

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT: KENYA

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: World Wide Fund for Nature International - Eastern African Regional Program Office

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): *Community Biodiversity Conservation Micro-Grants in the Eastern Arc and Coastal Forests of Kenya and Tanzania*

Implementation Partners for this Project: Nature Kenya, National museums of Kenya-Coastal Forests Conservation Unit, WWF EACFEP NEC office Kenya, WWF-TPO, Wildlife Conservation Society of Tanzania, Tanzania Forest Conservation Group

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): January 1, 2006 - June 30, 2009

Date of Report (month/year): August 2009

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

This portfolio has been very well received and highly appreciated by the beneficiary community based organizations in the target region. It has brought to the fore that CBO's can make an appreciable contribution to conservation efforts when accorded minimal resources, greatly contributing to improvements in their livelihood options and inculcating a sense of environmental stewardship.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: Targeted efforts to increase connectivity, biological knowledge, and the conservation of threatened species are supported through the Community Grants Programme.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level:	
1. CGCU is seen as an effective presence for integrating biodiversity concerns in the EACF hotspot.	CGCU is an effective presence for integrating biodiversity concerns in the EACF hotspot.
2. Stakeholders are developing projects that are addressing priority issues identified in the profile.	Stakeholders are implementing projects that are addressing priority issues identified in the profile.
2. New and innovative partnerships in civil society developed as a result of CGCU interventions.	New and innovative partnerships have been developed as a result of CGCU interventions, such as with the UNDP-Small Grants Program in the Gogoni Conservation Initiative in Kwale District, Kenya.

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

The project was able to achieve all its intended impact objective and performance indicators to great effect. Stakeholder involvement was critical throughout the project period to ensure that all viewpoints were taken into account. Based on the number of applications approved, it was clear that community based organizations in the hotspot were particularly enthusiastic as pertains to receiving funding for implementation of identified priority activities.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

Yes. Some of the grantees experienced challenges as pertains to timely reporting. This had the effect of delaying subsequent disbursements to them. We also had to issue no-cost extension contracts as result of these delays for a number of grantees.

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs:

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: A Community Grants Coordination Unit exists with appropriate mechanisms to facilitate achievement of the Investment Priorities under Strategic Funding Direction 1 of the CEPF Ecosystem Profile.	The Community Grants Coordination Unit is operational and fully functional.
<i>1.1. MoU and ToRs for the CGCU finalized between WWF-EARPO, WCST, NatureKenya, TFCG and CFCU by end of Q1 Y1.</i>	MoU's were not done and instead funds were transferred directly to the CGCU institutions through WWF-EARPO in Kenya and WWF-TPO in Tanzania
<i>1.2. Mechanism for liaison with the CEPF CU and the CEPF Africa Grants Manager in place.</i>	Liaison with the CEPF CU has been through reporting on the Community Grants Portfolio during all CEPF CU meetings and the same reported to the CEPF Africa Grants Manager during scheduled reporting on GEMS.
<i>1.3. EACF CGCU meeting held at least six monthly.</i>	CGCU Meetings were combined with the regular CEPF CU meetings for cost-effectiveness.
<i>1.4. Appropriate administrative, technical, and financial management strategies in place for the CGCU to deliver within budget.</i>	Optimal administrative, technical and financial management strategies are in place for the CGCU and delivery has been within budget.
Output 2: Community Based Organisations within the hotspot are aware of the Community Grants Scheme.	CBO' s within the hotspot are well aware of the Community Grants Scheme
<i>2.1. A communication action plan, that builds on the CEPF CU communication strategy and targets CBO's. developed by TFCG by end of Q2 Y1.</i>	Communication Action Plan was developed by TFCG and is operational.
<i>2.2. Awareness raising materials produced and disseminated by CGCU and other stakeholders on a continuous basis. This will include information on application, reporting and review procedures.</i>	Awareness raising materials were produced by TFCG and disseminated the the CGCU as well as other stakeholders in the region including the forestry departments in Kenya and Tanzania.
<i>2.3. Linkages forged with other institutions working with CBO's in the hotspot.</i>	Linkages have been forged with other institutions working with CBO's in the region such as CARE.
<i>2.4. Lessons learned documented and integrated with the CEPF CU communication activities.</i>	Lessons learned have been documented and workshops organized by TFCG inviting grantees to share their experiences.
Output 3: Community Based Organisations	Numerous CBO's have been supported to

supported to design effective conservation projects in line with the CEPF EP and submit applications to the CEPF CGCU.	design effective conservation projects and these projects are at different stages of implementation.
3.1. Simple application procedure developed and agreed by CGCU by end Q2 Y1.	Simple application procedure was developed and is in use.
3.2. Improved applications received from CBOs identified by the CEPF CU as requiring assistance on the basis of their submission of Letters of Inquiry by Q1 Y2.	Several CBO's have been supported to refine the applications they had submitted for the small grants portfolio (upto \$20,000) under this portfolio.
3.3. At least 50 additional CBOs submit applications to the CGCU by end Y2.	The final tally of supported grantees stands at 146.
3.4. Hold a grantees meeting in July 2007. The budget will allow for a meeting in Kenya and Tanzania. This will cut down on transport costs as well as accomodation and the meetings will be one day events (\$5,000-Kenya, \$7,000-Tanzania).	This meeting was not held and it was decided to hold it at the end of the funding period (Q4 2009) to ensure optimal capture of lessons and experience sharing from a wide representative spectrum of grantees.
Output 4: Community Based Organisations within the hotspot have successfully completed and reported on conservation projects aligned with Strategic Funding Direction 1 of the EACF Hotspot Ecosystem Profile.	A number of projects are in the final stages of implementation although reports have been received throughout the implementation phase.
4.1. Grant management procedures developed and agreed by members of the CGCU in consultation with the CEPF Grants Manager including grant agreement templates and reporting requirements by end Q2 Y1.	Grant management procedures are in place and reporting requirements are being adhered to by grantees.
4.2. Grant agreements signed with at least 50 CBOs. These agreements are legal contracts and will take the same format as the CEPF grant agreements presently in use.	Grant agreements have been signed with 196 grantees.
4.3. Grants to the value of US\$ 320,000 have been disbursed to community based organisations within the hotspot for the fulfilment of CEPF's Strategic Funding Direction 1.	Grants to the value of \$ 323,000 have been disbursed to community based organizations within the hotspot in fulfillment of CEPF's Strategic Funding Direction 1.
4.4. At least 70% of the Grantees have successfully completed and reported on projects according to their grant agreements.	At least 50% of the grantees have successfully completed and reported on projects according to their grant agreements.

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

The project delivered in excess of expectations. On project start-up, it was thought that at least 50 projects would be supported. The project has been able to successfully support 146 projects. Capacity building of these CBOs has included enhanced financial management and reporting skills, leadership and enterprise development skills.

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

The grantees' meeting that had been slated for 2007 has not been held but this has not affected the overall impact of the project.

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

Actions taken towards the realization of environmental and social safeguard policies were undertaken during the application review process based on the criteria established by CEPF as pertains to project implementation. Projects that did not meet these criteria were not approved.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT

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

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

It is worth noting that since this portfolio was in both Kenya and Tanzania, perspectives in the two countries took different forms. I have divided the responses below in the Kenyan and Tanzanian perspectives to ensure that those unique to each are not lost in generality.

The Kenyan perspective

1. The objective of the project design to support community groups to implement their conservation initiatives enhanced the confidence of groups to handle funds and make decisions on their own without much external influence. This also built a sense of ownership by groups including oversight and mistakes without pointing fingers at other stakeholders.
2. However, there are fundamental issues and structures relevant for community groups to effectively operate and have positive impacts in their undertakings including conservation initiatives. Vetting of groups using their LOI did not adequately address this and relied on information provided by the groups and endorsing bodies. The resulting successes and failures of the conservation projects by the groups was observed to have been attributed by presence or lack of the fundamental requirements including proper leadership, management practises, communication structures and sound financial management practices.
3. It was observed much later on that some community groups which benefited from the grants were based in areas where the CEPF research grants were also being undertaken. A case in point was the Gongoni conservation initiative group which was awarded grants to support establishment of energy saving stoves in their home and reduce their heavy dependence on forests for fuel wood. In the same locality, research on “Conservation of coastal forest birds in Kenya: a survey of Gongoni forest reserve” was undertaken by Maurice Ogoma who actually used the Gongoni groups members in collection of data. In future, some of the research projects could be linked to some community conservation project to add value by researching on related biodiversity trends either due to activities or lack of activities by the community.

The Tanzanian Perspective

1. The initial awareness and training given to the communities on the requirements of CEPF Small Grants proposals has contributed to good and well thought proposals.
2. Involvement of the beneficiaries of the CEPF grants at all stages in the design has also contributed to good proposals.
3. Providing a simplified version of the application forms and in clear understandable language (Kiswahili) allowed more open discussions.
4. A reporting matrix template for both physical and financial implementation has inspired more discussions by the stakeholders.
5. There was guidance that activities and costs in the project proposal be divided into two so that there are two sequential disbursements. The first one was meant to provide room for serious planning and setting ground for the next one. However in some instances it was not convenient due to the small size of the proposals such that a once-off disbursement could have worked better.
6. Stretching the limited project resources to too large areas has reduced the project impact.
7. The lack of a comprehensive monitoring plan has contributed to some of the groups swaying away from the original plan and therefore causing some problems in terms of realizing the expected outputs.
8. The lack of designated staff and the lack of incentive to an assigned staff to oversee the CEPF activities in the districts has caused some inefficiencies in the provision of technical guidance.
9. The resources set aside for the overseers (TFCG and WCST) were too low to make effective oversight considering the large geographic area covered.

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

The Kenyan Perspective

1. The primary driving force for many community groups' conservation efforts is a livelihood aspect while conservation of biodiversity is a secondary concern. It was difficult to link some groups' activities to the conservation impact. In this regard, the concentration of their efforts was on commercializing their initiatives and minimal monitoring on the impact of biodiversity. In future, it would be essential to note the baseline biodiversity status of a specific area where a group's activities are to be implemented and request for observations and remarks as part of the reporting process on the status of the biodiversity as the projects progressed.
2. Successful groups with positive impacts were observed to have visionary leaders with exemplary passion for conservation. These were optimistic despite noted challenges and devising solutions to the obstacles of achieving their conservation goals. An example is the Kilio cha haki group in Kilifi, which despite threats to the lives of their patrons; they resulted in a court case to force a quarrying company to rehabilitate degraded areas due to the quarrying. With the CEPF micro-grant support, the groups raised seedlings for the rehabilitation
3. Project execution by groups assumed the capacity of the group members to be adequate to implement and achieve the desired outputs. Although groups were

attached to institutions working within their regions and had contact persons, there was little commitment by these institutions due to inadequate facilitation support for monitoring and supervision of the said groups by the said contact persons. As a lesson, in any such future initiative, facilitation support of contact persons will need to be adequately budgeted (for example as pertains to communication and transport).

The Tanzanian Perspective

1. Communities understanding of the need to balance conservation of biodiversity and livelihood.
2. Constant follow up and backstopping by technical staff in some districts provided the implementing groups timely rectification of problems.
3. Good governance seminars provided by CSOs and attended by the CEPF grant leaders contributed to their appreciation of their roles and responsibilities.
4. The National policies (Tanzanian case) in the respective sectors of environment and natural resources have been articulated well in the National Poverty Reduction Strategy (MKUKUTA) and hence the easy of implementing the conservation and livelihood projects by the CEPF groups.
5. In the Eastern Arc districts of Tanzania there have been a lot of workshops/seminars for stakeholders in the location which provided a soft landing for groups implementing conservation / livelihood activities.

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
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	
		\$	

***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.

This project will not continue in the future in its present form. However, CGCU members will continue to support groups within their regions of operation to ensure sustainability.

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The community micro-grants portfolio has made an appreciable contribution towards targeted conservation efforts within the hotspot. Sensitization of community based organizations has contributed towards capacity building and the inculcation of environmental stewardship and advocacy. Many of the beneficiaries now appreciate the link between their activities and environmental degradation whilst appreciating that environmental conservation can be a win-win situation for both themselves and the environment.

WWF wishes to thank CEPF for awarding us this funding portfolio which has in itself served to inform some of our organizational operations as pertains to disbursement of micro-grants.

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: Mr John Salehe

Organization name: WWF-Eastern Africa Regional Programme Office

Mailing address: P.O.Box 62440 – 00200, Nairobi, Kenya

Tel: +254 20 3877355

Fax: +254 20 3877389

E-mail: JSalehe@wwfearpo.org