

Project Completion Report Validation

Mount Kenya East Pilot Project for Natural Resource Management

Republic of Kenya

Date of validation by IOE: December 2014

I. Basic project data

			Approval (US\$ m)		Actual (US\$ m)	
Region	ESA	Total project costs	25.7		30.5	
Country	Kenya	IFAD loan and percentage of total	16.7	66%	20.1	66%
Loan number	599-Ke	Borrower	1.8	7%	2.5	8%
Type of project (subsector)	Natural resources	Cofinancier (GEF)	4.9	18%	4.7	15%
Date of loan signature	26 Feb 2003	Beneficiaries	2.3	9%	3.2	10.5%
Date of effectiveness	1 July 2004					
Loan amendments	May 2008 November 2008 21 July 2011	Number of beneficiaries (if appropriate specify if direct or indirect)	360 000 (60 000 households)		558 145	
Loan closure extensions	1					
Country programme managers	N. Gobossa (current) ¹	Loan closing date	31 st March 2012		31 st March 2013	
Regional director(s)	P. Saint Ange (current) Feb 2012 ²	Mid-term review			June 2009	
Project completion report reviewer	C. Perch	IFAD loan disbursement at project completion (%)			99%	
Project completion report quality control panel	Ashwani Muthoo Avraam Louca	Date of the project completion report			February 2013	
*The President's report states that 580 000 people are considered poor or at risk of falling into poverty. It is expected that the project will effectively reach 60 000 households or 360 000 people. However, subsequent reports refer to the target as being 580 000 people.						

Source: Report and Recommendation of the President 2002.

* There are four types of lending terms: (i) special loans on highly concessional terms, free of interest but bearing a service charge of three fourths of one per cent (0.75 per cent) per annum and having a maturity period of 40 years, including a grace period of 10 years; (ii) loans on hardened terms, bearing a service charge of three fourths of one per cent (0.75 per cent) per annum and having a maturity period of 20 years, including a grace period of 10 years; (iii) loans on intermediate terms, with a rate of interest per annum equivalent to 50 per cent of the variable reference interest rate and a maturity period of 20 years, including a grace period of five years; (iv) loans on ordinary terms, with a rate of interest per annum equivalent to one hundred per cent (100 per cent) of the variable reference interest rate, and a maturity period of 15-18 years, including a grace period of three years.

¹ Previous Country programme managers were: M. Bradley (2005-2006); R. Mutandi (2009); and S. Eremie (2010-13).

² Previous Regional Directors were: G. Howe (2002-2003); J. Yayock, OIC (2004-2006); and I. De Willebois (2006-2012).

II. Project outline

1. The Mount Kenya East Pilot Project for Natural Resources Management (MKEPP) was IFAD's eleventh project in Kenya. The seven-year project was approved by IFAD's Executive Board in December 2002.
2. The Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (subsequently renamed Ministry of Water and Irrigation, and currently called Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources) was the project lead agency and the implementation was through various line ministries and government agencies. Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) was the agency responsible for the implementation of the GEF component. This was the first time IFAD acted as an executive agency for a GEF project.
3. Project area. The project was, as stated in the President's Report (2002), to be implemented in selected sub-catchments of the Tana River, on the eastern slopes of Mount Kenya, in the five administrative districts of Embu, Meru Central, Meru South, Mbeere and Tharaka. In these districts, the project was carried out in five river basins, within the Tana River Catchments. The project area included sites of national and global importance. The upper catchment area comprised the Afro-alpine zone, the Mount Kenya National Park protected area and the National Forest Reserve (highland forest) - which was more or less uninhabited, but home to biodiversity of national and global significance -. The middle and lower catchment areas of the project included high potential agricultural land, consisting of tea, coffee and cotton/tobacco zones. This land had been cleared of its natural vegetation and was covered by cultivation, human settlements and farmlands. The GEF component focused on interventions (ecosystem rehabilitation and management plan and National Reserve Reafforestation) inside the Mount Kenya National Reserve.
4. Project objectives and approach. The overall goal of the project was: "to contribute to poverty reduction by promoting a more effective use of natural resources and improved agricultural practices".³
5. The intermediate objective was "to enhance the equitable use of these resources with particular focus on environmental conservation". Specific objectives included: (i) introduce on- and off-farm environmental conservation and rehabilitation practices in the areas adjacent to rivers and trust lands, focusing on soil erosion control; (ii) bring about improvements in river water management in order to increase dry-season base flow and reduce sediment loads and pollution in these rivers; (iii) raise household income through improved marketing of agricultural and natural resource-based products; and (iv) strengthen governance at the local level for better land use and water management.
6. Target group. At design, the total population of the five districts was about 1.2 million with the population in the geographical area covered by the project being 750,000, of whom 350,000 lived in the river sub-basin areas and 400,000 in agricultural areas. Of these, about 580,000 people (136,000 households) were considered poor, very poor and at risk of falling into poverty.
7. Project components. The MKEPP had five components: (i) water resources management; (ii) environmental conservation; (iii) rural livelihoods; (iv) community empowerment; and (v) project coordination and management.

³ This, in the loan agreement of 2003 and subsequently, had become "to reduce poverty through improved food security and improving levels of income of farmers, particularly rural women. This is by promoting more effective use of natural resources, improving access to water and introducing better farming and water management practices for sustainable use of land and water resources".

8. The project components and their costs are set out in table 1 below:

Table 1
Summary of project costs (US\$) at design and completion

Components	Total US million	% of base costs	Actual US\$ 000	% of actual costs
Water resource management	9.7	37	7.7	39
Environmental conservation	7.0	28	2.3	12
Rural livelihoods	4.5	17	1.8	9
Community empowerment	1.7	7	1.3	7
Project management	2.7	11	6.7	34
	25.6	100	19.8	100

Source: President's Report 2002 and Project Completion Report (Discrepancies in totals are due to rounding up).⁴

9. Significant changes during project implementation. The IFAD Loan was extended by one year i.e. completion date to 30 September 2012 and closing date 30 March 2013.⁵ The extension was for the purposes of: (i) re-allocation of funds across categories to support implementation of community activities that were found to require more funds; (ii) development of sustainability mechanisms for implemented activities; and (iii) support the design for up-scaling the successful approaches.⁶ Two further amendments took place to reflect reallocations of funds towards salaries and allowances.⁷
10. Methodological Note. The project completion report (PCR) states that it only covers the IFAD loan funded activities and that the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) has been covered in an earlier report (presumably the GEF Terminal Evaluation 2012). Nevertheless, the grant is mentioned in certain places of the PCR, and a challenge in assessing the extent to which objectives have been achieved, is that there appear to have been a number of different log frames during the project's lifetime (including in some, but not all, cases a separate log frame for the GEF activities). This has caused some confusion (indeed it was noted by the GEF Terminal evaluation to have caused some confusion for project staff). This lack of clarity is also evident in the PCR.⁸ For the purpose of this project completion report validation (PCRV), the project completion report remains the main document of reference but the terminal evaluation has been used for triangulating certain findings and where relevant information about the grant has been included.

III. Review of findings

A. Project performance

Relevance

11. Relevance of project objectives. The PCR considered the project very relevant both as regards the needs of the beneficiaries and contributing to defined national

⁴ There are discrepancies between the figures presented on page xi and page 23 of the PCR (e.g the total project costs are different on page on the two pages). This figure does not include the GEF component.

⁵ Memo 21 July 2011.

⁶ 2012 Impact Assessment.

⁷ Memo 21 May and 12 November 2008.

⁸ There are inconsistencies among the log frames in the PCR and MTR on targets on for example number of WRUAs, WUA and Sub-catchment plans.

development goals. This assessment was based on the alignment of the project with the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2002-2005) and other policies such as the Environmental Management and Coordination Act (1999), the Water Bill (2002), the Kenya Strategy for Revitalising Agriculture (2004)⁹, and the 2002 COSOP. The latter emphasised maintaining and regenerating the renewable natural resources that under-pinned the Kenyan economy through a focus on natural resource management, water resource management and decentralised community involvement in land use and resource management.

12. The 2011 Kenya Country Programme Evaluation (CPE) and the terminal evaluation of the IFAD-GEF project (2012) took a similar view. It was found that MKEPP was "relevant and largely consistent with IFAD and government policies, as well as the needs of the rural poor".¹⁰ The CPE furthermore noted that this was the first project to be approved after the COSOP and reflected the COSOP very closely.
13. Relevance of project design. MKEPP was conceived as a pilot project. It used a two-pronged approach to environmental conservation by addressing firstly the causes and secondly the impacts of environmental degradation. Thus, on the one hand, IFAD financing addressed poverty (a driving force behind the pressure on the protected areas) in the agricultural areas; on the other hand, the GEF-funded activities aimed at relieving pressure on forest and water resources and thus, focus on poverty reduction strategies, alternative livelihood options and improved management practices in the forest adjacent agricultural areas. The project design was and remains relevant.
14. The CPE found that MKEPP had been designed with an explicit rural poverty reduction focus based on improving access to and use of natural resources, especially irrigation.¹¹ This approach made sense as poor environmental practices were becoming an increasing constraint on agricultural productivity, especially downstream in the watershed. From project documentation is clear that the project used a wide range of strategies and approaches to achieve its objectives, all based on the principles of participation.¹²
15. The OSC Minutes were positive about the project design and considered it a model for replication. It was noted that considerably more resources had been mobilized for the design process with internal IFAD grants, supplementary funds (DFID and FAO) and that the availability of these additional resources had enabled complimentary activities such as a full scale environmental assessment of the linkages between land degradation and poverty, support to the Poverty Reduction Strategy Process, assessment of local organizations, organization of post formulation workshops. It highlighted that this was a good way of pursuing IFAD's objectives of innovation, participation and partnership building. The OSC noted that it represented a good learning opportunity for staff on the design/implementation of GEF projects. This PCRV agrees with the above but notes that not unlike many other IFAD projects there was a lack of intermediary outcomes in the logframe.
16. It was IFAD's first experience with GEF, and perhaps because of that, there were some difficulties in getting the GEF supplementary funding approved. This was in part due to the use of different government agencies, the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) for the GEF grant (the Loan was under Ministry of Water and irrigation) and a separate project coordination unit (as opposed to the project management unit (PMU) for the Loan under the oversight of KWS).

⁹ Other policies included: Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation of 2003; Forest Act 2005; the Vision 2030 of 2007; Agriculture Sector Development Strategy 2010- 2020 of 2010; and the Constitution of Kenya 2010.

¹⁰ IFAD 2011, Country Programme Evaluation, page 27; 2012 Terminal Evaluation of IFAD-GEF project, page v.

¹¹ Ibid. page 27.

¹² See for example PCR 2013, page 10.

17. The OSC highlighted the need for ensuring a smooth disbursement process. This issue was not addressed entirely in the project design and no particular risk management was put in place.¹³
18. Another minor issue that was not foreseen and was raised in the MTR was the lack of capital on the part of farmers to carry out some of the income generating activities.¹⁴ However this seems to have been resolved post MTR with linkages made with relevant organizations. For example the GEF terminal evaluation noted that 43 community groups adopted Village Loan and savings Associations (VLSAs) to finance new enterprises.¹⁵
19. Targeting. The geographical area of central Kenya was in accordance with the COSOP focus on mostly medium to high potential areas. Detailed targeting was carried out based on the identification of Focal Development Areas (FDA) by district, divisional and other staff in consultation with community members and other stakeholders in the area. Further, baseline surveys, welfare indicator surveys and poverty surveys were used to identify households to benefit from project resources. The MTR noted that FDA targeting was effective in identifying project target groups described at appraisal but that some challenges remained. They related, in the main, to the fact that the project area was defined by administrative boundaries while the target areas were defined by river basin hence there were difficulties in implementing the project where a river basin shared two different districts or where a basin partly lay outside the project area.¹⁶ Although this could be interpreted as a design weakness this issue was one faced in implementing the evolving Kenya policy framework of the time (particularly relevant for the Water Bill 2003 and the Water Resources Management Authority responsible for providing water resource management services on a decentralised basis at the catchment and sub-catchment level) and as such not a project design issue but an issue being faced nationally.
20. Based on the above the PCRV has rated relevance satisfactory (5).

Effectiveness

21. The following paragraphs discuss the project's achievements in terms of the specific objectives identified in the main text of the President's report. As has been noted already in this report, the objectives - as outlined in the 2002 Report and Recommendation of the President - have subsequently been "lost" in reporting, with progress linked to, and sub-divided by components. However, the PCRV will look at effectiveness as per the original objectives. A further challenge noted is that the reporting focus mainly on outputs and that a narrative of how the outputs contributed to, for example, reduce incidents of catchment degradations is lacking. This is likely due to the lack of intermediary outcomes in the design report and subsequent log frames.
22. Effectiveness of targeting approach. The 2010 supervision report noted that the project's targeting approach was adequate. The river sub-basins under the project were selected on the basis of the need for critical natural resources management and restoration. The criteria for identifying catchments' blocks for intervention in each sub-basin included land use patterns and threats to the landscape. The strategies for targeting the poor, vulnerable and youth included: promoting different modes of contribution other than cash (such as labour), waiver on contribution by community members identified as being very needy (the aged and orphans), encouragement of project committees to peg contributions to

¹³ OSC Minutes 23 July 2002.

¹⁴ IFAD 2009, MTR, page ix.

¹⁵ IFAD 2012, Terminal Evaluation, page 7.

¹⁶ IFAD 2009, Mid Term Review page 63.

appropriate seasons (say harvest time), encouraging demonstrations in the homesteads of the very poor, and focus on the youth in the school greening programme and employed as casual labour in forest rehabilitation activities. Although there is little information on the effectiveness of this approach, the Impact Assessment cites examples of irrigation schemes where the group included a number of poor households who did not pay group contributions but benefited like other members. However, it also pointed out that some conditions associated to the poor and vulnerable - such as lack of basic needs like food - negatively affected their participation for some interventions. The costs associated to some activities also limited their participation and subsequent adoption. Nevertheless, according to the Impact Assessment study, 61.7 per cent of the survey respondents felt that community groups addressed the issues affecting the poor and vulnerable and 71.8 per cent felt that the community groups addressed the needs of the community.¹⁷ The PCR stated that 558,145 beneficiaries had been reached exceeding the target of the President's report considerably (360,000).¹⁸

Objective 1. Introduce on- and off-farm environmental conservation and rehabilitation practices in the areas adjacent to rivers and trust lands, focusing on soil erosion control.

23. To achieve this objective, the project financed community natural resource management, farm forestry, and improved integrity of Mt Kenya Forest Reserve Ecosystem (including plantation management and development) and institutional support.¹⁹ Key activities included 265 kilometers river line conservation (target 150 kilometers); conservation of springs and wetlands (228 springs, target 150), hilltop rehabilitation of 294 hectares (target 200 hectares), school greening programme where 1177 schools/institutions participated in tree planting (target 700); farm forestry where 5,455 farmers participated in on-farm tree planting (target 2,500), and 2600 cooperated in forest rehabilitation (target 2800); 60 kilometers control barriers constructed (target 387 Kilometers), rehabilitation of KWS research center and construction of six ranger barracks.²⁰ Furthermore, the project enhanced the sustainable management and equitable use of natural resources through capacity building of communities through training on participatory forest management (3000 trained no target), environmental governance, tree nursery management 714 (target of 250) including seed collection and handling. Farmers were trained on soil and water conservation structures with demonstrations on water harvesting for crop production. A total of 16,483 farms implemented different soil and water conservation structures with a total 250 soil and water conservation equipment procured.
24. The PCR states that through these activities the communities benefitted through reduced incidents of catchment degradation, enhanced soil and water conservation in the project area and hence access to clean unpolluted water and improved farm productivity. It highlights that project interventions under this objective contributed to sensitization on environmental conservation and sanitation issues and that the project also impacted directly on peoples' livelihood as they were able to generate income from sale of seedling and establishment of commercial woodlots.

Objective 2. Bring about improvements in river water management in order to increase dry-season base flow and reduce sediment loads and pollution in these rivers.

25. The PCR highlights that the project supported the rehabilitation/development of 98

¹⁷ Capital strategies 2012, Impact Assessment Study, page 84.

¹⁸ The President's report state that 580 000 people are considered poor or at risk of falling into poverty. It is expected that the project will effectively reach 60 000 households or 360 000 people. However, subsequent reports refer to the target as being 580 000 people.

¹⁹ Capital Strategies 2012, Impact Assessment Study.

²⁰ Capital Strategies 2012, Impact Assessment Study.

springs, 54 shallow wells, 140 boreholes, six earth dams and concrete dams, 12 brick rainwater-harvesting tanks, 17 piped gravity water systems and 12 irrigation schemes covering 1050 hectares. It goes on to note that there was an increase in water quality and quantity as a result of improved water resources management and highlights that this had led to an improved access for both domestic use and agriculture. In order to monitor water conditions the project installed 24 new river gauging stations and rehabilitated 54; in 2005 there were only 29 of them operating but by December 2012 there were 78 working.

26. The PCR notes that improved river basin management capacity at the district and community level was attained through the formation, registration and capacity building of five Water Resource Users Associations (WRUAs) and establishment of 17 sub-WRUAs (in 2005 only one WRUA existed), the development of seven River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs) and the holding of various training activities. These, according to the Impact Assessment 2012, had resulted in the reduction of water pollution and in increased base flows in the five river basins (e.g. 56 per cent of respondents acknowledged increased water flows from conserved springs). For example some WRUAs were able to disconnect illegal abstraction and support a requisite legalization process.²¹ The PCR states the RBMPs were conducted and disseminated to the WRUAs but there is no detail given on whether implementation has started.

Objective 3. Raise household income through improved marketing of agricultural and natural resource-based products.

27. In order to achieve this objective the project planned to support improvements in access to local markets enabling farmers to obtain fair prices for their goods by: (i) mobilizing farmers to form marketing groups; (ii) facilitating links between marketing groups and credit institutions; (iii) disseminating market information to target groups; and (iv) rehabilitating rural infrastructures, including selected access roads. The Kenya CPE 2011 suggested that the project had been effective in bringing about significant increases in productivity, food security (90 per cent increase) and incomes. The PCR highlights some of the achievements, stating that market support was provided through the spot rehabilitation and improvement of rural access roads to make movement of farm produce easier. A total of 182.8 kilometers (target 53 kilometers) of rural access were graded and five drifts and bridges constructed. This activity led to improvement of marketing of farm produce and growth of small markets centers within FDA. In addition this resulted in a positive impact through a reduction in costs of transportation of produce to markets due to shortening of distances by up to 10 kilometers (50 per cent) from markets. Marketing training was undertaken with a total of 77 groups trained on marketing strategies. In addition, as part of the support to irrigation a total of 1,738 farmers were trained on agronomy and marketing of high value crops, safe use of pesticides and enterprise choice which according to the PCR has improved their horticultural farming skills and incomes.
28. The MTR 2009 suggested that billboards and radio bulletins be used and 254 marketing bulletins were subsequently produced and posted on billboards within the FDAs to provide relevant and timely marketing information. The project constructed several marketing structures including a honey refinery and a grain store and six grading sheds within the new irrigation schemes to assist farmers in marketing their horticultural crops.
29. However, the CPE stressed that promoting market access was the weakest link in the MKEPP. There is little evidence of household incomes increasing as a direct result of the marketing activities but reducing transportation costs will most likely

²¹ IFAD, 2012, Impact Assessment, page 29.

have had an impact on savings.

Objective 4. Strengthen governance at the local level for better land use and water management.

30. MKEPP placed emphasis on empowering local communities to take charge of their development, based on identified needs through strengthening the capacity of community-based organizations (CBOs). Some of the activities highlighted in the PCR included participatory planning, delineation of Focal Development Areas (FDAs), formation of FDA Committees, building capacity of local level institutions such as River Users and WUAs, Project Management Committees, supporting implementation of innovative community initiatives and organizing tailor made short courses for key stakeholders. In addition, the project sought to strengthen district technical capacity through training of district level staff in project cycle management, preparation of annual work plans and participatory techniques, including those for monitoring and evaluation and field level physical audits of community support services.
31. RUAs were formed (see objective 2 above) and these were very important tools for provision of local governance for water management. Capacity building also contributed to communities taking charge of development issues at their level with 10,782 people trained on project management skills, and 2,175 on conflict resolution. Furthermore 58.9 per cent of people in the area were members of community groups.
32. The MTR highlighted that there was good integration of the various components in implementation. For example, the water management component implementation was integrated with that of environmental conservation components in preparing the River Basin management plan.²² However, there were some issues with ensuring synchronisation with the GEF project and implementing it as a single project.²³
33. This PCR considers that in terms of fulfilling the overall goal of contributing to poverty reduction by promoting a more effective use of natural resources and improved agricultural practices the project has made important contributions. More particularly the project provided opportunities for income generation and self-sufficiency through for example the establishment of tree nurseries, sales of poles and posts, and self-sufficiency in fuel wood at domestic level that have impacted on people's livelihoods. There was also a reduction in soil erosion, achieved by activities such as the planting of 7 million seedlings (75 per cent survival rate), which resulted in better farm productivity and improved environmental conservation in the project area. Farmers were also introduced to improved agricultural and natural resource management practices through the partnership with Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) (e.g. farm trials on key thematic areas focused on natural resource management, on-farm productivity, introduction of new crop varieties and introduction of emerging enterprises, soil and water conservation). The project reached more people than foreseen. The rating for this criterion is 5 (satisfactory).

Efficiency

34. In the PCR efficiency has been assessed comparing physical outputs and project expenditures. The highest efficiency was attained in community empowerment (0.83) and rural livelihoods component (0.91) with 1.01 for water resources and 1.02 for coordination and management. According to the analysis the percentage of physical outputs has in many cases been overachieved but then the budget has also in many cases been increased (in total by 19 per cent). The PCR concludes

²² IFAD 2009, MTR page 60.

²³ IFAD, 2013, PCR, page 57.

that for 1.04 physical units achieved 1 unit of funding was used. It is not entirely clear how the calculation was made if it is supposed to be a simple average, then it should have been 0.96 physical units achieved using 1 unit of funding unless weights have been applied to the different figures. Without the detailed calculations of how each activity has been weighted under the components it is virtually impossible to assess the validity of the methods used (e.g. how the overall rural livelihood or community empowerment outputs were achieved).

35. The project experienced a slow start due to an effectiveness lag of 18.9 months and a further delay in the release of the initial deposit. While delays were common across the portfolio in Kenya the MKEPP provides a typical example of early delays: The first year was used to mobilise stakeholders, set up necessary systems and infrastructure, as well as make necessary procurement of goods and services and thus not much was achieved; the initial deposit was released late by IFAD; there were slow flow of funds. Additionally, the PCR states that there was a loss of the first quarter of every financial year due to late arrival of Authority to Incur Expenditures (AIEs)²⁴. There were also some delays and issues with ensuring integration among the loan and the grant. However, The Kenya CPE 2011 highlighted that accounting efficiency, within a cumbersome pattern of bureaucracy, was improved when an access based accounting system (that captured all heads of accounts) was adopted.
36. The share of costs for programme management – often used as proxy indicator for efficiency rose from 11 per cent in the President's report to 34 per cent at completion.²⁵ The PCR states that the high expenditure was due to Appropriation in Aid but refrains from explaining this further. Conversations with project staff indicates that the increase in management costs was mainly a result of increases in allowances which took place to match allowances prevailing in Government. Also, some positions were raised to a higher grade and the programme recruited additional staff (M&E officer, procurement officer). It was also noted that fuel prices went up. Overall the changes took place to adapt to a changing economic environment in the country and all changes were approved by IFAD.
37. The PCR did not include an Economic Internal Rate of Return.
38. Based on the above, the efficiency is rated moderately satisfactory (4).

B. Rural poverty impact

39. The Country experienced a severe drought between July 2011 and mid 2012. In Kenya, the drought was described as one of the worst droughts in the last 60 years affecting about 3.75 million people. The drought caused crop failure, depleted pasture and water and led to loss of livestock contributing to a sharp deterioration of household food security. This is likely to have worked against some of the positive trends that the MKEPP was aiming at ensuring. However, based on the documentation available it is not possible to determine the exact impact of the drought on the project area.
40. Household income and assets. According to the PCR the project had a noticeable impact on household incomes and assets. Access to irrigation water contributed to the intensification and diversification of food and crop production and hence, to increased income levels. Incomes from agricultural employment were increased from 16 per cent to 22 per cent, incomes from small agri-businesses from 32 per cent to 38 per cent and horticultural incomes from 29 per cent to 51 per cent. The Impact assessment reported 71 per cent increase

²⁴ Aide Memoire of the Mid-Term Review 2009, paragraph 43.

²⁵ There are some discrepancies in the figures provided in the PCR on page xi and page 24. Depending on the figures used the management costs were either 29 per cent or 34 per cent.

of sale of crops and a 55 per cent increase of sale of livestock products like milk.²⁶ Poultry production improvements directly impacted on household incomes with increased incomes from the sale of eggs and chicken of 122 per cent and 118 per cent respectively. The CPE provided several examples of emerging impact on household income. It should be noted however, that these examples were not necessarily statically representative but presented case studies. For example, the Gaatia Umoja Farmer Field School, where beneficiaries increased their incomes through sales of tissue culture bananas. The income of one farmer increased from Kenyan Shilling (KES)²⁷ 16,000 before the project to KES 135,000 after project interventions. The CPE also provided examples of income increase as a result of selling tree seedlings and farmers leaving farm employment to work full time on their own farms.²⁸

41. According to the PCR the rehabilitation of rural access roads improved marketing of farm produce and inflows of farm inputs. Cost of transportation of produce to markets was reduced by up to 20 per cent and distances shortened by up to 10 kilometers.
42. The PCR does not provide much information on the project's contribution to increased assets. The PCR states there were some examples of beneficiaries being able to acquire assets as water from the Nthawa irrigation scheme had led to improved incomes from sale of fruit crops which again led to acquisition of physical assets such as water tanks, construction of ventilated improved pit latrines and better housing.²⁹ The information appears anecdotal and even the PCR states that it was unknown how widespread this phenomena was. However, it can be inferred that the increase of 1200 hectares of irrigated areas could have contributed to the impacts cited above.
43. In addition, the Impact Assessment (2012), based on a survey looking at before and after the project intervention, concluded that the proportion of people with a number of assets had increased. More particularly, temporary housing had reduced from 21.8 per cent to 8.2 per cent whereas permanent housing had increased from 30.7 per cent to 46.7 per cent. Furthermore, people with TVs increased from 19-29 per cent, solar panels from 13-23 per cent; cookers from 3-7 per cent; computers from 1-6 per cent; motor cycles from 3-14 per cent and DVD's/videos from 5-27 per cent.³⁰
44. Based on the above the assessment of this criterion is satisfactory (5).
45. Human and social capital and empowerment. The PCR stated that under the Community Empowerment component a lot of positive impacts had been brought to the lives of communities by the project. Amongst the most notable impacts were; good governance structures and instruments established in the management of community projects, communities were able to plan and monitor their activities through skills gained during the PRA process and empowerment trainings, reduced conflicts in community projects, ownership of projects embedded in the bylaws and the people and enhanced accountability. The PCR noted that the concept of community contribution to development intervention, coupled with the use of community project diaries and group constitutions, had enormously empowered the people in computing their contributions and realization of their rightful positions as major stakeholders in the whole broad spectrum of community development. This enhanced project ownership even in areas like Tharaka and Mbeere where initially, communities felt that the government had the entire responsibility to

²⁶ IFAD 2013, Project Completion Report, page 37.

²⁷ KES: Kenyan Shilling (Kenya official currency). Exchange rate as of November 2014: 1KES = 0,01US\$

²⁸ IFAD 2011, Country Programme Evaluation case study along with others Box 1, page 33.

²⁹ IFAD 2013, Project Completion Report, page 27.

³⁰ IFAD, 2012 Impact Assessment, page 37.

“bring development”. An example of an efficiently managed activity using the new skills learnt, was the Nthawa Irrigation Scheme in Mbeere district where Kshs 4.8 million was raised in a year. Another important indicator of the ownership of the project among the communities was that they contributed USD 3.19 million which was above the USD 2.31 projected during the appraisal.

46. According to the PCR, the ability of the beneficiaries to make their own decisions was improved by 86 per cent, community advocacy skills were improved by 82 per cent and the project provided a 45 per cent positive contribution to the development of local institutions. Also according to the GEF TER (2012) the project provided an 83% positive contribution to the development of leadership skills for communities. These and other project interventions had a positive effect on the beneficiaries' asset base (capacity to acquire land with title deeds, to own livestock, trees, farm equipment, tools, etc.) and their livelihoods in general (health, education, and housing). In the PCR it is noted that peoples livelihood's had increased through the provision of improved quality water by springs conservation and activities that had increased water recharge and reduced siltation rates. Specifically, MKEPP was able to provide 149,197 people (99.5 per cent achievement) with improved access to water.
47. The Impact Assessment 2012, stated there was a reduction by 20.6 per cent in the number of people who previously got water directly from the river leading to a reduction in time taken/saved to fetch water by 56.7 per cent and 49.2 per cent reduction in the distance walked in fetching water. In addition, the PCR reported that 39 per cent of the people reported improvement in water quality and 32 per cent a decline in water related disease incidence attributable to MKEPP interventions. Increased incomes through participation in IGA's were used to pay for school fees for children, medical bills, purchase of production inputs, and improved housing.
48. Based on the above the assessment of this criterion is satisfactory (6).
49. Food security and agricultural productivity. Household food security was improved, as shown by a household survey conducted in 2012. The large majority of the households reported positive results in the area of nutrition/household diet (64 per cent), availability of food (68 per cent) and affordability of food (56 per cent). Also, 60 per cent felt that access to food had altogether improved. A main contributing factor was improved access to water. Soil and water conservation, water harvesting, and the introduction of improved planting materials had a positive impact on agriculture productivity in the project area. Farmers who adopted soil and water conservation techniques reported increased crop yields (65 per cent reported increased in food production).
50. The PCR notes that the participation in farmers' field school³¹ through effective transfer of new technology and approaches had contributed to food security, including a reduction of 90 per cent in incidences of hunger in the lower areas like Thuraka and Mbeere districts. Farmers that adopted the farmers' field school technologies reported increased incomes from sale of crops by 71 per cent and by 55 per cent from sale of livestock products (milk). Despite the undoubted benefits gained by the take up of these technologies their take up was not always very high with only 23.8% of Households upgrading their goats and only 24% adopting galla goats (IAS 2012). Poultry upgrading was also reported to have had direct benefits including improved nutrition at household level but adoption levels only stood at 23% (IAS 2012) and with value addition (3%), Bee keeping (8%) and drip irrigation (6%) having the lowest adoption rates.
51. The project supported soil and water conservation measures in an effort to

³¹ IFAD, 2012 Impact Assessment.

conserve and improve soil fertility for increased productivity as well as to reduce silt load going to the rivers. Through the soil and water conservation measures on 16, 483 farms most reported on average a 65 per cent increase in agricultural productivity.³² In terms of breeding the artificial insemination programme, the dairy and meaty goat upgrading and rabbit upgrading improved farmers livelihood. The prices for the FI bucks for goats was very high ranging from Kshs 5,000-8,000 for young kid of five months. The community run AI services had made the services affordable (cost of AI had drastically come down from Kshs 800 per service to Kshs 600) and was accessible to most livestock farmers within the FDA while milk production increased by 100 per cent for most farmers.

52. The rating for this criterion is satisfactory (5). In giving this rating the PCRV has in particular taken into consideration the achievements on food security.
53. Natural resources, the environment and climate change. The Kenya CPE 2011 was straightforward in concluding that the impact of the project was significant with regard to natural resources and environment even prior to its completion. Some key items identified in the report included: greatly increased tree cover, better water use and efficiency of existing schemes. The report estimated that the measures put in place would greatly improve both the quality and quantity of water in rivers in the region and, in the long run, could contribute to greater efficiency in water use, increased river flows and reduced sedimentation. The report also noted that the enhanced technical and management capacity of KWS and KFS under the GEF grant was also expected to result in improving the integrity of the mount Kenya forest through better natural resource management and biodiversity conservation.
54. This finding is largely confirmed by the PCR and the GEF terminal evaluation. The PCR highlighted that an estimated seven million tree seedlings were planted with an average survival rate of 75 per cent (this translates to 5.25 million seedlings) and that this activity has had a very positive effect on the regeneration of the forest coverage and on reducing the negative effects of climate change. It also noted that the project's school greening programme had instilled the tree planting culture to students, teachers and parents.³³ Also roadside conservation activities had contributed to road maintenance, while avoiding erosion and river siltation. Other important conservation measures mentioned in the PCR included the planting of trees along the rivers to protect riverbanks against soil erosion, forest rehabilitation and the construction of wildlife fences to improve regeneration of the vegetation cover in the forests and promoting the use of efficient energy devices which allowed a reduction in the use of charcoal and firewood by over 400 per cent.
55. The GEF terminal evaluation 2012 observed that "a number of global environmental benefits had already been recorded such as reduction of pressure on forest resources through livelihood diversification and on-farm tree planting; environmental data collection that form baseline for future assessments; conservation of carbon stocks in forest through enhancement of carbon sequestration but that unfortunately many of these benefits and outcomes had not been quantified as adequate environmental monitoring was not yet in place".³⁴
56. The project did not have any specific climate change objectives but it was clearly relevant from a climate change perspective. However the 2012 supervision report stated that, both MKEPP and MKEPP-GEF, needed to characterise the climatic patterns observed during the project period and compare them with longer terms

³² IFAD 2013, Project Completion Report page 38.

³³ The impact is particularly visible in the arid districts where tree planting was not practiced before the project and where many tree nurseries now operate successfully and support hill top rehabilitation and agro-forestry.

³⁴ IFAD, 2012, Terminal Evaluation of IFAD-GEF Project ID 1848, page 8.

records. It went on to note that sweeping statements were being made about climatic change impacts in many of the reports without the necessary evidence. It noted that work was underway to assess carbon sequestration in collaboration with ICRAF within the project area and that a baseline assessment would be developed.³⁵

57. On climate change, the PCR states that considering that each tree can sequester around 12 tons of carbon each year, 5.25 million trees will ensure the oxygen supply of 21 million people. While the PCRV recognizes the potential of carbon sequestration it is not convinced by the rationale behind the claim that this would lead to supply of oxygen for 21 million people as this would depend on the type of trees and the conditions of the soil. However, the PCRV does recognise that the project is likely to have had an impact on climate change and this is also recognised by IFAD who considered it as a best practice in the IFAD's climate change policy approved by the Board in April 2010.
58. Based on the above and the fact that the project had an impact on climate change this criterion is assessed as highly satisfactory (6).
59. Institutions and policies. The project was implemented, by and embedded in, local and national institutions. They were strengthened through the training of staff in key areas such as participatory monitoring and evaluation (M&E), project management and planning, report writing, financial and procurement management, etc. According to the PCR the project made important contributions to strengthening local level institutions such as Focal Development Area Committees, Community Forest Associations, WUAs, and other CBOs in areas such as project management, gender mainstreaming, conflict resolution etc. There were benefits at the district level with improved river basin management capacity at community and district levels through e.g. the deployment of district project coordinators who improved their management skills at all levels and revitalised government support³⁶ and at national level with the enhanced technical and management capacity of KWS and KFS. The PCR stated that "through these local level institutions, the poor had been mobilized and trained to the extent that their voices can be heard and that they are able to establish links with markets and partners".
60. There are some indications in the reports that suggests some challenges however, and they relate to the high staff turn over and resultant low commitment of the PMU (see paragraph 36); the project provided 45 per cent positive contribution to the development of local institutions (see paragraph 47); and that the M&E function in the PMU was faced with various challenges including lack of capacity (see paragraph 82). In terms of policy the project design did not state any particular objectives in this regard.
61. Based on the above the rating for this criterion is moderately satisfactory (4).

C. Other performance criteria

Sustainability

62. The PCR judged the sustainability of project interventions as satisfactory. This assessment was based on the participatory nature of the strategies applied in the project and that the community action plans, reflected felt needs. In addition, the strong ownership of the project by the communities was reflected by the higher than expected contribution by the communities to the project (138 per cent).
63. The PCR furthermore noted that the strong focus on capacity building by the project - of both government staff and community leaders - would help ensure sustainability of the project's achievements.

³⁵ IFAD 2012, Supervision Report, page 4.

³⁶ UNOPS Supervision Missions 2005, 2006, 2007.

64. Furthermore, in the MKEPP Impact Assessment Study of 2012, 58 per cent of the respondents felt that the conservation of riverbanks would continue, 56 per cent of respondents acknowledged increased water flows from conserved springs, Community Forest Associations had been formed to manage the hilltops and energy saving jikos installed in schools had impacted greatly in terms of savings of wood fuel.
65. The project developed a project exit strategy³⁷ that spelt out the role and responsibilities of the various stakeholders once the project was closed and from the PCR it seems that Government line Ministries were committed to sustaining project benefits (e.g. water and community empowerment). For example it was reported in the PCR that officers had adequate resources for follow up trainings for communities and that various Government funds were or had been established (e.g. women enterprise fund, constituency development fund etc.). The community, through their enhanced resource mobilisation skills, would be able to access these funds in order to sustain certain benefits.
66. To ensure the sustainability of the RWUAs and WUAs the Associations were enshrined in law (registered) and MOUs with the Water Resources Management Authority (WRMA) were signed. The PCR noted that some (it only mentions Tungu but there might be more) of the WRUAs were able to source funds from the Water Services Trust Fund (WSTF).
67. The PCR noted that approximately half of the WUAs and WRUAs were still relatively new and more time was required in building their capacity to help them grow and carry out their mandate.)
68. The follow on project will address many of these issues. For example the UTaNRMP has as one of its activities to continue to support the WRUAs.
69. Based on the evidence provided, the sustainability is considered satisfactory (5).

Innovation and scaling up

70. The project was designed as a pilot, from the start, and therefore envisaged the replication and scaling up of successful approaches and innovations. The design identified the participatory approach to river basin management based on empowerment and involvement of water users in decision making and equitable distribution of river flows as an innovation, which at the time it was. The CPE noted that Government was planning to scale up key characteristics of the MKEPP in the eastern region of the country but the PCR does not elaborate further on this. A follow on project has been developed (the Upper Tana Catchment Natural Resource Management Project - UTaNRMP) and is scaling up many of the projects activities such as: river gauging stations, preparation of sub catchment management plans and support to the implementation of already-prepared plans through grants; training of WRUAs and institutional capacity-building of implementing agencies; rainwater harvesting etc. The PCR also states that the school greening programme has been scaled up by the Ministry of education to cover the whole country.³⁸
71. The assessment of this criterion is satisfactory (5).

Gender equality and women's empowerment

72. The loan agreement stated that the borrower should ensure that women were represented in the organization and management of the Project. Furthermore, it foresaw that gender equity considerations were integrated into all project activities during the project implementation period.³⁹

³⁷ Extracts included in PCR annexes.

³⁸ PSR 2013.

³⁹ IFAD 2003, Loan Agreement, page 25.

73. The PCR does not provide a great deal of information specific to gender but notes that the project has had a strong impact on women's empowerment and participation, brought about by continuous sensitization and training on gender mainstreaming (e.g. 4,249 community leaders of which 2,047 women and 246 officers of which 79 were women). The impact assessment stated that the trainings empowered the officers and communities to effectively implement the project with commendable results.⁴⁰
74. According to the PCR, this had an impact on the number of women in leadership positions. The project implemented measures to ensure gender equity which included: 40 per cent of the positions of leadership in all main project committees such as the Focal Development Area Committee were reserved for women; more "on-site" training was held to encourage participation by women as opposed to venues that might have had a negative social reputation such as hotels/lodgings from which women shy away from; etc. At the end of the project, women accounted for 15 per cent of all leadership positions in Focal Development Areas Committees and 48-52 per cent of leadership positions in the project area (compared to 40 per cent before the project).⁴¹
75. The PCR states that 74 per cent of the households interviewed at the end of the project indicated that the gender disparity between men and women had been reduced.⁴² If these figures are correct it is a considerable achievement unfortunately there is little information about how this had been achieved but there are indications that gender was effectively mainstreamed across all activities with high level of participation of women in most activities (e.g. 60 per cent women in Farmer Field Schools).
76. In terms of access to services, the Impact Assessment 2012 stated that of the people who were benefitting directly from water access (149,197), 80,666 were females as opposed to 68,531 males resulting in a reduction of time taken to fetch water (see paragraph 49) and a 39 % improvement in water quality and 32% decline in water related disease incidences attributable to MKEPP intervention. These will in particular have benefitted women and the time saved in fetching water and hospital funds saved were invested in income generating activities. There were also examples of women having been enabled to access and control resources that were previously purely in the domain of men such as beehives and goats and cash crops although it is not known how widespread this was.
77. In terms of economic empowerment the support to poultry production, with a 23 percent adoption rate, is reported as having had substantial impact on poverty reduction in the MKEPP project. More particularly, the direct benefits included improved nutrition at household level, increased incomes from sales of eggs and chicken (see also paragraph 42). This activity was dominated by women and will therefore have benefited them in particular.
78. From the above it is clear that considerable efforts were made in terms of sensitisation and mainstreaming and that this has translated into changes in attitudes and increased opportunities for women in a conservative environment.
79. The assessment of this criterion is satisfactory (5).

D. Performance of partners

80. IFAD. During the project period from 2002-2013 the project was managed by four Country Programme Managers. Prior to IFAD Kenya's office establishment in 2009 the project was supervised by UNOPS with annual IFAD missions. The

⁴⁰ IFAD, 2012, Impact Assessment, page 88.

⁴¹ IFAD, 2013, PCR, page 18.

⁴² IFAD, 2013, PCR, page 45.

replenishment and disbursement of funds appears to have been a major issue and the MTR highlighted that the information flow between the Government of Kenya and IFAD regarding funds released needed to be improved. Post 2009 the IFAD country office played an important role in supervision and implementation of the project. The PCR notes that IFAD provided timely decisions on payment requests and more important aspects such as the reallocation of funds in 2009 and 2011, and the extension of the loan closing date by one year to facilitate the design of up-scaling some activities to other river basins. This PCRV finds the MTR and the supervision reports of high quality.

81. The Impact Assessment Study final report (2012) also noted that IFAD undertook two external supervision missions a year (one implementation support supervision and one follow up) with one of the missions coinciding with the project's annual review workshops, which provided opportunities for the missions to work closely with all stakeholders to identify progress, constraints and perspectives and to facilitate review and approval. The study stated that this activity had been "very successful" though no specific examples were given. According to the GEF Terminal evaluation project managers reported that IFAD supervision and backstopping was extremely useful. However, as mentioned in paragraph 17 the grant and the loan were not implemented as an integrated project. The PCR notes that participation of GEF in supervision and implementation support was weak in that there was no clear mechanism in place for the same but that it relied on IFAD.⁴³
82. Based on the information available the criterion is rated satisfactory (5).
83. Government. The PCR notes that the Government of Kenya participated in the project design, negotiation, loan agreement, implementation, supervision and offering implementation support, undertaking specific studies, Annual performance reviews, auditing and reporting. It also underlined that the government adhered to all the loan covenants including the provision of counterpart funding with its contributions amounting to 140 per cent of the expected amount.
84. The Government set up the project's elaborate, but well-defined, implementation structures at national and district levels (e.g. Project Steering Committee, PMU, District Project Coordination Committee and Divisional Implementing Teams) to facilitate project implementation and provided sectoral staff at each of these levels. There was high staff turnover (attributed to the terms of service) in the PMU with an average of 3.5 years in the project, but it was noted in the PCR that vacancies were quickly filled. The Impact Assessment study (2012) underlined that the project activities were satisfactorily managed. However it was noted that the M&E function in the PMU was faced with various challenges including: lack of capacity in some districts both due to lack of skills and personnel and also to a lack of transport and equipment and also staff turnover. The GOK was, also responsible for delays in the flow of funds that affected the project's cash flows.
85. According to the PCR, the M&E system was found to be "functional and highly participatory". Communities were directly involved in the monitoring of project implementation using a community project diary. While the PCRV recognises that considerable efforts appear to have been invested in M&E, it finds the results are somewhat disappointing. The PCRV recognises the challenges related to M&E of environmental projects where impacts are longer term and where different tools may need to be applied. However, it was found that the reporting was too focused on outputs not unlike many other IFAD projects. In addition, the many log frames and various reports made it challenging to assess the project as it was unclear exactly what the targets were. This is, despite a baseline survey, impact assessment, a terminal evaluation of the GEF grant, supervision reports, RIMS

⁴³ IFAD 2013, PCR, page 57.

surveys, etc.

86. Based on the above the rating is moderately satisfactory (4) one rating below the PCR.

E. Overall project achievements

87. MKEPP was conceived as a pilot project and as such it is overall considered to have been successful. It tested a number of new approaches and achieved important results with respect to efficient use of water resources, reducing forest degradation and enhancing agricultural productivity through soil and water conservation techniques many of which are currently being scaled up by the follow on project. As such this PCR considers that the project has overall contributed to poverty reduction by promoting effective use of natural resources and improved agricultural practices as well as enhanced equitable use of these resources with particular focus on environmental conservation.
88. There were some initial delays but by project completion the project had caught up and most outputs were achieved. Management costs rose in response to changes in the economic environment in the country. Efforts were made to mainstream gender participation in all activities and seems to have been largely achieved. Sustainability –of benefits was ensured by strong involvement of stakeholders and signing MOUs with relevant line ministries (e.g. Water User Associations) and by the follow on project which will help consolidate activities started under MKEPP. The rating for this criterion is moderately satisfactory (5).

IV. Assessment of PCR quality

89. Scope. The PCR scope is uneven. The project is structured around the components and does not directly address several of the evaluation criteria (e.g. impact) which make it challenging to quickly find the information. Additionally, there are some discrepancies in some of the basic financial information (e.g. total actual project costs). In general the PCR could have provided more information and analysis for example on how the WRUAs have improved water flows and quality and the development and status of the RBMPs, especially with reference on how they overcame (or plan to overcome) the issues of differing administrative boundaries to river basin boundaries. The rating is moderately unsatisfactory (3).
90. Quality (methods, data, participatory process). Some quantitative data is included based on the Impact Assessment conducted in 2012 but few attempts have been made to qualify the findings within the project context. There are a number of statements which are not based on evidence. In particular, the effectiveness, the sustainability, and the gender section were found to be weak. Rating is moderately unsatisfactory (3).
91. Lessons. The PCR includes a long list of lessons of varying degrees of quality. Some appear to state project successes rather than how a certain lesson can be replicated or applied in future interventions. The rating is moderately satisfactory (4).
92. Candour. The PCR is far more positive than the GEF Terminal Evaluation which gives cause for reflection. While it is recognised that the GEF project covered different activities there is some overlap with the loan. Few problems are discussed and based on the triangulation with other sources of information (e.g. CPE, the Impact Assessment) the PCR. The rating for this criteria is (3) moderately satisfactory.

V. Final remarks

Lessons learned

93. The project suffered from having more than one log frame (including in some cases a separate log frame for the GEF activities). This had caused some confusion for project staff (and evaluators). In addition, the project's specific objectives - as delineated in the Report and Recommendation of the President (2002) - were not in the log frame annexes or in future project documents. This has led the project to focus on components and lose track of the overall objectives that the project sought to achieve.
94. Carrying out projects using an eco-system based delineation that does not mirror administrative boundaries was an issue that complicated the work.

Rating comparison

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>PMD rating^a</i>	<i>IOE rating^a</i>	<i>Net rating disconnect (IOE PCRVR – PMD)</i>
Project performance			
Relevance	6	5	-1
Effectiveness	5	5	
Efficiency	5	4	-1
Project performance^b	5.3	4.6	0.7
Rural poverty impact			
Household income and assets	5	5	
Human and social capital and empowerment	6	6	
Food security and agricultural productivity	5	5	
Natural resources, environment and climate change	6	6	
Institutions and policies	5	4	-1
Rural poverty impact^c	5	5	
Other performance criteria			
Sustainability	5	5	
Innovation and scaling up	5	5	
Gender equality and women's empowerment	5	5	
Overall project achievement^d	5	5	
Performance of partners^e			
IFAD	6	5	-1
Government	5	4	-1
Average net disconnect			-0.38

<i>Ratings of the PCR document quality</i>	<i>PMD rating</i>	<i>IOE PCRVR rating</i>	<i>Net disconnect</i>
Scope	4	3	-1
Quality (methods, data, participatory process)	5	3	-2
Lessons	6	4	-2
Candour	5	3	-2
Overall rating of PCR		3	

^a Rating scale: 1 = highly unsatisfactory; 2 = unsatisfactory; 3 = moderately unsatisfactory; 4 = moderately satisfactory; 5 = satisfactory; 6 = highly satisfactory; n.p. = not provided; n.a. = not applicable.

^b Arithmetic average of ratings for relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.

^c This is not an average of ratings of individual impact domains.

^d This is not an average of ratings of individual evaluation criteria but an overarching assessment of the project, drawing upon the rating for relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, rural poverty impact, sustainability, innovation and scaling up, and gender.

^e The rating for partners' performance is not a component of the overall assessment ratings.

Definition of the evaluation criteria used by IOE

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Definition^a</i>
Project performance	
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, institutional priorities and partner and donor policies. It also entails an assessment of project design in achieving its objectives.
Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted into results.
Rural poverty impact^b	Impact is defined as the changes that have occurred or are expected to occur in the lives of the rural poor (whether positive or negative, direct or indirect, intended or unintended) as a result of development interventions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Household income and assets 	Household income provides a means of assessing the flow of economic benefits accruing to an individual or group, whereas assets relate to a stock of accumulated items of economic value.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human and social capital and empowerment 	Human and social capital and empowerment include an assessment of the changes that have occurred in the empowerment of individuals, the quality of grassroots organizations and institutions, and the poor's individual and collective capacity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food security and agricultural productivity 	Changes in food security relate to availability, access to food and stability of access, whereas changes in agricultural productivity are measured in terms of yields.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural resources, environment and climate change 	The focus on natural resources and the environment involves assessing the extent to which a project contributes to changes in the protection, rehabilitation or depletion of natural resources and the environment as well as in mitigating the negative impact of climate change or promoting adaptation measures.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutions and policies 	The criterion relating to institutions and policies is designed to assess changes in the quality and performance of institutions, policies and the regulatory framework that influence the lives of the poor.
Other performance criteria	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability 	The likely continuation of net benefits from a development intervention beyond the phase of external funding support. It also includes an assessment of the likelihood that actual and anticipated results will be resilient to risks beyond the project's life.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Innovation and scaling up 	The extent to which IFAD development interventions have: (i) introduced innovative approaches to rural poverty reduction; and (ii) the extent to which these interventions have been (or are likely to be) replicated and scaled up by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector and others agencies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender equality and women's empowerment 	The criterion assesses the efforts made to promote gender equality and women's empowerment in the design, implementation, supervision and implementation support, and evaluation of IFAD-assisted projects.
Overall project achievement	This provides an overarching assessment of the project, drawing upon the analysis made under the various evaluation criteria cited above.
Performance of partners	This criterion assesses the contribution of partners to project design, execution, monitoring and reporting, supervision and implementation support, and evaluation. It also assesses the performance of individual partners against their expected role and responsibilities in the project life cycle.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IFAD Government 	

^a These definitions have been taken from the OECD/DAC *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management* and from the IFAD Evaluation Manual (2009).

^b The IFAD Evaluation Manual also deals with the 'lack of intervention', that is, no specific intervention may have been foreseen or intended with respect to one or more of the five impact domains. In spite of this, if positive or negative changes are detected and can be attributed in whole or in part to the project, a rating should be assigned to the particular impact domain. On the other hand, if no changes are detected and no intervention was foreseen or intended, then no rating (or the mention 'not applicable') is assigned.

Bibliography

GEF (2012): Terminal Evaluation Report

IFAD (2002): OSC Minutes – Mount Kenya East Pilot project for Land Use and Water Management of July 23

_____ (2002): Report and Recommendation to the President

_____ (2003): Loan Agreement

_____ (2009): Mid-term Review Report

_____ (2010): Supervision Report

_____ (2011): Country Programme Evaluation - Kenya

_____ (2012): Impact Assessment Study Report

_____ (2012): Supervision Report

_____ (2013): Project Completion Report