

**Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife
Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated
Approach (IWT-Kenya)**

State Department for Wildlife
Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife, Kenya



Supported by:



Led by:



In Partnership with:



GEF-UNDP Nationally Implemented Project (UNDP Atlas Project ID: 00108255)

Report of the Mid-Term Review

of

Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated Approach (IWT) Project

UNDP/GEF Project (UNDP PIMS ID: 5468 GEF ID No: 9659)

MTR time frame: 11 May and 21 July 2022

Date of MTR report: 29 August 2022

Region and countries included in the project: Africa/Kenya

GEF Operational Focal Area/Strategic Program: Biodiversity

Executing Agency/Implementing Partner: UNDP/Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife (MoTW)

MTR team members: Evans Mwangi and Benard Abingo

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank all the project partners who gave their time to respond to our requests for meetings and interviews. In particular, we acknowledge the assistance accorded to us by Dr Erustus Kanga (MoTW), Dickson Ritan of the Kenya Wildlife Service, Lauren Friedman (UNODC), Jill Barasa (ICCF) and Dickson Kaelo of KWCA. From UNDP, we thank Evelyn Koech, Washington Ayiemba, Geoffrey Omedo, Mandy Cadman, Onesimus Muhwezi, Hiwot Gebremeskel and Valerie Munyetti. We also wish to acknowledge the numerous respondents and meeting participants who shared useful insights with us from the KWS offices at the Tsavo Conservation Area and Narok, Taita Taveta County Government, Narok County Government, Taita Taveta Wildlife Conservancies Association, African Wildlife Foundation, Kasigau Ranch, Masai Mara Reserve, and Maasai Mara Wildlife Conservancy Association.

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	IV
GLOSSARY OF EVALUATION-RELATED TERMS	V
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	VII
PROJECT INFORMATION TABLE.....	VII
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	VIII
PROJECT PROGRESS SUMMARY.....	VIII
<i>Relevance</i>	<i>viii</i>
<i>Effectiveness</i>	<i>viii</i>
<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>viii</i>
<i>Impact</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Sustainability</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Cross-cutting issues</i>	<i>ix</i>
MTR RATINGS AND ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY TABLE	IX
<i>Table 1: MTR ratings & achievement summary for Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated Approach (IWT) Project</i>	<i>X</i>
CONCISE SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS	XIII
LESSONS LEARNED.....	XIII
RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY TABLE.....	XIII
<i>Table 2: summary of MTR recommendations</i>	<i>xiii</i>
2.0 INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY	1
2.1 PURPOSE OF THE MTR AND OBJECTIVES.....	1
2.1.1 <i>Conceptual Framework</i>	1
2.2 SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY.....	2
2.2.1 <i>Principles of design and execution of the MTR</i>	2
2.2.2 <i>MTR approach and data collection methods</i>	2
2.2.3 <i>Data analysis and interpretation</i>	4
<i>Table 3: Ratings for Progress Towards Results</i>	4
2.3 LIMITATIONS TO THE MTR.....	4
2.4 STRUCTURE OF THE MTR REPORT	5
3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT	5
3.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	5
3.2 PROBLEMS THAT THE PROJECT SOUGHT TO ADDRESS.....	5
3.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND STRATEGY.....	6
3.3.1 <i>Theory of Change</i>	7
3.4 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS.....	7
4.0 FINDINGS.....	7
4.1 ON THE PROJECT STRATEGY	7
4.1.1 <i>Alignment with the Global Wildlife Program and Theory of Change</i>	8
4.1.2 <i>Alignment with United Nations Country Team priorities and UNDP Country Programme</i>	8
<i>Table 4: Alignment with United Nations Country Team (UNCT) Priorities and UNDP Country Programme</i>	8
4.1.3 <i>Alignment with national strategies aspirations, and plans</i>	9
4.2 ON THE PROJECT DESIGN.....	9
4.2.1 <i>Overall relevance</i>	9
4.2.2 <i>Relevance to community needs</i>	10

4.2.3 Effectiveness	10
4.3 PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS	10
4.3.1 Progress towards project results and outcomes analysis	11
Table 5: Progress towards Project Results - Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.....	12
4.3.2 Progress towards overall objective	19
4.3.3 Progress toward achievement of component indicators	19
4.3.4 Progress towards translating resources into intended results.....	19
Table 6: Progress towards overall Project Objective.....	20
Table 7: Progress towards Component 1. Strengthening national and local capacity for effective IWT control in Kenya	22
Table 8: Progress towards Component 2. Reducing poaching and illegal wildlife trade in threatened species in Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems	23
Table 9: Progress towards Component 3. Strengthening Community Wildlife Conservancies in Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems	23
Table 10: Progress towards Component 4. Knowledge Management, M&E and Gender Mainstreaming.....	25
4.3.5 Factors contributing the Results Framework/Logframe	26
4.3.6 Catalytic Nature of the project	27
4.3 REMAINING BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE	27
4.3.1 Factors Challenging the Achievement of Results	27
4.4 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT	30
4.4.1 Management and Coordination.....	30
4.4.2 Work Planning	30
4.4.3 Finance and co-finance	31
4.4.4 Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems	33
4.4.5 Stakeholder Engagement, Collaboration and Partnerships	33
4.4.6 Reporting	33
4.4.7 Knowledge Management and Communications	33
4.5 IMPACT OF THE IWT PROJECT	34
4.5.1 Intended Results.....	34
4.5.2 Unintended Results	36
4.6 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES	36
4.6.1 Social and Environmental Standards	37
4.6.2 Gender Equality.....	37
4.6.3 Human Rights.....	38
4.7 SUSTAINABILITY	38
4.7.1 Risks to Sustainability	39
5.0 LESSONS LEARNED	40
6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	41
6.1 CONCLUSIONS	41
6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	42
7.0 ANNEXES	44
7.1 ANNEX 1: EVALUATION MATRIX.....	44
7.2 ANNEX 2: PROJECT PARTNERS CONSULTED	52
7.3 ANNEX 3: MIDTERM REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE	58
7.3 ANNEX 4: EVALUATION TIME FRAME	62
7.4 ANNEX 5: PARTIAL LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	64

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AWF	African Wildlife Foundation
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CA	Conservancy Association
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resources Management
CBWM	Community-based Wildlife Management
CG	County Government
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
CO	Country Office
COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease - 19
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DSA	Daily Subsistence Allowances
EAC	East African Community
EMP	Ecosystem Management Plan
FGD	Focus Group Discussions
FSP	Full Sized Project
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GEMP	General Ecosystem Management Plan
GK	Government of Kenya
GWP	Global Wildlife Program
HRBA	Human Rights-Based Approach
HWC	Human-Wildlife Conflict
ICCF	International Conservation Caucus Foundation
ICCWC	International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime
IFAW	International Fund for Animal Welfare
IPs	Implementing Partners
IRRF	Integrated Results and Resources Framework
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
IWT	Illegal Wildlife Trade
JKIA	Jomo Kenyatta International Airport
KFS	Kenya Forest Service
KII	Key Informant Interviews
KM	Knowledge Management
KRA	Kenya Revenue Authority
KWCA	Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association
KWS	Kenya Wildlife Service
LAMP	Leadership and Management Training
LPAC	Local Project Appraisal Committee
LTA	Long Term Agreements
MEAs	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
MMNR	Maasai Mara National Reserve
MMWCA	Maasai Mara Wildlife Conservancies Association
MT&W	Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NIM	National Implementation Modality
NPS	National Police Service

NRM	Natural Resources Management
ODPP	Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions
PA	Protected Area
PIF	Project Implementation Framework
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PMSU	Programme Management Support Unit
PMU	Project Management Unit
RBM	Results-Based Management
RP	Responsible Party
SaES	Social and Environmental Screening
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SES	Social and Environmental Standards
SESP	Social and Environmental Screening Procedure
SMT	Senior Management Team
SoC	Scene of Crime
STE	Shared Transboundary Ecosystem
STEs	Shared Transboundary Ecosystems
TA	Technical Assistance
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TBD	To Be Determined
TFCAs	Trans-Frontier Conservation Areas
TSG	Tsavo Conservation Group
TTCG	Taita Taveta County Government
TTWCA	Taita Taveta Wildlife Conservancies Association
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	UN Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDP-GEF	UNDP-Global Environmental Facility
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNSDCF	United Nations Kenya Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
WCO	World Customs Organization
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

Glossary of Evaluation-related Terms

Term	Definition
Baseline data	Data that describe the situation to be addressed by an intervention and serve as the starting point for measuring the performance of the intervention
Beneficiaries	The specific individuals or organizations for whose benefit an intervention is undertaken
Capacity development	The process by which individuals, organizations, institutions, and societies develop their abilities individually and collectively to perform functions, solve problems and set and achieve objectives
Conclusion	A reasoned judgement based on a synthesis of empirical findings or factual statements corresponding to a specific circumstance
Effect	Intended or unintended change due directly or indirectly to an intervention

Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved or are expected to be achieved
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results
Finding	A factual statement about the programme or project based on empirical evidence gathered through monitoring and evaluation activities.
Impact	Positive and negative, intended and non-intended, directly and indirectly, long term effects produced by a development intervention
Indicator	Quantitative or qualitative factors that provide a means to measure the changes caused by an intervention.
Lessons learned	Generalizations based on evaluation experiences that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations
Logframe (logical framework approach)	Management tool used to facilitate the planning, implementation and evaluation of an intervention. It involves identifying strategic elements (activities, outputs, outcome, impact) and their causal relationships, indicators, and assumptions that may affect success or failure. Based on RBM (results-based management) principles
Outcome	The likely or achieved (short-term and/or medium-term) effects of an intervention's outputs
Output	The product, capital goods and/or service which results from an intervention; may also include a change resulting from the intervention which is relevant to the achievement of an outcome
Rating	An instrument for forming and validating a judgement on the relevance, performance and success of a programme or project through the use of a scale with numeric, alphabetic and/or descriptive codes
Recommendation	A proposal for action to be taken in a specific circumstance, including the parties responsible for that action
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of an intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donor policies
Risk	Factor, normally outside the scope of an intervention, which may affect the achievement of an intervention's objectives
Sustainability	The continuation of benefits from an intervention, after the development assistance has been completed
Stakeholders	The specific individuals or organizations that have a role and interest in the objectives and implementation of a programme or project
Theory of Change	A set of assumptions, risks and external factors that describes how and why an intervention is intended to work.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project information Table

Project Title	Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated Approach		
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #):	5468	PIF Approval Date:	Jun 4, 2015
GEF Project ID (PMIS #):	9659	CEO Endorsement Date:	Mar 6, 2018
ATLAS Business Unit, Award # Proj. ID:	00108406/00108255	Project Document (ProDoc) Signature Date (date project began):	Jul 5, 2019
Country(ies):	Kenya	Date project manager hired:	April 2021
Region:	Africa	Inception Workshop date:	Jun 17, 2021
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Midterm Review completion date:	July 21, 2022
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:	Address direct drivers to protect habitats and species	Original planned closing date:	Jul 5, 2024
Trust Fund [indicate GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]:	GEF Trust Fund	If revised, proposed op. closing date:	n/a
Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner:		UNDP/Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife	
Other execution partners:			
Project Financing	<i>at CEO endorsement (US\$)</i>	<i>at Midterm Review (US\$)*</i>	
[1] GEF financing:	3,826,605	521,891	
[2] UNDP contribution:			
[3] Government:	8,750,000	902,500	
[4] Other partners:	6,615,663	1,266,960	
[5] Total co-financing [2 + 3 + 4]:	15,365,663	2,169,460	
PROJECT TOTAL COSTS [1 + 5]	19,192,268	2,691,351	

* [drawn from the last PIR]

Co-Financing Table					
Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement (US\$)	Actual Amount Contributed at stage of Midterm Review (US\$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
National Government	Government (MoTW)	In-Kind	8,750,000	877,500	10.03
Local Government	CG Taita Taveta	Grants	960,211	0	0.00
CSO	Tsavo Conservation Group	Grants	2,260,452	0	0.00
CSO	KWCA	In-Kind	275,000	113,960	41.44
CSO	MMWCA	In-Kind	2,900,000	890,000	30.69
CSO	MMWCA	Grants	220,000	200,000	90.91
Local Government	CG Narok	Grants	n/a	25,000	
Donor Agency	UNODC	Grants	n/a	35,000	
CSO	Space for Giants	Grants	n/a	10,000	
CSO	WWF Kenya	Grants	n/a	9,000	
CSO	AWF	Grants	n/a	9,000	
Total			15,365,663	2,169,460	14.12

Project Description

The *Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated Approach (IWT Kenya)* project aims to combat poaching and illegal wildlife trade, among the key factors contributing to wildlife decline in the East African Community region. It focuses on law enforcement through community involvement and coordinated approaches within and between wildlife management and other security agencies. The project seeks to strengthen national and local capacity for effective IWT control; reduce poaching and illegal wildlife trafficking in threatened species in Tsavo and Mara ecosystems; strengthen Community Wildlife Conservancies; promote knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation and; gender mainstreaming.

Project Progress Summary

The midterm review (MTR) of the project, undertaken between 11 May and 21 July 2022 and covering the implementation period from 5 July 2019 to-date, involved partners, national and local stakeholders. It assesses all aspects of the project focusing on each the objective and outcomes.

Relevance

The evaluation findings revealed that the IWT project is relevant to the priorities of the National Government and is aligned to the National Wildlife Strategy 2030, Kenya Vision 2030, Wildlife Conservation and Management Act 2013 and National Wildlife Policy 2020. In addition, it addresses the needs of the people of Kenya and in particular communities in Taita Taveta and Narok counties. This is underscored by support to community-led conservancies which have become the preferred avenue for securing land rights, settling resource use conflicts, pasture management, and managing droughts. Further, the project addresses UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2018-2022 and United Nations Country Team (UNCT) priorities in its engagement with the government as defined by the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2018-2022. The project is also in line with the new UNDP CPD (2022–2026). It also contributes to the Global Wildlife Program (GWP) by fostering partnership in wildlife conservation and related crime prevention.

Effectiveness

Project effectiveness was analyzed based on the four project outcomes and their requisite indicators in the four result areas. It was apparent that the project has begun making significant inroads towards establishing a highly coordinated multiagency approach within and between wildlife management and law enforcement authorities. These are however still in their primordial stages, largely because of the delayed startup. Overall, the review established that a number of outcomes have been achieved or partially achieved, while others remained off-track half-way through the implementation. On-track outcomes included the stabilization in populations of flagship species, decrease in numbers poached annually, increase in wildlife law enforcement and IWT control capacity, increase in area of newly established conservancies, reduced rate of retaliatory killing of elephants and increase in average annual household income from wildlife conservation. Despite the challenges associated mainly with delayed start-up, the MTR found that overall effectiveness of efforts towards combating poaching and illegal wildlife trafficking is **"Moderately Satisfactory"**.

Efficiency

Project expenditure for the period June 2021-May 2022 reflects a low level of efficiency which is rated as **"Highly Unsatisfactory"** and is directly attributable to the delay in startup and long procurement processes. Accelerated implementation and restructuring can improve this considerably. However, the

management demonstrated requisite oversight capacity, efficient and responsive commitment and, considering the initial challenges, activity implementation was coherent. The project demonstrated high efficiency with resource utilization once procedural impediments were overcome. Ability to efficiently turn available resources into outcomes explains the "Highly Satisfactory" rating in some of the results.

Impact

The project has made significant inroads in combating poaching and illegal wildlife trafficking and has resulted in increased capacity to conduct surveillance within the Tsavo and Mara ecosystems. This was stimulated by the provision of the 4 antipoaching vehicles and 20 motor bikes to the two landscapes. These have been instrumental in enhancing deterrent strategies through increased surveillance. This is complemented by enhanced investigations, intelligence gathering, faster response, and more effective collection of evidence at crime scenes. As a consequence, poaching and the amount of bush meat from the two ecosystems have been reduced significantly.

Sustainability

Project sustainability is drawn from its relevance to, and alignment with the national legislative and policy instruments, which give it leverage in supporting the delivery of the national agenda on wildlife protection. The planning and execution of activities were consultative and inclusive. The fact that relevant lead roles in execution of activities were given to key responsible parties at the design phase strengthened collective ownership of the project results. Cross pollination of skills and knowledge has created requisite capacity among the various actors for the successful project implementation and built a firm foundation for the future.

Cross-cutting issues

The MTR revealed that while gender considerations were prioritized in the design of the project, the participation of women during implementation has been below expectation. There were targeted interventions like capacity building specific to marginalized groups such as the youth, but no evidence was adduced to show that people living with disability were involved.

The evaluation established that social and environmental safeguards were adequately provided for at the design stage and are being monitored and documented through ATLAS. The first PIR however noted that these have not been appropriately flagged and therefore require more careful monitoring, especially recognizing that the project has not yet developed safeguards management plans. An exercise undertaken just before and concurrent with the MTR did not identify any new risks, or existing risks that had become more severe. Neither had any categorization changed in the project's safeguards screening.

MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary Table

The MTR ratings and achievement are summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1: MTR ratings & achievement summary for Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated Approach (IWT) Project

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	Project Objective: 5 on a 6-point scale.	<p>Satisfactory</p> <p>The project design was founded on a sound strategy that is proving to be effective in reaching the desired results and at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results achieved so far.</p>
Progress towards Results	Project Objective: 5 on a 6-point scale.	<p>Satisfactory</p> <p>Average 65% of mid-term targets over baselines for indicators 1-4.</p> <p>Indicator 1: no new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste in Tsavo and the Mara.</p> <p>Indicator 2: 512 males and 138 females directly benefitting in the project area from CBWM and other forms of sustainable NRM as a result of the project – from baseline of zero (0) and a mid-term target of 868 males and 372 females.</p> <p>Indicator 3: Populations of flagship species in the project areas - mid-term targets achieved with populations maintained at baseline levels in Tsavo: elephants (14964) buffalo (8051) giraffe (4314) rhino (275), and in the Mara: elephants (2,595) buffalo (11604) giraffe (2,109) rhino (54).</p> <p>Indicator 4: Number of individuals of flagship species poached annually in the project areas - decrease by at least 20% - in Tsavo: zero (0) elephants from 3 at baseline, zero (0) rhino from 2 at baseline and in the Mara: zero (0) elephants from 0 at baseline and zero (0) rhino: 1 at baseline.</p>
	Outcome 1: 1 on a 6-point scale.	<p>Highly Unsatisfactory</p> <p>Average 25% of mid-term targets over baselines for indicators 5-7.</p> <p>Indicator 5: capacity of key National Wildlife Crime Enforcement Agency to control IWT achieved a UNDP scorecard of 80%, beyond the mid-term target of , 75% above a baseline of 70% - the only indicator to be rated Highly Satisfactory for this outcome.</p> <p>Indicator 6: National Anti-Poaching Strategy is non-existent, against a mid-term target of a draft submitted to GoK for approval.</p>

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
		Indicator 7: Strengthened institutional capacity to combat IWT as indicated by a) the ICCWC Indicator Framework and b) National subset of indicator targets – no data provided for these, against which mid-term targets were to be determined at baseline.
	Outcome 2: 6 on a 6-point scale.	<p>Highly Satisfactory</p> <p>Average 84% of mid-term targets over baselines for indicators 8-9.</p> <p>Indicator 8: Annual results of IWT law enforcement in in the project areas - in Tsavo: a) 35 suspects prosecuted out of 42 arrests; 2.36 kg of ivory seized relative to a mid-term target of 14.16 kg and 11.8 kg at baseline; 236 kg of bushmeat seized against mid-term target of 1414 kg and 1178 kg at baseline; the ratio of prosecutions to arrests stood at 83% [all these compared to a mid-term target of an increase by at least by 20% over baseline]. In the Mara, 6 suspects prosecuted out of 8 arrests; 97 kg of ivory seized relative to a mid-term target of 48.12 kg and 40.1 kg at baseline; 601 kg of bushmeat seized against mid-term target of 74 kg and 0 kg at baseline; the ratio of prosecutions to arrests stood at 100% [all these compared to a mid-term target of an increase by at least by 20% over baseline]</p> <p>Indicator 9: METT score for Masai Mara NR - no data provided against a mid-term target of 67 and a baseline of 62.</p>
	Outcome 3: 6 on a 6-point scale.	<p>Highly Satisfactory</p> <p>Average 231% of mid-term targets over baselines for indicators 10-12.</p> <p>Indicator 10: Total area of newly established conservancies with improved wildlife and natural resource management - 3,521 ha achieved in the Mara, against at least 1,600 ha mid-term target.</p> <p>Indicator 11: Annual rate of retaliatory killing of elephants in the project areas (animals/ year) – in Taita Taveta, 5, a decrease by 54% compared to a mid-term target of at least 20% decrease from a baseline of 11. In Narok, 3, a decrease by 57% compared to a mid-term target of at least 20% decrease from a baseline of 7.</p> <p>Indicator 12: Percentage increase in average annual household income from wildlife conservation and implementation of SLM in the target conservancies - an increase by 6% against a mid-term target of at least 4% increase though the baseline was to be established at the inception phase.</p>

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
	Outcome 4: 1 on a 6-point scale.	<p>Highly Unsatisfactory</p> <p>Average 9% of mid-term targets over baselines for indicators 13-14.</p> <p>Indicator 13: Number of the lessons on IWT control and CBNRM learned by the Project that are identified and shared with other national and international projects - no data provided against a mid-term target of ≥ 2 and a baseline of zero(0).</p> <p>Indicator 14: Number of women participating in targeted gender-proactive investment, empowerment and capacity building activities at project sites -138 against mid-term target of 750 and a baseline of zero(0).</p>
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	4 on a 6-point scale.	<p>Moderately Satisfactory</p> <p>Substantial actions have been taken in the past one year, including stakeholder engagement and mobilization and partners taking up their designated roles in the PSC.</p>
Sustainability	3 on a 4-point scale.	<p>Moderately Likely</p> <p>There are great prospects for sustainability based on relevance and alignment with key national legislative and policy instruments, focus on ecosystem management planning, and having a multiplier effect among other attributes.</p>

Concise summary of conclusions

Overall, the project design and implementation so far are both appropriate and have been effective in producing the desired outputs with relevance to the local and national country context. The project contains aspects that are sustainable beyond its lifetime. Further, it has been a catalytic instrument in creating learning and knowledge sharing among government, partners and conservancies. The project management has been effective in enhancing delivery of outcomes, leading to perceptible efficiency in turning resources into results through multi-stakeholder engagement and community participation. It is on course towards achieving the desired results and outputs and can, if tweaked appropriately, deliver most of its targets. To succeed and inspire sustainability beyond current funding, it should remain focused on strengthening key actors and enhancing their ability to function, as well as mobilize resources for maintaining the conservancies.

Lessons learned

A number of lessons can be learnt from the implementation of the IWT Kenya project so far, as summarized below.

Lesson 1: A project well-aligned with existing needs and with capacity building integrated in the design increases sustainability, ownership and a shared vision.

Lesson 2: A flexible project design would allow for adoption of effective adaptive management, and inability to provide on-granting would have been mitigated by allowing for more UNDP involvement in the administration of funds.

Lesson 3: The immense potential of RPs in accelerating the project delivery can only be realized if they could be funded more directly.

Lesson 4: Substantial opportunity is being lost in not leveraging on new communication and technology, social media or local community radios to raise public awareness on the negative impacts of IWT.

Lesson 5: Stiffer penalties and more punitive jail terms imposed by court officers whose awareness of the wildlife security issues are resulting in reduced poaching incidences, deliberate engagement with court officers no doubt enhances the application of law in deterring poaching and illegal trafficking.

Lesson 6: Multi-agency, broad stakeholder and community engagement results in stronger partnerships and collaboration with enhanced potential for long-term sustainability. The promise for success lies in closer and more inclusive engagement.

Recommendations Summary Table

Based on the evaluation findings, the MTR arrived at the recommendations below. The MTR culminated in four recommendations as summarized in Table 2 below.

<i>Table 2: summary of MTR recommendations</i>		
Rec #	Key recommendation	Entity Responsible
A	<i>Increased national and local capacity to fight wildlife crime (Outcome 1)</i>	
A.1	Exploit all the avenues for adaptive management in the project design and take proactive measures to fast-track delivery of quality results, notably through a reconsideration of the implementation modality to allow UNDP move resources to the RPs, more use of partnerships and technical	PSC, MoTW, Treasury, UNDP

	assistance, enhanced project oversight and concentration of effort on quick-wins. The PSC, MoTW, Treasury and UNDP must roll out a rescue plan during the current and next quarters of the AWP and safeguard the PMU against loss of momentum.	
A.2	Revamp the PMU and encourage it to explore all the avenues for adaptive management in the project design and take proactive measures to fast-track delivery by employing every tactic acceptable in the rulebook. To overcome the underlying or perceived structural problem in project management, MoTW should officially second relevant staff to the PMU and the National Project Director should immediately initiate action that goes beyond providing contingency measures.	MoTW, PMU
A.3	Leverage on UNDP's comparative strength to help further fast-track the passing and adoption of ecosystem management plans by the Narok and Taita Taveta county governments, and the establishment of Anti-poaching Task force in the Mara ecosystem. This requires concerted action by the UNDP Country Office Programme Officer, the Project Manager/Coordinator, and National Project Director within the current AWP.	UNDP CO, MoTW, PMU
B	<i>Lessons learned by the project through participatory M&E and gender mainstreaming are used nationally and internationally (Outcome 4)</i>	
B.1	Prioritize specific interventions identified by the MTR, ranging from the development of clear field monitoring plans and allocating sufficient monitoring and evaluation budget to guide field monitoring activities, developing knowledge management plans, training staff on RBM to enhance the quality of results reporting and lesson learning, developing and institutionalizing a Gender Action Plan and, capacity building of TTWCA to enable the association to effectively play its role of a strategic RP. Immediate action by the PMU, with Project Manager/Coordinator taking direct responsibility, is required within the current AWP or the first quarter of the next AWP.	MoTW, PMU

2.0 INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

The midterm review (MTR) of the *Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated Approach (IWT Kenya)* project was undertaken between 11 May and 21 July 2022. It was commissioned by UNDP-GEF and the Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife to provide an impartial assessment of progress and covered the implementation period of 5 July 2019 to the current date. The review involved partners national and local stakeholders in assessing the project's relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; sustainability; gender, inclusivity, and human rights during its implementation.

Prior to the onset, the evaluation team was appraised about the progress and action plans for several off-track outcomes that had exposed the project to being flagged as high-risk. The review laid particular emphasis on areas of low or non-achievement of progress and embarked on establishing reasons for this. Throughout, the team remained cognizant about the principles and policies that guide such assessments and endeavored to exercise utmost personal and professional integrity. The review was led by propriety and ethics in the various steps while protecting the rights and confidentiality of persons interviewed.

2.1 Purpose of the MTR and Objectives

The overall purpose of the MTR was to assess the progress made in the implementation of project, aimed at assessing the achievement of objectives and outcomes and identifying early signs of success or failure. The goal was to bring out the project's strengths and weaknesses, and determine any changes necessary for setting the project on-track to achieving its intended results. Findings would help shed light on the need to either stay on course, change trajectory or downscale any activities with a view to maximizing their chances of success.

The specific objectives of the review were to:

- i) Assess the relevance and strategic positioning of the project to Kenya's efforts towards ecosystem conservation, combating poaching and reducing illegal wildlife trafficking.
- ii) Evaluate the progress made towards project results and whether there are any unintended results, and implications for ongoing and future UNDP programming.
- iii) Establish whether the project management, approaches and strategies were well-conceived and efficient in delivering the project results.
- iv) Analyze the extent to which the project enhances the application of gender mainstreaming and human-rights-based approach, and participation of other socially vulnerable groups such as the youth and persons living with disability.
- v) Determine broader achievements, challenges, opportunities, and lessons learnt and make recommendations for accelerating Kenya's efforts towards eradicating poaching and illegal wildlife trafficking.

2.1.1 Conceptual Framework

The review was based on the rationale that there were cohesive linkages in the complex interactions between the project objective, activities, results and anticipated outcomes. It commenced with an initial appreciation of the relationship between project objectives expected results or outcomes and mapping out how these would converge at coherent conclusions. Based on this, the team identified what might have conceived as independent and/or dependent variables in the project design, and how any of these could have been construed as having a cause-and-effect relationship. Determining what needed to be established gave the approach and method a clear focus for visualizing the anticipated end-points for the various monitoring indicators, and for mapping out how these translate from baselines to interim results.

2.2 Scope and Methodology

2.2.1 Principles of design and execution of the MTR

This evaluation was guided by the Monitoring and Evaluation Policy that requires a Mid-Term Review (MTR) for GEF financed projects and related documents. The MTR serves to provide the Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife (MoTW), Global Environmental Facility (GEF), UNDP, national stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment and serve as a means of quality assurance.

2.2.2 MTR approach and data collection methods

The MTR was conducted in accordance with the *Guidance for conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*. It assessed the project design and implementation modalities and processes. It also assessed deliverables, management arrangements and achievements against planned results, covering the period from the effective start date [5 July 2019] to May 2022. The review followed a participatory and consultative approach that ensured close engagement with implementing partners and direct beneficiaries, and covered deskwork and visits to the project sites in the Tsavo Conservation Area and the Mara ecosystem.

The review analyzed the project's strategy, progress to results, implementation and adaptive management and its risks to sustainability as set out in the Scope of Work in the ToRs. As a monitoring tool, the review sought to arrive at findings would inform the identification of challenges and mitigation actions to ensure that the project achieves maximum results at completion. It drew recommendations that provide direction on all angles of project. The review assessed the potential impact of the project management structure and staff turnover on operational effectiveness, with the main thrust being to generate ideas that might help spur action from government. It involved five steps namely;

- a) Inception: during which a draft inception report was prepared outlining expectations and an agreed evaluation approach/methodology and delivery plan, which put into consideration the COVID-19 situation in Kenya. Approval for this was obtained from the Programme Management Support Unit (PMSU).
- b) Data collection: using the agreed approach, methodology and tools, evidence was collected from multiple sources through literature review, key informant interviews, focus group discussions and field site visits.
- c) Data analysis and development of the draft report: the data obtained in the preceding step were analyzed to draw relevant findings, lessons, and conclusions. These were compiled into a draft report.
- d) Compilation of interim findings: an interim draft report was prepared and submitted to the UNDP M&E office as requested, and further developed for review by the PMSU and presentation to the Senior Management Team (SMT).
- e) Final report development: the final MTR report was prepared by incorporating comments received from UNDP and, upon approval, submitted with a detailed evaluation audit trail.

This analysis employed mainly qualitative evaluation methods and instruments including:

- a) Reviewing all relevant documentation including, inter alia, project document; theory of change and results framework; annual workplans; consolidated quarterly and annual reports; highlights of project board meetings and technical/financial monitoring reports.
- b) Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, Responsible Parties (RPs), representatives of key civil society organizations, and implementing partners.
- c) Data review and analysis and searching for other sources to ensure validity, reliability (quality) and to allow the evaluation team to triangulate the various sources.

In line with the guidance, the MTR assessed the project strategy (relevance), progress towards results (effectiveness), project implementation and adaptive management (efficiency), impact, sustainability, and cross-cutting issues. This provided the underpinning evaluation criteria upon which implementation and achievement of the project's objectives, outcomes and outputs were measured.

Taking into consideration the COVID-19 situation, the MTR relied widely on virtual Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and a face-to-face approach for Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). The team conducted a field mission to the project sites where it conducted 10 FGDs with project beneficiaries in each of the counties visited - six (6) in Tsavo and four (4) in the Mara. The FGDs targeted key implementing partners including but not limited to the Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife, Kenya Wildlife Service, Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association, Maasai Mara Wildlife Conservancies Association, Taita Taveta Wildlife Conservancies Association, Narok County Government and, Taita Taveta County Government. The KIIs and FGDs also incorporated executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, members of the Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs.

Secondary data collected during the inception phase formed the basis for consultations with stakeholders. These included the project's quarterly and annual reports and other relevant documents identified through literature review. Primary data collection closely followed the evaluation questions for each of the proposed criteria as elaborated in the evaluation matrix. During the individual key informant interviews, the team sought to establish the perspectives of strategic and expert opinion from respective officials, including: UNDP senior management and programme staff; officials in the Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife, relevant public institutions; donors and development partners; representatives of implementing partners (IPs) and civil society organizations (CSOs) and, key leaders in the communities neighboring the conservancies.

In applying the evaluation methodology, the team sought to establish the extent of progress towards expected results including, specifically, perspectives of implementing partners and beneficiaries, review of official files and reports. The assessment of relevance and effectiveness required the use of tools and techniques that sought answers to the question *"What has changed as a result of the IWT intervention(s)?"* *What is being done correctly? How best can the best practices be scaled up?*

Extensive interrogation was performed on the causal association between project interventions and the results on the ground. This included seeking answers to broad questions such as: (i) What was the situation before the project's interventions? (ii) What has changed since the project's interventions?

Efforts were made to analyze processes, including planning and monitoring, as well as assessment of the projects alignment to UNDP's Country Programme Document (CPD) 2018-2022, CPD 2022-2026 and UNDAF 2018-2022. Analysis of internal accountability systems was also undertaken to determine whether, and how well they were able to generate lessons and inform decision making, including management of risks and critical assumptions. This included asking project staff about implementation processes and challenges. Prior to the commencement of the draft report, the evaluation team held a debriefing meeting with the project team and UNDP to assess the preliminary findings and generate consensus on emerging findings and conclusions.

The primary output/deliverable was the final report to be submitted as a mandatory compliance and accountability requirement for a GEF-financed full-sized project (FSP). The content checklist provided

in the *Guidance for conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*¹ was adhered to as far as possible in the preparation of this report.

2.2.3 Data analysis and interpretation

The data collected were analyzed, compared, and triangulated with other appropriate information to decipher facts from the appropriate body of evidence against each project outcome and output indicator. In view of the nature of questions asked and use of predominantly qualitative approach, the data were interpreted based on the percentage achievements in relation to each planned result. Project performance was rated against the progress made towards the planned targets using a rating scale of 1-6. Color coding was applied to each rating as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Ratings for Progress Towards Results

Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)			
6	Highly Satisfactory (HS)	75%-100%	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
5	Satisfactory (S)	65%-74%	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
4	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	55%-64%	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
3	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	45%-54%	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
2	Unsatisfactory (U)	35%-44%	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
1	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	0%-34%	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

2.3 Limitations to the MTR

The chief limitation was the implicit assumption that any changes demonstrated in anti-poaching and combating IWT could be directly ascribed to the project. This belies common knowledge that the competent authorities routinely carry out tasks in this realm and that affects the confidence with which findings can be interpreted in the context of project efficiency and effectiveness of results. Moreover, while the guidance for conducting MTR of UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects stipulates that the 3rd PIR be undertaken prior to the review, this was not the case in this instance as only one PIR had been completed.

¹ http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf

The ToR placed a heavy premium on the ability to reconstruct past scenarios and visualize a plausible future, a difficult task if requisite data for the period prior to the project could not be provided with sufficient detail or accuracy. It is instructive that among the documents availed were reports on information gaps that the PMU has been endeavoring to fill, revealing that some of these were dependent on guestimates made by RPs at the behest of the project and therefore casting serious aspersions on reliability.

Further to the above, it is critical to appreciate that the measurable attributes are essentially estimates with an inherent margin of error that can only be minimized by multiple and repeated surveys. The only approach to taking care of this would be by setting an appropriate statistical confidence which in this case is limited by the predominantly nominal scale of measurement. The necessary statistical robustness and sufficient replications could not have been fitted within the time available for fieldwork.

2.4 Structure of the MTR Report

The report is organized into seven sections beginning with an executive summary highlighting the MTR process, findings, conclusion, lessons and recommendations. This is followed by introduction, outlining the purpose and objectives, conceptual framework, scope and methodology, and the limitations of the review. Section three presents the project description and background, which outline its strategy and theory of change. The next section provides the review findings drawing from the project strategy, design and progress towards results. It also analyses barriers to achieving the project objective, impact of the project, cross-cutting issues and sustainability. Sections five and six provide lessons learned, conclusion and recommendations, respectively, while section seven comprises annexes to the report.

3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT

3.1 Development context

Occupying a wide range of habitats and ecosystems ranging from the coastal and marine through the savanna to the montane forests and afroalpine zone, Kenya is home to at least 350 species of mammals, over 11,000 bird and 7,000 plant species, and other life-forms. The Mara and Tsavo landscapes are particularly endowed with large aggregations of wildlife species, especially globally significant mammals and birds. They also form part of Shared Transboundary Ecosystems (STEs) which are critical for regionally migratory species and are recognized as hotspots for Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT). Along with the greater Amboseli and the Laikipia-Samburu, it is within these landscapes that Kenya has designated a large part of the protected area system. This is where the Tsavo East and Tsavo West National Parks, Maasai Mara National Reserve, assorted forest reserves and a large and increasing number of wildlife conservancies are located, forming an important component of the country's conservation estate. Largely through non-consumptive use, this heritage offers tremendous value that must be safeguarded for present and future generations.

Underscoring the profound role played by biodiversity -and wildlife specifically - in the national economy, the government has put in place a wide range of measures to ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of protected areas. These include the enactment of supportive legislation, policy, capacity building and promotion of collaboration initiatives. However, the country continues to experience formidable barriers against the achievement of planned results, notably through the increasing global demand for wildlife parts and products that fuels poaching, illegal trade, and trafficking. As of 2011, the value of the illegal global trade in wildlife (excluding fisheries and timber) was calculated to be between US\$ 7.8 billion and US\$ 10 billion per year.

3.2 Problems that the project sought to address

Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) continues unabated, abetted by corruption within government and security lapses at border points, airports, and seaports. Proactive intervention lays emphasis on tackling these multiple challenges. Kenya is also a key transit country, with the Kilindini Port and Jomo Kenyatta International Airport (JKIA) as the main exit points. On the other hand, the extraction of bush meat is widely motivated by local demand and contributes greatly to declining wildlife populations. The numbers of elephants, black rhinos, lions, cheetahs, leopards, pangolins, and other species have been in sharp decline since the 1970s.

Illicit cross-border trade in wildlife products increases additional security concerns. Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC), predominantly experienced through carnivores killing livestock and elephants raiding crops or killing people, leads to retaliatory killings by local herders and farmers².

Despite the major successes achieved in establishing an anti-poaching response, combating the menace remains one of the greatest threats to Kenya's wildlife. Legislative, regulatory and capacity gaps have remained some of the challenges to effective coordination and law enforcement at national and county levels. The country lacks specific national guidelines on prosecution of wildlife crime³. Although party to several Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) which automatically become part of Kenya's legal obligations, their relevant provisions and requirements are often not considered in wildlife enforcement and prosecution.

Insufficient inter-agency communication (both within and between the wildlife and security sectors) and limited investigative capacity results in reduced effectiveness of anti-poaching efforts. Despite new investments in rangers and police reservists on the ground, these are ill-equipped and insufficiently trained in patrolling and operations, evidence gathering and data recording. They therefore cannot effectively enforce the law.

With the lack of benefits for wildlife conservation, engagement of local communities presents a challenge due to lack of motivation, there is widespread disenfranchisement. Wildlife law enforcement is also often seen to be directed "against" local people. Poverty and limited livelihood opportunities add negatively to the lack of appreciation for wildlife as few local people benefit from wildlife or find direct employment in parks or tourism. All these militate against ownership by local communities as important conservation partners.

3.3 Project Description and Strategy

The purpose of the IWT Kenya project is to combat poaching and illegal wildlife trade, which are the key factors contributing to the loss of wildlife in Kenya and the East African Community region (EAC) at large. It focuses on law enforcement through community involvement and coordinated approaches within and between wildlife management and other security agencies. Specifically, the project aims are:

- i. To strengthen national and local capacity for effective IWT control in Kenya.
- ii. To reduce poaching and illegal wildlife trafficking in threatened species in Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems.
- iii. To strengthen Community Wildlife Conservancies in Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems.
- iv. Knowledge Management, M&E and Gender Mainstreaming.

The strategy is well articulated in the project document (ProDoc), underpinned by the four objectives outlined above that are aimed at bringing about long-term solutions to the development challenges

² <http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/05/09/the-real-reason-africas-elephants-are-dying/>

³ Annex N: Brief report on the results of the Preparatory Phase Workshop for ICCWC Indicator Framework for Wildlife and Forest Crime Assessment for Kenya, held in September 2017.

identified. This is to be achieved by focusing on wildlife law enforcement through community involvement in two project areas, the Mara and Tsavo ecosystems, through coordination within and between wildlife management and law enforcement authorities, and support to wildlife conservancies established by local communities.

The project results are expected to emerge from the successful implementation of four Components namely:

- i. **Component 1. *Strengthening national and local capacity for effective IWT control in Kenya*** - under which the project seeks to facilitate the development, approval, and implementation of the National Strategy to Combat Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade in the country.
- ii. **Component 2. *Reducing poaching and illegal wildlife trade in threatened species in Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems*** - underpinned by the support for wildlife and community security in the two project areas, through a multi-agency highly coordinated approach.
- iii. **Component 3. *Strengthening Community Wildlife Conservancies in Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems*** - focusing on the development of integrated ecosystem management plans and laying the foundation for locally managed wildlife and grazing systems.
- iv. **Component 4. *Knowledge Management, M&E and Gender Mainstreaming***. - through which the project works towards effective lesson learning, participatory M&E, and gender mainstreaming.

3.3.1 Theory of Change

The project's theory of change provides a basis for evaluation of resources, activities and results. The MTR assessed this including the description of the outputs, outcomes, intended long-term conservation impacts, causal pathways for the long-term impacts and implicit as well as explicit assumptions.

3.4 Project Implementation Arrangements

The project follows UNDP's National Implementation Modality (NIM) according to the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of Kenya and the Country Programme. The Implementing Partner is the Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife, responsible and accountable for managing the project, including monitoring and evaluation of interventions, achieving outcomes, and the effective use of resources. Key Project partners include the Kenya Wildlife Conservancy Association (KWCA) and partners in the Tsavo and Mara ecosystems.

The Project Board, also referred to as the Project Steering Committee, comprises of an Executive: who is the Principal Secretary and chair. It also includes a Senior Supplier who representing the interests of the parties concerned. UNDP is the senior supplier in this case. There is also a Senior Beneficiary whose primary function is to ensure the realization of project results. Other members include the National Project Director, the Technical Project Coordinator, two Landscape Coordinators. UNDP plays a three-tier supervision, oversight and quality assurance role.

4.0 FINDINGS

The following sections present the main observations of the MTR team based on empirical evidence contain a synthesis of facts drawn from the project's monitoring and evaluation framework. It is intended to inform the identification of challenges and mitigation actions to ensure that the project stays on track for achievement of maximum results, in light of which some recommendations will be drawn to provide suggestions for critical intervention.

4.1 On the Project Strategy

From the analysis of the project design as outlined in the prodoc, the evaluation was of the view that it was founded on a sound strategy that dovetails with and is well aligned to relevant global, national and

local instruments. It therefore stands on firm ground and is building on the solid basis of a needs-driven set of interventions. The strategy is rated “Satisfactory” as it is proving to be effective in reaching the desired results and at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress achieved towards results at the mid-term point.

4.1.1 Alignment with the Global Wildlife Program and Theory of Change.

The evaluation found that by aiming to combat IWT, the project carries the essential elements of a cutting-edge and solution-oriented plan. It is well aligned with the World Bank-led Global Wildlife Program (GWP) which was launched by the GEF in June 2015 and whose objectives informed its development. It therefore contributes to the GWP’s international call for action to respond to the trafficking of wildlife and associated products as a growing crisis. The US\$ 3.8 million received by Kenya from the GWP’s \$131 million grant program is therefore going into good use. It is making a critical input to the strengthening of national capacity for effective biodiversity governance and reducing illegal wildlife trade, poaching and decline of threatened species. The planned establishment of new community conservancies in the Tsavo and Mara ecosystems provides fertile ground for one of the project components and sets the stage for it to contribute to the country’s sustainable land management and livelihoods agenda.

4.1.2 Alignment with United Nations Country Team priorities and UNDP Country Programme

The considered view of the MTR is that the project contributes to the UNDAF 2018-2022 and UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2018-2022, both of which promote policies and strategies contributing to sustainable economic growth. It is especially responsive to the need for progressive, resilient and inclusive green economy, an improved institutional (public and private) and community capacities. It also provides a critical link to the new United Nations Kenya Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) 2022-2026. In effect, combating poaching and IWT is integral to the country’s contribution to overcoming the interconnected triple planetary crises of biodiversity loss, climate change and pollution. Table 4 below summarizes the alignment of the project with United Nations Country Team (UNCT) priorities and UNDP Country Programme.

Table 4: Alignment with United Nations Country Team (UNCT) Priorities and UNDP Country Programme

UN Strategic Document	Priority Area
United Nations Country Team (UNCT) Priorities/UNDAF 2018-2022	<p>Strategic Priority Area 3: “Competitive and sustainable economic growth that is increasingly resilient, green, inclusive, equitable, and creating decent jobs and quality livelihoods for all”; Outcome 3.3: By 2022, people in Kenya benefit from sustainable natural resource management and resilient green economy.</p> <p>UNDAF 2018-2022 seeks to support the National Government to eliminate illegal wildlife trade and commercial poaching which has posed danger to wildlife survival and affected tourism in key protected areas. Further, UNDAF 2018-2022 aims to build national and local capacities to address pressing environmental challenges of climate change, natural resource depletion, loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services, land degradation driven by overgrazing, deforestation over the past years.</p> <p>The project contributes to scaling up of Kenya’s efforts towards long-term, transformative economic development, and accelerate sustainable climate resilient economic growth which translates into job creation for the youth and</p>

	improved livelihoods for the vulnerable members of the population, while slowing down the soaring rates of Green House Gas (GHG) emissions emanating from the forest sector and forest related products.
UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD 2018-2022) and (2022-2026)	<p>CPD 2018-22: Outcome 4: By 2022, people in Kenya benefit from sustainable natural resource management and resilient green economy; Output 4.2 - Improved institutional and community capacity to deliver pro-poor, sustainable natural resource management initiatives.</p> <p>CPD 2022-2026: Outcome 3: By 2026, people in Kenya at risk of being left behind – particularly in the ASAL counties, informal urban settlements, all women and girls, all children and youth – have access to and derive benefit from sustainably managed ecosystems for nature-based solutions in a green transition; Output 3.1 - Sustainable management of natural resources at national, subnational and grassroots levels, using people-centred approaches, enhanced.</p> <p>Directly relating to these two documents, the project lays great emphasis on sustainable resource management, benefits and inclusivity as key pillars.</p>

4.1.3 Alignment with national strategies aspirations, and plans

in our considered opinion, the project is consistent with, and contributes to the National Wildlife Strategy 2030 which outlines a vision for wildlife conservation as part of a strong environmental foundation for achieving Kenya's sustainable development agenda. This vision is strongly encapsulated in the Constitution of Kenya (2010), the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act 2013, and Kenya Vision 2030.

It is also in line with the objectives of the National Wildlife Policy 2020, which provides the framework for legislation that enables the country to conserve and manage wildlife better, for the present and future generations. In particular, the policy emphasizes sustainable management of wildlife resources, itself a daunting task in the context of incessant poaching and IWT.

4.2 On the Project Design

In assessing this, the evaluation sought to establish the extent to which the objectives of the project are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs and UNDP priorities in Kenya. Findings on this were broadly positive as outlined below.

4.2.1 Overall relevance

There was marked consensus among respondents that the project was relevant and consistent with country needs and beneficiary expectations. It was also relevant to the country's actions and commitment under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), and trans frontier conservation initiatives. The relevance was rated as "Highly Satisfactory" overall, with 100% of respondents agreeing on the congruence with national and target community needs. The key point of concurrence among the key informants and focus-group participants was that project interventions were being implemented at a time when target communities needed them. The majority were emphatic that any shortcomings would be overcome, and the project be placed back on track for the achievement of its intended results.

In addition, the project is well aligned with UNDP CPD 2018-2022 and the new CPD (2022–2026), both of which recognize natural resource depletion, loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services as among Kenya's pressing environmental challenges. In particular, there is congruence with CPD (2022–

2026) whose vision is to leverage partnerships to safeguard development gains by, among others, focusing on nature-based solutions and resilience. The CPD seeks to accelerate recovery for the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through a youth-centric and gender-centric lens, including borderlands communities. It is therefore fully consistent with the aspirations of the project.

4.2.2 Relevance to community needs

In line with one of the key priority areas for the National Wildlife Strategy which aims at increasing access to incentives while ensuring equitable sharing of benefits, the project is motivating community-led conservancies - currently numbering twenty-two (22) in the Mara and thirty-three (33) in Taita Taveta. This is complementing government efforts to support communities in taking the lead and consolidating gains arising from the rapidly growing movement.

By supporting the Maasai Mara Conservancies Association and Taita Taveta Conservancies Association, the project is helping build the momentum which has seen conservancies become the preferred avenue for securing land rights, settling resource use conflicts, promoting pasture management, and managing droughts. These have gained recognition as a highly successful model for protecting Kenya's natural resources outside of the formal PA system⁴. They also provide safe havens for populations of endangered species⁵. Entrenching support within local communities and building community-based law enforcement capacity is integral to the project's function in helping deepen willing informer networks that hold a great potential for strengthening partnerships that hold promise for combating IWT.

4.2.3 Effectiveness

In this regard, the MTR aimed to establish how far project results and specific objective(s) have been achieved or are destined to be achieved. It therefore endeavored to establish the extent to which various activities have contributed to the achievement of the planned results. Based on the analysis of the 2021 project implementation report (PIR) and quarterly reports against the project's monitoring and evaluation framework, and tracking progress and achieved results against planned project indicators, it was apparent that the journey has begun in earnest towards making significant inroads towards establishing a highly coordinated multiagency approach. Attaining this noble result will mark a critical turning point in relations within and between wildlife management and law enforcement authorities. Steps toward this are however still in their primordial stages, largely because of the delayed startup.

4.3 Progress Towards Results

The MTR dwelt on the achievements of the project in each of the four components, seeking to find out how far it had gone in:

- Strengthening national and local capacity for effective IWT control by facilitating the development, approval, and implementation of the National Strategy to Combat Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade.
- Reducing poaching and illegal wildlife trade in threatened species in the two target landscapes - Tsavo and Maasai Mara, by supporting wildlife security and engendering multi-agency approaches.

⁴ Weru, S. (2016). Wildlife protection and trafficking assessment in Kenya: Drivers and trends of transnational wildlife crime in Kenya and its role as a transit point for trafficked species in East Africa. TRAFFIC.

⁵ KWCA 2017. Status of Conservancies 2016.

- Strengthening Community Wildlife Conservancies and supporting the development of integrated ecosystem management plans.
- Building knowledge management, M&E and gender mainstreaming, as contribution to effective lesson learning and participation.

Overall, the review established that a number of outcomes have been achieved or partially achieved, while others remained off-track at a critical point half-way through the implementation period. Key among these were the cross-border negotiations/agreement with Tanzania; the development of the national IWT Wildlife Strategy and Operational Plan; establishment of a multi-agency assessment unit along the Kenya -Tanzania border; public consultation, validation and finalization of the draft Maasai Mara Ecosystem Management Plan (EMP) and; the proposed Centre of Excellence in the Mara ecosystem. The procurement of radio equipment for the two (2) Narok County vehicles and motorbikes was underway at the time of review, while Conservancy Association (CA) governance training was on schedule. The speedy and timely completion of these activities is a compelling need for the next stage of implementation.

4.3.1 Progress towards project results and outcomes analysis

Much has been achieved, but not all is rosy as shown in Table 5 which summarizes the project outcome Indicators against the baseline and mid-term targets, levels achievement and a % rating with comments informed by the evaluators' assessment. Out of 34 outcome indicators, 24 were rated as "highly satisfactory" based on achievement of mid-term targets, two (2) were either "moderately satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory", while nine (9) were either rated "highly unsatisfactory" or could not be rated because targets were supposed to be set in year one but were still pending by the time of MTR for two of these. No data were provided to guide the assignment of any rating in the case of one indicator. It is instructive that a 100% achievement was reached or exceeded for 21 of the mid-term targets.

The lowest achievement level was in the establishment of wildlife security systems through formal agreement as a law enforcement partnership mechanism. This presents a major drawback to fostering collaboration between KWS, conservancy managers and other partners such as county governments, conservancy associations (MMWCA and TTWCA) and NGOs. In the case of Mara NR, partners were to be determined during the project inception phase, which inevitably slowed down progress. Efforts by the evaluation team to investigate further revealed that the main contributor was the nature of security as a fundamental function of government. The other contributor was the delay in project startup. Notably, indicator 13 on the number of the lessons learned that were identified and shared with other national and international projects has fallen behind schedule. Regarding Indicator 7 on strengthened institutional capacity to combat IWT as indicated by the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC) Indicator Framework and targets for annual monitoring, both the baselines and targets were to be determined in year one but were still pending by the time of MTR.

Table 5: Progress towards Project Results - Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Objective/Outcome	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	Mid-Term Review Achievement/number recorded	% Achievement and Rating	Comments
Project Objective: To combat poaching and illegal wildlife trafficking in Kenya through an integrated approach	Indicator 1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or subnational level. (IRRF Indicator 1.3.1):	0	a) Tsavo and Taita Ranches: 2 Wildlife Security Systems Established through formal agreement as a law enforcement partnership mechanism between KWS, Conservancies & other partners such as County Governments, TTWCA, and NGOs;	0	0%	HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY Wildlife Security hub yet to be established in Tsavo Ecosystem
			b) Maasai Mara: Similar partnership mechanism established through formal agreement (partners to be determined during Inception Phase)	0	0%	HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY Multi-Agency antipoaching Coordination Task Force yet to be established.
	Indicator 2: Number of people directly benefitting in the project area from CBWM and other forms of sustainable NRM as a result of the project (f/m) (IRRF Indicator 1.3.2a): This comprises the populations of the Taita Ranch Conservancy, and the areas to be targeted by the Project in the Mara ecosystem.	2017: 0	868 males [figures provided by RPs]	512 males	59%	MODERATELY SATISFACTORY
			372 females [figures provided by RPs]	138 females	37%	UNSATISFACTORY

Objective/Outcome	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	Mid-Term Review Achievement/number recorded	% Achievement and Rating	Comments
	Indicator 3: Populations of flagship species in the project areas (\geq 2017 baseline): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elephant - Buffalo - Giraffe - Rhino 	Tsavo+Taita Ranches: Elephants: 14964	14,964	14,964	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Tsavo+Taita Ranches: Buffalo: 8051	8,501	8,501	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Tsavo+Taita Ranches: Giraffe: 4314	4,314	4,314	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Tsavo+Taita Ranches: Rhino: 275	275	275	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Maasai Mara: Elephants: 2,595	2,595	2,595	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Maasai Mara: Buffalo: 11604	11,604	11,604	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Maasai Mara: Giraffe: 2,109	2,109	2,109	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Maasai Mara: Rhino: 54	54	54	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY

Objective/Outcome	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	Mid-Term Review Achievement/number recorded	% Achievement and Rating	Comments
	Indicator 4: Number of individuals of flagship species poached annually in the project areas - Decrease by at least 20% (baseline for 2021): - Elephant - Rhino Note: Baselines provided by KWS data 2016 to the PPG team.	Tsavo+Taita Ranches: Elephants – 3	3	0	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Tsavo+Taita Ranches: Rhino: 2	20%=0.4	0	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Maasai Mara: Elephants: 0	0	0	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Maasai Mara: Rhino: 1	20%=0.2	0	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
Outcome 1 Increased national and local capacity to fight wildlife crime	Indicator 5: Capacity of key National Wildlife Crime Enforcement Agency to control IWT (UNDP Capacity scorecard, %): KWS	70%	75%	80%	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
	Indicator 6: National Anti-Poaching Strategy	Non-existent	Drafted and submitted to GoK for approval	0	0%	HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY
	Indicator 7: Strengthened institutional capacity to combat IWT as indicated by:	a) ICCWC Indicator Framework – Baseline scores and targets TBD	a) Mid-term target for strengthened institutional capacity compared to baseline achieved (TBD at baseline)	No data provided	No data Provided	HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY Baselines and targets were to be set in year 1. However, this is still pending by the time of MTR

Objective/Outcome	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	Mid-Term Review Achievement/number recorded	% Achievement and Rating	Comments
	a) the ICCWC Indicator Framework (note – baselines to be determined in year 1) b) National subset of indicator targets for annual monitoring drawn from ICCWC Indicator Framework baseline assessment	b) National subset baselines from above TBD	b) Mid-term target for strengthened institutional capacity compared to baseline for the national subset of indicators achieved (TBD at baseline)	No data provided	No data provided	HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY Baselines and targets were to be set in year 1. However, this is still pending by the time of MTR
Outcome 2 Increased effectiveness of Conservancies, PAs and local law enforcement agencies to control poaching and IWT in Tsavo and Maasai Mara Ecosystems	Indicator 8: Annual results of IWT law enforcement in the project areas (Taita Taveta County, including Taita Ranches, and Narok County including MMNR) 2021: a) number of suspects arrested and prosecuted: b) amount of seized wildlife products (kg) c) % ratio of prosecutions to arrests Source: The baseline data for both Taita Taveta and Narok Counties provided by KWS for 2021 to the PPG team	Tsavo Ecosystem: a) Number of suspects arrested and prosecuted – 35	a) Increase at least by 20% 42 arrested	Of 42 arrests, 35 prosecuted	83%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Tsavo Ecosystem: b.1) Amount ivory seized– 11.8 kg	b) Increase at least by 20% 14.16 kg	2.36 kg - a 20% increase	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Tsavo Ecosystem: b.2) Amount bushmeat seized– 1178 kg	c). Increase at least by 20% 1414 kg	236 kg- a 20% increase	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		c)Tsavo Ecosystem: % ratio of prosecutions to	d) Increase at least by 20% 35 arrests	35 prosecuted	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY

Objective/Outcome	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	Mid-Term Review Achievement/number recorded	% Achievement and Rating	Comments
		arrests - TBD in Y1				
		Maasai Mara Ecosystem a) number of suspects arrested and prosecuted – 6	a) Increase at least by 20% 8 arrests	Of 8 arrests, 6 prosecuted	75%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Maasai Mara Ecosystem: b.1) Amount of ivory seized– 40.1 kg	b) Increase at least by 20% 48.12 kg	97 kg – a 142% increase	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Maasai Mara Ecosystem: b.2) Amount of bushmeat seized – 0 kg	c). Increase at least by 20% 74	601 kg	100%	HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY
		c) Maasai Mara Ecosystem: % Ratio of prosecutions to arrests – TBD in Y1	d). Increase at least by 20% 6 arrests	Of 6 arrests, 6 prosecuted	100%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
	Indicator 9: METT score for Masai Mara NR	62	67	No data provided		No data provided

Objective/Outcome	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	Mid-Term Review Achievement/number recorded	% Achievement and Rating	Comments
Outcome 3 Strengthened Community Wildlife Conservancies and increased benefits for local communities from CBWM and sustainable NRM in Tsavo and Maasai Mara Ecosystems	Indicator 10: Total area of newly established conservancies with improved wildlife and natural resource management	0 ha	At least 1,600 ha (in the Maasai Mara ecosystem)	3,521	220%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
	Indicator 11: Annual rate of retaliatory killing of elephants in the project areas (animals/ year). Baseline (2021) Note: Baseline data for 2021 provided by KWS to the PPG Team.	Taita Taveta: 11	Decrease by at least 20% 9	5 - a decrease by 54%	270%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
		Narok County: 7	Decrease by at least 20% 6	3 – a decrease by 57%	285%	
	Indicator 12: Percentage increase in average annual household income from wildlife conservation and implementation of SLM in the target conservancies	To be established at the Inception phase, and ideally sex-disaggregated	Increased by at least 4%	Increase by 6%	150%	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY
Outcome 4 Lessons learned by the project through participatory M&E and gender mainstreaming are used nationally and internationally	Indicator 13: Number of the lessons on IWT control and CBNRM learned by the Project that are identified and shared with other national and international projects	0	≥2	No data provided	0%	HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY
	Indicator 14: Number of women participating in targeted gender-proactive investment,	0	750	138	18%	HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY

Objective/Outcome	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	Mid-Term Review Achievement/number recorded	% Achievement and Rating	Comments
	empowerment and capacity building activities at project sites					

4.3.2 Progress towards overall objective

The attainment of the overall objective would involve successful implementation of four key strategic variables namely.

- i. increased national and local capacity to fight wildlife crime.
- ii. increased effectiveness of conservancies, PAs and local law enforcement agencies to control poaching and IWT in the Tsavo and Mara ecosystems.
- iii. strengthened community wildlife conservancies and increased benefits for local communities from CBWM and sustainable NRM in the Tsavo and Mara ecosystems.
- iv. lessons learned by the project through participatory M&E and gender mainstreaming are used nationally and internationally.

Despite the challenges associated with delayed start-up, the MTR found that overall progress (effectiveness) made towards combating poaching and illegal wildlife trafficking is "Moderately Satisfactory". Pointers to this ranged from factors like a multi-stakeholder engagement approach, community ownership of the conservancies and collaborative cross border security operations with neighboring Tanzania. The majority (62%) of indicators show that the project is partially on track to achieving its intended objectives, should the initial momentum be maintained. Out of seven objective performance indicators, three (3) are "Highly Satisfactory", one (1) is "Moderately Satisfactory" while three (3) are "Highly Unsatisfactory". The effectiveness of the project is therefore rated "Moderately Satisfactory" and it is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets albeit with significant challenges. This analysis can be verified in the assessment of performance indicators of the overall objective of the project (Table 6). Respondents cited reasons why the project risks missing its targets as slow start-up, delays in procurement, lack of appropriate or timely acquisition of security and communication equipment by the conservancies.

4.3.3 Progress toward achievement of component indicators

Tables 7-10 present analysis of the progress made towards component indicators. One out of three indicators for component 1 was rated as "Highly Satisfactory" while two were rated "Highly Unsatisfactory". For component 2, one of two indicators was rated as "Highly Satisfactory" while the other was rated "Highly Unsatisfactory". All three indicators for component 3 were rated as "Highly Satisfactory", whereas both indicators for component 4 were rated as "Highly Unsatisfactory".

4.3.4 Progress towards translating resources into intended results

It has been explained elsewhere that the evaluation noted the significant progress made towards achieving the intended results at the mid-term. To establish how well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results. The evaluation examined the available evidence in terms of quantity, quality, and timeliness within the workplan, and rated this as "Satisfactory". This can be attributed to a working management structure, PMU responsiveness in resources utilization and a clear project design with clear timelines. Discounting for the lost time, comparison of achievement against what was planned for the midpoint was largely favorable although, on the expenditure score alone, the overall performance stood at 24% and was therefore rated as "Highly Unsatisfactory".

Table 6: Progress towards overall Project Objective

Objective Indicator	Progress towards Results	Evaluation Assessment	Achievement Description
<p>Indicator 1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or subnational level.</p>	0%	Highly Unsatisfactory	<p>The Anti-Poaching Security hub in Tsavo ecosystem is yet to be constructed.</p> <p>TTWCA approached AWF to support the coordination process. The AWF has procured a vehicle to support rapid response plan and supported the drafting of an MOU between KWS and TTWCA for the establishment of the Kasigau sub-hub by hiring lawyers to design the MOU. In the Mara ecosystem, the Multiagency Anti-Poaching Coordination Task Force is yet to be established. However, the recruitment of a consultant for establishment of antipoaching Task Force was underway at the time of conducting the MTR.</p>
<p>Indicator 2: Number of people directly benefitting in the project area from CBWM and other forms of sustainable NRM as a result of the project (f/m) (IRRF Indicator 1.3.2a):</p> <p>This comprises the populations of the Taita Ranch Conservancy, and the areas to be targeted by the Project in the Maasai Mara ecosystem.</p>	59%	Moderately Satisfactory	<p>A total of 650 people (79% males and 21% females) are directly benefiting from Community Based Wildlife Management (CBNRM) and other forms NRM. These include formal and informal businesses around the conservancies, employment and eco-tourism activities and revenue from membership.</p> <p>The number of people employed as staff working with wildlife management, law enforcement and/or advocacy was found to be 20 (16 males; 4 females) in the Tsavo ecosystem and 10 (8 males; 2 females) in the Maasai Mara ecosystem.</p> <p>In the Tsavo ecosystem membership of the 3 ranches have already been converted into conservancies. The membership of Mbale – which was targeted by the project –is 540 (422 males; 118 females) and are directly benefiting.</p>

Objective Indicator	Progress towards Results	Evaluation Assessment	Achievement Description
			On the other hand, 80 people (66 males;14 females) were found to be registered members of community-based organizations and cooperatives the 2 Masai Mara conservancies.
Indicator 3: Populations of flagship species in the project areas (baseline for 2021): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elephant - Buffalo - Giraffe - Rhino 	100%	Highly Satisfactory	In Tsavo ecosystem the populations of elephants (14,964), buffaloes (8,501), giraffes (4,314), and rhinos (2,595) remained the same between 2021 and 2022. The same trend was evident in Mara ecosystem where the population of elephants (2,595), buffaloes (11,604), giraffes (2,109) and rhinos (54) remained the same between 2021 and 2022. This trend may be construed as a demonstration of strong multi-agency coordination and community approach engagement in wildlife protection, anti-poaching and prevention of illegal wildlife trafficking.
Indicator 4: Number of individuals of flagship species poached annually in the project areas (baseline for 2016): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elephant - Rhino <p>Note: Baselines provided by KWS data 2016 to the PPG team.</p>	> 100%	Highly Satisfactory	In Tsavo ecosystem, the number of elephants poached reduced from five (5) in 2016 to three (3) by the time of the MTR against a target of 4. This represented a reduction of 40% against a target of 20% reduction in elephant poaching. In the same period there were no rhinos poached in Tsavo ecosystem. In Maasai Mara ecosystem, there were no elephants and rhinos poached between 2021 and 2022. This trend represents a significant improvement from previous years when five (5) elephants and one (1) rhino were poached in Maasai Mara ecosystem between 2017-2020.

Table 7: Progress towards Component 1. Strengthening national and local capacity for effective IWT control in Kenya

Outcome Indicators	Progress Towards Results	Evaluation Assessment	Achievement Description
Indicator 5: Capacity of key National Wildlife Crime Enforcement Agency to control IWT (UNDP Capacity scorecard, %): KWS	<100%	Highly Satisfactory	<p>The capacity building of county rangers was conducted for various aspects of law enforcement.</p> <p>In Tsavo ecosystem the capacity building of 48 KWS rangers from the Wildlife Protection Department on “Crime Scenes First Responders” in Manyani Academy enhanced their capacity in investigations, gathering of evidence and law enforcement related to poaching and illegal wildlife trade. In Maasai Mara Ecosystem, the three months capacity building of twenty (20) rangers (17 males and 3 females) in “Crime Scenes First Responders” in Manyani Academy has enhanced their capacity in community relations, legal aspects of cases, evidence at crime scenes and securing the crime scene. Other specific areas of training include field craft, leadership, skill at arms, community engagement, Multiple Procedure Orders, and anti-poaching</p>
Indicator 6: National Anti-Poaching Strategy	0%	Highly Unsatisfactory	This indicator has not been achieved. The development of the National Anti-Poaching Strategy has not been initiated.
Indicator 7: Strengthened institutional capacity to combat IWT as indicated by: a) the ICCWC Indicator Framework (note – baselines to be determined in year 1) b) National subset of indicator targets for annual monitoring drawn from ICCWC Indicator Framework baseline assessment	No data provided	Highly Unsatisfactory (No data provided)	It was not possible to evaluate and assess this indicator since no data was provided.

Table 8: Progress towards Component 2. Reducing poaching and illegal wildlife trade in threatened species in Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems

Outcome Indicators	Progress Towards Results	Evaluation Assessment	Achievement Description
<p>Indicator 8: Annual results of IWT law enforcement in in the project areas (Taita Taveta County, including Taita Ranches, and Narok County including MMNR) 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) number of suspects arrested and prosecuted: e) amount of seized wildlife products (kg) f) % ratio of prosecutions to arrests <p>Source: The baseline data for both Taita Taveta and Narok Counties provided by KWS for 2016 to the PPG team</p>	75-100%	Highly Satisfactory	<p>The indicator has been partially achieved, with successful arrests and prosecution but not all resulting in convictions.</p> <p>Between the period 2021 and 2022, thirty-five (35) suspects against an MTR target of 42 were arrested and prosecuted in Tsavo ecosystem. Out of these three (3) were successfully prosecuted with 1 serving three (3) years jail term. In the same period, 11.8kg of ivory, and 1, 178 kg of bush meat were seized in Tsavo ecosystem. However, the ration of prosecution to arrests stood at 100%. Comparatively (in Maasai Mara ecosystem) six (6) suspects were arrested and successfully prosecuted. The cases are still pending in court. The ratio of prosecution to arrests stood at 100%.</p> <p>During the same period 97 kg of ivory and 601 kg of bush meat were seized from poachers in Maasai Mara ecosystem. However, the ratio of arrests to prosecutions was 100%.</p>
Indicator 9: METT score for Masai Mara NR:	No data provided	Highly Unsatisfactory	A baseline score for Tsavo including targets were not included in the GWP TT at project design.

Table 9: Progress towards Component 3. Strengthening Community Wildlife Conservancies in Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems

Outcome Indicators	Progress Towards Results	Evaluation Assessment	Achievement Description
Indicator 10: Total area of newly established conservancies with improved	220%	Highly Satisfactory	The indicator was evaluated and found to have been achieved. Against a target of 1,600 hectares, a total of 3, 521 hectares of land had been allocated to 55 new conservancies in Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems. In Tsavo

Outcome Indicators	Progress Towards Results	Evaluation Assessment	Achievement Description
wildlife and natural resource management			ecosystem the project supported the formation of 33 new conservancies that work closely with communities/TTWCA. This has brought harmony between KWF and communities through advocacy for importance of conservation of wildlife and forests. In Maasai Mara ecosystem there are a total of 22 conservancies.
Indicator 11: Annual rate of retaliatory killing of elephants in the project areas (animals/ year).	285%	Highly Satisfactory	The indicator was evaluated and found to have been achieved. (57:20 ratio) per year in reduction in retaliatory killing of elephants in project areas. This has impressive achievement can be attributed to close working relationship between MMCA and TTWCA with KWS in managing wildlife-human conflict. Rangers from both institutions MMWCA and TTWCA engage in joint operations with KWS to engage communities in cases human-wildlife conflict. On the other hand, MMCA works closely with the Narok County government as they work as the buffer zones for the Maasai Mara National Game Reserve.
Indicator 12: Percentage increase in average annual household income from wildlife conservation and implementation of SLM in the target conservancies	?	Highly Satisfactory	While data provided indicates that this indicator is on track, it's not clear how the data was generated as an assessment or survey report was not available to help verify the information. With percentage increase by 4% to 6% in average annual household income from wildlife conservation and implementation in the Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems the indicator was rated Highly Satisfactory. However, there was no household data to verify this.

Table 10: Progress towards Component 4. Knowledge Management, M&E and Gender Mainstreaming

Outcome Indicators	Progress Towards Results	Evaluation Assessment	Achievement Description
Indicator 13: Number of the lessons on IWT control and CBNRM learned by the Project that are identified and shared with other national and international projects	0%	Highly Unsatisfactory	Some progress made in the regular communications with GWP, including communications training, conservation workshops, HWC training and lessons learnt in Q2 2021.
Indicator 14: Number of women participating in targeted gender-proactive investment, empowerment and capacity building activities at project sites	18%	Highly Unsatisfactory	The indicator was evaluated and found to be off track. A total of 138 women (18%) against a target of 750 are participating directly and benefiting from Community Based Wildlife Management (CBNRM) and other forms NRM. These include formal and informal businesses around the conservancies, employment and eco-tourism activities and revenue from membership.

4.3.5 Factors contributing the Results Framework/Logframe

This review has held throughout that progress had been made towards achieving the intended result in spite of the formidable challenges, chief among them being late start up. The team therefore identified a number of factors that have contributed to the results achieved so far. There are many facets to this and credit can be apportioned to the various stakeholders.

The national government has put in place the necessary legal, legislative, and policy instruments that have created an enabling environment for the implementation of the project. Enactment of the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act 2013 and formulation of the National Wildlife Policy have provided an enabling environment for arresting, prosecuting, and meting out appropriate punishment to offenders involved in poaching and wildlife trafficking. Further the National Wildlife Strategy 2030 and Kenya Vision 2030 provide direction to planning, implementing, and sustaining wildlife protection and conservation interventions.

A multi-stakeholder approach to implementation of the project has been a key factor in the achievement of planned results. Key informants indicated that the project design is precise, having a clear plan with time frames and easily understandable objectives. Coupled with a multisectoral base that brings in a wide range of expertise and experiences from the National Government, county government, CSOs and conservancies, the key informants indicated that the project has created a conducive environment that promotes discussions and consensus building, and enhances ownership.

Collaboration at the Kenya-Tanzania border has made it difficult for poachers and wildlife traffickers to operate and reduced illegal wildlife trafficking. Transboundary conservation has made it possible to exercise control over wildlife crime through increased surveillance in Maasai Mara – Serengeti and Tsavo – Mkomazi Trans-Frontier Conservation Areas (TFCAs). The provision of two Toyota land cruisers to each of the project sites has increased their capacities to patrol the respective geographic coverage, enhance surveillance, respond to intelligence. This has been a major deterrent to poaching/wildlife trafficking and retaliatory killing in case of human-wildlife conflicts.

The Capacity building interventions (provision of training) targeting key stakeholders has increased the capacity of KWS, Narok County Government and conservancy rangers to effectively deter wildlife crime. The training of prosecution staff has had the same effect in both the Mara and Tsavo ecosystems. At the same time, training of conservancy rangers has enhanced their capacity to mediate with local communities, respond to incidents, secure crime scenes, and collect quality evidence necessary for prosecuting those arrested for poaching and wildlife trafficking. It has also advanced their recognition by counterparts in KWS, raising their esteem and allowing them to more confidently participate in joint surveillance and sharing of intelligence.

Strategic partnership with stakeholders who enjoy comparative advantage in the two landscapes, like African Wildlife foundation (AWF) and World Wildlife Fund (WWF), has seen the project establish necessary networks for success and sustainability. The project is therefore able to catalyze support and resources from additional sources, the main reason it has surpassed its initial financing projections. It is also extending its frontiers to sensitizing key stakeholders within conservancies on linkages between deforestation and ecological degradation, social and environmental safeguards.

Lack of synergy in collaboration between some of the key players, notably the KWS and Maasai Mara National Reserve/Narok County Government, has in the past been attributed to low political goodwill. While this situation has improved considerably over the last one year when the project has been under implementation, it has the potential to create loopholes which can erode the gains. Inadequate goodwill was widely attributed to local narratives and utterances by KWS by past leadership. For example, it was

explained that politicians who advocated against wildlife believed they had higher chances of being elected to office. However, there are indications that this has now started changing. A good pointer is a letter written by the Taita Taveta County government indicating willingness to co-finance the fencing of part of the conservation areas. On the other hand, conservancies in both landscapes were reported to work closely with the KWS.

Ultimately, and notwithstanding the obvious teething problems, the management structure is well formulated for delivery. The placement of landscape coordinators in each of the project sites was a well-conceived idea and a key success factor. That the project is trying to entrench its vital components in the KWS communication system holds potential for even further success. Working with the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (ODPP) is setting the scene for leveraging the necessary capacity to more effectively prosecute wildlife related crimes.

4.3.6 Catalytic Nature of the project

The evaluation established that the project has catalyzed learning and knowledge sharing among the different stakeholders including the national government, county governments, Tsavo parks, TTWCA, MMWCA, the ranches, and local communities. Given its multi-stakeholder and multisectoral approach, it has resulted in extensive consultative meetings that allowed key players to exchange views on modalities for establishing new conservancies, networks, and partnerships. Through these, the project is showing the way for others seeking to achieve multiple objectives with limited resources.

Having taken note of the project's potential, other partners are stepping in to support the initiative through increased collaboration, leading to even greater promise for success than would have been envisaged. Notably, the AWF has joined in the effort to establish the sub-hub in Kasigau with a considerable contribution. The WWF is also engaging in partnerships to support conservation in the Tsavo ecosystem. Another notable observation was the emergent conversion of ranches into conservancies which has brought harmony between KWS and communities.

4.3 Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

The MTR holds the view that while project implementation roared off to a good start after the initial delays, it still faces considerable uncertainty. This arises from factors largely external to the PMU, but are surmountable if all players make determined efforts. To pave the way for smoother advancement, management responses must be geared towards revving up activities and overcoming the clear obstacles in the way of progress. These are summarized below.

4.3.1 Factors Challenging the Achievement of Results

Delays in start-up placed the project in an unenviable position in efforts to make up for lost time. This is likely to further affect progress along the path towards completion. While investigating reasons for the initial delay, the review established that fitting within government systems presented the biggest hiccup. Findings revealed that this was the main drawback to progress and a trigger for non-attainment of mid-term targets. It will certainly continue to drag the project downwards unless appropriate management responses are devised remedy the situation. This and other main challenges are itemized below.

- Having been designed in 2017 and approved by the GEF Secretariat in 2018 with implementation initially expected to commence in July of the same year, the ProDoc was not signed until July 2019. This drawn-out process was only the beginning of lags that would jolt the project to the point of occasioning a mid-term review after merely one year of implementation.

- Once the strat-up was finally unlocked, the Project Manager was not hired until April 2021, after which an inception meeting was held in June 2021. This meant that while the clock had started ticking as early as 2019, nearly two years had elapsed before implementation commenced in the strict sense. This evaluation therefore came barely one year into the most advanced of activities, a non-enviable position to be for any project to be during such a review.

At the planning stage, institutional capacity assessments were undertaken to establish if the Responsible Parties (RPs) were sufficiently able to perform their respective designated part of the implementation. It had been envisaged that funds would flow to the non-state actors through on-granting facilitated by a Letter of Agreement arrangement between UNDP and the government. Under the National Implementation Modality (NIM), this is a process for which the MoTW and National Treasury would have to take responsibility.

- The reviewers established that KWCA, MMCWA and Tsavo Conservation Group (TSG) were favorably evaluated and would have received direct funding to support all or part of their share of implementation. This appeared to have faced headwinds in light of concerns over accountability for funds coming through the national budget and therefore emanating from the Treasury. Although the capacity assessment found them capable to receive direct funds, the evaluation established that government was unwilling to follow this route since any RPs receiving the funds would have to comply with provisions of the Public Finance Management Act (2012), the Public Procurement and Asset Disposal Act (No.33 of 2015) and the Public Procurement and Asset Disposal Regulations (2020). The government was emphatic that accountability was vested in the line ministry. This inability to access direct funding led to considerable frustration among the RPs. In particular, output 3.4 (small grant facility for conservancies) has been set back for this reason. KWCA had been tasked with establishing the facility to provide support to target conservancies in both the Tsavo and Mara, delivery for which looks precarious at the mid-point stage of the project.
- The TCG, one of the RPs designated at project design, disengaged early in the project for reasons not entirely clear to the evaluators but no doubt at least partly over unrealized expectations revolving around funding. The abrupt pulling out was alluded to several times as partial cause for the slow pick up of momentum in the Tsavo. It occasioned a major set-back especially with regard to the expected building of capacity for TTWCA.

The entire PMU is based at the MoTW HQs in Nairobi as opposed to the initial plan where part of it would have been located in the field and appropriately embedded within the RPs. A concern was raised that this might have affected the ability to respond to the needs of the RPs in real time. However, the National Project Director indicated that contingency measures put in place at the ministry, such as pairing up project staff with specific finance and procurement officers, were geared specifically to iron out any such concern.

- That notwithstanding, it was clear that Landscape Officers had to grapple with bureaucratic bottlenecks at the ministry in order to attend to field demands. Responding specifically to this concern, RPs did not consider the distance from PMU a decisive factor in their delivery.

The acquisition of equipment also occupied a significant part of the narrative from project beneficiaries. Several references were made to mismatch between expectation and how some of the provisions were delivered. Similar concerns revolved around the manner or speed with which differences of opinion were resolved.

- One RP felt that the deployment of motor vehicles to the government was contrary to effective implementation. For example, there was a view that vehicles provided to the Maasai Mara National Reserve were of little use to the wider needs of the ecosystem. At the same time, the land cruiser

meant for the MMWCA was registered with Government of Kenya (GK) number plates, against expectation as the association can then not effectively use it in community work. All avenues explored to get around this had borne no fruit by evaluation time, including offers by MMWCA to pay-off the duty due in order to facilitate transfer of ownership. As a result, this amounts to an idle project investment.

- Rangers in the Maasai Mara National Reserve are poorly equipped without modern firearms as the law does not allow them to be equipped with such firearms until they get converted into Kenya Police Reservists. However, the MTR was informed that efforts are underway to vet and induct the rangers through training by the National Government to facilitate provision of newer equipment. It will require close working relationships and a coordinated mechanisms to fully implement this.
- While sounding most diplomatic, some key informants alluded to lack of clear mechanisms for handling grievances by stakeholders, that might have affected critical elements of progress. The matter in question related to engagement of non-state actor staff time without commensurate funding as expected and provided for in the project budget. A specific reference was made to the question of engagement costs in the case of KWCA, which have to be charged to clear budget lines for all their donor-funded projects. Without direct funding from the project this amounted to a big constraint that confronts a key partner.

Cross-cutting issues stand in the way of a favorable assessment. While clearly unique to the project, concern lingers over these when viewed against the serious implications of not adequately addressing them early enough.

- Although the MTR found that full representation and participation of women and people living with disability in wildlife conservation and management is still a challenge. It was evident that attempts had been made to bridge the gap, and a few female rangers had benefited from capacity building. The mainstreaming of gender and disability issues however remains a concern as few respondents raised this as a focus of their attention. The non-availability of disaggregated data makes it impossible to determine the comparative social, cultural, and economic benefits from wildlife resources for both men and women.

Limited livelihood opportunities contribute greatly to this problem and unsustainable bushmeat exploitation therefore stands in the way of project results. While subsistence hunting was a traditional way of life for some of the communities in the project landscapes, this has become commercialized to the extent that it literary amounted to large-scale poaching.

- The MTR established that the most prevalent form of poaching is hunting for bushmeat, fueled by local demand and targeting mainly big game like buffaloes, zebras, and eland. Other highly poached species are impala, gazelles, and warthogs. In addition to highly sought wildlife trophies like elephant tusks and rhino horn, the trafficking of pangolins has also been on the rise in recent years to meet international demand. IWT targeting these highly valued species outside protected areas therefore remains a formidable challenge. The porous nature of the Kenya-Tanzania border, compounded with the reliance on an old fleet of vehicles by KWS and the Maasai Mara National Reserve, make it difficult to respond to intelligence information.
- Illegal logging continues unabated in both landscapes, with the potential to continue piling pressure on tree and forest resources and eventually affecting water volumes in rivers like the Mara.

The development of Ecosystem Management Plans (EMP) is critical for fostering coordinated land use and natural resources management. In both Tsavo and the Mara, development and use of these plans has been delayed by a slew of glitches.

- The Mara General Ecosystem Management Plan (GEMP) was developed, approved by the Narok County Government, and forwarded to the County Assembly but has not yet been approved due to political expediency and suspicion that some unfavorable provisions were being sneaked into some. Since the assembly has been dissolved pending the August 2022 elections, it will take time before the EMP is passed by an incoming government. In Tsavo, plans are afoot for the development of both an EMP and the Tsavo Ecosystem Master Plan. Stakeholders perceive that the two have potential to create confusion. Instructively, officials of the TTWCA are yet to understand why the development of two documents that aim at the same thing were originated with apparent support from MoTW.

The adoption of multi-agency approaches is instrumental to achievement of project aims. This has been a major preoccupation of the project but has so far achieved mixed results.

- In Tsavo, while establishing a security hub at Voi and a sub-hub at Kasigau is just picking momentum, delays have led to continued unstructured and poorly coordinated antipoaching and anti-trafficking activities. The lack of proper coordination has made it difficult for group and, private ranches to have a central point for security operations. In the Mara, the delay in the establishment of a multi-agency anti-poaching Task Force has been a drawback to progress in rallying all players behind one central command.

4.4 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

The MTR analyzed the management arrangements pertinent to the project, work planning, financing and co-financing, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting and communications. As an overarching concern, the review observed that the project has neither taken advantage of modern communication platforms or community electronic media, nor leveraged on UNDP's strong communication to increase visibility nationally and locally. It emphasizes the urgency of developing a knowledge management (KM) strategy to guide communication, dissemination and use of data and relevant information among stakeholders. This is essential to enhance learning. Other major observations are outlined below.

4.4.1 Management and Coordination

The project has deployed qualified and experienced head office and field staff, and established close links with all stakeholders at the national, county and community levels. The evaluation revealed that while the PMU is well-established and empowered to carry out day-to-day operations while domiciled at the MoTW with supportive provisions for coordination, it is constrained in its operations by the incongruence between two institutional regimes. Efforts to blend the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between UNDP and the Government of Kenya procedures results in a work setting that falls below optimum, since they each have their own stringent requirements. Implementation was premised on smooth flow of funding within UNDP's NIM, requiring adherence to the structural regimes of both government and UNDP. These are not always easy to reconcile, not least because PMU staff are non-government employees in the strict sense. Nevertheless, there was clearly documented evidence to demonstrate that the PMU meets regularly with the ministry to iron out issues in the implementation process.

4.4.2 Work Planning

The evaluation established that there were clearly documented and approved 2021 and 2022 Annual Work Plans (AWPs), accompanied by ratified minutes of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings. A Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) was also conducted during the project approval

stage. The AWP's are results-based with outputs and related budgets, a clear demonstration that the PSC has been effective in carrying out their oversight function. It also demonstrates PSC commitment to management decisions that help fast-track implementation. Despite this, key partners expressed concerns and dissatisfaction with the pace of progress due to slow procurement.

4.4.3 Finance and co-finance

The review team sought to establish whether the implemented activities represented value for money and if procurement procedures and guidelines were adhered to by the project team. It found that contracts were being negotiated strictly within the law, and UNDP Long Term Agreements (LTA) were in operation. However, although LTA and could be used to save time and resources, these would only apply if and when MoTW requests and authorizes UNDP to undertake an activity on its behalf (partial support to NIM). That opportunity has not yet been exploited. In addition, payment of Daily Subsistence Allowances (DSA) and transport refunds through government systems made it difficult to engage with non-government participants, presenting a serious bottleneck against project delivery.

The project has also invested in documentation and evidence-based programming and made strategies to allocate resources based on the approved annual work plans. Funds were utilized according to respective budgetary allocations mostly attributable to strong collaboration between the government, UNDP, and its implementing partners.

Except for component 2 which has attained 46% of expenditure based on total project budget (Table 8), the rest return dismal expenditure scores with component 1 posting 16%, component 3 11%, component 4 13% and Project Management 15%. With the project in its third year (from the signing of Project Document) and at 24% financial resources delivery, it is imperative that an accelerated implementation plan be developed to make up for the lost time.

Taking into consideration the notable progress made in the past one year and the significant shortcomings likely to affect most of end-of-project targets, the MTR rates implementation and adaptive management as "Moderately Satisfactory". This is based on the first PIR undertaken in 2021 which assigned low ratings to both progress towards the development objective and implementation progress and noted that that it was unlikely the project can achieve all its end-of-project targets by the scheduled closure date unless substantial actions were taken immediately. Since then, stakeholder engagement and mobilization had been done to a satisfactory level, and partners designated to be part of the PSC have taken up their respective roles and are providing the requisite guidance to the project.

Table 8: Financial Delivery Report

Component	Available Resources/Total Budget (USD)	Cumulative Expenditures (June 2021-June 2022) (USD)	Resource Balance (USD)	% Expenditure (Based on Total Project Budget)	Comments
Component 1. Strengthening national and local capacity for effective IWT control in Kenya	995,000.00	157,913.32	837,086.68	16%	HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY
Component 2. Reducing poaching and illegal wildlife trade in threatened species in Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems	1,282,759.00	587,334.08	695,424.92	46%	MODERATELY UNSATISFACTORY
Component 3. Strengthening Community Wildlife Conservancies in Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems	1,065,000.00	115,890.70	949,109.30	11%	HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY
Component 4. Knowledge Management, M&E and Gender Mainstreaming.	301,627.00	38,934.93	262,692.07	13%	HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY
Project Management	182,219.00	26,880.29	155,338.71	15%	HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY
TOTAL	3,826,605.00	926,953.32	2,899,651.68	24%	HIGHLY UNSATISFACTORY

4.4.4 Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

The project has a clearly articulated Monitoring and Evaluation results framework with clear outcome baselines, indicators, targets, data collection methods, means of verification and assumptions. However, a number of indicators still lack baselines and target values as they are indicated as TBD (To Be Determined) in the evaluation matrix. Under Outcome Indicator 1, partners for the Multi-Agency antipoaching Coordination Task Force, reported as yet to be established, were to be determined during the inception phase. It was unclear what the figure of 540 provided as 'Mid-Term Review Achievement' actually represented. Under Outcome Indicator 7, the mid-term target for strengthened institutional capacity the ICCWC Indicator Framework was to be determined in year 1, and no data were provided for use by the review.

While there are documented monitoring reports which provide data on the numbers of law enforcement and judicial activities, people supported, and target species poached at program sites, there were no monitoring and evaluation plans to guide field monitoring activities. Further the findings indicated that there is no monitoring and evaluation budget to support field operations by the M&E Officer. This confirms concerns raised by one PSC member who pointed out that the committee had not been involved in monitoring missions. The scaling up of project level monitoring and evaluation is fundamental to efficiency in documenting and reporting results.

4.4.5 Stakeholder Engagement, Collaboration and Partnerships

To leverage on partnerships and comparative capacities and expertise, the project works with partners at national, county, and local levels. At the national level, the project works with MoTW and other relevant ministries, the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (ODPP); KWS; UNDP; United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC); International Conservation Caucus Foundation (ICCF); International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN); and Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association (KWCA). At the county and landscape levels, it collaborates with the Narok and Taita Taveta county governments, the AWF and WWF. Other local level collaboration is with TTWCA, MMWCA, and Kasigau ranch. All these partners have a common agenda and subscribe to the project objective. They continue to play key roles as set out during the planning stage and have been key factors in enhancing project efficiency to deliver planned results. The review findings confirmed that widespread stakeholder engagement is bearing fruit, inclusive and consultative, and that the multi-partner approach is key to efficient results achievement.

4.4.6 Reporting

There are clearly written field activity reports which indicate what has been implemented. Their reports are shared with the Project Board to inform adaptive management. The PMU and project partners undertake quarterly and annual reporting as an accountability and compliance requirement. However, in cases where data were not sufficient to facilitate analysis of results, progress reports do not meet results-based management (RBM) or results-based reporting requirement. It was found that documentation of lessons learned and shared with key partners to inform adaptive management was wanting.

4.4.7 Knowledge Management and Communications

According to the ProDoc, IWT Kenya is a GEN 2 Marker project. Under Component 4 (Knowledge Management, M&E and Gender Mainstreaming), the project was designed to ensure effective lesson learning, a participatory M&E approach, and gender mainstreaming. As part of the GEF programmatic approach to prevent the extinction of known threatened species, coordinated knowledge management

was integral to the project design. Cross-fertilization with other programmatic approaches was considered assured through the Project Board. It is the view of the MTR that the project has not yet established a clear mechanism and platform for disseminating results and lessons learned as well as feedback. Accordingly, it has missed the opportunity to take advantage of modern interactive technologies and social media to collect, retain and share experiences, as well as increase and promote visibility.

4.5 Impact of the IWT project

4.5.1 Intended Results

Notwithstanding the slow start, the project has made significant milestones in delivering some of the planned results. It availed two (2) Toyota Land Cruiser Patrol vehicles for use by KWS in the Tsavo landscape. These are stationed at the Voi KWS offices and are already in use even as the Multi-Agency Wildlife Security Hub and sub-hub at Kasigau are being set up. The project also provided two (2) rapid-response troop carrier vehicles to the Narok County Government for use in the Maasai Mara landscape. Both are stationed in the reserve - one deployed in the rhino programme while the other supports general antipoaching activities/wildlife security. The project also provided 10 motor bikes to TTWCA and KWS in Tsavo (6 & 4 respectively), and a further 10 to MMWCA which have been distributed to needy conservancies.

4.5.1.1 Increased deterrence and capacity to arrest and prosecute

By complementing the four vehicles, the motor bikes have been instrumental in enhancing anti-poaching and combating IWT through increased surveillance within the two ecosystems and along the Kenya-Tanzania border. They have also enhanced investigations, response to anti-poaching intelligence and securing evidence at crime scenes. This has significantly reduced poaching and the bush meat problem within the two ecosystems.

For example, between June 2021 and June 2022, the use of the 2 land cruisers provided by the project resulted in an upsurge in the number of poachers arrested in possession of wild game meat in Tsavo ecosystem. Thirty-five (35) were arrested out of which three (3) were successfully prosecuted with one fined Ksh 20,000,000 (168,918.9 USD) or 20 years of imprisonment in default. In April 2022 seven (7) suspects were arrested and taken to court in Voi. Some of these cases are still pending before the courts. In Mara ecosystem, six (6) suspects were arrested and prosecuted in the Narok court. The cases are still pending at the time of the review. Over the same period, 11.8kg of ivory and 1, 178 kg of bush meat were seized in Tsavo ecosystem while 97 kg of ivory and 601 kg of bush meat were seized from poachers in the Mara ecosystem. In both ecosystems, the ratio of prosecution to arrests stood at 100%.

There is a downside too. While the two vehicles given to the Narok county will form part of capital investment in the planned Multi-Agency Anti-Poaching Taskforce, the evaluation established that they currently do not go into the conservancies. The impact is therefore yet to permeate the wider landscape.

The MTR finds that the KWS wildlife crime investigation and prosecution team in Tsavo, which was initially hamstrung by a vehicle that could not access some terrains, has now greatly improved its ability to impound illegal wildlife products, prosecute and attend to court cases. The support with vehicles and fuel has enabled rangers to do more real-time patrols and helped enhance capacity to avert human-wildlife conflict.

The project supported first-responder training of 70 KWS rangers drawn from Tsavo and Mara ecosystems. While attending training does not amount to capacity building *per se*, it is a fundamental

ingredient in the process of developing and strengthening skills and attitudes which helps sharpen human instincts, abilities and resourcefulness. The one-week training that took place in Naivasha has significantly improved Scene of Crime (SoC) management. The training has also led to improved prosecution skills leading to increased quality of evidence, improved handling of wildlife crime, prosecution as well as court-attendance. Nine (9) officers from the Taita Taveta County Assembly (TTCA) also attended one-week capacity building in Naivasha, a definite boost to project efforts to improve effectiveness and accountability in line with results-based management (RBM). This also demonstrates the project's contribution to improved positive working relation between KWS and Taita Taveta County Government.

The project successfully held two (2) site-level stakeholder mobilization engagement workshops where support was obtained from RPs and landscape partners to collaborate on expediting quick-win activities given project time constraint. Further, support was provided for the development of the Greater Maasai Mara Ecosystem Management Plan (EMP) to the tune of Ksh. 7.1 million, culminating in a draft that was reviewed by the county executive and submitted to the county assembly for debate. In addition, a draft governance structure and site plans were developed for Tsavo-based Multi-Agency Wildlife Security Hub at KWS in Voi and a sub-hub to be based at the Kasigau Ranch and conservancy. This is being led jointly by KWS and TTWCA. These key milestones have been success factors for the achievement of results, and they represent quick win interventions for the project. The PMU has prioritized the security hub in its work plan, along with the Multi-agency Anti-poaching Task Force in the Mara, for implementation to commence during the current quarter.

The project was to provide 120 uniforms (60 in each ecosystem) to the anti-poaching unit personnel, as part of building synergy among the players in both landscapes. The review team established that the batch destined to the Mara was expected to arrive within a few days of the field visit with indications that these would be delivered the week of 20 June 2022.

4.5.1.2 Strengthened partnerships

MTR findings indicate that the project has promoted stronger partnerships and provided technical and financial support for resources mobilization for the enhancement of conservation efforts in the two ecosystems. It supported the development of a concept note and consultant Terms of Reference (ToRs) for a Conservancies Small Grants Facility which will be established and operationalized by KWCA. The project successfully secured co-funding totaling Ksh.4,350,000 from Narok County government, AWF and WWF for the joint training of rangers by KWS at Manyani. The project also supported the development of ToRs for Multi-Agency Task Force consultant for the Maasai Mara landscape, and the ToRs to engage a consultant to deliver the Tsavo Ecosystem Management Plan (EMP) in addition to the Mbale conservancy management plan. Further it supported the signing of a 30-year land lease agreement between TTWCA and Kasigau Ranch owners for the 10-acre site where the wildlife security sub-hub will be located. These initiatives have enhanced multi-agency collaboration and resources mobilization to strengthen anti-poaching activities.

In the Tsavo ecosystem the prospects of a security hub have brought new hopes for the reinvigoration of ranches that were on the verge of collapse. The three months capacity building for 48 rangers at the Manyani Academy, attended by twenty (20) (4 female) rangers from Kasigau, Mbale, and Wushumbu conservancies, underscored a major leap in the strengthening of partnerships between conservancies, county governments and KWS in the Tsavo landscape. Another twenty (20) (17 males and 3 females) from the Mara Reserve also underwent the same training, along with four (4) conservancy rangers (3 males and 1 female) from Mara North, Enonkishu, Olare-Motorogi and Mbokishi conservancies. This

bold contribution by the project stood out as a shining light for what might be achieved in the remaining time.

Through the support from the project TTWCA, has increased the conservancy areas by over 150,000 hectares. However only communities that are willing to join do so since membership is voluntary. With the increased number of conservancies being fully operational e.g. Mbale Conservancy, the space for illegal poaching will be minimized since they will enroll and train more rangers.

In the view of the review team, TTCWA capacity is weak in a number of critical areas. The need for strengthening in governance, financial management, resources mobilization and development of strategic documents was specifically mentioned during the field evaluation. This is a pointer to the urgency of carrying out a gap analysis for the organization and subsequent redressing of the weaknesses.

4.5.1.3 Enhanced ranger capacity

Concomitant with the scene-of-crime first-responder and prosecutorial trainings which elevated skills, knowledge and attitudes, the review found that the community rangers can now relate well with KWS rangers since the latter now accord them greater recognition. Individual accounts and manager comments all confirmed that they can now capably handle suspected poachers after making arrests, conduct ambush while following the law, provide first aid and deal with human-wildlife conflict before inviting KWS for reinforcement. They can also professionally handle community members who infiltrate the conservancies with livestock, and this has further enhanced trust, while their presence improved security within and around the community.

4.5.1.4 Benefits to local people

In the Mara ecosystem, businesses established within and adjacent to the conservancies are thriving through eco-tourism and have improved household and community livelihoods. Community members in general obtain employment, while women are increasingly more involved in the landowner committees where decisions are made. A significant finding of this review is that certain conservancies pay up to 42,000 Ksh to landowners for 150 ha of land annually, an amount not hitherto imagined in the area. This has enabled some conservancies to start a bursary scheme to support education for children from the community and provide consolation payments in cases of human-wildlife conflict.

4.5.2 Unintended Results

The training of community rangers has yielded results beyond anti-poaching and combating IWT. The increased awareness has led to greater sense of responsibility and stewardship. The training of four rangers from Kasigau ranch, for example, is contributing to enhanced protection of the environment by reducing not only poaching but also cutting down of trees and charcoal burning. Their presence has increased a sense of security within the community, in particular against cattle rustling from neighboring communities. Further the rangers have helped reduce human-wildlife conflict, trained community members on environmental protection and encouraged responsible eco-tourism. The training also enabled the community to benefit from knowledge on livestock pasture management which has reduced livestock losses during drought. The project has also demonstrated that achievement of gender equality is possible through training of both female and male rangers, and brought enthusiasm on wildlife and environmental conservation among young people.

4.6 Cross-Cutting issues

The review took into consideration that project implementation was also premised on the realization that deploying effective social and environmental safeguards requires adaptive and meaningful engagement of rights holders. A natural resources project implemented in the two landscapes which lie

in some of the last frontiers of diverse traditional lifestyles must therefore demonstrate cognizance of UNDP's corporate guidance on safeguards which underpin commitment to mainstreaming social and environmental sustainability. The review therefore sought answers to the key questions on potential social and environmental risks associated with the project, their levels of significance and management measures in place or expected for each.

Equally importantly, the evaluation sought to establish to what extent gender and human rights are encapsulated in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project. It assessed how this translates to ease of access to resources and opportunities, participation and decision-making. Particular attention was paid to finding out how the empowerment of women has been addressed and to what extent the disadvantaged and marginalized groups have benefited from the project.

In doing this the team indulged on the extent to which the broader development effects impinged on beneficiaries in a way that addresses the gaps and inequalities between women and men, boys and girls, encompasses all on the basis of participatory, inclusive and rights observing approaches. Whether or not such effects were enduring, having a long-term and sustainable perspective that recognizes that social change takes time, also weighed in heavily in the review.

4.6.1 Social and Environmental Standards

As articulated of Principle 2 of UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards (SES), it was necessary to take an in-depth look at how the various relevant provisions are taken into account, especially the standards with respect to cultural heritage, and indigenous peoples. To effectively achieve this, the consultants carefully studied the operational guidance related to SES, and the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) which ought to be used iteratively as a design and appraisal tool throughout the project cycle to assist in screening, assessment, and management of potential opportunities and risks. A safeguards exercise undertaken just before and concurrently with the MTR did not identify any new risks or existing risks that had become more severe. Neither had any categorization changed in the project's safeguards screening or management plans.

4.6.2 Gender Equality

The findings revealed that while gender considerations were prioritized in the design of the project, there has not been meaningful participation of women in every aspect of the implementation. With far much fewer women than men benefiting from the project so far these findings reveal that contributing to the achievement of gender equality still remains a distant goal.

Instances of women participation were identified, however, and these represented commendable effort. For example, out of 650 people directly benefiting from Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) and other forms of natural resources management (NRM), 21% were females involved in formal and informal businesses, employment and eco-tourism activities around the conservancies and those accruing revenue earned from membership.

In both ecosystems, the number of people employed in wildlife management, law enforcement and/or advocacy was found to be 20% female. In the Tsavo, where three (3) ranches have already been converted into conservancies, the female membership is a considerable proportion. In the Mbale for example – which was targeted by the project - membership is 540 (422 males: 118 females). On the other hand, 80 people (66 males and 14 females) were found to be registered members of community-based organizations and cooperatives in two (2) of the Maasai Mara conservancies.

The evaluation found that the interventions specific to the youth and other marginalized groups, focused on capacity building and employment as rangers in the conservancies. There was no evidence adduced to show that people living with disability were involved and had any form of participation in the project.

4.6.3 Human Rights

The nature of the project is such that it was not intended to cause any significant disruption such as the displacement or resettlement of persons, cause any environmental perturbations like pollution or raise concerns over resource efficiency. It would also not interfere with local labor and working conditions that would warrant concern. Whereas the project was located on lands and territories populated, or within areas influenced by indigenous peoples, no evidence was encountered on any adverse effects on their development priorities, traditional livelihoods, survival, or cultural heritage of such peoples. As such, the evaluation holds the view that the project has not violated any of the essential attributes in the 2003 Common Understanding on Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) to Development Cooperation, which indicates that all development co-operation, policies and technical assistance further the realization of human rights.

4.7 Sustainability

The evaluation sought to establish whether the positive outcomes of the project and the flow of benefits are likely to continue after external funding or non-funding support ends. The project has national ownership and is unmistakably gaining county government ownership in both landscapes. It is also founded on partnerships that hold the promise for continuity. It was therefore found to be sustainable due to these and a number of other factors and assigned a “Moderately Likely” rating.

Prospects for sustainability are drawn from its relevance to and alignment with key national legislative and policy instruments. These make it a national priority that responds to needs of the people of Kenya that are embedded into the National Wildlife Strategy 2030, Kenya Vision 2030, Wildlife Conservation and Management Act 2013, and Wildlife Policy 2020. Sustainability is also in-built within the MoTW as anti-poaching and combating IWT is its direct mandate.

Having been designed to address the ecosystem management planning, this is a big gain for conflict mitigation that will have a positive impact in social economic fronts. The creation and establishment of security hub in the Tsavo makes community members part of wider ecosystem response mechanism. The necessary legal safeguards have been built into the arrangements for this investment, as the 10 ha of land for the construction of the sub-hub in Kasigau conservancy will continue to be used over the 30 years of lease agreement. The proposed establishment of security border post at Jipe, which will increase surveillance and wildlife protection operations along Kenya-Tanzania border, is part of trans-frontier collaboration with long-term goals. Similarly, the establishment of Multi-Agency Anti-Poaching Task Force has long-term projections for building synergy and improving coordination of anti-wildlife trafficking in the Mara ecosystem and across the common border.

Building community and conservancies capacity for reporting and patrols will help minimize poaching as there will always be direct participation. This has a multiplier effect with strong indications for sustainability. For example, the rangers trained by the project will continue to use the skills gained long after closure, and facilitate involvement in more innovative ventures such as carbon marketing.

Working closely with the National Government, Narok and Taita Taveta county governments represent another avenue for sustainability. This has been strengthened by the commitment to co-finance the project at 25% of the total cost. The community-based RPs will also own and sustain the project results. For example, conservancies that subscribe to TTWCA and MMWCA have their own sources of funding and trained community rangers. They therefore have the capacity to sustain the project results beyond

the project funding period. Lessons learned and best practices documented will be used to adopt innovative ways for project financial and technical capacities to enhance sustainability.

Equipment provided to project partners are durable and will continue to function after the project. The four (4) rapid response vehicles and 20 motor bikes provided to support Mara and Tsavo ecosystems, and new communication equipment whose acquisition is under way, have lifespans beyond the project. They will continue to support antipoaching and anti-wildlife trafficking activities as envisaged. Security of the wildlife will be maintained since KWS is a key partner and is mandated to perform that role both inside and outside protected areas. Leveraging on the technological surveillance and partner collaboration will enable continued and wide area coverage of activities beyond project closure. All the partners and RPs are institutions established with clear mandates and perpetual succession, ensuring consistency in the fight against IWT.

4.7.1 Risks to Sustainability

At the inception stage, consultative forums were held to identify risks which could negate the gains made from the project. The 2021 PIR rated implementation progress unfavorably on account of low delivery, with four of the risks being flagged in the ATLAS risk register as high to moderate. COVID-19 was ranked high), the impacts of road development as substantial, as was budget availability and cash flow. Stakeholder complexity and synergies was ranked moderate. While the PIR noted that issues could be resolved with immediate and significant adaptive management, or be restructured to retrofit the 5-year cycle into the remaining 3 years, there has been little time lapse since then and not much difference has been made. The MTR therefore established a number of risks to sustainability.

Risks associated with social and environmental safeguards were identified at the design stage and the evaluation established that these are being monitored and documented through ATLAS. The PIR noted that these have not been flagged in ATLAS and they require careful monitoring, especially before the project's safeguards management plans are in place. Fast-tracking the safeguards management plans is a key imperative. This notwithstanding, the MTR found that project was designed to enhance human dignity by protecting the environment and livelihoods. This is in line with the Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and articles 42 and 43 of the Constitution of Kenya - which address the right of every person to a clean and healthy environment, economic and social rights, respectively.

Other risks to sustainability include the ongoing severe drought that has the potential to impact the project negatively. This may result in lack of clean drinking water for people and wildlife, with ramifications on health and food security. Animal diseases have potential to claw back the gains made in the conservation, and already real-time surveillance is being conducted by KWS and other key players to identify and treat or rescue sick animals. Outbreaks in the wild have the potential to wipe whole species. The project should devote some resources to support disease surveillance as mitigation measure.

The interference in the operations of ranches/conservancies by the local political class could pose a real threat to wildlife and forest conservation efforts. For example, the political rhetoric and narratives against wildlife conservation in Taita Taveta, and to a less extent in Narok county have the potential to be used to the detriment of conservation.

The lack of institutionalized grievance redress mechanisms is a general concern. While the ProDoc indicates that the project uses UNDP's Grievance Redress Mechanism policies, it is not clear why the discontent within TTWCA and MMWCA on the deployment of four rapid response vehicles has not been effectively addressed. While this might have passed as a low-key concern during the review, UNDP should activate its mechanisms to deal with the subtle but simmering disaffection.

Delays in commencing the full establishment of planned conservancies and the security hub in Tsavo and in setting up of Anti-Poaching Taskforce in the Mara, have been major bottlenecks to the project. These have potential to undermine the gains unless efforts are made to fast-track them accordingly. There is also the likelihood of progress being slowed down by incongruence in the provision of partner inputs. For example, KWS indicated that occasional lack of fuel prevents their rangers from conducting routine surveillance and anti-poaching intelligence information, pointing to the possibility that value added by the vehicles acquired through the project may be diminished. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) also meets periodically to look at risks and their mitigation. The issue of delays and adaptive management should feature as a permanent item on the PSC agenda, while proactive action should be undertaken on a continuous basis.

The project's management structure raises considerable concern over the versatility of staff within the MoTW's operational environment. The PMU has endured significant turnover in the relatively short duration of implementation, raising the specter of activities grinding to a halt should any further mobility occur abruptly. This review holds the opinion that such risks could be avoided in the future by allowing for use of Technical Assistance (TA) which comes with wider sway.

5.0 LESSONS LEARNED

The MTR brought out important lessons that can be used to improve the implementation via adaptive management and also be shared with other national and international projects to make sure the project strategies can bring real change in the country. The project design was itself based on the multiple lessons from elsewhere by GEF, UNDP, other international agencies and NGOs in Kenya and in other countries.

Lesson 1: A project well-aligned with existing needs and capacity building integrated in the design increases the probability for sustainability of its results. Strong stakeholder participation in project design and/or implementation leads to ownership and a shared vision.

Lesson 2: A more flexible project design would allow for implementation to adopt effective adaptive management. Inability by the implementing partner (MoTW) to provide on-granting to RP, which has considerably slowed down the project delivery, would have been mitigated by allowing for more UNDP involvement in the administration of funds destined to the RPs.

Lesson 3: RPs have immense potential to play key roles in accelerating the project delivery if they could be funded directly without having to go through a long process between UNDP and the ministry. A 'Letter of Agreement' widely cited as the remedy for this seems to offer little hope, if any at all.

Lesson 4: Substantial opportunity is being lost in not leveraging on new communication and technology, social media or local community radios to raise public awareness on the negative impacts of IWT, and to increase visibility.

Lesson 5: That stiffer penalties and more punitive jail terms imposed by court officers whose awareness of the wildlife security issues and capacity build on legislative provisions are resulting in reduced poaching incidences is amply demonstrated by a simple comparison of judgements delivered in cases handled locally at Voi which attract stiffer penalties than those in cases taken Malindi, even though they relate to similar crimes committed in the same ecosystem. Multiagency stakeholder and court users committee joint meetings have also resulted in more successful prosecution and determination of cases. The deliberate engagement of the court officers with wildlife sector players no doubt enhances the application of law in ways that are help deterrent poaching and illegal trafficking.

Lesson 6: The multi-agency, broad stakeholder and community engagement, a key success factor, results in stronger partnerships and collaboration with enhanced potential for longer sustainability.

Through this, the project has stirred interest in conservation, contributing to its catalytic role and the growth of confidence in the conservancy movement. The ongoing conversion of ranches (which are wildlife dispersal areas) into conservancies is clear testimony of this. In the Mara ecosystem, the frequency with which the anticipated establishment of a multi-agency Antipoaching Taskforce was cited in discussion with stakeholders underscores the great potential it holds for facilitating effective collaboration. It will be a vital innovation for improved coordination and wider geographic coverage along the Kenya-Tanzania border. The promise for success lies in closer and more inclusive engagement, as is evident in the consultations on the establishment of Kasigau security sub-hub which have led to a significant improvement in the relationship between KWS, the community and TTCCG. In the Mara ecosystem, the rising involvement of women in the landowner committees represents a key process indicator of how gender equality in wildlife conservation efforts can be improved with step-wise advocacy and incremental participation.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In accordance with the requirement for an independent evaluation, the MTR team has taken the prerogative to develop its own conclusion and recommendations as outlined below. It is expected that these shall inform the management response, the purpose of which will be to outline how the Project Team and other stakeholders propose to move during the remaining period of implementation.

6.1 Conclusions

Overall, the evaluation concludes that the project design and implementation process was appropriate. The project is effective and, if tweaked appropriately, can deliver results and the desired outputs. It is also relevant to the local and national country context and contains aspects that are sustainable beyond the project's lifetime.

The overall effectiveness was found to be "Moderately Satisfactory" and the IWT project is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. It has been catalytic in creating learning and knowledge sharing between government, partners and conservancies.

The project management structure has been effective in enhancing delivery of outcomes, but while the PMU is sufficiently well placed and empowered, innovativeness is required in operating with adherence to both government and UNDP rules under the National Implementation Modality (NIM). There is need to review the modality for funds disbursement to RPs to accelerate implementation. Staff turnover presents a considerable threat to operational effectiveness.

The project has been efficient in turning resources into results through multi-stakeholder engagements and community participation. However, it needs to employ a diverse range of strategies that target mainstreaming gender and people with disabilities in project activities.

Progress towards results on outcomes at the midterm is re-assuring. Based on the 4-point scale provided in the guidance for MTR and taking into consideration the moderate risks identified against expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained, the assessment assigns an overall Moderately Likely (ML) sustainability rating. The strength of the project lies in its relevance to, and alignment with, national legislative and policy instruments. This gives it a leverage to support the delivery of the national agenda on wildlife protection. The involvement of a wide array of actors has been key in assuring impact beyond the project life. Innovative ways of resource mobilization will be essential for guaranteeing financial sustainability of the conservancies.

Based on the evaluation findings, conclusion and above observations, the MTR arrived at the recommendations below.

6.2 Recommendations

At this stage, it is only wishful that any indicators for which the baseline is yet to be determined can still be used to monitor the project to its logical end. It is therefore incumbent on the management to make appropriate changes in the results framework to bring it in line with reality. In this regard, indicator 7 on the ICCWC assessments should be pegged on the biennial assessment closest to the mid-term. Similarly, indicator 12 on percentage increase in average annual household income should be anchored on livelihood surveys of sample communities undertaken at project inception or, if not available, one be done immediately to be representative of the mid-term.

Commensurate with the findings that there is no monitoring and evaluation budget to support field monitoring, and considering that the 2021 PIR flagged out low allocations and cash flow as substantial reasons for poor delivery, appropriate changes should be made in the budget. In addition to a fresh at the mechanism for facilitating the funding for non-state actors, an adequate reallocation is needed in Component 3 to cover the costs to enable KWCA, for it to effectively operationalize and administer the Small Grants Facility in support of conservancies. Movements should also be made in the corresponding budget-lines in Component 4 to accommodate the needs of the M&E function, or some resources be shifted from another component.

Recommendation 1: All the avenues for adaptive management in the project design should be exploited and proactive measures be taken to fast-track delivery of quality results. Management should move more deliberately towards enhancing the delivery of quick-win interventions and developing an even more accelerated implementation plan. This is where reconsideration is most needed on the implementation modality. A mechanism that allows UNDP to move resources to the RPs is urgently required - the 'Letter of Agreement' must either be brought into effect, or an alternative mechanism be devised to facilitate faster flow of funds. To achieve this with ample time for project success, the PSC, MoTW, Treasury and UNDP must roll out a rescue plan during the current and next quarters of the AWP. Faster implementation can be achieved by more determined use of partnerships and technical assistance, for example by using the available resources to deploy the services of a Technical Advisor. The project should also establish a more enhanced project oversight (PSC monthly meetings) to bulwark the fast-tracking of outstanding deliverables. The development and completion of the Multi-Agency Security Hub and sub-hub in Tsavo ecosystem and training for Mbale Conservancy Board members based on the TORs that have been developed represent other low-hanging fruits. Convening more frequent PSC meetings and baby-sitting the quick-wins is the responsibility of the PMU, which must however be safeguarded against loss of momentum, the onus of which lies with both the PSC and MoTW.

Recommendation 2: The PMU must come out more sabre-toothed in the discharge of its function in the remaining project time and employ every tactic acceptable in the rulebook. In order to do this, it should be revamped and charged with exploring all the avenues for adaptive management in the project design, and take proactive measures to fast-track delivery of quality results. In order to overcome the underlying or perceived structural problem in project management, the ministry should officially second relevant staff to the PMU in order to more directly support with matters relating to government procedures. Action in this regard is within the mandate of the National Project Director who should immediately initiate administrative change goes beyond providing contingency measures to formally assigning the necessary government officers.

Recommendation 3: UNDP should leverage on its comparative strength to help further fast-track the passing and adoption of Ecosystem Management Plan (EMP) by the Narok County government, the establishment of Anti-poaching Task force in the Mara ecosystem, and the completion and adoption of EMP by the Taita Taveta County Government. MoTW and stakeholders must also make efforts to

resolve the ambiguity and suspicion involving the development of the Tsavo EMP and Tsavo Ecosystem Management Master Plan. This requires concerted action by the Project Manager/Coordinator, National Project Director and UNDP Country Office Programme Officer, within the current AWP.

Recommendation 4: Developing clear field monitoring plans and allocating sufficient monitoring and evaluation budget to guide field monitoring activities is a key imperative that should be prioritized to enable project tracking of progress and involve PSC and key stakeholders. Knowledge management plans should be developed, and staff be trained on RBM to enhance the quality of results reporting and lesson learning. The project should also develop and institutionalize a Gender Action Plan to guide gender mainstreaming and deepen inclusion in wildlife conservation within the Tsavo and Mara ecosystems. Another urgent step is to consider taking up a request by TTWCA for capacity building on governance and financial management, resource mobilization and development of strategic documents, critical for the association to effectively play its role of a strategic RP. This would enhance their operations and improve sustainability. All this calls for immediate action by the PMU, with Project Manager/Coordinator taking direct responsibility within the current AWP or the first quarter of the next AWP.

7.0 ANNEXES

7.1 Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix



Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent does the project relate to the GEF Combating Illegal Wildlife Trafficking focal areas? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators The project makes explicit links with/alignment to national wildlife conservation strategies, policies and goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document GEF 5 Focal Area Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent does the design of the project position it to deliver global wildlife conservation benefits in line with relevant objectives of international agreements? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators The project makes explicit links with global treaties and goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document GEF antipoaching strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent does the project align to national development priorities, and objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy and national wildlife conservation policy and strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document National development strategy, National Wildlife Strategy 2030 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews of the project stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the project's Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified in the National Development Strategy and the National Wildlife Strategy 2030? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Theory of Change clearly indicates how project interventions and projected results will contribute to the reduction of the three major barriers (policy, institutional/technical capacity and financial) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document National development strategy, National Wildlife Strategy 2030 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews of the project stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent does the project directly and adequately address the needs of beneficiaries at local, national and regional levels? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Theory of Change clearly identifies beneficiary groups and defines how their capabilities will be enhanced by the project The project clearly outlines how the social and economic benefits of the project will be distributed among beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document Progress reports National development strategy, National Wildlife Strategy 2030 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Desk review of reports Review of national development strategy, national wildlife
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is the project's results framework relevant to the development challenges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project indicators are SMART Indicator baselines and milestones and targets are clearly defined and populated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document Project Implementation Framework (PIF) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews of the project stakeholders

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results framework is comprehensive and demonstrates systematic links to the theory of change 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the planned results been achieved? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document Project Implementation Framework (PIF) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews of the project stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement. Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document Inception report Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (PIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Stakeholder Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have the interventions of the project been adequately considered in the context of other development activities being undertaken in the same geographical areas or related thematic area? To what extent are there synergies between the project and other related interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities Project collaborates with other UNDP projects, other UN agencies or CSOs interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (PIR) Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Stakeholder Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SES checklist was completed appropriately, and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document SES Annex 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on project activity monitoring and achievement of indicator targets, to what extent has each of the expected project objectives and their 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has met or in the process of meeting the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly Reports Annual Reports Donor reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries

	related outputs been achieved according to the work plan or are likely to be achieved?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site visit/field reports 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have lessons learned been captured and integrated into project planning and implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validation Workshop Minutes (<i>if available</i>) • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the M&E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The M&E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded • The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&E tool • There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality) • Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • M&E Plan • AWP • FACE forms • Quarterly Narrative Reports • Site visit reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were relevant counterparts from the Government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the Project Board? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project Board participation included representatives from key project stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Board Minutes (<i>if available</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effective were the partnership arrangements under the project and to what extent did they contribute to achievements of the project results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A partnership framework has been developed that ensured coordination of parallel initiatives, involvement of key partners and identification of complementarities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Reports • Quarterly reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and other donors
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What have been the main contributing factors towards project's success in attaining its targets? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributing factors towards project meeting targets clearly identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Reports • Quarterly reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and other donors

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What have been the main challenging factors/barriers against project's success in attaining its targets? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barriers against project meeting targets clearly identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Reports Quarterly reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and other donors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How has the project catalyzed learning and knowledge sharing between government, local communities, private sector, civil society organizations and other stakeholders in addressing IWT in Kenya? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catalytic aspects of the project identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Reports Quarterly reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and other donors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have partnerships been effective in promoting progress towards planned results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contributions to partnerships with different partners documented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Reports Quarterly reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and other donors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How effective is the IWT Project management structure and how has it enhanced delivery of project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management effectiveness identified Proportion of participants who express satisfaction with management structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Reports Quarterly reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and other donors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What lessons can be drawn from implementation of the project to further enhance Kenya's Combating IWT process? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lessons learned documented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Reports Quarterly reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and other donors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SaES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A clearly defined risk identification, categorization, and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP ATLAS Risk Log M&E Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
• Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Work Plans Validation Workshop Minutes Quarterly Reports Annual Reports Project Board meeting minutes (<i>if available</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any changes to the project's planned activities were approved by the Project Board Any substantive changes (outcome-level changes) approved by the Project Board and donor, as required 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the Combating IWT Project been efficient in achieving results? Did the actual or expected results (outputs and outcomes) justify the costs incurred? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project achieved the planned results in an efficient manner Funds used for project implementation were utilized affectively and contributed to achievement of project results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Workplans Quarterly Reports Project document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have the Combating IWT Project resources been used to maximize its outcomes/outputs and provide early lessons for Combating IWT and Implementation in Kenya? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project achieved the planned results in an efficient manner Funds used for project implementation were utilized affectively and contributed to achievement of project results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Workplans Quarterly Reports Project document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How efficiently have resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) been allocated and used to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader project objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocation of resources documented or articulated by beneficiaries Time allocation for the interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audit reports Delivery reports Financial reports Project Document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can implementation of the Combating IWT Project be improved to attain efficiencies, based on the lessons learnt from the project so far? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestions for improvement and efforts towards results achievements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Workplans Quarterly Reports Project document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What were the strengths and weaknesses of the implementation modality? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project implementation followed the division of responsibilities between the project implementing partners in an efficient manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Reports Quarterly reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was co-financing adequately estimated during project design (sources, type, value, relevance), tracked during implementation and what were the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Work Plans (AWPs) Validation Workshop Minutes (<i>if available</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, other donors and beneficiaries

	reasons for any differences between expected and realized co-financing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly Reports, including financial reports Annual Reports 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical support to the Executing Agency and project team were timely and of acceptable quality. Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP project support documents Quarterly Reports Annual Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings. Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Audit Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent are the project activities sustainable? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of wide participation of key stakeholders Evidence and documented stakeholder engagement strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual reports Stakeholder engagement strategy Monitoring reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What steps can be taken to enhance the sustainability of project objectives, components and results? OR (How best can sustainability of the IWT be enhanced)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed sustainability enhancement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual reports Stakeholder engagement strategy Monitoring reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there political, social or financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure sustainability of relevant activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program Framework Document Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability and potential for replication? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure sustainability of relevant activities and identifies relevant factors requiring attention in the future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program Framework Document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program Framework Document Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program Framework Document Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program Framework Document Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents. Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress, that can be linked directly to project interventions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly Reports Annual Reports Progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents. Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the key intended outcomes for Kenya's Combating IWT process? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of intended outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly Reports Annual Reports Progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents. Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What, if any, unintended outcomes have been realized so far? What are the key opportunities and risks associated with these unintended outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of unintended outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly Reports Annual Reports Progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents. Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What catalytic impacts has the Combating IWT Project had in shaping the wildlife conservation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of catalytic nature of IWT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly Reports Annual Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy and institutional framework in Kenya that could determine longer term sustainability of national efforts on conservation efforts? 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What should have been done differently, and should be avoided in the next phase of the project or in similar projects? • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Un foreseen risks with potential to undermine sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports • Progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents. • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
Cross Cutting Issues: Assesses how disadvantaged groups (women, people living with disabilities and youth) have benefited from the IWT project			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have the people living with disabilities been involved in the design, implementation and monitoring. • How much benefits have they drawn from the IWT project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full participation of people living with disabilities at all staged of IWT project • Benefits drawn by people living with disabilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports • Progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents. • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full participation of women at all staged of IWT project • Benefits drawn by women 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports • Progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents. • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have the youth been engaged in the project and what benefit have they drawn from IWT? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full participation of youth at all staged of IWT project • Benefits drawn by youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports • Progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents. • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries

7.2 Annex 2: Project partners consulted

National					
	Organization	Contact Person	Email Address	Date	Comment
1.	Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS)	Dickson Ritan	dicksonr@kws.go.ke	03/06/2022	10.00 am

2.	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Washington Ayiemba	washington.ayiemba@undp.org	02/06/2002	10.00 am
3.	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)	Lauren Friedman	lauren.friedman@un.org	03/06/2022	14.00 pm
4.	International Conservation Caucus Foundation (ICCF)	Jill Barasa	jbarasa@internationalconservation.org	01/6/2022	09.00 am
5.	KWCA CEO	Dickson Kaelo		28 June 2022	09:00 am
6.	MoTW - Director of Wildlife	Dr Erustus Kanga		28 June 2022	14:00 pm

UNDP					
1.	Evelyn Koech	Team Leader, Environment and Resilience Unit	evelyn.koech@undp.org	09/06/2022	3.00 pm
2.	Onesimus Muhwezi	Regional Technical Advisor, Addis Ababa	onesimus.muhwezi@undp.org	21/06/2022	10.00 am
3.	Hiwot Gebremeskel	Regional Programme Associate, Addis Ababa	hiwot.gebremeskel@undp.org	21/06/2022	10.00 am
4.	Mandy Cadman	RTA Focal Point (until end of Feb 2022)	mandy.cadman@undp.org	03/06/2022	14.00 pm

KWS TSAVO CONSERVATION AREA (KWS-TCA) MEETING HELD ON 13 TH JUNE 2022 IN VOI			
1.	Francis Mutuku	PA to SAD	0722171668
2.	Stephen Kuseren	In-charge, Community Department	0729009532
3.	Wilson K. Njue	Tsavo East Park Warden	0720401641
4.	David Ougi	Tsavo West Park Warden	0714311716
5.	Moses Odhiambo	Intelligence Officer	0722170618
6.	John Were	Intelligence Officer	0708495864

TAITA TAVETA COUNTY GOVERNMENT (TTCG) OFFICIALS MEETING HELD ON 13TH JUNE 2022 IN VOI			
1.	John Mlamba	Director, Environment & Climate Change	0726632506

TAITA TAVETA WILDLIFE CONSERVANCIES ASSOCIATION (TTWCA) HELD ON 13TH JUNE 2022 IN VOI			
1.	Alfred Mwanake	Chief Executive Officer (CEO)	0723635916
2.	Noel Kasololo	Programs Officer	0708145981
3.	Martha Mwasi	HR Officer	0714815610
4.	Naomi Wanjia	Asst. Projects Officer	0729826863

AFRICAN WILDLIFE FOUNDATION (AWF) HELD ON 13TH JUNE 2022 IN VOI			
1.	Kenneth Kimitei	Landscape Manager	0723762592
2.	Amos Chege	Project Officer	0727947045

KASIGAU RANCH MANAGEMENT HELD ON 14TH JUNE 2022 IN KASIGAU			
1.	Jonathan Mwangeje	Chairman	0705723736
2.	Allen Mwakesi	Treasurer	0721202521
3.	Milton Mwaegwa	Secretary	0713879545
4.	James Mwakuja	Director	0719876116
5.	John M. Mwamburi	Director	0727141853
6.	Daniel Mademu	Director	0741399692

7.	Challa Gibson	Director	0724703010
8.	Mwakapoe Mwanjala	Director	0714749329
9.	Steve Mwaisaka	Manager	0721701663
10.	Jackline Mbura	Ranger	0799563154
11.	Violet Malemba	Ranger	0798433344
12.	Silvano Isaac	Ranger	0768338358
13.	Noel Kasololo	Programs Officer (ITWCA)	0708145981

KASIGAU RANCH MANAGEMENT HELD ON 14TH JUNE 2022 IN KASIGAU			
1.	Jonathan Mwangeje	Chairman	0705723736
2.	Allen Mwakesi	Treasurer	0721202521
3.	Milton Mwaegwa	Secretary	0713879545
4.	James Mwakuja	Director	0719876116
5.	John M. Mwamburi	Director	0727141853
6.	Daniel Mademu	Director	0741399692
7.	Challa Gibson	Director	0724703010
8.	Mwakapoe Mwanjala	Director	0714749329
9.	Steve Mwaisaka	Manager	0721701663
10.	Jackline Mbura	Ranger	0799563154
11.	Violet Malemba	Ranger	0798433344
12.	Silvano Isaac	Ranger	0768338358

13.	Noel Kasololo	Programs Officer (ITWCA)	0708145981
14.	Fredrick Kiute	Jora village	0700030209
15.	Vainece Nguwa	Makwasinyi village	0713952884
16.	Margaret Kizaka	Kiteghe village	0717223729
17.	Gilliard M. Lengube	Rukanga village	0724708477
18.	Rajab Yusuf Suleiman	Bungule village	0728310217
19.	Peris Bakari	Bungule village	0724342572
20.	Agnes Mole	Jora village	0704492222
21.	Jason Nyiro	Kiteghe village	0720144389
22.	Grace Mwachuga	Rukanga village	0723734225
23.	Elipina Mcholo	Bungule village	0728234221
24.	John Kalume	Kiteghe village	0742254470
25.	Laban Mwanjiu	Jora village	0725094026
26.	Nicholas Mwangeka	Makwasinyi village	0712740077
27.	Samuel Mwanjala	Makwasinyi village	0768079227
28.			

KWS NAROK TEAM HELD ON 16TH JUNE 2022 IN EWASO NYIRO			
1.	Jackson Muyanga	Prosecutions Assistant	0721992486
2.	David Wanyoike	Prosecutions Assistant	0722907628
3.	Albert Lesuuda	Community Wildlife	0720000818

<u>Masai Mara meeting RESERVE HELD ON 16TH JUNE 2022 IN SEKENANI</u>			
1.	James Sindiyo	Chief Reserve Warden	0722784193

<u>MAASAI MARA WILDLIFE CONSERVANCY ASSOCIATION (MMWCA) MEETING HELD ON 17TH JUNE 2022 IN AITONG</u>			
1.	Daniel Sopia	CEO	0717806260
2.	Daniel Ole Muli	Senior Programs Officer	0720213054
3.	William Kipetu	Mara North Conservancy	0701019816
4.	Danson Kaelo	Mbokishi Manager	0729217846
5.	James Mpusia	Olare-Motorogi Manager	0711859895
6.	Bolton Onyango	Enonkishu Field Assistant	0793522119
7.	Doris Nabaala	Olchoro Conservancy	0724404147
8.	Samuel Ngilisho	Mara North Ranger	0726853011
9.	Ben Njapit	Mara North Ranger	0727706038
10.	Naman Lenkume	Enonkishu Ranger	0791024144
11.	Salami Nkorieta	Enonkishu Ranger	0717457638
12.	Samuel Leposo	Director, Narok County Government (NCG)	0721553801

7.3 Annex 3: Midterm Review Terms of Reference

Services/Work Description: Midterm Review (MTR) of the GEF-financed project titled **Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated Approach (IWT) (PIMS#5468)**

Project/Programme Title: Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated Approach

Duty Station: Homebased

Duration: 30 working days (within 5 months)

Expected start date: March 2022 – August 2022

1. BACKGROUND

The project was designed to combat poaching and illegal wildlife trade are two important contributing factors to the loss of wildlife in Kenya and the East African Region (EAC) at large. While Kenya has made progress in combatting poaching, especially of large game, illegal trade in wildlife remains a threat. This project focuses on wildlife law enforcement through community involvement in two project areas, the Maasai Mara and Tsavo ecosystems, through a highly coordinated approach within and between wildlife management and law enforcement authorities, as well as Wildlife Conservancies established by local communities in the project areas. The project will carry out activities that will improve the livelihoods of communities that live within the two project areas. The proposed National Strategy to Combat Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade will guide the law enforcement efforts at national and project area levels. At the ecosystem level, multi-agency responses to poaching and illegal trade in wildlife will be coordinated, and law enforcement teams supported through relevant training, equipment, and infrastructure. An existing community-scout system will be strengthened as part of enhanced relationships with, and involvement of, local communities in conservation. Wildlife and other natural resources will increasingly be managed locally through the creation of new Community Conservancies (with a total additional area of more than 23,000 ha), with benefits accruing directly to rural communities.

The project's Objective is to combat poaching and illegal wildlife trafficking in Kenya through an integrated approach.

To address the development challenge and achieve the Objective the project will implement four Strategies/Components:

Component 1. Strengthening national and local capacity for effective IWT control in Kenya.

Component 2. Reducing poaching and illegal wildlife trade in threatened species in Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems.

Component 3. Strengthening Community Wildlife Conservancies in Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems.

Component 4. Knowledge Management, M&E and Gender Mainstreaming.

This project is part of the GEF Programmatic Approach to Prevent the Extinction of Known Threatened Species and falls under the GEF Program "Global Partnership on Wildlife Conservation and Crime Prevention for Sustainable Development" (9071). Under this programmatic framework, with the coordination through the Project Board, coordinated knowledge management and cross-fertilization of the individual projects will be assured.

The project implementation runs from 5th July 2016 to 5th July 2024 with a total budget of USD 19,392,268 of which GEF grant is USD 3,826,605 and a co-finance of USD 15,565,663.

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one team leader/International Consultant (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one team expert/National Consultant, from Kenya.

2. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED WORK

- MTRs are primarily a monitoring tool to identify challenges and outline corrective actions to ensure that a project is on track to achieve maximum results by its completion. The primary output/deliverable of the MTR process is the MTR report. The MTR report will be submitted to GEF as a mandatory requirement for all GEF-financed full-sized projects (FSP).
- The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.
- The MTR report must be completed and submitted to GEF secretariate with the 2nd Project Implementation Report (PIR). The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP), the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).
- The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool/Core Indicators submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool/Core Indicators that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.
- The MTR team is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach¹ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), the Nature, Climate and Energy (NCE) Regional Technical Advisers, direct beneficiaries, and other key stakeholders.
- Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.² Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to (Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife, Kenya Wildlife Service, Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association, Maasai Mara Wildlife Conservancies Association, Taita Taveta Wildlife Conservancies Association, Narok County, Taita Taveta County); executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to the project sites in Tsavo Conservation Area and Maasai Mara Ecosystem.
- Following the World Health Organization (WHO) declaration of COVID-19 as a global pandemic and the national controls on the spread of the disease, the MTR will potentially be carried out both virtually and via field visits as possible. Travel to Kenya is possible but with strict adherence to Covid19 Travel Guide for Kenya, that is reviewed based on the prevailing infection threats.
- If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the MTR, then the MTR team should develop a methodology and approach that takes this into account. This may require the use of remote interview methods through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.), extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys, and evaluation questionnaires. These approaches and methodologies should be detailed in the Inception Report and agreed with UNDP. If all or part

of the MTR is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability, and willingness to be interviewed remotely and the constraints this may place on MTR. These limitations must be reflected in the final MTR report.

3. Expected Outputs and deliverables

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission	MTR Team presents to project management and the Commissioning Unit
3	Draft Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	Final Report*	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

4. Institutional arrangements/reporting lines

The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Kenya Country Office, under the Team Leader – Environment and Resilience Unit.

5. Experience and qualifications

I. Academic Qualifications:

- A Master's degree or above in Environmental Science, Natural Resources Management, Biodiversity studies, Wildlife Management, or social sciences closely related fields (15 marks)

II. Years of experience:

- Minimum 10 years' experience working in relevant technical areas; (10 marks)

III. Language:

- Fluency in written and spoken English. (5 marks)

IV. Competencies:

- Relevant experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies; (10 marks)
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (5 marks)
- Competence in adaptive management, especially on Artisanal Small-scale Gold Mining (ASGM) and hazardous chemicals such as mercury; (5 marks)
- Experience in evaluating projects; (10 marks)
- Experience working in Africa especially east Africa countries; (5 marks)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and ASGM/hazardous chemicals, experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis. (10 marks)

- Excellent communication skills; (5 marks)
- Demonstrable analytical skills; (10 marks)
- Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset; (5 marks)
- Experience with implementing evaluations remotely will be considered an asset. (5 marks)

6. Payment Modality

Payment to the individual contractor will be made based on the actual number of days worked, deliverables accepted and upon certification of satisfactory completion by the manager.

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final MTR report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and completed TE Audit Trail

7.3 Annex 4: Evaluation Time Frame

MIDTERM REVIEW FOR COMBATING ILLEGAL WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING IN KENYA

SCHEDULE FOR DATA COLLECTION

	Date	Activity	Participants	Venue	Comments
1	2-3 June 2022	Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)	Project Steering Committee (PSC) members	Virtual	Physical meetings may apply only when necessary
2	6 – 7 June 2022	Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)	Project Steering Committee (PSC) members	Virtual	Physical meetings may apply only when necessary
3	8-9 June 2022	Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)	UNDP Staff	Virtual	Physical meetings may apply only when necessary
4	12 June 2022	Departure from Nairobi to Tsavo Landscape	Consultants	N/A	Physical meetings may apply only when necessary
5	13 – 14 June 2022	Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)	Tsavo Landscape stakeholders	TBD	UNDP/Ministry of Tourism to arrange venue
6	15 June 2022	Departure from Tsavo Landscape to Maasai Mara Landscape	Consultants	N/A	N/A

7	16 – 17 June 2022	Focus Group Discussions	Maasai Mara Landscape Stakeholders	TBD	UNDP/Ministry of Tourism to arrange venue
8	18 June 2022	Departure from Maasai Mara Landscape	Consultants	N/A	N/A
9	20-30 June 2022	Writing draft MTR report	Consultants	N/A	N/A
10	01-08 July 2022	Finalization of MTR report	Consultants	N/A	N/A
11	13 July 2022	Submission of final MTR report	Consultants	N/A	N/A

7.4 Annex 5: Partial list of documents reviewed

1. 9a. GWP TT Kenya at CEO Endorsement.xlsx: Tracking Tool for GEF-6 Global Wildlife Program (GWP).
2. 9b. GWP TT Kenya With Notes.xlsx: Tracking Tool for GEF-6 Global Wildlife Program (GWP).
3. 9c. GWP TT MARCH 2022 MTR Update .docx: C. GEF Global Environmental Benefits (GEB) and Socio-Economic Indicators.
4. 9d. DATA DISCREPANCIES MEETING REPORT.docx: A brief report of virtual meeting held on project data and information discrepancies and gaps.
5. 11a. SCAN-MINUTES REPORT OF IWT KENYA PROJECT SITE VISIT TO TSAVO LANDSCAPE.pdf
6. 11b. IWT-KENYA March 2022 PMU Maasai Mara Visit Minutes Report final.pdf
7. 11b. IWT-KENYA March 2022 PMU Maasai Mara Visit Minutes Report final.pdf
8. 12a. The Public Finance Management Act 2012.pdf
9. 12b. Public Finance Management Act-Legislative supplement.pdf
10. 13. Public Procurement asset disposal regulation 2020.pdf
11. 17a. Results-based Framework upd MARCH 2022.docx
12. 17b. Action Plan for off-track outcomes Mid-term V2.docx
13. 17c. Updated Action Plan for Off-Track Outcomes.docx
14. 17d. Latest Project Factsheet.pdf
15. Doc1_5605 7091 IWT ID9439__Rev.__Global_Wildlife_Program_PFD_May_02_vFinal.pdf
16. Doc2_PIMS 5468 - Kenya Wildlife Trade draft IP - resubmitted 09-02-2017 (1).docx
17. PIMS 5468 KENYA Action Plan for off-track outcomes Extract from 2021 PIR
18. Doc3_PIMS 5468-Kenya IWT GEF 6-ProDoc FINAL_Signature_5July2019.doc
19. Doc4_PIMS 5468 - SESP Kenya 19 Dec 2017 (2).docx
20. Doc5_PIMS 5468 _Inception Workshop Minutes final updated_ June17 21.pdf
21. Doc6_2021-GEF-PIR-PIMS5468-GEFID9659 (7).docx
22. Doc7_Annual and Quarterly reports
 - 8. REPORT OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL.pdf
 - Final_Approved_AWP_2021.pdf
 - Q1 2022 Project Progress Report Q1 2022.pdf
 - Q3 2021 Project Progress Report - external.pdf
 - Q4 2021 Project Progress Report.pdf
23. Doc14_UNDP CPD
 - CPD 2018-2022 UNDP Kenya.pdf
 - UNDAF 2018-2022 UN Kenya.pdf
24. Doc15_Project Steering Committee minutes
 - Inception Workshop Minutes final updated.pdf
 - Minutes of Project on combating poaching and illegal wildlife Meeting on 5th September 2019 (002).docx
 - Minutes of the meeting on combating poaching and illegal wildlife trafficking project in Kenya held on 9th October.docx
 - PSC virtual meeting 25 June 2021.pdf
 - Results of the PSC meeting 24-07-2021.docx
 - SCAN_- _Minutes_of_IWT-Kenya_2022_PSC_Meeting.pdf
 - UNDP-GEF-IWT-Kenya_InceptionReport_v10.pdf
25. Doc16_PROJECT SITE LOCATION MAPS.pdf

26. UNDP-GEF Directorate (2014) Project-level Monitoring: Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects. United Nations Development Programme.
27. UNDP (2022) Guidance Note: UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (SES) - Social and Environmental Screening Procedure. Updated Version: July 2022. Country programme document for Kenya (2022–2026). United Nations DP/DCP/KEN/4. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3972203>