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**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFCU</td>
<td>Coastal Forest Conservation Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH</td>
<td>Intangible Cultural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAs</td>
<td>Income Generating Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNATCOM</td>
<td>Kenya National Commission for UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRC</td>
<td>Mombasa Republican Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMK</td>
<td>National Museums of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wide Fund for Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS</td>
<td>World Heritage Sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Kayas are forested areas of spiritual and cultural significance to the Mijikenda people. The Mijikenda include nine Bantu-speaking ethnic groups in the Kaya forests of coastal Kenya region. They include the Chonyi, Duruma, Digo, Giriamha, Jibana, Kambe, Kauma, Rabai and Ribe. The identity of the Mijikenda is expressed through oral traditions and performing arts related to the sacred forests, which are also sources of valuable medicinal plants. These traditions and practices constitute their codes of ethics and governance systems, and include prayers, oath-taking, burial rites and charms, naming of the newly born, initiations, reconciliations, marriages and coronations.

Kayas are fortified settlements whose cultural spaces are indispensable for the enactment of living traditions that underscore the identity, continuity and cohesion of the Mijikenda communities. The use of natural resources within the Kayas is regulated by traditional knowledge and practices that have contributed to the conservation of their biodiversity. The Kaya forests are botanically diverse and have a high conservation value, as determined by a number of surveys undertaken by the National Museums of Kenya (NMK), both funded by World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). More than half of Kenya’s rare plants are found in the coastal region, many in the Kayas. Each of the nine Mijikenda groups identifies with a specific Kaya or Kayas.

The listing of the sacred Kaya forests of the Mijikenda as World Heritage Site (WHS) under the 1972 World Heritage Convention and the inscription of the traditions and practices associated to the Kayas in the sacred forests of the Mijikenda on the UNESCO’s List of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) in Need of Urgent Safeguarding under the 2003 Convention has led to increased awareness and more concerted efforts to restore the value of this heritage. It is for this reason
that a holistic approach for the sustainable management and conservation of the Kaya forests is crucial.

The Kenya National Commission for UNESCO (KNATCOM) initiated a bi-annual flagship activity in 2017 to award the best managed and well conserved sacred Kaya forest of the Mijikenda. The evaluation and selection of the best managed and well conserved Kaya forest was undertaken from 11\textsuperscript{th} – 16\textsuperscript{th} February 2019. All the nine Kayas of the Mijikenda were evaluated against a predetermined criterion by a team of experts drawn from Coastal Forest Conservation Unit (CFCU), Culture Programme Expert Committee and KNATCOM staff. It is on the basis of this criterion that the best managed and well conserved Kaya forest was arrived at. The award giving ceremony will be held in May, 2019 to honor the efforts of the Kaya communities in conservation of the Kaya sacred sites and related traditions of the Mijikenda.
1.0 Introduction

This report is about the mission undertaken by a team of experts drawn from Coast Forest Conservation Unit from Kilifi and Kwale Counties, Culture Programme Expert Committee and KNATCOM staff to evaluate and select the best managed and well conserved sacred Kaya forests of the Mijikenda from 11th – 16th February. The report presents the background and context under which the mission finds its basis, justification and objectives. It highlights the methodology used to select the best managed and well conserved Kaya forest and a day to day account of the events that took place in each Kaya visited. It also gives an account of how the kayas performed after evaluation is given indicating specifically a unique aspect or strength each Kaya possesses and suggest the venue where the event will be held.

2.0 Background

Since 2017, KNATCOM has been undertaking conservation activities with the Mijikenda Kaya communities in an effort to enhance conservation of the sacred Kaya forests. This is a bi-annual flagship activity of the commission under the culture programme that promotes conservation through a competition approach.

Kayas are fortified settlements whose cultural spaces are indispensable for the enactment of living traditions that underscore the identity, continuity and cohesion of the Mijikenda communities. The use of natural resources within the Kayas is regulated by traditional knowledge and practices that have contributed to the conservation of their biodiversity. The sacred Kaya forests are botanically diverse and have a high conservation value. Each of the nine Mijikenda groups identifies with a specific Kaya or Kayas.

The listing of the Sacred Kaya Forests of the Mijikenda as World Heritage Sites (WHS) under the 1972 World Heritage Convention and the inscription of the
traditions and practices associated to the Kayas in the sacred forests of the Mijikenda on the UNESCO’s List of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) in Need of Urgent Safeguarding under the 2003 Convention; promotes their visibility globally and therefore more concerted efforts to restore the value of this heritage is crucial.

3.0 Importance of the Activity

Selection and awarding of the best managed and well conserved sacred Kaya forests of the Mijikenda is a critical approach for the sustainable conservation of the Kaya forests and for the continued enactment of the traditions and practices associated with the sacred Kaya forests. It is out of this exercise that the best managed and well conserved sacred Kaya forests of the Mijikenda was identified and will be awarded in a ceremony to be held at Mwarakaya Youth Polytechnic (Kaya Chonyi), in Kilifi County on Friday 24th May 2019. The exercise will involve the participation of all the nine Mijikenda communities. The activity is captured in the culture programme work plan for 2018/2019 financial year. It is envisioned that the activity will endear KNATCOM to the communities, promote its visibility and enhance achievement of its mandate.

4.0 Objectives

The general objective of the activity was to promote holistic management and conservation of the sacred Kaya forests and safeguarding of related traditions and practices for sustainable development.

4.1 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives included:

I. sensitize, empower and strengthen the Kaya communities’ efforts on the management and conservation of their cultural and natural heritage; and

II. identify and select the best managed and well conserved sacred Kaya forest.
5.0 Methodology

Using pre-determined criteria, KNATCOM staff, a member of Culture Programme Expert Committee and Coastal Forest Conservation Unit staff from Kilifi and Kwale Counties visited the nine (9) Kayas to manually administer the data gathering tool and pick the best managed and conserved sacred Kaya forests. In the first day of evaluation, the mission team had a meeting at the CFCU offices in Kwale branch where the evaluation team was briefed on the work ahead, reviewed the criteria and agreed on the programme of visitation and logistics. The question items were put into five broad categories with each of the five members of the evaluation team independently scoring against the aspects in question. Where necessary, other members of the team would come in handy to further provide clarity so that respondents would answer questions as intended.

6.0 Planning meeting

The meeting to plan for the evaluation exercise was held on Monday morning at NMK CFCU Ukunda office. After introduction of the team, Mr. Omare gave a brief of the assignment ahead saying that it was going to be a demanding task as all the Kaya sites must be visited and there was a possibility that in some days more than two sites will be evaluated. The purpose of the visit was to undertake an evaluation of the Kaya forests and assess whether there had been development for the first assessment which was done two years ago and be able to rank the kayas on the basis of their developments in terms of their conservation and protection of the forests, safeguard ICH and undertake community livelihood projects. Afterwards, the team worked on a tentative programme for the entire exercise (See annex 5 of this report). Mr. Omare presented appointment letters to the team members and thanked them for agreeing to work with KNATCOM.
7.0 Review of the evaluation tool

After agreeing on the programme for the work, the team looked at the evaluation tool and made amendments to some questions and score distribution of the tool that had been developed during the first evaluation. Some questions were found unnecessary and were removed. The reworked evaluation tool is presented as annex 4 of this report.

8.0 Evaluation of the best managed and well conserved sacred Kaya forests of the Mijikenda

The evaluation exercise involved six officers and each one of them made individual evaluation/scores based on the assessment and understanding of the sites and also by the responses of the Kaya elders. The evaluation exercise began at Kaya Kinondo of the Digo community and proceeded to Kaya Gandini of Duruma community on the first day. On the subsequent days, the seven Kayas in Kilifi County were assessed. The results of the evaluation of the sites are presented in annex 3. The exercise involved visitation to the Kayas by the evaluation committee, meetings with Kaya elders to administer the tool, visits to the main central village in some Kayas depending on the state of the sites as explained by the elders and giving feedback of their strengths, weakness and potentials. The underlying text explains the site specific observations of the findings.

8.1 Kaya Kinondo of Digo community

A meeting was held with the Kaya elders’ committee in their visitors’ centre after which a tour of their income generating activities was made. The evaluation team was informed that there was no new activity undertaken since the last evaluation and therefore, the central village clearing area was not toured. Like in the previous evaluation experience, Kinondo strength was on their IGAs particularly the ecotourism component and their relations with private sector. The ecotourism
component is advanced and is one of its kinds in the region especially in the Kayas. The forest is intact as destruction by community members is minimal. However, the tree nursery was not well kept as a result of lack of commitment and difficult in accessing water for watering the seedlings. The wells are salty and the water pump had broken down and was awaiting servicing. Their main weaknesses were in promotion of ICH and documentation of their activities. The bee keeping project had stalled as there was no motivation of even harvesting the honey.

**Evaluation exercise at kaya Kinondo Digo visitor centre (photo Chiro)**

### 8.2 Kaya Gandini of Duruma community

Kaya Gandini fared very well in the assessment. They had strength in almost every sector of the assessment. Their central village was toured as well as their nursery and tree growing projects. The hives were not visited but were reported to have been hanged in the members’ farms closer for observation and security against thieves. Their main strength was in promotion of ICH, documentation and tree
nursery and tree planting within the Kayas. Despite the very arid nature of the area, remoteness and difficult of accessing water for the plants, Kaya Gandini has a beautifully kept woodlot and tree nursery much to the amazement of the team. Newly installed artifacts such as the Komas, Vigangos and cultural huts were admiration to the evaluators. The Kaya elders had put more effort to better the site and had used the KNATCOM money well. The pictures taken during the visit compliment this story. Their main weakness was lack of partnership with the private sector.
Tree nursery with seedlings at Kaya Gandini, Duruma

Planted trees in Kaya Gandini woodlot
Newly erected artifacts at Kaya Gandini, Duruma

Kaya elder in a prayer at newly erected Komas at Kaya Gandini
8.3 Kaya Kauma

Kaya Kauma is one of the power houses of ICH in Kilifi County Kaya forests. They have captivating Vigangos, Komas and a Kaya elder permanently residing in the village clearing. The Kaya is still actively used for burial and other ceremonies. The main weaknesses are in documentation and management of IGAs. Despite a permanent spring and source of water just in their proximity, there were no tree seedlings in their nursery. There was great laxity and lack of commitment in the committee as regards income generating projects. The elders seem contented with the frequent token they receive from visitation by locals, organizations and visitors.

8.4 Kaya Kambe

Kaya Kambe performed dismally in terms of conserving and managing their Kaya forest. There was nothing to show out of their activities as the evaluators for the second time running were denied access into the central village. When they were asked some sensitive questions, they accused the evaluators for violating or trespassing into their privacy. The meeting was held at the entrance/outside the forest. Their tree nursery and beekeeping projects failed to take off. Their main strength was on the beauty of the dense and interlocking forest canopy viewed
from Chigangoni mines. The panoramic view of Kaya Kambe forest is irresistible to any visitor.

8.5 Kaya Jibana

Kaya Jibana also featured very poorly this time round. Their ICH is good but documentation was totally lacking. This is the only Kaya committee that failed to secure the KNATCOM money as they were not able to register their group and open a bank account. Their tree nursery and beekeeping project failed miserably even with the presence of a nearby well with clean water for the seedlings. There is no cultural hut in the village clearing. The evaluation team was informed that there was no new activity undertaken since the last evaluation and therefore, the central village clearing area was not toured.
8.6 Kaya Ribe

Kaya Ribe is equally vibrant in ICH but failed to produce evidence of documentation. Their beekeeping project is doing well as some of the hives were observed being colonized by bees and awaiting harvesting. The forest protection is good. However, the only cultural hut in the village is dilapidated over attack by ants and their partnership with private sector is minimal.

8.7 Kaya Fungo

Kaya Fungo continues to enjoy some outstanding reign in ICH prowess among the Kilifi county Kayas. It is the only Kaya with good signage. Their bee keeping project is well managed and has recorded substantial incomes. However, their main weakness is in tree planting and management of tree nursery. Their relationship with the private sector is poor.
8.8 Kaya Rabai

Kaya Rabai is an excellent home of ICH promotion. The tree nursery managed by the Rabai cultural group and an outgrowth of the elders committee is doing very well. However, many of its IGAs have stalled, their documentation is poor and huts in the main village are dilapidated.

8.9 Kaya Chonyi

Kaya Chonyi has made tremendous improvement in ICH and site management since the first evaluation. It is the only Kaya headed by a female Kaya elder. About 15 elders both male and female are permanently residing in the Kaya and have made it their home. Huts were put up and are in frequent use. The village clearing was toured unlike the past where the village could not be accessed due to Mombasa Republican Council (MRC) members who were residing inside the
Kaya. The KNATCOM money was received by a conservation group but never benefited the Kaya programmes headed by the elders there. However destruction in the border areas of the Kaya over livestock grazing, squatting and farm encroachment appears to ruin its growing image. There is need to reconcile the conservation group and the elders group so that they can complement each other. As a matter of urgency there is need to register the elders group with the department of social services so that they can benefit from the best managed and well conserved sacred Kaya programme.

9.0 Venue of the award giving ceremony

After a thorough scrutiny of the sites, it was unanimously agreed among the evaluation team that the award ceremony could be staged at Kaya Gandini if it will be before the long rains. In case it was done during the rainy season, (April or May, 2019) Kaya Chonyi would be classical host as it is accessible by road all-round the year and the heavy population will hopefully translate into a big crowd.
### Annex 1 Evaluation results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaya</th>
<th>Scores by evaluators</th>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matano</td>
<td>Omare</td>
<td>Chiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digo Kinondo</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duruma Gandini</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauma</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kambe</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jibana</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fungo Giriama</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribe</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabai</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chonyi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2  
List of Evaluators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John Moogi Omare</td>
<td>KNATCOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lawrence Chiro</td>
<td>NMK CFCU Kilifi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Abdulrahman Matano</td>
<td>NMK CFCU Kwale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gambo Mdiwa</td>
<td>Kaya Kinondo ecotourism project, Kwale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Julius Shoboi Mwahunga</td>
<td>KNATCOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prof Samuel Nyanchoga</td>
<td>Catholic University in East Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 3  
Best Kaya Evaluation results and individual strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaya</th>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Individual Kaya strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duruma Gandini</td>
<td>74.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kaya Gandini has a beautifully kept woodlot and tree nursery despite the arid nature. Newly installed artifacts such as the Komas, Vigango and cultural huts along with Intangible Cultural Heritage activities are a major strength. The Kaya committee is big and with a good mix of women, men and youth. The Kaya has put more effort to better the site through tree planting and had used the KNATCOM cash award well with good records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fungo Giriama</td>
<td>73.8333</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kaya Fungo continues to have some outstanding reign in Intangible Cultural Heritage prowess in Kilifi county Kayas. It is the only Kaya with good signage. Their bee keeping project is very well managed and has recorded substantial incomes. It enjoys a lot of public and political goodwill regionally. A number of elders reside in the Kaya permanently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Rabai           | 59.333 | 3    | Kaya Rabai is an excellent home of Intangible Cultural Heritage promotion. The tree nursery managed by the Rabai cultural group, an outgrowth of the elders committee is doing so well. The only Kaya
with an organized and respected traditional court. The traditional court continues to arbitrate local conflicts in the area and has respect of local leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kauma</td>
<td>53.333</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kaya Kauma is one of power houses of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Kilifi County Kaya forests. They have captivating Vigagos, Komas and have a Kaya elder permanently residing in the village clearing. The Kaya is still actively used for burial and other ceremonies. It enjoys massive visitation by schools, groups and researchers and has great political goodwill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digo Kinondo</td>
<td>53.1667</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Best Kaya in terms of income generation activities particularly ecotourism and with good relations with the private sector. There is more involvement of women and youth in leadership. The forest is fairly intact and well conserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chonyi</td>
<td>52.500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kaya Chonyi has made tremendous improvement in Intangible Cultural Heritage and site management since the first evaluation. It is the only Kaya headed by a female Kaya elder. A number of elders both male and female numbering about 15 are permanently residing in the Kaya and have made it their home. Huts were put up and are in use. The Kaya forest in the middle of the Kaya central clearing is beautiful and well protected. It enjoys a lot of political goodwill and local leadership support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribe</td>
<td>50.833</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kaya Ribe is equally vibrant in Intangible Cultural Heritage. Their beekeeping component is doing well as some of the hives were observed colonized by bees and awaiting harvesting. Their Kaya forest is well protected and beautiful hidden between the hills of Ribe mission and Bedida.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jibana</td>
<td>37.667</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Intangible Cultural Heritage is good. The forest is fairly intact and beautifully looked at from the lower areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kambe</td>
<td>26.500</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Their main strength was on the beauty of the dense and interlocking forest canopy viewed from Chigangoni mines. The panoramic view of Kaya Kambe forest is irresistible to any visitor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 4 Evaluation criteria

### Evaluation criteria

Evaluation criteria for selection of the best managed and well conserved sacred Kaya forests of the Mijikenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Assessment entity/Indicators of change</th>
<th>Max Marks</th>
<th>Sub Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Forest integrity (forest protection, restoration and sustainable utilization)</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Is the Kaya boundary line clear and well-marked? Check for evidence
  - Not clear 0, partly clear 1, over half of its length clear 2, all boundary clear 3

- How often do you patrol the Kaya forest?
  - Number of community guards working 0- 0, >1- 1
  - No. of arrests made over the last 12 months 0-0, > 1- 1
  - Number of reports of destruction made to government agencies 0-0, >1- 1

- Evidence of minimal forest destruction in the Kaya i.e. Number of trails into the forest, number of stumps of cut trees, number of charcoal kilns, number of animal snares and traps, evidence of forest fires, Evidence of a traditional mechanism for fining forest destructors.
  - Maximum-1, Medium-2, Minimal-3

- How would you rate the forest status now compared to the last 12 months?
  - Worse 0, no change 1, better 2, much better 3

- Number of awareness meetings undertaken with the schools children and public over the last 12 months.
  - Number of schools that visited the kaya 0 0, 1- 1, >1- 2
  - No. of elders visits to neighbouring schools 0- 0, >1- 1

- Evidence of a well-managed group tree nursery to provide seedlings for replanting.
  - Number of seedlings in the nursery 0-0, 1000- 1, > 1000- 2, > 2000-3

- How often they do enrichment planting at the kaya forest.
  - Number of seedlings planted in the forest 0-0, <10- 1, > 100 -2, >500 - 3
Evidence of measures to enhance site visibility and publicity  
No signage 0, signage at strategic locations 2, signage with donors symbols 3  

Evidence of documented traditional rules and regulations regarding the removal and use of the forest resources.  
Rules not documented 1, rules documented 2, documented and shared 3  

Evidence of sustainable utilization activities undertaken over the last 12 months.  
Signs of bee keeping, ecotourism, fruits, medicinal harvesting, (more entries, higher score)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>ICH integrity (protection, restoration and sustenance of cultural and traditional practices)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Evidence of the presence of an annual calendar of cultural practices for the Kaya.  
Calendar known but not documented 1, known and documented 2 |
| The last time a ritual prayer/ traditional cultural ceremony were held in the Kaya.  
Over 2 years ago 1, over a year 2, A few months ago 3 |
| Evidence of documented Kaya traditional cultural protocols for visitation.  
Protocols known not documented 1, documented 2, documented and shared 3 |
| Number of genuine and legitimate Kaya elders forming the Kaya council of elders.  
Less than 5- 1, > 10- 2 |
| When was the last time you recruited new members into the Kaya council of elders.  
Over 2 years ago 1, over a year 2, a few months ago 3 |
| Number of Kaya elders of a youthful age in the committee (under 35 years of age).  
<1- 0, > 2, 1, > 3- 2, > 5- 3 |
| Any proof of documented procedure detailing joining instructions into Kaya eldership.  
Protocols known not documented 1, documented 2, documented and shared 3 |
| Evidence of cultural huts/ shelters and well maintained central village and paths of the Kaya.  
Number of newly built or repaired huts 0- 0, 1- 1, >2- 3 |
| How often do the Kaya elders visit or hold meetings in the Kayas?  
None-0, irregular-1, regular-2, fulltime- 3 |
| Evidence of restoration of some of the artifacts in the Kaya.  
No restoration 0, restoration of 1-1, > 2 3 | 0-3 |
| Proof of continuing use and value of kaya by community such as burial, commemorating Komas, etc.  
Check for signs the more entries, higher scores | 0-3 |
| **3** Kaya Institutional profile and its dynamics | 10 |
| Total membership of registered Kaya committee or conservation group.  
< 9- 0, > 9- 1 | 0-1 |
| The number of members disaggregated by gender (M, W, Y).  
No women 0, less 5 women 1, more than 5 women 2 | 0-2 |
| Evidence of documented regular committee or group meetings and venue of meetings.  
No meetings 0, meetings without minutes 1, with minutes 2 | 0-2 |
| Presence of financial records of incomes and expenditure  
No records 0, with records 1. | 0-1 |
| Evidence of affiliation with other organizations with similar interests.  
None 0, with affiliations 1 | 0-1 |
| Evidence of existing procedure for changing leadership in the committee.  
Not documented 0, documented 1 | 0-1 |
| Evidence of existing procedure for resolving conflicts within and outside committee.  
Not documented but exists 1, documented 2 | 0-2 |
| **4** Income Generating Activities (IGAs) development and implementation (Award) | 20 |
| Evidence of supported and continuing IGAs projects at Kaya.  
None 0, present but not productive 1, very productive 2 | 0-2 |
| Evidence of existing project implementation committee and revenue sharing procedure.  
No committee-0, Committee present-2, Committee present & active-4 | 0-4 |
| Whether the project has generated substantial financial benefits over the last 12 months.  
< Ksh 10,000- 0, > 25,000- 3, over 50,000- 6 | 0-6 |
| To what extent has the income generated been used  
None 0, Shared for use by members 2, for the site development 3, shared and also for site development 5 | 0-5 |
| Evidence of records of the project activities, challenges and lessons learnt for sharing of best practices.  
No records 0, records present 3 | 0-3 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Community, private and public linkage with the Kaya</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Evidence of Kaya elders playing additional roles in the community.  
More elders serving in other committees in the community development agenda 1, otherwise 0 | 0-1 |
| Evidence of good community perception and goodwill about the Kaya leadership.  
No goodwill 0, goodwill and supports conservation 1 | 0-1 |
| Proof of linkage to other community groups.  
More elders in other community groups 1, otherwise 0 | 0-1 |
| Evidence of good working relationship with the administrators in the Ministry of interior coordination.  
Administrators support elders committee 2, otherwise 0 | 0-2 |
| Whether Kaya committee has benefited from some support from a local politician.  
Local politician has visited or supported the committee 2, otherwise 0 | 0-2 |
| Evidence of visitation conducted in the Kaya village.  
No visits by community 0, community visit 1 | 0-1 |
| Evidence of activities undertaken with the private sector. Identify the company and activities undertaken and partnerships.  
No activities 0, 1 activity 1, > 1 activities 2 | 0-2 |
| **TOTAL MARKS** | |
### Annex 5  Programme for the activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Feb 2019</td>
<td>Planning meeting and review of evaluation tool and evaluation of Kayas Kinondo Digo and Duruma Gandini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Feb 2019</td>
<td>Evaluation of Kayas Kauma, Jibana and Kambe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 13&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Feb 2019</td>
<td>Evaluation of Kayas Ribe and Fungo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Feb 2019</td>
<td>Evaluation of Kaya Rabai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Feb 2019</td>
<td>Evaluation of Kaya Chonyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Feb 2019</td>
<td>Collation of results and closing meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>