

# CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** Missouri Botanical Garden

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** Plant Conservation Assessment in the Eastern Arc Mountains and Coastal Forests Biodiversity Hotspot of Tanzania and Kenya

**Implementation Partners for this Project:**

IUCN Global Species Programme, IUCN Eastern African Regional Office, National Herbarium of Tanzania, East African Herbarium (National Museums of Kenya), Fairchild Tropical Botanic Garden

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** February 1, 2005 – June 30, 2008

**Date of Report (month/year):** July 2008

## II. OPENING REMARKS

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

The grant funding this project was awarded jointly to the Missouri Botanical Garden and IUCN. This report was prepared by the Missouri Botanical Garden on behalf of co-grantee IUCN and all of the other implementation partners.

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

***Project Purpose:*** In partnership with an active, effective, and self-sustaining regional network of plant experts in the Eastern African region, governments, donors, and NGOs adopt plant conservation assessments based on reliable, verified data incorporated into more effective conservation planning and policy development for the Hotspot and adjacent areas.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Purpose-level:</b>	
At least 1,200 plant Red List conservation assessments incorporated into documentation for land use and protection within 2 years after Project completion.	List of Potentially Threatened Plants in the Eastern Arc Mountains (787 species) presented to Government of Tanzania for incorporation into Eastern Arc Strategy.
Number of East Africans with technical expertise and practical experience in applied conservation work increases by 15 before end of Project.	Number of East Africans with technical expertise and practical experience in applied conservation work increased by 28 through participation in workshops and other Project activities.
Regional strategy for Eastern Arc and Coastal Forests plant diversity conservation produced by Eastern Africa Plant Specialist Group within 6 months after Project completion.	East Africa Plant Red List Authority (EAPRLA) constituted during Project to formulate regional strategy.

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

Plant conservation assessments will become available for incorporation into documentation for land use and protection after their publication on the IUCN Red List. The Government of Tanzania has shown its willingness to use Red List assessments for these policy purposes by accepting a List of Potentially Threatened Plants based on the project's results for incorporation into the Eastern Arc Strategy document. The project reached nearly twice the planned increase in the number of East Africans with technical expertise and practical experience in applied conservation work. The East Africa Plant Red List Authority (EAPRLA), constituted as a result of the project, will formulate a regional strategy for Eastern Arc and Coastal Forests plant diversity conservation and will be a major instrument for continued realization of conservation goals after the completion of the project.

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

No.

**IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS**

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

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Actual at Completion</b>
<b>Output 1:</b> A comprehensive and widely accessible dataset containing all available data on the geographic distribution and population status of all plant taxa on the combined Red List and Potentially Threatened List, collated on TROPICOS.	A dataset containing all available data on the geographic distribution and population status of 1,570 plant taxa collated on TROPICOS, with 558 taxa from the combined Red List and Potentially Threatened List remaining.
<b>1.1.</b> Entry of historical field book and specimen data for ca. 12,000 collections completed by end of Year 2.	Entry of historical field book and specimen data for ca. 15,000 collections completed in middle of Year 3.
<b>1.2.</b> Fieldwork at 9 selected sites completed by middle of Year 3.	Fieldwork at 5 selected sites completed at end of year 2.
<b>1.3.</b> Dataset made accessible to users from beginning of Project through TROPICOS Web link.	Dataset made accessible to users from beginning of Project through TROPICOS Web link. Distribution maps and summary assessment parameters for taxa assessed at Workshops linked to TROPICOS records.
<b>Output 2:</b> Description and publication in the scientific literature of undescribed and newly discovered plant species for the Hotspot so that they can also be listed where appropriate.	
<b>2.1.</b> All new species on current Potentially Threatened List (ca. 15) described, illustrated, and submitted for publication within first year of Project.	3 new species described, illustrated, submitted, and published within first year of Project.
<b>2.2.</b> All additional new species (ca. 30) described, illustrated, and submitted for publication during remainder of Project.	7 additional new species described, illustrated, and submitted for publication during remainder of Project.

<b>Output 3:</b> A complete Red List evaluation of all (at least 1,788) target taxa compiled in the Species Information Service.	
<b>3.1.</b> Red List evaluations of ca. 1,788 taxa completed, analyzed and distributed before end of Project to key end-users	Red List evaluations of 634 taxa completed and analyzed.
<b>3.2.</b> Red List analysis published as peer reviewed scientific paper.	
<b>Output 4:</b> The complete Red List evaluation and analysis of threatening processes affecting plants in the Hotspot made available on the Internet, distributed in hard-copy publications in technical and popular literature, and delivered to key end-users.	
<b>4.1.</b> Analysis of key threatening processes affecting plants in the hotspot submitted to a peer reviewed journal and posted on the Internet.	
<b>4.2.</b> Articles (ca. 9) written in English and Swahili submitted for publication in popular media including a special edition of SWARA	
<b>Output 5:</b> A network of strong East African institutions possessing the facilities and capacity to continue plant conservation monitoring and implement appropriate conservation responses in partnership with a strengthened IUCN/SSC Eastern African Plant Specialist Group and other relevant organizations.	
<b>5.1.</b> Improved facilities at National Herbarium of Tanzania (NHT) and East African Herbarium, National Museums of Kenya (EA).	Needs assessment and facility improvements completed at National Herbarium of Tanzania (NHT) and East African Herbarium, National Museums of Kenya (EA).
<b>5.2.</b> Three Red List assessment review workshops, each of at least five days in length and each with a minimum of eight trainees and regional consultants, on Red List Categories and Criteria and other relevant SSC protocols such as species recovery and habitat management undertaken for Eastern African Plant Specialist Group members and other relevant people.	Three Red List assessment review workshops undertaken, each of five days in length: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 27 Feb – 3 March 2006, Dar es Salaam: 6 trainees, 2 regional consultants, 5 EAPRLA members;</li> <li>2. 31 Oct – 4 Nov 2006, Nairobi: 8 trainees, 4 regional consultants, 6 EAPRLA members;</li> <li>3. 21-25 April 2008, Arusha: 15 trainees, 3 regional consultants, 6 EAPRLA members.</li> </ol>

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

The project was highly successful in delivering the first intended output, with a comprehensive dataset of the geographic distribution and population status of 74% of the targeted taxa made available on TROPICOS and distribution maps and summary assessment parameters linked to TROPICOS records for all taxa evaluated at Plant Red Listing Workshops. Fieldwork was conducted at fewer sites than planned, but was judged adequate to enhance the data available from other sources. The project fell somewhat short of Output 2 performance goals, with

remaining new species to be described and published by the Project Supervisor, Project Coordinator, and associates without external funding. The number of Red List evaluations completed fell significantly short of Output 3 goals; the EAPRLA is currently seeking funding to complete the remaining evaluations. The Project Coordinator and the IUCN Red List Officer are compiling the evaluations already completed in the Species Information Service for publication on the IUCN Red List, which is prerequisite to distribution of evaluations to key end-users. Output 5 goals were met and exceeded, with planned facility improvements at the National Herbarium of Tanzania and the East African Herbarium completed and three Red List assessment review workshops undertaken with a great diversity of participants from NGOs, governmental agencies, and international conservation organizations, and an increasing number of trainees at each Workshop.

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

Output 4, publication of project results in technical and popular literature, remains unrealized. This affects the overall impact of the project by making its results less available to end-users, and will be remedied by publication in appropriate outlets.

## V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

No 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.***

Red List evaluation is a highly complex and time-intensive process requiring careful coordination between operational units: collation of distributional data; mapping and calculation of assessment parameters; dissemination of data to evaluators; organization and coordination of workshops and other evaluation meetings; continuing capacitation of evaluators in Red List procedures; timely communication of evaluations to IUCN for publication on Red List; and delivery of Red List analyses and evaluations to end users for incorporation into conservation planning. Each of these units must be fully operational and appropriately linked with the others to assure that these efforts produce practical and long-lasting conservation results.

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

Implementation partners were well chosen and worked effectively together to achieve project goals. Some goals were however overly ambitious, especially the number of taxa to be evaluated, and resources were not always appropriately allocated among the various project activities.

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

Development of efficient protocols for specimen databasing early in the project facilitated rapid collation of a very large dataset. Format problems with initial downloads slowed initial GIS analysis for Red List assessments, but were resolved following the First Red Listing Workshop.

## 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
National Geographic Society	A	\$19,600	botanical exploration of Rubeho Mountains
World Wide Fund For Nature	A	\$5,000	partial salaries for two project Field Botanists
Idaho Botanical Research Foundation	C	\$20,000	general project operating costs

**\*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 funded 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 funded 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.**

Remaining data collation and mapping of taxon distributions will be conducted by the Missouri Botanical Garden with no additional funding. Implementation partners are seeking additional funding to convene meetings of the EAPRLA and associates to complete remaining Red List assessments. Current and continuing payment of the Project Coordinator's salary by Fairchild Tropical Botanic Garden will facilitate compilation of evaluations in the IUCN Species Information Service and publication on the Red List. The EAPRLA will coordinate and implement delivery of evaluations and analyses to project end-users. The Project Supervisor will undertake the publication of remaining new species in collaboration with the Project Coordinator and colleagues, at least initially without additional funding. In consultation with implementation partners, the Missouri Botanical Garden will seek additional funding for publication of the complete Red List evaluation and analysis of threatening processes.

## VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF aims to increase sharing of experiences, lessons learned and results among our grant recipients and the wider conservation and donor communities. One way we do this is by making the text of final project completion reports available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and by marketing these reports in our newsletter and other communications. Please indicate whether you would agree to publicly sharing your final project report with others in this way.

Yes  \_\_\_\_\_

No  \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please also complete the following:

**For more information about this project, please contact:**

Name: Roy E. Gereau

Mailing address: Missouri Botanical Garden, P.O. Box 299, St. Louis, MO 63166-0299, U.S.A.

Tel: 1 (314) 577-9574

Fax: 1 (314) 577-9596

E-mail: [roy.gereau@mobot.org](mailto:roy.gereau@mobot.org)