

# CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** The East African Wild Life Society

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** *Improve Forest Connectivity in the Taita Hills: A Preparatory Phase*

**Implementation Partners for this Project:** None

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** May 1, 2007 - December 31, 2008

**Date of Report (month/year):** April 2009

## II. OPENING REMARKS

***Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.***

This project is a follow-up of recommendations of earlier projects on modeling forest connectivity. It is aimed at preparing for the legal requirements before actual forest rehabilitation and connectivity work can begin. A number of difficulties were encountered; the main one being that the project period coincided with the general elections and therefore there were some delays. Another issue is the slow process of registration of associations by the Registrar of Societies. However, during this project period, alliances were made or strengthened with various institutions working in the region – mainly the University of Ghent and the University of Helsinki. Attempts at fundraising through a joint proposal were made to the European Commission – the first being a joint proposal with University of Helsinki, University of Ghent, Kenya Forest Service, ICRAF, The East African Wild Life Society and the Taita Taveta Wildlife Forum, Unfortunately, it did not attract funding. A second attempt was made to the European Commission a year later jointly by University of Helsinki, Kenya Forest Service, ICRAF, The East African Wild Life Society and the Taita Taveta Wildlife Forum, fate unknown.

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

***Project Purpose:*** *To facilitate the preparation of PFM plans and the formation of CFAs in order to meet the legal requirements of the Forest Act 2006 in preparation for the actual rehabilitation work. 2. To establish trial plots in Vuria and Susu forests that would provide useful information in the rehabilitation work. 3. To establish linkages with ICRAF in order to obtain expertise in agroforestry-related matter for improving indigenous tree cover on farms in-between the forest fragments.*

### Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Purpose-level:</b>	
<b>1. Three PFM plans and three CFAs formed.</b>	Three PFM plans and three CFAs formed.
<b>2. Two trial plots for forest rehabilitation established.</b>	Two trial plots established.
<b>3. Minutes of meetings between EAWLS and ICRAF on linkages, and an MoU.</b>	Two meetings but no MoU signed.

**Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.**

The project achieved its intended impact objective and performance indicators. The legal provisions as per Forest Act 2005 were met through the preparation of the PFM plans and the formation of CFAs which are the most crucial aspects with regard to forest rehabilitation and forest connectivity. Two trial plots were established. Meetings with ICRAF were held through the preparation of joint project proposal to the European Commission, however, the interest of ICRAF did not go beyond this and this waned after the rejection of the first attempt and the departure of the contact scientist.

**Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?**

None

**IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS**

**Project Outputs:**

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Actual at Completion</b>
<b>Output 1: Three Participatory Forest Management plans prepared for Vuria, Susu and one for Wesu big rock/Mbili/Weni Mwana forests, respectively.</b>	Three PFM plans prepared for Vuria/Jaycee/Mwaghanini, Chawia/Susu and one for Wesu big rock/Mbili/Weni mwana forests, respectively. The plan for Vuria included Jaycee and Mwaghanini forests while that of Susu included Chawia forest due to the fact that they are close to each other and are within the KFS recommended radius of five kilometers.
<i>1.1. Three PFM plan documents.</i>	Three PFM plans covering eight forests instead of five as earlier envisaged.
<b>Output 2: Three Community Forest Associations formed for Vuria, Susu and one for Wesu big rock/Mbili/Weni mwana forests, respectively.</b>	Three CFAs formed also covering eight instead of five forests.
<i>2.1. Registration documents for the associations.</i>	Applications for registration made awaiting certificates.
<b>Output 3: Trial plots for habitat restoration established in Vuria and Susu forests.</b>	Trial plots established.
<i>3.1. Trial plots in Vuria and Susu forests. Data collected on the trials.</i>	Trial plots established in Susu and Vuria though no data collected yet. Too early.
<b>Output 4: To forge linkages with institutions such as ICRAF that could make a considerable contribution towards increased indigenous tree cover on surrounding farms through agro-forestry.</b>	Attempts made. Two meetings held during preparation of joint proposals to the European Commission for forest restoration and connectivity in the Taitas.
<i>4.1. Minutes of meetings related to linkages establishment. Memorandum of Understanding between ICRAF and EAWLS signed if applicable.</i>	Proceedings available but no MoU signed.

**Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.**

The project was very successful in that the intended outputs were achieved which were the preparation of PFM plans and formation of CFAs to meet the legal requirements of the Forest Act 2005. The plans were prepared and are currently being scrutinized by the KFS headquarters for approval and the CFAs lodged their applications with the Registrar of Societies and are awaiting their registration certificates.

***Were any outputs unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?***

The output not fully realized was the MoU between EAWLS and ICRAF. The discussions did not reach their conclusion with the departure of the contact scientist and the failure of two joint proposals to attract funding. However, this did not affect the project much since this was aimed at establishing a working relationship for future activities in the area.

## **V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS**

***Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.***

## **VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT**

***Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF's future performance.***

- The inclusion of government institutions in the project activities helped to raise the confidence among the provincial administrators and the community in the project.
- PFM process is a sensitive activity especially during political events such as general election that almost derailed the process in some of the areas. Careful handling and steering clear of politics and keeping the authorities adequately updated on the activities is a very helpful thing.
- However, working with government institutions too sometimes may cause delays and one needs to be very proactive to meet deadlines.

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

The process followed made the project design quite robust because it was a follow on from earlier projects that fully involved community members, government institutions and the civil society. The long presence of EAWLS and its Project Coordinator made the whole project implementation process much easier.

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

Close engagement with the authorities and the community contributed much to the success of the project, especially 2007 being an election year and the aftermath in 2008. The familiarity of the Project executants with the area and the community helped ease a lot of the tension and suspicion though this contributed to some delay in implementation. There was delay in the establishment of the trial plots which may be attributed to two factors, 1) the unavailability of the Research Scientists from Kenya Forestry Research Institute – Gede Regional Research Station on time, and 2) the failure of the Nov-Dec 07 rains and Mar-May 08 rainy seasons.

## VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING

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

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Date Received	Notes
Conservation International	C	\$9074	December 2008	Grant intended to work out the costs/benefits of forest connectivity in Taita
		\$		
		\$		
		\$		
		\$		
		\$		
		\$		
		\$		

**\*Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:**

- A** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)*
- B** *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF project)*
- C** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)*
- D** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

**Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.**

This is a long-term project and fundraising is on-going from various sources to carry out activities for forest rehabilitation and forest connectivity. Among the donors approached are the European Commission, Netherlands foreign ministry, Netherlands Embassy Small Projects in Kenya, Disney wildlife conservation fund.

## VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Forest rehabilitation and forest connectivity work is a long-term activity and there is need to establish a fund or a continuous source of financing. The momentum created by this project and previous ones through CEPF funding is enormous and there is need to take advantage of this to implement the activities, otherwise any delay may lead to dying down of this momentum and would take quite a bit of time and resources to revive it again. This is so far the best chance to make a big difference in biodiversity conservation in the Taita hills ever made and a chance to gain valuable lessons on forest connectivity and rehabilitation. It is also an opportunity to draw lessons on conservation of individual species on the brink of extinction on how forest re-connectivity aids their recovery.

## VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. One way we do this is by making programmatic project documents available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and by marketing these in our newsletter and other communications.

These documents are accessed frequently by other CEPF grantees, potential partners, and the wider conservation community.

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

Name: James Mwang'ombe Mwamodenyi

Organization name: The East African Wild Life Society

Mailing address: P. O. Box 1043 80300 WUNDANYI, Kenya.

Tel: +254 43 42403/30769/722 266449/733 849103

Fax: +254 43 30769

E-mail: [crossborder@wananchi.com/mwangombejames@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:crossborder@wananchi.com/mwangombejames@yahoo.co.uk)