

## SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	Saku Accountability Forum (SAF)
<b>Project Title:</b>	<i>Bridging the Gap: Promoting the Integrity of Mt. Marsabit Forest Ecosystem through Community-Based Advocacy around Environment Safeguards</i>
<b>Project Identifier:</b>	SG7 2015-98 SAF
<b>Date of Report:</b>	25th August 2016
<b>Report Author and Contact Information</b>	Mr. James Forole JARSO <i>Project Coordinator</i> Tel. +254-70-864-8005 Email (Primary): <a href="mailto:jarso.forole@gmail.com">jarso.forole@gmail.com</a> Email (Secondary): <a href="mailto:forole2000@yahoo.com">forole2000@yahoo.com</a>

<b>CEPF Region:</b>	Eastern Afromontane Biodiversity Hotspot
<b>Strategic Direction:</b>	Strategic Direction 2 – To improve the protection and management of the network of KBAs throughout the hotspot
<b>Investment Priority:</b>	Investment Priority 2.2 – To support the role of civil society organizations in the application of site safeguard policies and procedures, including the strengthening of environmental impact assessment implementation in order to address ongoing and emerging threats to priority KBAs, including freshwater KBAs
<b>Grant Amount:</b>	USD 10,000
<b>Project Dates:</b>	1st September 2015 – 31st May 2016

### **Implementation Partners for this Project:**

Throughout the project cycle, we placed a high premium on stakeholder participation in project cycle management (PCM), on the belief that this is critical to the sustainability of the project and its results. Accordingly, in implementing the project, we worked with a host of partners, who were fully involved in management of the entire project cycle (Furthermore, these partners were earlier involved in formulation of the project itself):

- 20 representatives of two forest-adjacent communities (FACs) in Jaldesa and Songa locations led the advocacy activities and participated in the routine progress monitoring and end-term review. Earlier, they participated in the awareness-raising and visioning forum (inception meeting), where participants developed a joint vision for the project.

- *10 local agents of accountability (LAAs)<sup>1</sup> participated in the inception meeting and the routine progress monitoring and end-term review. More importantly, they participated in a collaborative investigative study that unearthed the adverse environmental, health, social economic and other impacts of the Badasa Dam Project. The LAAs were engaged under the auspices of Marsabit Indigenous Organizations Network (MIO-Net), a collaborative entity that brings together some 14 indigenous LAAs.*
- *Two local community radios (Sifa FM 101.1 and Star FM 87.9) were instrumental in mobilizing participants for various project activities.*
- *We also partnered with the local government administrators (locational chiefs and ward administrators), CSO field staff and local religious leaders to broadly mobilize the targeted FACs for planned project activities.*
- *10 representatives of the local Environment Management Committees (EMCs) (in Jaldesa and Songa locations) participated in the inception meeting, routine progress monitoring and end-term review. Indeed, some were trained as community-based paralegals, and acted as the nerve of the project's location-level community actions.*

The project initially envisaged working with various partners within the Government, including: the National Water Conservation and Pipeline Corporation (NWPC), the County Directorate of Environment (CDE), the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), the Kenya Forest Service (KFS) and the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS). However, this was not possible as the targeted officers from these institutions were unresponsive. Our analysis revealed that the lack of response from these officers was largely due to the high-level political sensitivity of the Badasa Dam Project, around which our project was grounded.

Be that as it may, following one-on-one lobby by the project team, two officers from NEMA and KFS have expressed support for our initiative.<sup>2</sup> Though coming at the last minute in the life of the project, this development is highly welcome; we intend to leverage on the same as we envisage rolling out another phase of the project.<sup>3</sup>

## CONSERVATION IMPACTS

### Contribution of the Project to Implementation of the CEPF Ecosystem Profile

Since 2008, the government (through NWPC) has been implementing the Badassa Dam Project, a Vision 2030 flagship mega water project intended to address the perennial water problems in Marsabit Town and its environs. From the onset, the project has posed serious threats to the life and integrity of the fragile Mt. Marsabit KBA; it's implementation has already seen over 53 hectares of vegetation cover cleared to pave way for construction of a water reservoir, dam, access road, treatment works, pump houses and rising main pipeline and storage tanks. To make matters worse, environment safeguards have been sacrificed at the altar of convenience; though NWPC commissioned an environmental impact assessment, the culminating report (approved by NEMA, albeit without public input) is yet to be implemented.

---

<sup>1</sup> Local agents of accountability (LAAs) refer to non-state actors that work with local citizens to hold the government accountable. They include non-governmental organisations (NGOs), community-based organisations (CBOs) and faith-based organisations (FBOs).

<sup>2</sup> The identity of these officers will not be disclosed, for reasons related to their personal safety (Indeed, they have asked to remain anonymous for all purposes and intents).

<sup>3</sup> We expect construction of the dam to resume late this year or early next year (going by indications from the Cabinet Secretary for Water and Irrigation). This will give us (and the local FACs) a very good opportunity to engage the relevant duty-bearers (The project did not "pinch" the duty-bearers as construction of the dam had stalled, and "they had nothing to lose"). The next phase of the project will see the targeted FACs engaging in advocacy demanding for improved implementation and enforcement of safeguards relating to construction of the dam. We expect this to bear more tangible fruits, compared to the period when we implemented this project (when the construction stalled).

The project responded to this commanding threat to the KBA; it promoted community-based advocacy around implementation and enforcement of safeguards relating to construction of the dam. This has been achieved through empowerment of the targeted FACs on the framework for environment safeguards, improvement of the FACs' organisational capacity and facilitation of community engagements with relevant duty-bearers. Undoubtedly, this is a contribution to implementation of the CEPF Ecosystem Profile.

Throughout the life of this project, construction of the dam had stalled (This was not attributable to the project in any way). Accordingly, the project focused on empowering the targeted FACs in readiness for resumption of construction – to demand improved implementation and enforcement of safeguards upon resumption.

**Summary of Overall Results/Impacts of the Project (against the expected results detailed in the approved Proposal)**

Expected Results	Actual Results
<p><b>Long-term Impact (Overall Objective):</b> Improved integrity and sustainability of Mt. Marsabit Forest Ecosystem</p>	<p>Construction of the dam stalled during the project period.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, we focused on empowering the targeted FACs for monitoring and advocacy aimed at securing improved implementation and enforcement of safeguards should construction of the dam resume.</p> <p>As at the time of closing the project, there were indications that construction of the dam would resume soon.<sup>5</sup> In the event this becomes the case, we are confident that the FACs and other local stakeholders are ready to ensure that environment safeguards are well implemented and monitored. They are aware of the framework for environment safeguards, and have also acquired basic monitoring and advocacy skills. Unlike before the project, they can now conduct monitoring and advocacy on their own.</p>
<p><b>Short-term Impacts (Project Objectives):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sustained civic engagement around implementation and enforcement of environmental safeguards in the KBA</li> <li>2. Improved governmental responsiveness, transparency and accountability in implementation and enforcement of environmental safeguards in the KBA</li> </ol>	<p>Though construction of the dam stalled, the FACs engaged with relevant duty-bearers (NWCP, NEMA, CDE); they presented a petition demanding improved implementation and monitoring of safeguards should construction resume. Unfortunately, the target duty-bearers are yet to respond.</p> <p>As we close the project, SAF will spearhead follow-ups on the petition. The FACs too are well prepared to be able to continue engaging with NWCP and other relevant government authorities; the location-level advocacy groups are committed to working hand-in-hand with the community-based paralegals to ensure conservation of the forest.</p> <p>The project faced resistance from relevant authorities, who refused to respond to our request for information (EIA report/licence) and the FACs' petition. However, towards the end, critical inroads were made; two officers from NEMA and KFS (identities withheld) have pledged to support us by providing information that can help our advocacy efforts. We intend to leverage this development in the envisaged next phase of the project.</p>

<sup>4</sup> The project reportedly stalled due to a dispute between NWCP and the Contractor (Midroc Construction Co. Ltd.).

<sup>5</sup> Going by communications from the Cabinet Secretary for Water and Irrigation, there are indications that construction would resume soon, possibly towards the end of the year or early next year.

<p>3. Sustained performance of the Grantee to effectively manage the project for the intended results, and to sustain the results well beyond the funding period</p>	<p>The project generated mixed results; though it saw enhanced (and sustained) engagements by the FACs, it failed to secure responsiveness, transparency and accountability on the part of relevant government authorities (NWC, NEMA, CDE).</p> <p>To address the hitch, we embraced course-correction as a mitigation measure; we resorted to one-on-one lobby of individual government officers. As at the close of the Project, we had secured personal support from two KFS and NEMA officers, who have indicated readiness to provide us with relevant documentary evidence to support advocacy. We remain committed to sustaining this critical result, as we envisage rolling out another phase of the project.</p>
--	---

**Hectares Protected:** N/A

**Species Conserved:** N/A

**Corridors Created:** N/A

**Successes of the Project toward achieving its Objectives**

Though it failed to secure the desired long-term impact, the project registered remarkable success toward achieving its immediate and short-term impacts:

- Throughout its life, the project enhanced and sustained civic engagement around implementation and enforcement of environment safeguards in the KBA, with particular emphasis on safeguards relating to construction of Badassa Dam. Achievement of this short-term impact is attributable to the following key Outputs generated by the project:
  - *Civic awareness on the framework for environment safeguards raised* – About 1,846 members of FACs in the two targeted locations (1,086 men, 760 women), approximately 30% of the total population of the targeted FACs, were directly empowered on the framework for environment safeguards (with specific reference to safeguards relating to construction of the dam), as well as general respect for the environment and ecosystem services provided by the forest.
  - *Organizational capacity of FACs built* – The two targeted FACs were successfully mobilized, educated and organized to effectively engage with duty-bearers on matters relating to implementation and enforcement of environment safeguards relating to the construction of the dam. Two (2) location-level advocacy groups were established and operationalized to spearhead community-level monitoring and advocacy around implementation and enforcement of the safeguards. Also, 20 members of location-level advocacy groups were empowered on basic skills in monitoring and advocacy around project-related safeguards.
- In addition, throughout the project cycle, the Grantee ensured sustained performance for effective management of the project for the intended results, with specific focus on the need to sustain the results well beyond the CEPF funding. This critical short-term impact is attributable to the following Outputs generated by the project:
  - *Enhanced efficiency and effectiveness to ensure participatory results-based PCM* – Throughout the project cycle, we remained committed to ensuring efficiency and effectiveness in directing and managing the Project for the intended results, as evidenced by adherence to the project budget and implementation plan. We particularly ensured that project activities were implemented as planned and stakeholders participated in the project. In total, over 80 individuals representing various stakeholders (including representatives of the targeted beneficiary FACs and LAAs) participated in various PCM processes, including implementation monitoring and end-term review.

- *Sustained accountability in managing the Project and its resources* – Throughout the project cycle, we remained committed to ensuring accountability in managing the project and its resources. Comprehensive financial reports were prepared to account for every penny used. More importantly, progress in implementing the Project was routinely communicated to all relevant stakeholders.
- *Effective support for project administration and personnel* – Throughout the project cycle, we provided adequate administrative and logistical support for implementation of the project. This saw the planned activities implemented in a timely and successful manner.
- Further, in the hope of improving governmental responsiveness, transparency and accountability in implementation and enforcement of environmental safeguards in the KBA – *a short-term impact that was never realized* – the project successfully generated the following Output-level results:
  - *Increased community-level monitoring and advocacy around implementation and enforcement of environmental safeguards* – Though construction of the dam stalled, the targeted FACs engaged with relevant authorities (NWCP, NEMA, CDE); with the support of the community-based paralegals, they presented a petition demanding improved implementation and monitoring of safeguards should construction resume. Unfortunately, the authorities are yet to respond.
  - *Strategic partnership nurtured* – We established a strategic working relationship with MIO-Net to promote the project's cause. We particularly capitalized on our membership to put the project on the Network's agenda. The Network responded by initiating an independent study to establish the impacts of construction of the dam.<sup>6</sup> We believe that the partnership, with a growing convening power, holds immense potential to amplify the FACs' voice. As we close the project, we remain committed to sustaining this partnership and pursuing even more mutually beneficial partnerships to promote conservation needs in the KBA.

### **Challenges of the Project toward achieving its objectives**

Overall, the project is not likely to achieve the desired long-term impact – *improved integrity and sustainability of the fragile forest ecosystem*. It suffices to note that achievement of this overall objective (goal) was dependent on achievement of the lower-level short-term impacts – on one hand, *sustained civic engagement around implementation and enforcement of environmental safeguards in the KBA*, and, on the other hand, *improved governmental responsiveness, transparency and accountability in implementation and enforcement of the safeguards*. While remarkable progress was made in stimulating and sustaining engagements by the targeted FACs, the project did generate any tangible result in respect of the latter objective. In a nutshell, there was alarmingly poor responsiveness and lack of transparency and accountability on the part of the targeted duty-bearers, save for some last-minute individualized responses from KFS and NEMA officers. From our analysis, the problem is attributable to the high-level political influence around the (dam) project, right through the government hierarchy. Be that as it may, the FACs will not relent in their demand for improve implementation of the safeguards, and are committed to sustaining the demand in the post-project period.

The project also encountered the following additional challenges, which slowed down generation of the intended results (impacts):

- *Fear of intimidation among officers from partner LAAs, which has indefinitely delayed adoption of the collaborative investigative report (by MIO-Net).*

---

<sup>6</sup> This report is different from the EIA report for the dam; while the EIA report outlines the potential impacts of construction of the dam, the MIO-Net report unearthed the actual impacts of the dam project. We intend to use the (MIO-Net) report in our future advocacy work on the dam project.

- *Apathy among members of the targeted FACs, as a result of frustrations by the poor responsiveness on the part of duty-bearers, as well as past experiences of frustrations, intimidations and attacks against local environmental activists. This saw some members of the FACs backtracking on their commitments to support the cause of the project. However, this did not, in any way, derail the community-led advocacy agenda.*

### **Unexpected Impacts of the Project**

The project generated the following unexpected positive impacts:

- *The project awakened interest among local CSOs. For instance, immediately after the inception meeting, MIO-Net readily took up the project's cause as one of its action points and commissioned a field assessment to establish the adverse impacts of the dam project, including ecological impacts. Unfortunately, the report is yet to be officially adopted, over six months after the field assessment.*
- *Though targeted duty-bearers have generally remained unresponsive to engagements by the beneficiary FACs, some individual KFS and NEMA officers have expressed individual buy-in to support advocacy around implementation and enforcement of environment safeguards relating to construction of the dam. Undoubtedly, though coming at the last minute in the project's life, this is a welcome development that can be leveraged on as we envisage re-launching the project with revamped implementation strategies.*

### **LESSONS LEARNED**

***Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building. Consider lessons that would inform projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.***

In the course of implementing the project, we learnt the following critical lessons, which would inform the design and implementation of similar conservation projects (by our organization and others alike):

- *Communities can do much on their own; all they need is facilitation to effectively engage with duty-bearers. This lesson came to the fore in light of successes registered in facilitating community-level monitoring and advocacy activities.*
- *The project design should not underestimate the influence of any stakeholder group on the project. This lesson was learnt in light of the poor reception by relevant authorities and the attendant failure of the project to realise the desired result (responsiveness).*
- *A project is basically a mosaic of inter-twinned and interrelated activities. Consequently, realization of desired objectives would turn on the successful implementation of all (or most of) the planned activities.*
- *Open community education forums yield higher results (in terms of capacity-building) as compared to formal workshops. In the course of implementing the project, we experienced higher multiplier effects in utilizing the open forums, as opposed to a scenario where we would have utilized closed (targeted) workshops.*
- *Commercialization of capacity-building stands out as a huge threat to civic empowerment and engagement – we came across several instances where members of the targeted FACs demanded cash (and related) payments in return for their participation in project activities, including education and awareness-raising forums.*
- *"Travelling conferences" (which blend music and theatre performances) attract more sizeable audiences than traditional civic education and awareness-raising strategies. Further, they yield higher multiplier effects.*



**Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings)**

The following aspects of project design contributed to the success of the project in achieving the bulk of its short-term objectives:

- *The project design was simple and clear, hence easy to follow and implement. In particular, the deliverables (results) were well-articulated.*
- *In formulating the project, we appreciated that design and implementation of the Project would require the active support of stakeholders. Accordingly, we made sure that relevant stakeholders (including the targeted beneficiary FACs) were involved in the design of the project. This nurtured a sense of ownership from the onset.*

Meanwhile, the following aspects of project design contributed to the shortcomings of the project in generating the desired results:

- *The project design underestimated the influence of duty-bearers on generation of the desired results.*
- *The short lifespan of the project affected generation of results – the project did not benefit much from the course-correction measures adopted (late in the project cycle).*

**Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)**

The following aspects of project execution contributed to the success of the project in generating the reported results:

- *Prior to commencing implementation of the project, we convened an inception forum, where we raised awareness about the project (and its objectives), validated the Project proposal and plan, and developed a joint vision with participating stakeholders.*
- *In implementing the project, we ensured active participation of relevant stakeholders. This nurtured a sense of ownership of the project (and its results).*
- *Further, in implementing the project, we took account of the need to ensure the targeted beneficiary FACs experience benefits beyond the funding period. Accordingly, our PCM approach put focus on how to create sustainable benefits (at Outcome level) rather than how to provide and deliver services (at Output level).*

**Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:**

Nil

**ADDITIONAL FUNDING**

**Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.**

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
SAF	B (in-kind contribution)	USD 15,850	Breakdown of Contribution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff time (voluntary work) (Project Coordination, USD 1,000/month = USD 9,000; Project Accountant, USD 450/month = USD 4,050)</li> <li>• Office space, rent (USD 200/month = USD 1,800)</li> <li>• ICT equipment (USD 1,000)</li> </ul>

\* Additional funding should be reported using the following categories: A – Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project); B – Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project); C – Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project)

**SUSTAINABILITY/REPLICABILITY**

Throughout the project cycle, we remained committed to ensuring sustainability of the project and its results well beyond the CEPF funding. In implementing the project, we ensured active participation of all relevant stakeholders (particularly the targeted FACs) in PCM. This desirably nurtured and sustained stakeholder ownership of the project and its results. As we enter the post-completion phase, we will maintain meaningful interactions with the FACs, and engage them in ways that will draw upon their perspectives and strengthen their capacities to engage around issues relating to environment safeguards in the KBA in the longer term.

To particularly make post-completion sustainability a reality, we established (and will continually empower) community-level advocacy groups to spearhead monitoring and advocacy activities beyond the life of the project. The structures will be run with the facilitation of the volunteer community animators (paralegals), who were recruited and trained through the project. Further, we will integrate post-completion follow-up interaction, capacity-building and monitoring in all our (relevant) future projects/programs. At the moment, we are exploring avenues for re-launching the project to meet the unmet objectives.

**SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENT**

The project did not involve any activities that were/are likely to have adverse impacts on the environment. Neither did it involve any activities that were/are likely to have adverse social impacts on the local communities. In fact, the project was particularly intended to advance environmental and social objectives of benefit to the targeted local communities. Accordingly, there was no need for any special environmental and social safeguard actions.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

We further recommend that the RIT should explore the feasibility of organizing the following events to enhance the quality of Project implementation by Grantees:

- *A pre-implementation induction meeting for project focal persons (technical and financial), to introduce them to the CEPF project management system, with particular emphasis on progress and financial reporting.*
- *A review meeting bringing together CEPF staff and Grantees' focal persons, to review progress in implementing funding projects and share experiences. If the meeting is to benefit Grantees, it should be held during the life of projects (preferably mid-term).*

**Information Sharing and CEPF Policy**

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

**Please include your full contact details below:**

<b>Name:</b>	Mr. James Forole JARSO
<b>Organization Name:</b>	Saku Accountability Forum (SAF)
<b>Mailing Address:</b>	P.O. Box 265, 60500 Marsabit, Kenya
<b>Telephone:</b>	+254-70-864-8005
<b>Email:</b>	PRIMARY: jarso.forole@gmail.com SECONDARY: forole2000@yahoo.com

**\*\*\*please complete the tables on the following pages\*\*\***



<b>Performance Tracking Report Addendum</b>			
<b>Project Results</b>	<b>Is this question relevant?</b>	<b>If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved for project from inception of CEPF support to date</b>	<b>Describe the principal results achieved during project period (Attach annexes if necessary)</b>
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	NO		
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	NO		
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	NO		
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	NO		
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	NO		

**If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table.**

**Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities**

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

Name of Community	Community Characteristics							Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit															
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	Increased Income due to:					Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of colonization, etc.	Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc)	More secure sources of energy	Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or credit	Improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental management	More participatory decision-making due to strengthened civil society and governance	Other	
									Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services										
<b>Total</b>																							

If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit