

## Annex 2: Project Design Matrix (PDM)

Project Title: Intensified Social Forestry Project in Semi-arid Areas  
 Target Groups: KFS extension staff, Farmers in Kitui, Mbeere and Tharaka Districts.  
 Target Area: Kitui, Mbeere and Tharaka Districts as the intensive areas of field activities and the other semi-arid areas.  
 Duration: 29 March 2004 - 28 March 2009

Ver. No. 2

Date: 16th May 2006

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators For 2014	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p><b>Overall Goal</b>.....</p> <p>Living standards of the people in semi-arid areas are improved while enhancing sustainable environmental conservation.</p>	<p>1.1. By 2014, agricultural contribution to household income in semi-arid areas is improved by 1 % through the use and sale of social forestry products compared to year 2004 level.</p> <p>1.2. By 2014, accessible sustainable wood production related to farmlands is predicted to increase by 3 % compared to year 2004 level.</p>	<p>Kenya Forestry Master Plan, District Development Plans or equivalent report.</p>	<p>- No drastic negative changes in Kenya's socio-economic condition occur.</p>
<p><b>Project Purpose</b>.....</p> <p>Individual farmers, farmer groups and other stakeholders intensify social forestry practices in semi-arid areas.</p>	<p><b>By Mar. 2009</b></p> <p>1. Data noted below shows the increase by 2009 compared to 2004 in Kitui, Mbeere and Tharaka District among target group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i ) Number of tree seedlings annually produced on farm. : 50%</li> <li>ii ) Number of trees annually planted on farm. : 50%</li> <li>iii ) Number of individual farmers and farmer groups who introduced highly marketable tree species for seedling production or tree planting on farm at least one species: 50%</li> <li>iv ) Number of individual farmers and farmer groups who newly implement social forestry activities. : 70%</li> </ul> <p>2. Data noted below shows the increase by 2009 compared to 2004 in Kitui, Mbeere and Tharaka District in surrounding area of target group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i ) Number of tree seedlings annually produced on farm. : 5%</li> <li>ii ) Number of trees annually planted on farm. : 5%</li> <li>iii ) Number of individual farmers and farmer groups who introduced highly marketable tree species for seedling production or tree planting on farm at least one species: 5%</li> <li>iv ) Number of individual farmers and farmer groups who newly implement social forestry activities. : 5%</li> </ul> <p>3. Planning on social forestry extension is promoted in 10 districts in semi-arid areas.</p>	<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation Report</p>	<p>- No drastic price reduction in social forestry products occur</p>

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p><b>Outputs</b></p> <p><b>At the headquarters level</b></p> <p>1. Institutional and technical capacities for social forestry extension in Forest Department are strengthened.</p> <p><b>In Kitui, Mbeere and Tharaka districts</b></p> <p>2. Social forestry extension activities among individual farmers and farmer groups are promoted.</p>	<p><b>At the headquarters level</b></p> <p>1.1. By March 2009, Policy and planning for forestry development is elaborated.</p> <p>1.2. By March 2009, Implementation plan on social forestry extension is prepared, piloted and improved in 10 districts in semi-arid area.</p> <p>1.3. By March 2009, a functional unit for social forestry extension planning, monitoring and evaluation is established at KFS.</p> <p><b>In Kitui, Mbeere and Tharaka districts</b></p> <p>2.1. By March 2009, 60 % of individual farmers who participated in the project apply social forestry practiced by groups to their own farms.</p> <p>2.2. By March 2009, 120 farmer groups are involved in social forestry related group network.</p> <p>2.3. By March 2009, 150 farmers groups are facilitated by farmers in the area.</p> <p>2.4. By March 2009, 7,500 farmers attend field days conducted by farmer groups participated in the project.</p> <p>2.5. By March 2009, 70 % of farmers who participated in the project appreciate the project extension model.</p> <p>2.6. By March 2009, 60 % of KFS extension staff involved in the project implementation are recognized as qualified farm forestry FFS facilitators.</p> <p>2.7 By March 2009, 120 farmers groups are facilitated by KFS extension staff in the area.</p> <p>3.1. By March 2009, 50% of farmers who participated in the project implemented new techniques learned through the project in their own farms.</p> <p>3.2. By March 2009, 70% of farmers who participated in the project appreciate knowledge and techniques provided by the project.</p> <p><b>In semi-arid areas</b></p> <p>4.1. By March 2009, number of stakeholders, who are aware of information on social forestry extension, is increased by 5 % compared to 2004 level.</p> <p>4.2. By March 2009, 4,000 people visit the project website.</p>	<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation Report</p> <p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation Report</p> <p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation Report</p>	<p>- No catastrophic climatic condition occur.</p> <p>- Kenyan governmental forestry development policy and plans remain consistently positive.</p>
<p>3. Farmers and other stakeholders obtain enough practical knowledge and techniques.</p> <p><b>In semi-arid areas</b></p> <p>4. Information on social forestry extension and related issues is shared among the stakeholders.</p>			

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p><b>Activities:</b></p> <p>0.1 Hold joint steering committee meetings.</p> <p>0.2 Carry out baseline survey for project purpose.</p> <p>0.3 Monitor project purpose.</p> <p><b>At the headquarters level</b></p> <p>1.1. Assist institutional strengthening in KFS</p> <p>1.2. Carry out baseline survey for situation analysis.</p> <p>1.3. Prepare practical guidelines for planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>1.4. Conduct training for KFS staff</p> <p>1.5. Monitor extent of institutional and technical strengthening.</p> <p><b>In Kitui, Mbeere and Tharaka districts</b></p> <p>2.1. Carry out baseline survey for situation analysis.</p> <p>2.2. Improve extension staff's activities.</p> <p>2.3. Facilitate planning, implementation and evaluation of social forestry and related activities with individual farmers and farmer groups initiatives.</p> <p>2.4. Facilitate farmer to farmer extension.</p> <p>2.5. Facilitate network among farmer groups.</p> <p>2.6. Monitor extent of the promotion of social forestry extension activities.</p> <p>3.1. Carry out baseline survey for situation analysis.</p> <p>3.2. Identify useful local forestry related knowledge and develop farmers friendly techniques.</p> <p>3.3. Develop the technical manuals.</p> <p>3.4. Provide technical assistance for diverse needs of individual farmers, farmer groups and other stakeholders.</p> <p>3.5. Maintain and improve Tiva demonstration plot.</p> <p>3.6. Identify and assess usefull social forestry related techniques and establish/identify field demonstration site.</p> <p>3.7. Undertake cross visits among individual farmers and farmer groups.</p> <p>3.8. Monitor the extent of adoption of practical knowledge and techniques.</p> <p><b>In semi-arid areas</b></p> <p>4.1. Carry out baseline survey for situation analysis.</p> <p>4.2. Diversify methods for information sharing.</p> <p>4.3. Hold workshops and seminars.</p> <p>4.4. Identify potential marketing incentives for social forestry products and services.</p> <p>4.5. Monitor extent of information sharing.</p>	<p><b>Inputs</b></p> <p>&lt;Kenya Side&gt;</p> <p>1. Counterpart/Administrative personnel</p> <p>1.1. Project Director: Director, KFS</p> <p>1.2. Project Co-Director: Director, KEFRI</p> <p>1.3. Project Manager: Project Coordinator, KFS</p> <p>1.4. Project Co-Manager: Kitui Centre Director, KEFRI</p> <p>1.5. KFS headquarters</p> <p>1.5.1. Assistant Project Manager-Extension: an official, KFS</p> <p>1.6. Kitui District</p> <p>1.6.1. Field Manager: District Forest Officer (DFO), KFS</p> <p>1.6.2. Field Extension Officers: District Forest Extension Officers (DFEOs), KFS</p> <p>1.6.3. Field/Nursery Assistants, KFS</p> <p>1.6.4. Project Research Assistant: Research officer, Kitui Centre, KEFRI</p> <p>1.7. Mbeere District</p> <p>1.7.1. Field Manager: DFO, KFS</p> <p>1.7.2. Field Extension Officers: DFEOs, KFS</p> <p>1.7.3. Field/Nursery Assistants, KFS</p> <p>1.8. Tharaka District</p> <p>1.8.1. Field Manager: DFO, KFS</p> <p>1.8.2. Field Extension Officers: DFEOs, KFS</p> <p>1.8.3. Field/Nursery Assistants, KFS</p> <p>1.9. Supporting Staff:</p> <p>1.9.1. Administrative Staff</p> <p>1.9.2. Secretaries</p> <p>1.9.3. Drivers</p> <p>2. Land and Facilities</p> <p>2.1. Land and office facilities for project head office in KFS headquarters</p> <p>2.2. Land and office facilities for project field office in Kitui</p> <p>2.3. Land and office facilities for project field office in Mbeere</p> <p>2.4. Land and office facilities for project field office in Tharaka</p> <p>2.5. Training facilities in KEFRI headquarters</p> <p>2.6. Training facilities in KEFRI Kitui Centre</p> <p>2.7. Land for demonstration plot in Tiva Pilot Forest, Kitui</p> <p>2.8. Nursery facilities in KEFRI Tiva Pilot Forest and Kitui Centre</p> <p>2.9. KFS field nurseries in Kitui, Mbeere and Tharaka districts.</p> <p>3. Administrative and Operational Cost</p>	<p>&lt;Japanese Side&gt;</p> <p>1. Personnel</p> <p>1.1. Long-term experts</p> <p>1.1.1. Chief Advisor/Forest Policy</p> <p>1.1.2. Coordinator/Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</p> <p>1.1.3. Social Forestry Extension</p> <p>* Number and fields of the long-term experts may be revised after the Mid-term Review.</p> <p>1.2. Short-term Experts</p> <p>* Short-term experts will be dispatched upon the necessity.</p> <p>2. Counterpart Training</p> <p>* Training opportunities in Japan and/or the third countries for 1 to 2 counterpart(s) will be provided every year.</p> <p>3. Machinery, Equipment and Materials</p> <p>3.1. Equipment for social forestry extension</p> <p>3.2. Equipment for social forestry training</p> <p>3.3. Equipment for social forestry research</p> <p>3.4. Equipment for information sharing</p> <p>3.5. Vehicles</p> <p>3.6. Other necessary machinery, equipment and materials for the implementation of the project</p> <p>4. Infrastructures</p> <p>4.1. Renovation of project head office space in KFS headquarters</p> <p>4.2. Expansion of project field office in Kitui</p> <p>4.3. Expansion of project field office in Mbeere</p> <p>4.4. Expansion of project field office in Tharaka</p> <p>4.5. Rehabilitation of field nurseries in Kitui, Mbeere, Tharaka districts</p> <p>5. Supplementary budget for local expenditure</p>	<p>- Road condition in Kitui, Mbeere and Tharaka districts remains motorable.</p> <p>- Trained staff remain available.</p> <p>- No catastrophic climatic condition occur.</p> <p>Pre-Condition</p> <p>- Farmers in Kitui, Mbeere and Tharaka districts are willing to participate in social forestry activities.</p>

Annex3: Plan of Operation Plan and Actual

Outputs	Activities		Year										Staff in charge			
			Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5					
			1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2				
0	0.1	Hold joint coordinating committee meetings.	Plan	█	█	█									CCF,Director(KEFRI),CA	
			Actual	█	█	█										
	0.2	Carry out baseline survey for project purpose.	Plan	█											EMO,HDL,PM,DFO,CCF,CA, CO,Local Consultant	
			Actual	█	█	█										
	0.3	Monitor project purpose.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	HDL,PM,EMO,CCF,CA, CO,Local Consultant	
			Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█		
	1	1.1	Assist institutional strengthening in FD.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	CCF,HFF,HDL,PM,CA	
1	Institutional and technical capacities for social forestry extension in Forest Department are strengthened.			Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█		
		1.2	Carry out baseline survey for situation analysis.	Plan	█										CCF, PM,HFF, HDL,CA,CO	
				Actual	█	█	█									
		1.3	Prepare practical guidelines for planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.	Plan	█											HFF, HDL,PM, APM,DFOs,EX(CO),CA,International(Local)Consultant
				Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	
	1.4	Conduct training for FD staff	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	HFF,HDL,PM,APM,CA(CO),Local Consultant		
		Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█			
	1.5	Monitor extent of institutional and technical strengthening	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	CCF,HFF,HDL,EMO,PM,CA, CO(EX),Local Consultant		
		Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█			
2	Social forestry extension activities among individual farmers and farmer groups are promoted.	2.1	Carry out baseline survey for situation analysis.	Plan	█										HFF,HDL,PM,DFO,APM,CA, CO(EX),Local Consultant	
				Actual	█	█	█									
		2.2	Improve extension staff's activities.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	APM,DFOs,DFEOs,Field Ass.,APM,Co-PM,EX(CA, CO)Research Ass.Technical Organizations	
				Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█		
		2.3	Facilitate planning, implementation and evaluation of social forestry and related activities with individual farmers and farmer groups.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	APM,DFOs,DFEOs,EX(CO),Local Consultant	
				Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█		
	2.4	Facilitate farmer to farmer extension.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	APM,DFOs,DFEOs,Co-PM,EX(CO),Local Consultant		
		Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█				
	2.5	Facilitate network among farmer groups.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	PM,APM,DFOs,DFEOs,EX(CO),Local Consultant		
		Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█				
	2.6	Monitor extent of the promotion of social forestry extension activities.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	PM,APM,EMO,CA, CO(EX),Local Consultant		
		Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█				
3	Farmers and other stakeholders obtain enough practical knowledge and techniques.	3.1	Carry out baseline survey for situation analysis.	Plan	█										PM,APM,CA, CO(EX),Local Consultant	
				Actual	█	█	█									
		3.2	Develop farmers friendly techniques.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	PM,APM,EMO,Co-PM,Research Ass.CA, CO(EX),Local (International)Consultant	
				Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█		
		3.3	Identify useful local forestry related knowledge.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	PM,APM,EMO,Co-Director(KEFRI),Co-PM,Research Ass.CA, CO(EX),Local	
				Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█		
		3.4	Develop the technical manuals.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	HFF,HDL,PM,APM,EMO, Co-PM,Research Ass.CA, CO(EX),International (Local)Consultant	
				Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█		
		3.5	Provide technical assistance for diverse needs of individual farmers, farmer groups and other stakeholders.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	PM,APM,DFOs,DFEOs,Co-PM,Research Ass., EX(CO),Local Consultant.Short Exp.	
				Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█		
	3.6	Maintain and improve Tiva demonstration plot.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	Co-PM,Research Ass.CO (EX),Local Consultant			
		Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█					
	3.7	Identify and assess practical field demonstration sites and the needs for promotion.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	PM,APM,DFOs,DFEOs,EX(CO),Local Consultant			
		Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█					
	3.8	Undertake cross visits among individual farmers and farmer groups.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	PM,APM,DFOs,DFEOs,EX(CO),Local Consultant			
		Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█					
	3.9	Organize open days of project activities and demonstration plots for farmers and other stakeholders.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	PM,APM,DFOs,DFEOs,EX(CO),Local Consultant			
		Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█					
	3.10	Monitor the extent of adoption of practical knowledge and techniques.	Plan	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	HFF,HDL,PM,APM,DFOs, DFEOs,Co-PM,EX(CO),Local			
		Actual	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█	█					
4	Information on social forestry extension and related issues is shared among the stakeholders.	4.1	Carry out baseline survey for situation analysis.	Plan	█										HFF,HDL,PM,CA, CO,Local Consultant	
				Actual	█	█	█									
		4.2	Diversify methods for information sharing.	Plan	█										HDL,APM,DFO,PM,IT	
				Actual	█	█	█							Expert,CA,EX,CO,Local		

Outputs	Activities		Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		Staff in charge
			1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	
			Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Plan	
													Expert (REX), CO, Local Consultant (IT)
	4.3 Hold workshops and seminars.												PM, APM, CA (CO), International Consultant
	4.4 Identify potential marketing incentives for social forestry products and services.												HDL, PM, APM, DFOs, DFE Os, Co-PM, Research Ass, CA
	4.5 Monitor extent of information sharing.												PM, APM, CA, CO, Local Consultant
Equipment and Machinery													PM, CO (EX)
Prepare designs for infrastructures.													PM, DFOs, CO (EX)
Construct the infrastructures in accordance with the designs.													PM, DFOs, CO

\* Abreviation  
 FD KEFRI JICA  
 CCF: Chief Conservator of Forest Co-PM: Center Director-Kitui CA: Chief Adviser  
 HFF: Head of Farm Forest & Extension Branch CO: Coordinator  
 HDL: Head of Dryland Forestry Branch EX: Expert  
 EMO: Extension Monitoring Officer  
 PM: Project Managere  
 APM: Assistant Project Manager

Note: This PO is based on the PDM ver.0. Under the revision of PDM from ver.0 to ver.1, following amendment was made.  
 -Activity 3.2 and 3.3 were merged to 1 activity  
 -Activity 3.9 was integrated into 3.5  
 -Activity 3.7 was changed to more concrete discription as 'Identify and assess useful social forestryrelated techniques and establish/identify field demonstration site.'

ANNEX 4 : Evaluation Grid

I. Evaluation Grid on Achievements

Question for evaluation		Study Result	Source of information	Evaluation
Main items	Detailed Study Items			
Inputs	-	Generally, the inputs are adequate and timely provided. (Annex 5,6,7,8,9)	-	B
Outputs	-	<p><b>Output 1</b> Eight (8) policy and planning documents have been developed and capacity strengthened both at the Headquarters and field level. Some progress has also been made in the 7 Districts outside project area. The outcomes of the Output 1 will therefore be achieved by March 2009.</p> <p><b>Output 2</b> Good progress has been achieved in social forestry activities among farmers groups. As a result of FFS, 80% of individual and farmer groups have adopted social forestry technology and skills. 234 farmer facilitators have been trained and have facilitated 227 farmer groups (approximately 3,400 farmers).</p> <p><b>Output 3</b> 80% of the 4,965 target farmers appreciate the knowledge and techniques learnt through FFS and many have planted trees on their farms.</p> <p><b>Output 4</b> Although the target number of people visiting the project website was set at 4,000, the actual number to date stands at 10,451, indicating an increased interest in social forestry.</p>	Project Documents	A
Achievement of Project Purpose	-	Good progress has been made in achieving the four outputs, it is therefore anticipated that the Project Purpose will be realized by March 2009.	Project Documents	A
Prospected achievement of Overall Goal	-	Farmers are already generating income from sales of social forest products from e.g. Mango orchard, tree nurseries and woodlots in the project area.	Project Documents	A

## II. Evaluation Grid on Implementation Process

Question for evaluation		Study Result	Source of information	Evaluation
Main items				
Project Management	Has the Project been properly implemented?	Project Management has been properly implemented. JCC has been held 5 times as scheduled and 4 Semiannual meetings have also been held.	Experts, Counterparts (C/P), others	A
	Has the Project properly utilized the FFS monitoring?	The Project was properly utilizing the FFS monitoring system which was also reviewed and simplified in July 2008. Monitoring will also be implemented continuously under KFS after termination of the Project.	Target groups, Experts, C/P, others	B
Technical Cooperation by Japanese Experts	How was the relationship between the Japanese experts and counterparts?	The Project is being implemented with good relationship between the experts and counterpart.	Experts, C/P, others	A
	How was the relationship between the Project personnel and the target groups?	The Project is being implemented with good relations with the target groups.	Experts, C/P, others	A
Other Issues	Has there been good collaboration with the implementing agency?	The Project has been implemented with good collaboration with the implementing agency.	Experts, C/P, others	A
	Are there any inhibiting and/or contributing factors on overall project implementation?	No special concerns or inhibiting factors from target groups, experts, and Project counterpart emerged from the interviews of the terminal evaluation study. The contributing factors are frequent and good communication through meetings/discussion and site visits by Japanese experts and counterparts.	Target groups, Experts, C/P, others	A

III. Evaluation Grid on Five Criteria

Five Criteria	Question for evaluation		Study Result	Source of information	Evaluation
	Main study items	Detailed study items			
	Background of FSS methodology on ISFP	Background of introduction of FFS. Its characteristics, approach in social forestry, or remarkable achievement.	<p>[The Background of FFS introduction into ISFP]</p> <p>The initial assistance of social forestry in Kenya was through the Social Forestry Training Project (SFTP), from 1985 to 1997, which focused on technology development for tree nursery establishment and tree planting in the semi-arid areas. SFTP was succeeded by the Social Forestry Extension Model (SOFEM) which was implemented for five years up to 2002. Due to the SOFEM approach, establishment of farm forests by the local residents had been developed. (Minutes of Midterm Evaluation, 2006). Compared to previous technical assistance, ISFP was seeking to cover a wider area and scale of social forestry expansion (Report of Japanese Expert, 2007/Interview of Japanese Expert, 2008)</p> <p>[The features and adequateness of FFS in social forestry on ISFP]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FFS is an effective method for transfer to and adoption of technology by farmers.</li> <li>- FFS is a powerful tool for empowering the Project staff, KFS staff, and farmers (in areas such as planning, management, public speaking, facilitating and record keeping).</li> <li>- FFS has promoted self reliance and improved farmers' livelihood.</li> <li>- Implementation of FFS requires commitment by all stakeholders.</li> <li>- FFS is a structured method for extension service delivery and therefore requires commitment by all stakeholders for its success.</li> <li>- FFS is an efficient method of technology transfer, adoption technologies, and personal empowerment of stakeholders.</li> <li>- The Group Dynamics is the key pillar that guarantees continued interest in FFS.</li> <li>- Systematic and Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation and reporting at all levels has been key to smooth implementation of social forestry activities. (Workshop, Aug, 2008)</li> </ul>	Target groups, Experts, C/P, others	A
	<b>R E L E V A N C E</b>				



Consistency with national policy and planning documents	How does the overall goal and the Project Purpose relate to the Kenya policies and plans.	The Project is in line with the policy and planning documents of GoK in terms of forestry strategy, conservation and social welfare with regard to social forestry. e.g.: - Draft Forest Policy (Session Paper No.4 of 2006) - Draft Kenya Forest Service Strategic Plan 2008-2012 - Draft Forest Extension Strategy 2007 - District Extension Guidelines (KFS, 2007) - Farm Forestry Management Manual (ISFP, 2007) - Study Guide for Farm Forestry Tree Nursery Establishment - Vision 2030 - Medium Term Plan 2008-2012 (more details are in the List of Policy Analysis)	National development plan, others	A
Consistency with international policies on global forestry issues	Is the technical cooperation of ISFP consistent with international policies and strategies?	The relevant global strategies are as follows; - TICAD Yokohama Action Plan - UNFCCC, IPCC, UNEP Climate Change Program - UN/UNDP MDGs - Convention on Biodiversity (CBO)	Domestic and international policy reports	A
Agreement with the needs of the target groups	Did the Project appropriately select the target groups and understand their needs?	3 main Districts and 7 other Districts were selected in consideration of ecological and geographical criteria and in line with support to dry land forestry programme. Selection of the target groups was based on the FFS Ground Working and Group Selection Survey. (by The Project/"FFS Management Manual Ver.2.0 draft, June 2007")	Target groups, Experts, C/P, others	A
Relevance on strategy, technology and approach	To what extent have the needs of the target groups been met?  Were there any impacts and influences of the Project beyond the target groups?  Is FFS appropriate and effective as an extension methodology to enhance social forestry activities	The needs of target groups are; new knowledge, techniques and skills of social forestry. FFS has provided adequate information and technical assistance and has therefore met the needs.  Some surrounding farmers have expressed interest and adopted some of the technologies and skills. They have also participated in the field days and graduation ceremonies.  FFS was appropriate and effective as observed through terminal evaluation study as follows; - self confidence and ownership development - effectiveness team work building through team capacity development - network formation - enhancement of sustainability of social forestry activities (through FFS) FFS was appropriate and effective as observed through terminal evaluation study as follows;	Target groups, Experts, C/P, others	A
			Target groups, Experts, C/P, others	B

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- self confidence and ownership development</li> <li>- effectiveness team work building through team capacity development</li> <li>- network formation</li> <li>- enhancement of sustainability of social forestry activities (through FFS)</li> </ul> <p>Since there are many benefits for farmers in terms of agriculture and sustainable wood production that contribute to their livelihood, FFS is therefore cost effective.</p>				A
	Was Technical Cooperation cost effective for the farmers in terms of time, labor and other activities through FFS?	Is the Project consistent with Japan's ODA policy including sector policy? Is the Project consistent with Japan's ODA policy including sector policy?	It is in line with Japanese ODA policies. For example; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ODA Country Report for Kenya</li> <li>- ODA Policy documents</li> </ul>	Target groups, Experts, C/P, others			A
	Is there adequate coordination of the four outputs to achieve the project purpose?	Is the Project Purpose be achieved by the end of the project? (see Grid of Outputs)	There is good coordination especially between Outputs 2 and 3.	Country Report, ODA Sector Policy Report			A
	Will the Project Purpose be achieved by the end of the project? (see Grid of Outputs)	Is the relationship between the Outputs and Project Purpose adequate for the achievement of Project Purpose?	The Project Purpose will be achieved adequately.	Target groups, Experts, C/P, others			A
	Are important assumptions at Outputs level to the Project Purpose valid?	Relationship to the achievement of Outputs	There is no contradiction between Outputs and Project Purpose. However indicator of output 4 was required to be adjusted.	Target groups, Experts, C/P, others			B
	Are there any inhibiting factors that may prevent achievement of the Project Purpose?		The assumptions remained valid.	Target groups, Experts, C/P, others, Researchers of KEFRI			A
			None from the interviews conducted	Target groups, Experts, C/P, others			A
E F F E C T I V E N E S S							

EFFICIENCY	Achievement of Outputs	<p>Are there any contributing factors to enhance achievement of the Project Purpose?</p> <p>Was there proper timing, quantities and quality of inputs for Activities of the expected Outputs?</p> <p>Were FFS activities cost effective?</p>	<p>The contributing factors are also featured in FFS functions;          - self-confidence and ownership development          - effective team building through team capacity development          - construction of networks          - enhancement of sustainability of social forestry activities (through FFS)          - strong commitment by all stakeholders          It/they was/were fairly adequate.</p>	Target groups, Experts, C/P, others	A
			<p>According to the FAO report of (p41, FAO, June, 2007), from the economic analysis aspect, "Project has achieved an incremental effect" in terms of data on tree planting and crop improvement in the project districts. For example, incremental average is positively increased Y1 and Y2-5 of food crops and tree planting. (see Table 4.4, FAO, June, 2007)</p> <p>The initial investment was relatively high but cost effective considering benefit to farmers.</p>	Experts, C/P, others	B
Relationship to the achievement of Activities	Inputs by Japan	<p>Are the activities sufficient to realize the Project Outputs?</p> <p>Are the activities implemented with proper timing?</p>	<p>There are adequate activities and inputs to realize the Projects' Outputs.</p> <p>The activities are implemented adequately. Any serious delays of activities have not been reported by ISFP experts and counterparts. (Annex 2)</p> <p>The Project budget is adequate. (Annex 9)</p>	Experts, C/P, others	A
		<p>Is the project budget appropriate (according to the Kenyan budget plan)?</p> <p>Is the budget plan and allocation appropriate and consistent with the Kenyan budget plan?</p> <p>Is the number of C/Ps, their assignment and their capacities appropriate?</p>	<p>It is adequate. (Annex 9)</p> <p>It is appropriate. (Annex 8)</p>	Experts, C/P, others	B
Inputs by Kenya				Experts, C/P, others	A

		Is the Project budget of Kenya side appropriate?	It is appropriate. (Annex 9)	Target groups, Experts, C/P, others	A
		Are there any contributing factors that may inhibit or prevent efficient implementation of the Project?	Late release of funds and inappropriate itemization of budget were some of inhibiting factors.	Expert, C/P, Project documents	B
	Prospect of achievement of the Overall Goal	Are there any possibilities to achieve the Overall Goal?	There possibilities are high in terms of the many successful socioeconomic activities resulting from FFS, such as tree nursery enterprise, woodlots and fuel woods (e.g. Melia volkensii, Grevillea, Eucalyptus, Senna siamea, and Jatropha carcus, etc). Moreover, graduated farmers are already engaged in seedling and wood production enterprises. Some of them are also applying skills and techniques acquired through Special Topics agricultural production.	Expert, C/P, Project documents	A
	Relationship to Overall Goal	Is there any prospect of realizing Impacts from Kenya's social forestry policy through FFS??	The several policy and planning documents will support to improve livelihood of target farmers.	Expert, C/P, Project documents	A
		Is there adequate logic that if the Project Purpose is achieved, then realization of the Overall Goal should also be expected?	There is adequate logic between the Overall Goal and Project Purpose.	Expert, C/P, project documents	A
	Effect from the economic aspect	What are the socioeconomic effects of FFS?	There are many successful socioeconomic activities through FFS, such as tree nursery enterprise, woodlots and fuel woods (e.g. Melia volkensii, Grevillea, Eucalyptus, Senna siamea, and Jatropha carcus). Graduated farmers engage in the enterprises of seedling and wood production. Nowadays, they apply their experience to agriculture production.	Expert, C/P, project documents	A
	Effect from the technological aspect	What are technological effects on social forestry?	Since FFS has an educational program to provide a series of techniques for social forestry, FFS is an adequate approach from the technical aspect e.g.;	Expert, C/P, project documents	A
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tree species selection</li> <li>- Tree management techniques</li> <li>- Nursery maintenance techniques</li> <li>- Pest &amp; diseases assessment</li> <li>- PTD &amp; AESA analysis</li> </ul>		
<b>I M P A C T</b>					

	<p>Other aspects</p>	<p>What are the effect from the institutional, cultural, social, and environmental aspects?</p>	<p>Expert, C/P, Project documents</p>	<p>A</p>
<p>("FFS Guide for Final Sessions ver. 2007, ISFP/KFS)</p>				
<p>From the Institutional aspect:  - New unit of "Post ISFP Activities coordination Unit under Extension Management of Forest Extension services" is identified in the organization chart.(establishment is ongoing, Aug, 2008)  - Work Plan is formulated and committed in Performance Contracts at DFO level;</p>				
<p>From the Cultural and Social aspect:  - Farmers are empowered through group based activities through FFS and even after that, the social forestry knowledge and skills acquired are disseminated to other farmers through the assistance of graduated farmers. In some cases, FFS fits in very well with the social culture of the community and is therefore easily acceptable.</p>				
<p>From the environmental aspect:  - Increased biodiversity (birds, insects, grasses)  - Conservation farming  - More trees and (including fruit trees) planted</p>				
<p>There are many positive contributing impacts arising from ISFP, such as tree nursery enterprise, woodlots and fuel woods (e.g. Melia volkensii, Grevillia, Eucalyptus, Senna siamea, and Jatropa carcus, etc), bee-keeping and livestock rearing.</p>				
<p>None that the farmers, counterparts/KFS officers and experts are aware of. However, the weakness of FFS is its unsuitability for the busy farmers who are engaged in other community activities, those who are employed, and those engaged in domestic duties since consistent and regular attendance is necessary.</p>				
<p>Are there any positive impacts?</p>	<p>Are there any negative impacts?</p>	<p>Are there any differences and impacts of this technical assistance from that of other donors?</p>	<p>Expert, C/P, Project documents</p>	<p>B</p>
<p>Comparison with other donor supported initiatives</p>	<p>Are there any differences and impacts of this technical assistance from that of other donors?</p>	<p>What are the differences and impacts of this technical assistance from that of other donors?</p>	<p>Expert, C/P, Project documents</p>	<p>B</p>
<p>Structure/Programs, Operation and Monitoring System, and Formats for Monitoring or Study/Analysis of FFS is much developed compared to other donor's. Especially, backstopping services of DFEOs for Farmer Run FFS is strongly supports successful learning and implementation of social forestry in FFS. Moreover, JICAs media teaching</p>				
<p>National development plan, forestry policy</p>				

S U S T A I N A B I L I T Y	Policy aspect	Are there supportive policies to support and develop the FFS activities?	materials for teaching the foresters facilitation skills is being developed through the assistance of ISFP. The following policy and planning documents will support social forestry through FFS activities. - Draft Forest Policy (Session Paper No.4 of 2006) - Draft Kenya Forest Service Strategic Plan 2008-2012 - Draft Forest Extension Strategy 2007 - District Extension Guidelines (KFS, 2007) - Farm Forestry Management Manual (ISFP, 2007) - Study Guide for Farm Forestry Tree Nursery Establishment - Vision 2030 - Medium Term Plan 2008-2012	Target groups, Expert, C/P, project documents	A
Organizational aspect	Is the KFS organizational structure and policy sufficient to support and sustain FFS?	- Organizational structure and policy are supportive of FFS. - The forest extension division and extension management department have been created. - The process of establishing post ISFP activities coordination Unit is on-going and Terms of reference have been drafted. DFOs and DFEOs have enough ability for facilitation, monitoring and backstopping. FFS has been incorporated into Performance Contract in the target 3 Districts and some of other 7 Districts at the DFO level. However, trained staffs need continuous refresher courses. In some cases, FFS activities were disrupted by transfers of trained staffs hence there is need to train all DFOs, DFEOs and other KFS staffs on the concept and methodology of FFS.	Target groups, Expert, C/P, project documents	B	
Financial aspect	Is the current GoK budget allocation enough to sustain social forestry activities?	In the 5 <sup>th</sup> JCC (June, 2006), the budget of KFS and KEFRI on ISFP was 13% of the Project's activity cost. (see Minutes of 5 <sup>th</sup> JCC) In the terminal evaluation, the budget for KFS and KEFRI is Kshs. 7,100,000 (2008/2009), Annex-9. KFS and KEFRI should make an effort to set aside enough budgets for 2009/2010 for social forestry activities. As the new unit is going to be established for Post ISFP Activities coordination in KFS, the budget for post ISFP activities included FFS is anticipated to be allocated by GOK.	Target groups, Expert, C/P, project documents	B	
	Are there any countermeasures of the budgeting to continue FFS activities after the project termination?		Target groups, Expert, C/P, project documents	B	

	Technical Aspect	Is FFS accepted by the target groups?	<p>There are some positive acceptance behaviors;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FFS members songs of are mostly related to the positive aspects of FFS, e.g. FFS as hope, light, power.</li> <li>- Farmers enjoy very much participating in FFS through Group Dynamics and team work with unity and cooperation.</li> <li>- Farmers appreciate very much the new social forestry knowledge and skills taught in FFS.</li> </ul>	Target groups, Expert, C/P, project documents	A
	Are there any necessary countermeasures that can be taken to continue Social Forestry through FFS?	<p>There are some necessary countermeasures can be proposed as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training of personnel in FFS concept, for example Master trainers, annual ToT for DFOs and DFEOs, to avoid discontinuation of activities due to staff movement and to strengthen their facilitation skills.</li> <li>- To determine the function of the FFS monitoring unit including budget allocation measures in order to ensure timely and adequate disbursement of budgets to DFOs</li> <li>- To make concrete Annual Plans for FFS activities in all target districts, and include them in the Performance Contracts of DFOs</li> <li>- To determine the ideal duration of FFS activities in terms of GoK budget availability and appropriate curriculum before the end of ISFP.</li> <li>- To utilize farmer facilitators for cost effectiveness and to complete preparation of a Farmers Run module (concept, study guide, curriculum and format)</li> <li>- To maintain the required frequency of technical backstopping for FFS activities by DFEOs and farmer facilitators.</li> <li>- To modifying FFS to suit the situations in different agro-ecological zones.</li> <li>- Ensure effective PMER system</li> <li>- To assist groups to access resources eg revolving funds.</li> <li>- Encouraging group networking for exchange of ideas and information, engagement in activities jointly (e.g. marketing), and for creation of partnerships and collaboration with other institutions and organizations.</li> <li>- Value addition and linkage of FFS groups to markets</li> <li>- KFS Staff motivation.</li> <li>- Publicize FFS concept</li> </ul>	<p>Expert, C/P, of Policy Social Forestry, project documents</p>		

	Other issues	Are there any constraints for sustainability?  How have graduated farmers continued social forestry activities? (Ownership)	There are some issues and concerns found in the evaluation study such as; - The transfer of trained personnel disrupts implementation of FFS - Some delays of disbursement to DFOs affect effectiveness of FFS activities. - Budget is limited and itemization is not appropriate. The sense of ownership is well developed. The graduated farmers; - have continued planting trees (Mango, Melia volkensii, Grevillea, Eucalyptus, Senna siamea, Jatropha carcus, etc) - have been advising their neighbours and visitors on social forestry - have developed enterprises on their farms e.g. tree nurseries, orchards and woodlots.	Target groups, Expert, C/P, project documents	-
				Target groups, Expert, C/P, project documents	A



Project inputs  
(Japanese side)

## Expert dispatch

Name	Assignment	Period	Office affiliated
[Long-term]			
Yuichi SATO	Chief advisor / Forest Policy	2004.1.18-2007.1.17	Forestry Agency, Japan
Yoshiaki HATA	Chief advisor / Forest Policy	2007.3.8-2009.3.28	Forestry Agency, Japan
Shinji OGAWA	Social Forestry Extension	2004.3.26-2007.3.25	N/A
Takanobu NAWASHIRO	Extension Implementation Management / Project co-ordinator	2004.3.17-2006.3.16	JATACO Co.,Ltd
Shinji ABE	Extension Implementation Management / Social Forestry Extension / Project co-ordinator	2006.3.2-2009.3.28	Institute for International Cooperation, JICA (N/A, 2008.4.1-2009.3.28)
[Short-term]			
Isamu YAMADA	Management of Ecological resources in Farm Forestry	2004.1.9-2004.1.30	Centre for South-east Asian Studies, Kyoto University
Naoei ITAHANA	Tree Improvement	2005.7.16-2005.7.30	Kansai Regional Breeding Office
Megumi HIRAYAMA	Facilitation skill / Participatory evaluation	2007.9.1-2007.9.23	Faculty of International Studies, Meiji Gakuin University

Annex6: List of Kenyan Counterpart Personnel Trained in Japan

	Name	Course Title	Duration	Post	Organization /Department
1	Mr. David Kahuria MBUGUA	Forest Policy	2004/08/22 ~ 2004/09/03	AG. Chief Conservator	Forest Department
2	Ms. Elizabeth W. WAMBUGU	Extension Policy /Extension Method	2004/08/10 ~ 2004/09/25	Conservator of Forest 1	Forest Department
3	Mr. Paul Ndung'u KARANJA	Forestry Extension Method	2005/07/07 ~ 2005/8/12	Conservator of Forest 1	Forest Department
4	Mr. James Chomba RUKUNGU	Forestry Extension Method	2005/07/07 ~ 2005/8/12	Conservator of Forest 1	Forest Department
5	Ms. Jane Nzilani NDETI	Forest Management	2005/08/23 ~ 2005/10/8	Assistant Project Manager	Forest Department
6	Mr. Joseph Muthike NIIGOYA	Forestry Extension Method	2006/07/06 ~ 2006/8/11	Conservator of Forest 1	Forest Department
7	Ms. Monica Nekoye KALENDA	Forestry Extension Method	2006/07/06 ~ 2006/8/11	Conservator of Forest	Forest Department
8	Ms. Esther Muringo MATHENGE	Forestry Extension Method	2006/07/16 ~ 2006/8/11	Conservator of Forest	Forest Department
9	Mr. Francis M. MATHINJI	Forestry Extension Method	2007/06/26 ~ 2007/08/02	Conservator of Forest 1	Forest Department
10	Mr. Jason G. KARIUKI	Forestry Extension Method	2007/06/26 ~ 2007/08/02	Research Officer	Kenya Forestry Research Institute