



1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 06/24/2003	
PROJ ID: P001217		Appraisal	Actual
Project Name: Tana River Primate National Reserve Conservation Project	Project Costs (US\$M)	7.14	1.91
Country: Kenya	Loan/Credit (US\$M)		
Sector(s): Board: ENV - Other social services (54%), Central government administration (33%), General agriculture fishing and forestry sector (13%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)	6.2	1.36
L/C Number:			
	Board Approval (FY)		97
Partners involved : GEF	Closing Date	06/30/2001	12/31/2001

Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:
John English	Ridley Nelson	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST

2. Project Objectives and Components

a. Objectives

The primary objective of the project was to improve the management and status of the Tana River Primate reserve (a relatively small, but unique and diverse biological entity of global significance), with participation and increased benefits for local communities. The specific objectives were to :

- support the conservation of the unique biological community of the Tana River riparian forests;
- incorporate the results of targeted research and monitoring into the management of a fragile and complex ecosystem; and
- reduce identified threats to the ecological integrity and survival of the forest ecosystem .

b. Components

Three components were identified :

Research and Monitoring (US\$1.5 million - 27 percent of base costs). The research program was to address five priority areas: (a) monitoring of primate populations, genetics and habitat parameters; (b) baseline and monitoring surveys of flora and fauna; (c) studies and monitoring of the Tana River hydrological system and its ecological effects; (d) resource utilization for humans (to establish sustainable use levels for forest products); and (e) prospects and methods for promoting and facilitating community -based conservation of remaining forest patches outside the reserve boundaries .

Reserve Management (US\$1.46 million - 26 percent of base costs). This included: (a) measures to enhance security within the reserve and adjacent areas; (b) measures to reduce poaching and agricultural encroachment in the reserve; (c) improvement of physical facilities for reserve management, research and monitoring; (d) establishment of consultative and advisory bodies, such as the Joint Reserve Management Committee (JRMC), to involve local communities in the planning and management of project activities; and (e) preparation and implementation of an Adaptive Management Plan (AMP) for the reserve.

Community Conservation and Development (CCDC) (US\$2.43 million - 42 percent of base costs). The CCDC was aimed at building support among local communities and reducing pressure on the reserve's resources by : (a) supporting alternative livelihoods through the implementation of micro -projects and income generating activities, based on the sustainable use of resources within and outside the reserve; and (b) encouraging voluntary relocation of communities farming in the reserve by identifying and acquiring alternative land, and increasing its productivity .

Project management (US\$0.39 million - 5 percent of base costs).

c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates

Preparation was initiated in 1991, but the project was not approved until 1996. Final expenditure amounted to US\$1.91 million, or about 31 percent of that planned - less than 25 percent of that planned for the principal components, as expenditure on project management was 80% above the projected level.

3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:

--

The overall objective was not met, as the specific objectives were only partially met . The two significant species of primates have maintained their population levels during the project period . But the habitat crucial for these groups is declining in quantity and quality, so the future of the threatened species is under increased threat . Steps were taken to upgrade the management of the reserve based on ongoing research, but the identified threats to the ecological integrity and survival of the forest ecosystem have not been reduced, The area of suitable habitat is estimated to have decreased by 5%, while incompatible human activities in , and adjacent to the reserve, have increased .

4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:

Research and Monitoring . An overall plan for research and monitoring was developed shortly after effectiveness . Implementation, however, was slowed by a number of factors, bureaucratic, natural (unusual flooding of the area in 1997-98), and technical (inability to achieve consensus on some of the monitoring indicators to be used). However, most of the baseline biological studies were completed, and limited monitoring of the endangered primates and habitat quality is ongoing. At project closing, both the primates and habitat are viable, but remain at significant risk of extinction, if further erosion of the resource base occurs .

Reserve Management . An interim management plan for the reserve was developed during preparation . The JRMCC was established, but its effective operation has been fitful . The infrastructure of the park was upgraded and the continued presence of KWS staff increased security in the area and reduced the incidence of poaching, cattle rustling and other problems. However, there is some evidence that this infrastructure improvement resulted in some population movement into the area, thus increasing pressure on the endangered species . An AMP was prepared, but remains in abeyance with the termination of funding .

CCDC. Community reaction to the project was mixed. As the project proceeded it became clear that significant numbers of those in the area would be interested in moving, because of the remoteness of the area and its limited agricultural potential. However, it was also clear that they would have to be reasonably sure that their situation would be improved after the move. [This may have reflected the fact that some of those in the area had moved into it after experiencing failure (for largely fortuitous reasons) in another government sponsored irrigation scheme in the region] It became clear that the emphasis would have to be on element (b) (voluntary relocation) of the component rather than (a) (improvement of livelihoods in situ). GOK finally made available land between the reserve and the coast (see section 5).

5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):

While the work of the project offered the prospect of improved conservation of the project area, problems arising in the relocation of persons interested in moving, have brought operations to a halt and threaten to negate the improvements made. Irrigable land was made available between the project area and the Indian Ocean coast . However, in order to be usable this site will require significantly greater level of investment (primarily for access and to develop irrigation facilities) than had been foreseen when the project was appraised . The Bank prepared a proposal (costing \$3.2 million) to finance these activities. Most of the funding was to come from reallocation of funds within the CCDC component, with some contributions from the other component budgets . Agreement was not reached on this proposal. Government, supported by other aid agencies believed that the cost was too high, but the Bank claimed that it reflected the requirement of the Bank's resettlement guidelines . The GEF did not agree to the reallocation on the grounds that it did not want such a large proportion of the grant be used to finance resettlement, that in the original project the grant was to provide limited funds (5% of expenditure) to facilitate relocation. The revised proposal would use almost 50% for formal resettlement. Given that at the time (2001) the Bank had suspended lending to Kenya, it was not in a position to provide funding through another project . The failure to agree meant that the resettlement effort was terminated. In the circumstances it was decided not to extend the project to complete more of the research and management programs . It was considered that a continuation of these activities without the restoration of natural cover on significant patches of land now being farmed and a reduction of pressure on the forest resources would not be able to achieve project objectives .

The present situation is highly unsatisfactory . The sudden termination of funding has left the KWS, district authorities and the Tana River County Council with a major backlash of resentment from groups who feel cheated and misled. Some of the families who had begun to move will now probably return to their farms in the reserve . Any future collaboration with these communities and others involved in the project will be very difficult . KWS is also concerned about potential repercussions on its other community wildlife projects elsewhere in the country .

6. Ratings:	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome:	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Institutional Dev .:	Modest	Modest	
Sustainability:	Unlikely	Unlikely	
Bank Performance:	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Borrower Perf .:	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Quality of ICR:		Satisfactory	

NOTE: ICR rating values flagged with '*' don't comply with OP/BP 13.55, but are listed for completeness.

7. Lessons of Broad Applicability:

- Unless local communities believe that their interests are at the heart of project design, they are unlikely to actively support project implementation.
- Making the improvement of local livelihoods a secondary objective (either in situ or through relocation), merely to reduce pressure on biodiversity, may be counterproductive. Where population relocation is an objective then this needs to be agreed prior to project agreement and effectiveness, and the necessary efforts undertaken early in the project life. The longer discussions etc. continue, the more doubts, opposition, adverse circumstances and events etc. may act to block action.
- The eligibility of expenditures to promote sustainable development (including relocation and related livelihood investment) as a strategy for achieving sustainable global benefits for biodiversity conservation, must be agreed upon prior to project approval, and realistic cost estimates included.
- Where more than one international agency is involved in a project, care should be taken at the outset to ensure that differing operational policies or procedures, such as for resettlement, will not hinder implementation.

8. Assessment Recommended? Yes No

Why? A number of wildlife conservation related projects in East Africa (funded both by the Bank and GEF), initiated in the early 90s, are now being completed. A group audit would be desirable.

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

The ICR is of high quality, providing a detailed and balanced picture of the project experience.