

FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Name: BirdLife International

Project Title: Forest Conservation at Mont Peko, Cote d'Ivoire

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

This report covers outputs and activities funded by CEPF in 2001-2002, but also makes reference to a longer programme of conservation implemented at Mont Péko since 1999, with the following phases:

April 1999-May 2001: Phase 1 EU funding ("Programme Transitoire")

June 2001-May 2002: CEPF funding ("Forest Conservation at Mont Peko, Côte d'Ivoire")

May 2002-May 2004: Phase 2 EU funding ("Programme de conservation des Aires Protégées")

The programme since June 2001 has generally followed the outputs and objectives described in the proposal to CEPF. However, the role of the CEPF funding within that programme was changed, in order to complement the funding that was later obtained from the European Union. These changes are explained here. Throughout the project, we have discussed these issues with Nina Marshall of CEPF, and with Guy Rondeau, Dirck Byler, Karen Semkow and Olivier Langrand of CI, who are responsible for the CEPF-funded project at Marahoué National Park, which was in a similar position.

BirdLife's original request to CEPF proposed two years of activity: a 6-month phase of minimal activity funded entirely by CEPF, and an 18-month phase of expanded activity (with a new, full-time Technical Adviser) funded by the EU, with cofinancing from CEPF to be applied for if needed. Our CEPF funding contract was for the first phase only (June-November 2002).

The EU funding was delayed. We therefore economized our spending of the CEPF grant, and CEPF allowed us a 6-month no-cost extension (to a total period of one year, June 2001-May 2002). This covered the gap until EU funding became available in May 2002, to a BirdLife-CI alliance for the "second phase" (see above) funded by the EU only (no cofinancing requested). This EU funding is for two years, rather than 18 months. Since all CEPF funding has now been used and no more is sought, it has been agreed that we should provide our final report to CEPF now. We are reporting against final targets set for June 2003, and therefore it is not surprising that we have not met all of these.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: *To establish a sustainable, nationally-driven management and conservation system for Mont Peko National Park*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	
<i>1 Conservation status of key species maintained and/or increasing in 2003.</i>	Key points from analysis of biomonitoring data by team of 3 park staff and 3 villager auxiliaries, compared to 1999-2001 data: increased encounter rates (distance sampling and track density) for primates, elephants, <i>Cephalophus</i> spp. and <i>Neotragus pygmaeus</i> ; decreased rates for Musophagidae and Bucerotidae (large frugivorous birds, perhaps a local phenology effect); decreased signs of human presence; 2 new species for park list reported (<i>Anomalurus peli</i> , <i>Cephalophus niger</i>); general impression of increasing conspicuousness of forest fauna and ongoing improvement of status (continuing trend noted in 1999-2001).
<i>2 The area of intact primary vegetation in the Park is maintained in 2003, based on assessment of satellite and aerial photographs and ground truthing.</i>	Not assessed (planned for 2003, with Technical Assistance), but no significant forest destruction was noted during the year and it is believed that the area of intact primary vegetation in the Park has been maintained.
<i>3 Surrounding communities are involved in planning for the park and support its conservation, based on direct feedback through liaison activities.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village representatives consulted through Village Development Committees set up by the programme; this applies to rural development and outreach around park, e.g. implementing microprojects (pig-rearing) financed by UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office (Environment Project Fund) in 8 villages, with careful consultation to choose beneficiaries. • Communities not yet involved in planning for the park itself; DPN not currently willing to contemplate this.
<i>4 Conservation plans for the park are included in work-plans and strategies of regional development agencies.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Agency for Support to Rural Development (ANADER) collaborating (through MoU). • World Bank team evaluated collaboration with ANADER; recommendations made and workshops and new plans to follow in new phase of project and national Framework Programme for Protected Area Management (PCGAP), to follow. • Conservation of the park are included in World Bank (through PCGAP) and ANADER plans
<i>5 National staff implementing management plan, with involvement of government and civil society, verified by timesheets and reports.</i>	Park management is implemented by (and responsibility of) the park directorate — entirely national staff. This includes general management (the park directorate as an institution), infrastructure development, patrolling, biomonitoring and relations with adjacent communities. NGOs provide technical and administrative assistance only. This is confirmed by new EU contract documents (2002): a triumph of the first (1999-2001) programme and CEPF phase.

	Management Plan as single document not yet approved; to be done in remainder of EU programme.
--	---

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

Progress was made with all impact objective and performance indicators, with the hand-over of management control and responsibility to national staff especially successful. However, considerable technical assistance is still needed. Verification of fauna and flora conservation impacts should be stronger, through more rigorous surveys and remote sensing, although indications were generally positive. The first EU project showed what is possible, but relied heavily on expatriate supervision; the CEPF project made major steps towards greater national ownership and sustainability. The new EU and subsequent PCGAP phases are now set to continue this process, with ever greater emphasis on sustainability.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

No.

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs: From the Logical Framework for the project

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: Capacity of the Park management unit and motivation of the field staff are reinforced	
<i>1 Office and field equipment functioning and maintained, or obtained new where necessary</i>	New Pickup (Isuzu) purchased and handed over to park directorate (=management unit). Other equipment (books) purchased, but most new equipment is covered by new EU budget, not CEPF; all CEPF equipment has been bought.
<i>2 Staff working routines are followed, based on timesheets</i>	Routines followed; review and appraisals carried out satisfactorily.
<i>3 Staff working conditions are accepted (e.g. health insurance maintained), based on timesheets and verbal feedback from staff</i>	Health/accident insurance and general working conditions maintained from previous EU project. Review and appraisals carried out satisfactorily, indicating acceptance by staff.
<i>4 Motivation increased by capture and conviction of law-breakers (e.g. poachers, loggers)</i>	Two court appearances of poachers caught in park; both convicted. Small numbers of incidents reported suggest successful protection of the park. However, staff were frustrated by delays to EU financing. Overall, subjective assessment that motivation was maintained from previous EU project period. Bonus system for captures discussed; rates to be harmonized between parks nationwide, as part of the new EU-funded phase of the program, and so could not be set unilaterally at Mont Peko.
<i>5 Training needs assessment followed by training for staff on key topics, including outdoor survival and running ecotourism</i>	Training needs assessment made as part of planning for future projects by PCGAP consultant; results included in new EU contract documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • anti-poaching for 4 elite guards (4 months); • general patrolling techniques for 3

	<p>intermediate guards (60 days) and 4 support guards (15 days);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> management for director and assistant director (one month). <p>Training programs to follow, along with identification of further technical training needs (e.g. GIS).</p>
Output 2: National capacity for management and conservation increased through collaboration and training	
<i>1 Relationships with one Ivorian conservation NGO strengthened, through involvement in research and awareness-raising work around the Park, with a view to developing a long-term working relationship with BirdLife</i>	Discussions held with 3 Ivorian NGOs (Côte d'Ivoire Nature, SOS Forêts, Société pour la Conservation de la Nature en Côte d'Ivoire) regarding collaboration and the process of becoming a BirdLife network organization. SOS Forêts (with addition of one staff member from SCNCI with unique ornithological experience), engaged to collaborate with BirdLife, initially on BirdLife's CEPF-funded capacity-building project for West Africa; may also become involved at Mont Peko, but this to be determined under EU funded phase.
<i>2 Two exchange visits with NGOs (national BirdLife partners in Ghana and Sierra Leone) in adjacent countries</i>	Not done – was hoped to be part of the new EU-funded phase of the program, but was not included (by EU). However, similar activity is included in BirdLife's CEPF-funded capacity-building project for West Africa with SOS Forêts.
<i>3 Leverage of additional funds and catalysis of research activity (including inventories)</i>	Hugo Rainey (Univ of St Andrews, UK) researching Hornbill ecology in 2001-2002, with Peko as a study site.
<i>4 Collaboration with ANADER and Radio Man continued and expanded through at least one new activity or project for each</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rural development microprojects completed with ANADER, funded by UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office (Environment Project Fund). Long-term plan involving ANADER to be confirmed in EU phase of programme. No further collaboration with Radio Man, following breakdown of their transmitter.
Output 3: Park patrolling and law enforcement implemented effectively	
<i>1 Minimum of ten nights patrolling inside Park per month</i>	c. 100 man-days (average) of patrolling per month; patrols in field almost daily (thus >>10d/month), but 17 staff in two brigades which may divide further, so total man-days is a more meaningful measure.
<i>2 Villagers assisting in law enforcement and in regular contact with park management through meetings with Village Development Committees</i>	Contacts with 8 Village Development Committees, and 3 villager auxiliaries included in biomonitoring teams. Direct involvement in management and law enforcement not yet possible, because not contemplated by government (DPN).
<i>3 Park boundaries are clearly marked</i>	Not done - part of the new EU-funded phase of the program.
<i>4 Park infrastructure improved; tracks remain drivable year-round</i>	Not done - part of the new EU-funded phase of the program.
<i>5 Decline in number of intrusions and law-breaking incidents</i>	Small numbers of incidents reported in both biomonitoring and patrolling suggest successful protection of the park. However, number of incidents extremely small (May 1999-Apr 2001: 3 poachers and 4 woodcutters convicted, 7 guns confiscated in 2 years; July-Dec 2001: 3 poachers convicted, 3 guns confiscated). Longer-term

	analysis needed.
<i>6 Increased proportion of intrusions and law-breaking incidents are followed by arrests, charges and convictions</i>	Comparison of rates before and after project not meaningful as number of incidents extremely small; e.g. 100% conviction rate for latest period, but this based on two court appearances. Longer-term analysis needed. However, no major problem suspected.
Output 4: Relations and collaboration with neighboring communities are improved	
<i>1 Village Development Committees continue and strengthen operation: at least three meetings per year held with village representatives, regional authorities, development agencies and local NGOs</i>	VDC meetings held in 8 villages in 2002, a practice becoming well-established and appreciated by communities.
<i>2 Socio-economic studies completed for neighboring communities, to identify development problems that affect Park, and documented</i>	Participatory exercises to identify development problems and concerns of VDCs carried out at 8 VDC meetings. Further socio-economic assessments included in new EU-funded phase.
<i>3 Project provides core support to at least 4 rural development initiatives around the park, for which operational funding is sought elsewhere.</i>	First rural development initiative carried out, funded by FCO-EPF. Funding for second initiative appeared to have been agreed by GEF Small Grants, but funds never released; to be followed up. Further initiatives to follow as part of the new EU-funded phase of the program.
<i>4 Compensation for people resettled when the park was established in 1968 finalized</i>	Not done - part of the new EU-funded phase of the program.
Output 5: Ecological and socio-economic monitoring and research programs implemented	
<i>1 Continuation of biological and socio-economic monitoring to assess ecosystem status and trends, verified by reports from monitoring teams</i>	Routine biomonitoring (16 days/month) took place, with quarterly reporting.
<i>2 All spatial data installed on GIS system</i>	Not done, requiring technical assistance - part of the new EU-funded phase of the program.
<i>3 New biological inventory and research work (initiated under output 2) is linked to monitoring protocols</i>	Not done - biological inventory and research work too limited, but will be done under EU-funded phase of the program.
Output 6: The project is well managed, with Park management guided by a comprehensive Management Plan	
<i>1 Management plan incorporates all current socio-economic, legal and environmental information.</i>	Update to plan still in progress (by V. Béligné); being followed up under EU-funded phase
<i>2 Management plan is approved by DPN</i>	Not done
<i>3 Financing for long-term implementation of management plan is secured</i>	Consultation continuing; World Bank mission to Mont Peko hosted in April 2002, and planning of PCGAP ongoing.
<i>4 Ecotourism plan for the park is developed</i>	Not done, requiring technical assistance – excluded by EU from EU-funded phase of the program.
<i>5 Six-monthly technical reports are approved by donors</i>	Quarterly technical and financial reports submitted to CEPF; payments approved.
<i>6 End-of-project audit shows that funds were fully spent on their agreed purposes</i>	Final financial report submitted on paper on 12 August 2002.

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

The project was most successful in reinforcing the capacity of the Park management unit and motivation of the field staff, increased national capacity for management and conservation through collaboration and training, maintaining an effective system of Park patrolling and law enforcement, and improving relations and collaboration with neighboring communities. In each of these themes, the project maintained and enhanced the progress made with EU funding in 1999-2001. A World Bank team evaluated the socio-economic activities (Output 4) in May 2002; it praised BirdLife for making progress during this difficult year, and for forging collaborating with ANADER (the first collaborative relationship between ANADER and a National Park); similar collaboration with ANADER is now planned for the future in all other Parks, guided by lessons learnt at Mont Peko.

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

Progress was weakest with implementation of ecological and socio-economic monitoring and research programs, and higher level changes in Park management (in particular, increasing involvement of local people, and investigating the problems of compensation for people who claimed to have lost land then the Park was created). These tasks are dependent on either:

- technical assistance, which was not available on a permanent basis under CEPF funding, but will be under EU;
- time spent building relationships and trust, requiring a longer-term engagement which the two years of EU funding will provide; or
- legal changes; relevant targets (e.g. compensation, park boundary confirmation, establishment of a Management Liaison Committee) will be much easier to address by work under the EU contract, which is with the Côte d'Ivoire government (NGOs are given service contracts through the government to provide Technical assistance), rather than the CEPF contract which is directly between BirdLife and the donor.

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

As expected, the project had no adverse Environmental, Human Health and Safety, or Social impacts, being rated Category C for all. There were also no concerns regarding International Waterways and Disputed Areas. Therefore no actions were required to implement environmental and social safeguard policies.

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.

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

The main features of the CEPF-funded project were designed during the previous EU-funded project. All staff were ready and waiting to begin implementation immediately, and procedures were in place to support this process. These features contributed to the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the project.

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

Delays in the resumption of EU support extended the period between EU support phases (i.e. Phase 1, 1999-April 2001; Phase 2 beginning 2001 or 2002) far beyond the 3 months originally predicted by the donor. The Phase 2 Technical assistance contract was signed after 12 months (May 2002), and the Park Directorate's programme for field activities (the Phase 2 'Devis Programme') was approved after 14 months (July 2002). This reinforces the lesson to plan for such gaps in major funding to be longer than the first estimates suggest. This situation could have led to closure of the project; this was avoided by early anticipation of the problems and therefore special efforts to economize, combined with the willingness of CEPF to allow no-cost extensions to our contract.

VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

BirdLife's efforts in the last year have been extremely well received by the government and park authorities; the crucial role of CEPF is well understood and appreciated by all. The Directeur de la Protection de la Nature has repeatedly praised the achievements, their low cost, and the high proportion of benefits going to the park rather than the implementing NGO. BirdLife also very much appreciates the flexibility and responsiveness of CEPF, in rapidly agreeing the initial grant, and approving two no-cost extensions.

Since 19 September 2002, political stability in Côte d'Ivoire has again been disrupted, and this has affected the protected area management projects. At the time of writing (update on January 2003), expatriates remain in Abidjan until further notice and so park management activities have been severely curtailed. The long-term outcome of these political problems is uncertain. The progress made with CEPF funds has not been lost, because of capacity built locally. The CEPF-funded year may have been even more important than we at first realised, because it showed what national teams can achieve, and can continue to achieve under more adverse conditions.