

# CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Mrimadzo Forest Conservation and Rehabilitation Centre

## I. BASIC DATA

<b>Organization Legal Name:</b>	National Museums of Kenya
<b>Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):</b>	Mrimadzo Forest Conservation and Rehabilitation Project
<b>Implementation Partners for This Project:</b>	WWF, Ford Foundation
<b>Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> September 2007 - 31 <sup>st</sup> August 2009
<b>Date of Report :</b>	30 <sup>th</sup> November 2009

## II. OPENING REMARKS

The Mrimadzo project has been implemented in Kwale District in south coastal Kenya. Its activities are focused around three small forest areas: Mrima, Marenje and Dzombo which are comparatively small (totaling 2800ha) but important for biodiversity and facing threats from farm encroachment and tree product extraction by surrounding communities.

The project is implemented by the Mrimadzo group which aims to conserve biodiversity and enhance livelihoods of local communities. The CEPF grant for implementation by Mrimadzo is for US\$ 10 000. It is channelled through and managed by the National Museums of Kenya Coastal Forest Conservation Unit CFCU.

## III. NARRATIVE QUESTIONS

### 1. What was the initial objective of this project?

The broad objectives of the project include:

- Promotion of agroforestry and farm forestry
- Rehabilitation of degraded forest areas in the forest sites.
- Improvement of livelihoods of local communities in these areas

Projected outputs included:

- 10 000 seedlings planted in degraded areas
- Distribution and setting of 100 hives
- Establishment of farm woodlots
- Increased awareness and participation in conservation by communities

**2. Did the objectives of your project change during implementation? If so, please explain why and how.**

The objectives of the project as described above did not change appreciably during the implementation period

**3. How was your project successful in achieving the expected objectives?**

In our estimation the project was moderately successful in meeting its objectives and outputs as follows

2210 large indigenous tree seedlings were purchased and planted in degraded sites at Dzombo covering 3 hectares. Follow-up weeding was done but severe drought experienced in 2008 and 2009 took its toll. Combined with bushfires affected the plantings killing a large number of seedlings estimated at least at 30%. Survival counts are planned shortly.

30 beehives were distributed to farmers during the project period with the three groups receiving 10 hives each. In addition training was undertaken in apiary management and honey production for 90 farmers. Drought experienced through 2009 however resulted in poor colonization by bees of the new hives. The project actively encouraged the linkage of farmers with a community honey processing centre at Msambweni supported by WWF. 100 litres of honey were purchased from farmers to serve as initial stock for the processing centre to process and package for sale.

3 awareness meetings were held for local communities associated with each Mrimadzo area, which addressed a range of conservation and development issues.

**4. Did your team experience any disappointments or failures during implementation? If so, please explain and comment on how the team addressed these disappointments and/or failures.**

The main disappointment was due to long delay of disbursement. The long delay reduced implementation time leading to unnecessary pressure towards the end of the period. The failure to reach our target of procuring and distributing 100 beehives was also notable. It can be attributed to delays in procurement and the emphasis on training the farmers before handing out hives.

The project was also not quite successful in farm forestry objectives due to a focus on afforestation of the degraded forest sites. Prolonged drought and water scarcity were a

constraint on the development of on-farm nurseries and farm woodlots during the project period.

**5. Describe any positive or negative lessons learned from this project that would be useful to share with other organizations interested in implementing a similar project.**

The CEPF project allowed for change and flexibility in the activities. This reduced duplication and enabled the project to take advantage of opportunities emerging such as the honey processing centre being developed in the same area.

When undertaking afforestation it is important not to ignore changes in the seasons which are now increasingly being experienced due to climate change effects and adjust planting schedules accordingly to avoid wastage of seedling stock. Timely provision should also be made against the threat of fire in semi-arid areas. Monitoring of planting success is also important as is individual care in the first two years including spot weeding.

**6. Describe any follow-up activities related to this project.**

Follow-up activities for the project include monitoring success of the seedlings planted under the project and identifying other sources of seedling to replant areas where seedlings were burnt or dried.

Further support will be sought for the processing centre to enable it to purchase honey when the wet season arrives and conditions become ideal for hive colonization by bees and production of honey. Monitoring and support of the beekeepers and management Committee of the Processing centre will also be needed.

**7. Please provide any additional information to assist CEPF in understanding any other aspects of your completed project.**

All relevant aspects are presented here.

<b>IV. ADDITIONAL FUNDING</b>
-------------------------------

*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

**\*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.)*

## V. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The project suffered due to its implementation at a time when prolonged drought and unpredictable weather made conditions unfavourable both for afforestation as well as production of honey by bees. These were the main areas the project sought to invest in. However a positive element was the participation of local communities through Mrimadzo group who implemented the project in its entirety with technical support from the National Museums of Kenya and WWF. The experience built in this way among community members will be useful for future projects in the area.

## VI. INFORMATION SHARING

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

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

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

Name:	Anthony Githitho
Organization name:	National Museums of Kenya
Mailing address:	Box 596, Kilifi
Tel:	
Fax:	
E-mail:	<a href="mailto:cfcukilifi@yahoo.com">cfcukilifi@yahoo.com</a>