

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Ghent University, Terrestrial Ecology Unit (Department of Biology)

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): Restoration and Increase of Connectivity Among Fragmented Forest Patches in the Taita Hills, Southeast Kenya

Implementation Partners for this Project: East African Wildlife Society (EAWLS, Kenya), University of Antwerp (UA, Belgium) , Hensinki University (HU, Finland)

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): July 1, 2005 – September 20, 2006

Date of Report (month/year): March 2007

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

Full details on this project are provided in the attached document (149 pp), containing the following four sections:

- (i) Part I: executive summary
- (ii) Part II: non-technical report
- (iii) Part III: technical report (including all aspects discussed in the non-technical report)
- (iv) Part IV: addenda

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: *The purpose of this project is to (i) model the current degree of landscape connectivity based on a recently-developed digital land-use map of the Taita Hills and least-cost routines available in GIS software; (ii) to simulate changes in landscape connectivity based on different forest restoration scenarios; (iii) to compile a list of potential target sites for habitat restoration based on connectivity analysis; (iv) to cross-check the list of potential restoration sites based on least-cost analysis with site-specific biological, physical, legal and socio-economic attributes of the target sites.*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	
1. Least-cost analyses comparing different forest restoration scenarios available after one year.	Least-cost analyses comparing different forest restoration scenarios conducted and results available through research report.
2. Priority list of sites for forest restoration action available after one year.	Priority list of sites for forest restoration action compiled and available through research report.

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

See attached reports.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

See attached reports.

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs: Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: 3-D least-cost model adapted to the Taita Hills but offering wide applicability to the rest of the Eastern Arc Mountains.	3-D least-cost model adapted to the Taita Hills but offering wide applicability to the rest of the Eastern Arc Mountains.
1.1 <i>3-D least-cost model available after six months.</i>	<i>3-D least-cost model available after nine months.</i>
Output 2: Series of least-cost models simulating changes in landscape connectivity under different scenarios of forest restoration.	Series of least-cost models simulating changes in landscape connectivity under different scenarios of forest restoration.
2.1 <i>3-D least-cost simulations of various forest restoration scenarios available after nine months.</i>	<i>3-D least-cost simulations of various forest restoration scenarios available after twelve months.</i>
Output 3: Prioritized list of connectivity interventions based on least-cost modelling.	Prioritized list of connectivity interventions based on least-cost modelling.
3.1 <i>Priority list of sites for forest restoration based on least-cost modelling available after one year.</i>	<i>Priority list of sites for forest restoration based on least-cost modelling available after twelve months.</i>
Output 4: Prioritized list of connectivity interventions based on the combined results of least-cost modelling and assessment of biological, physical, socio-economic and legal attributes of the potential target sites.	Prioritized list of connectivity interventions based on the combined results of least-cost modelling and assessment of biological, physical, socio-economic and legal attributes of the potential target sites.
4.1 <i>Priority list of sites for forest restoration based on a combination of least-cost modelling and survey of biological, physical, socio-economic and legal attributes available after one year</i>	<i>Priority list of sites for forest restoration based on a combination of least-cost modelling and survey of biological, physical, socio-economic and legal attributes available after twelve months.</i>
4.2 <i>Stakeholder's workshop to follow-up on two other recent CEPF-funded stakeholders' workshops in February and October 2005 addressing important issues related to the conservation and management of the Taita Hills forests.</i>	<i>Stakeholder's workshop to follow-up on two other recent CEPF-funded stakeholders' workshops in February 2005 and September 2006 addressing important issues related to the conservation and management of the Taita Hills forests.</i>

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

As outlined in the two attached documents, all intended outputs were delivered. Due to a delay in finalizing the assessment of biological, physical, socio-economic and legal attributes of the potential target sites by the local partner (EAWLS), the final stakeholder's workshop was delayed till September 2006.

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

During the workshop organized in Wundanyi in September 2006 it became clear that one very important plantation plot was overlooked in STEP I as well as STEP II of this process (see attached documents). At

the workshop it turned out that the whole of Yale was indeed a state owned exotic tree plantation. Moreover, Toon Spanhove pointed out that this is a very important area since its' two small indigenous pockets still hold a small population of Taita thrush as well as Taita apalis. Total area of this plantation as recorded by provisional the GPS readings (by Toon Spanhove) was 98ha, including 1.7ha of indigenous forest. But considerable part of this area is taken up by bare rock. The area potentially suitable for habitat restoration was estimated at about 50ha. After adding the contour of Yale plantation to the GIS database, we reconsidered all potential effect on the modeling results and their interpretation. The attached documents discuss the most important consequences of adding Yale as a target plantation plot.

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 the project involved desk-based modeling, there was no such action required.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT

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

The results of the socio-economic survey in communities living next to the plantation plots studied in this project are very positive. A vast majority of the people questioned showed a very positive attitude towards forest in general and to the rehabilitation of indigenous forest in the nearby plantation(s) in particular. A large majority also preferred a wide platform of stakeholders to guide the reforestation projects: the Forest Department, NGO's and Community-Based Organisations (CBO). The vast majority also said to be willing to contribute to nature conservation projects and to consider planting of some indigenous trees on their land. This offers hope for a constructive collaboration with the local communities and a wide support for future actions. We are convinced that this is the only meaningful way forward to actual conservation in third world countries facing increasing socio-economic challenges.

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

Close collaboration with local stakeholders (see above) and with highly-qualified personnel (modeler, local partners) were key to the success of this project.

VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING

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

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
None	None	None	None

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

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

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

Research proposal currently under review by the National Foundation for Scientific Research Flanders:

Title: Population viability in fragmented rainforest: integrating individual-based modeling with landscape dynamics and connectivity

National partners: Ghent University (Belgium), University of Antwerp (Belgium), University of Leuven (Belgium)

International partners: National Museums of Kenya (Kenya), Helsinki University (Finland)

Total budget requested: 751.400 €

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

None

VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

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

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

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: **Luc Lens**

Organization name: **Gent University, Belgium**

Mailing address:

Tel: **32 9 264 52 54**

Fax: **32 9 2648794**

E-mail: **Luc.Lens@UGent.be**