

CEPF SMALL GRANT FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Conservation International - Center for Applied Biodiversity Science
Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): Design and Implementation of a Socioenvironmental Information and Monitoring System in the Chocó-Manabí Corridor

Implementation Partners for This Project: 1.CIEBREG; 2. Centro para la Investigacion en Sistemas Sostenibles de Produccion Agropecuaria (CIPAV); 3. Fundacion Ecuatoriana de Estudios Ecologicos (EcoCiencia)

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): November 1, 2006 – September 30, 2007

Date of Report (month/year): November 26, 2007

II. OPENING REMARKS

One important thing to bear in mind while reading this report is that I am not reporting on the entire larger project, titled *Design and Implementation of a Socioenvironmental Information and Monitoring System in the Chocó-Manabí Corridor*. Here I am reporting only on the forest cover and deforestation mapping project for the Choco-Manabi corridor.

III. NARRATIVE QUESTIONS

1. What was the initial objective of this project?

The initial objective of this project was to create a two-date (1990-2000), Landsat-based map of forest cover and deforestation for the Choco-Manabi Corridor to serve as a key layer of information for partners implementing the larger socio-environmental information and monitoring system for the corridor.

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

No, the objectives of our project did not change during the implementation, though we did find it necessary classify 7 satellite image-pairs (instead of 5) in order to get satisfactorily cloud-free results. Of course, our portion of the project was only a small part of the larger project, and I can't speak to whether or not there were changes at that level.

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

We successfully completed the project output, a digital map of forest cover and deforestation for the 1990-2000 period of the Choco Manabi Conservation Corridor, and we met all the output indicators. The project did require an extension of three months because of the two additional satellite image classifications that we did. We successfully

completed all of the Output activities, except for activity 1.3 (see question 4 below), which was to integrate the 1992 radar map with the map we produced. Even so, in spite of the extreme cloudiness of the region, and not being able to use the radar map, by using multiple landsat classifications in cloudy areas we managed to reduce the area of 'unknown' landcover to 19% for ~1990, and 23% for ~2000. The area of unknown landcover for ~1990 is considerably less than 19% for the priority 'windows', with all except Mache Chindul with $\leq 10\%$ unknown, while the for ~2000 the unknown area in the priority windows was about the same as for the corridor overall.

We believe this is by far the best landcover change map for the region.

A final technical report in Spanish and the digital mapping products were given to CIEBREG, with the understanding that they would distribute it to the other partners in their capacity as the coordinators of the project.

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 one disappointment was that the pre-existing radar-based map for the Colombian portion of the corridor was not suitable for combining with our map in order to eliminate clouds from the ~1990 period, for three reasons: 1) there were problems of coregistration between the two products—they didn't line up well; 2) there was a fair bit of disagreement between the two maps; and 3) the radar map had a number of categories that we weren't sure how to translate into the categories of our map. In the end we decided not to use the radar map, especially considering that a new radar mosaic of much higher quality will be coming out this year, which we can map to get a current, cloud-free look at the corridor.

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 main lesson learned was the necessity for improved planning, clarity of roles, and communication in a multi-partner project like this. The most concrete example of a communication-related issue that we experienced was CIPAV and EcoCiencia both were disappointed that we would not be providing more current forest cover. However, this discussion didn't happen until long after the proposal stage of the project, when the scope of the mapping activity was being considered and funding approved.

Multi-partner projects like this may be worthwhile, but it seemed to me that the additional complication of involving multiple groups from two countries makes it even more important than usual to plan thoroughly and communicate openly from the outset. It also seemed to me that it would be helpful to explicitly designate a point-person responsible for overall coordination of the project; at times, especially early on, it was difficult to know who to talk to about what.

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

No follow-up activities have been planned yet, but we are considering mapping the new radar data that will be coming out for the region in the next 6-8 months. Doing this would

give us a cloud-free 2006 data layer, in addition to the best 1990-2000 forest/deforestation map existing for the corridor.

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

IV. 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.)*

V. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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, 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: Grady Harper

Organization name: Conservation International

Mailing address: 2011 Crystal Drive suite 500, Arlington, VA 22202

Tel: 703-341-2761

Fax: 703-979-2514

E-mail: gharper@conservation.org