

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	N/A
Project Title:	Promoting the recognition of the Eastern Afromontane KBAs and Corridors to an International Audience of Ecologists and Climate Change Scientists
Date of Report:	November 2013
Report Author and Contact Information	Ian Gordon, igordonicipe@gmail.com

CEPF Region: Afromontane Hotspot

Strategic Direction:

SD 1. Mainstream biodiversity into wider development policies, plans and projects to deliver the co-benefits of biodiversity conservation, improved local livelihoods and economic development in priority corridors.

IP 1.2 Promote civil society efforts and mechanisms to mainstream biodiversity conservation into national development policies and plans, and into territorial planning in priority corridors and countries.

Grant Amount:

USD 4000

Project Dates:

1st August 2013 to 31st October 2013

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

None

Conservation Impacts

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

This project has increased the prospects for mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation into national development policies and plans by promoting the recognition of Eastern Afromontane KBAs within the global scientific community. It has done this through a presentation on the Afromontane KBAs in the 2013 London INTECOL/British Ecological Society Centenary conference (attended by over 2,000 delegates, involving 10 plenaries, 44 symposia and over 50 workshops) during a Symposium dedicated to *Climate change and African mountain ecosystems: Modelling ecological change at different scales*. The keynote speaker at this symposium (Christian Hof: *Understanding and predicting climate change impacts on biodiversity – the challenges of moving from global and regional models to local realities*), noted that a major priority was to determine the local geographical focus for conservation research and action within the vast areas that are covered by African Mountain ecosystems. The key message from the Afromontane KBA presentation (Slide

14) directly addressed this priority: “KBAs provide a clear site focus for dealing with Climate Change threats to African Montane Biodiversity”. The display and distribution of the KBA maps to 30 of the delegates who attended this symposium ensured that they would retain this site focus and be able to apply it in their research and awareness activities after the conference was over. The presentation was especially appreciated because it offered a management perspective on African Montane Ecosystems, as opposed to the overwhelmingly research-oriented papers given by the other delegates

The short term nature (4 months) of the project precludes an assessment of its long term impacts on the implementation of the Hotspot Profile, but personnel from the following institutions were involved in the African Montane Ecosystem Symposium and exposed to the KBA Hotspot analysis: Biodiversity Climate Research Centre (Bik-F), Frankfurt, Germany; Centre for Macroecology, Evolution and Climate, University of Copenhagen, Denmark; National Museum of Natural Sciences, Madrid, Spain; Global Species Programme IUCN, University of Witwatersrand, South Africa; Museum für Naturkunde, Leibniz Institution for Research on Evolution and Biodiversity, Germany; Metapopulation Research Group, University of Helsinki, Finland; Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Zentrum für Umweltforschung, Leipzig, Germany; University of Freiburg, Germany; Addis Ababa University; Ethiopia Environment and Coffee Forest Forum, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; Centre for Development Research, Zentrum für Entwicklungsforschung, University of Bonn, Germany; University of York, England; Geography Department, University of KwaZulu-Natal; Tanzanian Wildlife Research Institute, Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania; National Museums of Kenya, Nairobi, Kenya; and Imperial College, University of London, England. Modified versions of the INTECOL paper were also presented at the Birdlife Headquarters in Cambridge (27 people) and at Synchronicity Earth (3 people) at their offices in London.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project against the expected results detailed in the approved proposal.

The two most important expected results from this project are 1) greater awareness of threatened biodiversity, KBAs and corridors in the Hotspot amongst a key constituency of upcoming and influential global change ecologists, leading to their greater engagement with CEPF and its partners; 2) a project report that will assist the RIT to fulfil its mandate. The report will include professional contacts, summaries of the most relevant presentations and their implications for Hotspot biodiversity, and further information on contacts in ministries, donors and development agencies and issues that may impact on KBAs and corridors within the Hotspot. Based on the report, the RIT will produce an article for the BirdLife community page, the EAM Facebook, the e-bulletin and other communication tools.

Result 1). Although no KBA/Hotspot awareness baseline for the delegates attending the African Montane Ecosystem Symposium was obtained, the first part of result 1 was clearly achieved. A minimal indicator for this was the almost 100% uptake of the maps and CEPF brochures that were on offer: each delegate who collected a copy of the map now has a precise spatial reference for the number and location of the KBAs in the hotspot. It is premature to assess whether this will lead to greater engagement with CEPF; this will become clearer as the Afromontane investment proceeds. The indicator for this is the number of contacts who subsequently submit Lols to CEPF and the RIT team.

Result 2). This report and attached documents will assist CEPF and the RIT in fulfilling its mandate through providing: 1) new contact emails; 2) summaries of relevant proposals; 3) recommendations relating to the prioritization process for Hotspot KBAs. It is hoped this report and the attached documents will enable the RIT to communicate the results of the project to a wider audience.

Please provide the following information where relevant:

Hectares Protected:

**Species Conserved:
Corridors Created:**

Not Relevant

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

The short term objectives were to some extent achieved in that delegates who attended the African Montane Ecosystem Symposium were directly informed about Eastern Afromontane KBAs, but the sheer scale of the meeting was a major challenge. In addition to the 10 Plenaries (4 of which were of direct interest to the RIT and CEPF), there were 44 symposia (20 of interest) and more than 50 workshops, over 5 days. It made one's head spin and it was simply impossible to attend even those that were directly relevant. Competition for delegates between the overlapping symposia meant that a little more than 30 people attended the African Mountain session. This was a fraction of the over 2000 delegates, whose numbers made it difficult to track and contact speakers and people from other symposia with potential interests in CEPF and the Afromontane Hotspot. The list provided is therefore a minimal sample of such contacts, and the summaries of talks provided in the attached documents equally minimal in its coverage.

The long term objectives can only be assessed through the responses of those who are subsequently contacted by the RIT and CEPF, and of others with an interest in the Hotspot who may have attended the conference.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

See below under lessons learned.

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.

- 1) Many of the presentations demonstrated how far the science of conservation is outstripping its practice. This reflects the ivory tower nature of academic enquiry vs. the messy realities of the actual world, the necessity in the practical management of ecosystems and biodiversity of making decisions on the basis of woefully inadequate information vs. the luxury of skeptical enquiry and rigorous hypothesis-testing in science, and the political/development challenges that obstruct conservation action on the ground. Nonetheless, it was impossible to attend the conference without becoming conscious of the need for CEPF to invite a critical review of its practices and priorities from conservation scientists. While this happens to some extent during profiling and the implementation of hotspot strategies, a global expert review of CEPF's impacts and processes across all the hotspots could be instructive.
- 2) Similarly, CEPF should consider being more receptive to funding research activities within its implementation strategies. While research is sometimes incorporated into Hotspot projects, particularly when BINGOs are involved, it might be useful to set aside a portion of the funds for science that explicitly engages with specific conservation efforts in KBAs and corridors. Opportunities to do this could be identified in the profiles, perhaps by incorporating a dedicated section/chapter. The CEPF programme has deep scientific roots which need to be watered and fertilized. A hard line attitude that CEPF should not

fund research proposals may be limiting, particularly with respect to capacity building for indigenous scientists within Hotspots, where there is often an over-reliance on external expertise during the profiling process. A good example of an opportunity to do this was provided by the support for postgraduate students during the implementation of the Eastern Arc and Coastal Forests of Tanzania and Kenya investment.

- 3) Some of the emerging science is providing useful insights into two issues (climate change vulnerability and ecosystem services) that are directly relevant to the prioritization of KBAs and corridors for investment during profiling. For example, the keynote presentation at the African Montane symposium by Christian Hof presented detailed maps of climate change vulnerability of amphibians and birds (see also Fodden et al. 2013: PLOS One June Volume 8, Issue 6, 1-13). Such vulnerability assessments need to be more explicitly incorporated into the threat analyses that inform KBA priority setting. An equally instructive presentation by Ashley Massey on the pollination services provided by church forests in Ethiopia demonstrated how ecological benefits can extend over a significant proportion of the landscape when bee foraging distances are taken into consideration. Such integrated and cumulative assessments of ecosystem services need to be incorporated into the identification of priority corridors. These are sometimes determined more by investment convenience than by an understanding of ecological functionality and landscape synergies.

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

- 1) Although log frames were not previously required in SG proposals, the use of a log frame in this project helped to sharpen its focus.
- 2) Planned presentations at Oxford University and the Centre for Ecology and Conservation (CEC) at the University of Exeter, Cornwall Campus, near Falmouth, did not take place because the timing coincided with vacation/field work periods for key personnel. This was not taken into account when the proposal was designed.

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

While this was a relatively straightforward project, I should have paid more attention to the indicators in the log-frame during its implementation. For example, I failed to circulate a list to record participants at the various sessions I attended.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

None

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	Notes
Self	B	3500 USD	7 days of consultancy payments in lieu of salary @ 500 USD per day.

***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** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF 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.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

This project was a one-off intervention but is expected to lead to long term benefits through the expanded involvement of international scientists concerned with African Montane biodiversity.

Safeguard Policy Assessment

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

No actions required.

Additional Comments/Recommendations

None

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, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Ian Gordon
Organization name: N/A, private consultant
Mailing address: PO Box 2614-00621, Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 (0)733 779 835
Fax: N/A
E-mail: igordonicipe@gmail.com

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

Performance Tracking Report Addendum

CEPF Global Targets				
(Enter Grant Term)				
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.				
Project Results	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.	Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.	No			Please also include name of the protected area(s). If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?	No			Please also include name of the protected area. If more than one, please include the number of hectares strengthened for each one.
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.	No			
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.	No			
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.	No			

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

