







GEF-UNDP Project PIMS No: 4178, Project ID: 00063423

Biodiversity Focal Area SP3 – Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks

Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya

MID-TERM REVIEW REPORT

17 August – 5 September 2013

FINAL REPORT

Jonathan Timberlake

October 2013

Project implemented by Nature Kenya and Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources, Kenya

LIST OF CONTENTS

List of Contents	
Executive Summary	
Acronyms and Abbreviations	5
Acknowledgements	5
1. INTRODUCTION	
1.2 Methodology	
1.3 Structure of the Report	7
 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTI 2.1 Project Start & Duration 	EXT8
2.2 Problems Project Seeks to Address	
2.3 Immediate and Development Objectives of Project	9
2.4 Baseline Indicators Established	9
2.5 Main Stakeholders	
2.6 Expected Results	
 PROJECT FINDINGS	12 12 12 12 12 12 12 15 15 16
 3.2.2 Finance and Co-Finance	10 18 18 20 20 20 21 21
4. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS LI	EARNED22
4.1 Conclusions	
4.2 Lessons Learned	
4.3 Recommendations	
<u>Annex 1</u> . Terms of Reference (abridged)	
Annex 2. Consultant's Itinerary	
Annex 3. Persons Met & Interviewed	
Annex 4. Project Results Framework	
Annex 5. Summary of Field Visits	
Annex 6. Documents Consulted	
Annex 7. Questions for Project Mid-Term Review	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The UNDP GEF project "Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya" (PIMS 4178) is executed by an NGO, Nature Kenya, in conjunction with the Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources of Kenya. Operational since January 2011, it has a GEF budget of USD 4.5 million over 5 years with an additional UNDP budget of 0.5 million. This Mid-Term Review was carried out by an external consultant, Jonathan Timberlake, over a 3-week period in August-September 2013, at approximately the project's halfway point.

The project aims to improve the conservation status of moist forest patches across Western Kenya as part of a national strategy to improve protected area system coverage. It is hoped the project will bring an additional 95,000 ha of land into enhanced IUCN protected area categories designed to conserve biodiversity (including 65,000 ha of existing Forest Land). This would indirectly improve the status of the entire Western Kenya forest estate through improving accountability for decision making, monitoring and adaptive management. One of the main means is to develop participatory forest management plans and capacitate local CBOs to engage in joint forest management with the Kenya Forest Service, as called for under the Forest Act.

Given the state of flux over the last five or so years regarding forest legislation, ministerial and Departmental responsibilities, and particularly the still unresolved devolution of responsibility for some aspects of natural resources management to the new County governments, the project has had something of a "moving target". However, the project management team has remained focused on the main issues and been very adaptable, and has not allowed this to unduly hold up other project activities. Although the Kenya Forest Service did not fully engage with the project for some time (the situation is now rectified), communication amongst project partners at both national level (Technical Advisory Committee, consisting of senior staff in various Kenya government departments as well as Nature Kenya) and at local level (Site Advisory Groups, including national government officers, local government, forestry sector, CBOs, etc.) has always been excellent, with a good working spirit.

The project has had a number of significant achievements, in particular (a) the creation of good working relationships among all project partners and stakeholders, (b) helping establish and capacitate 8 Community Forest Associations (CFAs), (c) the development of 3 Strategic Forest Plans (for larger areas) and 8 participatory forest management plans (for forest blocks), (d) increased awareness amongst a range of partners of the importance of and threats to biodiversity conservation in forest areas, (e) identification of 38 potential Community Conservation Areas, (f) monitoring of bird species and populations, (f) support to numerous community tree nurseries, woodlot plantings and energy-efficient stoves to reduce pressure on forests for fuelwood, (g) infrastructural support to KFS, CFAs, etc., and (h) much training and general capacity building across the project areas. What is not yet clear, however, is exactly what impact these will have on conservation of forest biodiversity and how any impact can be demonstrated.

Overall progress of the project so far is considered **Satisfactory**. The project will achieve many of its objectives but, through no fault of its own, may not achieve them all – primarily because of the recent, unforeseen changes going on within GoK structures and the devolution of powers to County governments, but also due to rather ambitious institutional outputs given in the ProDoc. The project management team at Nature Kenya is highly motivated, committed and very energetic, both in the field and in Nairobi. For project management arrangements, the project can be considered **Satisfactory**, a category that would have been higher if clear monitoring systems and baselines were put in place soon after the project started. Most other aspects of project management can be considered Highly Satisfactory.

The main corrective measures suggested for the remainder of the project are to do with the biodiversity and conservation monitoring procedures, with the promotion of what the project is trying to achieve to a broader national and regional audience, and greater prioritisation and cutting back of the breadth of activities at the Cherangani site. There is danger that the project will achieve a number of its stated outputs yet not be able to demonstrate a positive conservation impact on one of its primary objectives - forest biodiversity in the form of species composition, species abundances, forest extent and ecological integrity. Twenty-one recommendations are given. Among the main ones are (1) working to ensure that forest management issues are incorporated into developing County government plans, (2) completion of PFMPs for all areas and ensuring these are turned into Forest Action Plans, suitably resourced and with timelines, (5) that issues of control of livestock grazing in forests are addressed, in part through careful and enforceable zoning, (6) activities involving restoration of indigenous forests through tree planting generally should not be supported, (7) particular challenges are faced by the much more difficult Cherangani project site, such that project activities here should be prioritized and more carefully focused, with some being dropped, (8) the project's approach to conservation is innovative, particularly in a national context, and its findings and achievements should be more widely disseminated and discussed, (9) biodiversity monitoring for plants in particular needs to be reassessed, with the suggested establishment of a series of forest permanent sample plots in all sites to act as a baseline, (10) changes in threat levels need to be carefully quantified to demonstrate that the project's activities are indeed reducing them, and (11) reporting procedures are not fully capturing either achievements or issues that still need to be addressed, and should be revised.

Among the main lessons learned are (i) that NGO project execution can be very dynamic and adaptable, and overcome inter-departmental issues that would otherwise hinder project progress, (ii) an NGO with a history of operating in an area has great comparative advantage in terms of gained trust, (iii) both Site Advisory Groups and Community Forest Associations have great value in providing a forum for discussion on and resolution of management issues, (iv) it is too easy for a project involved in working with communities on conservation issues to lose sight of the conservation objectives, (v) it is very important to establish good baselines for threats, the socio-economic situation, and (especially) biodiversity status before project interventions kick-in if real impact is to be demonstrated and used as a basis for advocacy elsewhere.

ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	African Development Bank
CBO	Community-Based Organisation
CCA	Community Conservation Area
DfID	Department for International Development (UK)
EoP	end of project
FR	Forest Reserve
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEFSEC	Secretariat of Global Environment Facility (HQ)
GoK	Government of Kenya
IBA	Important Bird Area
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
JFM	Joint Forest Management
KEFRI	Kenya Forest Research Institute
KFS	Kenya Forest Service
KWS	Kenya Wildlife Service
MEWNR	Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NEMA	National Environment Management Agency, Kenya
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NK	Nature Kenya
NMK	National Museums of Kenya
PA	Protected Area
PFMP	Participatory Forest Management Plans
PPG	Preparatory Project Grant
REDD	Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
SAG	Site Advisory Group
SSG	Site Support Group (Birdlife)
TAC	Project's Technical Advisory Committee
UNDP CO	United Nations Development Programme Country Office (Kenya)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USD	United States dollar (\$)

Acknowledgements

The Consultant firstly wishes to thank all Nature Kenya project staff – especially Paul Matiku, Joan Gichuki, Joel Siele, Gibson Kitsao and Julius Kimani – for hosting him at the various project sites and taking him around Western Kenya. And to Washington Ayiemba who spent much time chasing up figures and documents. Thanks also to the Technical Advisory Committee (KWS, KFS, KEFRI, NEMA NMK and MEWNR) in Nairobi for discussions and comments, to the various KFS and KWS staff at the project sites, and to members of the Community Forest Associations and various CBOs who gave of their time and patience in the face of interminable questions and challenges. Obviously the responsibility for any misrepresentation of statements made or facts given lies with me.

1. INTRODUCTION

The UNDP-GEF project, Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya, is executed by an NGO, Nature Kenya, in conjunction with the Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources of Kenya. A five-year project, it has a GEF budget of USD 4.5 million over 5 years with an additional UNDP budget of 0.5 million. Operational since January 2011, it is now in its third year. The main project details are given in Table 1.

The project addresses the need to improve protected area representation in the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot, complementing efforts to strengthen the management of Kenya's montane forests as part of a national strategy to improve the coverage of the protected area system. It is hoped the project will directly bring 95,000 ha of land, including 65,000 ha of existing Forest Land with limited conservation protection, into IUCN protected area categories designed to conserve biodiversity, thus indirectly improve the status of the entire Western Kenya forest estate through improving accountability for decision making, monitoring and adaptive management. The project is taking a comprehensive approach towards strengthening management effectiveness of protected areas. This will lead to the constitution of new protected areas and reclassification of Forest Reserves established for productive purposes under higher protected area management categories, managed expressly for biodiversity conservation. In order to ensure that existing management capacities and finances are not stretched unduly in the process, the project addresses capacity needs at the systemic level, particularly the need to improve institutional coordination of protected area management, and integrates protected areas into local area development frameworks.

1.1 Objectives of the Evaluation

As part of standard project reporting procedure and as laid down in the Project Document, UNDP-GEF projects require a mid-term review (MTR) as well as a terminal evaluation. The MTR normally takes place around the mid-point of project implementation, which is the case here. An MTR focuses on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; highlights issues requiring decisions and actions; and presents initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. An abridged version of the Terms of Reference for the present review are given as Annex 1.

The overall objectives of the mid-term review are to:

- Validate the project design in terms of its stated objectives, strategy, and activities;
- Assess progress towards and the likelihood of achieving the intended impact;
- Identify strengths and weaknesses in implementation;
- Make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project;
- Identify opportunities for learning and sharing lessons.

1.2 Methodology

The evaluation was carried out over the period 17 August to 5 September 2013 by an independent Consultant, Jonathan Timberlake. Although an accompanying National Consultant was specified in the original Terms of Reference, the project management team and the UNDP CO apparently did not think it necessary in this case. This MTR thus reflects the findings of one consultant alone. Mr Timberlake arrived in Nairobi on 16 August and was briefed the following day by the Nature Kenya project team (Dr Paul Matiku and Ms Joan Gichuki) and also by the UNDP Country Programme Officer, Dr David Githaiga. Unfortunately the Nature Kenya Project Manager, Mr Washington Ayiemba, was out of the country and not available for the duration of the review, and it was not felt

practicable to change the MTR dates. However, a skype conversation with him was arranged that covered numerous issues.

Table 1. Main project details.

Project Title:	Strengthening the Protected	ed Area Network within the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya			
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 4178	Project financing	<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at MTE (Million US\$)</u>	
ATLAS Project ID:	0005	GEF financing:	4.5		
Country:	Kenya	IA/EA own:	1.5		
Region:	Africa	Government:	10.47		
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:	0.5		
GEF Focal Area Strategic Program	Biodiversity	Total co-financing:	12.47		
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources	Total Project Cost in cash :	16.97		
Other Partners	Kenya Forest Service;	ProDoc Signature (da	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		
Kenya Wildine Service, Kenya Forest Research Institute; NGO Communi Nature Kenya			Planned closing date: 31/12/2013	Revised closing date: 31/12/2014	

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), comprising Nairobi-based senior officers (mostly GoK), met soon after the consultant arrived, giving an opportunity to introduce both the review process and to stimulate some discussion on where the project came from and where it is going. This was followed up with individual interviews, most based on a broad open-ended set of questions (Annex 7). A particular effort was made to meet with some persons and conservation institutions (particularly NGOs) that had not been involved in the project, or only peripherally so.

On 25 August the Consultant undertook a week-long field trip to all four project sites (Kakamega, South Nandi, North Nandi, Cherangani) accompanied by the Nature Kenya Local Empowerment Manager Joan Gichuki (see Annex 2). At each project site the Consultant met the respective Site Project Officer and Site Extension Officer, various Forest Officers (Zonal and Forest Station), Kenya Wildlife Service staff, members of the Site Advisory Group, and some community representatives at the project sites, many of whom were interviewed (see Annex 3). A full account of these visits is given as Annex 5.

Preliminary findings were presented to the project's Technical Advisory Committee on 4 September, during which comments were made. A draft report was finalised on 16 September and was submitted through the UNDP CO to involved institutions for comment.

1.3 Structure of the Report

This follows the headings and sub-headings given in the Terms of Reference (Annex 1). Recommendations and some preliminary lessons learned or good practices are given in Section 4. A comprehensive account is given of the field visits (Annex 5).

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Project Start & Duration

The project in part grew out of the success and achievements of an earlier UNDP-GEF project, African NGO-Government Partnerships for Sustainable Biodiversity Action (RAF/97/G31). This project, which ran from 1998 to 2002, helped to develop the idea of community-based conservation around Important Bird Areas (IBAs) implemented through Site Support Groups (SSGs) across 10 countries, including Kenya. The Kenyan component was implemented by Nature Kenya, a BirdLife International partner. Following on from this experience, and now with enhanced capacity, Nature Kenya received GEF PDF A funding (USD 50,000, GEFSEC Project ID: 2660) to develop a medium-sized GEF project to look at developing SSGs for bird conservation at a range of sites, including the South Nandi forests. However, owing to changes in GEF global strategy, as well as changed GoK national priorities, this project was not submitted to the GEF pipeline. Subsequently, under GEF-4, a similar but much larger (full-size) project was developed (PIF accepted by GEF in 2008) using a similar approach but focussing on the highly threatened and biodiversity-significant forest remnants in Western Kenya. This project would combine the protection and management responsibilities of the Kenya Forest Service (KFS) and Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) with the flexible and dynamic implementation capacities of an NGO, Nature Kenya, together with the evolving ideas of Site Support Groups and Joint Forest Management in order to change the status of these Forest Reserves and get greater community involvement in both conservation and forest management, as was envisaged under the new Kenya Forest Act (2005).

Using a PPG grant of USD 150,000 awarded in 2009, Nature Kenya and the main GoK departments involved (KFS, KWS, KEFRI, NEMA) jointly developed a full-sized project proposal. This was approved by GEFSEC on 9 December 2009. The Project Document (ProDoc) was signed by the GoK Ministry of Finance on 24 September 2010, and disbursement of funds and project implementation started effectively on 1 January 2011. However, Nature Kenya was already actively carrying out community-level conservation and awareness-raising in the area prior to GEF project commencement, in particular through a UK Government DfID grant for similar activities in the South Nandi area. This grant formed part of Nature Kenya's co-financing of the GEF project.

2.2 Problems Project Seeks to Address

Much concern has been expressed on the rapid decline in forest extent in Kenya, most of the loss being due to clearance for agricultural expansion. The parastatal Kenya Forest Service has not had sufficient resources to control this even within its own forest estate, and was still focussed on protection and utilisation of the forest estate, rather than on co-management/community involvement or any elements of biodiversity conservation. In addition, there were no clear policy guidelines or much experience on how to bring local communities into forest co-management, although this had become a legal requirement under the 2005 Forest Act.

A number of medium and higher altitude moist forest patches in Western Kenya are becoming increasingly fragmented, yet also contain internationally significant biodiversity (particularly birds and plants). The threats were acute, the rate of forest loss very high, and the resources were inadequate to prevent this. It was accepted that a new approach is required that involves significant levels of community involvement and co-management, such that communities become less alienated from management and could also obtain benefits from the forest on a more sustainable basis.

The Kenya Protected Area (PA) network is extensive covering roughly 44,000 km² or 10% of the country, but this figure is not evenly distributed across the nation's ecosystems. In particular, moist forest is very poorly represented. Approximately 6.2% of Kenya's estimated 12,400 km² of indigenous forest (including mangroves) is protected in National Parks and Reserves, while 85% of indigenous forest is included in gazetted Forest Reserves which are primarily established for extraction rather than conservation, thus lie outside the formal PA network. Forest cover in Kenya is now stated to be around 2%, and it is planned to raise this to 4% over the next decade.

At the time of project development the root cause of biodiversity loss in the montane forests of Western Kenya was said to be an inadequate and unharmonized legislative framework, an absence or inadequacy of management plans and conservation strategies, uncoordinated land development planning, and a deficit of financial and human resources. At the local level there was an absence of appropriate institutions and structures at community level to coordinate the use of natural resources and stimulate and sustain site-based conservation. Whilst at the national level conservation paradigms were based primarily on formal large PAs which did not address the issues of smaller, even fragmented, biodiversity-rich sites.

This project seeks to overcome some of the barriers by upgrading critical Forest Reserves from production forests to conservation areas, and to elevate management within these areas, changing the management objective from production use to conservation, and designating them as such. In particular, it seeks to greatly enhance the conservation of four indigenous forest patches in Western Kenya (Kakamega, South Nandi, North Nandi, Cherangani Hills) and reduce both the threats to them and the rates of forest loss and fragmentation across the landscapes in which they occur. One of the main mechanisms for this was to be community involvement through joint forest management.

2.3 Immediate and Development Objectives of Project

The expected Outcome of the project is stated to be: Support to sustainable management of natural resources; policies and capacities for sustainable management of environment and natural resources improved.

The expected Outputs are: Development of pro-poor policies for sustainable management practices for utilization of living natural resources on a sustainable basis for socio-economic benefits, national and community capacity for sustainable management of natural resources with focus on women and youth for sustainable management and use of natural resources, capacity for enhancement and compliance of policies, laws, and guidelines and public institutions such as NEMA, Kenya Forest Service and other relevant private sector entities and CSOs to improve and develop new subsidiary legislation, tools and guidelines for sustainable use of natural resources.

2.4 Baseline Indicators Established

Good consistent baseline data are not available for many attributes, either prior to the project or within its first year. Although various reports on various topics and from some forest areas are available (see below, in particular from the excellent Biota project), in many cases the data are inadequate to determine measured changes that can be attributed to project interventions. Compilation of available data to establish a retrospective baseline for project sites has not yet been done.

• Forest extent: The extent of gazetted forest land is clear, measured and available on GIS. For Kakamega and South/North Nandi forests, good time-series data (total area and maps) are

available under the Biota project for the extent of closed canopy indigenous moist forest within the gazetted forest blocks (Schaab, Khayota, Eiln & Wagele 2010). Kakamega is given as 11,989 ha in 2003, with 6922 ha in South Nandi and 7223 ha in North Nandi. However, similar data are not available for any of the Cherangani blocks, other than an approximate figure, "around 60,500 of closed canopy forest" (IBAs in Kenya, 1999). In the 1990s the KIFCON project (Wass 1995) measured the extent of some indigenous forests in detail using aerial photos, and all of them using satellite imagery. Although now quite dated, such data (presumably still at KFS) should prove useful.

- Socio-economic: Detailed reports are available on communities from the South Nandi area and the area around Cherangani Forest Station (Kerrer, Chemurkoi and Kiteber forest blocks), both studies being pre-project in 2010. Some information is also available in the PFMPs that have just been prepared for many of the other project areas.
- Threat levels: Although some data should be available through the Nature Kenya IBA monitoring programme (at least for Kakamega and South Nandi, see Nature Kenya IBA report), nothing measured or quantitative was seen on threat levels. Broad data on threat levels may exist, but do not seem to be available to managers on the ground. Some data on threats should be available for Kakamega National Reserve through KWS, and possibly also something on illegal activities inside some Forest Reserves from the KFS Forest Stations, but such data were not seen. Generally, data on threats is rather anecdotal. But there is no doubt the threats are real and active, just that they do not appear to be quantified in any way.
- Biodiversity: There are good data on bird populations available through the IBA monitoring programme, which has been on-going since the early 2000s. There has reportedly been some forest inventory data through KEFRI, and the KIFCON project in the early 1990s certainly characterised most of the forest blocks using measured forest plots (Blackett 1994 in Wass 1995), although these were not marked or permanent. In these plots all the main forest trees were identified and measured. Presumably the detailed KIFCON plot data is still with KFS. Other forest biodiversity data seen could not act as a baseline to measure change.
- Carbon: A report on carbon stocks within the South Nandi Forest Reserve was done in 2009 (Webb & Glenday 2009), which at a gross level may act as a baseline. Data were recorded in plots distributed across the forest, although the results are only presented at total forest level.

2.5 Main Stakeholders

There are six main project stakeholders at a national level, with a much greater range at site level. At national level these are:

- Nature Kenya (NK), a long-established national NGO (the East African Natural History Society), responsible among other things for annual bird monitoring across the country. Nature Kenya is the main project manager.
- Kenya Forest Service (KFS), a parastatal authority, initially under the Ministry of Environment, later the Ministry of Forests. KFS has the major mandate for formulation of policies for management and conservation of forests; preparation and implementation of management plans; management and protection of Kenya's gazetted forests; establishment and management of forest plantations; promotion of on-farm forestry; and promotion of environmental awareness. It operates forest stations.
- Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI), which falls under the KFS, has a mandate to carry out research into all forestry-related matters, to cooperate with other partners and to

disseminate the results. Its mission to enhance social and economic welfare through useroriented research for sustainable development of forests and allied natural resources. It has 17 research centres in various ecological zones of Kenya.

- Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), a parastatal to promote the conservation and management of Kenya's wildlife for consumptive and non-consumptive uses while harmonising environmental and development goals. KWS is responsible for conserving and managing wildlife in the country and for enforcing related laws and regulations. Their key strategic priorities are to achieve a policy, legal and regulatory framework and stability to discharge their mandate; enhance wildlife conservation, protection and management; improve KWS recognition, linkages and relationships with stakeholders.
- National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) was established by an act of parliament and has overall responsibility for coordinating environmental management issues in Kenya. With respect to forests and forest conservation, the enabling Act provides for protection of forests; allows the Director General to enter into contractual agreement with private land owners with a view to declaring such land forest land and provides for EIAs of forestry related developments.
- National Museums of Kenya (NMK) is under the Ministry of Home Affairs and National Heritage and has excellent and historic collections on natural history. A number of systematists work there.

It was generally recognised that the role of KFS, KWS, KEFRI and NMK needs to be better integrated to promote synergies for the conservation of biodiversity outside formal protected areas. In some regards this could be done through NEMA, the over-arching authority for environmental issues.

At a local level project stakeholders include:

- Local officers and stations for the GoK Departments listed above.
- Community Forest Associations, legally-registered bodies under the Forest Act that provide the liaison with KFS for joint forest management.
- Various CBOs with differing mandates, normally self-help or income generation at a local level.
- The new County governments which, under the new constitution, are likely to take on more powers (and resources) to manage land and resources.

2.6 Expected Results

The project hopes to improve protected area (PA) representation across the Eastern Afromontane Hotspot in Kenya, complementing efforts to strengthen management of montane forests as part of a national strategy to improve the PA coverage. It is hoped it will directly bring 95,000 ha of land into PA categories designed to conserve biodiversity, including unprotected forest lands and reserve forests being managed for production. Planned interventions will indirectly improve the status of the entire western forest estate by improving accountability for decision making, monitoring and adaptive management. The project takes a comprehensive approach towards strengthening PA management effectiveness leading to the constitution of new PAs and reclassification of Forest Reserves established for productive purposes under higher PA management categories, managed expressly for biodiversity conservation. In order to ensure that existing management capacities and finances are not stretched unduly in the process, the project addresses capacity needs, particularly the need to improve institutional coordination of PA management, and integrate it into local area development frameworks.

3. PROJECT FINDINGS

3.1 Progress Towards Results

3.1.1 Project Design

The Consultant did struggle with the logic behind the three Project Components or Outcomes and how/why the various Outputs were placed under them in the ProDoc. In some ways it may have been clearer to separate national level activities from local, rather than the eclectic mix at present. However, in practice the project managers do not seem to have struggled with this, and confusion at implementation level is not apparent.

A rough calculation was done of the costs of conservation per square kilometre of forest for this project, and per square kilometre of indigenous forest cover (i.e. excluding plantations, grazing land and degraded areas within Forest Reserves). The figures for this project shown in Table 2 (top two entries) compare moderately well with those from the UNDP GEF East African Cross-Borders Biodiversity Project (CBBP) and other forest conservation projects across East Africa.

Forest site	area (km ²)	cost/km ² /year
W Kenya	1424	702
W Kenya-good forest only	935	1069
CBBP-Kenya sites	392	1780
CBBP-Tanzania sites	685	1021
CBBP-Uganda sites	1920	367
Mt Elgon (Kenya)	1145	700
Ngezi (Pemba)	30	4600
East Usambaras (Tz)	300	3300
Udzungwa (Tz)	1100	1000
Eastern Arc (GEF)	5005	480
Bwindi (Uganda)	321	1900

Table 2. Costs of forest conservation projects across East Africa (source: UNDP GEF Cross-Borders Biodiversity Project, Terminal Review, 2004).

NB. Area of Forest Reserve covered by present GEF project = 142,400 ha Extent of good indigenous forest cover under project = 93,500 ha

3.1.2 Project Progress

The project has shown a commendable rate and level of progress, especially given the changing GoK institutional circumstances resulting from elections and the on-going devolution of powers to County governments under the new Constitution, and also given the very ambitious institutional outputs listed in the ProDoc. Such large institutional and mind-set changes (for example, turning a number of foresters trained in forest protection and utilization to now focus on biodiversity conservation and full participation/involvement of surrounding communities) do not usually happen over a short project life-span.

Another commendable outcome of project activities is that it can be difficult to separate out activities/ results from the GEF project from those done under other initiatives. This shows that project implementation is not compartmentalised, and activities are seen by KFS and the local communities as one coherent conservation and support initiative, and not just project-specific. Cases in point here include the completion of the South Nandi Visitor Centre, started under an earlier DfID-supported project, and the furnishing of the Cherangani Visitor Centre, construction of which was funded by the EU.

Annex 5 shows the Project Results Framework as completed after the main evaluation by the Nature Kenya project manager (Washington Ayiemba), indicating progress to date. Below are the Consultant's assessments on progress, listed under Project Components 1 to 3.

(a) Component 1. Systemic and Institutional Capacities for Managing an Expanded and Rationalized PA Estate.

There have been various and significant changes in GoK structures and responsibilities since the ProDoc was originally drawn up in 2009, but these now seem to be settling down. It appears as if KFS, KWS, NEMA will all fall under one Under-Secretary at the new Ministry Environment, Water and Natural Resources, which should greatly harmonise what had been sometimes disparate decision-making on natural resources management. What is still not clear is the extent to which delegation of powers for Forest Reserves and forest management will go to the new County governments – this is currently being debated in Parliament as part of the new Constitution. Given this fluid situation, the project faces a number of challenges in implementing what it seeks to achieve under this component, and will struggle to make much headway on it until the situation is much more clear. The new Forest Act is currently being reviewed to become consistent with the new Constitution, after which it will be presented to Parliament. What the project is promoting needs to be on the agenda in these discussions and debates (Output 1.2).

A systematic plan for forest conservation (Output 1.1) does not seem to be in place, although many of the pieces required probably are, including designation under IUCN PA categories. Progress on designation as KBAs using species other than birds does not seem to have happened. Although it is recognised that by definition the presence of an IBA means that an area is also a KBA, it is not good practice to use only birds and IBAs for KBA justification, not least in that it will be difficult for KFS, etc. to identify a useful range of management interventions. And it will also tend to cut out other interested parties and scientists.

Three strategic management plans, one for each of the three project sites (South and North Nandi combined), have been developed and almost finalised through KEFRI (Output 1.4). This is very commendable and provides a good context and basis for the more detailed PFMPs to be done for each forest area.

Site Advisory Committees are fully functional for each site (Output 1.6) and are proving very useful. They provide a good forum for discussions involving a full range of partners from GoK departments to County government to CBOs and others. However, the next stage is to get these issues well and truly embedded into the new County government environment departments, and forest management plans properly resourced. This is still in a state of flux.

Business cases for economic benefit do not appear to have been made (Output 1.7), but the project is involved in discussions on ecotourism and also potentially provision of ecosystem services such as water supply and carbon storage (KFS is carrying out an assessment).

(b) Component 2. Community Management of PAs.

Commendable progress has been made on the establishment and support of 8 Community Forest Associations (CFAs) across all project suites (Output 2.2). These have been given greatly increased capacity and focus by the project through infrastructural support, equipment, training and awareness. Some are functioning well and employing their own forest scouts (40 to date), as well as getting involved in their own supportive income-generating activities, often with project support. The CFA forest scouts are becoming effective and welcome additions to the stretched KFS scout force.

Participatory Forest Management Plans (PFMPs) have been developed, with 8 already approved (or almost so) by KFS. These are of great importance in setting a baseline for management/ conservation in each forest area for the new County governments as well as KFS. Priority should be given in the remaining project period to completion of the remaining PFMPs, which should be followed by turning at least some of them into Action Plans, with resources allocated and timelines given (see Recommendations).

Some communities/site support groups (SSGs) are effectively carrying out bird monitoring, and training has recently been given to extending such monitoring to other taxonomic groups (plants, reptiles, mammals, butterflies, bees). Bird monitoring started in most cases before the GEF project, but the project has reinforced this and provided additional training.

Income generating activities are being undertaken by most CFAs, generally covering tree nurseries (mostly raising eucalypts and cypress for sale to surrounding communities and KFS for establishment of woodlots), establishment of their own woodlots, and beekeeping (Output 2.3). The project has helped with beehives, nursery equipment and, most importantly, comprehensive and wide-ranging training. Specific training and support has been identified for the remaining project period. There does not appear to be any development of acceptable levels of sustainable offtake for forest products.

Many (38) Community Conservation Areas (CCAs) have been identified across all project sites (Output 2.1), more than suggested in the ProDoc (10). Management committees have been set up, although a number are not yet really functional. Bye-laws for conservation of these areas are not yet in place, although these will presumably have to be passed by the new County governments. A good level of awareness on conservation issues has been raised in the project areas,.

(c) Component 3. Operational Capacities for PA Management.

With the state of flux regarding responsibilities and legislation, it is a bit early for some outputs under this component. Given decentralisation and the possible taking on of some natural resource management responsibilities by Country government, it is not yet clear where responsibilities will eventually lie, making it difficult to design appropriate interventions. However, the project has significantly raised awareness of the importance of these forests for biodiversity conservation at local and County level, and has helped complete two visitor centres at South Nandi and Cherangani (Output 3.2). The one at Kakamega was built through Biota/ADB. The project has also supported infrastructural development at Kobujoi Forest Station and, with less obvious relevance, construction of the KWS Kapsabet offices. This was justified on the grounds that it would bring a greater range of KWS officers, and hence conservation interest, to the area; the nearest station at present is at Nakuru.

The project has done much to help establish on-farm woodlots in order to reduce pressure on forest areas for fuelwood, and in supporting CBOs/CFAs in establishing tree nurseries for extending this more widely (Output 3.1). The project has also assisted in the promotion of jiko energy-efficient stoves in order to reduce fuelwood demand, although it is surprising that no local enterprise has come in to manufacture these locally. It is said this is due to local soils not being suitable for the jiko liner moulds. Some CFAs have now established contracts with commercial users, such as tea estates and sugar plantations, for provision of fuelwood from on-farm woodlots.

Grazing is an area not explicitly mentioned in the ProDoc Outputs, although it is assuming a major significance as regards its negative impacts on forest regeneration and the cover it can provide for other illegal activities within Forest Reserves. At the various Site Advisory Group meetings it was recognised as a contentious issue, and one that should not be ignored. The project should perhaps

give more attention to this issue, especially in controlling access and cattle/sheep numbers. Careful zoning under the PFMPs may greatly help, as long as control mechanisms are also in place. Some members of CFAs are suggesting that a move to zero-grazing of livestock (i.e. cutting fodder and bring to animals, rather than wide-ranging grazing) and improved breeds (i.e. milk cattle) will reduce the need to graze in the forest. However, it is not clear if this would actually be the case.

Significant training has been given to KFS, CFAs and others in participatory planning and management, and to SSGs/CBOs in biodiversity monitoring (Output 3.3).

There has apparently been no progress with linking project activities to those of KFS in the Mau forest (Output 3.5). The Mau complex was left out of the GEF project at the development stage as the political situation regarding land settlement was considered too problematic for useful project interventions. The Mau forests have now been incorporated into the new Water Towers Agency, so there are now opportunities here to share lessons.

3.1.3 Overall Progress

Overall progress of the project so far is considered **Satisfactory** (see below). The project will achieve many of its objectives, but is unlikely to achieve all – primarily because of the many recent, unforeseen changes going on within GoK structures and the devolution of powers to County governments, but also due to rather ambitious institutional outputs laid out in the ProDoc. Such large institutional and mind-set changes (for example, turning a number of foresters trained in forest protection and utilization to now focus on biodiversity conservation and full participation/ involvement of surrounding communities) do not usually happen over a short project life-span. However, this assessment could go down to Moderately Satisfactory by project end (EoP) if GoK departments, particularly KFS, are not proactive or have further hindrances, or if it proves difficult to engage the new County governments. KFS was slow to get fully engaged with the project, which has delayed some aspects of implementation, but is fully engaged now. It would be unfair to place any such failings on the project management unit at Nature Kenya.

Progress towards results

Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield
	satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant
Satisfactory (MS)	shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major
	global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.

As regards project management arrangements, the project can be considered **Satisfactory**. This category would have been higher if clear monitoring systems and baselines were in place or put in place soon after the project started. As it is, it will be difficult for the project to demonstrate improved biodiversity status of forests by project end. However, all other aspects of project management are considered Highly Satisfactory.

Adaptive management and management arrangements

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The project has no shortcomings and can be presented as "good practice".
Satisfactory (S)	The project has minor shortcomings.

3.2 Adaptive Management

The project has shown a commendably high level of adaptive and driven management, yet still retained its prime focus. Adaptive management will still be required as the final GoK Ministerial and Departmental responsibilities are still not certain, nor is the level of devolution of powers to the new County governments taking place under the new Constitution. However, it does appear that the

current Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources will remain, which includes KWS, KFS and NEMA under one roof, a commendable situation that was not the case at project inception.

3.2.1 Work Planning

The work planning processes – Annual Workplan and Budget, and Quarterly planning and budgeting – appear to be pragmatic and results-based. The Annual Workplan is approved by the Project Steering Committee (TAC), comprising all the implementation partners (including GoK departments), and is also cleared by the UNDP Country Office. No issues were raised on this by UNDP-CO, which is very happy with planning and progress.

The project logframe has not changed since the project started. As mentioned earlier, it is not clear why the Outputs and Activities were clustered in the way they are under the three Components, which can seem rather vague. However, as far as can be ascertained, this does not seem to have been a problem to either Nature Kenya as project implementers or to the Project Steering Committee (TAC).

Some examples of adaptive management are given below:

- When disbursement of funding from GEF through UNDP took some time after final project signatures (as is often the case), Nature Kenya did not delay but built on existing activities, particularly those being supported by DfID in the South Nandi area and where a Nature Kenya office was already established, to kick-start GEF project activities.
- In 2012 GoK structures at the level of ministries were in a state of flux pending a new government and rationalization of ministerial responsibilities and devolution of powers under the new constitution. In terms of getting policy changes made this could have been a wasted year, but Nature Kenya contracted the Kenya Forests Working Group to start developing policy options while awaiting clarity on Ministerial and Departmental structures.
- There was initially uncertainty within KFS on whether re-designation of Forest Reserves to biodiversity reserves would result in loss of their authority and responsibility. This concern delayed the full involvement of KFS in the project for over a year. It was only in mid-2013 that the department became fully involved at implementation level. But, with full agreement of the Technical Advisory Committee, the project could meanwhile continue with activities on the ground, such as development of strategic-level forest management plans and PFMPs being drawn up by KEFRI, as Forest Officers were still able to collaborate. The high-level uncertainty did not stop project activities although it must have delayed them to an extent, especially activities at policy level.

3.2.2 Finance and Co-Finance

As mentioned earlier, initial project implementation was slow as some partners were not coming fully on-stream – in part due to major changes (still not yet resolved) in GoK structures, partly due to concerns on possible violence (which did not materialise) in the build-up to the 2012 elections, and in part due to fears within KFS about losing responsibility over parts of the forest estate if forests were to be henceforth managed for conservation rather than for forest products. Hence expenditure was slower than expected in Year 1 (see Quarterly reports). There was also an issue of vehicle procurement through UNDP, which could only provide vehicles said to be less-suited to the field terrain, resulting in delays in planned expenditure from 2011 to 2012.

The project is now running well as regards expenditure, and no queries have been raised by UNDP-CO, who authorise quarterly disbursement against agreed and approved budgets and workplans.

As is often the case with projects attempting to link conservation and development, it is difficult to ensure that all expenditure on CBOs or local governmental support is directly linked to conservation and/or project outcomes. Care always needs to be taken on this, but on the whole the project seems to have kept a balance. Expectations are normally greatly raised among resource-poor communities, which are not easy to rein in – as was experienced during the field visits when some CBOs, CFAs, and even GoK officers, were hoping for yet more basic support without too much thought given to sustainability or conservation outcome. In one case, the project's support (Ksh 4 million, USD 47,000) towards the construction of new regional office buildings for KWS at Kapsabet, the demonstrable conservation impact on forest biodiversity is unlikely to justify such expenditure. However, it was stated that it would bring a greater range of KWS officers, and hence conservation interest, to the area. Capacitating local partners is commendable, and has proved a great strength of this project. But this does need to remain cost-effective and result in tangible conservation outcomes.

At project inception a total of \$11.97 million was stated to be available for project co-financing, of which \$19.47 million was from GoK and \$1.5 million from Nature Kenya itself. According to the project manager, the actual co-finance made available to date is \$9.182 million, with Nature Kenya having contributed its full planned amount while GoK departments have so far contributed more pro rata than would have been expected at the halfway point of the project. Figures are given in Table 3.

Nature Kenya put in significant amounts of co-finance through the DfID-funded Civil Society Challenge Fund project in South Nandi (which finished in 2012) and through the RSPB-supported IBAs monitoring programme. GoK partners have generally provided staff and facilities on the ground as planned. The EU/Danida has funded a Community Resource Centre at Cherangani Forest Station through the Community Development Trust Fund, and there are various sources of support for tree nurseries and woodlot planting across the Cherangani landscape (e.g. Swedish Vi project) and for KFS infrastructural support through the African Development Bank (ADB), especially in Kakamega. As it was not possible to quantify these they have not been included in Table 3, but could be expected to add another few million USD to the effective co-financing total.

Sources of co- financing	Name of co- financer	Type of co-financing	Amount confirmed at CEO endorsement/ approval	Actual amount materialized at Midterm	Actual amount materialized at closing
Civil Society Organization	Nature Kenya	Grant/cash	1,500,000	1,500,000	-
National Government	Kenya Forest Service	In-kind (infrastructure and human resources)	5,500,000	3,300,000	-
National Government	Kenya Wildlife Service	In-kind (infrastructure and human resources)	2,850,000	1,710,000	-
National Government	Kenya Forestry Research Institute	In-kind (infrastructure and human resources)	1,500,000	900,000	-
National Government	National Environment Management Authority	In-kind (infrastructure and human resources)	620,000	372,000	-
National Government	Community Development Trust Fund	In-kind	-	1,400,000	-
		TOTAL	11,970,000	9,182,000	-

Table 3. Project co-financing at inception and mid-term (all figures in USD).

3.2.3 Risk Management

The major risk in the project seems to be the actual and proposed changes in administrative structures across GoK, and the planned devolution of powers to County (ex-District) governments. These are beyond the project's powers and significant influence. However, the proposed combining of KFS, KEFRI, KWS and NEMA – the main project partners – under a single Under-Secretary in the new Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources, instead of being in two separate Ministries as it was at project inception, has significantly reduced some of the risk present when the project was being developed. What is a new and unknown risk is to what extent implementation powers over management of gazetted Forest Reserves will be devolved to the newly-formed County governments. And if so, how this will be resourced and supervised, and how they might be held accountable for what are – in effect – national-level resources (water catchment and biodiversity values).

One other risk – which has always been present – is how forest co-management with KFS and the CFAs as community co-managers will manifest itself once external funding finishes. Will the CFAs retain their interest and (essentially voluntary) input? Will both KFS and CFAs look to income generation from the forest estate for economic survival rather than retaining the much less tangible ecosystem services and biodiversity values, unless national-level or external funding and intervention is forthcoming? It is not clear what can realistically be done to reduce such risks, other than trying to promote realistic nature-based tourism options (which, apart from Kakamega forest, are probably limited at this stage) and building on the excellent national Water-Towers idea and similar payments for ecosystem services resulting from intact protected forest areas. On the positive side, successful JFM will reduce management costs to the national exchequer, and in some ways there is no alternative sustainable method on offer, so the risk needs to be taken.

3.2.4 Monitoring

Monitoring is possibly the weakest aspect of the project's activities to date. It is important that the project establishes a baseline of significant aspects relating to forest conservation, such as threats from and economic status of the surrounding communities, extent of good intact forest, forest condition/integrity and species biodiversity values. These baselines can be used both to demonstrate any impacts project interventions may have over the life of the project (and beyond), but can also act as a baseline for KFS and others to decide upon and manage future interventions.

Some baseline data are available (see Section 2.4), but in most instances this is not for all project sites, nor is it adequate to be used to convincingly measure change. At a site level, too often it was stated by CFAs, KFS officers and others that there had been beneficial change to the forest, or reduced threats owing to project activities, but rarely could this statement be supported by any tangible evidence (although there was one mention of reduced incidence of the discovery of charcoal kilns in Kakamega Forest). It has also been stated (P. Matiku, pers. comm.) that the IBA monitoring process has measured reduced threat levels across the forests since the post-election violence in 2007. This is not to say that beneficial change has not occurred, just that it needs to be convincingly demonstrated if the project's achievements are to be promoted elsewhere, or even continue to receive the additional resources that the areas are presently receiving from GoK or County governments.

Forest extent, that is the extent of closed-canopy indigenous moist forest found within the gazetted Forest Reserves, has been very well recorded for Kakamega, South and North Nandi forests by the German-funded Biota project using satellite imagery, but is missing for the Cherangani Hills. Given this baseline, perhaps coupled with data from KIFCON plots from the 1990s (unfortunately these were not marked so it is not possible to revisit them), it should be possible to measure any future change in extent, both in hectares and where found. The project and/or KFS should seek to ensure this is done. A similar baseline needs to be established for the more diffuse and spread-out

Cherangani forests. It is recognised that the project's support to tree nurseries and planting has resulted in increased tree cover within and around the Forest Reserves, but it is not clear to what extent or what impacts this may have had.

Plant biodiversity monitoring needs to be radically rethought. The present system of threatened plant monitoring by NMK will yield little information of managerial or scientific value for monitoring change. Forest condition/integrity is much harder to measure, but is also important. From the air the forest may appear intact, but there may be little regeneration owing to grazing or clearance of the regeneration layer. In monitoring one needs (a) to be able to ascribe a detected change to an intervention or particular changed environmental parameter, and (b) do this with sufficient resolution and in an adequate time frame such that something can usefully be done about it in the form of a management intervention.

One of the main weaknesses in the proposed threatened plant monitoring scheme is in the choice of species. For example, of the five selected "surrogate species" (Prunus africana, Polyscias kikuyensis, Croton alienus, Commelina albiflora and Cynoglossum cheranganiense), only Prunus would seem to be a good species to monitor, as well as being threatened. Croton alineus has reportedly not been seen in Kakamega (its only recorded locality outside of central Kenya) for 15 years, and the identify of this record is in doubt (Beentje 1994); it is not a useful species to monitor. Commelina alienus, an annual herb, is known only from streamsides in Kakamega and not in the other forests, and thus would not be a good indicator species for forest condition. Cynoglossum cheranganiense is a herb mostly found to heathland vegetation above and outside of the forest in Cherangani. The literature and most specimen records suggest that *Polyscias kikuvensis* is not found west of the Mau forests, so it is possible the records given in the NMK report have been confused with Polyscias fulva, a very widespread forest gap species found from Ethiopia to Zimbabwe. It is difficult to separate the two except by seeing the flower arrangement, something that would often not be possible given that it is a tall tree, and especially by inexperienced local recorders during a monitoring programme. The report suggests that because of this, the two Polyscias species be monitored together, which rather defeats the original intention.

Given that it is important to have a monitoring system that addresses the main biodiversity values of the forests, it is suggested here (see Recommendations) that forest structure, composition and regeneration are addressed through the establishment of series of permanent sample plots (PSPs), perhaps 6 per project site. These should be carefully sited to be representative of the main forest types, and obviously permanently marked to allow re-measurement of exactly the same individual trees and area. Such plots could be established by KEFRI using standard methods.

Bird monitoring, already established under Nature Kenya's IBA monitoring programme running since 2004, is very good and should provide useful information on species change or changes in population status within all the forests. The system is tried and tested, and has been widely peer-reviewed. It is also amenable to a high level of involvement of locally-trained monitors. It looks at the full bird community, but with particular reference to known species of interest and/or concern, and brings in both forest condition and threats at the plots recorded, although these are not fully quantified. No modifications are required, except that forest-specific findings need to be brought out and fed into management. The main published report (Kenya's Important Bird Areas: Status and Trends 2011), for example, does not give any details for the project sites. It is recommended that existing IBA monitoring data are written up at an individual site level and made available to those involved in making management decisions.

For both reptiles/amphibians and mammals, the time-limited searches (Malonza 2013, draft) appear to be appropriate and should yield data with moderate resolution. The main difficulty, which is fully recognised, is that weather and local conditions can significantly alter what is recorded. Hence

regular monitoring, say twice a year, is probably appropriate. And caution should be taken in drawing conclusions on changes seen.

Project management at times is suggesting that with a bit more training all biodiversity monitoring can be carried out by volunteers from the local community, as this is considered to be cheaper as well as involving locals in management. This seems unwise and a potentially false economy, not least in that anyone analysing the data should be fairly engaged in the actual recording so he/she is aware of its limitations. In addition, given that the monitors would be community volunteers, with little in the way of incentive or reward, the rigour with which it is done may diminish. It is recommended technical staff remain fully involved in the field monitoring, even if others are equally involved.

3.2.5 <u>Reporting</u>

All required reports are being done, along with annual and quarterly workplans and budgets. The accounts have been audited and given a clean bill of health. The one weakness is a combination of the generic and score-based UNDP GEF reporting format coupled with, from the project team, what is perhaps insufficient or inadequately critical detail being provided; it was difficult during the evaluation to determine what actual progress had been made under each Output. The GEF reporting format (Implementation Progress Rating) may be useful for evaluating project achievements at an international level, but it does not really help the project identify weaknesses or areas of concern to implementation on the ground (or particular successes) – or indeed help project evaluators.

It is suggested (see Recommendations) that the project management team is more critical and careful in its reporting against specific Outputs, and that it also highlights areas of difficulty or issues that need to be addressed (whether by the project management team or by others such as UNDP or GEF). Particular achievements or successes should also be brought out in the reporting process such that these can be publicised as good practice, particularly those pertaining to joint forest management or conservation of forest biodiversity.

3.3 Management Arrangements

3.3.1 Project Implementation

Project management overall is going well. The management team at Nature Kenya is committed, driven, communicate well and are generally very effective. The Site Officers are adequately resourced and very dynamic. Both at site and national level there is good understanding, good will and good communication between the project management unit at Nature Kenya and all project partners – both at the level of government departments and at community level. This is most commendable.

The one comment that could be made refers to the Cherangani site. This covers an extensive geographical area compared to the others, across four different counties, there are far more separate forest blocks, the travel/logistics situation is more difficult (resulting in the project having two offices in different areas), and there has been less history of project involvement in the forest sector. In addition, Nature Kenya was known at the other two project sites (Kakamega, South Nandi), whereas it is relatively new in the Cherangani area. Given these factors, it will be difficult, and an unfair burden to put on the site staff, to expect the same level of progress here as at the other sites – it is just stretching the available resources (human skills, funding, time available) too far. In this light it is suggested (see Recommendations) that the project's activities in the Cherangani area are carefully prioritised and given greater focus. This could be either in the form focussing on just two or three forest blocks in just one County rather than all 18 forest blocks, or by focussing only on specific topics, such as development of PFMPs and liaison with the new County governments. In any event, the project should focus on just one (possibly two) counties and not try and distribute

itself evenly across the four counties that the Cherangani landscape straddles. An alternative, which is not particularly recommended at this stage of the project, would be to allocate more resources to the Cherangani site than at present in the form of more personnel and more funding.

Apart from this, there appear to be no significant issues with project management, which is doing a very good job.

3.3.2 Support provided by UNDP

The UNDP Country Office approves all work plans and disburses funds accordingly. No particular issues on this were raised by Nature Kenya, other project partners or UNDP. However, owing to a certain level of bureaucracy within the UN system, funds sometimes take longer to be released than would be expected.

There is occasional input from the GEF Technical Advisor in Pretoria, but as the project is not considered at all problematic and doesn't require such input, this is not an issue.

4. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS LEARNED

4.1 Conclusions

This is an innovative project that is attempting to overcome some significant barriers to effective biodiversity conservation in Kenya, primarily in the forest sector. So far it is succeeding well, helped in part-measure by recent positive changes in Kenya's Constitution and in changed Ministerial and Departmental responsibilities. A range of Government of Kenya stakeholders are involved and are now collaborating very well, despite some past reluctance. Forest Reserves, previously not particularly functional for the purposes of biodiversity conservation and open to degazetting, are now on their way to becoming biodiversity reserves with greater legal protection, but also with much greater acceptance by a range of local stakeholders from County (previously District) authorities and GoK Officers to local NGOs and local communities. Surrounding communities have been actively engaged through Community Forest Associations (CFAs), which have also been capacitated by the project such that they are now willing – and in some cases already able – to assist in forest management and in reducing threats to the forests.

There appear to be no significant design problems in the project, although this may have been the case if the recent political changes and reorganisation of ministries had not come about. The one caveat here is that it was perhaps rather ambitious in its Outcomes.

Project implementation is efficient, appropriately adaptive and clearly working towards achieving project objectives; there is a very good rapport between partners. Having implementation through Nature Kenya, a respected NGO, has proved to be not only efficient but has enabled the project to circumvent what could have been "territorial" or institutional difficulties within or between GoK Departments.

The main corrective issues suggested are primarily to do with the biodiversity and conservation monitoring procedures, and with the promotion of what the project is trying to achieve to a broader national and regional audience. At present the project will undoubtedly achieve many of its objectives yet may not be in a position to convincingly demonstrate a positive conservation impact on one of its primary objectives – forest biodiversity in the form of species composition, species abundances, forest extent and ecological integrity.

In such a project it is important to be able to demonstrate, both during and after implementation, that as well as the policy, legislative, capacity and activity achievements, that there has also been a net positive benefit to forest biodiversity in the Forest Reserves and surrounding landscape. At present it is not clear how useful or functional some of the baselines are, although for some attributes in some places (e.g. extent of true indigenous forest in Kakamega, South and North Nandi, bird species and populations) these are definitely available. Such attributes need to be monitored over the next 10 years or more to see if JFM and local involvement in forest management is actually having the required impact. With the notable exception of birds, some of the proposed biodiversity monitoring methods would not appear to provide reliable results given issues of resolution and timing of observations, especially if subsequent monitoring is to be undertaken by members of the local community with relatively little training or biological understanding. Recommendations for improvements are given.

The project is demonstrating a relatively new approach to forest conservation for Kenya, one looking at sites rather than large formally-protected areas, and one that explicitly and comprehensively involves the surrounding local communities in their management. It is building upon the SSG approach adopted by BirdLife in the African NGO–Government Partnerships for

Sustainable Biodiversity Action GEF project (1998–2002). Such an approach is intended to benefit both local communities through improving their livelihood options, and also the conservation community. For such an innovative approach to be more widely taken up across Kenya, or regionally, more effort needs to be made to promote it and try to determine what are the appropriate circumstances for its success. It may work well for some habitats such as forest patches, but not for others like wetlands with their broader catchments, or for rangelands. Or it may work well for sites under some types of threat or socio-economic circumstances, but not under others. The more widely the approach is examined and tried out, the more clear such answers will become. The project should ensure that its approach and the implementation requirements are promoted more widely through press articles, videos or presentations at technical conservation meetings or in papers, so that a broader critical evaluation can start to take place. At present it seems as if the story of what is being done is confined primarily to project participants.

4.2 Lessons Learned

The project demonstrates a number of useful lessons learned and best practice, although these may need to be re-evaluated in the Terminal Review. Among these are:

- 1. There is a great flexibility and dynamism with NGO execution of projects compared to government-level execution. NGOs are not caught up in inter-departmental issues and are often able to bring partners together in neutral forum; institutional barriers can be circumvented. Activities can proceed to an extent even when there is legislative or departmental inertia. However, one NGO weakness is that they do not have the power to make legislative changes, although they can be active in influencing such national discussions.
- 2. Long-established and moderately well-resourced NGOs that have been working in an area for a number of years, or through a number of different projects, are excellent implementation partners. They have already established local knowledge and trust and "hit the ground running", which is not often the case with specially-established Project Management Units.
- 3. Site Advisory Groups have shown themselves to be a very useful and effective forum for discussing and deciding upon conservation issues across sectors (e.g. GoK, County, CBOs), and a good way of ensuring communication and establishing trust.
- 4. Community Forest Associations, now registered as a legal body, seem to be useful way of engaging community participation in forest management. However, how sustainable they will be as effective management-assisting entities is not clear, and will probably be location and/or situation-specific.
- 5. Although capacitating and supporting local CBOs and government staff gains trust for a conservation project, it is too easy to lose focus on a project's conservation objectives. It is not easy to maintain a necessary balance between local support/ engagement and achieving conservation impact.
- 6. There is an imperative need for the establishment of good biodiversity and socio-economic monitoring systems within the first year of a conservation project or else it is not possible to convincingly ascribe a conservation impact to an intervention. This is something that is often overlooked. The baseline should be used to measure project impact by end of project, and should not be established at a half-way point, after interventions have already been implemented.

7. Any monitoring scheme must be scientifically sound and repeatable. In addition, it must be able to detect change at a moderate resolution and within the project's lifetime, as well as be able to ascribe any change to a particular intervention. Unreliable data may mean that it is not possible to confidently promote an intervention as achieving good conservation impact or as being good practice. Delegation of detailed monitoring to community participants with minimum training may reduce costs but can result in untrustworthy results, especially with biodiversity monitoring, thus potentially negating project findings. Trained technical personnel should be used at all stages, even if in conjunction with local people.

4.3 Recommendations

Since initial project design and inception, there have been a number of major changes in Government of Kenya structures and even in the Constitution as regards devolution of powers and responsibility from central to County (previously District) government. In addition, the experiences from the project and the ideas that it is promoting have so far been rather narrowly distributed at a national level. Whilst the project will undoubtedly achieve many of its objectives, it may face difficulties in being able to convincingly demonstrate a positive impact on one of its primary objectives – conservation of forest biodiversity in the form of forest extent, ecological integrity and/or species composition. To address these changed circumstances and other weaknesses the following 21 recommendations are given:

Project Design / Activities

- 1. Given the recent changes (still not finalised) in GoK structures, and the incipient devolution of some national responsibilities to County level, the project should as a matter of priority ensure it has good contacts and works with the appropriate County government structures as regards forest and site-based conservation, as well as retaining its previous links to the main GoK departments and institutions involved. In this regard, it may be necessary to prioritise areas, e.g. in Cherangani.
- 2. One of the main issues on which the project should engage County governments is to ensure that CFAs and KFS are capacitated and resourced into the future in order to be able to implement the approved forest management plans.
- 3. Also, as a matter of priority, the project should ensure all Participatory Forest Management Plans (PFMPs) are completed and approved by end of project (EoP) so that these can form the basis of all subsequent management and projects, whether GoK/KFS or County-driven.
- 4. At a national level, the project should keep abreast of and remain closely involved in on-going discussions around the new Forest Act and around County governmental environmental responsibilities/ accountability, etc. It should try to ensure that biodiversity conservation issues, particularly those pertaining to forests, are kept on the discussion agenda.
- 5. At a local (site) level, the project should ensure that at least some of the PFMPs are turned into agreed Forest Action Plans, such that statements of intent become resourced, with timelines and responsibilities clearly allocated.
- 6. Site Advisory Groups have shown themselves to be a very useful and effective forum for cross-sectoral discussion and collaboration. If requested locally (as in Cherangani), they should be formalised and maintained after EoP.
- 7. The project should investigate the possibility of involvement of project sites in any REDD+, carbon sales or provision of ecosystem services programme/project. However, this is not a

priority and if it looks as if the costs of involvement will significantly exceed the conservation or livelihood benefits, the project should not get involved but perhaps pass it on to others.

- 8. Restoration of indigenous forest on previously forested lands is not considered a good use of project resources, especially given that 'wildings' are often taken from nearby intact forests. Conservation and protection of the remaining good forest should be a priority, rather than trying to expand 'natural' forest by a few hectares. If soils and conditions are suitable, forests will re-establish themselves naturally. If the conditions are not right, then even re-planting is unlikely to be successful.
- 9. Control of grazing by livestock inside the forest is an issue that was not squarely addressed in the ProDoc, yet is a significant issue for conservation and forest regeneration. The project should encourage the establishment of bye-laws regarding this and ensure enforceable zoning under the PFMPs.

Site-Specific

- 10. Given the difficulties and complexity of the Cherangani Landscape project site (not least that it covers four Counties and has additional logistical problems), the project should start to prioritise activities and/or geographical areas across this site (i.e. reduce the number of Counties or forest blocks covered). At present project resources are spread too thinly to achieve reasonable and sustainable impact by EoP. An alternative, though not the best option, would be for the project to allocate additional project staff to the area.
- 11. While always a question of balance, the project should ensure that assistance at site level, whether to CBOs or KFS/KWS, is focused primarily on interventions with demonstrable conservation impact and relevance to project objectives, rather than on interventions primarily with livelihood benefit and tenuous or very indirect conservation impact. A considered evaluation should be made before any decision on support is taken, particularly with larger assistance allocations.

Advocacy and Dissemination of Findings

- 12. The project and Nature Kenya should start to promote this site-based and participatory approach to conservation to a broader range of conservation practitioners, including international conservation organizations, both nationally and regionally. This would include appropriate lessons learned and what are determined to be best practices. Such advocacy should be done through the media, in articles and in more technical fora such as conferences/ meetings.
- 13. The project, perhaps through Nature Kenya, should initiate a broader critical discussion of the merits, limitations and necessary or required circumstances for the success of this type of site-based approach to conservation, particularly as regards Kenya.
- 14. Given the changes in Kenya Government policy, KFS should now encourage and facilitate implementation of this participatory planning/co-management and biodiversity conservation approach elsewhere in Kenya.

Monitoring

15. Biodiversity monitoring across the project sites (with the notable exception of birds) needs to be more rigorous and robust such that any changes resulting from project interventions or into the future can be reliably measured. As a matter of urgency, the project needs to ensure there is a mapped baseline figure for the extent of less-disturbed forest for Cherangani (this was

done for Kakamega, South and North Nandi forests under the Biota project) with clear criteria, such that subsequent monitoring can be carried out, even after the project finishes.

- 16. Given that there is existing IBA monitoring data from most forest sites, Nature Kenya should analyse and write up findings on a forest site basis (not amalgamated at a national level) in a format that can be used by and guide managers. This particularly applies to data on forest condition and threat levels.
- 17. The project, perhaps through KEFRI, should establish a series of permanent sample plots (PSPs) in representative parts of the closed-canopy forest areas, perhaps six per project site. These should be used to measure forest structure, composition, integrity and regeneration on a long-term basis. It is unlikely any change could be detected within the remaining life of the project, but the PSPs will form a baseline for any future interventions as well as existing project-initiated activities.
- 18. The project should ensure that species-level biodiversity monitoring is based on standard repeatable techniques that can yield reliable data. Such monitoring techniques are already in place for birds under the IBA programme and are yielding useful information, but monitoring is particularly weak for forest plants such that any useful results are unlikely to be obtained. Technical advice on forest monitoring may need to be sought.
- 19. Responsibility for carrying out species-level biodiversity monitoring should not be simply delegated after brief training to volunteer members of local communities, but should be done with the close involvement of specialists from National Museums and subject to peer review. This is particularly relevant for species that are not readily identifiable by non-specialists. Otherwise the results will have little credibility into the future, and carry little weight in terms of advocacy.
- 20. The project should ensure that quantified data on threats are also recorded in order to measure reduced threat levels resulting from project interventions or greater community involvement in management. This could take the form of, for example, number of people apprehended for illegal firewood collection, numbers of trees cut, or number of snares found per kilometre of patrol. Such monitoring needs to be done on an annual basis.

Reporting

21. With present project reporting formats it can be difficult to determine progress against objectives; there is perhaps too much focus on activities rather than achievements, and too much duplication. UN/GEF formats may be useful at an international level, but are not particularly useful at project management or national level. Without additionally burdening Site Managers, project management should ensure that reporting captures progress towards stated targets and objectives as given in the logframe (Output–Activity detail to achieve Outcomes) and clearly highlights issues of concern, problems or barriers. Success stories or particular achievements also need to be highlighted.

Annex 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE (abridged)

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, a mid-term review of the full sized project "Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya" implemented through the Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources and Nature Kenya is to be undertaken in May 2013. The project started on January 1, 2011 and is in its third year of implementation. This Terms of Reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for this mid-term review.

1. OBJECTIVES OF THIS MID-TERM REVIEW (MTR)

The objective of the MTR is to gain an independent analysis of the progress of the project so far. The MTR will identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of the project objective, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF projects), and make recommendations regarding specific actions that should be taken to improve the project. The MTR will assess early signs of project success or failure and identify the necessary changes to be made. The project performance will be measured based on the indicators of the project's logical framework (see Annex 1) and various Tracking Tools.

The MTR must provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The review team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The review team is expected to conduct field missions to witness project activities (*location*), including the following project sites: Kakamega Forest, North and South Nandi Forests, Cherangani Hills Forest. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- 1. UNDP staff who have project responsibilities;
- 2. Executing agencies (including but not limited to senior officials and task team/ component leaders: implementing partners;
- 3. The Chair of Project Board
- 4. The NPD and ANPD of the Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya project
- 5. Project stakeholders, to be determined at the inception meeting; including academia, local government and CBOs

The team will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review. A list of documents that the project team and UNDP Country Office will provide to the team for review is included in Annex 2 of this Terms of Reference.

2. SCOPE OF THE MTR

The review team will assess the following three categories of project progress. For each category, the review team is required to rate overall progress using a six-point rating scale outlined in Annex 3:

3.1 Progress towards Results

Project design:

• Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions made by the project. Identify new assumptions.

- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards results.
- Review how the project addresses country priorities.
- Review the baseline data included in the project results framework and GEF Tracking tool and suggest revisions as necessary.

Progress:

- Assess the outputs and progress toward outcomes achieve so far and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project.
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future lead to, beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Examine whether progress so far has led to, or could in the future lead to, potentially adverse environmental and/or social impacts/risks that could threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes. Are these risks being managed, mitigated, minimized or offset? Suggest mitigation measures as needed.
- Review the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. Identify opportunities for stronger substantive partnerships.

3.2 Adaptive management

Work Planning

- a) Are work planning processes result-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results.
- b) Examine the use of the project document logical/results framework as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start. Ensure any revisions meet UNDP-GEF requirements and assess the impact of the revised approach on project management?

Finance and co-finance

- a) Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- b) Complete the co-financing monitoring table (see Annex 4).
- c) Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.

Monitoring Systems

- a) Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required?
- b) Ensure that the monitoring system, including performance indicators, meet GEF minimum requirements. Apply SMART indicators as necessary.
- c) Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop SMART indicators, including disaggregated gender indicators as necessary;
- d) Review the mid-term GEF Tracking Tool (s) as appropriate and comment on progress made, quality of the submission, and overall value of the GEF Tracking Tool.
- e) Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to M&E? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Risk Management

- a) Validate whether the risks identified in the project document, APR/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate. If not, explain why?
- b) Describe any additional risks identified and suggest risk ratings and possible risk management strategies to be adopted.

Reporting

- a) Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management, and shared with the Project Board.
- b) Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

3.3 Management arrangements

- a) Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the project document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- b) Review the quality of execution of the project Implementing Partners and recommend areas for improvement.
- c) Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

3. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the review will be 4 weeks starting mid-May (actual date TBD) according to the following plan:

Activity	Timeframe
Preparation	(2 days)
Review mission and debriefing	(10 days)
Draft review report	(2 days)
Finalisation of final report	(1 days)

4. TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent reviewers will conduct the review - one international team leader and one national expert. The consultants will not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The team should have prior experience in reviewing or evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

- Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in Adaptive Management, as applied to conservation or natural resource management;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years;
- Excellent English communication skills.
- Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- Experience working in region.

Annex 2. CONSULTANT'S ITINERARY

- 18 Aug AM/PM Travel from UK to Nairobi
- 19 Aug AM Reading documents PM UNDP Country Office; Nature Kenya, introductions
- 20 Aug AM Nature Kenya offices, briefing PM Meeting KFS
- 21 Aug AM Technical Advisory Committee meeting PM Nature Kenya discussions
- 22 Aug AM/PM Reading documents, Nature Kenya
- 23 Aug AM Meet with BirdLife International PM Skype conversation with Mr Ayiemba
- 24 Aug PM Reading docs and report writing
- 25 Aug AM/PM Travel to project sites; stay at Kakamega. Meet NK Site Officer
- 26 Aug AM Nature Kenya offices; BIC, KFS Western Conservancy; private farmer; KWS offices, Kakamega Tour Guides, forest walk PM Malava CFA, visit Malava Forest Reserve
- 27 Aug AM Visit KEFRI. Site Advisory Committee meeting PM Visit KEEP & Kakamega Forest Station; forest walk. Travel to Kapsabet
- 28 Aug AM SAG meeting at N Nandi forest offices, visit new KWS offices PM Murguiywet CFA & Kipsamoite forest patch
- 29 Aug AM Visit Kingwal swamp CCA, Kabujor CFA at S Nandi, forest walk/monitoring transect near Kobujoi Forest Station PM Kobujoi CFA, Forest Station & tree planting. Travel to Kitale
- 30 Aug AM SAG meeting, Kapenguria PM Meet Kabichbich CFA & Kerot CBO
- 31 Aug AM To Marakwet area. Meet Kapcherop/Cherangani CFA, forest walk. PM Visit Cherangani Nature-Based CBO. Travel to Eldoret.
- 1 Sept AM/PM Travel back from Eldoret to Nairobi
- 2 Sept AM Meet with KFWG & Min. Environ. PM Meet with UNDP CO
- 3 Sept AM Meet with IUCN Regional Office PM Preparation of presentation
- 4 Sept AM Briefing of initial findings to Tech. Advisory Ctte, Nature Kenya PM Field notes
- 5 Sept AM/PM Writing draft report
- 6 Sept AM/PM Travel back to UK
- 9/12/13/14 Sept Writing draft report
- 4 Oct Finalising report

Annex 3. PERSONS MET & INTERVIEWED

Nairobi Paul Matiku, Executive Director, Nature Kenya, Nairobi Joan Gichuki, Local Empowerment Manager, Nature Kenya, Nairobi Daniel Kathurima, Administrative Officer, Nature Kenya, Nairobi Paul Mauria, IBA Programme Coordinator, Nature Kenya, Nairobi. Washington Aviemba, Site Support Specialist/Project Manager, Nature Kenya, Nairobi [sykpe conversation] David Githaiga, Programme Officer, UNDP Country Office, Nairobi Dan Marangu, Senior Assistant Director, Multilateral Environmental Agreements, Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources, Nairobi James Mwang'ombe Mwamodenyi, Senior Assistant Director (Biodiversity Management), Kenya Forest Service, Nairobi Erastus Kanga, Assistant Director & Head, Ecosystems Conservation & Management, Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), Nairobi Wilson Busienei, National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA), Nairobi Joseph Masinde, National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA), Nairobi William Omondi, Seed Programme Coordinator, Kenya Forest Research Institute (KEFRI), Nairobi Itambo Malombe, Head, National Herbarium, National Museums of Kenya (NMK), Nairobi Patrick Malonza, Senior Research Scientist/Herpetologist, National Museums of Kenya, Nairobi Julius Arinaitwe, Regional Director, BirdLife African Partnership, Nairobi Maaike Manten, CEPF Coordinator, BirdLife International, Nairobi Rudolph Makhanu, National Coordinator, Kenya Forests Working Group, East African Wildlife Society, Nairobi Ali Kaka, Regional Director, IUCN Eastern & Southern Africa Office, Nairobi Mine Pabari, Regional Programme Coordinator, IUCN Eastern & Southern Africa Office, Nairobi Quentin Luke, private consultant/IUCN East African Plants SSC, Nairobi Kakamega Joel Siele, Site Project Officer, Nature Kenva, Kakamega Jennifer Adero, Extension Officer, Nature Kenya, Kakamega Hassam Bashir, Tourism Warden, Kenya Wildlife Service, Kakamega National Reserve Raile Busiedei, Office Assistant, Biodiversity Information Centre/Tour Guide, Kenya Wildlife Service, Kakamega Stanley Chiveti, Secretary, Malava Community Forest Association, Kakamega Patrick Inziani, Kakamega Tour Guides Association, Kakamega + 6 others Jonah Kanyanga, private farmer, Kakamega Charles Koech, Researcher/Sociologist, Kakamega Sub-Office, Kenya Forest Research Institute Joyce Kurui, Community Warden, Kenya Wildlife Service, Kakamega National Reserve Marcella Levi, Treasurer, Malava Community Forest Association, Kakamega Leonard Likhotio, Extension Officer, Nature Kenya, Kakamega Patrick Luteshi, Education Manager, Kakamega Environmental Education Programme (KEEP). Kakamega James Odiambo Maua, Research Scientist/Officer-in-Charge, Kakamega Sub-Office, Kenya Forest **Research** Institute Daniel Mkung, Station Manager, Kakamega Forest Station, Kenya Forest Service Frederick Ojuang Nyibule, Officer-in-Charge/Warden, Kenya Wildlife Service, Kakamega Benjamin Okalo, Chairman, Kakamega Environmental Education Programme (KEEP), Kakamega Wilberforce Okeka, Chairman, Kakamega Forest Station Biodiversity Monitoring Team Duncan Osale, National Environmental Management Authority, Kakamega Dominic Onuong'a Otieno, Head, Western Conservancy, Kenya Forest Service, Kakamega

Anthony **Pindo**, Organising Secretary, Kakamega Environmental Education Programme (KEEP), Kakamega Nixion Sajita, Chairman, Kakamega Tour Guides Association, Kakamega James Shihuma, Chairman, Malava Community Forest Association, Kakamega Prof H.M. Tsingalia, Department of Zoology/Chairman Site Advisory Group, Moi University, Eldoret Members of Kakamega Site Advisory Group Solomon Watai, Scouts Leader, Malava Community Forest Association, Kakamega South & North Nandi Gibson Kitsao, Site Project Officer, Nature Kenya Mary Mbenge, Project Extension Officer - energy & schools programme and monitoring, Nature Kenya, Nandi Office Rebecca Nkachoi, Project Extension Officer - community programmes, Nature Kenya, Nandi Office Nancy Sawe, Nature Kenva intern, Nandi Office Eric Keter Chano, Nature Kenya intern, South Nandi Charles Koech, Nandi Project Site Advisory Committee Chairman/Researcher, Kenya Forest Research Institute, Kakamega Enock Kilimo, County Forest Conservator, KFS, Nandi Joel Kanda, County Warden, KWS, Nandi Barnabas Mitei, SSG, South Nandi Francis Rono, Chairman CFA Chesumei/Vice-Chair SAC, North Nandi Johnston Koech, Chairman, Kimondi/Iruru CFA, Nandi Peter Kiptanui, Chairman, Kobujoi CFA, South Nandi Frederick Oyor, Manager, Kobujoi Forest Station, South Nandi Eliud Tuwei, Chairman, Murguiywet CBO, Kipsamoite, North Nandi Edwin Koriri, Vice-Chairman, Murguiywet CBO, Kipsamoite, North Nandi Rosa Jelimoi, Treasurer, Murguiywet CBO, Kipsamoite, North Nandi Mr Maruse, community scout, Murguiywet CBO, Kipsamoite, North Nandi Members of Murguivwet CBO, Kipsamoite, North Nandi Emanuel Kirwa, Chairman, Kingal Swamp CCA, South Nandi Lazarus Birgeu, Vice-Chair, Kingal Swamp CCA, South Nandi Members of Kingal Swamp CCA, South Nandi Eliot Murgor, Chairman, Kabujor CFA, South Nandi Members of Kabujor CFA, South Nandi Erik Abungu, District Forest Officer (extension), KFS, Nandi Cherangani Julius Kimani, Site Project Officer, Cherangani Landscape, Nature Kenya, Kapsowar John Kiptum, Site Extension Officer, Cherangani, Marakwet Alfred Tulel, Site Extension Officer, Nature Kenya, Kapsowar, Marakwet Jacqueline **Svo**, Nature Kenya intern, Tulel, Marakwet Alfred Nyaswabu, Zonal Forest Officer, KFS/SAG Chairman, Marakwet David Tanui, Kerio Valley Development Authority

Charles **Kiberen**, Sengwer Indigenous People Development Programme, Cherangani Samuel **Kenyatta**, Chairman, Kapkamyar–Kabichbich CFA, Kabichbich, West Pokot Monica **Ngimor**, Vice Chair, Kapkamyar–Kabichbich CFA, Kabichbich, West Pokot Members of Kapkamyar–Kabichbich CFA, Kabichbich, West Pokot Jackson **Atongoreng**, Chairman, Kerot CBO, West Pokot Members of Kerot CBO, West Pokot Josephat **Makokha**, Forest Officer, KFS, Cherangani Forest Station, Kapcherop, Marakwet Paul Keimo, Chairman, Chebororwa Sekemiat CBO/SSG, Kapcherop, Marakwet

- Ismail **Chemitay**, Chairman, Cherangani Nature-Based Organisation, Koisungur, Kapcherop, Marakwet
- Leah **Kimutai**, Secretary, Cherangani Nature-Based Organisation, Koisungur, Kapcherop, Marakwet

<u>Annex 4</u>. Project Results Framework: Project achievements against Outputs (completed by NK Project Manager).

Expected CP Outputs	Planned Activities	Activity Status	Responsible Party	Action
Output 1.1 A Systematic Conservation Plan for PA Coverage in the Eastern Montane landscape provides the frame for enhanced biodiversity protection Indicators: - Landscapes maintain global biodiversity values	1.1.1 Map all globally threatened biodiversity within a Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) methodology published by IUCN	Collation of species list for 5 taxa (plants, mammals, birds, reptiles, insects) from secondary literature for the three forest landscapes; Surveys for the 5 taxa conducted at the three forest landscapes to confirm the distribution of the selected species; 30 local biodiversity monitors trained on selected species/monitoring the 5 taxa	NMK, KWS	
 4 Key Biodiversity areas/PAs documented 4 biodiversity conservation strategies developed 	1.1.2 Assess the target forests for their qualification under National conservation categories (in relation to the IUCN criteria)	Discussions on the potential categorization discussed at the TAC; Case for forest status captured in the Strategic Plans for sites	NK	To be done in 2014 by Nature Kenya/KFS
	1.1.3 Develop biodiversity protection upgrade plans and strategy with shared responsibilities among key stakeholders	KFS supported to develop the strategy and framework, ongoing	NK	To be complete by end 2013, KFS/NK
	1.1.4 Map the PAs including buffer zones critical for PAs sustainability, involving communities in mapping)	PA area and zonation identified in the Strategic Plans for respective sites; KFS survey department supported to conduct physical boundary survey, ongoing	DRSRS,KFS, KWS	
	1.1.5 Develop a strategy for PAs incorporation into IUCN PAs grid	Not done	NK	To be done Nature Kenya by December 2013
Output 1.2 Regulations provided under the Forest Act established that formalize a new category of Forest Reserve managed for biodiversity conservation: to be termed 'Nature Reserve'.	1.2.1 Support ongoing review of the Forest and Wildlife Act	Engaged in the review of the Forest Act 2005 through the Kenya Forest working Group (KFWG); CFAs by support stakeholders consultative meetings. Policy brief developed and shared with Forestry ministry officials Not participated in Wildlife Review Not participated in EMCA Review	KFS,KWS	Stakeholders to participate as opportunity arises
Indicators:20,000 ha nature reserves mapped8 CFAs and PFM management agreements;	1.2.2 Develop a niche at KFS for biodiversity protection linking with KWS	Support given to KFS Natural Forest Management Division to develop biodiversity section, ongoing	KFS	To be done KFS by 2014
 Number of policy/legislation briefs/guides; Site advocacy strategies; 10 CCAs/ToRs; Biodiversity strategy under Forest Act 	1.2.3 Develop a strategy for local peoples involvement in PAs conservation under the Forest Act and Wildlife Act	Supported CFAs to engage in the National Umbrella discussions and that provided a policy brief on engagement and benefit sharing Not engaged in Wildlife Act	KWS, KFS	Continue to participate in ongoing action

				T 1 1 VIVIG1 0011
	1.2.4 Identify, survey and map expanded	18,000 Ha of CCAs identified and 4,286 surveyed and	KWS	To be done KWS by 2014
	network of Nature reserves	mapped		
	1.2.5 Review and support the enforcement	Local stakeholders meetings held at which stakeholders	MEMR	
	of EMCA Water Forest Wildlife and	and NEMA discussed identified violations of	IVILIVIIX	
	A grigulture A sta to enhance DA	and WEWA discussed identified violations of		
	Agriculture Acts to enhance PA	environmental regulations and follow-ups on		
	conservation.	enforcement (routine)		
Output 1.3 At least 6 Forest Blocks	1.3.1 Community buffer zones defined and	Ha of forest buffer zones identified in management	KFS	
gazetted as new PAs: boundary demarcation	agreed with local people	operational and strategic plans; the uses for the areas		
into core & buffer areas; site registration];		agreed and included in the plan programs		
Areas of at least 5 Forest Reserves upgraded				
to Higher PA category [gazettal and	1.3.2 All target forests surveyed and	Support provided to KFS to undertake task – ongoing;	KFS, KWS	
boundary demarcation completed] as	boundaries reestablished	Opinions of the forest adjacent residents and	,	
National / Nature Reserve		stakeholders sought on actions to be taken over the		
National / Nature Reserve.		encroached areas		
Indiastana	1.3.3 Title deeds issued for all the core	Not done	KES	Need to understand how to approach this
(5 000he of forest appointed or realogation to	forests	Not done	KI 5	under the new dispensation where the
- 65,000ha of forest gazetted of fectassified to	1010515			titles will be held by the Netional I and
higher status				titles will be neid by the National Land
- Number of forests upgraded to higher PA				Commission
status	1.3.4 Map the PAs including buffer zones	Areas identified during the strategic ecosystem and	KFS, KWS	
	critical for PAs sustainability	forest station operational plans development; KFS		
		supported to map boundaries of ecosystems, ongoing		
	1.3.5 New PAs taken through due legal	Not done	KFS	Need to understand how to approach this
	process to incorporate them within a			under the new dispensation where the
	national plan for national grid of PAs			titles will be held by the National Land
				Commission
Output 1.4 Management Plans developed	1.4.1 25 year strategic management plans	Final drafts produced and being edited for print and	KEFRI/KFS/	Induct the stakeholders and management
for three PA clusters in major Forest	developed for Cherangani incorporating	distribution	MEMR	teams on the ground to adopt the use of
Habitat Blocks: Charangani Hills	Participatory Forests Management Plans		MENIIC	these plans
Kakamaga Forest and Nandi Foresta (North	1 4 2 25 year stratagia management nlang	Final drafts produced and being edited for print and	VEEDI/VES/	Induct the stalkshelders and management
Rakamega Forest and Ivanui Forests (Ivorti	1.4.2 25 year strategic management plans	Final drafts produced and being edited for print and	NEFKI/NFS/	induct the stakeholders and management
and South Mandi Diocks)	developed for South Nandi Incorporating	distribution.	MEMK	teams on the ground to adopt the use of
T N	Participatory Forests Management Plans			these plans
Indicators:				
- 3 Strategic Forest Management Plans	1.4.3 25 year strategic management plans	Final drafts produced and being edited for print and	KEFRI/KFS/	Induct the stakeholders and management
developed;	developed for North Nandi incorporating	distribution.	MEMR	teams on the ground to adopt the use of
- 8 PFMPs developed and endorsed by KFS	Participatory Forests Management Plans			these plans
• · · · • • • · · · · · · · · · · ·				-
	1.4.4 25 year strategic management plans	Final drafts produced and being edited for print and	KEFRI/KFS/	Induct the stakeholders and management
	developed for Kakamega Forest	distribution.	MEMR	teams on the ground to adopt the use of
	incorporating Participatory Forests			these plans
	Management Plans			*
Output 15 Up and dod in the first land if	1.5.1 Multi ataliahaldar DAr Coordination	Site Advisory Committees constituent at respect	NIZ	Transform the SAC into Isint
Output 1.5 Upgraded institutional capacity	1.5.1 WILLI-Stakenoider PAS Coordination	Site Advisory Commutees operational at respective	INK	Transform the SAC Into Joint
for coordinating PA planning and operations	mechanisms developed and operationalized	sites; barriers to joint coordination of players		management Committees
at central, regional and local government				Lobby the ministry to harmonize the
levels.				overlaps and conflicting mandates of

Indicators: - Number of central coordination institution				relevant actors in the sector to develop structures for joint management
and systems developed	1.5.2 National and County PAs review commission /committee/taskforce established at the ministry of environment	Note done	KWS,KFS/ MEMR	To follow up
Output 1.6 PA management objectives are integrated into district development plans/ programs. Indicators:	1.6.1 Support County Development and Environment Action plans (EAP)	Kakamega commenced the development of County Environment action Plan from the prioritized issues from the SoE	NEMA	Develop the County EAP for Nandi and facilitate SoE development for other counties in the project implementation area
 Number PA plans/programs integrated by lead development agencies at District/County 	1.6.2 Provide support to state of environment reports and Local Authority Development plans.	State of the Environment (SoE) developed for Nandi and Kakamega County. Successful pilot of the process from district to county. Issues highlighted in the Nandi County Plans 2013- 2014 start of planning No development plans supported so far	NEMA	Mainstream the issues in the SoE in the development planning processes by local stakeholders/officers included in the planning processes.
Output 1.7 Business case for Forest PA sub system is made through research, documenting economic benefits, likely partners, cost coefficients for PA functions.	1.7.1 Carry out PAs economic assessments and valuation and document benefits to government and local communities	ToRs developed	KWS, KFS/ MEMR	Engage local team of Nature/Birdlife trained experts or engage a consultant – Nature Kenya
budgets and revenue options (PES, tourism concessions, government/ donor budget appropriations).	1.7.2 Develop a PAs business and sustainability strategy showing roles and responsibilities for communities, government and donors and potential partners such as <i>Exercist Again</i>	Not done	KWS/ MEMR	To be done NK by 2014
 Types of Value of the three PAs established; Number of Business options identified for the PAs 	1.7.3 Determine ecosystem services and their economic contribution to national development	Not done; part of 1.7.1 above	NK,KWS, KFS, KEFRI	To be done NK by 2014
	1.7.4 Assess the carbon status for the forests and recommend interventions to engage in climate change mitigation and benefits sharing mechanisms	KFS team engaged in biomass mapping of the Cherangani, ongoing	NK,KFS, KWS, NEMA, KEFRI/ MEMR	
	1.7.5 Build capacities of communities, Local staff and other stakeholders for business enterprise development	Stakeholders capacity build on entrepreneurship Mentoring of CBOs to enhance the skills on which they were trained ongoing	NK,KWS	
	1.7.6 Within business plan, provide assessment of value addition options for existing income generating activities	Business plans developed for the nature based enterprises at the respective forest areas (Kakamega – Beekeeping, ; Nandi – beekeeping, ; and Cherangani – Beekeeping,	NK,KWS	Develop action plans and targets for the CBO/Umbrella Association and mentor them during implementation

Output 2.1 >10 Community Conservation Areas established as new PAs to protect small forest patches with high conservation value and >10 Joint Forest Management systems established in the buffer areas to National Reserves, Nature Reserves Forest	2.1.1 Establish appropriate by-laws through participatory processes incorporating identification of additional required legislation	Draft management plans and by-laws developed for CCAs/PAs	NK	Test applicability of the by-laws and finalize for gazettement in view of the Land Commission Provisions
Reserves and managed to reduce pressures on core areas [boundary marking/ area zoning].	2.1.2 Gazettement of additional by-laws taking into account traditional natural resource management regulations	Not done	KWS,KFS, NK	To be done by NK by 2014, as feasible
 Indicators: Reduction in forest loss in unprotected forest blocks Number of CCAs established Number of Joint Management Teams established 	2.1.3 Policy and legislation on natural resource management made more accessible for communities and other users by creation and dissemination of manuals/guides to legislation & regulations.	Information packages on legislation for respective stakeholders developed and disseminated in workshops and public barazas. Policy and legislation documents distributed to stakeholders (Forest Act, EMCA, Agriculture Act, and Water Act)	NK/ NEMA	
 Number oc CCA management plans developed Gender considerations in planned actions 	2.1.4 Local community members and district level GoK officers trained in implementation (enforcement and compliance) of legislation relating to forest management systems.	Awareness made to the relevant CBO officials, GoK officers and given the documents; Officers discuss collaboration systems amongst the players	NK/ NEMA	
	2.1.5 Community Conservation Areas established at sites with functioning joint management committees in place, with >4 CCAs created and established at each project site.	38 CCAs identified and Management Committees in place (Kakamega 21; Nandi 6; and Cherangani 11)	NK/MEMR	
	2.1.6 Joint site management committees established and functional (between community / local council / government) with regular meetings and attendance	Not done	NEMA	To be done by Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources by 2014
Output 2.2 Village Site Support Groups established and registered; roles and responsibilities for CCA/ JFM are defined, management rules developed, bylaws enacted and site management plans are developed for all sites Capacity emplaced to administer PA functions in all sites (enforcement and monitoring).	2.2.1 Establishment and capacity development of Site Support Groups (SSGs) at project sites; at least 20 community members are trained in forest conservation and management at each site; Audiovisual and printing production: To supporting printing and production of meetings programmes and support for 4 field offices	Organisational capacity of participating CBOs/CFAs assessed; 84 CFA officials and GoK staff trained on PFM; 8CFAs supported to establish offices	NK	

]11 - - -	 Indicators: Reduction in forest degradation at the forest edge through creation of PFM buffer zones Number of CBOs capacity built to actively/fully engage in NRM Types of capacity building provided 	2.2.2 Development and implementation of participatory management plans between GoK officials and communities with 4 management plans developed in participatory way and implemented	4 PFM plans developed and signed by KFS; 4 PFM plans in the finalized awaiting approvals from KFS 4 socio-economic and forest resource assessments conducted in developing the PFMPs 3 CFAs facilitated in negotiation of management agreements and benefit sharing with KFS	KEFRI/KFS, NK/ MEMR	
	- Gender considerations taken during capacity	2.2.3 GoK staff trained in conservation co- management present at project sites	15 Local GoK officers trained on PFM	NK	
	ounding	2.2.4 Management and local protected area functions, livelihoods and monitoring and evaluation are effectively mainstreamed into PA system with 2 natural resource- based enterprises identified, developed and functional at each site	Viability of alternative livelihood activities conducted and action plans for their adoption developed	NK/ MEMR	Mentor CBOs on adoption of the alternative livelihoods
		2.2.5 Low cost biodiversity monitoring system implemented and informing management actions	30 Biodiversity monitoring teams trained on common protocol Biodiversity information packaged to responsive to management information requirements	NMK, KFS, KWS	
		2.2.6 Annual site monitoring implemented at each site with status report produced and Community Forest Monitoring Scouts established for each participating CCA	Not done; to be trained by SSG monitors from the main forest blocks	NMK, KFS, KWS	To be done NK by 2014
Output 2.3 Business plans define income generation opportunities from sustainable use of forests. Sustainable use management system invoked in areas zoned for forest extraction (resource inventories, sustainable off-takes defined, monitoring and enforcement system in place). Indicators: - PA management system effectively integrates conservation needs and local livelihoods - 6 business and marketing plans developed - 2 ecotourism enterprise models developed - Gender considerations in planned actions	2.3.1 Carry out value chain analysis for income generating opportunities including eco-tourism enterprises at the four target sites	Value chain analysis conducted for key enterprises and CBOs advised on value chain opportunities to invest on	NK		
	ff-takes defined, monitoring and aforcement system in place).	2.3.2 Build capacity of the business owners targeting the NBEs though business planning, development and management	Existing business plans updated and restructuring of enterprises for increased profit margins instituted. NBEs being mentored on the routine use of business and marketing plans	NK	
	 PA management system effectively integrates conservation needs and local livelihoods 6 business and marketing plans developed 2 ecotourism enterprise models developed Gender considerations in planned actions 	2.3.3 Establish linkages, partnerships and alliances with private sector and engage business development services and providers	3 new linkages developed with the tea and a sugar companies in Kakamega and Nandi for the supply of fuel wood grown on community woodlots; Linkage with Honey care to market and production service provision in Nandi 1 contract entered into in Nandi for fuel wood supply to Williamson Tea Estate	NK/MEMR	
		2.3.4 Establish Community Conservation Business Council (CCBC) for Site Support Groups	Concept and model discussed with SSGs but yet to start implementation, and identify the best place to locate the community market	NK	To be done NK by 2014

Mid-Term Review, Strengthening the Forest Protected Area Network in Kenya_FINAL, page 39

	 2.3.5 Develop eco-tourism site-based business and marketing plans and develop site-based tourism models and circuits 2.3.6 Develop capacity to engage in carbon trade for community benefits 	Viability of ecotourism enterprises undertaken for Kakamega and Cherangani; Network of tourism stakeholders/actors established and in Kakamega; Nandi ecotourism facilities and Resource Centre developed; CBOs engaged in ecotourism trained on respective trade and being mentored Kakamega community assisted to expand existing schemes so as to quicken realization of the benefits they have entered into contract	NK NK, KEFRI/NEMA/CI imate Change	
			Secretariat	
Output 3.1 Improved systems level operations capacity ensures deployment of funds, staff, and equipment) to address threats to forest PAs established expressly to conserve biodiversity (National Reserves and Nature Reserves).	3.1.1 Sensitize local partners on stakeholder rights and on the need to release pressure off the forest. Workshops including government lead agencies who will be assisting the local communities to undertake afforestation.	Sources of pressure on forest areas identified for respective forest landscapes; the community made aware and educated on the rights of stakeholders, pressure they exert on forest, and alternative activities/technologies promoted	NK	
 Indicators; Cost drivers for PAs are reduced as community acceptance of PAs leads to reduction of PA incursions 	3.1.2 Carry out feasibility study to determine best suited fast growing and environmentally friendly highland species and appropriate sites for locating planting including agro-forestry	Species identified, produced in community nurseries and growing introduced in woodlots and boundary planting	KEFRI	
Number of human pressure on forest reduction strategies adopted Number of private public partnerships developed with companies in the landscape Gender considerations in the technologies adopted	3.1.3 Promote, establish and strengthen partnerships between the tea estates/companies and the local farmers living around forests	3Tea and 2 Sugar companies linked with adjacent communities in Kakamega and Nandi	KEFRI	
	3.1.4 Support and facilitate farmers to enter into growers agreements with private sector including the tea estates to supply wood products.	1 agreement entered into with Williamson Tea Estates in Nandi	KEFRI	
	3.1.5 Support the local communities to establish their own woodlots and tree nurseries as a commercial activity and for supplementing the existing demand	Business plans developed and 38 CBOs/groups supported to produce over 20,000 seedlings each annually	KEFRI/KFS	
	3.1.6 Organize and deliver training on nursery and woodlots establishment and management and other commercial forestry practices (pruning, thinning and harvesting)	Training and mentoring provide to 38 CBOs	KEFRI	
	3.1.7 Support and facilitate lesson learning through exchange visits and educational tours targeting best practices in establishment and development of small- scale forestry and agroforestry	4 exchange visits conducted for mixed CBOs/stakeholders from Cherangani and Kakamega	NK	

	3.1.8 Set up demonstration sites for	400energy saving devices installed/fabricated and in	NK	
	alternative energy sources to wood, energy	use at the forest adjacent households and schools		
	efficiency plans and new technologies (e.g.			
	Solar improved stoves etc) in the target			
	areas and promote alternative energy			
	development			
Output 3.2 PA core infrastructure in place	3.2.1 Boundary posts built in all five	Kobujoi Forest station facilities renovated	KFS,KWS	
(boundary posts, fire breaks, and ranger	target landscapes			
stations, and visitor interpretation) in focal	3.2.2 Firebreaks put in place throughout	Not done	KFS,KWS	To be done as identified KFS by 2014
PAs /buffer zones.	fire risk areas			
	3.2.3 Ranger stations improved or built	KWS Kapsabet offices construction supported now at	KES KWS	
Indicators:		70% completion	111 0,1111 0	
- Number of posts/stations built or rehabilitated	3.2.4 Visitor centres improved or huilt	Kobujoj and Cherangani Forest Stations facilities	KES KWS	
Distance of firsbrooks algored	5.2.4 Visitor centres improved of built	developed	K15,KW5	
		uevelopeu		
- 2 visitor centres functionality				
Output 3.3 PA staff skills sets cover all	3.3.1 Participatory needs assessment	26CBO/CFA officials trained on group management,	NK	
conservation functions (enforcement,	conducted and then developed to implement	financial management, and advocacy;		
policing, reporting, survey/monitoring	a programme of training for the SSGs and	40 community scouts recruited and trained on forest		
work, participatory management).	other CBOs based on the identified needs	protection		
(or in) par elerparent y managemente).	(rights based advocacy, women's'	30 community members trained on biodiversity		
Indicators:	empowerment HIV awareness leadership	monitoring		
METT Scores are improved in target	marketing etc)	monitoring		
- METT Scoles are improved in target	2.2.2. Hald most in an arith lagel accommon and	Not down	NEMA MEMD	To be done has non-extine stated aldone as
landscapes	5.5.2 Hold meetings with local government	Not done	NEWA, MEWK	To be done by respective stakeholders as
- Types of capacity building need required	and regulatory bodies to agree capacity			appropriate
- Capacity building and training plans	needs and gaps and implement training			
Number of GoV staff trained	especially on institutional development			
	(Governance and accountability, leadership,			
- Number of community members trained	gender issues, policy, advocacy etc)			
- Gender considerations in planned actions	3.3.3 Facilitate development of	4 SSGs linked with the CFAs and KFS/KWS offices in	NK	
	partnerships between SSGs and other	their respective forest areas to engage in forest		
	CBOs District-level Government staff and	biodiversity monitoring and ecotourism development		
	private sector	actions: SSG in Kakamega linked with local tour		
		operators and hotels to promote hirding		
	2.2.4 Train KES KWG KEEDI NEMA	20 staff trained in Neudi and Channa seri	NEMA MEMD	
	5.5.4 Ifain KFS, KWS, KEFKI, NEMA	20 stall trained in Nandi and Cherangani	NEWA, MEWK	
	and government start in PFIM		TIEG ANT	
	3.3.5 Train and support the development of	24 research assistants engaged in Nandi and	KFS, NK	
	community based monitoring programmes	Cherangani on socio-economic surveys of forest		
	for key environmental and socio-economic	adjacent communities baseline documentation;		
	indicators of forest health	30 biodiversity monitors trained;		
		Monitoring protocols agreed for respective sites and		
		beneficiaries to be tracked		
	3.3.6 Support and strengthen national	A member of 4 SSGs/CEAs supported to attend the	NEMA MEMR	
	committees including the National Liaison	Kenya Forest Working group monthly meetings and the		
	Committee	austerly National Linican Committee marting		
	Commutee	quarterry mational Liaison Committee meeting	1	

	3.3.7 Set in place a 5 year organisational strategy and sustainability plan for the SSGs for beyond the end of the project	Nature Kenya strategy for SSGs adopted and signed by SSGs	NK	
Output 3.4 and Output 3.5 Systems in place (reporting, records and action) to improve the coordination of PA enforcement functions with districts and communities and	3.4.1 Accounting and filing systems in place within every target District Office, in appropriate departments	Not done	KFS	Currently under way KFS
Partnership Coordination and Lessons Learning, Mau Forest Complex.	3.4.2 Accounting and filing systems in place within every target CBO	30 CBOs trained and have basic books of accounts and documentation of their activities	NK	
 Indicators: Number of systems adopted Number of personnel trained on systems Level of the systems use by the institutions 	3.4.3 Accounting and filing systems in place within every target Location Office	Not done	KFS	Currently underway by KFS
Output 3.5 Partnership Coordination and Lessons Learning, Mau Forest Complex. Indicators: - Documentation of lessons	3.5.1 Field level PA support linking with the business planning and strategy; lessons sharing with Mau Secretariat	 5 experiences and success published in the Nature Kenya Newsletter and Kenya Birding Magazine; 20 social media/newspaper articles; 3 television clips on local news; Lessons yet to be documented for sharing with the Mau Secretariat 	MEMR	
 Number of lesson sharing meetings held Number of practices replicated after sharing Gender considerations in the lessons and 	3.5.2 Provision to support activities of Londiani and Manyani training centres to retrain staff on participatory PA management skills at site levels.	Not done	KFS	Currently underway by KFS
pramed actions	3.5.3 Provide lessons on site level business plans production and awareness creation linked to global, national and local levels activities	Not done	NK/ MEMR/NEMA	To be done NK 2014
	3.5.4 Lessons Learning between Project Landscapes and the work of the Mau Secretariat including exchange visits and training	Not done	NK	To be done NK 2014

Annex 5. SUMMARY OF FIELD VISITS

<u>Kakamega</u>

Nature Kenya offices in Kakamega town, a shared building with KFS, were visited. There are two Site Extension Officers, a driver and a 4WD vehicle (at present undergoing repair). The office is small but well-equipped. Management of the large Kakamega Forest is split between KFS (Kakamega Forest Reserve) and KWS (Kakamega National Reserve). There are some small additional forest blocks around.

<u>26 Aug</u>: The Biodiversity Information Centre, established in 2008 under the German-funded (Federal Ministry of Education & Research) Biota project (2001-2010) was visited, adjacent to the new Forest Offices/Community Resource Centre. This project also covered other moist forests in Uganda (Budungo and Mabira). There is a small library, some high-quality publications for sale, some GIS hardware (including an unwrapped plan printer) although no one to operate it, but few visitors, perhaps 1 or 2 per week, mostly students from various local universities involved in MSc or PhD studies. There are occasional overseas researchers visiting (mostly German), sometimes for many months. An interactive DVD is available explaining the forest and with learning tools and educational games for students and children on it. The maps produced by Biota are of very high quality, and the forest extent, historic changes to it, and its biodiversity have been very well documented. But it seems most of the people involved have moved on and the whole setup is rather "orphaned".

Visited the KFS Regional Offices, which are new and large, funded through the African Development Bank (ADB) in part as a Community Resource Centre as well as a KFS HQ. The Forest Conservator Western Region (3 Counties) was very happy with the GEF project and Nature Kenya. The project mostly works through his junior officers, so he is not aware of all activities and details. In effect, the project is doing some of his work for him, but as he is not directly involved he is not reporting on it or directly responsible/accountable. In the past there has been community encroachment, but now through the Forest Act the community has to be involved in forest management. The project is greatly facilitating this.

Also visited KWS in the Kakamega Natural Reserve. The Warden was very happy with the project, which has provided a lot of help. The National Reserve is not yet fenced and has had some problems of illegal encroachment. No extraction or other use is permitted in the NR, unlike the situation with the Forest Reserve where excisions have been made, plantations allowed on previously cleared land, grazing, etc. There are significant differences in management and what is permitted in the two portions, which does lead to problems. KWS is looking to increase tourism, partly by enhancing the Western Circuit. There is talk of a tree walkway. Already the NR has 47 km of marked trails, regularly cleared by KWS local contract staff. Numbers of visitors around 12,000/year, some are researchers and the majority are citizens. The costs of entrance and staying are quite high.

Walk through forest in Kakamega Natural Reserve and also up the hill to lookout point. Good stocking, tall trees, but the relatively high number of strangler figs and low number of large girth trees are evidence that it has been cut and disturbed in the past (said to be 1930s to 1950s, even later in some parts). In many old cleared areas guava trees are abundant, and are much liked by primates. The lookout hill in the middle of the NR is of quartz-rich rock and was extensively cleared in the ?1950s for road construction material, leaving bare quartzitic rock and leading to severe soil erosion. These areas were planted up ± 25 years ago with cypress, which is now established widely, even naturalised, but with very stunted growth. It looks as if it will take some hundreds of years to re-establish good soil cover again in this area. From the hill viewpoint it can be seen that patches of the forest were cleared in the past, with other smaller patches that look more/less intact.

The Tour Guides Association by the KWS offices was visited - an impressive knowledge was demonstrated. Two of them have been involved in guiding for over 23 years, others are much younger. Project has helped them with equipment, including a motorbike, as well as training, etc. Some guides were trained by Biota project and visiting researchers in tree and plant identification, birds, butterflies and larger mammals (especially primates). The Association has its own building; income from visitors is pooled then divided out weekly among the 15 members. However, there are often periods with few visitors (1 or less/week in Jan to

May) so all guides need to supplement their income; most are farmers. Some guides are involved in IBA monitoring, which has been going on for 10 years.

Visited a local farmer/entrepreneur who has a tree nursery. He raises eucalyptus, *Grevillea*, *Markhamia* and cypress for sale to the local community for their own plots, and to Nature Kenya and KFS for tree planting. There are problems with water availability in the dry season as all water has to be hand-carried from the river, but he says the enterprise is generally successful.

The CFA at Malava (450 members) was visited. They have uniformed forest scouts and are helping KFS with management, particularly policing of the Malava forest patch. The CFA received much help from the project, motorbike, uniforms and training, but they also need to generate some of their own income. This they are attempting to do through beekeeping (the project has helped supple many locally-constructed beehives) and a tree nursery. A nearby patch where the CFA has been doing enrichment planting (*Croton megalocarpus, Zanthoxylum gillettii, Olea, Prunus africana*) into a very degraded forest patch / old plantation of *Bischofia javanica* was visited. Seed is from KEFRI of Western Kenya ecoregion provenance. Survival is said to be fairly good. Trees are planted out when fairly robust (1 m high), probably 1-2 years old. The forest itself in very disturbed and secondary, almost choked with invasive *Lantana* and similar undergrowth, although almost bare under the 20-30 year old *Bischofia plantation*, which was planted by the Forest Dept. on what were previously old shambas or cleared areas. *Maesopsis eminii* is also invading. Antelope and primates are still found.

<u>27 Aug</u>: KEFRI's sub-county offices were visited. They have been involved in developing the 25-year strategic plan, but mostly at HQ level, and are also participating in PFMP development, especially on the socio-economic side. PFMPs for Kibere, Bunyala and Muileshe have been completed or are almost finished. A key component is to ensure that adequate benefit from management accrues to the community. Impacts of the GEF project in this process are said to be greatly increased awareness by the local community of PFM expectations and benefits. A KEFRI scientist based elsewhere is looking at forest regeneration, especially in Kibiri Forest, using permanent sample plots.

Meeting of the Kakamega Site Advisory Committee (SAC) with 28 persons present. It is said to be an effective and comprehensive steering committee with wide involvement from GoK departments (KFS, KWS, KEFRI, NEMA, Agriculture, Water) to County government to CBOs and tour guides. Most persons have been on it since inception in 2011. Questions and ensuing discussions were broad. The main issues and questions arising to the evaluator were: What demonstrable changes has the project made to the forest? How will the SAC and management continue when project resources finish? Once PFMPs are in place and approved how will new management practices be implemented if not fully resourced? There was general consensus that the project, through the SAC and its activities, has brought stakeholders together in a way not seen before, and that issues are now being raised and addressed that previously had been more confrontational. As regards sustainability, it was stated that some income-generating activities will continue and local capacities will have been raised. There is some evidence that firewood, timber extraction and cattle grazing has been reduced, but this may not be real or due to project activities. There is surprisingly little evidence of reduced threats or improved forest status, although this was generally thought to have occurred. There is still a perception in some quarters that the project is meant to be improving livelihoods rather than focussing on conservation.

Visited a local CBO, Kakamega Environmental Education Programme (KEEP), established in1998, which has a centre on the southern side of the main forest block and has received support from a number of external donors as well as the GEF project. Has been Nature Kenya's IBA SSG since that time. Activities include butterfly farming in the forest, snake park (still no snakes), botanic garden, schools education, tourist accommodation and tour guides. Tour guides and education seem to be functional, others not.

This was followed by a forest walk with Chairman of the Kakamega Forest Station Biodiversity Monitoring Team (also a tour guide). Unfortunately it wasn't possible to visit any of the 3 permanent monitoring transects. Forest is in good condition with canopy to 40-50 m, numerous tall trees, but few large girth trees except for strangler figs. There is a good understory with few invasives. A number of clearly maintained trails are present, and a viewing platform (Nature Kenya/UNDP Small Grants 2005).

Nandi

A project overview was provided by the Site Project officer. The Nature Kenya offices were visited and staff introduced - two Project Extension Officers and one intern. The office is well-equipped with computers, printer and office furniture. One Hilux twin cab vehicle is available, with driver.

It is clear that the GEF project has built well upon the extensive work, contacts and trust developed during the DfID-funded South Nandi project (Civil Society Challenge Fund, 2007–2012), implemented with some assistance from RSPB in UK. Socio-economic and bird biodiversity baselines were established under that project. At the time the Nature Kenya office was in Kobujoi, South Nandi, and only moved to Kapsabet in 2012.

<u>28 Aug</u>: Meeting of the Site Advisory Group was held at the KFS Nandi North Forest Office, hosted by the County Forest Coordinator, now called the Forest Ecosystem Conservator, said to reflect an institutional change from just managing the forest estate to looking at the whole ecosystem and the recent devolution of implementation and responsibility to County level. There are 6 Forest Stations in Nandi County and 6 Forest Station Managers. Some of the office furniture and equipment for the Divisional Forest Office was provided by the GEF project.

Changes resulting from the 2005 Forest Act were outlined by the KFA Forest Conservator and the SAG Chairman (KEFRI Sociologist); shortcomings in that act are being addressed by the 2013 Act still being discussed in parliament. New Act will address issues of devolution, benefit sharing and forest excisions. Values of biodiversity and ecosystem services within Forest Estate also feature. Revenues from gazetted forest under new Act will be divided 50% to KFS, 30% to County govt, and 20% to communities.

The project achievements in Nandi area (North & South) were outlined and comments from 4 CFA Chairman present were given. Nine CCAs (but main focus on 6) have been established covering 4121 ha, and a series of viable nature-based enterprises developed. 60 ha of degraded land has been planted with trees, and the World Land Trust agreed to fund 45 ha for carbon credits. The Chesumei CFA Chairman said that the projects (GEF + DfID) had helped significantly in changing attitudes; communities were now not so dependent on the forest and had increased awareness of their responsibilities and involvement. An important issue in the future would be the attitude and actions of County governments - would they have the will and resources to ensure implementation of, for example, the PFMPs. The project should help make the CFAs strong, "give them wings to fly".

Grazing is seen as a significant impact in many areas - even though licenced there is much abuse. KFS charges grazing fees, and CFAs are trying to regulate/control grazing. But it seems there is a tension between the desire to raise income for KFS/CFAs from grazing and other uses vs. conservation. However, zoning is given in the PFMPs and can only be changed as long as forest conservation values are retained. Other issues raised were: key impediments to CFAs are resource availability, skills and shortfall in wider community awareness. KFS and CFAs do not always fully accept each other's mandates and workings. There are also still issues of boundaries – title deeds of farmers and gazetted forest boundary do not always mesh – that need resolution, which will probably be done through the County government structures. CFA scouts have received a lot of help from the GEF project – motorcycles, cellphones, training.

The local CFA & Kenya Forests Working Group were successful in advocating against construction of a hydroelectric dam in the middle of South Nandi forest. An EIA was done and said it was OK, although few stakeholders were apparently consulted. NEMA eventually did not approve it. The project helped resource this advocacy.

Visited the site of the new KWS offices, still under construction. GEF project have allocated Ksh 4 million (USD 47,000) towards this, although it was not clear if additional support would also be requested. The reason for support being given was that it would enable KWS to be more active in forest conservation in the Nandi area as they are very under-capitalised at present.

Visited Murguiywet CBO at Kipsamoite village, a CBO comprising 25 self-help projects with 1027 members who mainly focus on raising tree seedlings. CBO has 3 sites and meets weekly; at the Kipsamoite site they are using an old KFS nursery and building. Reason for CBO was stated to be to control environmental and

forest destruction, and for tree planting on farms, along water courses or for sale to others (including NK and KFS). There was a mix of species, some native forest ones. This was followed by a visit to a *Eucalyptus grandis* woodlot nearby belonging to one of the CBO scouts, support to which (provision of seedlings and advice) was justified on the grounds of reducing pressure on the forest for firewood collection and tree cutting. Interestingly, there were significant areas of *E. saligna* plantation nearby just inside the Forest Reserve boundary, planted in areas that had previously been cleared for Nyayo tea plantations. Timber from this is sold by KFS to Nyayo for curing of tea, and is not available to the local population.

A forest patch visited along the road from Kipsamoite village showed signs of significant disturbance, probably primarily related to tree cutting. Tree canopy was up to 40 m high with a number of tall, straightboled trees. However, such secondary or gap species as *Polyscias* are more common than would be expected. Some of the main canopy tres noted were *Diospyros abyssinica*, *Polyscias fulva*, *Celtis africana*, *Prunus africana*, *Ficus* sp., *Schefflera abyssinica*. *Tabernaemontana* and *Macaranga capensis* were common in the sub-canopy along with some Rubiaceae (*?Heinsenia*). There was dense undergrowth of *Acanthus eminens* and numerous small lianas, but no invasive or exotic species were noted. A short stretch where trees had been felled for illegal road construction was also visited, which gave a canopy cross-section.

<u>29 Aug</u>: A new CCA was visited at Kingwal swamp, just outside Kapsabet. It is a possible IBA although a full bird survey has not yet been done. There is said to be an increasing population of sitatunga antelope (recorded as up to 350), probably coming from lake Victoria. Swamp is 17.8 km², mostly community land, with its core being a dense stand of papyrus along with *Typha* and *Polygonum*. Interestingly it is said to be increasing in size, possibly owing to siltation. KWS is supporting its establishment as a CCA, as is Baraton College (a private Seventh Day Adventist University), and Nandi County government. Baraton College is keen to provide office support and use the area for student education. The CCA group at present is housed in a nearby building provided by the local chief. The main threats are dry season cultivation (especially maize), clay extraction small small-scale commercial brick making (although impacts are localised), heavy grazing and occasionally fire eating into the swamp margins.

Visited Kabujor CFA and 500 ha of rehabilitated land at Chepkumia. This was formerly a legal settlement area (i.e. people had title deeds) by GoK/KFS wanted to move them out as it was an important catchment area. People were settled nearby in 1998 and are being given title deeds in exchange. The forest boundary area was taken by Nyayo tea plantations, now a few years old. The upper slope area, now well covered in short grass and *Vernonia* shrubs, is being planted with indigenous trees. Most come from wildings collected from the nearby forest, raised by the community, then planted out in a mixed and random fashion. A large proportion are *Croton megacarpus* as this survives cattle grazing well and is easy to raise. *Albizia* is not common in the forest and also difficult to raise.

An IBA monitoring transect in South Nandi forest was walked, not far from Kobujoi Forest station. The IBA scheme has 3 such transects here, each a \pm straight, walked 1 km long transect with 5 marked 10 x 10 m plots along it, 200 m apart. Recording has been by NK/SSG twice-yearly (wet & dry seasons) for the last 7 years. Establishment and monitoring of these transects was initially by Nature Kenya under their IBA programme. In each plot all trees >50 cm dbh are recorded by name (scientific or vernacular), an estimate made of density of vegetation at breast height, and % canopy cover recorded. Any signs of disturbance, cutting or grazing are noted. A smaller 3 x 3 m subplot is used to record tree regeneration. All bird species are recorded and whether more or less than 30 m away. The new NMK monitoring for other groups is using these transects, but has also established 3 additional transects to cover particular habitats (e.g. along streams). For plant monitoring there are two species of interest – *Prunus africana* and *Polyscias kikuyuensis* (although this is apparently not known from the west side of the Rift, nor is it at all easy to separate from the common *P*. *fulva* except from the flowers). All individuals of these 2 species are recorded along the whole transect in a belt 10 m wide, e.g. a belt transect 1000 x 20 m = 20,000 m².

The forest contains a lot of *Croton megalocarpa*, especially along the road, much *Tabernaemontana* in the lower canopy, with *Prunus africana* in the main canopy (most large girth trees see were *Prunus*). Also *Schefflera abyssinica*, *Diospyros abyssinica*, *Strombosia scheffleri* and *Polyscias fulva*. The canopy is high, to 40 m, most trees have tall unbranched stems, although there are numerous old gaps where presumably there had been felling in the past. Undergrowth was of *Acanthus eminiens* indicating much disturbance, with frequent cattle tracks and dung.

Kabujoi CFA near Kabujoi Forest station was visited for tree planting. The CFA includes scouts and a CBO self-help group to income-generate. Trees were planted in the Nature Kenya (DfID + GEF) supported botanic garden/arboretum, set up earlier. The recently opened (GEF funded completion of a structure started under DfID funding) resource centre was visited. It is now well-equipped, with a CFA office, Nature Kenya office and auditorium for meetings. Nearby, 2-unit bandas are being built (again, started with DfID funding but being completed through GEF) for ecotourism. The GEF project has also rehabilitated the KFS Forest Officer's accommodation which was preciously unusable; he can now live on-site rather than in a nearby township.

There is much integrated activity here, initially started under the DfID-funded UKP 470,00 Nature Kenya project, under which much was achieved, but is now being completed by the GEF project – demonstrating good integration.

<u>Cherangani</u>

Nature Kenya has two offices in the Cherangani area – one in Kapsowar in Marakwet (Site Project Manager + Site Extension Officer) and one in Kapcherop in West Pokot (Site Extension Officer). There is also an intern in Iten (Marakwet) and another near Kapcherop. The project has one shared Hilux double cab with driver.

<u>30 Aug</u>: Travel to Kapenguria for meeting of Cherangani Landscape Site Advisory Group; 22 persons present. Project achievements to date were outlined. It is apparent the area is more complex and difficult than the other three GEF project sites – forest is fragmented and divided into numerous blocks, with 9 Forest Stations, each potentially with a CFA; it covers 4 Counties (although only two are large and significant – West Pokot & Marakwet), difficult logistics with lengthy travel times and two separate project offices; and Nature Kenya has little prior history or experience in the area.

There have been some previous projects in the forest sector including the World Bank-funded Natural resource management project through KFS, an ADB-funded project on Green Zones, and some support to woodlots and tree planting.

The CFA Chairman (KFS Zonal Officer for Marakwet) said how the GEF project had brought together all the stakeholders, which had not been done before. He particularly wanted to emphasise the importance of capacity building of both CFAs and communities and the project's role in this. Control of illegal activities is a problem with only 48 Forest Rangers for 65,000 ha of gazetted Forest Reserve in Marakwet and 18 Rangers for 25,000 ha of Forest Reserve in West Pokot. Various participants pointed out that tree planting on private farms/shambas is important and a much desired activity. CFA representatives were all very positive about what the project has done for them in terms of support, equipment, training, and general awareness raising and capacity building.

In the past illegal logging was a threat, but his is now said to be much reduced (no clear evidence given). Other threats are squatters and encroachment, charcoal burning, and cattle grazing inside the forest. At present no grazing fees are payable, so it is difficult to manage or control. There is obviously still some distrust between communities and CFAs and KFS in palaces, but the SAG forum has proved very useful in helping overcome this. There is little community awareness of what rights and responsibilities they have under the new Forest Act. The need for greater clarification and marking of forest boundaries was brought up.

One suggestion made was that the present SAG should be formalised and registered so it can continue to function and act as a cross-sectoral, cross- or inter-County forum after project end, one also with technical capacity. Resources could be obtained from the CFAs from community receipts, from individual GoK departments involved, and also from County governments. What is becoming clear is that the major priority is to complete and get approval for all the PFMPs – so far two are virtually complete/approved (Marakwet) and four more have still to be started (2 Marakwet, 2 West Pokot). These plans will act as guidelines for all future decision-making, and for the new County Governments.

Visit Kabichbich CFA covering 5 forest blocks, especially Lelan. CFA was registered in 2008 before the GEF project, but really only got functional and capacitated by GEF project. They demonstrated energy-saving jiko stoves, some tree planting (cypress) and a very impressive tree nursery on land donated by KFS. 36,000 seedlings neatly arranged – mostly eucalyptus and cypress, but a few *Hagenia*, *Afrocrania* and *Rapanea*.

Visit to Kerot CBO office nearby – it wasn't clear what the relationship was between the two. CBO has 211 members and focuses on environmental issues, especially energy-saving stoves. These can be constructed locally apart from the inner rim, which has to be brought in form e.g. Kakamega at cost of Ksh 200–300. The women point out the many advantages (less firewood, more efficient, less smoke) but it is not clear why a local entrepreneur has not taken up manufacture of the inner rings.

<u>31 Aug</u>: Visit Project sub-office site at Kapcherop and Cherangani Forest Office, Marakwet. Also site of Cherangani Hills Community Eco-Resource Centre. Nature Kenya Project Extension Officer based here, and a Nature Kenya intern in a nearby village. Meet with Cherangani CFA, Chepororwa Sekemiat SSG (carrying out IBA monitoring) and some CBOs.

The Community Eco-Resource Centre is a separate building from Forest Offices but on the same site. Built in 2009 with funding from Community Development Trust Fund (EU/Danida) and looks well-resourced. Nature Kenya office is in it.

Cherangani CFA has 200+ members, and was formed in 2011 from an amalgamation of 5 separate CFAs dating back to 2006-8, a process that GEF project facilitated through awareness meetings. It does not yet have an office, even though it has an income from its members. Not clear why this is as answers were vague.

Marakwet part of Cherangani consists of 65,000 ha of gazetted forest under 4 Forests Stations, so 4 Station Managers and 2 zonal Forest Managers (Marakwet N & S). KFS have received support from Natural Resources Management Project (World Bank – soon to finish), with emphasis on rehabilitation of degraded sites, livelihood programmes and support to farm forestry. There was also an African Development Bankfunded Green Zones project focussing on supporting income-generating activities. The forests here are also considered to be one of Kenya's main "water towers". Of 4 possible PFMPs to be developed in Marakwet, only 2 have been \pm completed; other 2 yet to start. PFMP for one of largest forest blocks has been held up owing to disagreements and misunderstandings with some communities if indigenous peoples – the Sengwer. They were originally hunter-gatherers who used to use the forest extensively until moved out by the colonial authorities. They feel they should have greater control over the forest resources. What is missing is forest inventory data (which possibly KEFRI would provide) and a socio-economic baseline. The earlier consultants were prevented from carrying this out in this block, but the issue is now said to be resolved (no further details given) and the PFMP process can go ahead.

10,000 ha of gazetted forest is said to have been destroyed for farmland (not clear over what period). According to CFA Chairman, illegal activities such as charcoal making and tree cutting have decreased significantly over the last 2 years, but no convincing figures were produced. The advent of Community Forest Scouts is said to be particularly significant in this. But perhaps most important is community sensitization and awareness; before there was a general belief that forest resources belonged to GoK.

Grazing seems to remain the greatest threat. At present there is no control, no regulation, and no grazing fees. However this should be resolved once the PFMP is completed and zonation is in place. Much hope is placed (perhaps too much) on the introduction of improved cattle for milk production and significant move towards zero grazing.

Meeting was followed by a forest visit. Generally a good canopy to 25-30 m. There is a lot of evidence of cattle and tracks and a lot of *Acanthus eminii* coming in with disturbance from livestock, but the structure seems OK with reasonable regeneration. Main species are *Podocarpus latifolius*, *Syzygium guineense* subsp. *afromontanum* and *Teclea nobilis*. Also *Strombosia scheffleri*, *Schefflera abyssinica*, *Faurea saligna* (with spreading canopy) and *Macaranga capensis*. Plenty of ferns, mosses and epiphytes suggest a very moist forest. The forest on the other (drier) is dominated by *Juniperus procera*. We passed through a natural/semi-

natural grassy glade with many sheep and cattle grazing and a fringe of *Hagenia abyssinica*. There is said to be an increasing problem with a small invasive tree – *Cestrum aurantiacum* (Solanaceae).

Biodiversity monitoring for Nature Kenya's IBA programme has been carried out since 2008 by the SSG Chepororwa Sekemiat, but at basic level with 6 plots. All bird species are recorded as well as the total canopy cover, signs of tree regeneration, disturbance or use.

GEF project has supported various CBOs with income generating activities. Brief visit to a restoration plot on a steep catchment slopes. After clear-felling a cypress planation, KFS fenced the area off and planted 500 trees indigenous trees, many raised by community groups from forest wildlings. There was no apparent appreciation that this may set back true forest regeneration. Others were bought from the Vi tree planting project, mostly *Prunus*. The main explanation as to why trees were planted instead of allowing natural regeneration to occur (something that was very apparent) was that if trees were planted the community would respect the area, otherwise they would want to graze it.

Visited the Cherangani Nature-Based Organisation, a CBO at Koisungur, a fairly high altitude site (over 2800 m). It has 204 members living within a radius of 4-5 km. A tree nursery was seen, they were setting aside land (530 ha) for conservation (a "conservancy"), even hoping to have a small lodge and a plant for bottling water. Economically the CBO seems to be doing well from the sale of tree seedlings, and is regarded as progressive and ambitious, getting support from both GEF and KFS.

The Cherangani programme seems to be more disparate and fragmented than the others, probably a reflection of the fragmented nature of the forest patches and administrative structures as well as difficulties in logistics/travel and the lower state of development compared to e.g. Nandi. There are more Forest Stations, more CFAs, and Counties to cover, making it difficult for the project to make an overall impact. Suggested that the project needs to set priorities and perhaps focus on fewer geographical areas. Also need to ensure that any project interventions are clearly focused on the project's objectives of conservation of indigenous forests and their biodiversity, and on improving their protected status.

Annex 6. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Project Document, PIMS No. 4178, Project ID 00063423. Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Forest Hotspot of Kenya. undated.

2013 Annual Project Review (APR), Project Implementation Review (PIR). PIMS 4178. Completed 6 Aug 2013.

Standard Progress Report, Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Hotspot of Kenya. Reporting period: 1 Jan-31 Dec 2011. Nature Kenya, Nairobi.

Standard Progress Report, Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Hotspot of Kenya. Reporting period: 1 Jan-31 Dec 2012. Nature Kenya, Nairobi.

Quarterly Progress Reports, Jan-Mar 2011 – Apr-Jun 2103.

Annual Workplan & Budget, Strengthening the Protected Area Network within the Eastern Montane Hotspot of Kenya, 2011, 2012, 2013. Nature Kenya, Nairobi.

Strengthening Protected Areas Network within the Eastern Montane Hotspot of Kenya. Reporting Progress in Protected Areas: METT Data Sheets – Kakamega, Nandi. Nature Kenya, Nairobi. July 2012.

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels. Baseline sheets for Kakamega, Keiyo, Marakwet, Nandi, Trans Nzioa, West Pokot. Kenya Forest Service, May 2009.

Progress review - April 2011 to July 2013, South & North Nandi. Nature Kenya Project office, Kapsabet.

A rapid biodiversity survey of Nandi Hills and Cherangani Hills Forests. National Museums of Kenya, Nairobi. October 2011.

Literature review on biodiversity status of Kakamega, Nandi Hills and Cherangani Hills Forests. National Museums of Kenya, Nairobi. September 2011.

Biodiversity mapping and monitoring of threatened species in the eastern Afromontane protected areas: Kakamega, Cherangani Hills and South/North Nandi forests, Kenya. National Museums of Kenya, Nairobi. November 2012.

Biodiversity monitoring and mapping of threatened species in the Eastern Afromontane protected areas: Kakamega forest, South/North Nandi forests, Kenya - DRAFT (editor P. Malonza). National Museums of Kenya, Nairobi. August 2013.

Preliminary report on threatened species monitoring in Eastern Afromontane forests (P. Kirika, R. Kiprotich, C. Chesire, I, Malombe). National Herbarium, Nairobi. 2013.

Summary of the Kenya National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. Ministry of Environment & Natural Resources. IMP 00015. March 2000.

Cherangani Forest Strategic Ecosystem Management Plan. Kenya Forest Research Institute, Nairobi. December 2012.

Kakamega Forest Ecosystem Strategic Management Plan. Kenya Forest Research Institute, Nairobi. 2012.

Nandi Forest Strategic Ecosystem Management Plan, 2013-2038. Kenya Forest Research Institute, Nairobi. August 2013.

Kakamega Forest Participatory Forest Management Plan 2011–2015. Environmental Resource Centre, Kakamega. June 2011.

Participatory Forest Management Plan for Kobujoi Forest Station 2011–2015 [South Nandi]. Local Planning Team, South Nandi. January 2011.

Socio-economic Characterization of Forest Adjacent Communities in Cherangani Forest Station: Report based on socio-economic survey of households adjacent to the separate blocks of Cherangani Forest. Consultancy report for Cherangani Hills CBOs Consortium (CHCC), Moiben prepared by Retasi Strategic Solutions, Nairobi. May 2010.

Socio-economic report for South Nandi forest-adjacent communities, by M.T.E. Mbuvi, J. Gichuki and J.K. Musyoki. Project report, Improving Livelihoods through Sustainable Government, NGO, Private Partnerships In South Nandi Forest, Western Kenya. March 2010.

South Nandi Forest Carbon Report by S. Webb & J. Glenday. Report prepared for Nature Kenya GEF project, July 2009.

Elgeyo Marakwet Forest Ecological Report. Report prepared for Nature Kenya GEF project. Unknown author and date.

Kessup Forest Ecological Report. Report prepared for Nature Kenya GEF project. Unknown author and date.

The Biota East Africa Atlas: Rainforest change over time (Gertrud Schaab, Beatrice Khayota, Gerald Eiln & J. Wolfgang Wagele, editors). 2010.

A Short Guide to Kakamega Forest (J. Holstein, A. Mwaura, M. Kathambi & P. Okonde). Biota, Stuttgart & Kakamega. 2010.

Kakamega Forest ecosystem: An introduction to the natural history and the human context (Nick Mitchell, Gertrud Schaab & J. Wolfgang Wagele; editors). Karlsruher Geowissenschaftliche Schriften, Reihe A, Band 17. Karlsruhe, 2009.

Kenya's Important Bird Areas: Status and Trends 2011 (compiled P. Muoria, F. Barasa, T. Mwinami, E. Kanga, J. Mwangombe, B. Ithagu, R. Mulwa). Nature Kenya, Nairobi. 2013.

Kenya's Indigenous Forests: Status, Management and Conservation, edited by P. Wass. IUCN Forest Conservation Programme/ODA. 1995.

Kenya Trees, Shrubs & Lianas by H. Beentje. National Museums of Kenya, Nairobi. 1994.

Upland Kenya Wild Flowers and Ferns (3rd edition) by A.D.Q. Agnew. Nature Kenya, Nairobi, 2013.

Annex 7. QUESTIONS FOR PROJECT MID-TERM REVIEW

Below are series of open questions relating to the Mid-Term Evaluation emailed to members of the Technical Advisory Committee after meeting with them at Nature Kenya. Responses are incorporated in the report.

Project Design and Inception

- 1. What has been your role, and what are your activities, in the project
- 2. Were you involved in project design, and if so and how were you involved
- 3. How and why were the four forest sites chosen. Why were not others chosen.
- 4. What were your expectations from this project. What did or do you and your institution hope to get out of it.
- 5. What does your Department or institution think will result from this project.

Implementation

- 6. What are the good practices you see coming out of the project, things that you think have a future here for conservation in Kenya.
- 7. USD 5 million is a lot of money. Could the same or a similar outcome be achieved by tackling the issues in a different way. If so, which.
- 8. Although it is still early days, what lessons do you think have been, or will be, learned from the project.
- 9. What do you think of the monitoring procedures and protocols currently in place. Do you feel that the changes in biodiversity, forest extent, fragmentation, threats, livelihoods, people's attitudes, and political perceptions at a national level are being captured adequately.
- 10. Are there any additional activities or aspects that could be usefully incorporated into the project to enhance or ensure impact. Or modifications that could be made to the activities, the indicators or even to resource allocation.
- 11. What are your thoughts on carbon valuation of the project sites, and its use on the conservation "menu".
- 12. What about valuation of ecosystem services. Do you think this has value; do you think this something the project could usefully follow up upon. If so, what might the pitfalls be.

Impact

- 13. What do you think will be the lasting impacts, the legacy, of the project.
- 14. What do you think will be the impacts of the project in 5 or 10 years' time, impacts beyond the four areas themselves.