, and to inform policy. Major gaps however remain, particularly regarding the socio-economic aspects of wildlife (assessment of cost-benefit of mixed production system involving livestock and wildlife); and socio-economic status of communities at household level.

The project interventions relating to sustainable utilization and management of natural resources within the conservancies (in Kenya) and in the buffer zones/game reserves (Burkina Faso) will no doubt contribute to improved community livelihoods, protection of biodiversity, sustainable livestock production and environmental conservation. This will become more evident within the next few years if the efforts are sustained.

- b) **DLWEIP did contribute to the development and implementation of conflict resolution mechanisms and strategies for resolving and mitigating natural resources based-conflict and human/wildlife/livestock conflicts within project sites.** Capacity building for negotiations relating to natural resources and conflict resolution is already paying dividends in Burkina Faso. Conflicts between pastoralists, farmers and Arly Park management have decreased (as reflected in justice offices/court and local Committees for Peace Management records)<sup>136</sup>. The experiences in Kenya suggest that conflicts are likely to increase with intensive management of rangelands that involve giving up part of the grazing areas to conservation for wildlife land-use system (particularly as nomadic pastoralism is part of the overall land-use pattern in the project site, expected to persist in the foreseeable future) . Training of community leaders and management in conflict resolution and support to local mechanisms for monitoring and enforcement of local by-laws (local scout-based units) has contributed towards empowering of the communities for this challenge. More work need to be done in the area of policy at local and national level.
- c) **Project did contribute to enhancing the community capacity to utilize available natural resources in a sustainable way.** In Burkina Faso, biggest impact is expected from capacity building for conflict resolution/negotiations which has resulted in reduced conflicts between pastoralists and farmers, as well as securing access routes for transhumance. In Kenya, biggest impact can be expected from capacity building for improved livestock based livelihoods arising from community-based natural resources management (CBNRM) interventions-planning and sustainable management of rangelands (setting aside conservation areas, reseedling of grasslands) and improved livestock/veterinary services. This will however take time to be realized. The Impacts from alternative livelihoods interventions is limited in scope and of questionable sustainability.

---

<sup>136</sup> IUCN/RECOPA studies

- d) **Project did contribute to policy and good governance of the management of natural resources at the interface.** At local, national and sub-regional level, project interventions are already bearing fruits. Capacity building of local institutions (ARECOPA, Disease Control Committee, Women Groups) has empowered them to advocate and push for the interests of the respective groups during local and national debates on crucial issues: access to watering points, access routes for transhumance, ownership of resources, fair share of revenues from concessions. Pastoralists are able to go to Togo and Niger to negotiate agreements to facilitate access to grazing of their animals there.
- e) **DLWEIP did facilitate the sharing of best practices within and between communities in both countries- not so much in other African member states.** Project facilitated intra and interstate exchange of information and experiences at project level through seminars and workshops. However, documentation and dissemination of information has not been adequately effected as intended.

**3.92 Overall conclusion:** The project performance is rated satisfactory based largely on the assessment of effectiveness, relevance and efficiency in attaining the project objectives and planned results.

- **Main achievements** are in capacity building for land-use planning and biodiversity conservation in the wildlife/livestock interface zone through training and strengthening of local institutions for governance of natural resources, conflict resolution and enhanced livestock livelihoods.
- **Main shortfall** is in sharing of adaptable best practices on land use management with other countries facing similar challenges.
- **Major constraints included:**
  - ***Institutional issues:*** delay by government counterparts in reaching decision on implementation/coordination arrangements. This was the most significant cause of delay in launching project activities leading to delay in timely delivery of project outputs, and in particular completing documentation of adaptable practices and the sharing of the same with other countries facing similar challenges in Africa. Future projects should address this issue as early as possible, and preferably at project inception stage to avoid frustration as occurred in this project.
  - ***Project design, including preparation and readiness:*** baseline/objectively verifiable indicators not clearly defined; expectation to share lessons with other African countries- not achievable within the 3 year timeframe, also associated seminars/workshops not factored in the budget; divergence of expectations between stakeholders due to lack of clear definition of what constitutes “activities involving the community stakeholders directly at the grass root level<sup>137</sup>”.

---

<sup>137</sup> As per original project document

**Table 3g: OVERALL RATINGS**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Evaluator's Summary Comments</b>	<b>Evaluator's Rating</b>
<b>A. Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating)</b> <b>Sub criteria (below)</b>	Overall the project attained most of the objectives in a fiscally responsible manner	<b>S</b>
A. 1. Effectiveness	Effective in establishing the majority of objectives and outputs.	<b>S</b>
A. 2. Relevance	Very relevant to perceived local and national priority needs (livelihoods, poverty reduction) strategies and priorities Very relevant to GEF priorities, particularly OP-13 and OP-15	<b>HS</b>
A. 3. Efficiency	The project design (Choice of sites/scope) and delays in sorting out institutional arrangements at national level affected the efficiency of obtaining project objectives-particularly documentation and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned.	<b>MS</b>
<b>B. Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating)</b> <b>Sub criteria (below)</b>	The overall sustainability of the project objectives appears good, based mainly on political will at local and national level (drylands policy instrument in place)	<b>HS</b>
B. 1. Financial	The communities have indicated their interest to continue to develop the project, and in some cases committed some resources to it.	<b>S</b>
B. 2. Socio Political	Political good will in view of relevance to local and national priorities (poverty reduction, combating land degradation and biodiversity conservation)	<b>HS</b>
B. 3. Institutional framework and governance	Capacity building focused on training of existing institutional management structure	<b>HS</b>
B. 4. Environmental	Could be undermined by, among others, governance and conflict issues.	<b>S</b>
<b>C. Achievement of outputs and activities</b>	Assessments and desk studies, generally of good quality ready for documentation. Capacity building for livelihoods and conflict resolution satisfactory, delayed documentation and dissemination of best practices.	<b>S</b>
<b>D. Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating)</b> <b>Sub criteria (below)</b>	The overall M&E was well done.	<b>S</b>
D. 1. M&E Design	The design for the M&E was consistent with GEF criteria but definition of indicators and means of verification were wanting.	<b>MS</b>
D. 2. M&E Plan Implementation	The reporting allowed for adaptive management of the project	<b>S</b>
D. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities	There was sufficient money for M&E activities.	<b>HS</b>
<b>E. Catalytic Role</b>	The impact as catalyst and replicability already demonstrated.	<b>HS</b>
<b>F. Preparation and readiness</b>	Delay in launching activities: Institutional/partnership arrangements not negotiated prior to implementation;	<b>MS</b>

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Evaluator's Summary Comments</b>	<b>Evaluator's Rating</b>
<b>G. Country ownership / drivenness</b>	Political goodwill exists expressed through policy frameworks and NAP & NBSAP processes in place. Community empowered for negotiations, contribution to local and national policy debates.	<b>HS</b>
<b>H. Stakeholders involvement</b>	Community participation effective at implementation level-perception of not consulted at formulation stage. Key National level institutions (NEMA, KWS, KFS) barely involved. Collaboration with partners/ public awareness activities satisfactory,	<b>S</b>
<b>I. Financial planning</b>	Allocation to community activities not as planned, due diligence satisfactory	<b>S</b>
<b>J. Implementation approach</b>	The project management, AU/ IBAR and UNEP, were slow at reacting to the delays associated with institutional issues at national level. Flexibility/adaptive management	<b>S</b>
<b>K. UNEP Supervision and backstopping</b>	The support given to the project from the UNEP was clearly adequate.	<b>S</b>

## 4. LESSONS LEARNED

### 4.1. *Wildlife/livestock co-existence and Biodiversity conservation*

*Context:* This project served to demonstrate that the concept of wildlife/livestock co-existence is possible and can contribute to reduce conflicts in land-use planning. Economic feasibility is yet to be established. The project also demonstrated the complexity of the human-wildlife and other resource use conflicts and the need for a more thorough analysis before prescribing solutions. For example the establishment of wildlife conservancies is likely to increase human wildlife conflicts as the contact between people and wildlife increases due to increases in wildlife abundance and the human population.

*Prescriptive Action:*

- One option to deal with this is to put in place mechanisms of consolation and compensation to be agreed upon between the various stakeholders (communities and conservancies, and KWS), which will greatly ameliorate levels of conflict.
- Need to put in place conservancy/Zovic by-laws and legal instruments to facilitate enforcement and decentralized governance of local resources; and initiate national debate on wildlife ownership and management in conservancies with a view to influencing policy to allow for controlled consumptive utilization of wildlife in Kenya.
- Need for greater understanding and appreciation of the economic value of biodiversity in the interface, both consumptive and non-consumptive. This is critical in empowering communities in negotiations with the powerful private sector interests.

### 4.2. *Nomadic land-use system as an adaptive strategy in drylands threatened*

*Context:* Land-use planning and zoning to set aside conservation areas is a threat to nomadic land-use system. It creates potential for conflicts, particularly from out of area herders.

*Prescriptive Action:* This risk can be managed through capacity building and empowerment of communities so they are able to handle this risk, including through policies and regulations at national and local levels to regulate ownership and access to grazing resources in conservation areas.

### 4.3. *Regional verses national projects – issue of value-addition.*

*Context:* DLWEIP was conceived as a regional project, premised on the outcome of “best practices to be disseminated at Africa regional level through two Thematic Programme Networks (TPNs) of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), TPN 3 and TPN 6”. The reality is that this project could just as easily have been conceived as national projects since there was no linkage at operational level between activities in Kenya and Burkina Faso. On the other hand, the impacts and effects of wildlife/livestock land-use systems are not restricted to national boundaries. DLWEIP experiences with pastoralists in the Diapaga and surrounding regions in Burkina Faso suggest that interventions would have benefited more if the project had taken a regional (involving Togo, Niger and Benin) rather than a national perspective- since pastoralists migrate to and from these countries within the region, in search of grazing and water.

*Prescriptive Action:*

- There is need for clarity at GEF level of what constitutes a truly regional project, including issues relating to shared/transboundary resources and/or common issues such as

trade or cross border conflicts. Future DLWEIP-type projects to follow strictly the principle of Subsidiarity (whatever can be done at national level should be done there). Regional approach should only apply where comparative advantage/value addition can be demonstrated.

- For greater impacts and cost effectiveness, more emphasis should be given to the “true regional” dimension of DLWEIP-type projects, particularly where transhumance and wildlife migration are common.

#### ***4.4. Institutional arrangements as a constraint to project implementation***

*Context:* The most significant shortfall in this project was the documentation and publication of best practices and the sharing of the same with other countries facing similar challenges in Africa. One of the causes for this was the delay in launching project activities particularly in Burkina Faso, but also in Kenya. The issue was the time it takes for governments to put in place arrangements and mechanisms to ensure coordination and come to an agreement on roles and responsibilities of all concerned government stakeholders.

*Prescriptive action:*

Future projects must give this issue the attention it deserves. At project formulation stage, a detailed stakeholder analysis can already identify and assign responsibility for the various roles/project activities. Full agreement on coordination and implementation arrangement should be reached during the project launch and be part of the inception report.

## 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

This project was to end on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2009. However, the most significant output of the project is yet to be fully realized, the finalization of documentation and publication of the best practices and lessons learned, for wider dissemination. There are draft policy briefs to be finalized and other documents lined up for preparation and publication<sup>138</sup>. The evaluator therefore recommends:

1. That the UNEP-DGEF facilitates the completion of the documentation and publication of these documents as appropriate before the project is finally closed.
2. Ensure that as a minimum, all information and documents, including the final evaluation report are made available in both French and English.

---

<sup>138</sup> See Annex 1A- section highlighting documents still in draft form.

## 6. ANNEXES

### **Annex 1: Documents Reviewed and Personal Communications**

#### **1a: List of relevant documents produced by the project**

(verified by evaluator (this does not include training, workshops and progress reports) - provided by Nouala).

1. ASSESSMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCE UTILIZATION IN SAMBURU AND LAIKIPIA WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON NAMUNYAK, KALAMA AND NAIBUNGA CONSERVANCIES
2. ASSESSMENT OF STATUS AND TRENDS OF NATURAL RESOURCE USE IN EWASO NYIRO BASIN, KENYA (THIS INCLUDE WATER RESOURCES)
3. ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE POLICIES IN KENYA
4. IDENTIFICATION AND PROMOTION OF SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT AND REHABILITATION OF WOODLANDS
5. CONSUMPTIVE AND NON-CONSUMPTIVE WILDLIFE UTILIZATION IN KENYA:
6. ANALYSE DE L'OCCUPATION DES TERRES DE LA ZONE D'INTERVENTION DU PROJET INTERFACE FAUNE BETAIL
7. DIAGNOSTIC DE LA MOBILITE DU BETAIL POUR UNE GESTION DURABLE DE LA ZONE D'INTERFACE FAUNE SAUVAGE – BETAIL DANS LA ZONE DU PARC NATIONAL D'ARLY
8. PROBLEMATIQUE DE LA TRANSHUMANCE ET LIGNES DIRECTRICES POUR LE DEVELOPPEMENT PASTORAL EN AFRIQUE DE L'OUEST
9. ASSESSMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCE UTILIZATION IN SAMBURU AND LAIKIPIA DISTRICTS, WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS IN NAMUNYAK, KALAMA AND NAIBUNGA CONSERVANCIES (POACHING AND CHARCOAL BURNING)
10. LA NEGOCIATION, STRATEGIE DE SECURISATION DES RESSOURCES PASTORALES : ESPOIR POUR LA CONSERVATION
11. PLAN D'AMENAGEMENT ET DE GESTION DE LA ZONE VILLAGEOISE D'INTERET CYNEGETIQUE (ZOVIC) DE PIENI, SABORKOURI ET SABOURKPELA
12. PLAN D'AMENAGEMENT ET DE GESTION DE LA ZONE VILLAGEOISE D'INTERET CYNEGETIQUE (ZOVIC) DE MADJOARI
13. DYNAMIQUE DES PATHOLOGIES DU BETAIL ET DE LA FAUNE SAUVAGE DANS LA ZONE D'ARLY AU BURKINA FASO
14. DONNEES COMPLEMENTAIRES DE L'ETATS ET LES TENDANCES DES RESSOURCES NATURELLES ET SYSTEMES DE PRODUCTION
15. EXPLORING A SIMPLE SUSTAINABLE FINANCIAL SERVICE MODEL FOR KIJABE & NKILORITI AND UMOJA WOMEN GROUPS IN THE SAMBURU HEARTLAND
16. NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLANS: 2008-2012: NAMUNYAK WILDLIFE CONSERVANCY, KALAMA COMMUNITY WILDLIFE CONSERVANCY (SAMBURU DISTRICT) & NAIBUNG'A CONSERVANCY TRUST (LAIKIPIA DISTRICT), KENYA

17. ÉVALUATION DES FILIERES D'EXPLOITATION FAUNIQUE AU BURKINA FASO

18. LES ZOVIC DE L'EST, PERCEPTION DES PRODUCTEURS, ENJEUX ECOLOGIQUES ET SOCIOECONOMIQUES POUR LE CONSERVATION DANS LA PROVINCE DE LA TAPOA (ZONE D'ARLY)

19. SUSTAINABLE NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT AND LAND POLICIES: A REVIEW IN KENYA AND BURKINA FASO

Policy briefs:

Completed and posted on the Au-IBAR web site:

1. Status and Trends of Natural Resources at the Livestock Wildlife Interface
2. Status and Trends of Resource Conflicts at the Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface

Drafts to be finalized:

1. Community Scouts Based Monitoring Programme for Wildlife in Conservancies
2. Zoning for Sustainable Resource Use at the Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface
3. LE PLAN DE GESTION Instrument de gestion durable des zones de pâture
4. LES REGLES LOCALES DE GESTION : Outil de gestion durable des ressources naturelles
5. SECURISATION DES RESSOURCES PASTORALES : La négociation comme outil et stratégie de durabilité

## **1b. List of assorted documents stored on CD available at AU/ IBAR**

### **Workshop reports (training and exchange of best practices/lessons, including synergy)**

1. DLWEIP Mid-Term Review Report, March 2008
2. DLWEIP Exit Workshop Report- Feb 2009,
3. Report on Conflict Resolution And Management Training- Northern Region Communities- Held At Bomen Hotel, Isiolo 8<sup>th</sup>- 9<sup>th</sup> June, 2006 – OPP
4. Report on Conflict Resolution And Management Training- Naibunga Conservancy Board of Trustees: Held at Ibis Hotel, Nanyuki On 29<sup>th</sup> -30<sup>th</sup> May, 2006
5. DLWEIP-Kenya implementation progress synthesis draft report - April 2007
6. DLWEIP- Findings of a synergy workshop Report held at Lions Court Hotel, Nanyuki, 13-14 April 2007
7. DLWEIP-Kenya Implementation Progress Synthesis (Kenya) DRAFT Report - April 2007 -In preparation for MTR
8. 2<sup>ND</sup> Synthesis Of Dryland Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project, Kenya and Burkina Faso – Sept 2008
9. Facilitation of a workshop for the trustees of the Naibunga conservancy trust on the nature, content and implementation of the final trust deed- period: 28<sup>th</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> April 2006 – AWF- 1<sup>st</sup> Progress report
10. 2<sup>ND</sup> Progress Report On Training Program for the 4 Conservancy Groups in Samburu, Girgir/Kalama, Namunyak, Sera And Ngutuk O'ngiron Conservancies.- AWF- July 2006 (Training Needs Assessment Done In June 2006)
11. Progress report on training program for Naibunga Community Conservancy- AWF- July 2006.
12. Overall Summary Report On Training Program- AWF- July 2006
13. Report on training needs assessment for Naibunga Community Conservancy- AWF- June 2006
14. Formation des Agents des postes forestiers en inspection du gibier- mecv- Burkina Faso- 2007
15. Rappor Synthese' Projet interface Faune Betail –Burkina Faso- Sept 2008
16. Rapport de Plantation D'arbres dans la zone interface- Sep 2008
17. Rapport Définitif: Diagnostic de la mobilité du bétail pour une gestion durable de la zone d'interface faune sauvage – bétail dans la zone du Parc National d'Arly – MECV/IUCN- March 2008
18. Rapport technique des activites RECOPA dans le cadre du projet Interface Bétail-Faune- Environnement- Rapport du troisième trimestre 2006- the first technical report from Burkina Faso
19. Projet De renforcement des capacités des pasteurs dans le cadre du programme interface betail faune Dans L'est Du Burkina Faso- IUCN- Jan. 2007- The Second Technical Report From Burkina Faso
20. Training Report for the Group Ranch and Grazing Committees from West Gate, Namunyak and Kalama Conservancies Held at Mocharo Hotel- Isiolo on 12th -15th Nov 2008
21. Kijabe, Nkiloriti and Umoja Women Groups: Training Report- AWF- June – October 2008
22. Training of Members Of Namunyak, West Gate and Kalama Conservancies on Natural Resource and Livestock Management - Ministry of Livestock & Fisheries Development- May 2008

23. Tiemamut Nkilorit and Kijabe Women Groups Training Report on Project Management and Business Options- AWF- December 2008

#### **Information dissemination and Public awareness**

1. GEF Brochure- Highlighting DLWEIP and lessons learnt – by ACC, IUCN and Gov. of Kenya 14/08/2006
2. GEF Poster- highlighting project objectives, scope of activities- GEF, AU/ IBAR, UNEP, AWF, ACC, IUCN and Government of Kenya- 2008
3. Key Issues in the Livestock Sub-Sector for Inclusion in the CAADP Pillar Frameworks

#### **Management plans**

1. Natural Resources Management Plans: 2008-2012: Namunyak Wildlife Conservancy, Kalama Community Wildlife Conservancy (Samburu District) & Naibung'a Conservancy Trust (Laikipia District), Kenya - December 2007
2. Plan D'aménagement et de gestion de la zone villageoise d'intérêt cynégetique (Zovic) de Madjoari- MECV/IUCN- Feb 2009n
3. The Koiya Community Group Ranch- STRATEGIC PLAN - 2007
4. Tiemamut Rehabilitation Project Progress DRAFT Report: January 2008

#### **Implementation/progress/Steering Committee reports**

1. Steering Committee Meeting Report- Nanyuki, Kenya, 12<sup>th</sup> -13<sup>th</sup> April 2007
2. Identification and Promotion of Sustainable Management and Rehabilitation of Woodlands- IUCN- Dec. 2006
3. Implementation Progress Synthesis Report (Kenyan Component)- July 2007
4. Tiemamut Rehabilitation Project Phase-1 Final Report: January 2009
5. Tiemamut Rehabilitation Project Progress Brief: August 2008
6. Rapport Annuel 2008 – Burkina Faso- Janvier 2009
7. Etat de Mise en Œuvre Du Projet Interface Faune-Betail- Environnement En Zone Aride (DLWEIP)A\ au Burkina Faso: MECV/IUCN- May 2008
8. Dynamique des Pathologies du Betail et de La Faune Sauvage Dans La Zone D'Arly au Burkina Faso.- MECV- 2007
9. D'aménagement et De Gestion de la Zone Villageoise D'intérêt Cynégetique
10. Rapport de Formation des Agents Forestiers en Inspection Du Gibier et en Techniques De Prelevements Biologiques Sur Animaux Legalement Chasses Dans la Region Est Du Burkina Faso.- MECV- Jan 2009
11. La Loi D'orientation Relative Au Pastoralisme De Regles Zp Yitibari : IUCN/RECOPA- Jan 2009
12. La Negociation, Strategie De Securisation Des Ressources Pastorales: Espoir Pour La Conserva-tion- IUCN/ RECOPA- Jan 2009
13. Village Bank- Memorandum and Articles of Association -Kijabe And Nkiloriti Women Groups- June 2008
14. Synthèse Préliminaire des Résultats de Recherche Sur le Thème: Les Zovic De L'est, Perception Des Producteurs, Enjeux Ecologiques et Socioéconomiques Pour le Conservation Dans la Province de la Tapoa (Zone D'Arly)- IUCN/ RECOPA- Jan 2009

**1c: Key documents reviewed and personal communications**

<i>Title and reference</i>	<i>Key words/ content</i>	<i>Evaluator comments</i>
Original DLWEIP Project Document	Objective, Activities, M&E plan, Work plan, Logframe	Document available on the website
Implementation Agreements (6) MoUs	Obligations of the parties (signatories) Commitments	Copies made available- originals with AU/ IBAR
Project launch workshop Nanyuki, November 2005	Project presentation, implementation plans, executing partners.	Copy made available for review in Nanyuki- AWF Offices
DLWEIP- MTR Report	Recommendations:	See Annex 4
<i>Baseline assessment reports</i> Assessment of natural resource utilization in Samburu and Laikipia districts, with special emphasis in Namunyak, Kalama and Naibunga conservancies- by ACC- Oct 2007	Status and trends of poaching and bush meat consumption and; assessing the livestock stocking rates and densities at project sites.	A desk study supplemented by interviews with experts
<i>Progress Reports(implementation)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly Progress reports</li> <li>• Findings and Synergy Workshop Report- April 2007</li> <li>• Quarterly financial reports</li> <li>• Implementation Progress Synthesis Report (Kenya component)- July 2007</li> <li>• Rapport de Synthese Projet Interface Faune Betail Environment, Burkina Faso (Sep 2008)</li> <li>• AWF- Quarterly report of Oct-Dec 2006</li> <li>• Minutes of Steering Committee meetings</li> </ul> <p>-10<sup>th</sup> Feb 2006-AU/IBAR Office, NRB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DLWEIP-Kenya Implementation Progress Synthesis DRAFT Report by J Njoka, April 2007</li> <li>• Synthesis of DLWEIP activities- Burkina Faso by Joseph Youma, National Project Coordinator-Jan 2009</li> </ul>	<p>Coordination mechanisms, Agenda, issues, Action points, follow-up.</p> <p>Review of Annual Work Plans</p> <p>Review of progress on activities</p> <p>Review of progress on activities</p> <p>Summaries of baseline studies undertaken in Kenya as of April 2007</p>	<p>Issue of coordination at field level was the first major issue, with use of District Steering Groups (chaired by DCs) being suggested.</p> <p>Only one audit of accounts has taken place covering 24 months (1<sup>st</sup> August 2005 to 31 July 2007). This indicated satisfactory accountability and proper accounting procedures were observed during the reporting period. The next one is under preparation</p>

<p><i>Financial reports</i> Audited Financial Statements- 1<sup>st</sup> August 2005 to 31 July 2007 (24 Months)</p> <p>UNEP-GEF Project Document Revision- July 2008</p>	<p>Quarterly technical and financial reports</p> <p>Project extension to Jan.2009</p>	<p>Discussed with UNEP Fund Manager- satisfactory</p>
<p><i>Steering Committee Reports:</i> 1<sup>st</sup> Steering Committee Report- 12-13 April 2007- NRB 2<sup>nd</sup> Steering Committee meeting- April 2008 Burkina Faso</p>	<p>Issue of delay in Burkina Faso</p> <p>Progress in implementation</p>	<p>Sufficient for a three year project.</p>
<p><i>Technical Review reports on good practices</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constitution for Musul Group Ranch</li> <li>• A Conflict Resolution and Management Training for Naibunga Conservancy- 29-30 May 2006</li> <li>• “National Policy on Peace Building and Conflict Management”- 19 July 2006 by the OP.- First Draft</li> <li>• Grazing management plans-Nkiloriti Group Ranch</li> </ul>	<p>Rules and regulations governing membership of Group Ranches</p> <p>Conflict resolution, governance of NR, rules and regulations, Conflict resolution plans</p> <p>Zoning/management plan for the Nkiloriti GR</p>	<p>GR constitutions have the force of the laws of Kenya under Land (Group Representatives Act), Cap 287 of the laws of Kenya.</p> <p>AU/ IBAR/GEF and OP-Special Programmes (ALRMP) organizers. Main outputs were recommendations on priority conflict areas and strategy for solution.</p>
<p>Training workshops</p>	<p>Various themes (see Annex 1B)</p>	<p>Well organized, substantive and participatory</p>
<p><i>Others</i> Laikipia District Livestock Production Office- Proposed Work Plan 2009-2010</p>	<p>Range Rehabilitation included as a key activity (capacity building and pilot activities)</p>	<p>Confirmed</p>
<p>Validation Workshop on “Land-use Policy, Natural Resources Status and Trends, and Environment Rehabilitation Options” organized by IUCN- 12-14 September 2006-Sportsman’s Arms Hotel, Nanyuki</p> <p>Exit strategy workshop held in Nanyuki, Kenya</p> <p>Exit strategy workshop held in BF-Fada 7-9 Feb 2009</p>	<p>Baseline information and studies identifying good land management practices covering Laikipia and Samburu project sites</p> <p>Replication, up-scaling ownership and sustainability,</p>	<p>Good quality/substantive</p>

## **Annex 2: Consultations and Interviews**

### **2a: Meeting with zovic committee- Diapaga, BF.**

(1<sup>st</sup> April 2009)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Zovic</b>	<b>Main issues and observations</b>
Lompo Foldjoa	Saborga Kpela	<p>Consultant met with Zovic Committee representatives - Diapaga, Burkina Faso stakeholders- 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009. These are Village Committees responsible for managing wildlife reserves. Biggest contribution of DLWEIP project- Capacity building: tree planting, Zovic management, alternative livelihood (soap manufacture for women, honey production), negotiating skills.</p> <p>Major issue in Zovic management is conflict management- accommodating the various interests- farmers (growing cotton), livestock owners and forestry (wildlife). Group raised several issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Follow-up to training not there- need for equipment to allow women start the milk project.</li> <li>• Need for continued training on negotiating with concessionaires to get a fair deal</li> <li>• Water points needed to attract fauna in the wildlife reserves.</li> </ul> <p>Group considered DLWEIP awareness creation and training had contributed greatly to reduction of conflicts from 196 in 2004 to 15 in 2008 according to police reports.</p>
Lompo Limani	Saborga Kpela	
Wali Bindoa	Pieni	
Lompo Bindjoa	Saborga Kpela	
Lompo ialenli	Saborga Kori	
Lompo Kompaba	Saborga Kori	
Yonli Tiandama	Pieni	
Wali Bindi Issaka	Diapaga	
Lompo Handi	Mordeni	

### **2b: Briefing with animal disease control committee- Diapaga, BF.**

(1<sup>st</sup> April 2009)

<b>Name</b>	<b>Village/group represented</b>	<b>Main issues and observations</b>
Tankoano K Timothé	Partiaga	<p>Consultant met with Animal Disease Control Committee - Diapaga, Burkina Faso stakeholders- 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009. This turned out to be a new institution- 4 months old, still grappling with structural and operational issues. Committee is composed of livestock owners, business community (butchers) and Gov. representatives. Key issues that emerged from discussions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition of their roles and responsibilities-Disease surveillance, tracking, monitoring and data collection on livestock products market</li> <li>• TOR and its legal status</li> <li>• Issue of sustainability- not guaranteed</li> <li>• Issue of support to enumerators</li> </ul> <p>This outfit would benefit from experiences from Kenya (DVOs)</p>
Tankoano Aguima	Nadiabonli	
Tankoano Yeripagba	Nadiabonli	
Morbiga Kanfidini	Nampoansiga	
Lompo Jacques	Mahadaga	
Wadre Saidou	Logobou	
Yonli Y Blaise	Partiaga	
Yonli Yentema Emmanuel	Logobou	
Koanari hamado	Tambaga	
Diallo Hama	Tambaga	
Lido Hamadou	Nadiabonli	
Ouoba Diassibo	Mahadaga	
Leszogo Inoussa	Tansarga	
Combari Tadjia	Diapaga	

**2c: Briefing with livestock owners committee members – Matiacoali, BF.**

(2<sup>nd</sup> April 2009)

N°	Names	Commtity from	Main issues and observations
01	Lompo Pauline	Yamba	<p>Consultant met with ARECOPA-an association of livestock owners (pastoralists) - Matiakoali, Burkina Faso stakeholders- 2<sup>st</sup> April 2009. DLWEIP support to institutional strengthening and empowerment so it can support its members. Focus on conflict resolution and negotiations with farmers and Park authorities to secure transhumance routes to Togo and Niger. Key challenges for ARECOPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transhumance routes not accessible due to crops</li> <li>• Water for animals during transhumance movement</li> <li>• Transboundary crossing- need for permits/costly</li> </ul> <p>Project facilitated work of ARECOPA- meeting with farmers and park officials to negotiate for access routes, travel to Togo and Niger to negotiate for extension of periods when animals can stay in those countries, etc.</p> <p>Committee priority action areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue of water points</li> <li>• Continue negotiations with other stakeholders, including to togo and Niger</li> <li>• Preparation of pastoral area management plans</li> </ul> <p>Need for a regional approach to address pastoral issues, to include Togo and Niger Issue of sustainability.</p>
02	Diallo Fatimata	Fada	
03	Savado Salif	Kompienga	
04	Touré Maimouna	Matiacoali	
05	Kandia Boureima	Matiacoali	
06	Tandamba Raphael	Matiacoali	
07	Kondé Hamadou	Matiacoali	
08	Bandé Hamidou	Fada	
09	Sondé Saalou	Matiacoali	
10	Sondé Tchayéri	Matiacoali	
11	Nakandé Yacouba	Matiacoali	
12	Thiombiano Jérôme	Fada	
13	Lydo Ibrahim	Matiacoali	
14	Maiga Boubacar	Fada	
15	Lydo Samma	Matiacoali	
16	Lydo El Hadj Mamoudou	Matiacoali	
17	Lydo hamadou	Matiacoali	
18	Ouoba Paguindamba	Matiacoali	
19	Diallo Ali	Tambaga	
20	Diallo Hama	Tambaga	

## 2d: Briefing with National Steering Committee (NSC)

(Ouagadougou, 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2009.)

N°	Names	Coming from	Proceedings
01	Zongo Dominique	PNGT II- Ministry of Agriculture	<p>The consultant made a presentation of the main findings from the field visit and emerging issues regarding the DLWEIP implementation. The participants made very constructive comments, clarifications and recommendations on lessons learned, with proposals on way forward. Following were some of the comments and suggestions:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Key lessons:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lessons on good practices: Planning and management of Natural resources; Diversification of livelihood opportunity (including factoring in the wildlife component) as a strategy to promote sustainable management of Natural Resources- reducing dependence on livestock;</li> <li>• Project served as a demo on integrated multi-sectoral planning and implementation of NR (involving forestry, agriculture, livestock and wildlife), an old (UNCED) concept but whose actualization has not been tested.</li> <li>• Regional projects- issue of language as a constraint to sharing of knowledge and exchange of experiences (translation a cost)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Issue of data ownership, documents and safe custody.</li> <li>■ Documents to be also in French</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Overall conclusion:</b></p> <p>Main beneficiaries (CBOs/Groups and Private ranchers/investors):- highly appreciative of project's capacity-building interventions (created awareness, knowledge and empowerment particularly on conflict resolution and rangelands conservation and management techniques and approaches. Raised expectations- need for follow-up.</p>
02	Dibloni Ollo Théophile	INERA- Research Inst for Agric and Env	
03	Ouattara Lacinna	DGSV- Veterinary Service	
04	Gansaoré Guesrim	DFC- Wildlife and Hunting	
05	Youma Joseph	DFC- Wildlife and Hunting	
06	Savado Moumouni	UICN/BF	
07	Nouala Simplice	AU/ IBAR	
08	Mathu Winston	UNEP	

**2e: Interviews with key persons/groups involved in project management in BF.**

<b>Official and title</b>	<b>Key issues/contribution</b>	<b>Evaluator's Comments</b>
<b>Doukom Adama</b> Director of Forests & Acting Director General, Conservation of Nature	Project relevance in context of national development and poverty strategic planning.	Informed of the importance of the project to the country as expressed by the President of the Republic when he visited the project site a month ago.
<b>Urbain Belemsobgo</b> Director of Wildlife	Project coordination at country level, delay in launching field activities, country ownership of the project.	Was first project coordinator (part-time) while also serving as Director of Wildlife department. Institutional delay in setting up NSC.
<b>Joseph Youma,</b> DLWEIP Burkina Faso Project Coordinator	Project implementation, coordination and collaboration in the field, Government's co-financing contribution	Associated with project since inception but coordinator since 2007
<b>Dr. Moumini Savadogo,</b> Chef de Programme, Burkina Faso	Role of IUCN, Co-financing contribution, project impacts and lessons learned	Associated with project since inception as a private consultant, joined IUCN in October 2008.
<b>Bachirou Derme,</b> Manager, Concession de Chasse de Konkombouri, Arly Park	Private sector Hunting Concession operations, interaction with communities and with DLWEIP project.	Concession owned by brother (Moumouni DERME)- Tel 70-36-15-02. No idea there was a project called DLWEIP by whatever name.
<b>David Pouya,</b> Field Assistant, Ministry of Environment and Quality of Life, Arly Park	Responsibilities in the Park and with DLWEIP. Environmental issues facing the Park (poaching and conflicts related to landuse.	Understanding was that project was all about studies and documentation, no concrete activities on the ground. Mainly facilitated work of consultants. Project rehabilitated a watering point in the park for animals and livestock, and tree planting with communities
<b>Eugene Compaore,</b> Regional Director- Gouma Region, representing the Minister of Environment (Fada)	DLWEIP in the regional and national context. Project focus and impacts- Capacity building, data collection and studies strongest aspects of the project.	Worked on DLWEIP at the beginning as assistant coordinator under Urbain. Stated project not well-known at local level;
<b>Baro Sie' Jean</b> Provincial Director of Environment TAPOA province	Project activities in the province- More studies no concrete achievement- objectives not fully achieved Thematic workshops impact on conflicts between land users. Project helped harmonize	Was with project since inception (Worked under Urbain, first national coordinator
Animal Disease Control Committee- Diapaga, Burkina Faso, 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2009	Institutional structure, roles and responsibilities in disease control. Disease surveillance, livestock market data collection, patrolling transhumance corridors	Young institution, sustainability uncertain.

<p>ARECOPA- the Association of Livestock owners committee members at matiacoali on 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2009</p>	<p>Role and responsibilities in DLWEIP. Association received training and support to undertake activities relating to conflict resolution with farmers and foresters (concessionaires), negotiations for transhumance routes and support to women groups for milk processing.</p>	<p>Activity spearheaded by RECOPA with support from IUCN. Members enthusiastic and appreciative of support received. Empowered and achieved results as conflicts reduced- Issue of watering points along transhumance routes still an issue.</p>
<p><b>Guiré Tahirou</b>, ADELE Programme, based in Fada- 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2009</p>	<p>Role of ADELE- Contracted by Ministry of Environment to train Zovics on NRM. A member of the NSC. Trained one Zovic but no funds for follow-up. Reported frustration with release of funds for activities, lack of proper planning and procedures</p>	<p>An NGO funded by Gov and Swiss Gov. A clear case of episodic participation.</p>

**2f: Interviews with key persons involved in project management in Kenya**

<b>Official and title</b>	<b>Key issues/contribution</b>	<b>Evaluator's Comments/observations</b>
<b>Dr. Mohamed Sessay</b> - UNEP-GEF and project Task Manager	GEF procedures, requirements and guidelines for project concept, formulation and implementation	Providing supervision and oversight since 2008, previously provided by Daya Brigante
<b>Paul Vrontamitis</b> - UNEP- Fund manager	Financial planning, and reporting, Audited accounts	Supervision of financial reporting and accounting, release of funds.
<b>Dr. Simplicie Nouala</b> - AU/ IBAR- Animal Resource Officer, Project coordinator	Project execution issues: overall project implementation, coordination and collaboration. Partnerships, documentation, M&E, UNEP support	First Coordinator, Dr. George Gitau. Nouala Coordinating since 2007- refocused project to pilot activities and less on studies.
<b>Fabian Musila</b> - AWF Director, Samburu Heartlands	Project implementation, coordination and collaboration in the field	Newly appointed, previously occupied by Ms. Fiesta Warinwa
<b>Philip M. Lenaiyasa</b> - AWF, Senior Community Development Office (15-20 March)	Project implementation, coordination and collaboration in the field	On the project since 2006. DLWEIP active in the field since 2007
OPP- Kenya, "coordinator"- Halakhe	Role/responsibility in DLWEIP, co- financing	Issue of MoU- Short interview: ALRMP had specific assignment and this was a regional project. Coordination by AU/ IBAR- no formal agreement on AWF role as coordinator of field activities.
IUCN-ROA- Dr. Jonathan, Ben Wandago	Role/responsibility in DLWEIP, co- financing	Issue of MoU- Very little information- Prof. Ntahuga left 2007, not much involved since then
<b>ACC- James Ndungu</b> , Deputy Director	Role/responsibility in DLWEIP, co- financing	Issue of MoU, co-financing and partnership relations
<b>Dr. Njoka, Consultant</b> , AU/ IBAR	Exit strategy outcome, MTR recommendations	Overall project orientation and changes since Simplicie joined the project. New dynamism, new institutional alignments.

<p>16<sup>th</sup> March 09: Visit to Naibunga Conservancy: 9 Group Ranches- 1200 households: project working with 4 intensively on reseeded, Community enterprise (linking livestock market to conservation), and support to land-use planning (CBNRMP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visit to Tiemamut Group Ranch- Conservation area and reseeded areas. Discussion with local scouts involved in monitoring and enforcement of grazing by-laws. Jacob Yiangere</li> <li>• Met local Chief- David Ole Mayiani and village Committee, Kijabe GR</li> <li>• Visited to Ildigiri GR chicken project</li> <li>• Visited Koiya Group Ranch- Met with GR Manager – Edward Ole Ngoliai and Chairman of the Board.</li> </ul>	<p>Issue of marketing of cultural crafts, issue of market for eggs except to eco-lodge</p> <p>Delay in receiving money from group after sale of crafts</p> <p>Priority concerns: Security, poverty, water and health</p> <p>Were not consulted about DLWEIP- Know about AWF</p> <p>Government services (Vet, medical,) very limited; Literacy level very low- affecting leadership</p> <p>Issue of conflict, mainly for pasture- dealt with by GR Committee, Grazing sub-committee involving local administration. Cattle rustling not a major issue in this conservancy</p> <p>Group Ranches as economic units dependent on ecotourism- eco-lodges. Most of them generating income and making profit</p> <p>Grass types: Cynchrus celliaris/Eragrostis superba</p>	<p>Chicken project -5 women Groups involved- issue of market for the eggs. Project provided seed money to purchase chicken.</p> <p>Bee keeping reported as an activity with women groups- 60 improved hives given to start off.</p> <p>Women and Youth groups involved in cultural crafts for income generation- issue of market, tourism affected by post election crisis</p> <p>Reseeded areas average 2-5 ha. per Group ranch, issue of economies of scale.</p> <p>50 ha. of conservation area in Tiemamut protected with solar- good use of local resources.</p> <p>600 ha. set aside for conservation/dry season grazing in Tiemamut</p> <p>150 ha. set aside for conservation/dry season grazing in Koiya</p> <p>Community IGA appear to be incidental rather than well planned activities.</p> <p>Main project input appear to be CB- training in conservation and reseeded techniques, also in financial management of enterprises</p> <p>Emphasis on Resource Management- Capacity building</p>
---	---	--

<p>17 March 2009:</p> <p>Morning: Meetings with DVO-Laikipia East- Dr Mwaura</p> <p>Morning: Meeting with Drought Management Officer (DMO)</p> <p>Afternoon: Meeting District Livestock Production Officer- William Letitia</p>	<p>Gov. collaboration with AWF in implementation of DLWEIP</p> <p>Specific inputs to DLWEIP: Data collection in Naibunga in collaboration with IUCN. Also training communities on animal health, nutrition and marketing. Partners include AWF, IUCN, ALRMP</p> <p>Project emphasis was on NRM, mobilizing communities. Project interventions: providing seed for reseeding grasslands, training communities, support to establish Community Development Groups- Livestock Marketing Groups; and data collection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training of GR officials</li> <li>• Establishment of Grazing Committees</li> <li>• Exchange visits to Baringo, Narok</li> <li>• Training on livestock breeding, improvement and marketing</li> </ul> <p>Linking markets (KMC and other traders) to Group Ranches and community groups: e.g Women groups: markets for manure, hides and skins and meet</p> <p>District Steering Committee of Arid Lands meets on ad hoc basis according to issues at hand.</p>	<p>According to DVO, biggest project impact is change in attitude of government towards range management. This activity already built into government work plan for 2019/10 (copy given).</p> <p>Group ranches already replicating reseeding on their own, using own resources.</p> <p>Data and information from DLWEIP already being used to inform policy at national level</p> <p>DVO received consultancy to collect data on honey production, beef production, marketing of livestock products, disease control.</p> <p>DLWEIP activities to be continued under ALRMP II Range Rehabilitation component</p> <p>According to DVO, DLWEIP design was too complex with emphasis on studies and training of institutions, not communities. Would have liked to see more livelihood activities.</p> <p>Choice of AWF as lead agency in the field appropriate as it was well established in the field and has the confidence of communities, information and data.</p>
---	--	---

<p>18 March 2009:</p> <p>Visit to Kalama Community Wildlife Conservancy- Met with Secretary to BoM. Conservancy area-32,000 ha., 700 registered members-established 1980, registered 1999.</p> <p>Visited Westgate Community Conservancy, Met with Manager Daniel Letoiye: 1300 Members, has an Eco-lodge. This was added on to the DLWEIP project one year ago. Main support is training of BOM and Grazing Committee on conservation and reseeded</p> <p>Visit to Namunyak Wildlife Conservation Trust: 6 Group Ranches, 2 active (Serara and Sapashe). Met with Chairman (Reuben Lekaldero) and BoM member (Julieta Naipanoi). Project main support to land-use planning (CBNRMP)- 5 Year Management plan.</p>	<p>DLWEIP support: training of Board of Management and Grazing Committee; training visits to Nanyuki, support to CBNMR- 5-year Management Plan; and reseeded of degraded grassland areas.</p> <p>Emphasis on training of managers and board members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grazing management</li> <li>Governance workshop</li> <li>Board orientation</li> </ul> <p>Took Manager of Kalama to BF for exchange visit</p> <p>Also exchange visits to Magadi (Namunyak)</p> <p>Institutional structure of community Conservation Trust: Members AGM/BoM/Grazing Committee/ Management</p> <p><i>Ewasonyiro river drying up due to flower growing in upper catchment- an issue for the project not being addressed (Philip)</i></p>	<p>DLWEIP support fully integrated into AWF work plan- very good for sustainability.</p> <p>Over 60 members of Namunyak trained</p> <p>200,000 ha. of conservation area serving a community tourist lodge, next to Matthews Range.</p> <p>Game hunting as income generating opportunity- not allowed</p> <p>Namunyak Community Conservation Trust (NCCT) own the tourist lodge, being run by a partner- main source of revenue. Conservation area therefore a priority. Main attractions: culture, wildlife, Matthews Range, wilderness.</p> <p>NCCT experiencing pressure from other communities</p> <p>Namunyak chairman thinks enough research, need more action on the ground.</p>
---	--	--

**2g: Debriefing with DLWEIP stakeholders in Nanyuki, Kenya**  
(AWF offices, Nanyuki 19 March 2009)

Name and title	Conservancy/Group or institution	Issues
Daniel Letoiye- Manager David K. Mayiani- Assistant Chief Magdaline Ndirangu- Board of Management-Member Mathew Orguba- Management-Chief Accountant Reuben Lekaldero- Management Board- Chairman William Letitiya- DLPO Dr. K. Mwaura- DVO Philip M. Lenaiyasa- DLWEIP-Team Leader Winston Mathu	West Gate Naibunga-Kijabe Naibunga-Tiamamut Kalama Namunyak DLPO- Laikipia East DVO- Laikipia East AWF- Samburu UNEP/AU/ IBAR Evaluator	<p>The consultant made a presentation of the main findings from the field visit and emerging issues regarding the DLWEIP implementation. The participants made very constructive comments, clarifications and recommendations on lessons learned, with proposals on way forward.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Lessons leaned:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender participation in livelihood enterprises (hides and skin, selling manure, keeping chicken) offering a safety net in case of drought</li> <li>• Enhancing group approach to rangeland management to stop trend towards segmentation of land resources and sustaining the economies of scale. This calls for regulations and guidelines to facilitate management of benefits</li> <li>• Diversification of livelihood opportunity as a strategy to promote sustainable management of Natural Resources- reducing dependence on livestock.</li> <li>• Conservation of NR have local, national and global benefits. Need for incentives to encourage community conservation initiatives- (reference to REDD); and payment for environmental services</li> <li>• Sedentary trends (conservation areas) where nomadism is being practiced raises potential for conflicts, particularly from out of area herders. Need for capacity building towards civic and economic empowerment of communities to handle this risk (policies and regulations at national and local levels) to regulate ownership and access to grazing resources in conservation areas.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Overall conclusions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main beneficiaries (CBOs/Group Ranches and Private ranchers/investors):- highly appreciative of project's capacity-building interventions (created awareness, knowledge and</li> </ul>

		<p>empowerment particularly on community conservation techniques and approaches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main approach: provided forum for collaborative activities between stakeholders; provided catalytic resources (human and financial) to facilitate capacity building and pilot activities on the ground</li> <li>• Limited field interventions (pilot scale by design- serving to demonstrate good practices and as catalyst). Group ranches on their own or with support from partners already integrating good practices in their work plans, and/or up-scaling the activities. (see 2009/2010 Work plans of DVOs/DLPOs Laikipia and Samburu)</li> <li>• Project did not adequately respond to priority community needs (did not consult communities at concept/formulation stage). Future efforts should aim at being demand-driven (e.g. alternative/value adding to livestock products and marketing); and capitalize on exploitation of the key resources in drylands, e.g. sunlight/wind (energy) and sand.</li> <li>• Contribution to knowledge through data and information collection will inform policy at local and national level- leading to changes in attitude and understanding of the importance of drylands to local and national economy and therefore need for high priority in allocated development funds targeting drylands.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

**2h: Debriefing with implementing and executing agencies- 28 April 2009**

<i>Participant and title</i>	<i>Institution</i>	<i>Key issues</i>
Segbedzi Norgbey	Chief, EOU Unit, UNEP	Debriefing on progress of the evaluation exercise and preliminary finding. Key clarifications received: Project focus on community support initiatives, allocation of tasks to executing agencies/MOUs, Budget allocation, AU/ IBAR role in Coordination.
Jessica Kitakule-Mukungu	Evaluation Officer, EOU, UNEP	
Mohamed Sessay	UNEP-DGEF, Project Task Manager	
Simplice Nouala	Project Coordinator, AU/ IBAR	
Winston Mathu	Evaluator	

**Annex 3: Evaluation Benchmarks and Indicators  
(Questionnaire)**

Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP GEF project  
“Dry Land Livestock Wild Life Environment Interface Project (DLWEIP)”

**Questionnaire 1**

<b>A Effectiveness, Relevance, Efficiency</b>
<i>Has the project been effective in achieving the objectives and expected outcomes?</i>
<i>If nothing more is done, will the project achieve positive long term impacts for the project sites (5-10 years)?</i>
<i>Were the project’s outcomes consistent with national/regional and GEF priorities?</i>
<i>Was the project cost effective?</i>
<i>Was the project implementation delayed , and did that have an effect on cost effectiveness?</i>
<i>Did the project build on earlier initiatives, make use of scientific information and data?</i>
<b>B Sustainability</b>
<i>What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will be available once GEF Assistance stops</i>
<i>To what extent will the outcomes of the project be dependent upon continued financial support?</i>
<i>Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?</i>

<i>What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow the project outcomes to be sustained?</i>
<i>Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow?</i>
<i>Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project?</i>
<i>To what extent is the sustenance of the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance?</i>
<i>What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?</i>
<i>Are the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical expertise in place to continue.</i>
<i>Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits?</i>
<i>Are there any activities in the project area that will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes?</i>

<b>C. Achievement of outputs and activities:</b>
<i>Were all expected outputs of the project delivered as programmed?</i>
<i>Were all expected outputs of the project delivered useful and on time?</i>
<b>D. Catalytic Role</b>
<i>What examples are there of other areas, in Africa or elsewhere, that are building on the lessons and experiences of this project?</i>
<i>Are there examples of the lessons and experiences learned in this project being advanced and expanded on by other funding sources?</i>
<b>E. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems</b>
<i>What was the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation tools?</i>
<i>Were risks adequately addressed?</i>
<i>M&amp;E design - was it well designed?</i>
<i>Implementation</i>
<i>Budgeting and funding? Adequate and timely?</i>

<b>F. Preparation and Readiness</b>
<i>Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe?</i>
<i>Were the capacities of executing institutions and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?</i>
<i>Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?</i>
<i>Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation?</i>
<i>Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place?</i>
<b>G. Country ownership</b>
<i>Was the project effective in catalyzing action taken by the authorities in the countries that received assistance from the project?</i>
What actions ?
<i>What is the level of country commitment to facilitating financial and in-kind contributions to the project?</i>

<b>H. Stakeholder participation / public awareness:</b>
<i>Were the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders in each participating country successful?</i>
Strengths and weaknesses
<i>Were collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project effective?</i>
<i>Were public awareness activities undertaken during the course of implementation of the project effective?</i>
<b>I. Financial Planning</b>
<i>Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables</i>
<i>Actual project costs compared to budget</i>
<i>Present major findings from financial audit</i>
<i>Sources of cofinancing - verification</i>
<i>Appropriate standards of diligence.</i>
<i>Final and actual costs -</i>

<b>J. Implementation approach:</b>
analysis of the project's management framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.
<i>Have project steering committee meeting decisions been followed?</i>
<i>effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management – day to day as well.</i>
<b>K. UNEP Supervision and Backstopping</b>
<i>Assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP/DGEF.</i>
<i>Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project.</i>

In addition, there are many other factors and issues that affect the success of the project, some quantitative but mostly qualitative in nature. The following were the main issues and factors considered, along with the benchmarks and indicators applied:

- Some **Important characteristics** to look-out for in a project of this nature:
  - Flexible implementation with open goals.
  - Clear definition of the problems, objectives and strategy.
  - Level of participation of local communities in setting out targets, goals, timing of activities monitoring and evaluation.
  - Project scope: small-scale with limited external inputs and using technologies largely built on improved local techniques.
  - Level of staff commitment.
- Is there a **conducive/enabling environment** for local community participation in DLWEIP and development activities?
  - Level of governance/devolution of authority, including empowerment of local communities.
  - Reinforcement of local popular participation in development activities.
  - Existence of local community institutions and mechanisms to carry out the functions relating to the design, decision-making and implementation.

- Did the project have a **strategy to promote local community participation in DLWEIP?**
  - Strengthening local community institutions including CBOs, NGOs, women organizations, etc.
  - Clarification of roles and legal authority of local institutions for NRM.
  - Recognition and acknowledgement of rights of local land users and integration of customary land-tenure arrangements within the administrative structures.
  - Empowerment of local community groups so they can have a say in determining the use of local financial resources.
  - Need for mechanisms for conflict resolution in **DLWEI management**, e.g. the use of resources by different stakeholders. Need to balance conservation against livelihood concerns.
  - Need to enhance and/or develop negotiating skills of local communities.
  
- Did the project have an **effective livelihood/poverty reduction strategy?**
  - Should be centered around the grassroots communities and ensure and/or promote
    - Ownership and access to capital assets as defined by the people
    - Equity and participation
    - Basic needs are met
    - Use of traditional knowledge systems.
  - **DLWEIP management** and utilization with a long term perspective
  
- What are the main issues **relating to project design and implementation?**
  - Clear definition/statement of the problem.
  - Based on accurate and adequate baseline information
  - Identification, design and implementation involving local communities (issue of ownership with implications to sustainability)
  - An implementation strategy that encompasses:
    - Complementarity/synergy with other projects
    - Partnership
    - Catalytic
    - Replicability
  
- Are there any concerns relating to the **Technical team** as the principal mechanism for drawing out maximum gains from the project?
  - Level of training/subject matter composition
  - Involvement of local technicians
  - Continuity of staff
  - Staff morale.
  
- How effective was the project in **information collection, synthesis and dissemination?**
  - Is documentation of lessons learned a regular feature
  - Extension education
  - Is research on environment an integral aspect of the project
  
- How effective is the project in **Capacity building as the centerpiece of DLWEIP?** In this context, capacity building is defined as actions needed to create or enhance the capability of the local communities (and individuals within the communities) to carry out the allocated functions and achieve set objectives. This could include improvements in human resources in such fields as education and training in **DLWEIP management**, conservation, etc.

- AU/ IBARs role in the design and implementation of the project, relative to that of the local communities.
- Clear definition/identification and assignment of roles for local people in the project document.
- Training workshops and seminars involving local population etc.

## **Annex 4: Review of implementation of MTR recommendations**

The MTR rated the project performance as **satisfactory** in Kenya while **marginally satisfactory** in Burkina Faso as of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2007. Project outputs for outcome 1 and 2 were found to be well done and almost completed in Kenya, while in Burkina Faso outputs for outcome 2 were found to be satisfactory but marginally satisfactory for outcome 1 since the baseline information was not complete. Outputs for outcome 3 on the dissemination of good practices were scheduled for the second half of project implementation although some reasonable progress has been attained so far in both countries. The following were the recommendations, *together with the evaluator's findings on the follow-up*:

1. DLWEIP to apply for a “No-Cost Extension” from 31<sup>st</sup> July 2008 to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2009 to allow time lost to be recovered in Burkina Faso and if possible to facilitate the consolidation of DLWEIP outcomes and positive impacts with other projects and Government institutions in both countries. The political instability in Kenya, following the general election in December 2007 has also adversely affected project implementation for the last three months. *Effected (see Project budget Revision- July 2008)*
2. Introduce an adapted AWF M & E system to monitor wildlife numbers in protected areas in DLWEIP sites: The project monitoring and evaluation system does not explicitly address the issues of sustainable land management practices. DLWEIP may consider adopting the AWF M & E framework which is replicable in DLWEIP sites in Kenya and Burkina Faso. *AWF M&E system adopted in the field in Kenya (see Exit Strategy report)*
3. Give more emphasis on livestock production and marketing issues for the remaining phase of project implementation. -Pastoral livestock production and marketing issues seem to have been given less emphasis in Kenya yet the livestock sector is the core of livelihood support for pastoral communities. It is recommended therefore that for the remaining DLWEIP implementation period livestock related issues should receive more attention. *Establishment of the Animal Disease Control Committee in Burkina Faso*
4. Conduct comparative studies on wildlife utilization strategies, ecotourism enterprises, land tenure, land use policies and disseminate study findings and lessons learnt in form of policy briefs, in seminars, workshops and in a DLWEIP website for sharing experiences with UNCCD-TPN3. *No indication of action.*
5. Strengthen the national steering committee in Burkina Faso to steer the project forward without further delays: High priority is to be accorded to resolving institutional bottlenecks in relation to disbursement of funds and supervision of field activities. *Effected (see Exit Strategy report).*
6. Formulate participatory natural resources management plans as a project exit strategy where DLWEIP activities and outcomes are supported by all key stakeholders and especially Government departments. The project needs to strengthen field partnerships at District and local levels and particularly with the relevant Government Departments in both countries. *Effected (See draft Exit Strategy Workshop report)*

## **Annex 5:           Monitoring And Evaluation Plan**

### **SUMMARY OF SECTION 4: MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN - (GEF Project Document GEF, PMS: GF-3010-05-10)**

#### *Approach*

The project was to base its monitoring and evaluation needs on the following definition: the process of observing (monitoring) and valuing (evaluation) results and progress towards achieving objectives with the aim of informing management decisions (corrective adaptation for continuous improvement). The approach will follow four key principles: (1) Achievement: ensuring that project management teams are equipped with appropriate management tools to allow for performance (e.g. extent to which a project is carried out as planned in terms of objectives, time and financial constraints, and organizational policy and procedures); (2) Learning: ensuring that project knowledge is fed back into project planning processes to allow for improvement; (3) Measurement: ensuring that proper processes keep developing relevant project indicators to allow for internal and independent results evaluations; (4) Accountability : ensuring quality through systemized processes that allow for transparency.

#### *Processes performance*

At the end of every six months, an internal monitoring and evaluation of project implementation will be carried out by AU/ IBAR in collaboration with other stakeholders including the community itself. During the project inception, consensus will be reached with other implementing partners/stakeholders on what data to collect, how to collect and process the data on performance indicators.

**5a: Indicators that ISC and NSC units are operating efficiently**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Means of Verification<sup>139</sup></b>
Quarterly and annual activity progress reports are prepared in a timely and satisfactory manner	Arrival of reports to UNEP
Quarterly financial reports are prepared in a timely and satisfactory manner.	Arrival of reports to UNEP
Performance targets, outputs, and outcomes are achieved as specified in the annual work plans.	Semi annual and Annual progress reports
Deviations from the annual work plans are corrected promptly and appropriately. Requests for deviations from approved budgets are submitted in a timely fashion.	Work plans, minutes of SC meetings, timely submission of revised budget to UNEP for approval
Disbursements are made on a timely basis, and procurement is achieved according to the procurement plan.  Report on the procurement of non-expendable equipment against the project budget filed in a timely manner.	IMIS system at UNEP and Bank Account statements of executing agency Inventory of Non-Expendable Equipment reports
Audit reports and other reviews showing sound financial practices.	Audit statements
International Steering Committee (ISC) is tracking implementation progress and project impact, and providing guidance on annual work plans and fulfilling TOR.	Minutes of ISC meetings
ISC is providing policy guidance, especially on achievement of project impact.	Minutes of ISC meetings

<sup>139</sup> The responsible officer to track this will be the GEF project task manager in consultation with the project manager.

**5b: Monitoring, reporting and evaluation responsibilities**

UNEP	AU/IBAR	International agencies National counterparts responsible for project components	National Steering Committee (NSC)	International Steering Committee (ISC)
<p>Monitor the agreed M&amp;E plan in accordance with the terms of agreement with GEFSEC.</p> <p>Receive quarterly progress and financial reports and annual summary progress reports and copies of all substantive reports from AU/IBAR</p> <p>Task manager to attend and participate fully in meetings of the project ISC and visits to selected project sites</p> <p>Engage and prepare terms of reference for independent M&amp;E consultants to conduct the mid-term and final evaluations.</p>	<p>Establish reporting guidelines for all partners in the project, ensure that they meet reporting dates, and provide reports of suitable quality.</p> <p>Prepare quarterly progress and annual summary progress reports for UNEP, and forward substantive and quarterly financial reports, with supporting documentation as appropriate, in a timely manner to UNEP.</p> <p>Carry out a program of regular visits to project sites to supervise activities, and pay special attention to those sites with serious implementation problems.</p>	<p>Prepare progress reports every six months for AU/IBAR, and forward related financial reports, with supporting documentation as appropriate.</p> <p>Carry out a program of regular visits to project sites to supervise activities as appropriate.</p>	<p>Use reports to review the progress of work in the project as a whole.</p> <p>Advise AU/IBAR on implementation problems that emerge, and on desirable modifications to the work plan for the succeeding year.</p> <p>Monitor progress in the capacity-building aspects of the project, and advise AU/IBAR on steps to enhance this aspect of the project.</p>	<p>Use progress and financial reports and provide policy guidance to the project on any matters arising from a reading of these reports.</p> <p>Assist AU/IBAR in developing linkages with other projects, thus ensuring the wider impact of project work.</p> <p>Provide overall guidance for the project implementation.</p>

*Adopted from the Project Document*

### 5c: Monitoring project impacts

The overall project objective is to mainstream biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas through the promotion and support to sustainable land use management system to improve the livelihoods enhance biodiversity conservation and reduction of land degradation. The indicators at this level include:

- The land set aside for conservation and drought refuge areas at the interface in Kenya and Burkina Faso by the end of the project.
- The ecosystems under improved management of livestock and wildlife at the interface improve in terms of vegetation recovery and biodiversity of wildlife coexisting with livestock.
- The harnessing of the support for conservation of wildlife under livestock production systems. This will be objectively verified by the amount of land put under a community owned management plan for sustainable management of natural resources under their jurisdiction.

#### *Monitoring outcome*

<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Indicator</i>
Reduction of biodiversity loss and land degradation at the interface of mixed management of wildlife and livestock in an African traditional setting	Improvement of vegetation and tolerance for the coexistence of wildlife and livestock.
The improvement of community livelihoods that depend on the wildlife and livestock at the interface	Functional community committees charged with responsibilities for regulating resource utilization at the interface
The documentation of a reproducible model on the best practices on land use and management of natural resources at the interface.	A model that will be shared with other communities in Africa facing similar challenges of sustainable mixed management of livestock and wildlife.

### 5d: Review of activities undertaken by the project in line with the M&E plan

<i>M&amp;E Activity</i>	<i>Responsible parties</i>	<i>Evaluator's findings/Observations</i>
Launching Workshop	AU/ IBAR UNEP	November 2005- Nanyuki
Inception report	AU/ IBAR UNEP	
Collection of baseline information	Oversight by AU/ IBAR- Project Coordinator Implementation by AU/ IBAR- Project Coordinator and implementing partners/agencies	<p>Assessment reports (covering Kenya and Burkina Faso) on following themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status and trends on NR</li> <li>• Trends on Wildlife population</li> <li>• Analysis of land-use policies</li> <li>• Capacity building needs assessment</li> <li>• Analysis on conflict resolution</li> <li>• Assessment of woodlands utilization</li> </ul> <p>Most of these carried out between July 2005 and April 2007.</p> <p>Most assessments of high quality, based primarily on already available information and data (desk studies)</p> <p>Most of the assessments followed by validation workshops involving all stakeholders. E.g. IUNC Validation Workshop- Land-use policy, NR Status and Trends, and Environmental Rehabilitation- Nanyuki, Kenya, Sep 2006</p>
Quarterly and ad hoc progress reports- operational and financial	AU/ IBAR Project Coordinator with inputs from national coordinators/team leaders	<p>Quarterly progress. For example report by AWF (Oct-Dec. 2006) reported activities in Koija, Tiemamut and Kijabe group ranches- Training on CIP, implementation of GR NR Management plans</p> <p>Quarterly financial report- copies from AU/ IBAR, Budget Revision report from UNEP-Fund Manager</p> <p>-Implementation Progress Report-Kenya - April 2007 (in preparation of the MTR).</p> <p>-Implementation Progress Report-Burkina Faso- Jan 2009 (in preparation of the Exit Strategy workshops).</p> <p>.</p>
Financial audit reports	AU/ IBAR UNEP fund manager	01 Aug 2005-31 July 2007 Report: Grant accountability statement: Proper books of accounts kept: Grant accountability statement gives a true and fair view of the financial position of the project.
International Steering Committee (ISC) meetings	AU/ IBAR, UNEP, National Coordinators/team leaders	<p>Two ISC meeting held,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nanyuki, Kenya, 12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> April 2007</li> <li>• One in Ouagadougou,.....</li> </ul>
National Steering Committee meetings	AU/ IBAR, UNEP, National Coordinators/team leaders	<p>NSC minutes provided by AWF and Ministry of Environment in BF</p> <p>Example of Agenda for NSC- AWF-Kenya 9 Feb 2007:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of on-going activities</li> <li>• Review of annual work plan</li> <li>• Quarterly technical and financial reports</li> <li>• Workshop on internal evaluation</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mid-Term Evaluation of DLWEIP</li> <li>• AOB</li> </ul>
Technical reports	Oversight by AU/ IBAR- Project Coordinator Implementation by AU/ IBAR- Project Coordinator and implementing partners/agencies	<p><i>Documents available in Burkina Faso – in French</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 thematic workshop reports covering specific issues on water resources, pastoralism and floristic diversity in arly parc.</li> <li>• 5 studies reports on: Land tenure ; Wildlife health status ; Cattle mobility or transhumance ; Competitive use of natural resources ; Wildlife exploitation study report</li> </ul> <p><i>Documents available in Kenya- in English</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 thematic workshop reports covering specific issues on Conflict resolution, woodlands utilization, Capacity building needs assessment, NRM planning, and land-use policies</li> <li>• 6 Assessment studies reports on: Land-use policies ; Woodlands utilization, Status and trends in NR use, Conflict resolution, status and trends in wildlife populations, capacity needs assessment</li> </ul> <p>The documents reviewed are generally of good quality from a technical and editorial perspective. They present a wide range of information and data on status, trends and experiences/lessons management of resources in the wildlife/livestock interface zone in the respective project sites.</p>
Mid-term review	UNEP-DGEF Task Manager, AU/ IBAR- Project Coordinator and implementing partners/agencies; and Review team	<p>MTR took place June 2007, 6 months behind schedule.</p> <p>Conclusion: The project performance was rated satisfactory in Kenya while marginally satisfactory in Burkina Faso as of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2007.</p> <p>Not much reference to MTR recommendations in the Exit strategy.</p>
Exit strategy report/workshop	UNEP-DGEF Task Manager, AU/ IBAR- Project Coordinator and implementing partners/agencies	27-30 January 2009
Final Report	UNEP-DGEF Task Manager, AU/ IBAR- Project Coordinator and implementing partners/agencies	
Terminal evaluation	UNEP-EOU UNEP-DGEF Task Manager, AU/ IBAR- Project Coordinator and implementing partners/agencies, stakeholders and the Evaluator	

## **5e: Examples of events where community/ stakeholders were engaged**

### **BURKINA FASO**

- Environmental consultation workshop (Field workshop) held in Aryl National Park on 8<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> March 2004
- National workshop held in Kossodo/Ouagadougou on 11 and 12 March 2004.
- Project launching workshop
- Project Exit Strategy workshop

### **KENYA**

- Workshop on proposed UNEP-GEF funded project on 29th January 2004 in Bomen Hotel Isiolo
- National Stakeholders workshop on 12th February 2004 in Nairobi
- Project launching workshop
- Project Exit Strategy workshop

### **REGIONAL**

- Regional workshop discussion on 21st-and 22nd April 2004, where key stakeholders from Kenya and Burkina Faso met in Nairobi, Kenya.

## Annex 6: Log Frame matrix analysis showing actual achievements

### Outcome Level

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Means of Verification	Actual achievements/Results <i>(Evaluators observations and comments)</i>
<p>Objective:</p> <p>To promote the mainstreaming of biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas in Africa</p>	<p>(Revised by evaluator)</p> <p>The concept of integrated livestock/wildlife interface management embraced in context of local, national and international planning and programming processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas set aside and effectively managed for multiple use of wildlife and restricted livestock grazing during critical seasons.</li> <li>• Community based governance structures to oversee the management at the interface.</li> <li>• National policy /strategies and programme documents on wildlife and livestock management incorporating “best practices at the interface”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultative meetings with communities/resource user groups and stakeholders during the field visits to verify (see Annex....)</li> <li>• Interviews with various Government, NGO and CBO officials involved in DLWEIP implementation process.</li> <li>• Review of relevant documents and reports</li> </ul>	<p><i>At local/community level</i> within the project sites, the concept of livestock/wildlife interface management has already been readily embraced following awareness raising, capacity building and demonstration of the benefits to livelihoods and biodiversity conservation when the two land use systems are applied in an integrated manner. This is evidenced by communities making decisions to set aside conservation and drought refuge areas at the interface in Kenya, and transhumance routes in Burkina Faso.</p> <p><i>At national level</i>, the concept has received acceptance at policy and planning level, as demonstrated in governments setting up inter-ministerial taskforce to oversee the integrated management of natural resources of the livestock/wildlife environment interface sites in Burkina Faso) and the integration of range rehabilitation activities in annual work plan 2009-2010 of the DLPO, Ministry of Livestock in Kenya.</p> <p><i>At regional level</i>, the concept has already entered the African Ministers of Environment (AMCEN) dialogue. A review of the AU/NEPAD CAADP initiative indicate several references to the issues of livestock/wildlife interface under Pillar #1 on Land and Water- introduced by AU/ IBAR borrowing from DLWEIP experiences.</p>
<p><b>OUTCOME LEVEL:</b></p>			

<p>OUTCOME 1</p> <p>Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites</p> <p><b>Activities for component 1:</b></p> <p>1.1 Assessment of the status and trends of natural resources e.g. water, livestock, wildlife and fodder resources) as well as the impacts of changes, incentive and capacity building measures on the market shares of the derived products.</p> <p>1.2 Assessment of land use policy frameworks in Kenya, and land tenure systems “gestion des terroirs” in Burkina Faso, at both national and local levels, including customary laws and local bylaws, and strengthening of local-level land-use planning and management.</p> <p>1.3. Assessment conflict status on natural resources and identification and implementation of conflict resolution mechanisms.</p> <p>1.4 Assessment of the status of non-sustainable wildlife and natural resources utilization and identification and implementation of sustainable alternatives.</p>	<p>1.1Vegetation cover improved by 10% after three years</p> <p>1.2 Acreage of designated areas for interface management under wildlife and livestock increased by 10% by the end of three years</p> <p>1.3 Four wildlife-based enterprises supported:-two in Burkina Faso and two in Kenya</p> <p>1.4 reduced incidences of resource conflicts in the pilot and adjacent areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with project staff, resource user/women groups and Group Ranch officials.</li> <li>• Interviews with DLWEIP executing agencies</li> <li>• Progress reports</li> <li>• Conflict resolution reports</li> <li>• Exit strategy Assessment report</li> </ul> <p>(see Annex ....- Documents reviewed)</p>	<p>Project intervention led communities to make decisions to set aside conservation and drought refuge areas at the interface as follows:</p> <p>In Kenya, West Gate-34,000 ha, Kalama 16,000 ha, Naibunga 43,000ha, Namunyak-78,000ha)</p> <p>In Burkina Faso, Arly National Park-120,000ha; Koakrana concession-27,000ha; Pagou Tandougou-34,000ha and 8village Zovics-about 8,000ha)- also transhumance routes (in an area totaling 358,000 ha). The later translates into security of the biodiversity in the national park from reduced incidences of grazing.</p> <p>Four thematic workshops as platform for inter-agency and inter communal conflict resolution in Burkina Faso and two in Kenya. RECOPA documentation of trends in conflict reporting to police/courts in the project site indicate a drop from 358 in 2004 to 11 in 2008.</p> <p>Training and support of community leaders on land-use planning and management of Natural resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• -Training on Scout Based Monitoring system; Livestock Breeding; Fodder Conservation; Pasture and Grazing management; Range rehabilitation</li> <li>• -3 management plans completed in Kenya- Nabunga, Kanama and Namunyak.</li> </ul> <p>Several assessments undertaken in both Kenya and Burkina Faso, providing data and information to facilitate planning for interventions and to inform policy:</p> <p>Main issues identified at these workshops included lack of transhumance routes; Insufficiency of the water resource; Conflicts (farmers-foresters &amp; farmers-pastoralists); Lack of quality seeds; Soil degradation and &amp; lack of production implements; Need to add value to agricultural</p>
--	---	---	---

			products through transformation and new agricultural products commercialization; Lack of knowledge in agricultural techniques; Animal and plant health
<p><b>OUTCOME 2</b> Community livelihoods improved and Sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso</p> <p><b>Activities for Component 2</b></p> <p>2.1 Identification and promotion of sustainable management and rehabilitation of indigenous woodlands (in charcoal burning areas in Kenya; agriculture expansion zones in Burkina Faso).</p> <p>2.2 Capacity building for local community and institutions- (user associations, stakeholders meetings, inter-sectoral forums and platforms for feedback mechanisms).</p> <p>2.3 Establishment and support to community conservation initiatives.</p>	<p>2.1 Four functional community wildlife and livestock committees supported (at least two in Kenya and two in Burkina Faso) by the end of the project period</p> <p>2.2 Reduced incidences of natural resource conflict at pilot sites in Burkina Faso and in Kenya</p> <p>2.3 Grazing management plans established: four in Kenya and one grazing plan for Burkina Faso in place by end of project.</p> <p>2.4 Official Livestock off take in Kenya increased by 10% Livestock/wildlife management at the interface established in Burkina Faso</p> <p>2.5 Livestock/wildlife based Livelihood enterprises at the interface increased by 10%</p> <p>2.6. Income directly accruing to at least 50% of the women increased by 20%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews with project staff, resource user/women groups and Group Ranch officials.</li> <li>• AU/ IBAR project progress technical reports</li> <li>• Stakeholder meetings during evaluation mission</li> </ul> <p>(see Annex...- People/Groups met during the evaluation mission)</p>	<p>Capacity building for livelihoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training in financial and enterprise management (bee keeping and poultry keeping for women and youth groups in Kenya; milk processing for women groups in Burkina Faso)</li> <li>• Provided initial capital to initiate community livelihood enterprises in Kenya (60 improved beehives, NWCT, Grass seed for reseeding and chicken to Kijabe Women Group in Naibunga Conservancy)</li> <li>• Establishment of Disease Control Committee in Burkina Faso<sup>140</sup> and the training of veterinary scouts for disease surveillance in Kenya expected to improve livestock health.</li> <li>• Improve information access and marketing of the tourist enterprises of Group Ranches in Kenya (e.g. Koiya)</li> <li>• Enhanced the range of cultural activities at the cultural villages through training and exposure (exchange visits).</li> </ul> <p>Training of community resources user groups for livelihoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 Women groups (one in each Conservancy) and one Youth Group in Kenya were trained in business management and on poultry and bee keeping, and catalytic funding provided for equipment (60 beehives) and purchase of chicken.</li> <li>• In Burkina Faso, one Women group (28 members) were trained in business management and in milk processing and</li> </ul>

<sup>140</sup> See Annex....meeting with the Disease Control Committee in Diapaga

<p>2.4. Establishment of community disease control committees and initiatives on local slaughter and marketing of livestock and wildlife products by examining the dynamics of diseases among livestock and wildlife at pilot sites.</p>	<p>2.7 The status and trend of livestock and wildlife numbers in project sites in Kenya and Burkina Faso established by the end of the project.</p>		<p>are in the process of setting up the enterprise.</p> <p>Conflict resolution</p> <p>In Burkina Faso, the reduction in conflicts between pastoralists, farmers and foresters resulted in increased access to pasture-improvement to livestock health and increased sales. This translates to increased income for pastoralists.</p> <p><i>Interview with Koija Group Ranch in Naibunga Conservancy in Kenya elicited that their income had grown six times (from 1million to 6 million between 2006 and 2008), mainly from ecotourism activities. Eight Other Group ranches reported improved income from .their investments in tourism activities. How much of this is attributable to project intervention is still an issue. There was also no way to verify how this translated into improved livelihood.</i></p> <p><i>In the absence of baseline data on household livelihood status, it is not possible to give a figure on how much increase was attributable to project intervention.</i></p>
<p>OUTCOME 3 Enhanced awareness in Africa of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the livestock-wildlife interface</p> <p><b>Activities for Component 3</b></p> <p>3.1 Documentation of the success stories and lessons learnt and sharing of information (experiences in land management and land use and indigenous methodology of collecting and analyzing information).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management identified and disseminated at end of project.</li> <li>• Awareness in conservation among the communities increased by end of project in Kenya and Burkina within and outside the project sites and at Africa regional level;</li> <li>• Success/best practices/lessons learnt documented in various forms by the end of the project.</li> <li>• Use of best practices at the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop reports;</li> <li>• Policy briefs;</li> <li>• Review of the various technical and assessment reports in the custody of AU/ IBAR</li> </ul> <p>(see Annex...on documents reviewed)</p>	<p>Project has documented success stories and lessons learnt and initiated sharing of information on best practices. For example two Policy Briefs are posted on the web-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status and Trends of Natural Resources at the Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface:- DLWEIP Working Policy Brief #1 at <a href="http://www.au.ibar.org/dlweip">www.au.ibar.org/dlweip</a>;</li> <li>• Status and Trends of Natural Resources Conflicts at the Livestock Wildlife environment Interface:- DLWEIP Working Policy Brief #2 at <a href="http://www.au.ibar.org/dlweip">www.au.ibar.org/dlweip</a>.</li> <li>• Several documents in draft form, ready to be finalized.</li> </ul>

<p>3.2. Identification of the target groups and facilitation of exchange visits for the dissemination of success stories and lessons learnt.</p> <p>3.3. Identification and training of facilitators and organization of dissemination workshops and seminars at local, national and Africa regional level.</p>	<p>interface in at least 5 new countries by end of project</p>		<p><i>Documents available in Burkina Faso :</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 thematic workshop reports covering specific issues on water resources, pastoralism and floristic diversity in arly parc.</li> <li>• 5 studies reports on: Land tenure ; Wildlife health status ; Cattle mobility or transhumance ; Competitive use of natural resources ; Wildlife exploitation study report</li> </ul> <p><i>Documents available in Kenya</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 thematic workshop reports covering specific issues on Conflict resolution, woodlands utilization, Capacity building needs assessment, NRM planning, and land-use policies</li> <li>• 6 Assessment studies reports on: Land-use policies ; Woodlands utilization, Status and trends in NR use, Conflict resolution, status and trends in wildlife populations, capacity needs assessment</li> </ul> <p>Project facilitated exchange visits (to Kenya, Niger and Togo) for community leaders involved in the project, as well as project staff for the dissemination of success stories and lessons.</p> <p>Project also organised workshops and seminars at Zovic/community level for dissemination of best practices and experiences, including the Exit Strategy Workshops.</p> <p><i>Real concern is in dissemination. The thematic workshops in Burkina Faso, the exit strategy workshop are examples of efforts to disseminate/exchange knowledge and experiences on DLWEIP between the two countries, but the project could have done more, e.g. taking opportunity of MEAs (CBD, UNCCD) COP/CRIC processes and technical conferences and seminars.</i></p>
---	--	--	---

## Annex 7: Expenditure Report As Of December 2008

Project life Extension (cost free) to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2009

### ACTUAL EXPENDITURE BY BUDGET LINE, 2005 - 2008

Project Title: Dryland Livestock Wild Life Environment Interface Project (DLWEIP)						Annex I	
Project No: GFL-2328-2770-4857 Rev2							
PMS: GF-3010-05-10 Rev. 2							
UNEP BUDGET LINE	2005 US\$ ACTUAL	2006 US\$ ACTUAL	2007 US\$ ACTUAL	2008 US\$ BUDGET	Total US\$	2008 Original	IMIS Variance
<b>PROJECT PERSONNEL COMPONENT</b>							
1100 Project Personnel							
1101 Project Coordinator (1) B. Faso			0	9,600	9,600	2,400	7,200
1102 Field Assistant (1) B. Faso		5,000	(5,652)	4,800	4,148	1,200	3,600
1187 UNEP Participation (External Evaluation)			0				
1199 Total	0	5,000	(5,652)	14,400	13,748	3,600	10,800
1200 Consultants							
1201 Consultants for community disease control & Mkt initiative			10,000	0	10,000		0
1202 District Vet. Officers (2) Kenya			2,000	2,000	4,000	4,800	(2,800)
1203 Consultant for findings & lessons learnt Kenya (2)			4,000	4,000	8,000	4,000	0
1204 Consultant for findings & lessons learnt B. Faso (2)			0	5,000	5,000	5,000	0
1205 Consultant for Policy Framework (2 Kenya, 2 B. Faso)			0	20,000	20,000	10,000	10,000
1299 Total	0	0	16,000	31,000	47,000	23,800	7,200
1600 Travel on official business							
1601 Travel to/within B.Faso (Project Manager, Project Coordinator)		4,582	6,331	18,600	29,512	6,000	12,600
1602 Travel within Kenya (Project Manager, Project Coordinator)		1,760	9,404	5,000	16,164	5,000	0
1699 Total	0	6,342	15,735	23,600	45,676	11,000	12,600
1999 Component Total	0	11,342	26,083	68,000	106,424	38,400	30,600
2200 SUB-CONTRACT							
2201 IUCN (Kenya)	65,000	15,000	15,000		95,000	5,000	(5,000)
2202 AWF (Kenya)	70,000		50,000	46,000	166,000	10,000	36,000
2203 ACC (Kenya)	20,000		25,000	14,000	59,000	5,000	9,000
2204 OOP (Kenya)			209		209	0	0
2205 IUCN (B. Faso)	20,000		20,000	29,907	69,907	10,000	19,907
2206 Min. of Environment (B. Faso)	60,000		0	60,000	120,000	10,000	50,000
2207 Community Conservancies			9,667		9,667	3,600	(3,600)
2208 Community and producer			0		0	2,400	(2,400)
2299 Total	235,000	15,000	119,876	149,907	519,783	46,000	103,907
2999 Component Total	235,000	15,000	119,876	149,907	519,783	46,000	103,907
3200 TRAINING							
3201 Training							
3201 Project Initiation Workshop	17,026	(326)	3,476		20,176		0
3202 Community seminars/workshops			12,377	70,821	83,198	30,000	40,821
3203 Study Tours/Field Visits/Trainings			19,191	28,854	48,045	20,000	8,854
3299 Total	17,026	(326)	35,044	99,675	151,418	50,000	49,675
3999 Component Total	17,026	(326)	35,044	99,675	151,418	50,000	49,675
4100 EQUIPMENT & PREMISES COMPONENT							
4100 Expendable equipment (Items under US\$1,500 )							
4101 Stationery		40	1,887	6,379	8,307	1,000	5,379
4199 Total	0	40	1,887	6,379	8,307	1,000	5,379
4200 Non-expendable equipment (computers, office equip, etc)							
4201 Computer			1,625		1,625		0
4202 Printer/scanner			1,764	550	2,314		550
4220 Office table/Filing cabinet			4,002	2,001	6,003		2,001
4299 Total	0	0	7,392	2,551	9,943	0	2,551
4999 Component Total	0	40	9,279	8,930	18,250	1,000	7,930
5100 MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT							
5100 Operations and Maintenance of equip							
5101 Vehicle fuel		979	1,946	11,500	14,426	4,000	7,500
5102 Vehicle maintenance		5,487	15,446	4,000	24,933	5,000	(1,000)
5103 Miscellaneous (general)	424	1,918	9,442	6,343	18,127	3,000	3,343
5199 Total	424	8,384	26,835	21,843	57,486	12,000	9,843
5200 Reporting Costs (publications, maps, newsletters, printing e.t.c)							
5201 Reporting and Publications			3,017	20,000	23,017	15,000	5,000
5202 Dissemination			8,368	16,700	25,088	6,000	10,700
5299 Total	0	0	11,405	36,700	48,105	21,000	15,700
5300 Sundry							
5301 Telephone		90	691	1,309	2,091	700	609
5302 Postage/faxes		8	0	492	500	400	92
5303 Audit fees				6,188	6,188		6,188
5399 Total	0	98	691	7,969	8,759	1,100	6,869
5500 Evaluation							
5501 Midterm review			10,300	4,475	14,775		4,475
5502 Final Evaluation				50,000	50,000	30,000	20,000
5503 Consultants - fee/travel/DSA							
5599 Total	0	0	10,300	54,475	64,775	30,000	24,475
5999 Component Total	424	8,482	49,231	120,987	179,125	64,100	56,867
Project Total	252,450	34,538	239,513	448,499	975,000	199,500	248,999
Previous Budget	252,450	34,538	488,512	199,500	975,000	194,400	
Variance	0	0	(248,999)	248,999	(0)	5,100	

# ALLOTMENT AND DISBURSEMENT BY BUDGET LINE, 2008

<b>STATUS OF ALLOTMENT REPORT</b>									
Summary by Source of Fund, Project, Object, Object Class/Code									
For Fiscal year 2008, Posted Accounting Period As at 200812.5.									
Source of Fund, GFL	4857	85700MR3	GF30100510 - Dryland Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project (DL-WEP)	Technical Cooperation Trust Fund for UNEP's Implementation of the Activities Funded by the Global Environment Facility	BUDGET	Pre- Unliquidated	Disbursement	Expenditure	Total Unencumbered
Project:	4857	85700MR3	GF30100510 - Dryland Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project (DL-WEP)	Technical Cooperation Trust Fund for UNEP's Implementation of the Activities Funded by the Global Environment Facility	BUDGET	Pre- Unliquidated	Disbursement	Expenditure	Total Unencumbered
Object Class/Code	Class/Code Name	Allotment	Encumbrance	Obligations	Disbursement	Expenditure	Total Unencumbered	Balance	X
441	Other Fund Source - Project Personnel								
1101	project coordinator	9,600.00	0.00	0.00	4,800.00	4,800.00	4,800.00	4,800.00	
1102	Field Assistant 1 B. Fasso	4,800.00	0.00	0.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	
1202	District Vet. Officers	2,000.00	0.00	0.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00	0.00	
1203	Consultant for finding and lessons learnt Kenya (2)	4,000.00	0.00	0.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	0.00	
1204	Consultant for findings & lessons learnt B. Faso 2	5,000.00	0.00	0.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	0.00	
1205	Consultant for Policy Framework	20,000.00	0.00	0.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	16,000.00	
1601	Travel to/within B. Faso	18,600.00	0.00	0.00	18,042.00	18,042.00	18,042.00	568.00	
1602	Travel within Kenya (Project Manager, Project Coordinator)	5,000.00	0.00	0.00	1,835.00	1,835.00	1,835.00	3,165.00	
<b>441</b>	<b>Total Obj. Class Other Fund Source - Project Personnel</b>	<b>69,000.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>42,077.00</b>	<b>42,077.00</b>	<b>42,077.00</b>	<b>26,923.00</b>	
442	Other Fund Source - Subcontracts								
2202	AWF (Kenya)	46,000.00	0.00	0.00	43,000.00	43,000.00	43,000.00	3,000.00	
2203	ACC (Kenya)	14,000.00	0.00	0.00	14,000.00	14,000.00	14,000.00	0.00	
2205	IUCN (B.Faso)	29,907.00	0.00	0.00	29,907.00	29,907.00	29,907.00	0.00	
2206	Min. of Environment B. Faso	63,600.00	0.00	0.00	60,000.00	60,000.00	60,000.00	3,600.00	
2207	Community Conservancies	-1,200.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-1,200.00	
2208	Community and Producer	-2,400.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-2,400.00	
<b>442</b>	<b>Total Obj. Class Other Fund Source - Subcontracts</b>	<b>149,907.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>146,907.00</b>	<b>146,907.00</b>	<b>146,907.00</b>	<b>3,000.00</b>	
443	Other Fund Source - Training								
3202	Community Seminar	69,321.00	0.00	0.00	39,688.00	39,688.00	39,688.00	29,633.00	
3203	Study Tours/ Field visits/Trainings	27,354.00	0.00	0.00	28,918.00	28,918.00	28,918.00	-1,564.00	
<b>443</b>	<b>Total Obj. Class Other Fund Source - Training</b>	<b>96,675.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>68,606.00</b>	<b>68,606.00</b>	<b>68,606.00</b>	<b>28,069.00</b>	
444	Other Fund Source - Equipment								
4101	Stationary	6,379.00	0.00	0.00	5,968.00	5,968.00	5,968.00	411.00	
4202	Printer/scanner	550.00	0.00	0.00	547.00	547.00	547.00	3.00	
4220	Office table/ Filing cabinet	2,001.00	0.00	0.00	1,978.00	1,978.00	1,978.00	23.00	
<b>444</b>	<b>Total Obj. Class Other Fund Source - Equipment</b>	<b>8,930.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>8,493.00</b>	<b>8,493.00</b>	<b>8,493.00</b>	<b>437.00</b>	
445	Other Fund Source - Miscellaneous								
5101	Vehicle Fuel	11,500.00	0.00	0.00	702.00	702.00	702.00	10,798.00	
5102	Vehicle maintenance	4,000.00	0.00	0.00	3,840.00	3,840.00	3,840.00	160.00	
5103	Miscellaneous	6,343.00	0.00	0.00	2,704.00	2,704.00	2,704.00	3,639.00	
5201	Reporting costs (UNDP - new regime)	20,000.00	0.00	0.00	10,008.00	10,008.00	10,008.00	9,992.00	
5202	Dissemination	16,700.00	0.00	0.00	1,817.00	1,817.00	1,817.00	14,883.00	
5301	telephone	1,309.00	0.00	0.00	19.00	19.00	19.00	1,290.00	
5302	Postage/faxes	482.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	482.00	
5303	Audit Fees	9,168.00	0.00	0.00	3,168.00	3,168.00	3,168.00	6,000.00	
5501	Mid Term Review	4,475.00	0.00	0.00	2,597.00	2,597.00	2,597.00	1,878.00	
5502	Evaluation Costs	50,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50,000.00	

**STATUS OF ALLOTMENT REPORT**

Summary by Source of Fund, Project, Object Class/Code  
For Fiscal year 2008. Posted Accounting Period As at 200812.5.

Source of Fund: GFL Technical Cooperation Trust Fund for UNEP's Implementation of the Activities Funded by the Global Environment Facility  
Project: 4857 85700MR3 GF30100510 - Dryland Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project (DL-WEP)

Object Class/Code	Class/Code Name	Allotment	Encumbrance	Pre- Obligations	Unliquidated Obligations	Disbursement	Expenditure	Total Unencumbered Balance
445	Total Obj. Class Other Fund Source - Miscellaneous	123,987.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	24,855.00	24,855.00	99,132.00
	Total Project: 4857 85700MR GF30100510 - Dryland Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project (DL-WEP)	448,499.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	290,938.00	290,938.00	157,561.00
	Total Fund: GFL Technical Cooperation Trust Fund for UNEP's Implementation of the A	448,499.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	290,938.00	290,938.00	157,561.00

2008 BUDGET

2008 TOTAL EXPENDITURE

**DLWEIP WORKPLAN 2008**

Outcomes	Outputs	Lead Institution	SUB-ACTIVITIES	Status	Timeline			
					Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
<b>Outcome 1</b>	Output 1.1	MECV	Analyse complémentaire de l'état des tendances des ressources naturelles et des systèmes de production et des conditions socio-économiques des communautés riveraines	Ongoing				
	Output 1.2	MECV	Evaluation des impacts environnementaux et socio-économiques des initiatives prometteuses	Ongoing				
<b>Outcome 2</b>	Output 1.2	AU/IBAR	Comparative studies of land use policies and conflicts in Kenya and Burkina Faso	Ongoing				
	Output 2.1	MECV	Elaboration de deux plans de gestion de 02 ZOVICS					
	Output 2.1	MECV	Appui à l'aménagement du couloir d'Arly					
	Output 2.1	MECV	Appui au curage de la mare Bulyabou à Arly					
	Output 2.1	IUCN BF	Elaboration de 02 plans de gestion de aires de pâture					
	Output 2.1	IUCN BF	Elaboration et formalisation des règles de gestion pour les ressources pastorales négociées					
	Output 2.1	IUCN BF	Plantations de 200 ha (4000 plants) en plein champ					
	Output 2.1	AWF	Training of Group Ranch, Conservation, grazing committees on roles and responsibilities	Ongoing				
	Output 2.1	AWF	Training of committees on Landuse management aspects	Ongoing				
	Output 2.1	AWF	Development of bi-laws to govern land-use zones					
	Output 2.1	AWF	Study tour to Tiernamut and Baringo					
	Output 2.1	AWF	Training of scouts on mapping of conservation area	Ongoing				
	Output 2.1	AWF	Rehabilitation of 100 acres of degraded land					
	Output 2.1	AWF	Field trip to Tiernamut, Baringo					
	Output 2.1	AWF	Field trip to Tiernamut, Baringo	Ongoing				
	Output 2.1	AWF	Rehabilitation of 100 acres of degraded land					
	Output 2.2	AWF	DISEASE SURVEILLANCE (Kenya)	Ongoing				
	Output 2.2	MECV	Mise en place des comités communautaires de suivi des pathologies					

	Output 2.2	MEVC	Appui à la formation des agents des postes forestiers à l'inspection sanitaire dans les concessions de chasse				
	Output 2.2	AWF	Training of grazing committees on roles and responsibilities	Ongoing			
	Output 2.2	AWF	Training of Wamba Women's Group on bee-keeping				
	Output 2.2	AWF	Training of Nkiloriti Group Ranch on office Management	Ongoing			
	Output 2.2	AWF	Training on Kijabe & Tiermamut Women's group on project management & business options				
	Output 2.2	AWF	Field visit to Dupto women's group Kajiado				
	Output 2.2	AWF	Training of Group Ranch, Conservation, grazing committees on roles and responsibilities	Ongoing			
<b>Outcome 3</b>	Output 3.1	IUCN BF	Capitalisation des expériences de négociation pour la sécurisation des ressources pastorales				
	Output 3.1	IUCN BF	Capitalisation des expériences de règlement de conflits (Tenue ateliers participatifs avec les communautés de documentation des mécanismes de gestion des conflits)				
	Output 3.1	IUCN BF	Capitalisation des acquis et expériences du projet (notes synthétiques à partager)				
	Output 3.1	IUCN BF	Edition et diffusion des produits de capitalisation (production cassettes audio, vidéos, affiches, posters, etc.)				
	Output 3.4	AWF	Capturing live field experiences in the project site on audio and visual media				
	Output 3.4	AWF	Synthesize the Kenyan experiences on conflicts mapping and mitigation				
	Output 3.4	AWF	Synthesize and printing of elaborated NRM plans of 3 projects sites in Kenya				
	Output 3.4	AWF	Prepare a stepwise manual on approach to conflict analysis and peace building				
		AU/IBAR	Publications of documented experiences and lessons learnt from DLWEIP pilot sites in print and electronic media.				
		AU/IBAR	Upload all relevant project material and improve access to the website				
		AU/IBAR	Synergy Workshop with other GEF ongoing project to share best practices and lessons learnt for publication				
		AU/IBAR, UNEP	Organizing Final Evaluation				

## ORIGINAL BUDGET BY UNEP BUDGET LINES

Annex 6: Budget in UNEP format

		Years				
		2005	2006	2007	2008	Total
		US \$				
UNEP BUDGET LINE		BUDGET				
<b>10</b>	<b>PROJECT PERSONNEL COMPONENT</b>					
<b>1100</b>	<b>Project Personnel w/m</b>					
1101	Project Coordinators 2 (Kenya & B. Faso) (400/month)	4,800	9,600	9,600	4,800	28,800
1102	Field Assistants (4) - 3 Ke & 1 BF (200/month)	4,800	9,600	9,600	4,800	28,800
1187	UNEP Participation (External Evaluation)	0	15,000	0	20,000	35,000
1199	Total	9,600	34,200	19,200	26,900	92,600
<b>1600</b>	<b>Travel on official business (above staff)</b>					
1601	Travel To/within B. F. (Project Manager, Project Coordinator)	6000	10000	10000	6000	32,000
1602	Travel within Kenya (Project Manager, Project Coordinator)	2000	6000	9000	3000	20,000
1699	Total	8,000	16,000	19,000	9,000	52,000
<b>1999</b>	<b>Component Total</b>	<b>17,600</b>	<b>50,200</b>	<b>38,200</b>	<b>38,600</b>	<b>144,600</b>
<b>2200</b>	<b>Sub-contracts</b>					
2201	IUCN (Kenya)	65,000	15,000	15,000	5,000	100,000
2202	AWF (Kenya)	70,000	50,000	10,000	10,000	140,000
2203	ACC (Kenya)	20,000	15,000	15,000	5,000	55,000
2204	OOP (Kenya)	15,000	8,000	0	0	23,000
2205	IUCN (BF)	20,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	50,000
2206	Min. of Environment (BF)	60,000	40,000	40,000	10,000	150,000
2399	Total	250,000	138,000	90,000	40,000	518,000
<b>2999</b>	<b>Component Total</b>	<b>250,000</b>	<b>138,000</b>	<b>90,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>518,000</b>
<b>30</b>	<b>TRAINING COMPONENT</b>					
<b>3200</b>	<b>Group training</b>					
3201	Project Initiation Workshop	17000	0	0	0	17,000
3202	Community seminars/workshops	0	15000	20000	30000	65,000
3203	Study Tours/Field Visits/Trainings	0	15000	13400	20000	48,400
3299	Total	17,000	30,000	33,400	50,000	130,400
<b>3999</b>	<b>Component Total</b>	<b>17,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>33,400</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>130,400</b>
<b>40</b>	<b>EQUIPMENT &amp; PREMISES COMPONENT</b>					
<b>4100</b>	<b>Expendable equipment</b>					
4101	Stationery	1400	900	900	1000	4,200
4199	Total	1,400	900	900	1,000	4,200
5102	Vehicle maintenance	7000	6000	7000	4000	24,000
5103	Miscellaneous (general)	4000	3000	4000	3000	14,000
5199	Total	16,000	15,000	17,000	11,000	59,000
<b>5200</b>	<b>Reporting costs</b>					
5201	Reporting and Publications	0	0	15000	30000	45,000
5202	Dissemination	3,000	6,000	9,000	10,000	28,000
5220						
5299	Total	3,000	6,000	24,000	40,000	73,000
<b>5300</b>	<b>Sundry</b>					
5301	Telephone	400	600	600	500	2,100
5302	Postage/faxes	200	200	200	300	900
5399	Total	600	800	800	800	3,000
<b>5500</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>					
5501	Conference/seminars - venue/hosting	0	4500	6500	5000	16,000
5502	Administration support	0	3000	3000	3000	9,000
5503	Consultant/s - fee/travel/DSA	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	15,000
5599	Total	0	12,500	14,500	13,000	40,000
<b>5999</b>	<b>Component Total</b>	<b>19,600</b>	<b>34,300</b>	<b>56,300</b>	<b>64,800</b>	<b>175,000</b>
<b>99</b>	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>308,400</b>	<b>253,400</b>	<b>218,800</b>	<b>194,400</b>	<b>975,000</b>

Please note that the activities that will be undertaken by the collaborating institutions shall also include community consultations and, training workshops. These workshops by the collaborating institutions shall be held jointly by these institutions.





## 2. Leveraged resources

Please describe in 50 words the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's global environmental objective.

IUCN Burkina Faso was able to leverage resources for DLWEIP implementation from US Government; while in Kenya, ALRMP heavily subsidized DLWEIP activities on conflict management and resolution  
AWF raised funds from the GEF small grants to upscale reseeded of degraded land in one community conservancy (Naibunga) while the ministry of Livestock sponsored within the AfDB grant the reseeded of more land in other communities in Laikipia district.

## DEFINITIONS AND GUIDANCE

Only those projects which, during FY 2007, have gone through mid-term evaluations or that have been closed are required to report on co-financing and leveraged resources<sup>[1]</sup>.

***“Proposed” co-financing*** refers to co-financing proposed at CEO endorsement.

***Co-financing*** are resources committed by the GEF Implementing and/or Executing Agencies or by other non-GEF source, that will be managed with the GEF allocation as part of the initial financing package for the GEF project and without which the GEF objectives cannot be met. Information should include: co-financing by source, type, and total disbursements by June 30, 2007. Please see Table 1 as the reporting format.

***Leveraged resources*** are defined as additional resources—beyond those committed to the project, itself by GEF and co-financiers at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. As such, leveraged resources do not form part of the committed financing plan at the outset and are not defined as “co-finance”. Leverage is nevertheless a very important indicator of GEF's catalytic effect.

Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and may be from other donors, NGOs, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector.

---

<sup>[1]</sup> The GEF Council approved the GEF policy on Co-financing (C20/6) on September 16, 2002. This policy required that all projects regularly report type and source of co-financing as well as leveraged resources.

## **Annex 9: Terms of Reference for Evaluation**

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

#### **Terminal Evaluation of UNEP/GEF project – Dry land Livestock Wild Life Environment Interface Project (DLWEIP)**

##### **1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW**

The DLWEIP project commenced in August 2005 and completed in July 2008. The aim of the project was to mainstream biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas in Africa through promotion and support to sustainable land management systems for livestock and wildlife to improve community livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and reduce land degradation.

The project was to develop and test good practices at two pilot sites in representative agro-ecological systems, one representing typical West African conditions in Burkina Faso and the other one in Kenya representing the wildlife rich savannah ecosystems in East Africa. The project was to document the good practices and share them with other countries facing similar challenges. African Union's Inter Africa Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAAU- IBAR) was to facilitate the sharing process because of its mandate under Programme Network (TPN) 3 and the internal collaboration with other TPNs of United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) under the guidance of the African Union.

Indicators for progress towards the realization of the project goal included expansion of greater constituency of supporters for mixed production systems as exemplified by their willingness to set more land for livestock and wildlife land use. The improvement of ecological health of the fauna and flora under a mixed production system would be indicative of community support and institutional sustainability of the management system. By the end of the project, the policy framework to govern the operations of local institutions that manage resources at the interface would have been initiated. Locally based conflict resolution institutions would minimize the conflicts between sedentary farmers and transhumance pastoralists in Burkina Faso by building consensus around contested resources along the migratory corridors.

The project was to demonstrate that the mixed wildlife livestock based livelihood system is more sustainable than wildlife or livestock alone , and provides the basis for more sustainable livelihoods than more settled agro-pastoral systems in African Drylands. The project aimed at achieving three major outcomes by capitalizing on the sustainable management of livestock and wildlife mix:

1. Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized or reversed around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites;
2. Community livelihoods improved and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso; and
3. Enhanced awareness of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the interface, leading to scaling up of best practices in other African Drylands rich in wildlife.

Samburu and Laikipia districts in Kenya were role models on community participation and support for the establishment of conservancies where controlled management of livestock is practiced in order to allow the coexistence of wildlife and pastoral production systems. Arly National Park in Burkina Faso provided a good example on how wildlife conservation areas continue to provide corridors and migratory routes for transhumance pastoralists from neighbouring countries of Niger and Benin.

#### Linkages with other projects and UNEP regular work programme

The project is consistent with the GEF Operational Programme no. 13 on Conservation and Sustainable use of Biological Diversity. It is also relevant to the strategic priority on generation and dissemination of best practices for addressing current and emerging biodiversity issues (BD-4). The project also has linkages with GEF Operational Programme no.15 on Sustainable Land Management, as land degradation in Drylands is increasingly destroying good management practices in the conservation of biodiversity, in particular wildlife under sustainable and indigenous agricultural production systems.

#### Executing Arrangements

The implementing Agency was UNEP. AU/ IBAR was the executing agent in charge of the overall technical backstopping of the project with the support of full time country project coordinators and their assistants. AU/ IBAR worked in collaboration with other key partners including Government Departments, IUCN, AWF, ACC, ILRI and local NGOs and CBOs. In Kenya, IUCN, AWF, ACC, and OOP lead some activities and IUCN, DAPF, DGEF, DSV and AT in Burkina Faso. The institutions had a service contract under the supervision of AU-IBAR. The financing of the project activities by the collaborating institutions was through sub-contracts administered through MOUs.

There were two national project steering committees in Kenya and Burkina Faso comprising of the national agencies, ministerial departments, institutes, NGOs and CBOs. The national steering committees provided general oversight and guidance to the project and facilitated interagency coordination.

An international project steering committee comprised of: one representative from UNEP, AU/IBAR, the Office of the President-Arid Lands Resource Management Programme (ALRMP) in Kenya and la Direction Générale des Eaux et Forêts of Burkina Faso and representatives from two key organizations based in Burkina Faso and Kenya, designated by AU/IBAR.

#### Programme Activities

**Component 1:** *Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites*

##### **Activities for component 1:**

1.1 Assessment of the status and trends of natural resources (e.g. water, livestock, wildlife and fodder resources) as well as the impacts of changes, incentive and capacity building measures on the market shares of the derived products.

1.2 Assessment of land use policy frameworks in Kenya, and land tenure systems “gestion des terroirs” in Burkina Faso, at both national and local levels, including customary laws and local bylaws, and strengthening of local-level land-use planning and management.

1.3. Assessment conflict status on natural resources and identification and implementation of conflict resolution mechanisms.

1.4 Assessment of the status of non-sustainable wildlife and natural resources utilization and identification and implementation of sustainable alternatives.

**Component 2: *Community livelihoods improved and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso***

**Activities for Component 2**

2.1 Identification and promotion of sustainable management and rehabilitation of indigenous woodlands (in charcoal burning areas in Kenya; agriculture expansion zones in Burkina Faso).

2.2 Capacity building for local community and institutions- (user associations, stakeholders meetings, inter-sectoral forums and platforms for feedback mechanisms).

2.3 Establishment and support to community conservation initiatives.

2.4. Establishment of community disease control committees and initiatives on local slaughter and marketing of livestock and wildlife products by examining the dynamics of diseases among livestock and wildlife at pilot sites.

**Component 3: *Enhanced awareness of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the livestock-wildlife interface.***

**Activities for Component 3**

3.1 Documentation of the success stories and lessons learnt and sharing of information (experiences in land management and land use and indigenous methodology of collecting and analysing information).

3.2. Identification of the target groups and facilitation of exchange visits for the dissemination of success stories and lessons learnt.

3.3. Identification and training of facilitators and organisation of dissemination workshops and seminars at local, national and Africa regional level.

**Budget**

The total budget was US\$ 3,356,000 with US\$ 975,000 funded by GEF, Co-financing US\$2,356,000 of which in-kind is US\$47300 from government, US\$1,000,000 from bilateral (AU/ IBAR), US\$ 200,000 from NGOs and US\$683,000 from institutions.

## TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION

### **1. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation**

The objective of this terminal evaluation is to establish whether the project achieved its objective of integration of biodiversity conservation at the wildlife/livestock interface production pastoral landscapes in Kenya and Burkina Faso and the future impacts. The evaluation will also assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. In addition, the evaluation will review the recommendations of the mid term Evaluation and their implementation. It will focus on the following main questions:

- A Has the project assisted the pilot areas to adopt sustainable land use practices that support wildlife and livestock management at the interface while conserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation?
- B Has the DLWEIP developed and implemented conflict resolution mechanisms and strategies for resolving and mitigating natural resources based-conflict and human/wildlife/livestock conflicts within project sites in Kenya and for cross-border areas adjacent to Arly National Park in Burkina Faso.
- C Has DLWEIP enhanced the community capacity to utilize available natural resources in a sustainable way?
- D Has the project facilitated the sharing of best practices within communities in both countries and other African member states through the UNCCD TPN3?

### **2. Methods**

This terminal evaluation will be conducted as an in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, key representatives of the executing agencies and other relevant staff are kept informed and consulted throughout the evaluation- as well as representatives of key beneficiaries. The consultant will liaise with the UNEP/EOU and the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager on any logistic and/or methodological issues to properly conduct the review in as independent a way as possible, given the circumstances and resources offered. The draft report will be circulated to UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, key representatives of the executing agencies and the UNEP/EOU. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP / EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary or suggested revisions.

The findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:

- A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
  - a. The project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP and GEF annual Project Implementation Review reports) and relevant correspondence.
  - b. Other project-related material produced by the project staff or partners.
  - c. Relevant material published by GEF and the project team.
- Interviews with project management and technical support including the Project Management in AU/ IBAR, other key partners including Government Departments, IUCN, AWF, ACC, ILRI and local NGOs and CBOs. In Kenya, IUCN, AWF, ACC, and OOP and IUCN, DAPF, DGEF, DSV and AT, ARECOPA, ZOVIC, IUCN in Burkina Faso.

- Interviews with the stakeholders involved with this project. The Consultant shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of donor agencies and other organisations.
- Interviews with the UNEP/DGEF project Task Manager and Fund Management Officer, and other relevant staff in UNEP dealing with biodiversity related activities as necessary.
- Field visits to project sites in Kenya, and Burkina Faso- opportunity to interview with key beneficiaries.
- Evaluator’s vetting of the third and final Tracking Tool for Reporting Progress at Protected Area Sites: Data Sheet completed for this project (Draft to be prepared by project team in advance of evaluation)

### **Key Evaluation principles.**

In attempting to evaluate any outcomes and impacts that the project may have achieved, evaluators should remember that the project’s performance should be assessed by considering the difference between the answers to two simple questions “*what happened?*” and “*what would have happened anyway?*”. These questions imply that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts and potential externalities. In addition it implies that there should be plausible evidence to **attribute** such outcomes and impacts **to the direct or indirect actions of the project.**

Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluator, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance. (*need to review baseline/background information and data available during project formulation*)

### **3. Project Ratings**

The success of project implementation will be rated on a scale from ‘highly unsatisfactory’ to ‘highly satisfactory’. In particular the evaluation shall assess and rate the project with respect to the eleven categories defined below:<sup>141</sup>

#### **A. Attainment of objectives and planned results:**

The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were effectively and efficiently achieved or are expected to be achieved and their relevance.

- **Effectiveness:** *Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives have been met, taking into account the “achievement indicators”. In particular, the analysis of outcomes achieved should include, inter alia, an assessment of the extent to which the communities have integrated biodiversity conservation into livestock management, improved livelihoods and are practicing sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources.*

As far as possible, also assess the potential longer-term impacts considering that the evaluation is taking place upon completion of the project and that longer-term impact is expected to be seen in a few years time. Frame recommendations to enhance future

---

<sup>141</sup> However, the views and comments expressed by the evaluator need not be restricted to these items.

project impact in this context. Which will be the major ‘channels’ for longer term impact from the project at the national and regional scales? The evaluation should formulate recommendations that outline possible approaches and necessary actions to facilitate an impact assessment study in a few years time.

- *Relevance*: In retrospect, were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Ascertain the nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the wider portfolio of the UNEP. What is the contribution of the project to the national related policies and strategies?
- *Efficiency*: Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project leveraged additional resources. Did the project build on earlier initiatives, did it make effective use of available scientific and /or technical information. Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

## **B. Sustainability:**

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, e.g. stronger institutional capacities or better informed decision-making. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes. The evaluation should ascertain to what extent follow-up work has been initiated by relevant stakeholders and how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time.

Four aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks and governance, and ecological. The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

- *Financial resources*. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the likelihood that necessary financial and economic resources will not be available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)? To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support?
- *Socio-political*: Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- *Institutional framework and governance*. To what extent is the sustenance of the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? While responding to these questions

consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.

- *Environmental.* Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.

### **C. Achievement of outputs and activities:**

- Delivered outputs: Assessment of the project's success in producing each of the programmed outputs, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness.
- Assess the soundness and effectiveness of the methodologies used for developing the technical documents and related management options in the targeted project area.
- Assess to what extent the project outputs produced have the weight of scientific authority / credibility, necessary to influence policy and decision-makers, particularly at the local, national and regional level.

### **D. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation systems.**

The evaluation shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The Terminal Evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for 'project design of M&E' and 'the application of the Project M&E plan' (see minimum requirements 1&2 in Annex 4). GEF projects must budget adequately for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources during implementation of the M&E plan. Project managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to adapt and improve the project.

### **M&E during project implementation**

- *M&E design.* The Terminal evaluation should verify that the Project had a sound M&E plans to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. This M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators (see Annex 4) and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.
- *M&E plan implementation.* The Terminal Evaluation should verify that: an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period (perhaps through use of a logframe or similar); annual project reports and Progress Implementation Review (PIR) reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings; that the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs; and that projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities.
- *Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.* The terminal evaluation should determine whether support for M&E was budgeted adequately and was funded in a timely fashion during implementation.

### **E. Replicability/Catalytic role:**

What examples are there of replication and catalytic outcomes? Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Specifically: Evaluation should describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out.

Assess whether the project has potential to be replicated, either in terms of expansion, extension or replication in other countries and/or regions and whether any steps have been taken by the project to do so and the relevance and feasibility of these steps

#### **F. Preparation and Readiness**

Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place?

#### **G. Country ownership/drivenness:**

This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. The evaluation will:

- Assess the level of country ownership. Specifically, the evaluator should assess whether the project was effective in providing and communicating information that catalyzed action in participating countries to improve decisions relating to the biodiversity conservation and land management in protected areas.
- Assess the level of country commitment to address the issues concerning biodiversity conservation and land management at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas.

#### **H. Stakeholder participation / public awareness:**

This consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the UNEP financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project. The evaluation will specifically:

- Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of various public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project.

#### **I. Financial Planning**

Evaluation of financial planning requires assessment of the quality and effectiveness of financial planning and control of financial resources throughout the project's lifetime. Evaluation includes actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co- financing. The evaluation should:

- Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables.
- Present the major findings from the financial audit if one has been conducted.

- Identify and verify the sources of co- financing as well as leveraged and associated financing (in co-operation with the IA and EA).
- Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
- The evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual costs and co-financing for the project prepared in consultation with the relevant UNON/DGEF Fund Management Officer of the project. (table attached in Annex 2 Co-financing and leveraged resources).

**J. Implementation approach:**

This includes an analysis of the project’s management framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management. The evaluation will:

- Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed. In particular, assess the role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable the implementation of the project.
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels (1) policy decisions: Steering Group; (2) day to day project management.
- Assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP/GEF.
- Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project.
- Assess whether the logical framework was used during implementation as a management tool and whether feedback from M&E activities more broadly was used for adaptive management.

**K UNEP Supervision and Backstopping**

- Assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP/DGEF.
- Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project.

The *ratings will be presented in the form of a table*. Each of the eleven categories should be rated separately with brief justifications based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The following rating system is to be applied:

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

#### **4. Evaluation report format and review procedures**

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain; the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible and include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

**The evaluation will rate the overall implementation success of the project and provide individual ratings of the eleven implementation aspects as described in Section 3 of this TOR. The ratings will be presented in the format of a table with brief justifications based on the findings of the main analysis.**

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. Any dissident views in response to evaluation findings will be appended in an annex. The evaluation report shall be written in English, be of no more than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- i) An **executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- ii) **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the evaluated project, for example, the objective and status of activities; The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2006, requires that a TE report will provide summary information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology.
- iii) **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the evaluation's purpose, the evaluation criteria used and questions to be addressed;
- iv) **Project Performance and Impact** providing *factual evidence* relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report. The evaluator should provide a commentary and analysis on all eleven evaluation aspects (A – K above).
- v) **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the evaluator's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given evaluation criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative. The ratings should be provided with a brief narrative comment in a table (see Annex 1);
- vi) **Lessons (to be) learned** presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on good practices and successes or problems and mistakes. Lessons should have the potential for wider application and use. All lessons should 'stand alone' and should:
  - Briefly describe the context from which they are derived
  - State or imply some prescriptive action;
  - Specify the contexts in which they may be applied (if possible, who when and where)
- vii) **Recommendations** suggesting *actionable* proposals for improvement of the current project. In general, Terminal Evaluations are likely to have very few (perhaps two or three) actionable recommendations.

*Prior to each recommendation*, the issue(s) or problem(s) to be addressed by the recommendation should be clearly stated.

A high quality recommendation is an actionable proposal that is:

1. Feasible to implement within the timeframe and resources available
2. Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
3. Specific in terms of who would do what and when
4. Contains results-based language (i.e. a measurable performance target)
5. Includes a trade-off analysis, when its implementation may require utilizing significant resources that would otherwise be used for other project purposes.

viii) **Annexes** may include additional material deemed relevant by the evaluator but must include:

1. The Evaluation Terms of Reference,
2. A list of interviewees, and evaluation timeline
3. A list of documents reviewed / consulted
4. Summary co-finance information and a statement of project expenditure by activity
5. The expertise of the evaluation team. (brief CV).

TE reports will also include any response / comments from the project management team and/or the country focal point regarding the evaluation findings or conclusions as an annex to the report, however, such will be appended to the report by UNEP EOU.

Examples of UNEP GEF Terminal Evaluation Reports are available at [www.unep.org/eou](http://www.unep.org/eou)

### **Review of the Draft Evaluation Report**

Draft reports submitted to UNEP EOU are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DGEF staff and senior Executing Agency staff are allowed to comment on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks feedback on the proposed recommendations. UNEP EOU collates all review comments and provides them to the evaluators for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

### **5. Submission of Final Terminal Evaluation Reports.**

The final report shall be submitted in electronic form in MS Word format

The final evaluation report will be published on the Evaluation and Oversight Unit's web-site [www.unep.org/eou](http://www.unep.org/eou) and may be printed in hard copy. Subsequently, the report will be sent to the GEF Office of Evaluation for their review, appraisal and inclusion on the GEF website.

### **6. Resources and schedule of the evaluation**

This final evaluation will be undertaken by an international evaluator contracted by the Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP. The contract for the evaluator will begin on **1 March 2009 and end on 30 May 2009 (1 month)** spread over 13 weeks. The evaluator will submit a draft report on 30 April 2009 to UNEP/EOU, the UNEP/GEF Project Manager, and key representatives of the executing agencies. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP/EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions. **Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant by 15 May 2009 after which, the consultant will submit the final report no later than 30 May 2009.**

The evaluator will after an initial telephone briefing with EOU and UNEP/GEF then travel to Kenya and Burkina Faso to visit the project sites.

In accordance with UNEP policy, all UNEP projects are evaluated by independent evaluators contracted as consultants by the EOU. The evaluators should have the following qualifications:

The evaluator should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP. The evaluator should be an international environmental expert. The consultant should have the following minimum qualifications: (i) experience in natural resource management and planning (ii) experience with management, implementation and evaluation of projects (iii) experience with ecosystem management related issues (iv) experience in biodiversity especially in the mainstreaming and sustainable utilization of biodiversity. Knowledge of UNEP and GEF Programme and activities is desirable. Fluency in oral and written English and French is necessary.

**TOR Annex 1. OVERALL RATINGS TABLE**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Evaluator's Comments</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Evaluator's Rating</b>
A. Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)			
A. 1. Effectiveness			
A. 2. Relevance			
A. 3. Efficiency			
B. Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)			
B. 1. Financial			
B. 2. Socio Political			
B. 3. Institutional framework and governance			
B. 4. Ecological			
C. Achievement of outputs and activities			
D. Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)			
D. 1. M&E Design			
D. 2. M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)			
D. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities			
E. Replication/Catalytic Role			
F. Preparation and readiness			
G. Country ownership / drivenness			
H. Stakeholders involvement			
I. Financial planning			
J. Implementation approach			
K. UNEP Supervision and backstopping			
Overall Rating			

## RATING OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Please note: Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results may not be higher than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

## RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

A. Sustainability will be understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The Terminal evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-economic incentives /or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes..

### Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Likely(ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

According to the EOU, all the risk dimensions of sustainability are deemed critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in any of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

## RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E

Monitoring is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation may involve the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, and an assessment of actual and expected results.

The Project monitoring and evaluation system will be rated on ‘M&E Design’, ‘M&E Plan Implementation’ and ‘Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities’ as follows:

- Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system. Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

“M&E plan implementation” will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on “M&E plan implementation.”

All other ratings will be on the six point scale.

Performance Description	Alternative description on the same scale
HS = Highly Satisfactory	Excellent
S = Satisfactory	Well above average
MS = Moderately Satisfactory	Average
MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory	Below Average
U = Unsatisfactory	Poor
HU = Highly Unsatisfactory	Very poor

## TOR Annex 2. Co-financing and Leveraged Resources

### *Leveraged Resources*

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO’s, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project’s ultimate objective.

**Table showing final actual project expenditure by activity to be supplied by the UNEP Fund management Officer. (insert here)**

### TOR Annex 3: Review of the Draft Report

Draft reports submitted to UNEP EOU are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and discussion. The UNEP Division staff and senior Executing Agency staff provide comments on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The review also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. UNEP EOU collates the review comments and provides them to the evaluators for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report. General comments on the draft report with respect to compliance with these TOR are shared with the reviewer.

#### Quality Assessment of the Evaluation Report

All UNEP Terminal Evaluation Reports are subject to quality assessments by UNEP EOU. The quality assessment is used as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluator.

The quality of the draft evaluation report is assessed and rated against the following criteria:

Report Quality Criteria	UNEP EOU Assessment notes	Rating
A. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable?		
B. Was the report consistent and the evidence complete and convincing and were the ratings substantiated when used?		
C. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes?		
D. Were the lessons and recommendations supported by the evidence presented?		
E. Did the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?		
F. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of the project M&E system and its use for project management?		
UNEP EOU additional Report Quality Criteria	UNEP EOU Assessment	Rating
G. Quality of the lessons: Were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
H. Quality of the recommendations: Did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can they be implemented?		
I. Was the report well written? (clear English language and grammar)		
J. Did the report structure follow EOU guidelines, were all requested Annexes included?		
K. Were all evaluation aspects specified in the TORs adequately addressed?		
L. Was the report delivered in a timely manner		

### Rating system for quality of terminal evaluation reports

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.

*Quality of the MTE report = 0.3\*(A + B) + 0.1\*(C+D+E+F)*  
*EOU assessment of MTE report = 0.3\*(G + H) + 0.1\*(I+J+K+L)*  
*Combined quality Rating = (2\* 'MTE report' rating + EOU rating)/3*  
*The Totals are rounded and converted to the scale of HS to HU*

## **TOR Annex 4: Minimum requirements for M&E**

### **Minimum Requirement 1: Project Design of M&E<sup>142</sup>**

All projects must include a concrete and fully budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan by the time of Work Program entry (full-sized projects) or CEO approval (medium-sized projects). This plan must contain at a minimum:

- SMART (see below) indicators for project implementation, or, if no indicators are identified, an alternative plan for monitoring that will deliver reliable and valid information to management
- SMART indicators for results (outcomes and, if applicable, impacts), and, where appropriate, corporate-level indicators
- A project baseline, with:
  - a description of the problem to address
  - indicator data
  - or, if major baseline indicators are not identified, an alternative plan for addressing this within one year of implementation
- An M&E Plan with identification of reviews and evaluations which will be undertaken, such as mid-term reviews or evaluations of activities
- An organizational setup and budgets for monitoring and evaluation.

### **Minimum Requirement 2: Application of Project M&E**

- Project monitoring and supervision will include implementation of the M&E plan, comprising:

---

<sup>142</sup> <http://gefweb.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/MEPTools/meptstandards.html>

- Use of SMART indicators for implementation (or provision of a reasonable explanation if not used)
- Use of SMART indicators for results (or provision of a reasonable explanation if not used)
- Fully established baseline for the project and data compiled to review progress
- Evaluations are undertaken as planned
- Operational organizational setup for M&E and budgets spent as planned.

SMART INDICATORS UNEP projects and programs should monitor using relevant performance indicators. The monitoring system should be “SMART”:

1. **Specific:** The system captures the essence of the desired result by clearly and directly relating to achieving an objective, and only that objective.
2. **Measurable:** The monitoring system and its indicators are unambiguously specified so that all parties agree on what the system covers and there are practical ways to measure the indicators and results.
3. **Achievable and Attributable:** The system identifies what changes are anticipated as a result of the intervention and whether the result(s) are realistic. Attribution requires that changes in the targeted developmental issue can be linked to the intervention.
4. **Relevant and Realistic:** The system establishes levels of performance that are likely to be achieved in a practical manner, and that reflect the expectations of stakeholders.
5. **Time-bound, Timely, Trackable, and Targeted:** The system allows progress to be tracked in a cost-effective manner at desired frequency for a set period, with clear identification of the particular stakeholder group to be impacted by the project or program.

**TOR Annex 5: List of intended additional recipients for the Terminal Evaluation (to be completed by the IA Task Manager)**

Name	Affiliation	Email
<b>Government Officials</b>		
<b>GEF Focal Point(s)</b>		
<b>Executing Agency</b>		
<b>Implementing Agency</b>		

## Annex 10: Qualifications of the Evaluator

### 1. ID Particulars:

**Name:** DR. Winston Mathu

**Title:** Consultant- Community Forestry and Woodfuel Development Consultants Ltd. (WOODEC)

**Address:** P.O. Box 14316-00100, Nairobi, Kenya

**Phone:** 254-0733 638540 or 254-721 282425

**E-Mail:** woodec@iconnect.co.ke

### 1. Educational status:

Institution	Degrees/certificates obtained
University of British Columbia-Canada (1983)	PhD in Environmental Sciences-Forestry Management & Biometrics
University of Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania (1977)	MSc in Forestry (Silviculture)
University of New Brunswick-Canada (1971)	BSc in Forestry and Natural Resources Management
University of Nairobi, Kenya (1975)	Certificate in Tropical Ecology
World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF), Nov.1983	Certificate in Agroforestry Research for Development-Training Course No. 18

### 2. Professional experience

Date	Place	Employer	Position	Nature of work
June 2001 to date	Kenya	WOODEC LTD.	Managing Director	Consultant in forestry and environmental development
June 1988 to June 2001 (13 years)	New York, UNDP HQ	UNDP-Office to Combat Desertification	Senior Technical Advisor	Responsible for UNCCD, CBD, and UNFCCC (as GEF focal point); and desertification control programs in East and Southern Africa
Dec. 1985 to June 1988 (3 Years)	Kenya	WOODEC LTD	Managing Director	Consultant in forestry and environmental development
Jan.1979 to Dec. 1985 (7 years)	Nairobi/ Eldoret	University of Nairobi 1979-83 Moi Universities 1983-85	Senior lecturer in forest silviculture and mensuration	Teaching and research in forestry and agroforestry
June 1971 to Jan. 1979 (9 years)	Londiani/ Nyeri/ Forest Research Station Muguga	MENR-Forest Dept.	Assistant Conservator of Forests Senior Research Officer (Silviculture)	Forest administration and management  Forest research

### 3. Language skills: English, Swahili and French (for reading)

#### 4. Experience:

2001 onwards: Principal Consultant leading a multidisciplinary team of experts on Forestry, Bioenergy (biomass and biofuels), Agroforestry, Desertification/Land Degradation, Agriculture, Integrated Rural Community Development programmes and environmentally sound and sustainable Management of Natural Resources (MNR). Specific experiences include Forest policy and law, Forest biometrics/inventory, Renewable Energy, Decentralized Governance of NR, the implementation of the environmental Conventions (UNCCD, CBD and UNFCCC); and the formulation, development and management of community-based wetlands, forestry and conservation programmes and projects. Geographical experience in Africa and the Horn of Africa in particular, including Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda.

#### 5. Most recent (selected) consultancies:

- Consultant to East African Community/Lake Victoria Basin Commission and Embassy of Finland- Regional Facilitator to define the East African Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade- September to October 2008
- Consultant to WWF- East African Regional Office (EARPO)- Evaluation of the Mara River Basin Management Initiative- April 2008
- Consultant to the United Nations Forum on Forests- Background document to UNFF8 global forum- May to July 2008
- Consultant to African Academy of Sciences (AAS)/Africa Forest Research Network (AFORNET)- Review on Forest Law Enforcement and Governance (FLEG) in Kenya- April to June 2007
- Consultant to UNDP Somalia: Drought mitigation and Livelihoods programme: Formulating and managing Drought Mitigation and Sustainable Livelihood programme and Sustainable Energy: June 2004 to December 2006- as senior Technical Advisor
- Consultant to UNEP-Global Environment Facility (GEF)- Formulation of an IGAD Medium-Sized Project (MSP) and PDF-B on Land Degradation: *“Sustainable Land Management in the IGAD Region through capacity building in Environment Assessment and Monitoring”*: March 2004 to Dec 2005-
- Consultant to United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) Secretariat-Bonn, *May to July 2005*: Developing a Framework Programme of cooperation between UNCCD Secretariat and United Nations Volunteers (UNV) for the implementation of “Youth and the Environment” programme in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean and Asia.
- Consultant to UNDP-Drylands Development Center- Programme development, formulation and evaluation-*July 2001 to June 2002*.
- Consultant to Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) as advisor on restructuring the IGAD Sub-regional Action Programme for combating Drought and Desertification-*November 2001 to December 2002*.

- Consultant to UNAMA-Afghanistan: Formulation of a framework project: Integrated Post Drought Recovery and Development Programme (IPDR&D)- *15 October to 30th November 2003*
- Consultant to WWF-EARPO on Conservation and Community-Based projects: evaluation and projects formulation-*May 2003*
- Consultant to WWF-Tanzania Programme Office on Mid-Term Evaluation of the Udzungwa Mountains National Park project-*November 2003 to January 2004.*
- Consultant to WWF- Coastal Forest Programme- Preparation of the Eastern Africa Coastal Forests Ecoregion- Strategic Framework for Conservation: January to June 2004
- Consultant to UNDP Drylands Development Centre, Nairobi- *June 2004 to February 2005*: Preparation of Manual on Decentralized Governance of Natural Resources based on a global study-(draft manual available)

## 6. References

1. Mr. Philip Dobie, Director, UNDP/Drylands Development Centre based at UNEP in Nairobi  
P.O Box 30218  
Nairobi.  
Tel. 254-20-7622010 Nairobi  
Email: philip.dobie@undp.org
2. Prof. Benson Mochoge  
Director, Agriculture and Environment Division  
IGAD Secretariat  
P.O Box 2653, Djibouti  
Tel. 253-354050  
Email: igad@intnet.dj
3. Mr. Mohamed Awer  
WWF-Eastern Africa Regional Programme Office  
P.O. Box 62440  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Mawer@wwfearpo.org

## 7. Membership

- Member- National Steering Committee for Small Grants Programme of the GEF
- Board Member- Kenya Forest Research Institute (KEFRI)
- Member, Forestry Society of Kenya

## 8. Selected recent publication

1. Decentralized Governance of Natural Resources- Manual and Guidelines for Practitioners- *UNDP publication- 2005*
2. The Eastern Africa Coastal Forests Ecoregion- Strategic Framework for Conservation- 2005-2025: *WWF publication- 2004*
3. Implementing the Millennium Development Goals in the Drylands of the World- *UNDP publication: 2006*
4. East African Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT)- *Proceedings of the regional workshop to define an East African FLEGT programme- EAC- Lake Victoria Basin Commission- 2008*
5. Challenges and Opportunities for Rural Development in Dryland areas of Somalia:- *UNDP Somalia and UNDP Drylands Development Centre (DDC) presentation to the EU Expert Consultation Workshop to elaborate a support strategy to marginal areas in Somalia- Nov. 2004*

**Annexe 11: List of Intended Additional Recipients for the Terminal Evaluation**

*(Completed by the IA Task Manager)*

Name	Affiliation	Email
Aaron Zazueta	GEF Evaluation Office	azazueta@thegef.org
<b>Government Officials</b>		
<b>GEF Focal Point(s)</b>		
<b>Executing Agency</b>		
<b>Implementing Agency</b>		
Carmen Tavera	UNEP DGEF Portfolio Manager	

---

<sup>i</sup> Key Issues in the Livestock Sub-Sector for Inclusion in the CAADP Pillar Frameworks-see Annex....Doc No.

---