

## CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	BirdLife International
<b>Project Title:</b>	Sustaining and Securing Capacity in Biodiversity Conservation Action in the Upper Guinea Forest Area
<b>Date of Report:</b>	30 September 2011
<b>Report Author and Contact Information</b>	Julius Arinaitwe, Regional Director for Africa, BirdLife International Africa Partnership Secretariat, PO Box 3502 - 00100 GPO Nairobi, Kenya; Tel: +254 (0)20 8068314   Fax: +254 020 8068315  Email: Julius.Arinaitwe@birdlife.org
<b>CEPF Region</b>	Guinea Forest
<b>Strategic Direction:</b>	Consolidation
<b>Grant Amount:</b>	\$472,352
<b>Project Dates:</b>	1 January, 2009 to 31 August, 2011

**Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):**

Several partners were involved in the implementation of the project;

- Five BirdLife partner NGOs in Liberia (Society of the Conservation of Nature in Liberia-SCNL), Ghana (Ghana Wildlife Society GWS), Côte d'Ivoire (SOS-FORETS) Sierra Leone (Conservation Society of Sierra Leone-CSSL) and Guinea (Guinee Ecologie (GE));
- Five Universities, University of Conakry in Guinea, University of Cocody in Côte d'Ivoire, Njalla University Sierra Leone; University of Ghana and Nkwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology in Ghana;
- Government forestry departments in the five countries in which the project was implemented (Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire and Sierra Leone).

The five BirdLife partners were responsible for the implementation of the project in their respective countries. All five partners had benefited from the capacity building project implemented by BirdLife under the CEPF phase one funding in the Upper Guinea Forest (UGF) and collaborated with BirdLife in the development of this consolidation project.

The five Universities were closely involved in the implementation of the young graduate's grants. They were involved in the selection of candidates and responsible for the supervision of their work. Universities in Liberia do not offer graduate studies in the field of conservation.

The government departments were involved through their Protected Area (PA) managers. The PA managers at sites selected for project activities were involved in the organization and facilitation of activities. Thirteen Protected Area Managers (2 per country and 5 from Ghana) participated at the Regional workshop on emerging conservation initiatives, (Carbon finance, REDD and FLEGT) and facilitated the organization of the national workshops to replicate the regional workshop in their respective countries. They were also responsible for the preparation and submission of reports of METT (Monitoring Effectiveness Tracking Tool) for their respective sites. Seventeen PA managers benefitted from the short term training courses on biodiversity survey and identification.

At the site level, the BirdLife partners supported local community groups, called Site Support Groups. Eleven of these groups were engaged in project work. They are considered as site partners of the national BirdLife partners. Two of the SSGs were established during the implementation of the project while the others were groups that benefitted from the first phase of the CEPF funding in the UGF.

The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) collaborated with BirdLife in securing Euros 3.2 million for conservation work in Liberia and Sierra Leone, which will ensure the continuation of some project actions in the Gola transboundary forest area, which is the remaining largest intact block of the Upper Guinea Forest Area

### **Conservation Impacts**

***Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.***

The investment strategy for the CEPF ecosystem profile in the UGF sought to achieve five main outputs:

1. strengthened local institutional capacity for conservation
2. effective processes for coordination and ecosystem monitoring
3. mechanisms for promotion and implementation of biodiversity corridors
4. effective collaboration in community outreach, awareness building and education
5. a fast response mechanism to address immediate and unpredicted conservation needs.

The project contributed to the achievement of outputs 1, 2 and 4 as follows:

Strengthened local institutional capacity for conservation: This was the main thrust of the project which aimed to secure and sustain capacity for the conservation and management of Protected Areas (PA) in the Upper Guinea Forest area with focus on government institutions responsible for PA management, national biodiversity conservation NGOs, Academic institutions and Community-based Organisations. PA managers, young graduates and Site Support Groups (SSGs) in and around priority KBAs within the hotspot were facilitated by BirdLife partners in strengthening their capacities. In the process, the partners also gained capacity in various aspects of biodiversity conservation. A total of 136 nationals in the five countries benefitted from knowledge and information shared by the project on climate change with focus on innovative conservation initiatives such as carbon finance, Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) and Forest Law enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT). The short term training courses in field biodiversity identification benefitted a total of 111 nationals in the five countries. Six young graduates were awarded support for higher studies, 2 PhDs and 4 MSc. Two from the University of Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire; one from the University of Conakry, one from Njala University Sierra Leone and two from Ghana studying in the universities of Ghana and Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi. The capacity of five BirdLife partners (CSSL, SCNL, SOS-FORETS, GE and GWS) was strengthened through equipment and training courses on biodiversity conservation while that of 11 Site support Groups was enhanced via, capacity building as well as the provision of technical and material support for alternative livelihood actions.

Effective processes for coordination and ecosystem monitoring: The project trained PA managers in the use of a number of monitoring tools such as; the BirdLife Important Bird Area Monitoring Framework, the World Biodiversity Database (WBDB) and Monitoring Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) to ensure results of monitoring can be compared. Guidance notes for the identification and survey of biodiversity with focus on birds, plants and mammals has been developed and will be disseminated for use in the UGF and elsewhere. Project activities were carried out in a total of 13 protected areas (table 1).

A google group (<https://groups.google.com/group/BPAM?hl=en>) to facilitate discussion and coordination between Protected Area (PA) managers in the UGF was established. The project also encouraged the establishment of a PA manager's platform in Liberia to provide a forum for the discussion of PA issues and monitoring results.

Effective collaboration in community outreach, awareness building and education: The project established and/or strengthened 11 SSGs, (table 1) which it used as vehicles for collaboration in community outreach, awareness building and education necessary to ensure effective participation of local communities in the conservation and management of Protected Areas. The importance of this output cannot be overemphasized in view of the inadequate capacity and financial constraints of governments to ensure total and

effective conservation and management of Protected Areas. Obtaining buy-in and full collaboration of local communities is crucial for the sustainability of the resources in PA.

Table 1: SSGs at Protected Areas/Important Bird areas that benefitted from the project

Country	Name of Protected Area-IBA	Name of Site Support Group (SSG)
<b>Cote d'Ivoire</b>	1. Azagny National Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gbeyo</li> <li>• Nandibo2</li> </ul>
	2. Dassioko Forest Reserve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SOS Dassioko</li> </ul>
	3. Lamto Ecological Research Station	
	4. Swamp Forest Tanoé-Ehy (being upgraded)	
<b>Ghana</b>	1. Amansuri wetland	
	2. Mount Afadjato--Agumatsa Range forest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSG at Gbledi Gbegame,</li> <li>• SSG at Gbledi Kyebi and</li> <li>• SSG at Ahor</li> </ul>
<b>Guinea</b>	1. Chutes de la Sala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chutes de la Sala</li> </ul>
	2. Grandes Chutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grandes Chutes</li> </ul>
	3. Kounounkan,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kounounkan,</li> </ul>
<b>Liberia</b>	1. Lake Piso Multiple Used Reserve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Piso Conservation Forum (PCF)</li> </ul>
	2. East Nimba Nature Reserve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zor Conservation Monitors(ZOCOM)</li> </ul>
<b>Sierra Leone</b>	1. Gola Forest Reserve	
	2. Western Area Peninsula Non-hunting Forest Reserve	
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>

***Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.***

The project is estimated to have achieved approximately 80% of its short-term objective which was to secure and sustain capacity for the conservation and management of Protected Areas in the Upper Guinea Forest area with focus on PA managers, young graduates and Site Support Groups in and around hotspots. This achievement was made in spite of serious political problems which halted activities during six months of insecurity in Guinea and since November 2010 when the post-election violence started in Cote d'Ivoire. In addition the project was effectively implemented for 29 months out of the 36 months envisaged. The project effectively started on 31 March 2009 and ended on August 31, 2011.

By the end of the project, the capacity of 111 nationals in the five countries, 17 of them PA managers, had being built in techniques of field biodiversity identification and survey with focus on birds, plants and mammals. This was achieved through eight short training courses organised in all five countries, two each in Ghana, Liberia, and Guinea, 1 each in Cote d'Ivoire and Sierra Leone. The training courses were hosted by the BirdLife partners and facilitated by some of the beneficiaries of the first phase of the CEPF

funding in the Upper Guinea Forest (UGF). Through the project, therefore, the pool of conservationist with capacity to identify and survey birds, plants and mammals in West Africa sub-region in particular and the Africa region, as a whole, has being increased. This will have significant positive impact, especially in Liberia and Sierra with huge capacity limitations as a result of the 14 years civil war that affected the education systems, as well as, all other sectors of the society.

The project produced 2 new toolkits to enhance training in biodiversity conservation; i) Guidance notes for short term training in field biodiversity identification and surveys with focus on birds, plant and mammals and ii) in-service training modules for Protected Area managers. All five countries have made significant progress in the preparation of the Important Bird Areas directories for their respective countries. These tools would go a long way to support and facilitate future capacity building efforts in the UGF.

A total to 15 Monitoring Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) reports were produced, covering 12 PAs during the course of the project by the PA managers. These reports provide data and information that will enable management to put in place measures to enhance conservation and monitor progress towards sustainability in the PAs.

Capacity of the implementing partners as well as beneficiaries of the short term training courses was also enhanced through the provision of materials and equipment; 150 books (60 Birds of West and Central Africa (Barrow and Demey, 50 Kingdom Field Guide to African mammals by Kingdom and 40 Woody plants of Western Africa (Hawthorne and Jongkind), 6 digital cameras, about 10 tents, 6 GPS and a vehicle for the regional office to facilitate travel to monitor work in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire and, 4 motorcycles. These resources are held in institutions that permit wide availability to different stakeholders.

Six young graduates (2 PhDs and 4 MSc) were awarded grants for higher studies. Unfortunately, the MSc grantee in Sierra Leone had to withdraw and refund the grant because he had secured another grant to study abroad. No application was received from Liberia because Universities in the country do not offer MSc degrees in the field of forestry and Natural resources management. The research work of one grantee has produced interesting results contributing to science. Research by one of the grantee in Ghana led to the re-discovery of the Giant West African Squeaker, (*Arthroleptis krokosua*). The information provided on the species has resulted in its up listing from Not Evaluated to Endangered by the IUCN.

One hundred and thirty six nationals in the five countries, 65 of them PA managers, benefitted from knowledge and information shared by the project on emerging conservation initiatives such as, REDD, carbon finance and FLEGT. This was achieved via six workshops (one regional and five national ones) organised by the project. It is anticipated that the knowledge and information acquired puts the beneficiaries, especially the PA managers, in a better position to effectively engage in the ongoing debate and discussions on these subjects and would enable them to make informed decisions on the way forward on these matters.

The capacity of eleven local community groups (three each in Ghana, Guinea, and Cote d'Ivoire and two in Liberia) was enhanced through various training courses organised by the project and support for alternative livelihood actions. These local community groups served as the vehicles for communicating with the community at large and monitoring of

community action. The importance of community involvement in biodiversity conservation cannot be overemphasized in view of their heavy dependence on biodiversity and claims to land and user rights to these resources. This is more so because governments have limited manpower and resources to effectively protect and manage these areas.

A platform for PA managers was established in Liberia. The platform provides a very useful forum for the sharing of information and discussion of national PA issues and also for monitoring PA management and development in the country.

The project helped to revamp the momentum for conservation among the national organizations initiated during the first phase of the CEPF funding in the UGF that was ebbing away for lack of funds, to support among other things, interactions and exchange visits among partners in the various countries.

One key lesson learnt is the need to ensure that all key project documents are translated into both French and English (the main languages used in the sub-region) to facilitate communication, understanding and effective participation of all partners and beneficiaries in project activities.

**Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal):**

The biological resources of the Upper Guinea Forest ecosystem are secured and managed sustainably for the benefit of its people.

**Actual Progress toward Long-term Impacts at Completion:**

The project has made a number of contributions towards securing the long-term conservation and management of the biological resources of the UGF area for the benefit of its people, especially the local communities that depend heavily on these resources for their subsistence. These contributions include:

1. Increasing the number of conservationist with capacity to conserve and sustainably manage the resources of the UGF. The capacity of 111 nationals (15% of whom had benefitted from the first CEPF funding in the UGF) in the five countries was built and secured in techniques of field biodiversity identification and survey with focus on birds, plants and mammals. The project in addition provided the implementing organizations and some of the beneficiaries of the training courses with equipment and materials to support their work (see list of equipment and materials above).
2. Creating an enabling environment for the sustainability of action through educating and raising of awareness of local communities on the global importance of the UGF and hence the need for the long-term conservation and management of its resources. A total of 11 local community groups were established/strengthened to serve as channels for communicating with the community at large and monitoring of community conservation and management action.

3. Securing further resources for sustainable conservation action. BirdLife International in collaboration with the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) secured Euros 3.2 million from the European Commission for the conservation of the largest intact block of forest in the UGF between Liberia and Sierra Leone. The Gola Forest Reserve which stretches across Liberia and Sierra Leone and covers a total of 155,000 ha is being targeted for the establishment of a transboundary peace park within the framework of a four year project that started in March 2009 called, 'Across the river, a transboundary peace park for Sierra and Leone and Liberia'. Two of the project partners (SCNL and CSSL) are involved in the implementation of this project. The upgrade of the Gola Forest to a National Park in Sierra Leone and planned upgrade of same in Liberia in the near future would be the greatest commitment by both governments to the long-term conservation of the biological resources of these forests by their respective governments. The credit for the upgrade in Sierra Leone and progress in Liberia can be partly attributed to the project because of the involvement of project partners (CSSL and SCNL) in the process and co-finance from the project.
4. BirdLife International has long-term commitment for the conservation of the UGF. The UGF is one of BirdLife's Endemic Bird Area (EBA 54) and BirdLife has partners and contact NGOs in all five countries of the UGF through which they have been engaged in the conservation of same since 2002.

**Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal):**

To secure and sustain capacity for the conservation and management of protected areas in the Upper Guinea Forest area with focus on PA managers, young graduates and Site Support Groups (local community groups) in and around hotspots.

**Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:**

The progress towards short-term impact at completion is provided below.

- The capacity of 65 PA managers was enhanced in climate change and emerging conservation initiatives such as REDD, carbon finance and Forest Law Enforcement Governance and Trade (FLEGT) while 17 others benefitted from the short training courses on field biodiversity identification and surveys. The PA managers were also trained in the use of a number of toolkits, the World Biodiversity Database, BirdLife IBA monitoring framework and the Monitoring Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). A google discussion group was established to facilitate online communication for PA managers. The PA managers prepared 15 METTS reports during the course of the project.
- Three grantees (1PhD and 2 MSc) out of the five who were supported to pursue further studies have completed their studies and submitted their thesis to their respective Universities (copies are annex to this report). The work of the two grantees in Cote d'Ivoire was interrupted by the post-election unrest. Research by

one grantee in Ghana led to the re-discovery of the Giant West African Squeaker, (*Arthroleptis krokosua*), which has resulted in its up listing by the IUCN from Not Evaluated to Endangered. In addition to the grantees, ninety four other students were trained in techniques of field biodiversity identification and survey. Two of the small grantees are research assistances in their various universities while most of the students were final year BSc students. It is worth noting that Universities in the sub-region generally have difficulties supporting field training course for students. This explains the high number of applications that were received for the training courses when they were advertised by the project.

- Eleven local community groups were supported in various ways by the project; short training courses; provision of materials and equipment for site monitoring and alternative livelihood actions. These groups in return supported PA management through site surveillance and education of other community members. Major outcome of SSG involvement was reduction in hunting and encroachment for agricultural activity in PAs.

Two toolkits to facilitate and sustain PA conservation were produced by the project; guidance notes for the organization of short-term field training courses on biodiversity identification and survey and ii) in-service training modules for PA managers. Information collected during the various short training courses was used to update national IBA books being prepared by the BirdLife national partners

**Please provide the following information where relevant:**

**Hectares Protected:**

Although this project was not intended to ensure site protection, through the various training courses and monitoring done, sites have indirectly benefited from enhanced conservation action stimulated by the project. Table 2 shows the number of PAs per country at which the project activities were implemented with some benefits in terms of protection. The short-term training courses were organised in PAs that covered a total of 284,328 hectares in the five countries.

Table 2: Area covered by sites at which project activities were implemented per country

Country	Sites	Area (ha)	Some key species of Global conservation concern at the sites used by the project (source WBDB)		Total species
			Birds	Other species of conservation concern	
Liberia	East Nimba Forest Reserve	20,240	<i>Bathmocercus cerviniventris</i> , <i>Picathartes gymnocephalus</i>	<i>Nimbaphrynoides occidentalis</i> , <i>Micropotamogale lamottei</i>	18
	Gola Forest Reserve	76,100	<i>Malimbus ballmanni</i> , <i>Melaenornis annamarulae</i> , <i>Scotopelia ussheri</i>	<i>Pan troglodytes verus</i> , <i>Procolobus badius</i>	22
Ghana	Kakum Forest reserve	36,000	<i>Lamprotornis cupreocauda</i> , <i>Illadopsis rufescens</i> , <i>Agelastes meleagrides</i>	<i>Colobus vellerosus</i> , <i>Loxodonta africana cyclotis</i>	11
	Ankasa Forest reserve	50,900	<i>Bleda eximius</i> , <i>Criniger olivaceus</i> , <i>Campephaga lobata</i>	<i>Loxodonta africana cyclotis</i> , <i>Pan troglodytes</i>	15
Guniee	Haut Niger National Park	54,000			
Sierra Leone	Western Area Peninsula Forest Reserve	17,688	<i>Psittacus erithacus</i> , <i>Picathartes gymnocephalus</i>	<i>Pan troglodytes verus</i> , <i>Cercopithecus Diana</i>	8
Cote d'Ivoire	Azagny National Park	19,400	<i>Ceratogymna elata</i> , <i>Psittacus erithacus</i> , <i>Bycanistes cylindricus</i>	<i>Procolobus verus</i> , <i>Colobus vellerosus</i>	13
<b>Total</b>		<b>284,328</b>			<b>87</b>

### Species Conserved:

Although the project was not aimed at species protection, *per se*, it can be assumed that species were indirectly protected at sites in which project activities were implemented and would continue to be protected, after the project ends. For instance, the capacity developed in local community groups to engage in alternative livelihoods activities will reduce dependence on hunting, encroachment for farming and other activities that threaten key species. The number of species identified, per country, at the various PAs used by the project for training courses are presented in table 3 and some of the key biodiversity species of global conservation concern that triggered the protection of the sites are provided in table 2.

Table 3: Number of species identified in the PAs used for the short term training courses

Country	Total number of species identified per taxa		
	Birds	Mammals	Plants
Liberia	248	37	420
Ghana	182	23	105
Guinea	105	21	141
Sierra Leone	83	70	70
Cote d'Ivoire **			

\*\* Office destroyed and looted following post-election violence, hence reports cannot be retrieved.

### Corridors Created:

**Not applicable.** However, the 'Across the river, a transboundary peace park for Sierra and Leone and Liberia' project, which was developed and co-financed by this project, focuses to a great extent on the establishment and protection of corridors linking Gola in Liberia and Sierra Leone.

### **Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.**

The most significant achievement of the project is the number of people (111) with skills in biodiversity identification and surveys that have been added to the pool of conservationists that would help in the conservation and management of the biodiversity of the UGF. The project also improved knowledge and shared information to 136 people on climate change and innovative conservation initiatives such as carbon finance, REDD and FLEGT. It is anticipated that the people with this information and knowledge will be able to participate more effectively in debates and discussions on these subjects and

that any decisions they make would be based on sound information that will lead to the sustainability of the UGF.

Another achievement is the two toolkits (Guidance notes for field biodiversity identification and in-service training modules) produced by the project to facilitate future capacity development endeavours in the UGF forest in particular and the sub-region in general.

Two of the five young graduates supported by the project are assistant researchers in their respective universities. This is a good indicator that the capacity developed would be put to good use and multiplied to other students and researchers and would eventually benefit biodiversity conservation in the UGF.

Another success of the project was the establishment and/or strengthening of relationship between government and national civil society organizations and the local community groups at the various Protected Areas at which project actions was undertaken. Governments are increasingly recognizing the important contributions of local communities and legalizing local community groups as part of efforts to encourage increase participation in view to sustainably conserve and manage biodiversity of Protected Areas.

The greatest challenge faced by the project was the insecurity experienced in two of the implementing countries (Guinea and Cote d'Ivoire). Guinea experienced a 6-months period of insecurity in the middle of the year 2010 and Cote d'Ivoire is still not very secure for any field work since November 2010. This insecurity situation has had negative impact on project activities. It has made it impossible for the young graduates in Cote d'Ivoire to continue field work and resulted in the destruction and looting of the office of the implementing partner (SOS-FORETS) rendering it impossible to report on outstanding achievement and expenditure of the project.

The project was also aimed at securing capacity developed in the first phase of the CEPF portfolio in the UGF. Unfortunately many of the beneficiaries of the first phase had moved on and out of the region in search of greener pasture. Another challenge the project faced was the poor management of the project by the CSSL resulting in many several activities being unrealized. For instance, the PA network was not established and no work was done with SSGs in Sierra Leone. As part of measures to address the situation, the CSSL board replaced the Chief Executive officer.

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

- The unexpected positive impact was the re-discovery of the Giant West African Squeaker, (*Arthroleptis krokosua*) by one of the young graduate grantees (Gilbert Basse Adum) in Ghana. This discovery, as indicated above has resulted in the up listing of the species, by the IUCN, from Not Evaluated to Endangered.

- There were a few unexpected and negative impacts recorded during the implementation of the project; i) the insecurity situations that arose in Guinea and Cote d'Ivoire; ii) the mismanagement of the project by CSSL which resulted in some project activities not implemented; iii) the withdrawal of the young graduate grantee in Sierra Leone to pursue studies abroad and iv) Late start (March 31, 2009 instead of January 1, 2009) and early closure of project (on August 3), four months before the official end date of December 31, 201.

## Project Components

**Project Components:** *Please report on results by project component. Reporting should reference specific products/deliverables from the approved project design and other relevant information.*

**Component 1 Planned:** Improved capacity of conservationists especially of protected area managers in Ghana, Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, Guinea and Sierra Leone for effective biodiversity action.

### Component 1 Actual at Completion:

The project implementing partners in the five countries organised eight short training courses in field biodiversity identification and survey with focus on birds, plants and mammals which benefitted 111 nationals, 17 of them PA managers and remainder students. The number of PA managers who benefitted from the training courses per country is given in table 4. Two training courses were organised each in Ghana, Liberia, and Guinea and one each in Cote d'Ivoire and Sierra Leone. The training courses were facilitated partly by beneficiaries of the first phase of the CEPF portfolio in the UGF.

Also as part of the capacity building, the implementing partners as well as some beneficiaries were provided materials and equipment including; 150 books (60 Birds of West and Central Africa (Barrow and Demey, 50 Kingdom Field Guide to African mammals by Kingdom and 40 Woody plants of Western Africa (Hawthorne and Jongkind), 6 digital cameras, about 10 tents, 6 GPS and a vehicle for the regional office to facilitate travel to monitor work in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire and, 4 motorcycles. These are held in institutions that permit wide availability by different stakeholders.

A total of 136 people, 65 of them PA managers, benefitted from knowledge and information shared on emerging conservation initiatives to mitigate climate change such as; REDD, carbon finance and Forest Law Enforcement Governance and Trade. These was achieved via a series of 6 workshops; the regional workshop was organised by BirdLife regional office in Accra Ghana, while and the five national workshops were facilitated by the national implementing NGOs in the five countries in collaboration with the PA managers who participated at the regional workshop. The number of beneficiaries per country is in table 4. The regional workshop, organised in Ghana in September 2009, was attended by 27 participants; fifteen of them were PA managers from the 5 implementing countries (Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone) and the others were students from Universities and projects in Ghana. The regional workshop was followed by five national workshops to replicate the regional workshop and targeted at PA managers in the respective countries. Detail information about the various

workshops and training courses can be found in annexes to this report.

Table 4: Number of beneficiaries of the training courses in biodiversity identification and workshop on emerging conservation initiatives per country.

Country	Beneficiaries Biodiversity identification training course		Beneficiaries Workshop on emerging conservation initiatives	
	Total	PA managers	Total	PA managers
Cote d'Ivoire	11	0	39	10
Ghana	30	15	30	18
Guinea	25	0	15	10
Liberia	30	1	23	13
Sierra Leone	15	1	29	14
Total	111	17	136	65

**Component 2 Planned:** Improved knowledge in key emerging conservation issues and opportunities (climate change carbon credit, REDD) with focus on young graduates and scientists in Liberia and Sierra Leone to achieve conservation action.

**Component 2 Actual at Completion:**

Six young graduates (2 PhDs – Augustus Asamoah of the University of Ghana and KOUADIO KOFFI ROGER of the University of Cote d'Ivoire; 4 MSc, namely-Gilbert Baase Adum of the Nkwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana; KOUAME Akissi Paule-Sandrine of the University of Cote d'Ivoire BARRY Mohamed Lamine of the University of Conakry, Guinea and Thomas Fayia Kamara of Njalla University, Sierra Leone) were awarded a total of USD 30,000 to undertake projects on emerging conservation issues such as climate change carbon finance and REDD. The subjects under research by the young graduates were i) Restoration of the botanic garden in Abidjan to increase carbon sequestration and reduce climate change impacts in the city ii) Restoration of degraded portions of the Tanoe Ehy swamp forest (South East Cote d'Ivoire) for enhanced biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration, iii) The Ecological Distribution and Conservation of White necked-Picathartes (*Picathartes gymnocephalus*) in Ghana, iv) Amphibians as Models for Understanding the Impacts of Logging on Biodiversity in Upper Guinean forests, v) Assessment of management and impact of climate change on the natural resources of the kakoulima Forest Reserve, vi) Protected area management and community conservation in Sierra Leone: the opportunities and challenges; a case study of the Tiwai community conservation programme. Unfortunately, the last research topic had to be discontinued because the grantee in Sierra Leone secured another grant to continue his studies abroad. No application was received from Liberia because Universities in the country do are not yet offer MSc degrees in forestry and natural resource management. In addition to enhancing the knowledge and the education of the grantees, some of the research work has produced interesting results and contributed to science. The work by the grantee in Ghana, Gilbert Baase Adum, resulted in the re-discovery of the Giant West African Squeaker, (*Arthroleptis krokosua*). The information provided on the species has led to its up listing by the IUCN from Not Evaluated to Endangered.

Three of the grantees (Gilbert Baase Adum of Ghana, BARRY Mohamed Lamine of

Guinea and Asamoah Augustus have submitted drafts of their thesis, Sandrine has completed her field work but unable to continue because the University of Abidjan is closed following looting and destruction of facilities after the elections in November. Roger is unable to continue with field work as a result of the precarious security situation in Cote d'Ivoire. Thomas Fayia Kamara of Sierra Leone, as indicated above, had to discontinue his research to pursue studies abroad. Fortunately the project was able to recover the funds but it was too late to re-award to another candidate. Report of the work done by the young graduates can be found in the annexes to this report.

**Component 3 Planned:** Increased capacity of Site Support Groups (SSGs) to effectively engage in conservations action at PAs located in hotspots (focus will be on the SAPO National Park, lake Piso forest reserves in Liberia, and Gola Forest Reserves in and Sierra Leone and Azagny Forest Reserve in Cote d'Ivoire).

**Component 3 Actual at Completion:**

At the end of the project, 11 Site support groups located at 13 hotspots (table 1) in four countries had benefited from project actions. A total of USD 25,000 was earmarked for SSG work over the duration of the project. Support provided and activities undertaken to enhance SSG capacity varied from country to country and is summarized in table 4. Table four also gives some of the actions of the SSGs.

Table 4: Summary of actions with regards to SSGs.

Country/SSG	Materials and equipment	Capacity building and SSG activities
<b>Guinea</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GSS Sidakoro</li> <li>GSS diaragbela</li> <li>GSS kassa</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mobile phones; five bicycles, badges ; note books, pens, field guides, fishing nets, wheel barrows, watering cans, machetes, hoes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education, awareness raising and monitoring, of illegal activities (hunting, fishing quotas)</li> </ul>
<b>Liberia</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Piso Conservation Forum(PCF)</li> <li>Zor Conservation Monitors(ZOC OM)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>USD 1000 provided to open bank account.</li> <li>Facilitated negotiation for the acquisition of office space.</li> <li>Construction of 15 improved ovens</li> <li>Initiated the establishment of two fish pounds</li> <li>Members trained in field identification and survey of biodiversity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education and awareness raising. Encouraging and supporting the use of improved ovens through training courses in their construction.</li> <li>Training in site monitoring.</li> <li>Assisted in the establishment of the new boundaries of the Lake Piso Multiple use Reserve</li> <li>Provide support to researchers in biodiversity identification.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Ghana</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSG at Gbledi Gbgame,</li> <li>• SSG at Gbledi Kyebi and</li> <li>• SSG at Ahor</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awareness raising and capacity needs assessment workshop that resulted in the identification of the following training needs; bushfire Combating; biodiversity Identification techniques; customer care and communication skills training and basic first aid training.</li> <li>• Training course organised in bush fire prevention and management.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Cote d'Ivoire</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gbeyo</li> <li>• Nandibo</li> <li>• SOS-Dassioko</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial support of USD 6,000 (USD 4,400 from GEF small grant)</li> <li>• Provision of equipment and material such as, cassava grinding mill; 4 bicycles and field guides,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building with focus on biodiversity survey and identification.</li> <li>• SSG actions include monitoring especially of illegal activities, sensitization of other community members</li> </ul>

**Component 4 Planned:** Improved/new mechanisms/tools for Protected Area (PA) management including best practice manuals, Management Effectiveness Tracking Tools (METT), Important Bird Area (IBA) monitoring frameworks, online PA management support; published/updated IBA/KBA books

**Component 4 Actual at Completion:**

The regional training workshop in Accra, mentioned above, which was replicated at national level in all five countries was also served as an opportunity to train PA managers in the use of a number of tools; the METT, IBA monitoring tool and the World Biodiversity Database. The PA managers were in turn supposed to train other nationals in same. By the end of the project 15 METT reports had been prepared for 12 PAs in all five countries. Details of the METTS can be found in workshop reports annexed to this report.

Guidance notes for the organization of short-term (2-3 weeks) training courses in field biodiversity identification and survey with focus on birds' plants and mammals have been developed. Two of the guidance notes (for mammals and plants) need to be translated into English and the birds into French and further edited before it can be widely distributed for use.

The project has also developed in-service training modules for PA managers to help keep them abreast with current developments in the conservation world.

The project also established a Google discussion group (see link above) for the UGF to encourage linkages with PA managers for information and experience sharing. However, the Google group has been poorly used partly because most PA managers are located in remote areas without internet services.

All five countries have made progress in the preparation of their IBA books; GWS has updated draft data and information for its IBA book; SOS-FORETS and Guinee Ecologie have completed the collection of information from the various IBAs and started drafting their books. In Liberia 75% of the IBA book has been drafted by the SCNL. Very little progress has been made by CSSL in revising the first edition of the IBA book for Sierra Leone.

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

All project components were implemented although not all were completely realized. The production of the IBA books envisaged under component 4 was not realized. This did not affect the project because most of the information for the production of the books is available with partners and also via the BirdLife datazone and it now remains to be compiled, reviewed, edited and produced.

The project had also envisaged testing and fine-tuning the in-service training modules for PA managers but this never happened partly because of the early closure of the project. This also was of no consequence on the overall impact of the project.

The level of monitoring and application of knowledge from the workshops was below expectations, mainly stemming from the lack of willingness within PA authorities to mainstream monitoring into PA management processes.

***Please describe and submit (electronically if possible) any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.***

The following documents/manuals were produced as a result of this project:

1. In-service training modules for PA managers. The modules which can be independently implemented provide guidelines for the training of PA managers in various aspects of conservation and management to enhance conservation of biodiversity.
2. Guidance notes for the organization of short-term field training courses in biodiversity identification and surveys with focus on birds, mammals and plants. The guidance notes provide simple and practical steps in the planning and implementation of short-term (2-3 weeks) training course in field biodiversity identification based experience of BirdLife International in organizing such courses. As indicated above, the guidance note still need to be edited and translated before it can be widely distributed for use.

3. A google discussion group, <https://groups.google.com/group/BPAM?hl=en>, was created by the project to facilitate information sharing and discussion of issues on PA management and biodiversity conservation in the Upper Guinea Forest. The use of the discussion group, by partners, has not been encouraging partly because most PA managers are located in remote areas without access to internet facilities
4. Also annexed to this report are the various training course reports organised by the project.
5. Reports from 5 young graduates funded by the project (including draft thesis by three of the grantees; Augustus Asamoah, Barry Mohammed and Gilbert Baase Adum) have also been annexed.

## Lessons Learned

***Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building. Consider lessons that would inform projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.***

- Effective involvement of all stakeholders in project design is crucial for its success. This can only be effectively achieved if future projects include a project development phase during which stakeholders would be associated in the identification of problems, development of strategies to address them as well as putting in place mechanisms for the successful implementation and monitoring of the project.
- Many of the national conservation organizations, in West Africa, do not have adequate capacity to implement and sustain projects and therefore require substantial and/or long-term external support. This problem can be partly addressed by factoring in a strong capacity development component, with focus on fundraising.
- The substantial time required for results from conservation projects to be visible should be factored into future project design.
- Efforts should be made to encourage south-south mentoring and collaboration in future projects. Although effort is being made, in some countries, to encourage networking between national NGOs, success has been minimal.
- Working with organizations with similar objectives and who already have some form of working relationship facilitates project implementation and consequently the realization of objectives.
- Management efficiency of the implementing partner organizations has direct implication on the project outcome.

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

The aspects of the project design which contributed to its success include; i) the fact that all implementing organizations were not only partners of BirdLife International but had taken part in the first phase of the CEPF project portfolio funded between 2002-2006; ii) BirdLife has been engaged in conservation work in the sub-region since 2000 and iii) the project design was done within the overall framework of the BirdLife programme for the sub-region as part of mechanisms to ensure its sustainability.

The main short coming was the lack of a project development phase to enable a quick review and update on the current situation in the sub-region, especially with regards to the status of the beneficiaries of the first phase of the CEPF portfolio. It would have been noticed that most of the beneficiaries of the first phase had moved on and/or out of the sub-region.

National PA authorities were not involved in the project design which might partly explain their unwillingness to mainstream the approaches for PA monitoring, resulting in the skills and knowledge imparted by the project not put to maximum use.

***Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings).***

Aspects of project execution that contributed to its success include; i) On the ground implementation was led by national organisations in the respective countries ii) ease of communication since the lead national implementing organizations were BirdLife partners who had been involved in the first phase of the CEPF portfolio, iii) Project coordination by BirdLife was ensured by the same team leader as for the 2002-2004 project hence ensuring continuity; iv) there was substantial information on the PA sites targeted by the project; v) All project implementing partners have good working relationship with the governments and relevant forestry departments who have overall responsibility for Protected Areas; vi) most countries have policies and legal frameworks that enable participation of local communities in the conservation and management of biodiversity even within Protected Areas and vii) local communities are relatively knowledgeable about the importance of biodiversity and thereby the need for their conservation.

The project did not enjoy the full benefits from the beneficiaries of the first phase of the CEPF portfolio. The project was aimed at securing the capacity of these beneficiaries and also to make use of their expertise in the implementation of the project such as training of other nationals. It was discovered that many had moved on and out of the region mainly because the organization were unable to pay competitive salaries.

***Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:***

A communication strategy should have been developed and means for its implementation made available at the early stages of project implementation to ensure timely sharing of information.

Sub-regional projects provide an opportunity for closer collaboration, experience and information sharing and networking among implementing organizations. This is fundamental if the UGF hotspot is to be sustained.

Irrespective of the relationship with the implementing partners, close monitoring, technical support, guidance, and consultation are vital ingredients for project success.

Collaboration with state institutions is very important but there are numerous bottlenecks that slow down progress of project implementation.

There are very few opportunities to raise funds locally to support national conservation organizations which perpetrate dependence on external support.

The holistic approach to capacity building which involves training of personnel, review of organizational structures and their functioning, provision of core support as well as materials especially vehicles contribute significantly to the success of the project.

**Additional Funding**

***Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of the CEPF investment in this project.***

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
European Commission	A	USD 3.12 million (Euros 2.4 million)	Funds secured to conserve the largest remaining intact bloc of UGF between Liberia and Sierra Leone. Project funds were used as counterpart funding. The aim is to establish a transboundary national park that brings together the Gola reserve, portions of which are found in both Liberia and Sierra Leone and cover a total area of 155,000 ha.
BirdLife International	A	USD 51,750 (GBP 28,750)	Funds secured by BirdLife for the production and publication of a field guide called, 'Birds of Ghana'. Information for the

			production of the book was partly provided by the project.
UNDP	B	USD 30,000	Secured from the UNDP to construct energy efficient ovens in communities not covered by the project in the Lake Piso Multiple use Reserve area. Funds were also to be used to establish woodlots for future fuelwood production for fish smoking in order to reduce deforestation and mangrove harvesting.
GEF Small Grant	A	USD 4,400	To facilitate alternative livelihood activities of one SSG in cote d'Ivoire SOS-Dassioko
Various donors	A	USD 32,200	Additional funds secured by five young graduates for their research work.

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

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

## Sustainability/Replicability

***Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.***

The indicators of sustainability and replicability of project components are classified under 3 main categories; Environment; Institutional, Economic/social. The main successes in this regard are:

### 1. Environment

- a. A good number of Protected Areas have been established in the UGF containing much of the remaining relatively intact habitats. This project has provided capacity, skills and connections to improve management effectiveness of these Protected Areas.
- b. In the region, there are relatively favourable policies and legislative frameworks regarding environmental management. This project brought in necessary skills and connections to exploit this favourable policy environment.

- c. This project contributed towards the setup of an ongoing project in the largest remaining intact bloc of the UGF (Gola Forese Reserve) covering Sierra Leone and Liberia. This project is enhancing protection and establishing corridors, which are strategic steps towards sustainable protection.
  - d. Plans are underway by GEF/Worldbank for long-term investment in Protected Area management and biodiversity conservation in Liberia which has the largest percentage (46%) of the UGF. The World Bank (one of the CEPF donors) intends to work closely with other partners and especially civil society and local organizations in all its future projects in the sub-region. Results from this project will be used to provide input into these plans.
2. Institutional
- a. The project actions are aligned with BirdLife long-term programme for Africa and the sub-region. The UGF is one of BirdLife's endemic bird areas (EBA 054) and hence of high priority to BirdLife
  - b. Availability of capacity within the BirdLife partner organizations and the PA managers to continue with project action.
  - c. Toolkits and materials are available to facilitate replication where and when necessary.
3. Economic and Social
- a. The skills and knowledge acquired by beneficiaries, especially the young graduates, will improve their social status, enrich their curriculum vitae and contribute to their economic wellbeing by enhancing their chances of employment.

However a number of challenges still exist that need to be addressed including:

1. Inadequate and insufficient human resource capacity. There is need to increase the quality and quantity on human resources, especially in Sierra Leone and Liberia where the long years of civil war had disrupted the educational systems affecting the human resources in the country. Governments would need to restructure and resource the educational systems to ensure young graduates have the requisite capacity and experiences to be employed immediately after graduation.
2. The precarious security situation in the sub-region is not encouraging for long term investment required for conservation work.
3. Limited financial resources for biodiversity conservation, especially within the sub-region and Africa in general.
4. Need for increase commitment and more attention to biodiversity conservation.
5. Holistic and integrated approach to biodiversity conservation and PA management with other development sectors.

6. Government commitment to mainstream biodiversity conservation, especially the modern approaches in terms of monitoring, financing and climate change

*Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.*

<b>Safeguard Policy Assessment</b>
------------------------------------

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

Not applicable

<b>Additional Comments/Recommendations</b>
--

## Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

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

Name: Paulinus Ngeh

Organization name: BirdLife International

Mailing address: c/o Ghana Wildlife Society, Efua Sutherland Children's Park, P.O. Box 13252 Accra, Ghana.

Tel: +233 302665197; +233244606878

Fax: +233303670610

E-mail: [paulinus.ngeh@birdlife.org](mailto:paulinus.ngeh@birdlife.org);

**\*\*\*If your grant has an end date other than JUNE 30, please complete the tables on the following pages\*\*\***

### Performance Tracking Report Addendum

<b>CEPF Global Targets</b>				
<b>(Enter Grant Term)</b>				
Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant. Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.				
<b>Project Results</b>	Is this question relevant?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.	Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.	<b>Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. (Attach annexes if necessary)</b>
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	Yes		1,664,900	Fifteen METT reports were prepared over the project period for a total of 12 PAs (3 had 2 METTs).
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	Not relevant			
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	Yes	17,688	284,328	These were sites used for the short term training course in field biodiversity identification that benefitted 111 nationals in the various countries. An outcome of the training courses was the identification of species that partners have used in the review of the IBA books being prepared
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management	Not relevant			

practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.				
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	Relevant			

**If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table**

**Table 1. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities**

Please complete this table if your project provided concrete socioeconomic benefits to local communities. List the name of each community in column one. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes. In the bottom row, provide the totals of the Xs for each column.

Name of Community		Community Characteristics							Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit													
		Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists/nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty rate	Other	Increased Income due to:				Increased food security due to the adoption of sustainable fishing, hunting, or agricultural practices	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource due to titling, reduction of colonization, etc.	Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides, flooding, etc)	More secure sources of energy	Increased access to public services, such as education, health, or credit	Improved use of traditional knowledge for environmental management	More participatory decision-making due to strengthened civil society and governance.	Other
										Adoption of sustainable natural resources management practices	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services									
Piso	Liberia	X	X						X				X	X	X		X	X	X	X		
Zortapa	Liberia	X	X						X				X				X	X				
Yolowee	Liberia	X	X						X				X				X	X				
Geipa	Liberia	X	X						X				X				X	X				
Sentontuo	Liberia	X	X						X				X				X	X				
Kongbor	Liberia	X	X						X				X				X	X				
Sidakoro	Guinea	X	X						X		X							X				
Kassa	Guinea	X	X						X		X							X				
Diaragbela	Guinea	X	X						X		X							X				
Gbeyo	Cote d'Ivoire	X	X						X	X	X		X					X				
Nandibo	Cote d'Ivoire	X	X						X	X	X							X				
Dassioko	Cote d'Ivoire	X	X						X	X	X		X					X			X	
Gbledi Gbgame	Ghana	X	X						X	X							X				X	
Gbledi Kyebi	Ghana	X	X						X	X							X					
Ahor	Ghana	X	X						X	X							X					
<b>Total</b>																						

If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit:

