

## Notes of Kenya IBA Monitoring and Management Advisory Group Meeting

Tuesday 5 April 2005 RSPB, Sandy, UK

Present: Dr Richard Bagine, Chris Bowden, Paul Buckley, Dr Lincoln Fishpool, Dr Richard Gregory, Paul Matiku, Solomon Mwangi, Dr Helida Oyieke

### 1. Welcomes and apologies

PB welcomed participants to Sandy, in particular those arriving from Nairobi. Apologies were received from Dr Leon Bennun, who had fallen ill and from Dr William Sutherland. LF was standing in for LB.

The opportunity was also taken to congratulate the project team on excellent progress to date, reflected by the award of a follow up grant by Darwin Initiative. In particular to observe that the project was increasingly owned by all the agencies and should in future be seen as a collaborative programme rather than a NatureKenya project though they would continue to coordinate.

### 2. Notes of previous meeting 24 August 2004

#### Status report use and follow up

The report had enabled the project to make a key contribution to the 2<sup>nd</sup> report to CBD, which would now also be combined with the 3<sup>rd</sup> report. It had also fed into the state of the environment report produced by NEMA. The CBD report had quite an unsatisfactory format – lots of box ticket – hopefully future revisions of the format would allow more meaningful input. Future input would be as part of the NLC.

Quite a lot of informal feedback on the status report. But maybe for the second one we should try to have more organised feedback via a questionnaire and also a more formal discussion with NEMA, KWS, FD etc about what data they really need. We might also at that stage review whether an annual report was necessary or whether the frequency of publication(though not the reporting) could be reduced.

More widely in BirdLife similar processes would be used for reporting on the 2010 targets. The African partnership meeting in July in Cameroon was an excellent dissemination opportunity.

#### Future conservation interventions

It was reported that the concept for a GEF MSG had been approved for NatureKenya to work up for a PDF A. It was intended to focus especially on the papyrus swamps. Although the management plan for Dunga could possibly be funded under this, it would be better to complete it under this project if possible, and it would serve as a model for others in the future.

Action: PIT aim to complete Dunga plan before June

#### Databases

There is still a lack of clarity as to how this issue should be taken forward. There are some common data needs amongst the agencies but very unlikely that anything

approaching a harmonised system can be developed. As far as the basic monitoring information is concerned, BirdLife need first to produce a summary version for international use – within Kenya the agencies led by NMK are free to produce their own version provided it has this minimum content. The follow up programme gives a chance for this aspect to be improved.

### **3. Current project progress**

#### Basic monitoring

The forms are being returned albeit slowly. This reflects increasing ownership by the key institutions. This is probably owing to the amount of consultation undertaken, the use of their logos on forms, efforts by key individuals. We made good decisions in enabling them to undertake follow up visits with their own staff and also allowing them to nominate and invite people for the courses themselves. A lot of recommendations in the previous report have been taken on e.g. by the FD.

There are still some gaps, especially in Machakos, Cherangani, Didi Galgalla, Turkana. A trip to Cherangani is imminent, others may be filled by work through KWS, NEMA.

Noted that we should try and evaluate how many of those trained were actually involved in filling the forms in – this would give some idea both of effectiveness of training and of how big the gap was in terms of those now involved who need to be trained. Handovers have occurred e.g. at South Nandi 2 staff had received a thorough briefing by the departing staff member. In future we might want to focus also on the lower tier of staff who are less likely to be relocated. An immediate opportunity exists as a large cadre of KWS staff are currently completing training upto June/July.

Action: PIT liaise with KWS re completing training before June

As KWS devolves this information becomes more valuable and its easier for field staff to see the links between this information and decision making. We discussed the quality of the data – its subjectivity has been criticised by some scientists – but agreed that it is scientifically robust and stands a good chance of continuing to be collected – unlike in most monitoring programmes. Indeed the approach is being used in Europe and elsewhere based on the Kenya model. Agreed that having the same person complete the form from year to year improves its quality – and we do need to be aware of the tendency to paint a rosy view of your site, which is why feedback and visits by the managing agency is so important.

#### Detailed monitoring

All on track at Kakamega, Kinangop, Kereita and Mukurweini. A meeting is still scheduled for Sokoke. It is hoped detailed monitoring will start soon at South Nandi, Mida and Sabaki. A recent near accident at Mukurweini had highlighted the need to take health and safety issues more seriously and consider the liability issues arising out of SSGs doing work 'on behalf of' NatureKenya.

Action: Compile a lessons learned report on detailed monitoring as early part of follow on project

Action: Consider developing a Health and Safety course for partners in Africa/SSGs

Generally this work should be easier to raise funds for as part of any project e.g. the GEF project should cover funding for detailed monitoring at Papyrus swamps, future work at Kakamega was already funded.

Considerable challenges still faced the project in convincing SSGs that this work was valuable. They enjoy it but this interest could wane – need to strengthen the links in their minds to the rest of the groups work and with income generating programmes etc. Feedback remained a critical aspect of this. As more was likely to happen in future, it is a good time to review this.

#### **4. Project Evaluation**

Solomon presented the key outcomes/conclusions of the final evaluation conducted by Ms Mine Pubari. It focused heavily on the way forward and seemed to have been acknowledged to be a useful process.

An aide memoire summarising the evaluations findings is attached with these notes.

The Advisory group noted the conclusions of the evaluation which we felt were generally accurate. They presented a number of action points and challenges which would need to be addressed either before the end of the current project in June 2005 or in the main during the follow up commencing July 2005 for 2 years.

#### **5. Project sustainability and follow up**

The successful proposal to Darwin and a summary of outcomes was circulated. These comprise:

1. further strengthen the existing monitoring network of key government and non-government conservation agencies through targeted training and the development of additional monitoring tools.
2. place future training firmly in the hands of national agencies, through the delivery of 'training for trainers' and the development of a targeted monitoring manual.
3. enhance and harmonise biodiversity monitoring databases, in particular by securing agreement on data quality and sharing and integrating existing databases with a new web-based database
4. enhance the capacity of existing Site Support Groups and replicate the detailed monitoring by these local community groups at three new sites.
5. Significantly improve the use of monitoring data in site management plans, in conservation action and in policy formulation.
6. Improve the dissemination of results.

We agreed that stakeholders had been less involved in developing this proposal than we would have liked and that while the main details would meet with general support, a fairly extensive consultation should take place to refine details. This would start with a workshop probably in May based around the NLC institutions together with site support groups. The findings of the evaluation would also need to be built into the programme. Among issues discussed in brief at the meeting

- The best targets for training in relation to different tiers of staff and also to the correct emphasis of organised training courses for new staff versus facilitation of agencies to undertake their own in house training
- The need to permanently influence the curriculum e.g. of new trainee rangers – this would include training for lecturers
- On databases we still need to assess the main information and training needs. The detailed monitoring databases need to be revamped. Ideally Birdlife staff would be involved in a roundtable meeting with the project team and agency staff. We need to beware of trying to spread the scope and resources of this project too far – we will not solve all the problems of data management and sharing in Kenya. We should focus on the WBDB and its links e.g. with detailed monitoring and the Kenya Birdfinder system. Then on how other agencies can best link into this, but perhaps confine this to FD and KWS at least initially..
- Detailed monitoring and SSGs – need to review what has been done and the lessons learned. Try and progress the basic analysis of the data we have. Then link more to issues of sustainability and how it can benefit SSGs.
- We should look at doing additional peer reviewed papers and also popular articles

## **6 Future of the advisory group**

Agreed that the future Advisory group should be more Kenyan in focus. It would normally meet in Kenya and NEMA and FD would be invited to join. Three UK members would continue to be on the group and would attend wherever possible but it should be controlled from Kenya and might meet without the presence of any UK representatives on occasion.

## **7 Any other business**

We noted the need to capture project outcomes which were less obvious. For example the posters produced for SBSTTA and CBD CoP meetings had featured the project as had the publication 'state of the worlds' birds'.

Action: LF to send any additional material from Secretariat to PB, SM to send additional materials from Kenya