

Summary of Terminal Evaluation

I. Outline of the Project	
Country: Republic of Kenya	Project Title: Intensified Social Forestry Project (ISFP)
Sector: Environmental Management/Natural Environment	Cooperation Scheme: Technical Cooperation Project
Division in Charge: JICA Kenya Office	Total Cost (at the time of evaluation): 385 million yen
Period of Cooperation: February 2005 to February 2008 (Conclusion of R/D: 14 th February 2005)	Partner Country's Implementation Agency: Kenya Forest Service (KFS) (Supportive Agency: Kenya Forestry Research Institute(KEFRI))
	Supporting Organization in Japan: Forestry Agency
	Related Cooperation:
<p>1 Background of the Project</p> <p>Kenya's closed canopy forest cover which mainly falls in the category of state forests is low and is estimated at 1.7 % (or 1.4 million hectares) of the total land area. Outside this category of forests, there are numerous woodlands, bush lands and wooded grasslands, which primarily occur in the arid and semi-arid areas of the country. The arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs) cover about 80% of the total land surface and are home for about 25% of the human population. Under the prevailing low technology production systems, coupled with the unreliable rainfall regimes, the ASALs are characterized with high incidences of poverty. The threat to the livelihoods of the inhabitants of the ASALs is thus real which calls for practical interventions so as to improve on the livelihood conditions of the people in these areas.</p> <p>The involvement in assistance of the Government of Japan (GOJ) in the forestry sector dates back to the middle 1980's. The initial assistance was through the Social Forestry Training Project (SFTP), which was implemented from 1985 to 1997. SFTP's main focus was on technology development on tree nursery establishment and tree planting in the semi-arid areas and to provide training in social forestry. The Social Forestry Extension Model Development Project (SOFEM) followed SFTP and was implemented for five years. The main output of SOFEM was the development of a model through the establishment of farm forests by the local residents. During the terminal evaluation in 2002, the review mission recommended the necessity to give further support to the extension component so that more impact could be created in the development of farm forestry in the semi-arid areas.</p> <p>Meanwhile, in 1994, the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MENR) of the Kenya Government completed preparation of the Kenya Forestry Master Plan 1995-2020 (KFMP). KFMP as well as the revised Kenya Forestry Development Policy identifies farm forestry, which is one of</p>	

the social forestry practices as an important model of forestry development in Kenya. In addition, the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (2003 – 2007) identified the development of the ASALs as a key area for accelerated development to offset pressure from state forests located in high and medium rainfall areas.

In this context, Government of Kenya (GOK) requested a technical cooperation for the sector, and in response to the request, JICA accepted the implementation of the project entitled as “Intensified Social Forestry Project in Semi-arid Areas” (hereinafter referred to as “the Project”) in accordance with the results of discussions with the authorities concerned of GOK.

JICA conducted the Ex-ante evaluation of the project in October 2003 that resulted in the preparation of the Project Document and Project Design Matrix (PDM). The Record of Discussions (R/D) that constitutes the agreement of the project was signed between JICA and the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources on 29th March 2004. Upon this agreement, JICA commenced the five - year technical cooperation project with the then Forest Department (FD) (now Kenya Forest Service (KFS)) as the implementing agency and Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI) as the collaborating implementing agency.

2 Project Overview

(1) Overall Goal

Living standards of the people in semi-arid areas are improved while enhancing sustainable environmental conservation.

(2) Project Purpose

Individual farmers, farmer groups and other stakeholders intensify social forestry practices in semi-arid areas.

(3) Outputs

- 1) Institutional and technical capacities for social forestry extension in Forest Department are strengthened.
- 2) Social forestry extension activities among individual farmers and farmer groups are promoted.
- 3) Farmers and other stakeholders obtain enough practical knowledge and techniques.
- 4) Information on social forestry extension and related issues is shared among the stakeholders.

(4) Inputs (At the time of evaluation) in total: 385 Million Japanese Yen (as of evaluation date) Japanese Side

(a) Experts

Five (5) Long-term Experts in Total

Three (3) Short-term Experts in Total

(b) Training of Kenyan Counterpart Personnel in Japan

Eight (8) Counterpart Personnel

(c) Provision of Equipment

In total Ksh 44,128,577 (equivalent to USD 668,169 as of August 2008)

(e) Local Cost

In Total Ksh 66,364,868 (equivalent to USD 1,004,858 as of August 2008)

Kenyan Side

(a) Counterpart Personnel

Forty Six (46) Counterpart Personnel in Total

(b) Land and Facilities

- Land, office space and necessary facilities for project head office at KFS.
- Land, office space and necessary facilities for project field offices in Kitui, Mbeere and Tharaka Districts.
- Training facilities at KEFRI headquarters.
- Training activities at KEFRI Kitui Centre.
- Land for demonstration plot in KEFRI Tiva Pilot Forest, Kitui.
- Nursery facilities in KEFRI Kitui Tiva Pilot Forest and Kitui Center
- Kenya Forest Service field nurseries in Kitui, Mbeere and Tharaka Districts.
- Rooms and space necessary for installation and storage of equipment.

(c) Local Cost

In total Ksh 23,545,519

II. Evaluation Team

Member of Evaluation Team:

(1) Japanese Members

Mr. Yoshiyuki Takahashi (Leader), Chief Representative, JICA Kenya office
 Ms. Tomoshi Ichikawa (Evaluation Analysis), VSOC
 Mr. Yoichi Inoue (Evaluation Planning), Representative, JICA Kenya Office
 Mr. John N. Ngugi (Evaluation Analysis (Assistant)), Senior Program Officer,
 JICA Kenya Office

(2) Kenyan Members

Mrs. Monica N. Kalenda(Leader), Deputy Director, Kenya Forest Service
 Dr.Ebby Chagala-Odera, Assistant Director, Kenya Forestry Research Institute
 Mr.Dedan Nderitu, Principal Forest Officer, Kenya Forest Service
 Mr.Samuel K.Gichere, Chief Economist, Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife

Period of Evaluation: 27/7/2008 - 15/8/2008

Type of Evaluation : Terminal Evaluation

III. Results of Evaluation

Project Summary

To strengthen institutional framework of Kenya Forest Service (KFS) and capacity of its staff. KFS extension officers supported by the Project will expedite Social Forestry activities among target farmer groups, and give them practical knowledge and technique. With result of the Project, Social Forestry activities in ASALs will be intensified by supported farmers and related institutes.

1 Achievement

(1) Achievement of the Project Purpose

According to the monitoring result which the Project established, in main target areas and neighboring areas, the production of seedling and the number of trees planted are increasing every year in farmlands of individual farmers, farmers group and the surrounding farmers. They also started planting mango orchard and firewood, and 80% of farmers (individual and the surrounding) applied social forestry activities. The means that the indicators from 1-i) to iv) and 2-i) to iv) are mostly accomplished. As the overall goal of the project is the improvement of the livelihood of people, cashable commercial crops such as not only *Melia Volkensii*, *Grevilea*, but also *Senna Siamea*, and *Jatropha* are nurtured through FFS.

Regarding the formulation of implementation plans at prefecture level mentioned in the indicator 3, 2007/2008 implementation plans of social forestry diffusion are formulated in three main target prefectures (Kitui, Mbeere, Tharaka) and Malindi, Kilifi, Kwale. As for Laikipia, West Pokot, Mru South and Rachuono, while Implementation plans of 2006/2007 were confirmed. Implementation Plan of 2007/2008 will be formulated while the Project will support the technique of formulation.

As Indicator 1, 2, and 3 of PDM are mostly achieved and the expression of Project Outputs are high as of this moment, the prospect of the accomplishment of this project purpose is high.

(2) Achievement of the Outputs

Output 1: Institutional and Technical capacities for social forestry extension in Forest Department are strengthened

Several policies and plans are formulated regarding forest development and extension plan at higher level of national plan. In addition, implementation plans of social forestry extension are formulated in 10 Districts of semi-arid areas.

After the project, Kenya Forest Service (KFS, before called as Forest Department) is considering the establishment of a new unit, Post ISFP Activities coordination Unit, taking charge of the social forestry extension. They have already formulated a draft of an organization chart and TOR. Thus, regarding the Output1, accomplishment of the three indicators defined by PDM are confirmed.

Output 2: Social forestry extension activities among individual farmers and farmer groups are promoted

Most of the farmers groups in three districts (Kitui, Mbere, Tharaka), main target area of the project, are proactively conducting social forestry activities on their own farm land, such as producing seedling, planting, and grafting trees. Networking between the farmers groups participating in FFS are formulated by the assistance of the Project. These are accomplishment of Indicator 2.1 (the ratio of the application of activities by participants), and Indicator 2.2 (the ratio of coordination between network). 234 farmer facilitators were fostered and they are instructing 227 farmer groups (3,400 farmers). (Indicator 2.3: The accomplishment of the utilization of farmer facilitators)

11,345 people participated in the field day (an event where FFS participant farmers exhibit there output to neighbor farmers.), which means the achievement of the extension to the surrounding

farmers. (Achievement of indicator 2.4) The monitoring of the project indicates that almost 100% of the FFS participants acquired knowledge and technology of social forestry, and highly valued extension model of this project. (Achievement of the indicator 2.5) More achievement is confirmed that 80% of KFS diffusers correctly understood FFS method and became certified facilitators. (Achievement of Indicator 2.5) FFS conducted by Extension officers of KFS have been implemented in 105 groups (2100 farmers). (Prospect of Achievement of Indicator 2.7)

Output 3: Farmers and other stakeholders obtain enough practical knowledge and techniques.

The result of the project monitoring indicates that among 4,965 farmers participated in the project (FFS), almost all of them acquired appropriate knowledge and technology (Achievement of Indicator 3.2), and practicing them in their own lands. (Achievement of Indicator 3.1) According to the interview to graduated farmers, they keep producing seedling and planting trees after the graduation. They also sell seedlings and give advices about planting trees to the surrounding farmers.

Output 4: Information on social forestry extension and related issues is shared among the stakeholders

Regarding the information sharing of social forestry diffusion, the hit count of the project homepage is 8,432 so far. (see management site of the homepage) This hit count is 3.8 times bigger than that of the midterm evaluation. (The hit count of midterm evaluation is 2,200) KFS is conducting public relation about social forestry extension through various opportunities such as the presentation at forums.

(Prospect of Achievement of Overall Goal)

In target districts of the Project, FFS graduates and FFS participants are producing seedlings with commercial value, planting fruit trees like Mango and preparing tree fields. Agricultural contribution to household income can be improved.

In view of the fact that seedlings for wood production are also well planted with steady extension of Social Forestry activities, it can be judged that there is possibility to achieve overall goal.

2 Summary of Evaluation Results

(1) Relevance

This project is consistent with “Vision 2030”, a Kenyan national development plan, which considers the development of arid and semi-arid area to be a development issue. In addition, the direction of the project is consistent with the development principle of Kenyan forest development sector, as upper level plans of forest sector such as forest law consider “forestry in arid and semi-arid areas”, “forestry in farmland”, and “extension” as issue. This project is consistent with the Japan’s ODA Country Report of Kenya which defines the preservation of environment as a important development assistance issue and the formulation and preservation of forest as a development issue.

The target groups are highly interested in social forestry. As we selected groups which had already conducted community activities to a certain extent, they actively participated in FFS. In these reasons, the selection of target groups is evaluated as appropriate. Before conducting FFS, farmers didn't have any possibility of improving livelihood by producing seedling and growing orchard nor knowledge and technology of planting trees. Since a lot of requests from farmers asking for the application of a technology which can be used for agricultural production of forestry suitable for climate and natural environment are received, this project is coincident with the needs of target areas and groups. Through activities like Field Day, social forestry activities are extended to the surrounding farmers of target groups.

This project applies FFS as a means to extension of the social forestry. According to the result of interview to farmers and extension officers, FFS has developed ownership, strengthens community, and farmers capacity with knowledge about forestry. As many of the participant farmers of FFS highly evaluate its effectiveness, this approach is evaluated as appropriate.

Considering these observations, relevance of this project is high.

(2) Effectiveness

The result of project monitoring indicates that farmers continue the production of seedling and planting trees in farmland and the production and planting of cashable commercial trees through FFS. There is growing number of neighbor farmers newly applying social forestry activities.

(Achievement of the Indicator 1 and 2) In 10 Districts of semi-arid area, yet some of the implementation plans are to be update (three main target areas and other seven prefectures), extension implementation plans are formulated and Output 3 will be likely achieved.

(Achievement of Indicator 3)

Effectiveness of this Project is evaluated as high, as KSF and farmer facilitators are steadily progressing social forestry through FFS and sufficient achievement of the Project Outputs is indicated.

(3) Efficiency

Input of Japan was as scheduled and appropriate in terms of quality, amount, and timing, which contributed to the project activities and coming out the achievement of the Project Outputs. Though financial support of the Kenyan government was concerned at the time of the midterm evaluation, they have been growing the amount of disbursement since then. However, they delay the disbursement to frontline extension officers from time to time, and the input of the Kenyan government budget needs improvement.

FFS (farmer run FFS) utilizing farmer facilitators has the same effect with an FFS. While the annual cost of FFS by extension officers is 100 thousand yen per year that of FFS by farmer run is 750 thousand yen. Thus, FFS by farmer run is a cost-effective method.

(4) Impact

Individual farmers, farmer groups, and the surrounding farmers are continuing rising and producing seedling and planting trees every year through FFS. They have already started selling the production of social forestry (such as mango, seedling, lumber, and firewood). Though these activities, farmers are increasing their awareness of methods to improve their livelihood. Wider

extension activity of the social forestry is expected, as graduated farmers give advice about agriculture and social forestry to the neighboring and the surrounding farmers, which indicated creating networks.

(5) Sustainability

FFS conducted by KFS has developed the ability of a lot of farmer facilitators and their FFS (94 schools) have turned out more than 125 graduated farmers. As a result, frontline forest extension officers have sufficient capability of facilitation, monitoring, and backstopping, and we can expect the extension activity of social forestry through FFS by KSF and farmer facilitators.

KSF is planning to establish “Post ISFP Activities Coordination Unit” and it will take charge of extension of social forestry after this project termination. It indicates a prospect of sustainability of extension utilizing the achievement of the project. Assured implementation is expected, if this unit formulates annual FFS implementation plan, frontline officers like District Forest Officers surely formulate an annual implementation plan, and implementation of social forestry extension officers activities are incorporated into a Performance Contract.

While the budgetary preparation after the project is a challenge for KSF, KSF has been growing its burden of expenses to the project, highly evaluates the FFS method and the achievement of the project, and is positive about the implementation of FFS by itself. Therefore, we can expect that KFS will take a necessary budgetary preparation and extension activities of social forestry through FFS. KFS is also applying for the Japanese Social Development Fund of the World Bank, and planning to implement further extension activities of social forestry through FFS utilizing this fund if adopted.

As observed above, sustainability of this project is evaluated as high.

3 Factors Promoting the Achievements

(1) Factors Concerning to Planning

N/A

(2) Factors Concerning to the Implementation Process

The Project and Counterparts have been constantly discussing and trying to solve problems of the implementation and management of the project through periodic Joint Coordinating Meetings (JCC), Project Semiannual Meetings, and monthly meeting of three main target prefectures. In this way, there are sufficient communications and smooth discussions between the project and counterparts, and this makes the management of this project smooth.

“The adequacy of FFS” mentioned at midterm evaluation was taken as a promoting factor at the time of the semiannual meeting, and FFS was also highly evaluated at the extension field in the time of this evaluation study. This evaluation study team confirms high evaluation and acknowledgements of FFS by those who not only introduced FFS in the initial time of the Project but also those who implement manage and operate FFS including target groups.

4 Factors Inhibiting the Achievement

(1) Factors Concerning to Planning

N/A

(2) Factors Concerning to the Implementation Process

In the midterm evaluation, the problem was pointed out that “because of too frequent monitoring, too much report, and poorly-organized or insufficient data, monitoring is dysfunctional.” With the assistance of the Project, since monitoring system was reviewed in the field level and the frequency of the monitoring, check sheet of facilitators and reporting are simplified, the monitoring system is improved in July 2008. The problem of monitoring is solved at the moment of terminal evaluation.

5 Conclusion

The Project Purpose is realized, while the project has been appropriately implemented and the achievement of four Outputs of the project is sufficient. In main target and other areas, FFS graduated farmers and FFS target farmers have already started producing seedling of commercial trees, planting orchard like mango, and placing wood lock. The growth of trees will contribute to improvement of livelihood of the farmers, the accomplishment of the overall project goals is prospectively achieved.

When to summarize the main criteria of 5 evaluation criteria of terminal evaluation, first, relevance is high, as the project is coincident with the principle of the Kenyan government and the aid policy of the Japanese government. Next, effectiveness is high, as the appropriate input heightened the expression of each project output through project activities. However, the continuation of TOT is necessary not to allow personnel changes to inhibit the continuation of FFS. As for sustainability, a new unit, planned to be newly established in the KSF, will take charge in extension of social forestry after this project end, and increasing disbursement and the budget preparation of KFS is expected. As we expect that individual members of farmer groups will transfer the knowledge and skills of social forest to the neighbor farmers and the surrounding farmers, the prospect of sustainability utilizing the Outputs of this project is high.

As stated above, according to the achievement of the Project Outputs and the verification of the project implementation processes and the evaluation result from the viewpoint of five evaluation criteria, this project highly contributes to the intensification of social forestry in Kenya. As the KFS highly evaluate the FFS approach and the Outputs of the project, and is positive about the implementation of FFS, further extension of social forestry in Kenya is expected in the future through FFS as a method of spreading social forestry.

6 Recommendations

(1) Continuity of Capacity Building of Facilitators

Under the condition of frequent personnel changes of DFOs and DFEOs, to continue the extension activity of social forestry through FFS, it is necessary to conduct TOT continuously for the relevant forest officers so that successor officers will be able to continue even after any personnel changes. Among those DFEOs who attended the training, the demand for re-trainings is high, and it is desirable to conduct re-trainings including strengthen their skills. While this project received

support from FFS master trainers (who attended three-month facilitator training by FAO in Philippine) of Agricultural Ministry, the KSF needs to foster its own FFS master trainers.

(2) Institutionalization of KFS

KSF needs to decide the role of a new unit of “Post ISFP Activities Coordination Unit”, which takes charge of planning policies of social forestry extension implemented by DFO/DFEO, allocation and expenditure of budget, and monitoring FFS.

The annual implementation plan of social forestry extension in each district is insufficient with only two-sheet-paper document to require budget, except for three main target prefectures. The commissioner of DFO in each district needs to formulate concrete annual activity plans of FFS activities in all target area of division level. At the same time, it is desirable for Performance Contracts, operation implementation contracts between the KFS and government officers, to include the annual activity plans. (Indeed, the activity annual plans of three main target districts are already incorporated into Performance Contracts.)

(3) Review of FFS duration and Curriculum

While “Extension Run FFS” conducted by DFEO is 1 year and a half, “Farmer Run FFS” conducted by farmer facilitators is planned to 1 year for cost saving. There is a trade-off in the period of 1 year and a half with advantage that it includes two rainy seasons and also disadvantage that it costs more. According to the result of interviews with DFEOs and farmer facilitators, there are both positive and negative opinions about the idea of shortening the period of FFS for 1 year. Before this project terminate, curriculum and an appropriate FFS implementation period needs to be determined with consideration of the Kenyan budget.

(4) Promotion of Farmer Run FFS

While Farmer Run FFS was adopted as a cost-saving method, it functions well with activities like the production of seedling in the Farmer Run FFS. It is desirable to continue utilizing Farmer Run FFS in the future, because it costs less than FFS run by DFEO.

(5) Promotion of Networking of Participant Farmers

The networking of participating farmers is addressed by the project, and is to be addressed by the World Bank JSDF after the Project. The project activities of JSDF is expected that the networking of participating farmers will promote information sharing of social forestry skills and marketing, and joint negotiation with brokers. As the JSDF is to conduct microfinance to ISFP target farmers, the production of seedling and planting trees are expected by the finance.

7 Lessons Learned

(1) FFS on Social Forestry

FFS is an effective approach which was systemized to expand extension and transfer and

implement skills of farmers. At the time of the midterm evaluation study, there are some findings utilizing a group approach targeting organized farmers. For example, FFS decreased the sense of unfairness, fostered linkage of the groups. As a result, social forestry activities are widely extended. At this terminal evaluation study, “group dynamics” (dynamic group activities), such as songs and dance expressing FFS and group, plays a core role of assuring the continuation of activities, as it expresses a joy of solidified farmer groups working and studying together, and keeps farmers interested in FFS. The Green Zone project of the African Development Bank adopted FFS approach in its forestry preservation activities in high potential areas. FFS is useful to utilize the existing approach in other similar projects in the future.

Moreover, FFS functions well for capacity building of related staff of KFS and farmers, such as formulation of plans, project management, public speaking, taking minutes, and data management. FFS is an influential approach to foster human resources.

However, to increase the effectiveness of FFS, stakeholders all commitment to participate in FFS is required. Further intensification of social forestry is expected to utilize strength of FFS with consideration of stakeholders’ condition to be participated in FFS.

(2) Appropriate Budget Allocation

The budget allocation to seven districts, except for three main target areas, is not adequate, and the budget items of 10 prefectures are not adequately planned. The delay of the budget disbursement of the Kenyan government affected the extension activities in 10 target districts. In the future, it is required to decide the establishment of a new unit in the KFS so that they are able to plan to adequate allocation and budget disbursement to each district at an appropriate timing. It is required to prevent inhibiting social forestry in the future through periodical monitoring of FFS implementation.