



# MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT PROPOSAL

## REQUEST FOR GEF FUNDING

**AGENCY'S PROJECT ID:** TBD  
**GEFSEC PROJECT ID:** TBD  
**COUNTRY:** Burkina Faso, Kenya  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Dryland Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project (DLWEIP)  
**GEF AGENCY:** United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)  
**OTHER EXECUTING AGENCY(IES):** AU-IBAR  
**DURATION:** 3 years  
**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Biodiversity with relevance to Land Degradation  
**GEF OPERATIONAL PROGRAM:** OP 13 on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture with relevance to OP 15 on Sustainable Land Management  
**GEF STRATEGIC PRIORITY:** BD-2 on Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors and BD-4 on Generation and Dissemination of Best Practices for addressing Current and Emerging Biodiversity Issues  
**ESTIMATED STARTING DATE:** June 2005  
**IMPLEMENTING AGENCY FEE:** 146,000

FINANCING PLAN (US\$)	
GEF PROJECT/COMPONENT	
Project	975,000
PDF A*	25,000
<b>Sub-Total GEF</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>
CO-FINANCING**	
GEF Agency	
Government (In Kind)	473,000
Bilateral (AU-IBAR - In Kind and In Cash)	1,000,000
NGOs	200,000
Others (institutions - In Kind)	683,000
<b>Sub-Total Co-financing:</b>	<b>2,356,000</b>
<b>Total Project Financing:</b>	<b>3,356,000</b>
FINANCING FOR ASSOCIATED ACTIVITY IF ANY:	

\* Indicate approval date of PDF A (December 2003)

\*\* Details provided in the Financing Section

### CONTRIBUTION TO KEY INDICATORS OF THE BUSINESS PLAN:

The project is consistent with the strategic priorities BD-2 and BD-4 and will contribute to the conservation of wildlife in two representative pastoral systems in the semi-arid zone of Africa at two pilot sites covering approximately 182,000 ha. Best practices derived from the project will be disseminated and scaled up at Africa regional level and ultimately resulting in more appropriate projects/programs in livestock production systems in Africa.

### RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT:

(Enter Name, Position, Ministry) Date: (Month, day, year)

Burkina Faso

Mr. Jean Baptiste Kambou  
 GEF Operational Focal Point  
 Ministry of Environment

13 May 2003

Kenya

Prof. Ratemo Michieka  
 GEF Operational Focal Point  
 National Environment Management Agency

30 April 2004

This proposal has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the standards of the GEF Project Review Criteria for a Medium-sized Project.

Name & Signature  
 IA/ExA Coordinator  
 Mr. Ahmed Djoghla  
 Assistant Executive Director  
 Director, UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination  
 Date: April 5, 2005

Project Contact Person  
 Anna Tengberg  
 Daya Bragante

Tel. and email: 254-20-624147/3860,  
[Anna.Tengberg@unep.org](mailto:Anna.Tengberg@unep.org),  
[Daya.Bragante@unep.org](mailto:Daya.Bragante@unep.org)

**A – SUMMARY**

The project aims to mainstream biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas in Africa through the promotion and support to sustainable land management systems for livestock and wildlife at the interface to improve community livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and reduce land degradation. This will be achieved through development and testing of good practices at the interface at two pilot sites in representative agro-ecological systems, one representing typical West African conditions in Burkina Faso and the other one in Kenya representing the wildlife rich savannah ecosystems in East Africa. The identified best practices will be disseminated at Africa regional level through two Thematic Programme Networks (TPNs) of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), TPN 3 and TPN 6.

Since the adoption of the UNCCD in 1994, which entered into force in 1996, African countries have committed themselves to take actions that would mitigate the negative impact of drought and desertification. Such activities include sustainable ecosystem and environmental management, management of livestock/wildlife conflicts and land degradation, all of which fall within the mandate of the African Union's Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR).

The proposed Dryland Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project (DLWEIP) falls under TPN3, one of the six Thematic Programme Networks (TPNs) for the elaboration of UNCCD for Africa region. The TPN3 Launching Workshop took place at Maseru in Lesotho in November 2001. The project, seeks novel integrated strategies for sustainable rangeland management, which can be replicated in many regions in Africa. This is highly significant since over 60% of Africa is rangeland that is being utilized by pastoralists and contains most of the large mammal and avifauna biodiversity on the continent.

TPN3 offers a strategic entry point into the AU institutional framework to contribute towards the implementation of UNCCD at the levels of national (NAPs), Sub-regional (SRAPs), regional action programmes (RAPs) and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). The current MSP is developed to facilitate the elaboration and implementation of one programme under TPN3, namely, the wildlife-livestock and environment interactions. TPN6 on the development of sustainable agriculture is being coordinated by AU-SAFGRAD, in Ouagadougou in Burkina Faso. It is hoped that the coordination of the two TPNs in Kenya and Burkina Faso will create synergy for the implementation of UNCCD TPN's under AU.

Livestock wildlife and environment management at the interface is a challenging scenario in the integration of development and environmental conservation in Africa. The conflicts over natural resources are increasing with wildlife losing the ground to livestock and land degradation is now increasing at alarming rates in Sub-Sahara Africa. The goal of DLWEIP is to document good practices on mainstreaming biodiversity in mixed production landscapes through the sustainable management of livestock and wildlife at the interface in Kenya and Burkina Faso for dissemination to other relevant member states through TPN3.

The project is addressing some of the main barriers of sustainable management at the interface by examining multiple use of grazing land by livestock and wildlife. Development approaches that lead to the improvement of natural resources at the community level and more efficient livestock production and marketing, will in turn lead to less poverty and environmental degradation. The latter

will be achieved through community capacity building involving training, introduction of good natural resource management practices and entrepreneurship. The project will contribute to the mitigation of negative impacts of agricultural systems and practices on biological diversity in agro-ecosystems and their interface with other ecosystems. The realisation of the project purpose will be through documentation of good practices of mixed production systems where wildlife and livestock are deliberately managed for both economic benefits to the local communities and to the sustainability of environmental goods and services from the ecosystems, Lessons learnt from successful livestock wildlife interface management will be shared between Burkina Faso and Kenya and also with other member states. The project will focus on maintaining goods and services of targeted ecosystems and on overcoming barriers to the realization of benefits derived from such goods and services.

The DLWEIP locations in Western and Eastern Africa provide an opportunity for dialogue and exchange of ideas on good land use practices on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity important to agriculture and of relevance to sustainable land management within the AU framework of South- South cooperation. DLWEIP will focus on conflicting land use practices under TPN3 on Rational Use of Rangelands coordinated by AU IBAR in Kenya and TPN6 on the Development of sustainable agriculture - AU /SAFGRAD, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. In this respect the location of DLWEIP in Burkina Faso in Western Africa and in Kenya in Eastern Africa will enrich the experiences of these two African sub-regions in the implementation of UNCCD, UNFCCC and CBD conventions. The sustainable management of the mixed production systems in the two sub-regions provides an opportunity to compare land tenure systems and possible policy changes that are relevant to other African countries in Western and Eastern Africa. It is also important to share the challenges of protecting and conserving the elephant population in West and East Africa; where the social economic changes are enhancing conflicts on wildlife conservation and sustainable agriculture.

Conflict analysis in both countries will also provide global lessons on the management approaches of contested trans-boundary resources among the pastoral nomads. The conflicts over access to critical pastures in Arly regions involving the Niger, Benin, Togo and Burkina Faso in Western Africa will provide important lessons for Kenya. AU IBAR is involved in conflict resolution around the Greater Karamanjong Ecosystem in Eastern Africa where the pastoral nomads from Sudan, Uganda, Ethiopia and Kenya are involved in intermittent conflicts over contested cross-border resources for many years. The contrast between the agricultural production systems that characterize the two projects sites will also provide important global lessons on conservation of biodiversity in the face of expanding opportunities in horticulture and cotton farming in both countries.

Hence, the project's overall objective is to mainstream biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas. Unless the biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface are well managed under enabling policy environment framework, non-sustainable land uses will continue to easily replace mixed production systems that favor livestock wildlife coexistence. The project purpose is to identify buffer zones around protected areas where good management practices exist that can be disseminated to similar situations in Africa. It is expected that the project outcomes will be: reduction of biodiversity loss and land degradation at pilot sites; community livelihoods improved and capacity for sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface strengthened at pilot sites; and also enhanced awareness and capacity at Africa regional level in adaptable best practices and sustainable land use management at the interface.

Activities are sought adjacent to conservation areas in Burkina Faso and in the wider agricultural landscape in Kenya that are particularly important to wildlife. The project activities will take place

within the livestock production sector and will help address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss and contribute to enhancing ecosystem structure and function.

AU-IBAR in partnership with other collaborating institutions such as UNEP, ILRI, IUCN and WWF, and AWF among others is strategically placed to disseminate a model of good practices in land management because of AU- IBAR's excellent performance in Pan Africa Rinderpest Campaign (PARC) that has had dramatic positive impact on the livestock production in Africa. It is with this understanding that the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN) mandated AU-IBAR to be the lead institution in elaborating and facilitating the implementation of UNCCD Thematic Programme 3 on the Rational Use of Rangelands and Development of Fodder Crops.

## **B - COUNTRY OWNERSHIP**

### **1. COUNTRY ELIGIBILITY**

Kenya ratified the UNCBD on 26<sup>th</sup> July 1994, and UNFCCC on 30<sup>th</sup> August 1994 and UNCCD on 24<sup>th</sup> June 1997. Similarly, Burkina Faso ratified all the three conventions on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 1993 for UNCBD and UNFCCC and on 26<sup>th</sup> January 1996 for UNCCD. The two countries are therefore eligible for GEF support to the biodiversity and land degradation focal areas.

### **2. COUNTRY DRIVENESS**

The two countries have finalized the consultation process of identifying national priority action programmes for the implementation of the three conventions. The Kenya NAP<sup>1</sup> provides an overview of the national efforts to combat desertification touching on the policy and legal framework, institutional framework, programmes, coordination, partnership and financial arrangements. The NAP document identifies priority areas such as land use and tenure, capacity building and support to local level community initiatives. Under sectoral programme areas, NAP identifies priority activities in vegetation cover and wildlife, conservation of biodiversity (National Biodiversity Strategic Action Programmes-NBSAP), agriculture and pastoralism and soil and water management. DLWEIP will be supporting the national NAP and NBSAP initiatives in the two countries. DLWEIP will therefore fit within the national action programmes for implementing the conventions and will receive financial and technical support from the ongoing national activities under various government institutions charged with reporting progress within the framework of Conference of the Parties.

#### **Kenya:**

Kenya is currently revising the wildlife policy to favor the utilization of wildlife resources by the landowners since a significant proportion of the national biodiversity is found outside the protected areas. Currently, the government is supporting community owned conservation initiatives although the policy framework has not been enacted into law. Community participation, benefit sharing by communities residing in buffer zones around protected areas and development of ecotourism activities outside the protected areas is gaining support from stakeholders in conservation. The outcome of DLWEIP will add synergy to the national action programmes in combating desertification, and national biodiversity conservation strategies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Republic of Kenya: Feb 2002- National Action Programme – A framework for combating Desertification in Kenya – in the context of the UNCCD. Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources.

Kenya has also come up with a revised ASAL Development Policy<sup>2</sup> that will provide guidelines and principles for sustainable implementation of development initiatives. This policy has benefited from two decades of development approaches in the Drylands. Kenya has also made a strategic decision to increase both public and private investment in the Drylands that constitute 80% of the country as one strategy of tackling poverty reduction. The Arid Land Development Programme<sup>3</sup> in the office of the President in Kenya is supporting community development initiatives. This project seeks to build on the good practices of community conservation for ecotourism income generations and for supporting livestock production during the drought periods. The list of Government institutions that will be participating in the implementation of DLWEIP is a clear indication that the project fits well within Kenya's development agenda. These development initiatives will complement the GEF funded activities in the MSP especially in livestock development activities. (See Annex 2 & 4)

#### **Burkina Faso:**

In Burkina Faso<sup>4</sup>, the project will be drawing synergy from previous and current programmes that focus on the sustainable management of natural resources in the Drylands. The lessons from the UN Convention to Combat Desertification Programme<sup>5</sup> indicate that a) local institutions are critical in scaling up impacts of successful tested methods and techniques; b) upgrading of basic skills in local communities is prime condition for local institutions to taking up new responsibility; c) the promotion of legal and regulatory frameworks for effective and genuine local and regional participation are critical for sustainability of development initiatives.

Current initiatives in natural resource management in Burkina Faso are building on the strong foundation of the past experiences. The Sahel Integrated Lowland Ecosystem Management Programme (SILEM) from Phase I to Phase III (2002- 2017) is providing support for environmental and natural resources management related activities of the Community Based Rural Development Project (CBRDP). This project involves land use planning, targeting the marginalized groups, soil and water management, and conflicts among participants.

The GEF supported programme on the Partnership for Natural Ecosystem Management is focusing on biodiversity under the theme of environment and rural development. The intended impact is on biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction. This is a long-term development programme over a period of 15 years starting from 2002. The programme purpose and development objective is to enhance the capacity of Burkina Faso to reverse the trend of biodiversity loss through sustainable management of woodlands forests and wildlife. GEF is providing financing to assist in conserving its globally important protected areas.

#### **Regional level:**

The project is also linked to the Regional Action Programme (RAP) for Africa of the UNCCD and its Thematic Programme Networks on Rational use of rangelands and development of fodder crops (TPN3) that is based in Nairobi and, Development of sustainable agriculture (TPN6) that is based in Ouagadougou. The implementation of the UNCCD RAP in Africa will also contribute to the implementation of the Environment Initiatives of NEPAD.

---

<sup>2</sup> Republic of Kenya: National Policy for Sustainable Development of Arid and Semi arid Lands of Kenya, Third Draft dated January 2004.

<sup>3</sup> Republic of Kenya, Office of the President – Aridland Resource Management Project Phase 2. May 2003. Financed by World Bank IDA (Regional Office AFTRI)

<sup>4</sup> Environmental Resources Management Ltd; August 2003: Government of Burkina Faso Process Framework: Community-Based Rural Development. Reference 0002038. Source: <http://www.erm.com>

<sup>5</sup> SIDA/UNDP 1997: Lessons from the field for Implementation of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification- the case of the UNSO/SIDA SAHEL Programme ( Burkina Faso- Niger and Senegal)

The CCD Regional Action Plan (RAP) for Africa is being elaborated through TPNs that AU-IBAR has the mandate of implementing through the institutional framework provided by its member countries. While working in Kenya and Burkina Faso, DLWEIP will be seeking means to contribute to the overall goal of RAP by translating National Action Programmes to Regional Activities. The entry point in this case will be through domestic and wild animals, which are the relevant resources in dryland ecosystems that constitute 60% of Africa.

The project will also be implemented within the framework of the Action Plan for the Environment Initiative of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). In the framework of NEPAD, AU is responsible for facilitating the elaboration and the implementation of the six thematic programmes networks (TPNs) under the UNCCD and designated institutional focal points that include the following:

1. TPN 1: Integrated management of water resources – SADC- Maseru, Lesotho;
2. TPN2: Sustainable land use (agroforestry and soil conservation) – INSAH –CILSS, Bamako, Mali;
3. TPN3: Rational use of rangelands and development of fodder crop. AU IBAR, Nairobi, Kenya;
4. TPN4: Ecological Monitoring, natural resources mapping, remote sensing and early warning systems. African Organization for Mapping and Remote Sensing, Algiers, Algeria;
5. TPN5: Promotional of new and renewable energy sources: national agency of for renewable Energy (ANER) Dakar, Senegal;
6. TPN6: Development of sustainable agriculture- AU /SAFGRAD, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

TPN3 offers a strategic entry point into the AU institutional framework to contribute towards the implementation of UNCCD at the levels of national (NAPs), Sub-regional (SRAPs), regional action programmes (RAPs) .The current MSP is developed to facilitate the elaboration and implementation of one programme under TPN3, namely, the wildlife- livestock and environment interactions. TPN6 on the development of sustainable agriculture is being coordinated by AU-SAFGRAD, in Ouagadougou in Burkina Faso. It is hoped that the coordination of the two TPNs in Kenya and Burkina Faso will create synergy for the implementation of UNCCD TPN's under AU.

## **C – PROGRAM AND POLICY CONFORMITY**

### **1. PROGRAM DESIGNATION AND CONFORMITY**

The project is consistent with the GEF Operational Programme no. 13 on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity important to Agriculture. The overall goal of this project is to mainstream biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas through the promotion and support to sustainable land use management systems to improve community livelihoods and enhance biodiversity conservation and reduce land degradation. The project will therefore support the mainstreaming of biodiversity in production landscapes and sectors (BD-2). It is also relevant to the strategic priority on generation and dissemination of best practices for addressing current and emerging biodiversity issues (BD-4) as it will develop and test best practices for management of biodiversity at the livestock, wildlife interface in Africa, which will also include mechanisms for conflict resolution. The project also has linkages with GEF Operational Programme no.15 on Sustainable Land Management, as land degradation in Drylands is increasingly destroying good management practices in the conservation of biodiversity, in particular wildlife under sustainable and indigenous agricultural production systems.

This project will document and disseminate good practices and opportunities for improving on the management of resources at the interface.

## **2. PROJECT DESIGN**

### *1. Project rationale*

Since the adoption of United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) in 1994, which entered into force in 1996, African countries have committed themselves to take actions that would mitigate the negative impact of drought and desertification. Such activities include sustainable ecosystem and environmental management, management of livestock/wildlife conflicts and land degradation, all of which fall within the mandate of the African Union's Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR).

The proposed Dryland Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project (DLWEIP) falls under TPN3, one of the six Thematic Programme Networks (TPNs) for the elaboration of UNCCD for Africa region. The TPN3 Launching Workshop took place at Maseru in Lesotho in November 2001. The project, seeks novel integrated strategies for sustainable rangeland management, which can be replicated in many regions in Africa. This is highly significant since over 60% of Africa is rangeland that is being utilized by pastoralists and contains most of the large mammal and avifauna biodiversity on the continent.

Livestock wildlife and environment management at the interface is a challenging scenario in the integration of development and environmental conservation. The conflicts over natural resources are increasing with wildlife losing the ground to livestock and land degradation is now increasing at alarming rates in Sub-Sahara Africa. The goal of DLWEIP is to document good practices on mainstreaming biodiversity in mixed production landscapes through the sustainable management of livestock and wildlife at the interface in Kenya and Burkina Faso for dissemination to other relevant member states through TPN3.

Due to the continued increase in the human population, previously sparsely populated biodiversity rich areas in rangelands continue to lose resources at an unsustainable rate. As human settlements increase and continue to expand with changing land tenure systems, the livestock wildlife interface is becoming restricted in scope but more intense and problematic. Conflicts result from the competition for the existing resources especially water and pastures, disease transmission and predation. The proposed project will therefore play a central and crucial role in the support of sustainable management of these natural and human resources. Specifically, sustainable co-existence between livestock and wildlife will be of critical importance to conservation of the biodiversity in these pastoral lands.

The project location in Burkina Faso is in the Arly region in the South East, which is part of a dryland system with transhumance and the largest elephant population remaining in West Africa. The fact that elephant survive here indicates that the remaining biodiversity is also reasonably intact and Arly forms part of a protected area complex that extends over three countries (Burkina Faso, Benin and Niger) and comprises a series of national parks, preserves and hunting areas. This complex is of crucial importance for the survival of the last populations of sahelio-sudanian mammals. Among the threatened or already extinct mammals are the African wild dog, cheetah, black rhinoceros, Derby eland, giant pangolin, common jackal, white-faced otter, spotted-neck otter, serval and caracal.

The human diversity is also considerable in this region with an interface between the pastoral and agricultural communities as well as with wildlife. Hence, agricultural diversity is also important with

various races of cattle, sheep, goats, asses and horses. In the buffer zones, there is also a broad diversity of cultivated plant species (millet, sorghum, maize, fonio, cowpeas, peanuts, okra, sorrel, calabash, etc.).

A stakeholders' workshop held in the framework of the PDF A, in Burkina Faso, in March 2004 learnt that currently people are witnessing very poor management of natural resources characterized by traditional and outdated patterns on land occupation; migratory farming on burnt fields and uncontrolled grazing. These unsuitable land management practices are due to: a) lack of rigor in the enforcement of the law after independence; b) disappearance of livestock transhumance routes, for example, that of Pieni-Bargou; c) Inadequate land management policy that does not take into account population growth; d) Prevalence of erratic climatic conditions, which are determinants of population movements. The farmers are clearing the natural vegetation around the buffer zones to take advantage of cotton export opportunity under the African Growth Opportunities Agreement (AGOA) supported by US Government.

The poverty situation in this country has been aggravated by a) continuous declining rainfall amounts and endemic droughts (partially linked to the likelihood of longer climate cycles - 30 years); b) degradation of natural resources (loss of vegetative cover, reduction of soil fertility and soil erosion among others); c) unsustainable land use systems (due to demographic growth, declining productive lands, animal pressure on ecosystems-overgrazing, unsustainable management of transhumance, migrations and social tensions over resources); and d) Inadequate management and use of natural resources (conflicting customary laws and modern land use policy framework, lack of coordination between the key partners involved in rural development)

The current styles of management have excluded buffer zones, as they are virtually non-existent due to encroachment by cash crop-cotton farmers. Following the excessive pressure from crop farmers on the land, including the buffer zones, the space for pasture has greatly reduced. The animal farmers (nomadic and local) end up with no alternative but to invade the wildlife areas. The lack of rest zones for the nomadic pastoralists, of water along their routes, and transhumance corridors that are not followed, are all circumstances that force nomadic livestock farmers to go through agricultural land and wildlife areas, which result in conflicts. Along the transhumance route, there are variations in taxation from one province to another and this represents a major problem for herders.

These conflicting interests on land resources by divergent actors bring about conflict in Arly National Park Burkina Faso. The current initiatives in Arly affecting the socio-economic and structural trends make management of natural resources difficult. However, the Burkina Faso Government has made some efforts through the Ministry of Environment (MECV) in consultation with the Department of Forestry. This Ministry has since 1996 embraced wildlife management reforms that introduced the participatory style of management for wildlife resource. By these reforms, the Ministry ceded on the management of wildlife units to private sector operators and to communities through village zones (French acronym-ZOVIC).

In Kenya, arid and semi arid lands (Drylands) make up more than 80% of landmass; support nearly half the livestock population of the country and over 30% of the total human population (GoK, 2004) and the dryland ecosystems are home to most wildlife species. Because of their fragile ecosystems, previous unfavorable development policies and historical marginalization, these areas represent a major development challenge to the Government and the entire people of Kenya (GoK, 2004). Though there are ongoing economic and conservation activities in these lands, rarely have integrated approaches targeting resolution of conflicts at the wildlife and livestock interface been considered. More often projects have focused on wildlife alone or on livestock alone, which often simply exacerbates the extent of the conflict.



The Kenyan DLWEIP location is in the Ewaso Nyiro river basin north of Mt. Kenya (Annex 5), an area, which has seen considerable transition in recent years from livestock production to wildlife management systems. It also contains important biodiversity from the largest elephant population outside of protected areas in the country and endangered species like the cape hunting dog, the black rhinoceros and Grevy zebra. For this reason, protected areas were established, which although providing considerable revenue to local authorities are not ecologically viable alone and local communities derive minimum benefits from these resources.

The Protected Area (PA) systems in the Ewaso Nyiro Ecosystem Basin include Mt Kenya National Park, Aberdares National Park, the Samburu National Reserve, Buffalo Springs National reserve, Shaba National Reserves and Meru National Park. The buffer zones around the protected areas system include several community/private-managed conservancies, mixed production systems that include wildlife, livestock, and rainfed and irrigated areas. Areas that are set aside by the communities for livestock wildlife controlled management cover more areas than the lowland protected areas under national game reserves. These include several group ranches and community conservation projects (Ilingwesi, Lekurruki, Namunyak, Kalama Conservation Project, and Sera Project).

In one private/community conservation area, the Lewa Down Conservancy within the Greater Ewaso Nyiro North Ecosystem, which is rich in biodiversity, the major wildlife species that have been monitored between 1992 and 2003 indicate steep decline for some species while stable or increase in others. The species that have shown population increase between 1992 and 2003 include cape buffalo from 71 to 203, impala from 379 to 760, Grevy Zebra from 287 to 462, Greater Kudu from 14 to 33, black rhino from 17 to 32 and elephants from 102 to 157. Grevy Zebra and black rhino are globally threatened with extinction and it is encouraging that community and private management of these species in mixed production systems are showing signs of recovery.

Some species are locally threatened with extermination according to census taken in 1992 and 2003<sup>6</sup> respectively; these include the giraffe with numbers declining from 440 to 215, eland from 260 to 108, Grant's gazelle from 322 to 167, Jackson hartebeest from 63 to 4, water buck from 147 to 64 and Gerenuk from 440 to 11. Other wildlife species found in the ecosystem include Beisa Oryx, bushbuck, cheetah, Silver backed Jackal, sitatunga, warthog, Burchell Zebra, lion, leopard, ostrich among others. There are over 400 species of birds found in this location some of which come from Europe to winter and migrate through the area. The overgrazing and over-abstraction of water from the ecosystem for horticulture production have adversely affected the wetlands in Lorian Swamps that are used by European birds on their annual migratory routes.

The genetic livestock resources in Ewaso Nyiro have contributed significantly to national development of livestock sector. The origin of the Borana cattle is from this pastoral production system in Ewaso Nyiro arid ecosystem and has contributed to the development of beef cattle in other parts of the world and in particular Australia. The area is also the home of the Gala goat that has significant economic attributes for meat and milk production. Conserving the livestock and wildlife interface production systems will contribute global benefits in agricultural biodiversity and conservation of threatened wildlife species.

Conservation issues in Ewaso Nyiro Ecosystem that have global significance include the conservation of Grevy Zebra and black rhino which are listed in CITES appendix 1 and also those that are locally threatened due to poaching, such as the leopard and the elephant. Some of the species are of national

---

<sup>6</sup> Lewa Down conservancy GEF project, April 2004

concern due to rapid decline in numbers and loss of habitat due conversion to non-compatible land use with wildlife livestock interface management.

The basin supports at least 3 ethnically diverse pastoral communities, the Samburu, Boran and Somali, who are also in transition, but until now almost entirely dependent on livestock for their livelihoods. This mix of cultural differences and contentious claims over the natural resource tenure has made the Greater Ewaso Nyiro Ecosystem to be one of the most insecure and potentially volatile hotspot in Kenya. Conflicts over access to natural resources and antagonistic land use systems can easily trigger tribal conflicts and interfaith differences.

A stakeholder's workshop held in the framework of the PDFA in Isiolo (Kenya) in January 2004 identified current negative trends in the DLWEIP site located in the Greater Ewaso Nyiro Ecosystem. These trends include: increasing scarcity of water resources in Ewaso Nyiro basin due to unregulated water abstraction for rapidly growing horticultural production for export to Europe, increasing resource and land use conflicts, upstream wildlife migration, permanent veterinary quarantine, resulting in delayed livestock marketing thereby aggravating land degradation, worsening marketing opportunities in domestic and foreign outlets and increasing relief food dependency. Amid these negative trends, current local initiatives aimed at optimizing the utilization of natural resources include: bee keeping, ecotourism (through community based conservancies e.g. - Ilingwesi, Namunyak,), improved community policing and harvesting of natural gums and resins.

There are however, barriers to mainstreaming of biodiversity in the production landscape calling for urgent intervention within the ecosystem. These include: marketing of biodiversity products, need to improve management at the interface, inadequate policy framework to support innovative management practices at the interface, inappropriate technologies, undefined management systems for natural resource tenure, cultural attitudes and practices and commercial poaching of natural resources including wildlife and trees due to poverty and lack of alternative non-land based livelihood opportunities. The workshop participants affirmatively preferred mixed wildlife and livestock systems, but observed that success of such management alternative to be closely pegged on improved and fully empowered local communities' capacities in decision-making on management of natural resources practices that benefit the local people while conserving the rich biodiversity heritage for Kenya and the world.

The DLWEIP locations in Western and Eastern Africa provide an opportunity for dialogue and exchange of ideas on good land use practices on mainstreaming of biodiversity within mixed wildlife-livestock production systems within the AU framework of South- South cooperation. DLWEIP will focus on conflicting land use practices under TPN3 on Rational Use of Rangelands coordinated by AU IBAR in Kenya and TPN6 on the Development of sustainable agriculture- AU /SAFGRAD, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. In this respect the location of DLWEIP in Burkina Faso in Western Africa and in Kenya in Eastern Africa will enrich the experiences of these two African sub-regions in the implementation of UNCCD, UNFCCC and CBD conventions. The sustainable management of the mixed production systems in the two sub-regions provides an opportunity to compare land tenure systems and possible policy changes that are relevant to other African countries in Western and Eastern Africa. It is also important to share the challenges of protecting and conserving the elephant population in West and East Africa; where the social economic changes are enhancing conflicts on wildlife conservation and sustainable agriculture.

Conflict analysis in both countries will also provide global lessons on the management approaches of contested trans-boundary resources among the pastoral nomads. The conflicts over access to critical pastures in Arly regions involving the Niger, Benin, Togo and Burkina Faso in Western Africa will provide important lessons for Kenya. AU IBAR is involved in conflict resolution around the Greater

Karamanjong Ecosystem in Eastern Africa where the pastoral nomads from Sudan, Uganda, Ethiopia and Kenya are involved in intermittent conflicts over contested cross-border resources for many years. The contrast between the agricultural production systems that characterize the two projects sites will also provide important global lessons on conservation of biodiversity in the face of expanding opportunities in horticulture and cotton farming in both countries.

In summary in Kenya's Ewaso Nyiro Ecosystem, the root causes of livestock-wildlife conflicts arise from the policy failure in the following:

- Inadequate legal mechanism for management of wildlife outside Protected Areas (PA's) (ownership and use rights).
- Land subdivision in wildlife dispersal areas (destruction and/or disruption of wildlife habitats).
- Inadequate incentives for wildlife conservation by communities in wildlife dispersal area and corridors.
- Inadequate land use policies especially in the control of land-use changes and human activities.
- Absence of a comprehensive policy for the resolution of conflicts between wildlife, pastoralism and other land uses.

In Burkina Faso, some of the root causes that undermine the livestock wildlife interface management in the buffer zone include:

- Lack of water points along the transhumance routes leading to conflicts between farmers and pastoralists.
- Inadequate fodder for livestock due to competition between resident livestock kept by sedentary farmers and the seasonal transhumance livestock from the Niger and Benin.
- Lack of benefits for the resident livestock farmers to conserve wildlife and forage resources.

This scenario has impact on the global environment and the sustainable development at community level. The increasing land degradation leading to loss of land productivity and biological diversity is closely linked to the interactions of the socio-economic, cultural and political systems with the environment. Hence, the project has been designed to address some of the main barriers of sustainable management at the interface by examining multiple use of grazing land by livestock and wildlife. Development approaches that lead to the improvement of natural resources at the community level and more efficient livestock production and marketing, will in turn lead to less poverty and environmental degradation. The latter will be achieved through community capacity building involving training, introduction of good natural resource management practices and entrepreneurship. The project will contribute to the mitigation of negative impacts of agricultural systems and practices on biological diversity in agro-ecosystems and their interface with other ecosystems. The realisation of the project purpose will be through documentation of good practices of mixed production systems where wildlife and livestock are deliberately managed for both economic benefits to the local communities and to the sustainability of environmental goods and services from the ecosystems. Lessons learnt from successful livestock wildlife interface management will be shared between Burkina Faso and Kenya and also with other member states. The project will focus on maintaining goods and services of targeted ecosystems and on overcoming barriers to the realization of benefits derived from such goods and services.

Policy issues are critical in relation to water catchments and distribution, land tenure and livestock economics as well wildlife utilization. The project will seek to address some of these through supplementing efforts of government agencies such as National Environmental Management Agencies as well as NGOs. One of the main areas of effort will be improving the integration of different agencies and communities in order to develop a common informed strategy at the wildlife

livestock interface. In the context of an enabling environment, it is believed that there are sufficient policies in place already and aspects of National Action Plans appropriate for the philosophy of sustainable development.

## *2. Project Goal and Objectives*

The DLWEIP overall objective is to mainstream biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas in Africa through the promotion and support to sustainable land use management systems for livestock and wildlife at the interface to improve community livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and reduce land degradation.

Land degradation in dryland ecosystems is increasingly destroying good management practices that have global significance in the conservation of biodiversity under sustainable and indigenous agricultural production systems. This project will document good practices and opportunities for improving on the management of resources at the interface. Indicators for progress towards the realization of the project goal include expansion of greater constituency of supporters for mixed production systems as exemplified by their willingness to set more land for livestock and wildlife land use. The improvement of ecological health of the fauna and flora under a mixed production system will be indicative of community support and institutional sustainability of the management system. By the end of the project, the policy framework to govern the operations of local institutions that manage resources at the interface will be initiated. Locally based conflict resolution institutions will minimize the conflicts between sedentary farmers and transhumance pastoralists in Burkina Faso by building consensus around contested resources along the migratory corridors.

Samburu and Laikipia districts in Kenya are role models on community participation and support for the establishment of conservancies where controlled management of livestock is practiced in order to allow the coexistence of wildlife and pastoral production systems. Arly National Park in Burkina Faso provides a good example on how wildlife conservation areas continue to provide corridors and migratory routes for transhumance pastoralists from neighboring countries of Niger and Benin.

Documentation of good practices will be shared with other countries facing similar challenges. AU-IBAR is well placed to facilitate the sharing process because of its mandate under TPN3 and also the internal collaboration with other TPNs of UNCCD under the guidance of the African Union.

DLWEIP intends to strengthen the existing positive partnerships among the local communities, CBOs and NGOs, international organizations and Government line ministries charged with the responsibility for the management of livestock, wildlife and environment interactions.

Activities are sought adjacent to conservation areas in Burkina Faso and in the wider agricultural landscape in Kenya that are particularly important to wildlife. The project activities will take place within the livestock production sector and will help address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss and contribute to enhancing ecosystem structure and function.

## *3. Project outcomes:*

The project will demonstrate that the mixed wildlife livestock based livelihood system is more sustainable than wildlife or livestock alone, and provides the basis for more sustainable livelihoods than more settled agro-pastoral systems in African Drylands. The project aims at achieving three major outcomes by capitalizing on the sustainable management of livestock and wildlife mix and these are:

- 1) Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized or reversed around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites;
- 2) Community livelihoods improved and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso; and
- 3) Enhanced awareness of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the interface, leading to scaling up of best practices in other African Drylands rich in wildlife.

The first outcome addresses the need to adopt sustainable land use practices that support wildlife and livestock management at the interface while conserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation. The project will look at current attempts at establishing private and community managed conservancies in terms of their success at achieving wildlife and livestock management at the interface and in reducing land degradation. The realization of this outcome has both local and global benefits in conservation and support of sustainable livelihoods based on new ways of optimizing on biodiversity and productive potential of the land without consequences of aggravating land degradation. At local level, the farmers and herders will agree on a land use plan that is more inclusive of special interests thus minimizing conflicts. At national level, the coexistence of wildlife and livestock will require the appropriate policy support especially in the management of areas adjacent to protected area. At Africa regional level, DLWEIP will contribute to a replicable model of good practices at the interface.

In addition, DLWEIP will promote mechanisms for early warning information dissemination (i.e. during the extreme climatic events such as drought and floods) and will also develop and implement conflict resolution mechanisms and strategies for the resolving and mitigating natural resources based-conflict and human/wildlife/livestock conflicts within project sites in Kenya and for cross-border areas adjacent to Arly National Park in Burkina Faso.

For the second outcome the establishment of conservancies will enable the pastoralists to benefit both directly and indirectly from income generated by these initiatives. Community conservancies in Kenya are spreading to many parts of the country but the genesis of this trend is from the Ewaso Nyiro ecosystem. DLWEIP will conduct studies to identify good practices and lessons from past experience and also monitor the process of establishing new community conservancies by those participating communities in the project who have indicated interest to learn from ongoing practices in Laikipia and Samburu district in Kenya. Stakeholders in the Burkina Faso project site in Arly are also keen to know more about ecotourism benefits from community managed conservancies in Kenya while the Kenyan counterparts are keen to learn the challenges of managing safari hunting under private concessionary arrangements. The community capacity to utilize available natural resources in a sustainable way will be enhanced through training and adoption of appropriate technologies. The outcome will also benefit the synergy from similar initiatives by other collaborating development partners. In the two countries, the focus on Poverty Reduction Strategy, Rural Development and Decentralization of governance at local level will have positive effect on DLWEIP activities.

The third outcome will facilitate the sharing of best practices with communities in both countries and other African member states through the UNCCD TPN3 network on rational use of rangelands and development of fodder crops; as well as TPN6 on Development of sustainable agriculture- AU /SAFGRAD, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. The long-term impact of this is expected to be the development and design of more appropriate projects and programmes in livestock production systems in Africa's Drylands that will conserve wildlife in the landscape while improving rural livelihoods.

AU-IBAR in partnership with other collaborating institutions such as UNEP, ILRI, IUCN and WWF, and AWF among others is strategically placed to disseminate a model of good practices in land

management because of AU- IBAR's excellent performance in Pan Africa Rinderpest Campaign (PARC) that has had dramatic positive impact on the livestock production in Africa. It is with this understanding that the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN) mandated AU-IBAR to be the lead institution in elaborating and facilitating the implementation of UNCCD Thematic Programme 3 on the Rational Use of Rangelands and Development of Fodder Crops.

#### *4. Assumptions*

The realization of the three project outcomes is based on the following assumptions:

- There will be positive change in the prevailing national policy on community based natural resources management and this will be entrenched within the national policy framework.
- Inter community conflicts over diminishing and contested natural resources will not escalate during and after the life of the project.
- The community ownership of best practices and lessons learnt will be based on long term equitable sharing of benefit from sustainable use of natural resources.

#### *5. Outputs and Activities*

The overall DLWEIP goal is to mainstream biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas through the promotion and support of sustainable land use management systems for improved community livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and reduction of land degradation.

The main strategy is to create and effectively manage conflict issues at the interface. Activities related to establishment of pastoral routes and initiation of pastoral rotational grazing systems, fodder crop farming, effective marketing systems, and creating inter-group management structures to organize use of resources as shown by the effectiveness of ARECOPA in Burkina Faso (Inter-village group managing pasture zones), attitude change among the farmers, improved livestock production systems, and clear zoning of buffer zones. Demarcating, developing and protecting transhumance corridors are critical.

The management of community land including the buffer zones requires the good will of the sedentary livestock farmers. Land use planning and management will be developed in consultation and participation of all stakeholders and with the supportive policy structures. The intensification of livestock farming and rational management of land is critical in sustaining effective management at the interface. Dynamic land use planning is needed to appraise the access to buffer zones for livestock and to determine accessible and non-accessible areas for livestock. The community needs to be empowered through training to take advantage of income generating opportunities, especially in improved livestock marketing system.

Capacity building of communities that are responsible for the management of the resources at the interface is critical. The capacity building activities will ensure community participation and enhancement of community negotiation skills, empowering of communities in the management of security and control of illegal use of resources at the interface, use of improved marketing infrastructure of livestock and livestock products by other development partners, identifying and training in alternative non-livestock based livelihood options, ensuring equitable benefit sharing, resource distribution and utilization, and enhancing livelihood security. Also the activities will ensure, in partnership with other development partners, effective disease control and management at the interface. The project will also ensure that the CBOs and local social organizations are well trained

and equipped with knowledge and skills to educate others. The project will play a leading role in agitating for proper land use policy to be put in place to minimize resources use conflicts.

**Component 1: *Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites***

The project will have the following outputs and activities for component 1:

1.1 Assessment of the status and trends of natural resources e.g. water, livestock, wildlife and fodder resources) as well as the impacts of changes, incentive and capacity building measures on the market shares of the derived products.

1.2 Assessment of land use policy frameworks in Kenya, and land tenure systems “gestion des terroirs” in Burkina Faso, at both national and local levels, including customary laws and local bylaws, and strengthening of local-level land-use planning and management.

1.3. Assessment conflict status on natural resources and identification and implementation of conflict resolution mechanisms.

1.4 Assessment of the status of non-sustainable wildlife and natural resources utilization and identification and implementation of sustainable alternatives.

**Component 2: *Community livelihoods improved and sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso***

There is need to achieve a balance between livestock and wildlife especially to establish drought refuge areas as safety nets. The old conservation strategies ignored the negative impact on pastoral communities. This component is geared towards supporting pastoral and agricultural livelihood as well as conserving wildlife in areas set aside by the communities.

2.1 Identification and promotion of sustainable management and rehabilitation of indigenous woodlands (in charcoal burning areas in Kenya; agriculture expansion zones in Burkina Faso).

2.2 Capacity building for local community and institutions- (user associations, stakeholders meetings, inter-sectoral forums and platforms for feedback mechanisms).

2.3 Establishment and support to community conservation initiatives.

2.4. Establishment of community disease control committees and initiatives on local slaughter and marketing of livestock and wildlife products by examining the dynamics of diseases among livestock and wildlife at pilot sites.

**Component 3: *Enhanced awareness of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the livestock-wildlife interface.***

3.1 Documentation of the success stories and lessons learnt and sharing of information (experiences in land management and land use and indigenous methodology of collecting and analysing information).

3.2. Identification of the target groups and facilitation of exchange visits for the dissemination of success stories and lessons learnt.

3.3. Identification and training of facilitators and organisation of dissemination workshops and seminars at local, national and Africa regional level.

The project design is detailed in the **logical framework** in **Annex 1** indicating the intervention logic project outcomes and impact indicators and the means of verification.

### **3. SUSTAINABILITY (INCLUDING FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY)**

The project is building on the ongoing community driven initiatives on the establishment of conservancies to resolve the wildlife/livestock and environment interface challenges in Kenya. In Burkina Faso, this project will also build on the ongoing Community-Based Rural Development Project under implementation from 2002 to 2017. The capacity building activities will strengthen community management practices at the interface. Community participation and improved management practices will promote sustainability of project benefits which include equitable sharing of ecotourism revenue and participative formulation and implementation of a code of regulations for the use of grazing resources in the conservancies.

The project will also encourage direct benefit sharing from game reserves and parks. In addition the project will promote local conflict management and establishment of resolution committees to minimize inter-tribal rivalry and conflicts arising from non-compatible land uses that are likely to threaten long-term viability of both community and national conservation initiatives. The farmers around Arly National Park in Burkina Faso are keen to have a forum to express their grievances arising from conflicts with the pastoral nomads from Niger and Benin. Such a forum will be established and supported by development partners operating in the area. In Kenya such a forum exists and the project will study the effectiveness and long-term sustainability of the Wildlife Forum operating within the project site.

The project will also agitate for the changing of conflicting policies in order to have clear land tenure policies on trust land. The creation of the right policy environment will enable community based natural resource management that in turn will entrench ownership to local communities. The communities will therefore have direct generation of economic gains from natural resources and in particular wildlife resources to support their willingness to conserve for long term global, national and community benefits. Moreover, the project will promote diversification to alternative livelihoods and also encourage formation of water user association so as to minimize resource use conflict between horticultural farming and traditional livestock/wildlife mixed production system. Adoption of compatible land use in the buffer zones in protected areas will ensure long-term sustainability and ecological integrity of these areas. Mixed production system involving wildlife and livestock management is an effective indigenous strategy for conserving biodiversity in Burkina Faso and in Kenya Drylands.

Financial sustainability in Burkina Faso will come from the following sources. One of the sources is the fee charged to the pastoral nomads as they pass through corridor in the Arly National Park as result of the expanding cotton farming in the buffer zone. The pastoralists are also expected to pay tax on the sale of their livestock part of which the local/ village governments can have access to support the conflict management at the interface. The sedentary farmers can also contribute from the sale of cash crops and some of their resident livestock herds to support local peace-building and resource conservation of critical resources. Financial contribution from private sector operating Safari Hunting



in game concession areas will also be pursued within the framework of participating stakeholders in the DLWEIP. Activities having positive impacts for biodiversity conservation and reduction in land degradation are likely to benefit from the long term Dryland development strategy of Burkina Faso government.

In Kenya, financial sustainability of project impacts or promotion of an effective model of livestock wildlife management at the interface will greatly benefit from the stated government policy to invest in the human population living in the Drylands. The financial return from ecotourism enterprises around community-managed conservancies is the most promising source of revenue to sustain biodiversity at the interface. If the communities also decide to charge some fees for access to conservancies for dry season grazing areas, this will also promote financial sustainability from livestock production system. If proper a model is documented, the Government may wish to sustain the positive project impacts particularly around buffer zones around protected areas as well as community managed conservancies. The Government is also encouraging partnership between the private sector and community development of enterprises in Drylands. Through the Wildlife forums, the private ranches and Kenya Wildlife Service will ensure sustainability of ecotourism by supporting the DLWEIP activities that promote peaceful coexistence between livestock and crop farming, and wildlife.

Dissemination of good practices at sub-regional and regional levels will be sustained through the operationalisation of UNCCD TPN3. Under UNCCD, sub-regional and regional action programmes are being elaborated for compliance with Conference of Parties resolutions for reversing land degradation and biodiversity losses. The DWLEIP implementation strategy will ensure the inclusion of pilot project outcomes/activities in the Kenya and Burkina Faso as integral part of national sub-regional and regional action programmes/plans/strategies.

#### **4. REPLICABILITY**

The thrust of this project is the identification and documentation of best practices in land management at the livestock-wildlife interface. One of the outcomes is specifically on the dissemination of good practices within the two participating countries and also through the TPN3 Website hosted by AU-IBAR. Specific actions are to: document the success stories and lessons learnt in the project sites; identify the target groups; organize dissemination workshops on the findings of pilot studies; package message and means of sharing the lessons and experiences for sharing the lessons learnt; identify and train facilitators for information dissemination; and facilitate communities within the countries to exchange visits to demonstrate success.

During the project formulation consultative workshops, some communities indicated desire to replicate the success of ongoing community initiatives in resolving livestock wildlife and environment interface challenges. It is also expected that the Kenyan participants will learn some useful lessons from the experiences Burkina Faso wildlife hunting expeditions under private sector management. Wildlife hunting is an illegal activity in Kenya since 1976. There is a proposal to reintroduce the Safari hunting activities in Kenya under a new Kenya Wildlife Policy currently under discussion.

#### **5. STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

- **Stakeholder Identification**

All stakeholders working in livestock wildlife and environment in the Ewaso Nyiro North Ecosystem in Kenya and Arly Ecosystem in Burkina Faso have been identified and actively involved in the

project proposal development. At community level, all relevant Government ministries and parastatals, NGOs and CBOs working on issues of livestock, wildlife and environment were identified as key stakeholders for project formulation and implementation (See Annex 2 & 4).

At national level, Government Departments and national, regional and international institutions working in the areas of livestock, wildlife and environment were identified for project formulation and implementation. In Kenya, for example, at the national level, the institutions had formed a working cluster to address the livestock wildlife and environment interface in 2002.

- **Stakeholder Participation**

All the stakeholders participated in a three-tier workshop set up (Annex 4). At local level, communities in project sites were involved in participatory workshop to give inputs in generating project activities and identifying the priority issues at the livestock wildlife and environment interface. At the national level, technical stakeholders working in the livestock wildlife and environment areas were involved in a participatory workshop to elaborate on issues generated by stakeholders at community level for formulation and integration in the MSP proposal. At regional level, stakeholders from Kenya and Burkina Faso held a joint workshop to harmonize issues and activities developed in both countries.

During project implementation all stakeholders who participated in the three level workshops listed below will be directly involved in the project activities that they have already identified (See Workplan in Annex 2)

#### **INTERNATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS**

The PDF A facilitated consultation workshops during which international and regional organizations participated in the formulation of the MSP proposal. UNEP, AU-IBAR, ILRI, IUCN, WWF, AWF, ACC and Terra Nova participated in national and regional workshops. These institutions are members of Nairobi Cluster on wildlife livestock environment interactions consultative forum that held its first meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> August, 2002. AU-IBAR, WWF and UNEP hosted the consultative meetings held on 9<sup>th</sup> June, 2003 and 8<sup>th</sup> January, 2004. The members of the Nairobi Cluster contributed ideas on the formulation of the MSP and also indicated the preferred activities they would like to be involved during the implementation phase of the MSP.

#### **BURKINA FASO**

- Environmental consultation workshop (Field workshop) held in Aryl National Park on 8<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> March 2004
- National workshop held in Kossodo/Ouagadougou on 11 and 12 March 2004.

#### **KENYA**

- Workshop on proposed UNEP-GEF funded project on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2004 in Bomen Hotel Isiolo
- National Stakeholders workshop on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2004 in Nairobi
- Regional workshop discussion on 21<sup>st</sup>-and 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2004, where key stakeholders from Kenya and Burkina Faso met in Nairobi, Kenya

- **Social and Participation Issues**

The stakeholders at all levels will contribute resources such as time and use of community social facilities and infrastructure. In addition, the local communities together with other stakeholders will be involved in community mobilization, and also provide security and policing on misuse of natural resources.

- **Information Dissemination and Consultation**

Information documented on the best practices will be disseminated through exchange visits, workshops and conferences, print and electronic media, Pamphlets and Newsletters and through internet (e.g. websites) television discussions, debates, Radio, Films and organization of an international wildlife exhibition room.

Information will also be disseminated through cultural exchange and upholding cultural values and beliefs system that support conservation efforts. Organizing study tours for the communities and organization of community consultative workshops will be implemented in the two countries as effective methods for information dissemination.

The choice of dissemination methods will be arrived at through consultation at community, national and regional levels. AU- IBAR will facilitate information dissemination of best practices to AU- Member States and globally through the TPN3 network and other relevant TPNs within AU.

## **6. MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

### **Monitoring and Evaluation Plan**

#### Approach

The project is basing its monitoring and evaluation needs on the following definition: the process of observing (monitoring) and valuing (evaluation) results and progress towards achieving objectives with the aim of informing management decisions (corrective adaptation for continuous improvement). The approach will follow four key principles: (1) Achievement : ensuring that project management teams are equipped with appropriate management tools to allow for performance (e.g. extent to which a project is carried out as planned in terms of objectives, time and financial constraints, and organizational policy and procedures); (2) Learning : ensuring that project knowledge is fed back into project planning processes to allow for improvement; (3) Measurement : ensuring that proper processes keep developing relevant project indicators to allow for internal and independent results evaluations; (4) Accountability : ensuring quality through systemized processes that allow for transparency.

Monitoring is the continuous or periodic review and surveillance by management of the implementation of an activity. Monitoring helps to ensure that all required actions are proceeding according to plan. Evaluation is a process for determining systematically and objectively the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and impact of the activities in light of their objectives. Ongoing evaluation is the analysis, during the implementation phase, of continuing relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness and the present and likely future outputs, effects, and impacts. The project will be evaluated on the basis of execution performance, output delivery, and project impact (outcomes per the project logframe).

Monitoring and control will be exercised by AU-IBAR through progress meetings to assess the realization of project objectives and outcomes. Specific outputs and indicators shown in the logical framework will be adhered to and feedback from communities and other participating institutions will also be incorporated in project implementation and management.

### Processes

#### *Performance*

At the end of every six months, an internal monitoring and evaluation of project implementation will be carried out by AU-IBAR in collaboration with other stakeholders including the community itself. During the project inception, consensus will be reached with other implementing partners/stakeholders on what data to collect, how to collect and process the data on performance indicators.

**Table 1: Indicators for evaluating whether project implementation unit and steering committee are operating effectively**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Means of Verification<sup>7</sup></b>
Quarterly and annual activity progress reports are prepared in a timely and satisfactory manner	Arrival of reports to UNEP
Quarterly financial reports are prepared in a timely and satisfactory manner.	Arrival of reports to UNEP
Performance targets, outputs, and outcomes are achieved as specified in the annual work plans.	Semi annual and Annual progress reports
Deviations from the annual work plans are corrected promptly and appropriately. Requests for deviations from approved budgets are submitted in a timely fashion.	Work plans, minutes of SC meetings, timely submission of revised budget to UNEP for approval
Disbursements are made on a timely basis, and procurement is achieved according to the procurement plan.	IMIS system at UNEP and Bank Account statements of executing agency
Report on the procurement of non-expendable equipment against the project budget filed in a timely manner.	Inventory of Non-Expendable Equipment reports
Audit reports and other reviews showing sound financial practices.	Audit statements
International Steering Committee (ISC) is tracking implementation progress and project impact, and providing guidance on annual work plans and fulfilling TOR.	Minutes of ISC meetings
ISC is providing policy guidance, especially on achievement of project impact.	Minutes of ISC meetings

<sup>7</sup> The responsible officer to track this will be the GEF project task manager in consultation with the project manager.

**Table 2 Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation Responsibilities**

<b>UNEP</b>	<b>AU/IBAR</b>	<b>International agencies National counterparts responsible for project components</b>	<b>National Steering Committee (NSC)</b>	<b>International Steering Committee (ISC)</b>
<p>Monitor the agreed M&amp;E plan in accordance with the terms of agreement with GEFSEC.</p> <p>Receive quarterly progress and financial reports and annual summary progress reports and copies of all substantive reports from AU/IBAR</p> <p>Task manager to attend and participate fully in meetings of the project ISC and visits to selected project sites</p> <p>Engage and prepare terms of reference for independent M&amp;E consultants to conduct the mid-term and final evaluations.</p>	<p>Establish reporting guidelines for all partners in the project, ensure that they meet reporting dates, and provide reports of suitable quality.</p> <p>Prepare quarterly progress and annual summary progress reports for UNEP, and forward substantive and quarterly financial reports, with supporting documentation as appropriate, in a timely manner to UNEP.</p> <p>Carry out a program of regular visits to project sites to supervise activities, and pay special attention to those sites with serious implementation problems.</p>	<p>Prepare progress reports every six months for AU/IBAR, and forward related financial reports, with supporting documentation as appropriate.</p> <p>Carry out a program of regular visits to project sites to supervise activities as appropriate.</p>	<p>Use reports to review the progress of work in the project as a whole.</p> <p>Advise AU/IBAR on implementation problems that emerge, and on desirable modifications to the work plan for the succeeding year.</p> <p>Monitor progress in the capacity-building aspects of the project, and advise AU/IBAR on steps to enhance this aspect of the project.</p>	<p>Use progress and financial reports and provide policy guidance to the project on any matters arising from a reading of these reports.</p> <p>Assist AU/IBAR in developing linkages with other projects, thus ensuring the wider impact of project work.</p> <p>Provide overall guidance for the project implementation.</p>

### *Project Impacts*

A mid-term external evaluation will be conducted after 18 months in addition to a final end-of-project external evaluation commissioned by UNEP-GEF. The details on objectives, outcomes and activities indicators and the means of verification are given in the **project logical framework in Annex 1**. The external mid-term review will be carried out with the assistance of an independent reviewer. At the end of every six months there will be self-evaluations by AU-IBAR and the stakeholders on the implementation of the work plan. An independent team of reviewers to assess the overall success of the project will conduct an end-of-project evaluation.

Since project participants/stakeholders will be mandated to implement specific activities, the monitoring and evaluation will be participatory and they will be required to present to the overall project team progress made in implementing specific activities in the work plan. The latter will be done at the end of every six months.

The budget will have provision for supporting monitoring and evaluation of activities. The budget support shall be provided for different levels such as community, national teams and external reviewers. The external M&E will be funded by UNEP-GEF while the internal M&E will take up not more than 10% of the total budget. This will be necessary to ensure that the project products for dissemination are well supported by field data and observations.

The monitoring and evaluation results will be used to review the activities and the implementation strategy and modification will be done where and when necessary to ensure project outcomes and objectives are realized. Various indicators will be used to ascertain whether the projects objectives were met. For instance, at the end of the project the stakeholders will be able to tell, how many community based conservancies have been started, how many CBOs have been supported in their activities in natural resource conservation, how many pastoral association for resource use harmonization and management will have been started by the mid/end of the project.

The overall project objective is to mainstream biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas through the promotion and support to sustainable land use management system to improve the livelihoods enhance biodiversity conservation and reduction of land degradation. The indicators at this level include the land set aside for conservation and drought refuge areas at the interface in Kenya and Burkina Faso by the end of the project. It is also anticipated that the ecosystems under improved management of livestock and wildlife at the interface will improve in terms of vegetation recovery and biodiversity of wildlife coexisting with livestock. The critical indicator of the project success is the harnessing of the support for conservation of wildlife under livestock production systems. This will be objectively verified by the amount of land put under a community owned management plan for sustainable management of natural resources under their jurisdiction.

There will be three main outcomes expected by the end of this project. The first one is reduction of biodiversity loss and land degradation at the interface of mixed management of wildlife and livestock in an African traditional setting. It is expected that one indicator of ecosystem health under mixed management is the improvement of vegetation and tolerance for the coexistence of wildlife and livestock. It is expected that the communities will participate in environmentally friendly entrepreneurial activities based on the rich biodiversity in their areas. The second outcome is the improvement of community livelihoods that depend on the wildlife and livestock at the interface. Functional community committees charged with responsibilities for regulating resource utilization at the interface

will be a clear indicator of the achievement of this outcome. The final outcome is the documentation of a reproducible model on the best practices on land use and management of natural resources at the interface. The core indicator will be a model that will be shared with other communities in Africa facing similar challenges of sustainable mixed management of livestock and wildlife.





## FINANCING

### 1. Financing Plan

A detailed budget per project activity is provided below.

ACTIVITY	GEF	CO-FINANCING		TOTAL
		IN KIND	CASH	
1.1 Assess status and trends of natural resource as well as the impact changes, incentive and capacity building measures on the market shares of the derived products	50,000	100,000	-	150,000
1.2 Assess land use policies frameworks in Kenya and land tenure systems in Burkina Faso at the both national and local levels including customary laws, and strengthen local level and land use planning and management	50,000	100,000	-	150,000
1.3 Assess conflict status on use of natural resources and identify and implement resolutions mechanisms	30,000	100,000	50,000	180,000
1.4 Assess status of non-sustainable wildlife and natural resources utilization and identify and implement sustainable alternatives.	60,000	100,000	100,000	260,000
2.1 Identify and promote sustainable management and rehabilitation of woodlands	50,000	100,000	-	150,000
2.2 Build capacity to local community and institutions	100,000	100,000	-	200,000
2.3 Support community conservation initiatives	100,000	200,000	-	300,000
2.4 Establish community disease control committees and slaughter house and marketing initiatives	100,000	400,000	300,000	800,000
3.1 Document success stories and lessons learnt	70,000	200,000	50,000	320,000
3.2 Identify target groups and facilitate exchange visits	50,000	150,000	-	200,000
3.3 Identify and train facilitators and dissemination workshops	40,000	50,000	-	90,000
Coordination Units (Kenya and Burkina Faso)	200,000	100,000	-	300,000
Monitoring and evaluation	75,000	106,000	-	181,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>975,000</b>	<b>1,856,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>3,331,000</b>

The largest portion of the finances will finance activities involving the community stakeholders directly at the grass root level. The latter will be done in collaboration with NGOs, CBOs and government agencies. Subcontracts will be made with collaborating institutions to undertake specific activities based on their institutional expertise and comparative advantages.

The coordination budget will be controlled by AU-IBAR and shall comprise such items like salaries of two country coordinators (one each in Kenya and Burkina Faso), four field assistants (3 in Kenya and 1 in Burkina Faso), Trips to Burkina Faso (at least twice a year) by Project coordinator at AU-IBAR, local travel to project sites, communication (telephone, faxes, etc), purchase of computers (one laptop and 2 desktops), conference and workshops by project coordinator (local and international), stationery and supplies, translation (English-French and vice versa), etc.

Monitoring and evaluation shall be coordinated by AU-IBAR under the special budget set aside for that purpose and will include cost of hiring the experts and their travel costs.

## **2. Cost Effectiveness**

The project aims at the sharing of experiences through south-south cooperation between Kenya and Burkina Faso on how to mainstream biodiversity, in particular wildlife in mixed production systems at their interface with protected areas, buffer zones and biological corridors. The cost effectiveness of the project will be built on the comparison of different natural resources planning systems and policy frameworks as well as on the replication of successful land use practices to conserve biodiversity and mitigate land degradation.

The main output of this project is the documentation of existing community and national efforts at combating desertification and biodiversity losses in indigenous livestock and wildlife mixed production systems. The challenges of sustainable management of such mixed production systems from rapidly changing land use are characteristic of several African countries undergoing rapid socio economic changes. The case studies and documentation of good practices at community level will be disseminated widely in the African region under the Thematic Programme Network 3 on the rational use of rangelands and development of fodder crops. The lessons learnt will have direct contribution in the national and international project/programmes for the implementation of the international conventions. The information derived from these case studies in both Kenya and Burkina Faso will have sub-regional and regional positive impact on the environmental policy formulation for conserving wildlife within the indigenous pastoral production systems. The case studies will also enhance GEF understanding on socio-cultural and economic driving variable that lead to land degradation and loss of biological diversity in semi-arid and arid environments.

The consequences of the driving forces in land degradation and loss of biological diversity are seen in declining wildlife numbers in mixed production systems, loss of woody vegetation and extensive soil erosion, conflicts over declining livestock grazing resources and water, rapid change in land use and land tenure regimes. It is therefore important that GEF supports documentation of good natural resources management practices. The selected case studies of good land and biodiversity management practices are largely supported from other projects and the GEF incremental contribution will therefore be used in a cost-effective way and will be increasing the support of the existing community and government initiatives for the purpose of learning lessons and documenting the process for sharing with other stakeholders in the implementation of UNCCD and UNCBD.

## **3. Co-financing**

Co-financing by source and type is as follows:

CO-FINANCING SOURCES				
Name of Co-financier (source)	Classification	Type	Amount (US\$)	Status*
AU/IBAR	Bilateral	In kind	300,000	
AU/IBAR/PAC E/PLP	Bilateral	In kind	200,000	
AU/IBAR	Bilateral	In Cash	500,000	
Participating Institutions (see Annex 2)	Collaborators	In kind	683,000	
NGOs	Collaborators	In kind	200,000	
GoK	Government	In kind	213,000	
GoBF	Government	In kind	260,000	
Sub-Total Co-financing			2,356,000	

Letters of commitment from co-financiers are attached.

## **E - INSTITUTIONAL Coordination and Support**

### **1) CORE COMMITMENTS AND LINKAGES**

#### **A) Country/regional/global/sector**

The project is in line with the *Land Use Management and Soil Conservation Policy* of UNEP (UNEP/GC.22/INF/25) that emphasizes UNEP's role in addressing the environmental dimensions of land use management, i.e. linkages with land and soil degradation, poverty, land tenure and public participation, environmental impact of agriculture, water management, environmental emergencies, urbanization, global climate change, and trade and environmental externalities. In order to support governments and civil society in achieving environmental sustainability of land use, UNEP is to further develop and apply environmentally focused and development oriented policy guidance.

In addition, UNEP's Regional Office for Africa (ROA) has provided catalytic support to the operationalization of the Thematic Programme Networks of the CCD in Africa. Notably, ROA has provided a grant to AU-IBAR to establish a TPN3 Desk in Nairobi.

#### **B) GEF activities with potential influence on the proposed project (design and implementation)**

The project will add value to the GEF funded *Desert Margin Programme* involving Burkina Faso and Kenya, jointly implemented by UNEP and UNDP and executed by ICRISAT by providing documentation of good practices in arid and semi-arid lands that support wildlife and livestock, at their interface. The project will contribute to the refinement of measurements of impacts of changes on biodiversity loss, in particular wildlife and solutions in solving land degradation problems.

The project will be thematically linked to the UNEP/UNDP concept on *Sustainable Transboundary Rangeland Management in Liptako-Gourma, West Africa* aimed at contributing to the management of shared rangelands, including pastures and woodlands, of Liptako-Gourma, a shared area between Mali, Burkina Faso and Niger in West Africa. Where experiences of regional relevance will be shared.

The project will also contribute to the UNEP/GEF project on *Community-based Management of On-farm Plant Genetic Resources in Arid and Semi-arid Areas of Sub-Saharan Africa* involving Burkina Faso and Kenya, whose main goal is to improve the effectiveness of traditional farming systems for conservation of crop landraces of local and global importance through the development of models for enabling environments in biodiversity conservation and measures to maintain and promote wider adoption of viable systems.

In Burkina Faso, the project will support UNEP/GEF projects on Building Scientific and Technical Capacity for Effective Management and Sustainable Use of Dryland Biodiversity in West African Biosphere Reserves which aim at improving the understanding of interactions between local communities and savanna ecosystems, identifying and promoting sustainable use of biodiversity in pilot demonstrations, strengthening stakeholder capacity at all levels, and more effectively integrating stakeholders into the management of each biosphere reserve.

In Kenya, the project will complement the findings of the UNEP/GEF medium sized project on *Land Use Change Analysis as an Approach for Investigating Biodiversity Loss and Land Degradation*, which analyzes new and existing data concerning the linkages between the processes of change in biodiversity, land degradation and land use in order to design a guide on how to use land use change analysis to identify spatial and temporal trends, and linkages of change in biodiversity and land degradation; integrating ecological, socioeconomic and land use data and theory to develop a replicable analytical framework to identify the root causes of land use change leading to changes in biodiversity and land degradation in East Africa.

The project will also support the UNEP/GEF project on *Development and implementation of a sustainable resource management plan for Marsabit mountain and its associated watersheds in Kenya* as well as the UNEP/IFAD Mt Kenya East Pilot Project for Natural Resources Management that are also dealing with human-wildlife conflicts between protected areas and agricultural areas.

The project is located within the TPN 3 programme thrust that focuses on the Livestock and environment interactions. AU- IBAR has the mandate to elaborate UNCCD Thematic Programme 3 on the Rational Use of rangelands and development of fodder crops. The project will be located in the Animal Production Department of AU – IBAR and later will form a part of the environment section within AU- IBAR.

AU – IBAR has also initiated the Nairobi Cluster, which draws participation of several organizations dealing with wildlife livestock and environment interactions. The organizations will be participating in the implementation of this project as one concrete initiative supported by the Cluster members. AU- IBAR will provide project resources to some of the participating members of the Nairobi Cluster to execute some component of the project. Participating members of the Cluster in Kenya include: AWF, Kenya Wildlife Service, ILRI, University of Nairobi, IUCN and UNEP.

In Burkina Faso, the Wildlife Department will be the chief implementing agency supported by IUCN, Ministry of Environment, and other similar programmes operating in the project area.

## **2) CONSULTATION, COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION BETWEEN AND AMONG IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES, EXECUTING AGENCIES, AND THE GEF SECRETARIAT, IF APPROPRIATE.**

The proposed GEF-UNEP-AU-IBAR project will be linked to the UNDP Global Pastoralism Programme through their GEF medium-sized project on *Enabling Sustainable Dryland Management through Mobile Pastoral Custodianship* whose main purpose is to build the capacities of pastoralists;

using information that is strategic in changing popular perceptions and policy decisions; and disseminate tools and approaches for enhancing sustainable management of rangelands for maintaining the functional integrity of such ecosystems. The project will enhance the enabling environment for sustainable rangeland management, through improved pastoral livelihoods, and pastoral empowerment.

The project will also be linked to the GEF-UNDP supported programme on the Partnership for Natural Ecosystem Management Project which is focusing on biodiversity under the theme of environment and rural development. The intended impact is on the biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction. This is a long-term development programme over a period of 15 years starting from 2002. The programme purpose and development objective is to enhance the capacity of Burkina Faso to reverse the trend of biodiversity loss through sustainable management of woodlands forests and wildlife. GEF is providing financing to assist in conserving its globally important protected areas. AU-IBAR will coordinate and add synergy in the implementation of activities by the stakeholders

In Kenya, the project will be contributing to the Government ASAL development strategy whose major outcome is sustainable use of natural resources in an environmentally sustainable way. Several Government initiatives in these areas include the promotion of community-managed conservancies that bring tangible benefits to the local communities. The Kenya Wildlife Service, one of the key stakeholder in the project implementation, is mandated to deal with wildlife human conflicts issues and this project will provide an opportunity to enhance KWS capacity to address these issues.

In Burkina Faso, the Government is already consulting with the Governments of Niger and Benin in order to resolve the complexity of nomadic movements through Arly National Park and the surrounding buffer zones occupied by sedentary livestock farmers. Land use change from livestock to cotton farming is driven by the AGOA (African Growth Opportunity Agreement). The project will also benefit from the ongoing activities in Game Concession areas where the involvement of the private sector is critical to resolving the conflicts between the nomadic pastoralists and the owners of Safari Operators in concession areas.

At regional level, the proposed project will finance the compilation and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned related to sustainable land management at the livestock-wildlife interface. For this purpose, a number of GEF projects will be invited to contribute with relevant experiences.

### **3) IMPLEMENTATION/EXECUTION ARRANGEMENTS**

The Institutions that will be directly dealing with field implementation held workshops at project sites in Kenya and in Burkina Faso in 29<sup>th</sup> January and 8<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> March 2004 respectively. The roles in project implementation are shown under the Workplan Annex 2. The project has been developed through participation of key stakeholders at project site level, national and regional level. Consultative process at national levels in Kenya and Burkina Faso was facilitated through project site and national workshops between January and March 2004. Regional/international consultation was done in April 21-22, 2004 in Nairobi where Burkina Faso and Kenya project activities were harmonized and the final logical framework was completed incorporating inputs from the two countries.

The implementing Agency will be UNEP. AU-IBAR will be the executing agent in charge of the overall technical backstopping of the project through regular internal monitoring and evaluation. The full time country project coordinators and their assistants will assist AU-IBAR to implement the project as indicated above and will be directly answerable to AU-IBAR. The financing of the project activities by the collaborating institutions will be through sub-contracts administered through MOUs.

Two national project steering committees will be established in Kenya and Burkina Faso and will comprise of the national agencies, ministerial departments, institutes, NGOs and CBOs involved in the project implementation. The national steering committees will meet every six months and provide general oversight and guidance to the project, facilitate interagency coordination. An international project steering committee will also be created and will comprise of one representative from UNEP, AU/IBAR, the Office of the President-Arid Lands Resource Management Programme (ALRMP) in Kenya and la Direction Générale des Eaux et Forêts of Burkina Faso as well as representatives from two key organizations based in Burkina Faso and Kenya, to be designated by AU/IBAR on a rotational basis among the agencies implementing project components. The international steering committee will meet once a year alternatively in Kenya and Burkina Faso. AU-IBAR will oversee the project implementation according to the agreed workplans of activities and following the recommendations of the project steering committee.

AU-IBAR will be responsible for the implementation of DLWEIP in collaboration with other key partners who include Government Departments, IUCN, AWF, ACC, ILRI and local NGOs and CBOs. In Kenya, IUCN, AWF, ACC, and OOP will lead some activities while in Burkina Faso, IUCN, DAPF, DGEF, DSV and AT will lead some activities. The latter institutions will provide a service contract under the supervision of AU- IBAR. Within AU-IBAR, PACE and PLP projects will also support relevant DLWEIP activities that are within their work plans. AU-IBAR has the technical and political good will from member states for effective coordination and also has the potential to sustain and disseminate the outcomes of DLWEIP to member states in Africa, regional and international institutions.

While AU-IBAR will be the executing agency on behalf of UNEP, the institutions listed above will lead in the baseline survey of natural resources and land use and land tenure systems as well as in assessing the status of water and forage resources. They will also take part in the documentation of the case study model in partnership with AU-IBAR.

## Annex 1: Log frame for DLWEIP

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
<p><b>Objective :</b></p> <p>To promote the mainstreaming biodiversity and livestock resources at the interface between mixed production ecosystems and protected areas in Africa</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communities make decisions to set aside conservation and drought refuge areas at the interface in Kenya (Kina, Namunyak) and Arly in Burkina Faso by the end of the project in an area totaling 182,000 ha</li> <li>Number of households with increased income increase by 20% at pilot sites</li> <li>Ecosystem health (animals, land and people) in the pilot sites improves by 20% by the end of the project.</li> <li>Use of best practices at the interface in at least 5 new countries by end of project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultative meetings with communities living at the interface to establish conservancies</li> <li>Areas set aside and effectively managed for multiple use of wildlife and restricted livestock grazing during critical seasons.</li> <li>Community based governance structures to oversee the management at the interface.</li> <li>National policy documents on wildlife and livestock management incorporating “best practices at the interface”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Different ethnic and local communities do not contest areas endowed with rich bio-diverse resources. It is therefore assumed that any conflicts and suspicions on allocation and designation of land for multiple uses will not arise and that the establishment of such areas will strengthen community peace-building around shared natural resources.</li> <li>Enabling national policy framework for mitigation of community based initiatives on wildlife/livestock and environment interactions.</li> </ul>
<b>OUTCOME LEVEL:</b>			
<p><b>OUTCOME 1</b></p> <p>Biodiversity loss and land degradation minimized around livestock/wildlife interface areas at pilot sites</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation cover improved by 10% after three years</li> <li>Acreage of designated areas for interface management under wildlife and livestock increased by 10% by the end of three years</li> <li>Four wildlife-based enterprises-supported (two in Burkina Faso and two in Kenya).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conflict resolution reports</li> <li>Maps</li> <li>Other reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The community ownership of the project</li> <li>Security is maintained</li> </ul>
<p><b>OUTCOME 2</b></p> <p>Community livelihoods improved and Sustainable management of wildlife and livestock resources at the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Four functional community wildlife and livestock committees supported (at least two in Kenya and two in Burkina Faso) by the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainable livelihood survey reports</li> <li>AU-IBAR project progress technical reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Free trade</li> <li>Conflict/security improved;</li> <li>Wildlife utilization is allowed;</li> <li>Livestock market demand is</li> </ul>

interface enhanced in Kenya and established in Burkina Faso	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>end of the project period</li> <li>Reduced conflict between livestock, people and wildlife at pilot sites by 20% in Burkina Faso and 50% in Kenya.</li> <li>Grazing management plans established: four in Kenya and one grazing plan for Burkina Faso in place by year 2.</li> <li>Livestock off take in Kenya increased by 20%. Livestock/wildlife management at the interface established in Burkina Faso</li> <li>Livelihood based on livestock/wildlife at the interface increased by 10%</li> <li>Decline in wildlife numbers reversed by 20%.</li> <li>Existing land use/tenure reviewed and recommendations sent to relevant institutions at the end of project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of livestock monitoring reports</li> <li>Socioeconomic surveys at household level</li> <li>Number of stakeholder meetings held by the committees</li> </ul>	available and influx of livestock from outside the project areas minimized.
<p>OUTCOME 3</p> <p>Enhanced awareness in Africa of adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management at the livestock-wildlife interface</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adaptable best practices on sustainable land use management identified and disseminated at end of project</li> <li>Awareness in conservation among the communities increased by end of project in Kenya and Burkina within and outside the project sites and at Africa regional level;</li> <li>Success/best practices/lessons learnt documented in various forms by the end of the project.</li> <li>Use of best practices at the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshop reports;</li> <li>Policy briefs;</li> <li>National policy documents on wildlife and livestock management incorporating “best practices at the interface”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Security in the area is maintained.</li> </ul>



	interface in at least 5 new countries by end of project		
--	---	--	--

<b>OUTPUTS/ACTIVITIES: Narrative summary</b>	<b>Objectively verifiable Indicators (OVIs)</b>	<b>MEANS OF VERIFICATION</b>	<b>RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS</b>
<b>COMPONENT 1</b>			
1.1 Assessment of the status and trends of natural resources water, livestock, wildlife and fodder resources) as well as the impacts of changes, incentive and capacity building measures on the market shares of the derived products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of awareness on the number and conditions of people, livestock and wildlife dependent on the Ewaso Nyiro North Basin in Kenya and on Arly National Park in Burkina Faso documented by end of year 1</li> <li>• Biodiversity and ecological trends of selected species of animals and plants documented by end of year 1</li> <li>• Range condition and land cover trends analysis done by year 1</li> <li>• Hot spots for natural resource use conflicts identified by year 1</li> <li>• Number of identified best practices in satisfactory co-habitation between people/livestock/wildlife in natural resource use.</li> <li>• Land use and degradation /evaluation reports produced by end of year 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dry and wet season water measurement report</li> <li>• Report of water management structures</li> <li>• Environmental Impact assessment report</li> <li>• Natural resources baseline reports</li> <li>• Monitoring and survey reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Security in the area is maintained.</li> <li>• Community is willing to cooperate and participate</li> <li>• No trans-boundary conflicts;</li> <li>• Existent data information available.</li> </ul>
1.2 Assessment of land use policy in Kenya, and emerging land tenure and land use systems and “gestion des terroirs” in Burkina Faso, at both national and local levels, including customary laws and local bylaws, and comparative analysis; (1.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparative studies on land use/land tenure policy frameworks at project sites and national levels in Kenya and Burkina Faso ready by middle of project.</li> <li>• Seminars/workshops recommendations on land use/land tenure policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study reports on land use/land tenure in Kenya and Burkina Faso project sites</li> <li>• Seminar/ Workshop reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political goodwill and commitment exists in both countries for the adoption/ implementation of the recommendations from land use/ land tenure studies and seminar/workshop discussions</li> </ul>

	frameworks in context of project study findings on customary laws/by laws available by end of year 2.		
1.3. Assessment of status and trend of natural resource –based conflicts and identification of resolution mechanisms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced conflicts over resource use by half in 2007;</li> <li>• Documentation of local arrangement for improved access to natural resources in both countries by 2007</li> <li>• Documentation of nature of conflicts by year 2;</li> <li>• One new initiative for conflict resolution/peace building in each site by 2007.</li> <li>• Reduced numbers of poaching cases by 50% in 2007.</li> <li>• One community-based committee against illegal poaching and charcoal burning established in each area by 2007.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conflict resolution reports</li> <li>• Water flow measurement reports</li> <li>• Reports on local by laws/customary arrangements on access to natural resources</li> <li>• Survey reports</li> <li>• Reports on conflict analysis and resolution</li> <li>• Reports on local peace-building and conflict resolution</li> <li>• Reports on poaching and charcoal burning</li> <li>• Reports on bush meat consumption</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community willing to cooperate and participate in giving the necessary information on conflicts and compliance with laws and customary regulations related to shared natural resources.</li> <li>• Support from target communities in reporting illegal activities on poaching and charcoal production in the project sites</li> </ul>
1.4 Assessment of the status of non-sustainable wildlife and natural resources utilization on Ewaso-Nyiro dry land Eco-system by reviewing the threats and trends of wildlife numbers and habitats; and livestock censuses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Status and trends of wildlife and livestock established in the study area by 2006</li> <li>• Types and extent of water use conflicts identified by 2007</li> <li>• Loss of vegetation cover to charcoal, agricultural expansion quantified by 2007</li> <li>• Causes, types and extent of wildlife poaching and bush meat consumption established by 2006</li> <li>• Factors that lead to land degradation and loss of pasture established by 2007.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports on poaching and charcoal burning</li> <li>• Reports on status of consumption of bush-meat</li> <li>• Evaluation reports</li> <li>• KWS reports</li> <li>• Monitoring reports</li> <li>• Status and trends reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from target communities in reporting illegal activities on poaching and charcoal production in the project sites</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>COMPONENT 2</b>			
2.1 Identification and promotion of community- based sustainable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased area under indigenous woodland and sustainable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Statistics on no. of trees planted</li> <li>▪ Training reports for viable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities are willing to cooperate and participate in the</li> </ul>

management and rehabilitation of indigenous woodlands (in charcoal burning areas in Kenya; agriculture expansion zones in Burkina Faso)	<p>management by local communities by 20% by the end of the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Environmental management plan showing zoning of natural woodlands for protection and areas designated for crop agriculture developed at the end of project</li> <li>▪ Number of new tree nurseries and trees planted at the end of project</li> <li>▪ No. of Environmental awareness seminars/training syllabus on woodland management conducted/developed at the end of project</li> <li>▪ Number of information and education materials on woodland management developed at end of project</li> <li>▪ Number of working community facilitators in place at end of project</li> <li>▪ Number of community M&amp;E systems in place at end of project;</li> </ul>	<p>alternatives to indigenous wood fuel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management plan showing the zoning for protected woodlands and limit for agriculture expansion</li> <li>• Supervision reports</li> <li>• Needs assessment reports on development/extension education and environmental awareness</li> <li>• Training curriculum on development/extension education</li> <li>• Committee meeting reports</li> <li>• Formal linkages with other stakeholders established.</li> </ul>	<p>development of a management plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PRA studies will identify training needs for the communities and development partners</li> </ul>
2.2 Capacity building of local community and institutions-(user associations, stakeholders meetings, inter-sectoral forums, platforms feedback mechanisms)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of functional community institutions for sustainable management of natural resources at end of project</li> <li>• Number of local stakeholders participating in policy change initiatives for livestock wildlife coexistence at end of project.</li> <li>• Number of participatory meetings for land use planning (wildlife and livestock) at end of project</li> <li>• Number of new grazing associations established around</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentary natural resources management practices reports</li> <li>• Number of negotiations meetings for harmonizing land use plans</li> <li>• Participatory rural appraisals conducted</li> <li>• Reports on grazing association meetings and wildlife forum training curriculum</li> <li>• List of key participants in the dialogues meeting on policy change initiative</li> <li>• Meetings on policy dialogue held</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inter community conflicts minimized</li> <li>• Willingness by the community to participate in strengthening community institutions.</li> <li>• The formation of grazing association and training of wildlife forum will take place early enough for policy dialogue to take place in the life of the project</li> <li>• The training is adequate to empower the communities to participate</li> </ul>

	<p>buffer zones in Burkina Faso by end of project;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of training workshops held for Wildlife Forums to deal with wildlife livestock interface challenges by end of project;</li> <li>• Number of new community driven initiatives on land use and natural resource management plans</li> <li>• Number of functional community institutions holding consultation meetings on land use and NRM plan by end of project</li> <li>• Number of validation workshops held by end of project;</li> <li>• Number of joint planning meetings for the harmonization of land use and natural resources management plans by key institutions at end of project;</li> </ul>	<p>with all participating key stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use and natural resources management plans</li> <li>• Community Training reports</li> <li>• Training courses/syllabus on the methodologies dealing with the development and implementation of national management plans</li> <li>• Institutions participating in the training programme</li> <li>• Jointly implemented land use plans</li> <li>• Reports on the consultative forums on the evaluation and monitoring of implementation of land use plans</li> </ul>	<p>effectively and to enhance ownership of in land use and natural resources management plans.;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Willingness of institutions to collaborate in land use planning and natural resource management;</li> <li>• The process of decentralization of land use and natural resource management from national to local level is reasonably completed</li> </ul>
2.3 Establishment of and support to community conservation initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of functional, new and proposed community conservation initiatives documented and supported at end of project;</li> <li>• Resources invested by DLWEIP in supporting community conservation initiatives at end of project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports on community driven conservation proposals</li> <li>• DLWEIP financial budget and expenditures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities will be adequately trained and motivated to develop proposals on conservation of natural resources.</li> </ul>
2.4. Establishment of community disease control committees and initiatives on local slaughter and marketing of livestock and wildlife products by examinations of the dynamics of diseases among livestock and wildlife at pilot sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of animals slaughtered by 2007</li> <li>• Operational Abattoirs by 2007</li> <li>• Number of rehabilitated livestock holding grounds and migratory corridors for livestock marketing by 2007</li> <li>• Number of stock routes opened</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Veterinary office records</li> <li>• Livestock movement permits</li> <li>• District livestock production office records</li> <li>• Meat inspection/slaughter records</li> <li>• Certificate of registration by the Ministry of Social services</li> <li>• Socio-economic project reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Security in the area will be maintained</li> <li>• Political good will continue</li> <li>• The effect of drought will not compound the livestock offtake and numbers of livestock slaughtered</li> <li>• Stakeholders willing to participate</li> <li>• Private sector involvement</li> </ul>

	and used by 2007. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of community disease control committees formed and functional by 2007</li> <li>• Supportive disease policy white paper in both countries in support of the marketing of pastoral livestock by 2007</li> </ul>		
<b>COMPONENT 3</b>			
3.1 Documentation of the success stories and lessons learnt and sharing of information (experiences in land management and land use practices; and indigenous methodology of collecting and analysing information).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information sharing networks established by end of project;</li> <li>• Livestock wildlife interface management practices identified and documented by end of project.</li> <li>• Success stories posted on CCD and other websites in the middle and end of project.</li> <li>• Increased access to information on best practices at all levels by 20% at the end of the project</li> <li>• Comparative studies on land tenure and management practices documented at the end of project;</li> <li>• Policy recommendations on land tenure and management forwarded to authorities at the end of project.</li> <li>• Community M&amp;E system developed and in place at the end of project;</li> <li>• Indigenous mechanisms of collecting and analyzing information documented at the end of project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Newsletters</li> <li>• Case studies</li> <li>• Print and electronic media</li> <li>• Number of registered conservancy groups active.</li> <li>• Website (interactive) accessible</li> <li>• No of people reached</li> <li>• Exchange visits</li> <li>• Radio programs</li> <li>• News brief</li> <li>• Press releases</li> <li>• Policy briefs</li> <li>• Research and policy review reports</li> <li>• Workshop reports</li> <li>• Community driven M &amp; E reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Willingness by the community to cooperate</li> <li>• No change in land use affecting the community conservancies and buffer zones</li> <li>• STD Telecom improved</li> <li>• Information reach users</li> <li>• Political goodwill for in-depth analysis of land policy issues that may be politically too sensitive.</li> </ul>
3.2. Identification of the target groups and facilitation of exchange visits for the dissemination of success stories and lessons learnt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs assessment reports to assist in targeting groups for dissemination ready by middle of project;</li> <li>• Increased local community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No of target groups identified in the dissemination reports;</li> <li>• Facilitators training reports and project progress reports</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• participation in the NRM by 20%</li> <li>• List of trained facilitators for information dissemination available in the middle and at the end of project</li> </ul>		
3.3 Identification and training of facilitators and organise dissemination workshops and seminars.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No of workshops/seminars held by the end of project;</li> <li>• Improved stakeholders networking by 10% from PRA baseline study</li> <li>• Number of communities with capacity for NRM increased by 20% at the end of project</li> <li>• Total number of community members trained in seminars and workshops on NRM at the end of the project</li> <li>• Number of community members and/or target groups involved in exchange visits by the end of project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training materials for workshops;</li> <li>• Documented lessons and experiences on livestock wildlife interface management models</li> <li>• List of workshop participants</li> <li>• List of focal institutions in member states accessing the information on pilot study findings</li> <li>• Print and electronic media</li> <li>• Workshop reports</li> <li>• No. of people trained and reports produced.</li> <li>• Reports of exchange visits in progress reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information technology readily available in member states and for the relevant stakeholders;</li> <li>• The information reach the users</li> </ul>

ACTIVITIES	Burkina Faso	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3	
		1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>1. Coordination of Activities (AU-IBAR)</b>		X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>2. Outcome A Activities</b>							
<b>1.1.</b> Assess status and trends of natural resource use (ENDA, ACC, MWRMD, ILRI, MLFD, KWS, LWF, LEWA, AU-IBAR, IUCN*).	DGEF*, IDR, PNGT	X	X	X			
<b>1.2.</b> Assess land use policies (EDNA, UoN, ILRI, IUCN*, MLFD, AU-IBAR,)	A.T.*, DGEF, PNGT	X	X	X			
<b>1.3.</b> Assess conflict status on use of natural resources (OP*, AU-IBAR*, EDNA, UoN, FONI, KWS, MLFD) .	A.T.*, DGEF, PNGT	X	X	X			
<b>1.4.</b> Assess status of non-sustainable wildlife and natural resources (KWS, ILRI, ACC*, IUCN, ENDA, AU-IBAR, OP).	DAPF*, DGEF, PNGT	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>3. Outcome B Activities</b>							
<b>2.1.</b> Identify and promote sustainable management and rehabilitation of woodlands (AWF, MENR, IUCN*, KWS, LEWA, LWF, ENDA, ILRI).	DGEF*, DAPF, PNGT	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>2.2.</b> Build capacity to local community and institutions (AWF*, LWF, AU-IBAR, ENDA, LEWA, MWRM, MLFD, ILRI).	UICN, DGEF, A.T	X	X	X			
<b>2.3.</b> Support community conservation initiatives (AU-IBAR, AWF*, LWF, ENDA, LEWA).	DGEF *, ADELE, UICN	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>2.4.</b> Establish community disease control committees and slaughterhouse and marketing initiatives). (AU-IBAR*, MLFD, FONI, ENDA).	DSV*, DAPF	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>4. Outcome C Activities</b>							
<b>3.1.</b> Document success stories and lessons learnt (UoN, ILRI, AU-IBAR*, IUCN, LWF)	DGEF*, UICN, DAPF				X	X	X
<b>3.2.</b> Identify target groups and facilitate exchange visits (AU-IBAR*, ACC,	DGEF*, UICN, DAPF				X	X	X

AWF, LWF, IUCN)							
<b>3.3. Identify and train facilitators and dissemination workshops (AU-IBAR*, UoN, AWF, LWF)</b>	DGEF, UICN*				X	X	X
<b>5. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>		X	X	X	X	X	X

\*indicates the lead institution

#### Kenya

OP	Office of the President, Arid lands Resource Management Programme (ALRMP).
AU-IBAR	African Union-Interafrican Bureau for Animal resources
AWF	Animal Wildlife Fund
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
KWS	Kenya Wildlife Service
UoN	University of Nairobi
LWF	Laikipia Wildlife Forum
ACC	African Conservation Centre
ENNDA	Ewaso Nyiro North Development Authority
MLFD	Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development
FONI	Friends of the Nomads International
LEWA	Lewa Dams Conservancy
MW	Ministry of Water

#### Burkina Faso

DGEF:	Direction Générale des Eaux et Forêts (Water and forestry authority, which regroups Wildlife, National Parks, as well as Forests)
IDR :	Institut du Développement Rural (Agricultural Research & training Institute)
PNGT:	Programme National de Gestion des Terroirs (National Programme for Land Management)
DAPF:	Direction des Aménagements Pastoraux et du Foncier (Ministry of Livestock Development)
DSV:	Direction des Services Vétérinaires (Ministry of Livestock Development)
AT:	Administration Territoriale (Ministry in charge of Land Development Planning)
ADELE:	Programme d'Appui au Développement Local dans l'Est.



### **Annex 3: ACRONYMS**

AGOA	African Growth Opportunities Agreement
ALRMP	Arid lands Resource Management Programme.
AMCEN	African Ministerial Conference on Environment
ASAL	Arid and Semi-Arid lands
AU	African Union
AU-IBAR	African Union-Interafrican Bureau for Animal resources
AWF	Animal Wildlife Fund
CAPE	Community Based Animal Health Participatory Epidemiology
CBOs	Community Based Organizations
CBRDP	Community Based Rural Development Project
CCD	Convention to Combat Desertification
DLWEIP	Dry land Livestock wildlife Environment Interface Project.
ExAs	Executing Agencies
EU	European Union
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GoK	Government of Kenya
IAs	Implementing Agencies
ICRISAT	International Centre for Research
IDA	International Development Association
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
KWS	Kenya Wildlife Service
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NCCK	National Christian Council of Kenya
NEMA	National Environmental Management Authority
NEPAD	New Partnership for African's Development
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NMK	National Museums of Kenya
NRM	Natural Resource Management
OAU	Organization of African Unity
OVis	Objectively Verifiable Indicators
PACE	Pan African Programme for the Control of Epizootics
PAGEN	Partnership for Improvement of Management of Natural Ecosystem
PARC	Pan African Rinderpest Campaign
PRA	Participatory Rural Approach
RAP	Regional Action Plan
ROA	Regional Office for Africa
SADC	South African Development Community
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SILEM	Sahel Integrated Lowland Ecosystem Management
TPN	Thematic Programme Network
UNF/A	Arly Fauna Conservation Unit Area
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Bio-diversity

UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNSO	United Nations Sahelian Office
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank
WWF	World Wide Foundation

#### **Annex 4: Kenya Stakeholders who attended the consultative workshops**

##### **List of Isiolo Field Workshop Participants on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2004.**

1. WASO Trust land Project from
2. District Livestock Production Officer
3. National Museums of Kenya (NMK)
4. DAMESA Community Association Isiolo District
5. Sera Conservancy
6. Lekurruki Group Ranch, Laikipia District
7. District Warden – Isiolo
8. Namunyak wildlife Conservation Trust)
9. District Range Management Officer, Laikipia (GoK)
10. District Veterinary Officer Isiolo
11. Lewa Wildlife Conservancy
12. NCCK Upper Eastern Region
13. Il NGWESI Group Ranch
14. Kenya Wildlife Services –
15. District Livestock Production Officer
16. Centre for Training and Integrated Research in ASAL Development– CETRAD
17. Laikipia Wildlife Forum
18. EWASO Nyiro North Development Authority
19. District Pastoral Association – Wajir
20. District Livestock Production Officer
21. Friends of the Nomads International

##### **List of National Workshop Stakeholders on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2004 in Nairobi**

AU-IBAR  
 UON  
 IUCN  
 UNEP  
 ILRI  
 Arid Lands Resource Management Project (ALRMP)  
 African Conservation Centre (ACC)  
 AWF  
 DVS

DLP  
ME, NR&W  
Friends of the Nomads International (FONI)  
Ewaso Nyoro North Development Authority (ENNDA)  
LEWA Conservancy  
IL NGWESI Conservancy  
Laikipia Wildlife Forum  
DLPO – LAIKIPIA  
DLPO – SAMBURU  
District Pastoral Association (DPA) – WAJIR  
NAMUNYAK Conservancy  
TERRA NUOVA  
WWF  
KWS  
NEMA

## **Annex 5      Burkina Faso Consultative workshops**

### **List of Stakeholders who attended field Workshop in Arly National Park on 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> March, 2004**

1. SILEM
2. Pagou/Tandougou
3. Paol/Tapoa
4. Adele Program
5. Paucof
6. Dpahrh
7. Logobou
8. Kokrana Concessionaire
9. ADELE/ Tapoa Programme
10. National Parks
11. ARECOPA
12. Regional Commissioner / Logobou
13. Community Based Rural Development Project (CBRDP)
14. DPECV

### **List of Stakeholders participating in the national Workshop between 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> March 2004 in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso**

1. ARLY Fauna Conservation Unit (U C F/A) area.
2. Ministry of Environment of Burkina Faso
3. Water and forestry authority
4. Project for fauna conservation
5. Ministry of Livestock Development
6. Director of Wildlife and National Parks
7. Ministry of Agriculture
8. IUCN
9. Director of Forestry