

Project Evaluation Series

26/2023

Terminal evaluation of project “Capacity, Policy and Financial Incentives for Participatory Forest Management in Kirisia Forest and Integrated Rangelands Management”

Project code: GCP/KEN/073/GFF

GEF ID: 5083

Follow-up report

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Rome, 2025

CTerminal evaluation of project “Capacity, Policy and Financial Incentives for Participatory Forest Management in Kirisia Forest and Integrated Rangelands Management” – Follow-up report					06/2025
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR Score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
<p>Recommendation 1.</p> <p><i>To KFS, CFA and partners:</i></p> <p>The governance and institutional capacity of Kirisia CFA should be further strengthened to effectively play its role in implementing the recently launched PFMP (<i>Immediately</i>).</p> <p>The leadership of Kirisia Community Forest Association (CFA) should adopt better management practices in its operations and promote transparency and accountability in the management of CFA affairs. KFS in collaboration with local authorities should address community relations and power struggles within Kirisia CFA.</p> <p>The County Government of Samburu should continue supporting CFA activities through budgetary allocations (County Integrated Development Plan and annual budgets). There should be sustainable measures and priority in budgeting to provide incentives for scouts patrolling the forest.</p> <p>KFS and the Kirisia CFA should regularly monitor the implementation of Forest Management Agreement (FMA) and Participatory Forest management Plan (PFMP). A PFMP implementation committee comprised of key stakeholders could be formed to spearhead its implementation.</p>	Accepted	<p>Through other ongoing FAO projects in the project areas, FAO will follow up on the partner coordination meetings initiated by the project and continue with the leadership of the County Executive Committee Member (CECM) in charge of Environment and/or Tourism chairing these meetings at least on a quarterly or biannual basis involving all stakeholders, i.e the community, KWS. KFS, new partners e.g BOMA – working with the CFA on forest conservation activities and to develop the grazing plans for Kirisia Forest. This team should be formalized and steer implementation of the PFMP launched under the project. Kirisia CFA shall also have a formal role in the Environment Committee of Samburu County Government, headed by the CECM of Environment.</p>	<p>The FAO implemented Forest and Farm Facility (FFF) Project scope has been expanded to Samburu County and Kirisia CFA has successfully applied to funding under the direct beneficiary grants modality. The grant will be utilized for further leadership and organizational development of the CFA, livelihood development and implementation initiatives as per the PFMP.</p> <p>The county government of Samburu has continued its support to the CFA after the closure of the project and has supported with a new Landcruiser for forest patrols and new offices and furnishment of the same. Suyian trust have also continued its support to the CFA and forest scouting/monitoring activities. The KFS has posted 40 new forest rangers and 3 new forest station managers to support the existing Maralal forest station in anticipation to delineate & gazette two more forest stations within Kirisia Forest. The CFA has been holding timely meetings with the communities, KFS and the relevant County departments.</p>	Advancing	<p>The legitimacy of the CFA has continued to grow among community members and the membership and operation of the CFA has been sustained or increased after project closure.</p>

CTerminal evaluation of project "Capacity, Policy and Financial Incentives for Participatory Forest Management in Kirisia Forest and Integrated Rangelands Management" – Follow-up report					06/2025
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR Score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
<p>Recommendation 2.</p> <p><i>To FAO Kenya and Partners:</i></p> <p>Established Partnerships and collaborative engagements with stakeholders should be optimally utilized for enhanced results. Mechanisms for mobilizing project co-financing partners in the planning and execution of agreed activities, and for quantifying and tracking project Co-financing should be improved (<i>Immediately</i>).</p> <p>FAO should develop and clarify the mechanism to identify and plan during implementation, internal activities (those of the project) or external activities (those specific to the partners) to be the subject of co-financing, as well as the expected synergies and added value.</p> <p>Strengthen existing partnerships established by the project and identify new partners who can continue with the work done by the project. Partners should closely work together to promote synergy in their work/efforts. FAO should promote transparency and information sharing among partners to build trust</p> <p>FAO should develop and provide a template for project co-financers/partners to record and report on co-financing contributions.</p>	Accepted	<p>FAO through other projects such as the digital land governance programme will continue to support in development of County integrated development plans and championing for more resources to be injected for continuity of participatory forest management and community land registration.</p> <p>BOMA was identified as a new partner in Kirisia to continue the project interventions.</p> <p>Through other FAO project in the project area, FAO will consult with the County government to come in strongly in mobilizing and holding organizations to account in terms of co-financing agreements. This would be more sustainable, and most development partners will comply with the government requirement to co-finance.</p> <p>FAO to develop/apply clearer reporting requirements and template for projects requiring co-finance to streamline co-finance reporting among project partners.</p>	<p>Projects such as digital land governance project and forest and farm facility are continuing the support for the implementation of the county integrated development plans. The same project has also built on partnerships from the GEF project in implementation and development of participatory forest management plans.</p> <p>The FAO implemented Forest and Farm Facility (FFF) Project scope has been expanded to Samburu County and Kirisia CFA has successfully applied to funding under the direct beneficiary grants modality for continuation of the restoration and livelihood development.</p> <p>The co-finance requirements for GEF project are more closely monitored in collaboration with project implementation partners under the GEF-6 project implementation cycle</p>	Good	<p>Increased number of local communities are supported to develop and implement the participatory forest management plans (PFMP) across forest landscapes in Kenya</p> <p>The expanded scope of the FFF project has availed funding for the continuation of the implementation of the PFMP by Kirisia CFA.</p> <p>Co-financing is regularly updated under the GEF 6 and 7 project cycle.</p> <p>Under GEF 6 tracking was done quarterly and was a reporting requirement by project partners in quarterly review and planning meetings. This was reported in every PPR and PIR.</p>

CTerminal evaluation of project “Capacity, Policy and Financial Incentives for Participatory Forest Management in Kirisia Forest and Integrated Rangelands Management” – Follow-up report					06/2025
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR Score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
Implementing partners should regularly and accurately quantify and document co-financing contributions					
<p>Recommendation 3.</p> <p><i>To FAO Kenya and GEF project formulators:</i></p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation systems and processes should be strengthened to accurately and effectively track the performance of project indicators. An effective M&E plan should be developed and adequate resources allocation during project design or at the inception phase of project implementation (for ongoing projects and for future programming).</p> <p>Project outcomes, outputs and indicators should be well formulated, simple and clearly defined and project indicators should be SMART. Indicators should include figures/data for baseline and target. If baseline data is not available, the projects should establish those figures/data early into the project implementation (inception phase).</p> <p>In order to avoid inconsistencies or gaps during reporting, it is good practice to reach a clear and common understanding of each outcome indicator and its baseline value and to have in place a uniform reporting mechanism for effective M & E.</p>	Accepted	FAO will ensure that formulation of project results (outputs, outcomes) and their measures(indicators) to encompass monitoring and evaluation experts to ensure a workable results logic is arrived at during design stage. More funding towards monitoring and evaluation of projects during the design phase must be taken into account for efficient tracking of activities and planned results.	FAO Kenya has instituted an M&E unit that ensures all projects have an M&E expert supporting each project. The M&E team is also undertaking training in monitoring and evaluation to the project implementers with practical exercises. This is to enable the project managers and technical team to understand and apply good M&E practices from developing M&E systems and ensuring all MEL activities are budgeted for during project design.	Good	All new projects under FAO Kenya have developed or are in the process of developing Mel systems with a well-defined results, indicators reporting mechanisms and M&E tools developed together with the technical staff. Baseline surveys are being done for all projects to ensure a datum to measure results against.

CTerminal evaluation of project "Capacity, Policy and Financial Incentives for Participatory Forest Management in Kirisia Forest and Integrated Rangelands Management" – Follow-up report					06/2025
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR Score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
During project design, FAO should develop and implement a detailed monitoring and evaluation plan and encourage partners to submit reports using a template that speaks to targets and indicators.					
<p>Recommendation 4.</p> <p><i>To FAO Kenya, GEF project formulators and partners:</i></p> <p>The sustainability of accrued benefits and results of a project should be given priority when planning project interventions and results (for ongoing projects and for future programming).</p> <p>Project design should include a detailed and well-defined exit strategy with roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>Securing funds from development organizations that are involved in climate issues should be a continuous priority because NRM projects such as this one directly helps to reduce greenhouse gas' emissions and local people to adapt to a changing climate.</p> <p>Project partners should consider investing in sustainable methods of water access and storage for success of some livelihood initiatives such as agroforestry and tree nurseries.</p>	Accepted	<p>Emphasis on exit strategy is and will continue to be made a priority from the project start with more follow-ups on the roles, responsibilities, and financing from affiliate partners.</p> <p>Water infrastructure rehabilitation is key to success of restoration and livelihood interventions and are already in place in the current GEF 6 funding cycle. More resources are being sought towards water access and availability together with empowering communities especially pastoralists better their mainstay livelihoods to deter it from being a source or driver of degradation</p>	<p>Exit strategy continues to be a key priority in development and implementation of projects under the NRM portfolio.</p> <p>Water infrastructure rehabilitation has been completed in project sites under the GEF 6 project cycle and emphasis is given to ensure access to water for livelihood project e.g. rooftop rainwater harvesting for tree nurseries etc. Water infrastructure and access is integrated in upcoming projects.</p> <p>The implementation modality "Direct Beneficiary Grants" is being integrated in existing and development of new project in the NRM programme. DBGs funds restoration and livelihood/value chain micro projects proposed by the local community which ensures ownership, targeted and sustainable interventions.</p>	Good	<p>Focus on water has increased access in project sites with positive effects on the sustainability of the interventions.</p> <p>Direct Beneficiary Grants (DBGs) are fully integrated in the project cycle of most projects under the NRM programme. Local communities are more involved in the proposal, development and implementation of interventions under existing and up-coming projects.</p>

CTerminal evaluation of project “Capacity, Policy and Financial Incentives for Participatory Forest Management in Kirisia Forest and Integrated Rangelands Management” – Follow-up report					06/2025
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR Score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
The Samburu County Government and other partners should link the established value chains with relevant county departments and funds (e.g., the Department of Trade, cooperative, women/youth funds, CDF, etc.)					
<p>Recommendation 5.</p> <p><i>To FAO (FAO Kenya, GEF-FAO unit, Lead Technical Unit):</i></p> <p>For Projects to start and end within the approved time frame, FAO should carefully analyze and address factors that are manageable within its capacity and scope (ongoing).</p> <p>FAO should reduce bureaucratic hurdles to ensure timely start and completion of project activities. Improve the coordination between FAO and partners to avoid delays in the procurement of equipment and supplies</p> <p>Conduct thorough due diligence of partners in terms of their capacity to deliver on letters of agreement (LOAs) before approval.</p> <p>Adjustments to project results chain (outcomes, outputs and activities) should be thoroughly discussed, especially during the project PSC meetings and in periodic meetings to ensure any such adjustments do not affect the achievement of some of</p>	Accepted	<p>Procurement, especially of LOAs has been noted as a challenge and is already being addressed to reduce the bottlenecks faced.</p> <p>FAO is implementing a competitive new system of LOAs, which incorporates rigorous due diligence procedures.</p> <p>Adjustments to the project results chain (Outcome, outputs, and activities) are and will continue to be anchored in the PSC meetings. Any changes to the results chain will continue to be formally proposed and endorsed at PSC meetings.</p>	<p>The function of programme assistants has been established to fast track LOA and Procurement activities and ensure proper planning of the same. A limit of extensions after or close to LOA closure have been established to avoid delays and ensure continuation of implementation.</p> <p>Competitive selection of service providers and beneficiaries is increasingly the norm. Local procurement committee requires strong justification for direct selection; direct beneficiary grant modality in the NRM programme is implemented fully competitively and an online platform for open calls for LOAs and DBGS have been developed and used by the NRM programme.</p>	Good	<p>Delays in LOAs and Procurement has been reduced.</p> <p>The new online platform has reduced the administrative burden in competitive selection and has increased transparency of the selection process of DBGs and LOAs.</p>

Terminal evaluation of project "Capacity, Policy and Financial Incentives for Participatory Forest Management in Kirisia Forest and Integrated Rangelands Management"
Follow-up report

CTerminal evaluation of project "Capacity, Policy and Financial Incentives for Participatory Forest Management in Kirisia Forest and Integrated Rangelands Management" – Follow-up report					06/2025
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR Score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
the Global Environmental Objective indicators.					
<p>Recommendation 6. <i>To FAO (FAO Kenya, Lead Technical Unit), and Partners:</i></p> <p>There is a need to develop a Knowledge management system and a communication strategy for Kirisia forest.</p> <p>A mechanism should be put in place to ensure that the various information and knowledge products developed by the project are made available and accessible to the targeted audience.</p> <p>There should be collective action by the stakeholders in documenting lessons learned and best practices considering that a lot has been learned from this project in terms of the processes and public participation and engagement with the local communities. Partners should borrow, document, and share lessons learned and best practices from other forest and landscape areas.</p> <p>Partners should consider developing a digital platform/website for knowledge management and awareness raising about the Kirisia forest. Learnings generated from</p>	Accepted	Through the GEF 6 cycle which FAO is implementing the restoration initiative project, a knowledge management (KM) portal is being put in place to aggregate forest and landscape restoration activities, interventions, best practices, lessons learnt, individual success stories policies etc. which will be a one stop information and communication hub.	KM is being developed. The hardware and software have already been procured and the process of development is ongoing to be completed by the closure of the GEF6 project in April 2025. Stakeholders and technical engagements have already been done to support the synchronization and alignment with the national needs and others existing systems.	Advancing	The involvement of the stakeholders and other agencies in the process has made the process to developing the KM portal to flow. The adoption of the KM by KEFRI is made to ensure that there is continuity and sustainability of the system and its synchronization with the existing frameworks even after the exit of the GEF5 and GEF6 projects.

CTerminal evaluation of project “Capacity, Policy and Financial Incentives for Participatory Forest Management in Kirisia Forest and Integrated Rangelands Management” – Follow-up report					06/2025
Evaluation recommendation	Management response Accepted, Partially accepted or Rejected	Management plan			
		Actions to be taken, and/or comments about partial acceptance or rejection	Description of actions actually taken, or reasons for actions not taken	MAR Score	Impact of, or changes resulted from taken actions
<p>the project can be made available on the website.</p> <p>The Samburu County Government’s Department of Communication should continue collecting data on different products for Kirisia and share the best practices and lessons learned on other platforms or with stakeholders.</p>					

Office of Evaluation
E-mail: evaluation@fao.org
Web address: www.fao.org/evaluation

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome, Italy