

CEPF 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): Assessment of Deforestation, Threats and Management

Implementation Partners for this Project: EcoCiencia

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): September 1, 2003 – September 30, 2004

Date of Report (month/year): June 2005

II. OPENING REMARKS

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

The protected area management cost component of the project was modified during initial implementation, due to the creation of a broader national initiative to detail budget shortfalls across the entire national protected area system. Accordingly, we devoted the majority of our effort to assisting this initiative, including defining goals, sharing the methodology used under this CEPF grant and assisting with methodology development more broadly, and participating in pilot field implementation. The work performed under this CEPF grant has had a major influence in both directly raising awareness of the funding shortfall for protected area management, as well as in assisting the National Protected Area Finance Working Group to design a methodology to rigorously quantify financing for all National protected areas.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: The conservation community uses the information generated by the project to both focus on key new areas of the Choco-Manabi Corridor and to increase support for protected areas to a level commensurate with threats.

Planned vs. Actual Performance

| Indicator | Actual at Completion |
|--|----------------------|
| Purpose-level: | |
| Within 1 year there is an increased interest in conservation projects in important areas in the region | |
| Upon completion of the project, the Ministerio del Ambiente and other groups are aware of the shortfall in funding for management of the protected areas and seeking to diminish it. | Achieved |

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

Referring to the management cost component of this project, results better than expected. As noted above, our activities contributed actively to a national level process, which has resulted in broader national commitment to funding.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

Contribution to a broader national process of information sharing and consensus building on protected area costs

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: Change detection map completed and available, identifying remaining forest and deforestation since circa 1990. | Achieved |
| 1.1. Change map completed and final CD and paper maps distributed | 1990-2000 Forest Change Map for corridor area completed and validated for accuracy, final CD of deforestation map distributed to in-country conservation institutions. Paper maps pending, as we will be producing a countrywide map in the near future. |
| Output 2: Detailed assessment of threats (deforestation and other major resource uses), current management capacity and shortfall in management budgets completed for Cotacachi-Cayapas, Machalilla, Cayapas-Mataje and Mache Chindul. More informal analysis completed for the Reserva Etnica Forestal Awa. | As noted, output was modified to support the national process. All National protected areas now have formal and official estimates of current management capacity and shortfall in management budgets. This CEPF project enabled us to contribute to the rigor of the national process. Threat assessments conducted for Cotacachi-Cayapas and Machalilla. |
| 2.1. Report produced and distributed | Report to the national government produced and distributed. Distribution focused on the National Protected Area Finance Working Group as a key input to methodology and results. Broader distribution was considered but rejected, to avoid confusion from the production of separate reports on similar themes. |
| Output 3: Informal measurement of the impact of the project via distribution of | The importance of the contribution of the CEPF funded protected area analysis to |

| | |
|--|---|
| materials and subjective impressions of the scope of their use. A formal monitoring and evaluation system is not judged to be appropriate for this project given its scope and the importance of larger projects in achieving final Outcomes and Goals. The achievement of the Goal and Outcome will need to be measured by other groups making a broader contribution to their achievement, including CI and the CBC. | the national costing initiative has been widely recognized. |
| 3.1. Distribution of products and subsequent discussions on them with key actors | Continued discussion with Ministry of the Environment and other national actors on protected area costs and follow up, including the use of study results in fundraising and international agreements, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity |

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

The protected area analysis component of the project was more successful than expected, due to the initiation of a national level process and our successful and effective integration into that process.

The forest cover / forest change detection map was successfully completed, and distributed to CI Ecuador. This map is the first precise estimate of the distribution of forest and forest clearance in the corridor. It is a high-resolution map, 30 meters, and forest patches and clearings as small as 2 hectares can be observed. This map is being used to compare rates of clearing in different regions of the corridor and around different protected areas. The map is compatible with other maps being created for the rest of Ecuador and the Andean Hot Spot and the Amazonian Wilderness Area.

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

Several of the components of protected area analysis were unrealized to avoid repeating a slightly modified version of the national level process. Such repetition would have placed an undue burden on protected area staff, and created conclusion among participants. This modification allowed us to contribute to the strength of the national level process.

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

none

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.

It is important to be flexible in project plans so that coordination with partners working on similar projects can result in changes to project design that allow it to more effectively achieve its objectives.

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

Rigor in methodology gave us credibility to contribute to actively to national processes.

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

Technical skill, flexibility, significant dedication of time were all key to successful execution of the 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 |
|-------|------------------|--------|-------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

****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.

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, 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

For more information about this project, please contact:

Name: Marc Steininger
Mailing address: Conservation International, CABS
E-mail: m.steininger@conservation.org